

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:07 p.m., Tuesday, October 27, 2020, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Joe Dodson, Brian McClure, Brian Caldwell, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: So, I will call this meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, October 27th, at 6:07 p.m. We will begin this regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Our next item is our community invocation, which will be led tonight by Michael Pearson with the Seventh Day Adventist Church. If you would all join us in the invocation or take this as a moment of silence. Mr. Pearson, thank you for being here. We appreciate it very much.

Pearson: Thank you. Almighty God, we recognize that a few moments ago you bore witness to our pledging allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible. And like you I pray that we as a community will be found to be indivisible, celebrating the many things that we have in common and being respectful of each other where we disagree and we pray, too, for the United States of America as a whole over the next few months. So, I ask that you will pour out your love and your grace and your forbearance onto us, that the citizens of the City of Meridian will be seen to be a people who serve each other and in that way serve you and so to this end I pray for your presence here this evening, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

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

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: I understand we did have someone sign up under the public forum.

Johnson: Yes, Mr. Mayor, Ryan Lancaster, and he's joining the meeting as a panelist now.

Simison: Okay. Mr. Lancaster, you will be recognized for three minutes. If you could state your name and address for the record.

Lancaster: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, my name is Ryan Lancaster. I reside at 346 East Moskee Street in Meridian. I am also a transportation commissioner for the city. On there there is seats for two technical experts and I am one of those with a degree and employment as a traffic engineer. I come to you tonight to speak about the Eagle Road and Amity intersection that you have on your agenda as number two. I listened to your joint meeting with the ACHD commission last week and I want to address you before you discuss this on your agenda. At the previous meeting Councilman Cavener mentioned how Public Works is taken for granted. In contrast in traffic engineering we have a phrase that everyone that has a driver's license thinks they are a traffic engineer. And I saw some of that in your meeting last week. I'm familiar with that project. As a commission we have discussed that project, both the roundabout and the path crossings. Both those were discussed in your meeting last week. I, as a traffic engineer, as a professional, not employed by ACHD, I'm employed elsewhere, but with my experience as a traffic engineer with designing roundabouts, I'm very much in favor of the roundabout project. Some of the concerns that you addressed there last week, such as driver familiarity, pedestrian crossings, those are actually benefits to roundabouts. A roundabout -- it slows driver speeds. The pedestrian crossings are shortened and benefit from the lower speeds in the roundabout. So, instead of one crossing, you cross a wide signal, for instance, there is two crossings across a shorter distance. So, these are actually benefits. As far as neighborhood concerns, I go back to that statement that everyone that has a driver's

license thinks they are a traffic engineer. You know, in reviewing that project and listening to the ACHD's comments last week, you know, I think they -- they have done a fine professional job and I ask you to support the project as designed. You know, somebody that I work with said once upon a time that they appreciate feedback, they appreciate involvement in projects. Don't trip a project at the last minute and I'm afraid that's, you know, some of the -- the notions that were discussed last week. I'm afraid that's what's happening. So, I ask that you, please, don't trip this project that at the last moment. You know, when you have concerns I ask that --

Simison: Mr. Lancaster, your three minutes has expired. That's what that noise was. So, thank you very much. We appreciate it.

Lancaster: Thank you, Mayor.

Simison: Okay. Did we have anyone else sign up under the public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Public Hearing for Gateway at 10 Mile (H-2020-0046) by GFI - Meridian Investments III, LLC, Located at the Northeast Corner of N. Ten Mile Rd. and W. Franklin Rd.**
 - A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of approximately 41.28 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the C-G (26.54 acres) and R-40 (14.74) zoning districts to accommodate the future construction of a mixed-use commercial and high density residential development.

Simison: Okay. All right. Then with that we will move into our Action Items for tonight's agenda. The first item up is a public hearing for Gateway at Ten Mile, H-2020-0046. I will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council. I have been trying to reduce and make my hearing outlines more concise, but with this project it was very complex and took a lot of analysis, so bear with me on my long outline. Hold on, let's get this presentation going. Okay. So, the application before you is for an annexation of approximately 41.2 acres of land, currently zoned RUT in Ada county, with a request to rezone them to C-G and R-40, with 24 and 17 acres respectively. It is located on the northeast corner of Ten Mile and Franklin and lies within the Ten Mile specific area plan as well. These zoning districts accommodate future construction of a mixed use commercial and high density residential development. There is no subdivision proposed with this application at this time. Again, this application is only for annexation and the development agreement that will be tied to the sub -- the submitted concept plan. Future development should, therefore, be based on this DA and the concept plan. The subject site lies within the Ten Mile interchange specific area plan as noted and has a future land

use designation of mixed use commercial. There are some very specific goals and policies within the Ten Mile plan that should be met. Since there are no other concurrent applications associated with this project, staff anticipates further refinement of this concept plan as end users are identified and a traffic impact study is completed in the future. With this site residing within the Ten Mile area plan, as many goals and policies of the plan as possible should be met. The four main points are -- I guess some that I outlined in my staff report are as follows: Traditional neighborhood design concepts that have a strong pedestrian oriented focus. Street oriented design is also critical in urban environments and especially at a gateway to the Ten Mile area such as this. Buildings should be as close to the property line creating a consistent edge to the public space and making streets more friendly and walkable. Incorporating plazas between compatible uses to provide shared outdoor seating and to enhance pedestrian circulation between users is also key. There is another goal in these areas to achieve a floor area ratio of one to 1.25 or more. Staff notes that this FAR for short is indeed a goal and not a prescribed standard, as achieving this will be very difficult for any development. Staff and the applicant have had discussions regarding this goal and the Ten Mile plan goal of two story or more structures and how it applies to the overall concept. To help meet the intent of this goal staff has recommended provisions that all commercial structures along the main thoroughfare, which is this blue line through the center here, will have a ceiling height -- all those buildings will have a ceiling height of at least 12 to 15 feet for the ground level commercial. This is also the only road that has on-street parking -- parallel parking. This minimum height for the first level commercial helps create placemaking along this road and the provision is consistent with language within the Ten Mile specific area plan. There is a small area near the northeast corner of the site that is adjacent to the railroad tracks and shows a civic future land use with a transit station icon on the future land use map. This area is labeled as civic to serve as a placeholder for future multimodal transportation options should they arise. The applicant plans to incorporate that area into their proposed R-40 zoning district. The applicant shows this area as an open space area to act as a placeholder as it may be decades before it develops as a public transportation hub. It should be noted that the city and outside agencies, like that of COMPASS and VRT, do not currently have specific plans for how a mass transit within the valley will work within the rail corridor or at this specific location. It should also -- it should also be noted that COMPASS is currently doing a study to determine the corridor -- the rail corridor and mode for the I-84 alternative -- alternative analysis. Council should be aware that the applicant is choosing to work with staff on preserving this area for the benefit of the city and not necessarily for themselves, which is very much appreciated. The applicant has continued to be open to working with staff on current and future uses for this area of the site. The subject site currently has multiple curb cuts onto Ten Mile and Franklin. The applicant desires to keep a majority of these accesses, but not all of them. According to ACHD, a traffic impact study will be required for future development of this site. Because of this staff is not conditioning the accesses until such time that the property is subdivided and a TIS is submitted. Along the eastern boundary the master street map and Ten Mile area plan show a future collector roadway along almost the entire eastern boundary that connects down to Franklin and into the Ten Mile Crossing Subdivision on the south side of Franklin. This intersection is intended -- this intersection at Franklin is intended to be signalized in the future. However, this collector roadway cannot be built as it is proposed

-- at its proposed connection point to West Franklin at this time due to the applicant not owning the property that directly abuts Franklin Road. The applicant is agreeing to construct half plus 12 of the public right of way on the area of the site that they do own in the southeast corner of their site. In addition, directly to the east of this site is light industrial zoning where a new FedEx distribution center is under construction. Since the FedEx distribution center was approved without constructing the north-south collector roadway on the shared property line as shown on the master street map and it was not required of this because it already had the zoning, it is not a feasible option -- it is not, therefore, feasible to require this applicant to construct the collector roadway as shown on the master street map. Instead the east-west connection for a collector roadway will be this road here, as was required with the FedEx distribution center and with subsequent applications that we are working through at the administrative level to the further east and also on industrial zoning. Other than the access points to Ten Mile and Franklin Road, the road will be -- the road network will be the backbone of connectivity for this development and is, therefore, incredibly important to future development of this site. These areas appear to be shown on the submitted concept plan as a combination of public streets, private streets and drive aisles. Staff believes creating a public thoroughfare should help traffic flow and create a grand drive through development lined with street trees and pedestrian walkways. In line with this staff previously recommended changing the requested zoning from C-G and R-40 to the traditional neighborhood districts. This recommendation was made with the intent to ensure pedestrian oriented design and ensure some multi-story buildings on the subject site in order to comply with the Comprehensive Plan and the Ten Mile plan. Since the original publication of the staff report, the applicant and staff have worked to create a more refined concept plan that includes an overall stepping in building height from the arterials towards the interior of the site and incorporate the street sections that mirror those within this specific area plan as seen on the bottom left of your screen and top right. These types of street -- sorry. These proposed street sections show on-street parking, bike lanes, parkways with a tree canopy and detached sidewalk. These types of street designs are largely what a complete street should look like and offers walkable and inviting neighborhoods for both the residential and commercial component projects. An additional change from the original plan with the applicant's addition of three story townhomes along the main thoroughfare of the site that front on the roadway, instead of towards the additional multi-family. These three story townhomes are a welcome additional housing type on site and should help to create placemaking within the transition between high density residential uses and commercial uses on the subject site. Because of these changes staff is now more comfortable with the requesting -- with the requested zoning designations of C-G and R-40. These revisions make the development more consistent with the policies outlined in the mixed use commercial designation, specifically those that promote different housing types and an integration of commercial and residential uses. The applicant has also proposed plazas within the commercial nodes and has provided an exhibit of these plazas as seen on the screen here. The exhibit shows what appears to be raised crossings for vehicles, which add pedestrian safety, benches with trees -- within tree grates and sails providing shade for bistro tables between the commercial buildings and shared outdoor spaces. Staff finds that these -- these details within the submitted exhibit show integration of pedestrian elements and better access to the proposed commercial retail buildings for

those who will live and work on site or nearby. Future development of these plazas should minimally contain these main elements to ensure compliance with the Ten Mile area plan and Comprehensive Plan. Staff has recommended provisions in line with these elements. The site does offer at least two constraints, the civic use previously discussed and the very southwest corner of the site that is constrained by the Ten Mile Creek. This creek and its location will severely limit any use in this section of the site. The revised concept plan has a note stating possible ACHD -- ACHD pond relocation in this area of the site, which the current location of that is near the north -- southeast corner right here and ACHD. There is no guarantee that ACHD will agree to relocating their pond and the applicant should be open to a number of possible options on this constrained piece of property. This corner of the property is approximately one and a half acres, including the easement area, and is highly visible from public roadways. This area should, therefore, be treated with great care and consideration of its intended use. During the commission meeting the main issues discussed were the viability of allowing up to two building permits prior to any platting process or -- and before an approved traffic impact study, which staff did not support that request. There were questions regarding the access -- access points and if they were provisionally approved by the city, the location and potential future use of the civic and transit area along the north boundary of the site, the overall vehicular travel layout mostly focused on new location of collector roadway versus that shown on the master street map, including where a future signal is planned at Franklin Road. And what is the relation of the corner -- the southwest corner as discussed in terms of development of other areas within the Ten Mile area. The only change that the Commission had to the staff report was revising one of the conditions to include some of the language that the applicant requested and after that -- well, the Commission did recommend approval to the City Council and following that I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Joe, thank you so much for that presentation. Just a quick question about that southwest corner. From what I have seen and what I understand to be the issue with the creek, would that -- no matter what goes in there is that going to be pedestrian only? I mean there is -- there is, obviously, no access from the arterials. So, how would that be accessed if it were used for any kind of public use?

Dodson: Council Woman Perreault, Members of the Council, great question. Yeah. This is something that we have -- myself -- staff and the applicant have gone around and around with. There are currently two access points to this small area that are used by the irrigation district, but other than that I -- I could not anticipate ACHD allowing any public access to this. If it were we have had internal discussions that have not had anything confirmed by ACHD that it might be beginning of a trailhead to continue the master pathway, but I'm not entirely sure if ACHD would be on board with that. Otherwise, yes, it would be all pedestrian connected from the interior of the lot, which they could add a

pedestrian bridge here. That was one of the discussions within my staff report that anything on this corner is probably going to be very pedestrian focused and not vehicular.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you very much. I can tell on this application that the planning staff has put a huge amount of effort into getting this one right and it's a very important project. Can you try to maybe elaborate for us a little bit the challenges meeting our -- I guess prescribed or desired floor area ratio. Is it truly that we can't make the calculation or an estimate? Is it an economic challenge for the developer in terms of going vertical? Exactly -- help us understand the dynamic there of why we can't try to strive for that.

Dodson: Council Woman Strader, Members of the Council, again, thank you. Great question on that. From my experience, the biggest hurdle is the economic hurdle for the applicant on that side of it and getting a -- you know, 40 acres, getting a floor area ratio of a hundred percent of one point or higher is very difficult. You are probably going to have minimum five story type of buildings, especially on the residential side, in order to accommodate that type of square footage compared to this site and, obviously, going vertical creates more cost to the applicant. It's -- again, it's not a prescribed standard, it's something that Ten Mile plan strives for. My understanding is that that kind of floor area ratio has not been met anywhere in the Ten Mile area, let alone the city. Part of that discussion with the applicant has been that the city is just not quite at that population density yet in order to require that type of density. Again, not necessarily meaning that we shouldn't strive for it, but what the applicant has done instead has tried to create a small step in height. So, along the arterials it's one story and, then, mostly multi-story here and, then, three story and, then, four stories closer to the interior, which for the R-40 zoning district should have a very high floor area ratio for that area. Again, it's not something that staff took lightly to just let go in a way, but it is something that we understand that if we consistently make a hard line in the sand on that, then, we may not be getting a lot of that development along this Ten Mile area for the foreseeable future.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions for staff at this time? Okay. Next we will invite the applicant to, please, come forward where they will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, the applicant's representative is raising her hand, but she is in the meeting as a panelist and should be able to unmute and speak.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, can you hear me?

Simison: Yes, we can, Stephanie. If you would state your name and address for the record, please.

Leonard: Thank you. Stephanie Leonard. 9233 West State, Boise. 83714. I'm going to attempt to share my screen real quick, too. Mayor, Members of Council, thank you for having us here this evening, allowing us the opportunity to attend both virtually and in person. So, I think if you -- can you all see my screen? Okay. We are really excited to be here tonight to discuss this project. As Joe mentioned, we have been working with staff for several months on this project to get the plan to a place that we are happy with and that the staff in our development team feel comfortable with as well. So, we are requesting annexation and zoning for the future mixed use commercial and residential projects, which is located at the northeast corner of Ten Mile and Franklin Road. We are requesting to annex from the RUT district to the R-40 and C-G districts. Pretty consistent with a lot of the developments that's happened -- or is going to be happening in the area. There is commercial located to the west and to the north and, then, high density residential to the north and, then, southeast. A couple of properties that are not yet annexed into the city at the northwest and southwest corners. As you can see on this map, the site is located in a great location. We really perceive this project being a premier area of Meridian and a place that folks are entering the city they can stop and dine or shop or potentially live and work in the same spot. So, the property is approximately 40 acres, as Joe mentioned. This is a photo that was taken last winter sometime that shows -- there is a lot more development that's occurred since this photo was taken, but it does show the area pretty well. Our site is -- I don't know if you can see me outlining with my mouse or not, but it's the square that's kind of in the central part of the photo and, then, there is the Ten Mile Crossing project to the south, which has quite a bit more development that's occurred since this photo and the FedEx distribution center, which is located directly to our east and zoned I-L. There is existing residential and a small commercial development to the north and, then, storage center and a religious facility to the west. So, we are located adjacent to the Ten Mile and Franklin Road, most of which have been improved to their full width with sidewalk and five to seven lanes, depending on where they are located. We are also about a mile north of I-84, so we are really a great location for access and along major transportation corridors for -- for easy facilitation of the site. Joe already commented, so I will be quick. But our future land use designation for this site is mixed use commercial and the Ten Mile interchange specific area plan and as Joe alluded to the Ten Mile Plan and pretty stringent on quite a few of the requirements, so that was one of the reasons we had the opportunity to work with staff so closely and -- to make sure that our plan is really adhering to what the city foresees for this area, as well as what the Comprehensive Plan calls for. So, the zoning districts that we are requesting, combined with the design elements that we have included in our development plan, reflect this land use and we really think that the mixed use commercial as being fulfilled with our development plan. So, as you can see on this map, too, where we are adjacent to other areas that are -- the land use is mixed use commercial to the south and, then, southwest and, then, commercial and high density residential. So, initially, when we met with staff -- I think it was in February of this year, we had a general idea of what we wanted to propose for this -- for this project and this property, but we didn't have a concrete place to kind of start, so we -- in meeting with them staff recommended that we come up with a bubble diagram to kind of provide a conceptual idea of what we wanted to develop on the property. This developed -- or this bubble diagram that you see on the left is the result of those conversations and what we submitted with our annexation

application. Since that initial concept we have modified the plan significantly and Joe mentioned and you kind of saw briefly, through various conversations and kind of working with our -- our development team to see what would work best with the Comprehensive Plan and the Ten Mile plan what our -- the developers would like to see on the property. So, we have developed this development plan, which as you can see is no longer conceptual, but it's much more of a concrete idea towards the property. This revised plan includes elements specifically requested by staff. Parkways, detached sidewalks, close to residences and pedestrian oriented street design, which are specifically called out in the Ten Mile plan. We also have a diversity of residential products that we are proposing, as well as a lot of variety in the commercial properties that are -- are shown on this site, too. We all -- we do feel that the orientation of the buildings that we have shown here, as well as the stories that Joe kind of went along to describe along our main road fulfill a lot of the -- the goals of the Ten Mile plan. We did take this into account with this design and has really used some of the natural buffering located within the railroad easement and, then, also on the east side for the industrial use to the -- to the east to naturally buffer the -- the developments we are proposing. The commercial and office uses that we are proposing along the arterials were located there basically provide a nice buffer for the residential uses that are located on the east part of the site. I really think that placing these commercial properties in offices and other employment areas along the arterials will provide for easy access and will kind of create a natural transition from the maybe more heavily traffic uses to the more residential uses. We are requesting the R-40 zoning district for approximately 17 acres. We do have four story executive style apartment buildings that we are proposing, as well as three story townhome units. This was per staff's direction that we include more of a variation in the type of residential units that we were proposing. In -- in working with them we actually -- it does create more of a variety for a multitude of demographics that could potentially live here, as well as provides a decent amount of residential property for people that might want to live and work in the same spot, so -- and as always the development of the multi-family components will be required to go through subsequent approval. So, this is a general plan and development idea, but they will kind of be further changed as they go further down the process. For the C-G zoning district it's going to be comprised of approximately 24 acres. We have 15 buildings that we are showing here and as I mentioned the orientation and the height of these buildings was carefully thought out and discussed with staff. We felt that this is going to be an easily utilized area and also complies well with the Ten Mile plan. We have focused on pedestrian orientation and kind of gearing the place for pedestrian uses, while also focusing on providing some employment opportunities that would help to serve the adjacent residential properties and then -- so, as part of our discussions with staff we did -- they were asked -- they asked us to provide a little bit more detail on how the site would actually function and what site circulation would look like. We provided these exhibits to demonstrate kind of how pedestrians, vehicles, and bicycles with all work together and kind of flow throughout the site. We do have street sections that will clearly delineate exactly how that works, too. Per staff's request we changed this northern roadway to a public road and we have the main kind of corridor roadway that Joseph was -- was mentioning. So, these are the street sections that we have developed that coincide well with the Ten Mile plan. We actually almost directly modeled them from the Ten Mile plan to make sure that we are complying with the requirements there. The street section on

the north side is going to be -- is going to have two travel lanes. It will have two bike lanes and, then, sidewalks that will be buffered by landscaping to -- to really kind of create a safe pedestrian environment, but also an efficient use for vehicles and bicycles. The second street section provides even more of a buffer for pedestrian use, as well as some parallel parking on the -- on the outsides of the lane and that's shown on this. These designs are shown in the Ten Mile plan, but will be subject to ACHD requirements, so they will go through their review and will be part of our traffic impact study as well. So, part of our discussions with staff really directed us into developing a semantic exhibit to show how our plaza areas will function and be used for pedestrian oriented designed and complies with the Ten Mile plan -- let me back up real quick. These are located at the center of the north -- the northwest part of the site and in the southwest part of the site. These plazas are really supposed to be an area for people to gather and to kind of vary all the different types of uses that will be occurring on this project. We were asked to connect the commercial areas with the multi-family to provide space for the different users to gather in one space and feel that this is really going to help facilitate that. We do have the seating areas. We have the shade structures that we are proposing as well. Those designs will be further defined as we go through the development process, but this is kind of just a general idea to kind of give you a picture of what could be. We also have vehicle -- kind of raised vehicle areas to allow them to travel through this space as well, but to also delineate pedestrian space between vehicle space, so -- so, we -- we are in agreement with staff's recommendation and Commission's recommendation to you tonight. We do have a couple of changes that we would like to request just to the phrasing of a couple of conditions just to make sure it's super clear for -- for us as we go through the development process. So, the first one is for Condition A-1-B. The only change we would like to make here is to delete the -- the last part of the sentence which is the specific development plan as approved by Council, with basically if this project is approved tonight and you agree with these conditions, this wouldn't be a necessary part to include in the -- in this condition, so we would just like ask that it be omitted from this condition and the second one is just some rephrasing in some of the conditions to make sure that it's reflecting what we are proposing with the roadway. So, we just changed I believe the southeast and northeast and, then, we wanted to delay the approved development plan that we are proposing. So, overall I think, you know, we are very excited about this project. It's been a pleasure to work with staff and to kind of get such a close interaction with them and the feedback on -- on the proposed project. As Joe mentioned we have gone through several iterations and we -- we initially were I believe scheduled to be heard in June, but we requested continuance a couple times just to make sure that we really get it right. So, we are excited about this project and think it has been designed in the best way to be -- to comply with the Ten Mile plan and the Comprehensive Plan and think that it aligns well with our -- our plans for the property, as well as the city. So, I -- I'm available for questions remotely and, then, we have got our client and developers are there in person, I believe, and we have also got members of our development team there, as well as one of our developers online as well. So, I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Stephanie. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: A couple of short ones. Stephanie, as part of this application I saw a reference in the staff report to a DA being a required condition. Is that -- am I seeing that correct?

Leonard: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Borton, that is correct. And we are proposing to enter into the development agreement. As part of this application we did include some conditions, too, that we would like to be included in, as well as this development plan.

Borton: Okay. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: A couple quick follow ups. Some of the discussion in that report of whether the mixed use commercial versus the TN-R -- is the DA -- is the DA going to provide some of that certainty on -- on the elements that you have described in this proposal that -- that makes at least our staff comfortable with that recommendation of the mixed use commercial being the right zone?

Leonard: Sure. Councilman Borton, I believe that initially staff had recommended that we do -- we pursue that TN-R and the TN-C, the traditional neighborhood and traditional neighborhood center districts to comply with the mixed use commercial and, then, through several iterations that we have revised they feel more comfortable with C-G and R-40 zoning districts, so they -- they recommended approval on those districts I believe as we -- as we have requested. I think that that -- I would imagine that will be included in the development agreement.

Borton: Okay. Thank you. One more final question if I could. The -- the southwest corner where it says possible ACHD pond relocation, can you highlight if -- if there is no relocation what is that intended to look like once build out and if there was a relocation what, then, might it look like? I'm trying to get an understanding of the two paths a very important corner may take.

Leonard: Councilman Borton, I believe, honestly, right now we don't have a defined plan with it. I think that our clients may come up to speak, actually, to give a little bit more light on something I'm not aware of, but I believe the intent is to speak with ACHD to see if that might be an option. If it is that would be probably the preferred venue to go down, just because as Joe mentioned, that this space is just pretty hard to use. It may not be allowed to have access points to it and there is a fairly decent easement there with the ditch that's there, but it doesn't develop into the ACHD pond or if it's not relocated to that location I would imagine -- I think that we are talking about leaving it open or using it as kind of space for pedestrians and -- and other folks to use, but that might be something I will have our client come up and speak about it further.

Borton: Okay. Thanks, Stephanie. I didn't see a specific DA condition or condition of approval that referenced what it would need to look like, but it might be there and I missed it. So, thank you.

Leonard: Okay. Thanks.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Joe.

Dodson: If I may just respond to a couple of those comments by Mr. Borton. Councilman Borton, to answer your first question there are some very specific DA provisions that do outline some of those traditional neighborhood and street oriented design requirements. That would be in the code of the TN-R and TN-C and that's why I put those in there, so that they -- we can hold them to those through the DA, rather than the zoning. It should function very much the same way. There is some additional design requirements about the building facades as well for the commercial also in line with the Ten Mile plan and, then, regarding your question about the southwest corner, I do have a DA provision S is specifically for that. I have two or three different options in there. First of which being if -- you know, if the ACHD pond relocation could occur there, obviously, they would beautify it and use that as -- as a little bit of an entry feature there, which the applicant has understood and agreed to. If that doesn't work, then, to coordinate with the Parks Department to include something that is a public benefit and public use there and, then, if that can't be figured out, then, the applicant would have I guess a little more leeway to create some kind of area for a pedestrian focused specialty use in that corner. So, those are the -- the three options that I outlined in that DA provision.

Borton: Perfect. Thank you, Joe.

Dodson: You are very welcome.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I have a few questions for Stephanie. Stephanie, it's good to hear from you --

Leonard: You, too.

Perreault: -- this evening. So, can you give me some idea of -- obviously, this is still conceptual. What -- what is the anticipated build out of this in terms of commercial first or residential first and is it going to be, essentially, the same owner or group that is -- that is building this out, meaning like are they going to be selling these pad sites and overseeing how all of this is -- is constructed and developed and the -- with the anticipated timelines or is this -- I mean are they just going to plat it and, then, sell those individual,

you know, lots off and make it constructed when it -- get constructed when the new owner proceeds forward? So, can you give us some idea of the anticipated -- anticipated timeline for what this would look like as far as residential versus commercial? You know, is the anticipation to sell what's closer to the arterials or -- I think you probably understand where I'm going with that.

Leonard: Council Woman Perreault, I don't -- I don't know the timeline strictly. I do know that we are -- we are trying to get a preliminary plat and a traffic impact study going as soon as we can, so that we can process this property out and really have a better defined development plan for the future. I know that in the past the developer typically holds the property and they sell the lots as they go. So, they actually develop the pad sites and they will do the multi-family residential as well. I don't know if they have got a plan to do the residential before the commercial, but my understanding is that they do have some commercial tenants that are interested in the property. So, I anticipate that it will probably go, as you had mentioned, with the pad sites along the arterial roadways and, then, to the residential portion. And they -- as I mentioned they are there in the chambers, so they can speak to that probably a little bit more than I would be able to. Does that answer all of your questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Stephanie, thank you. It -- it does mostly, but I wouldn't mind with the Mayor's permission hearing from -- hearing from your other parties about what the -- what the anticipated -- I don't -- I'm not looking for a specific schedule. I guess my main concern is that they would start first with the residential and, then, the commercial would take a significant amount of time to -- to move forward and -- and you would have this project up in these -- in a variety of phases and maybe not be so appealing for -- for quite some time.

Gasser: Trevor Gasser. 74 East 500 South, Suite 200, Bountiful, Utah. Council Woman, to answer that question we don't know the exact timeline that this will build out. It is a couple years off as we still finish off, you know, subdividing the property. Our intent has been to build and hold. That is our intent. It doesn't mean that is for sure what will happen in the future on it, but that is our intent to build and hold. There will be phasing on the property. We don't plan on building the whole thing at the exact same time, because we don't like to speculate when it comes to our commercial properties, we wait until we have a tenant in place and, then, we build for that tenant. So, that, you know, we are not vacant with a bunch of buildings here and the property suffers and so that's -- that's typically how we have done our developments. As far as if the residential will come before the commercial, I would think -- we will start on probably both around the same time and I think you can build a portion of the residential and, then, we will probably in-fill with commercial as -- as tenants come forward and we sign leases with tenants.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant at this time?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: A quick question. You talked about phasing and whatnot. What -- what section would that be if you do a phase one, two, three, so on?

Gasser: We have not decided on which one would be a phase one. You know, again, it's going to depend on what tenants come to us and where they want to locate and it will -- it will depend on that as far as where we start. But I think once we get further down the road on the platting process we will be able to identify, you know, more of a phasing plan.

W.Gasser: Mr. Mayor, I'm speaking remotely, but I am also one of the applicants. This is Walt Gasser. I reside at 2299 Woodhollow Way in Bountiful, Utah. I'm speaking with you from Utah tonight for reasons of COVID. Appreciate the time to visit with Council and with you.

Simison: Mr. Gasser, are you attempting to answer the question or are --

W.Gasser: No, I would be happy to answer the question.

Simison: Okay.

W.Gasser: I would like to just add to this question, because there is several that have been asked by Councilman Borton and Council Woman Perreault. With regards to the most recent one, as Trevor indicated to you, usually in a development like this -- I have been in the development business for 45 years and we go forward and we never know for sure which one comes first. Where these are -- this is a strong intersection and Brighton's Ten Mile Crossing to the south is creating a lot of activity, could very well lead that some of the commercial who would go first. Could be some of the office first and it could really be some of the townhouses and multi-family. We just have to -- as we go forward try and make this happen in an orderly manner and -- and as Trevor indicated to you we don't want to go forward with something that we are spec'ing at all, we want to make sure we have a good development that's been annexed properly and is laid out right. With regards to Mr. Borton's question on the southwest corner of the pond, if you will notice in the drawing that's in front of you that dotted line between those two one story buildings and the possible ACHD pond location, is about time and a half larger than the actual possible ACHD pond relocation. That is a hundred foot easement that Nampa-Caldwell Irrigation District has in there and we are not sure what we can really do in that hundred foot easement area. So, the -- the probable area of development is just that small area right on the corner. It still has the two access points that come into the property, but those access points are really only utilized by the Nampa-Caldwell Irrigation District and we would like to follow what the staff has recommended. We have not approached ACHD yet, but we intend to talk with members of the city Parks Department to explore ideas they might have for public use of this property, as well as private use for us in helping us figure out what would be the best use. We recognize this is a very focal point

and it is a very important point to us, it's just sort of awkward, because the majority of that southwest corner is an easement and, then, there is the creek as part of that easement area. So, we will endeavor to spend a lot of time on that and make sure that what we do will -- it will come to the city and it will be presented to them as we don't have the detail on it now for -- you will have another look at this in the future. Originally when we started this pre-ap process back in February, we had mentioned to staff that we estimated that this project could be two to five years away, just -- just depending on where we were with regards to the demand and, you know, the commercial demand has really declined all across the country and a lot of the big box retailers that we have worked with in the past, some have taken out bankruptcy and others just aren't building right now and so we have tried to lay out a plan that we thought would allow us to go forward without relying on a big box retailer and though we have built 50 Kmart stores in the country, one in Sandpoint, one in Burley and one in Idaho Falls in Idaho, we just -- Kmart is taking out bankruptcy. We have built Albertsons in four or five locations in Utah, as well as in Blackfoot, Idaho, and -- and yet there is -- we just have to look at this and decide what are the real tenants that we can get. So, our -- our plan has been to get a development plan that we think we can do and, then, just do our very best to make it possible and look at the timing and -- and we don't know if it would be apartments before commercial or commercial before apartments, it just depends what the demand dictates. One other thing if I could, Mr. Mayor, unless you -- if I haven't answered those questions. There is -- Mr. Borton and -- and Mr. Dodson in his presentation talked a little bit about accesses. I would like to make a comment to you on the access if that would be permitted now, if you would rather have me wait.

Simison: Go ahead.

W.Gasser: With regards to the accesses, originally we showed four accesses on Ten Mile and two accesses on Franklin. We had a meeting with staff that was a Zoom meeting in June and ACHD was also present on that call and they had done quite a bit of legwork to help us understand their policies with regards to these accesses and we discovered soon that the parameters and the ACHD policy didn't really fit the four accesses that had been developed already and put in by ACHD as this was -- was built, because they didn't really know it would maybe just be one larger owner that would do all of the development. So, we have come back in the development plan and we have eliminated two of those accesses and one of which isn't technically eliminated, because it's still the access that Nampa-Caldwell will be using on Ten Mile when they service the irrigation ditch, but one we did eliminate and we tried to take the spacing on those -- on the two remaining accesses on Ten Mile to where they met the requirements that ACHD pointed out to us in their policy distancewise from Ten Mile and Franklin, the distance to the first intersection for a full intersection and, then, from -- coming north going south from the railroad track. So, we have -- we have tried to design that in accordance with what we believe they were asking us. Trevor had mentioned we -- and Stephanie, we have commissioned a traffic impact study and that is taking place right now and we hope that as that completes that we, then, can ascertain the points that we have shown to date. We also moved one of the accesses on Franklin that was the -- there is two there. One is the access at the Ten Mile Crossing that Brighton has been developing to tie in across the street directly with

where the new traffic signal is. A little further to the west we had made another access on the bubble plan, but we have relocated and pushed that a little further, because that spacing was too close to the traffic signal that Brighton was developing that would go back to the FedEx building and so we have tried to be responsive the best that we could as we go through this to make sure that we have flexibility and we think this development plan will be verified from the traffic impact study without any real major modifications. We think the two accesses on Ten Mile and Franklin are both warranted. The Franklin -- second Franklin would just be a right-in, right-out, but we appreciate the support we have had from staff. There has been a lot of questions, because this is a difficult area to develop in under the parameters of the Ten Mile plan and we have tried very hard to be cooperative and listen to their input and, then, take their input and we have changed these drawings many many times as I think Mr. Dodson indicated. We have tried to use local architects and engineers that are familiar with typical issues in the City of Meridian and hope that will add help to us as we finalize the project and continue to go forward in our platting and ultimately in the development of the project.

Simison: Thank you.

W.Gasser: I would be happy to answer any questions that anyone might have if you would like to direct them to me.

Simison: Thank you. Council, I don't know if that answered more questions or if --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Not a question, but just a comment for the applicant. Thanks for that commentary. I think that was really helpful. Certainly one of the things that our city is striving to do as we develop our economy is to bring more family wage jobs here to Meridian, especially good paying ones that people don't have to commute so far, and I would just encourage you to keep working with the Community Development Department to try to attract the kind of commercial tenants that -- that we are really looking for and I know that's something that our city focuses on is bringing the right tenants here. So, I just wanted to make that comment. Thanks for answering those questions.

W.Gasser: Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Question for Joe. When ACHD works on their -- the traffic impact study, I'm curious about -- as Mr. Gasser mentioned, the Brighton and the light there at Franklin. I mean we are dealing -- will they be -- putting in some plans for that? I mean it's not part

of this project. You have got private property owners that -- that it would have to intersect. When does that come about? When -- how does that fit into this -- this project.

Dodson: Councilman Hoaglund, Members of the Council, so ACHD already has some type of plans for that signal. I think they already have some of the poles that are ready to go on both sides of the street. There is just nothing activated right now, because this one remaining RUT parcel right on this southeast corner of this site -- again, there is -- there is no road connection going -- public road connection going north from Franklin. So, until that site redevelops that connection to the interior of this site will not occur, unfortunately. Which, therefore, there won't be a signal there until that happens.

Hoaglund: So, Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: So, Joe, what you are saying is that if this moves forward there is development activity happening, it is likely that that would put the dominoes into play and that would, then, take place and so on and so forth, is that what I'm hearing?

Dodson: Council Hoaglund, yes, sir. I believe that -- you know, as you know when things start popping up around these RUT parcels that are kind of outparcels right along arterials, they -- it does kind of push the dominoes over. In addition, to the east -- not on the FedEx parcel, but further -- one more parcel over there is actually going to be another signal for Franklin and that property owner does own the rights to -- up to Franklin Road. So, there will be another signal a little ways down there that will be part of the east-west collector street that -- that we are requiring with this and, then, with regard to FedEx and, then, the other Amazon building to the east there. So, as that all gets constructed, which that area should be constructed sooner than this, we will have another connection to Franklin, which is beneficial.

Hoaglund: And, Mr. Mayor, I don't know if Justin from ACHD wants to weigh in on this or not. It's not required, but if you want to weigh in feel free to enlighten me further on -- on the -- how the dominoes fall in all of this, if you will.

Lucas: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councilman Hoaglund. For the record my name is Justin Lucas. I represent the Ada County Highway District. Business address is 3775 Adams Street in Garden City, Idaho. I think your staff articulated it pretty well. Before you tonight is only an annexation and zoning request and so ACHD hasn't reviewed a staff report. We don't do that until there is a more detailed application where the applicant is, then, you know, required to submit a traffic impact study. During a traffic impact study that's prepared by the applicant and reviewed by ACHD, they do signal warrant analysis, they do analysis of the different access points and turning movements, and that's when the decisions are made related to the requirements associated with signalization, how the site will function, if the signal cannot be put in because there is a parcel that doesn't allow it, all of that type of information would be analyzed at that point. And, then, it would come

back in front of the City Council. You would have an opportunity to see the outcome of that -- of that traffic impact study and the -- and the requirements that ACHD develops.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you, Justin.

Lucas: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant? Okay. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on the item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did have two people sign in, but they did not indicate wishing to testify.

Simison: Okay. Well, this is a public hearing. If anyone is present and would like to come forward and testify, please, do so at this time. If you are online you can use the raise your hand feature and we will bring you in to testify remotely on this item. Seeing no one who wishes to testify, would the applicant like to make any final comments?

W.Gasser: Yes. Mr. Mayor, this Walt Gasser again remotely. We understand what we heard from the short presentation from ACHD and we appreciate that commentary to help you and us better understand. At this time we are still asking for the approval of our development plan as proposed. We do have a provision in the development agreement that allows for some small adjustments if they are necessary and not the major deviation, which could come from the results of the traffic input study and, then, visiting with ACHD subsequently and as he mentioned, then, that would come back to the city for the development plan. At this time we still would ask that you would approve the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission to annex this property into the city with the zoning designation C-G and R-40 and also approve the development plan as we have submitted it at this time and that is all governed by the development agreement that we will work out with the city.

Simison: Thank you very much.

W.Gasser: Thank you.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: A couple of quick questions for staff if I could. Joe, the first question is on the October 27th proposed edits to two of the conditions of approval that the applicant has requested, that A-1-B and A-1-I I think it is, can you comment to each briefly, if there is any specific concern with either or both or what your position is on those.

Dodson: Councilman Borton, thank you. Thanks, Stephanie. Condition B I don't have problems with. I don't -- I think it's more of a semantics verbiage thing. I do understand

their request, just because with this approval it would be approving that concept plan and it's kind of redundant to state that. So, I'm fine with that. The second one is more to just clarify -- again, it's -- I think I -- I didn't write it the best. My college education didn't serve me well there. So, just having them clean it up is perfectly fine to me. It doesn't change the condition's intent at all.

Borton: Okay. Thanks, Joe. The second question concerns that civic parcel and for you -- or maybe the applicant, but what's the mechanism that encumbers that parcel to ensure it's -- it's preserved for future public use, you know, similar to an easement on it or -- I mean it's not deeded to the city, but what specifically ensures there will be some future rights retained by perhaps the city or another governmental entity to utilize that for a -- perhaps a transit node or some civic purpose.

Dodson: Yes. Councilman Borton -- and in my development agreement -- my staff report, provision H does outline that. It is reserved as civic through the development agreement, with some allowed interim uses, like overflow parking and open space. I discussed it more thoroughly in my staff report, but it -- it is difficult, because we -- the city doesn't have any specific plans right now and neither does COMPASS or VRT. It makes it difficult for us to say give us this property or you can't do this, you can't do that, because at the end of the day it is on their property. So, that is something that staff has worked through diligently and, like I said, the applicant has been very gracious and saved this area for us and asked that we just give them some of the timeline. So, in that DA provision we do have if by FY-2040 no valleywide study is adopted or the Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study determines the transit station is not necessary here, then, they will no longer have to maintain that area for a civic use and, then, they would be able to use it for their benefit fully. So, we do have some -- some parameters there, but the applicant and staff both understand that this is a long term hold and it's not something that's just going to go away in five years or something like that.

Borton: Okay. Thanks, Joe.

Dodson: You're very welcome.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Two questions for staff. I guess first question would be is it just too early to get West Ada to comment on what this would look like? Do we feel like just the timing is so far out that it didn't make sense at this stage or at what stage would you expect them to kind of comment on their ability to absorb some capacity in terms of student population? And, then, my second question may be harder to answer. You know, is 2040 an appropriate time frame to make that determination on whether that civic use will be realized? We have been talking about putting in rail for like as long as I can remember and I'm just wondering how we arrived at that time frame.

Dodson: Council Woman Strader, thank you for your question, yes. First one, West Ada, from my understanding, rarely -- well, I guess because there is no unit count proposed they are not going to give us an estimate. I don't have any idea how many units. I don't think the applicant knows what -- how many units they are going to propose. I presume that when we have a preliminary plat that shows more of these definitive numbers, then, West Ada will make their comments and -- and be able to tell us how much they can and cannot absorb. To your second question, that is more difficult, yes. That number, frankly, was given to me from my manager Caleb Hood and I believe that is directly related to some of the studies that are out there and some of the timelines that COMPASS has given us regarding multimodal transportation in the city. I personally don't know exactly when that will occur and that's why it's a fine line between hoping that we get it, because we do want multimodal transportation and it would be a great benefit to the valley, obviously. But, then, at the same time, respecting the private property rights and not requiring them to hold a piece of land for -- maybe in perpetuity when they could better use it for their site.

Strader: Thank you.

Dodson: You are welcome.

Simison: Council, any further questions or dialogue? Or motions?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Joe, do you feel like the development agreement as proposed that we are talking about right now, do you feel like we dotted all our I's and crossed all our T's? Is there anything we are missing or you think that you have concerns with?

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, I have gone over this more times than probably any of the other projects that I have done so far and had it reviewed by not only myself, but other staff, you know, beyond my supervisor. I believe that we have crossed as many of the T's and dotting our I's as much as possible and that includes some of those design requirements that we don't normally put in this, because we will say, hey, we will do this at design review, this is design requirements with the site design, and so we have added a lot of those provisions in here. So, I'm much more comfortable with this than where we started.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, one follow up.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Is it -- is it -- I know this is just a conceptual design for the most part. They are asking for -- to change the zoning and to be annexed, but if -- if need be at a -- at a future

point would the topic of residential -- the percentage of residential use versus commercial use in this project, can that be discussed at a future time as well?

Dodson: Councilman Bernt, I actually made a provision within the staff report that limits the -- that the residential cannot exceed 45 percent on the properties. I think currently it sits at about 40. So, I gave them a little bit of leeway if they -- let's say the civic use doesn't occur and they wanted to put residential there, just to give them a little bit of extra wiggle room there. But I did anticipate that, again, the city's lost a lot of commercial to residential, so to help with that, just adding that provision in there. Now, if the applicant were to want to change it they would have to do a development agreement modification and, then, City Council has their rights to say, no, or welcome whatever their next proposal would be.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: In your opinion, Joe, do you feel like that 45 percent mark of residential is appropriate?

Dodson: Councilman Bernt, in this instance, yes, and that is because we are not going to get a commercial element to the east at all, because of the I-L. We will hopefully get, you know, obviously family wage jobs, which is great. The adjacent corner to the west is the church use and -- and storage. So, again, no commercial there. But everything to the south is going to have a lot of commercial elements, including the undeveloped area on the southwest corner in the Ten Mile area there, too, up to the interchange. It's also -- my thought process was also trying to activate this internally, as well as externally. So, I think that striking a balance there was key and I think the density of the residential on this property will help activate this commercial here. So, I think that 45 percent limit is -- is good. They don't get there and they will need more commercial, the applicant has expressed that they -- they have no problem having more commercial on the property, too.

Bernt: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just two quick follow ups. You know, certainly I thought that the example was really telling, you know, the variety of what we might end up getting and there is a big difference in terms of helping our economy from a job perspective between like a Kmart, for example, or like the TED company, for example, and I was just wondering if the planning staff could elaborate a little bit on their willingness to help the applicant if this were to move forward in identifying some possible tenants that we think would work well here, just to try to give it the best chance of possible developing our economy. And, then,

my second question was just going to be at -- at what stage would this come -- would this come back before Council at all or, you know, at -- at what stage would it, if it would at all?

Dodson: Thank you, Council Woman Strader. First question -- well, let me answer your second one first. They will be required, because they will have to plat this, they will have to subdivide it and do so through a preliminary plat, because of the public roads that we are going to -- that we are requiring with this DA. We want public roads for a few reasons. One, to make sure that they do come back, because we want this subdivision to occur and we will be able to get that TIS information to ACHD and be able to really dive into the details. The second reason we wanted to offer that public benefit and not be constrained to some of the private street standards and things like that. Your first question I honestly forgot. Could you ask that again?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I was just, you know, pointing out there is a big difference between a big box retailer in terms of helping our employment base and having an employer that brings in higher wage jobs to Meridian. I'm not too far into the Ten Miles specific plan, we don't want to get into telling private property holders how to go about selling their pads, but I just wonder if you could elaborate on the willingness of the Planning Department to help the applicant as they move forward to identify tenants that we think would be great in this location. It's a key commercial corridor for us. We don't have very many sites that have this proximity to rail and to the interstate. It's a pretty unique location. So, I just wanted you to comment on that and maybe, you know, if there is anything that helps us attract those types of tenants to this sort of location.

Dodson: Thank you, Council Woman Strader. Appreciate that. The Planning Department is very willing and has been very willing with a lot of different properties and applicants to help increase the -- the kind of jobs that we are getting here. Our economic director Tori has been wonderful in that so far and works way too much, but she's been helping a lot with that -- lately mostly with some of the industrial properties, but also with commercial in trying to find these users that -- that help create better jobs. Tori has been very very adamant about that and working very hard to do that. There is nothing specific in the DA that says that the applicant will work with Planning staff, but I couldn't imagine that they -- they wouldn't want to utilize us as that avenue as well, since we are the local connection to that. I don't know that anybody would be opposed to adding a provision in here, but it would largely be, I guess, administrative in the sense of just saying, hey, work with staff and we intend to do that anyways as we get to the platting process and if they ever have questions for staff regarding commercial users we are always open for them to work with us.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And I have no doubt that Tori will introduce herself and make herself available as a resource. I don't think there is a need for a specific provision. Last question. The civic piece is -- is bugging me a tiny bit. Probably just because I'm a little bit worried about the conditions. What if we decide on, you know, year 19 or something that we think rail is on the horizon and that option expires, is there -- is there a way to -- have you guys considered like a renewal option or a way for the city to extend that time period? I know it seems very long, but, again, we have talked about rail for a long time and I'd hate for us to lose one of the few opportunities where we have to put rail.

Dodson: Council Woman Strader, thank you. Staff has not considered that. I -- I understand your concern. I very much do. Coming from southern California I used to take the train to work, so I appreciate the desire and want and need for some light rail or commuter rail. I, too, do not want to lose that area. I think there is some built-in precaution there by the applicant, because if this were to be a rail corridor and they were to have this with a multimodal transportation hub, that would hugely benefit their site and they understand that, they have expressed that to me multiple times. They -- they -- they would like it to be rail and they want that area to grow and be transit oriented, but they also don't want to have to sit on how many acres that is, you know, over -- over one and a half acres of usable land forever. I understand the Council's concern there and your concern, ma'am. If you guys decide that an additional provision or revised -- to revise that provision about a renewal option, more than welcome to entertain that.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. And not to muddy the waters, but I'm going to say one thing about it. City Council can also approach purchasing that property themselves if they want to protect it long term forever for that purpose, you know, that's -- whether that's tomorrow or in 20 years, so -- Council, any further questions or comments? Motion? Break?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: If no one else would like to, I will make a motion to close the public hearing.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I -- I appreciate the good work that staff has put into this and the applicant as well. There have been changes moving from the bubble to concept and reworking that it sounds like reworking again multiple times. But to come up with a good concept that we can live within the parameters of and putting things into a DA that kind of solidify some things more than normal, which helps in having a process if things change I think makes this workable for everybody involved. I don't have any issues after hearing from staff and the applicant about the changes that they have -- the applicant has asked for. So, I would move that after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve H-2020-0046 as presented in the staff report for October 27th, 2020, with the changes to DA provision 8.A-1.B and 8.A.1. -- it looked like an I to me, but it could have been an L. I really couldn't tell from the -- the document which -- if it was a capital I or a lowercase L. L. So, that is provision 8.A.1.L. And include those changes to -- to the motion.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Is that a second?

Cavener: Second the motion, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion? Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yes. Sorry. Thank you. I -- I wanted to mention I love the project. I truly believe this is an area that density makes a lot of sense for our city. The one change that I would like to see -- and I'm just curious what Council's opinion would be about it, would be if we wanted to add some type of a purchase option or -- or just instruct staff to see if they could negotiate a purchase option for the city for that civic piece of property at the end of a certain time period. It feels like a critical piece of property and I don't feel confident that we have identified the right time frame or that we have given ourselves the right optionality with that piece of property.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I will just share my thoughts. Council Member Strader, I think my initial conclusion was very similar to yours, but I really struggle with that, because at the end of the day we are not a transit authority. That authority falls to VRT and -- I mean I can't even begin to surmise the -- the needs that our city is going to face 20 years from now and I worry about just complicating the matter by saying, you know, 20 years from now we are going to -- we are going to buy a piece of property potentially. What happens if it's not for VRT or we buy it and, then, VRT doesn't want it at a later point in time? I think staff did a great job of summarizing that -- that that particular location, should multimodal transportation emerge, is going to be a huge benefit for them. So, I think that we complicate the matter by putting something like that in an annexation agreement. It's not

something that -- I appreciate the intent, I just don't know if it's necessarily appropriate with -- as part of the annexation agreement.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I appreciate Councilman Cavener's insight. I -- I think what I'm struggling with is, you know, what I guess was envisioning was negotiating some type of a purchase option between now and the final plat. If that couldn't be negotiated that would be fine. We could proceed. But I guess the challenge is your -- we are hoping a transit authority is involved at that stage. It feels like we are the only entity that has a bite at the apple, though, that I can tell, besides just negotiating directly with the applicant. Also approve the project. I think it's a great project. I just -- I was trying to find a way to give us some optionality.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just a comment to the motion. I think this is probably the most silent I have been on a land use application in a long time and typically anytime we see an annexation without a plat I get -- I get a little -- a little wiry about it and I just think it speaks to -- to two things. One, Joe, don't be so hard on yourself about your staff report. I found it incredibly helpful. And, two, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Clerk, appreciate, again, the ongoing effort of you and the planning staff to get these agendas out to us early. This is one that there has been a lot of time and attention both in the planning staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission. Clearly the applicant has responded to the feedback that each question that I had kind of emerged in my head was -- was answered with great detail in the staff report. So, appreciate staff's work. Appreciate the applicant. Appreciate Planning and Zoning. I'm in full support of the application as presented.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Cavener. I'm sure staff and all appreciate that comment. Council, any further questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, my iPad is going to die, so if we could call for the question I would appreciate it.

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

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion passes and the item is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

2. Discussion and Recommendation to Ada County Highway District (ACHD) Regarding Amity Rd./Eagle Rd. Intersection Design and Construction

Simison: So, thank you very much everyone and I look forward to the next steps. Council, next item on the agenda, Item 2, discussion and recommendation to Ada County Highway District regarding the Amity Road, Eagle Road intersection. I'm going to turn this over to Mr. McClure for some opening comments following our joint discussion with ACHD this last week.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Could we take a five minute break before we move -- would that be okay?

Simison: I'm fine with that. If folks who are ready -- so, we will take a five minute break and reconvene at 7:41. 7:41, people.

(Recess: 7:36 p.m. to 7:43 p.m.)

Simison: Okay. Well -- and I see we have a quorum present, so we will go ahead and come back into -- from our recess and I will turn this over to Mr. McClure.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, thank you for having me here tonight. I'm here to speak to you about the Eagle Road, Victory to Amity project. This is a follow-up conversation to the joint meeting that you had with ACHD. I'm not going to dwell on the details, but briefly you can see some project highlights on the screen. The existing roadway is two lanes, sometimes with the center turn lane, and numerous bike and pedestrian gaps. This expansion project is a five lane roadway, including center turn lane and multi-use sidewalks on both sides of the street. ACHD is accommodating a pathway crossing at the Ten Mile feeder creek and there are two roundabouts for this project, one at Zaldia and one at Amity. There is an existing single lane roundabout at Amity, which is to be rebuilt as a double lane roundabout with bypass lane. Generally multi-use pathways are ten feet, though adjacent to all county parcels they are eight feet, including portions of the roundabout. This is due to a determination of state law with improvements outside of cities. This project began in 2018 and included two public open houses and online comment periods. ACHD added a roundabout at Amity this year to the project, since Albertsons did not move forward and having originally agreed to complete it with their Firenze project. The project has gone out to bid and is awaiting an award to begin construction. Staff had a few requests for this meeting with -- with this map being one of them. I will show another version of this zoomed in shortly. The color lines on the arterials are the ACHD master street map designations. There are labels describing the type and, then, black circles with numbers indicating planned lanes. The roundabouts are colored blobs at the intersection at this scale. Also shown are schools, future schools, parks and the city's pathway plan. The orangish line work are preliminary line work for new

developments, either entitled or in the application process. I will leave this up for awkward silence for a few moments to digest, unless there is questions, and, then, flash the vision that zooms in a little further. Here is the same map, but zoomed in a little closer to this project. You can see it's centered in the -- in the viewing area. As mentioned, staff received a few requests for discussion tonight. So, this page is some follow-up to some of those requests. I will say that I now have indivisible stuck in my head. For school questions Miranda Carson talked to West Ada. The future school site on Amity will be a middle school, but with no ETA on construction. There may be an optional smaller alternative high school there as well, since this site is large, but likely with very little lunchtime traffic. If you are curious where that's at, it's immediately north of Hillsdale and Hillsdale Park. Middle school students do not typically leave the campus. Joe Yochum with West Ada indicated that the district does not have any issues with students utilizing roundabouts. And I'm moving my mouse where that school site is. There was also a few requests to overview staff comments to ACHD. Staff did not actively advocate for specific intersection types or treatments with this project. At the time we did not have direction to do so and we left that for public involvement and ACHD to work out. We did request accommodations and enhancements to selected design treatments, though, to improve them and based on our professional experience. Staff believes we have a really good handle on site contexts, local attractions, pending developments, local habits and perhaps a strong concern for local trips and other nodes. We aren't the ones stamping the plans, though, and aren't the ones answering for engineering decisions later. In general, common areas -- common areas of significance are those that have been discussed at previous meetings. Some of these have been addressed and others we are still uncomfortable with, but, nevertheless, we appreciate the opportunity for involvement. I'm going to summarize these topic areas, but I do want to provide some broad perspective first. Many of our concerns are not just about engineering. Standards change, trends change and values differ. Right now in this area Meridian staff have especially been concerned with walkability. Bike and especially pedestrians supported designs are very sensitive to perception and human behavior can have significant implications on function. Design matters for those users -- the multi-use crossings remain a concern for Meridian staff. They make a lot of sense in certain conditions, but we haven't been convinced of that here in a residential corridor with lots of landscaping distractions. Maybe it's just new, but human behavior with lots of landscaping -- human behavior is to take shortcuts, rather than to be inconvenienced, and this design used poorly may complicate and devalue the intended benefits. ACHD staff has expressed a willingness to re-address any issues that come up though. Staff had some initial concerns with the Z crossings due to the size -- size and openings facing the crosswalks. ACHD was already aware of these concerns from previous installations and accommodated improvements. These will have wider openings, which should make them easier to use. The offset -- the crossing also has the added benefit of ensuring the pedestrians and people are taken in to the actual pathway and not encouraged to use the maintenance road instead. The Zaldia roundabout was added after the first public open house. I believe some of this was due to requests from the neighborhoods for more access control at the intersection. Since intersections -- I believe some of this was due to requests for more access control at the intersection, so the neighbors could be -- get out more easily. It's also shown on ACHD's master street map. Since the intersection was never preserved for a roundabout, though, staff

requested that ACHD do their best to adjust the intersection's center and approaches to limit property impacts. We feel ACHD largely accomplishes and especially when you compare with road widening impacts on other projects. The public saw this design at the second open house and was able to provide input to ACHD. The Amity roundabout design as mentioned was a new addition to ACHD's project. Staff was invited to the kickoff meeting in May of this year and impressively ACHD was able to complete the design and incorporate it into their larger project in less than six months. The roundabout was originally intended to be widened, but was designed to shift the intersection towards the east to improve safety with approach angles and design speeds. Staff continues to have concern for bike and pedestrian use here, especially as it relates to the bypass lane. There is an increased number of pedestrian crossings and a need for pedestrians to be aware of more approaching angles and potential conflicts. It's not a square and without the benefit of red lights, though ACHD did add pedestrian flashers. The other concern was just the complexity. Westbound users especially have to look in a lot of different directions and locations and merge from three lanes into one on top of looking out for the pedestrians. Staff has suggested that ACHD look at waiting on the bypass lane element until Amity improvements to the west are made, which is not an integrated five year work plan and assuming the state -- but an alternative was available at that time. Lastly -- and this is not specific to this project, but it relates to the roundabout. Many of the projects in south Meridian are being hamstrung by the determination that ACHD cannot build more than eight feet of sidewalk in areas outside of the city. While very sympathetic ACHD's project managers haven't been equipped to speak towards this or discuss any alternatives. The entirety of this project is surrounded by the city. This is not a rural area, even though some of the properties adjacent have -- haven't annexed and developed yet. One of them on the northeast corner, ACHD now owns. The ultimate intersection area surrounded by the city is being built here and with entitlements in all directions and yet the usable design of the building -- these facilities -- eight feet in some areas, safe for bicyclists and pedestrians and that's a ten foot standard. The roundabout is intimidating enough for pedestrians in this area without also narrowing the sidewalks. This law is not ACHD's fault and the decision is recommend these projects, but Meridian staff haven't been able to even discuss workarounds. The option that seemed feasible to our staff was annexation of at least portions of these projects, such as the properties zoned by ACHD staff. There may be some really good reasons why this wouldn't work, but we haven't been able to have that conversation. It would be nice for more communication to happen with decision makers in the near future. And, hopefully, some creative solutions to avoid this on ultimate roadway designs near -- instead of lesser improvements. Staff is aware that ACHD would like to have the law changed, but there is no guarantee and we have other active projects being impacted as we speak. As a summary of the big items that staff have had, there were both e-mail -- e-mails, comments written, and verbal comments to staff. Some we agreed on. Before moving on I did want to also remind Council the pending cost share for non-transportation improvements. That was originally on for earlier, but moved as a result of the joint meeting and today's conversation. If the project moves forward as designed, the city will need a cost share for fiber optic conduit along the Eagle Road corridor, landscaped PVC sleeves to the roundabout islands, and for any landscape improvements. This is not before you tonight, but it will be coming back. Staff was asked to provide some options based on the discussion at the joint meeting for

Council to consider. Meridian staff were also asked to look into cost impacts of delayed approaches. But we will need to defer to ACHD staff for discussions on -- along those lines of thought. From Meridian's staff perspective Council has three potential options within the context of the previous joint meeting discussion. Those are in the memo and summarized on the screen and I can also read through those if desired. One digression that staff had really encouraged Council to consider how you want to be involved in these projects, when you want to hear from city staff, ACHD staff, the Transportation Commission and how you may want to respond to public involvement and where you may see room for other improvements. I'm probably not the good person to be having a conversation with and it may be able to do that on another night, but I do want to plant that seed. Meridian staff can provide additional comments and you also have ACHD staff available to speak with you and with that I would stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Brian, for bringing that forward and being the middleman in several conversations with ACHD on a regular basis. I know it's not easy. Things change. People change. Decisions change. With that, though, Council, any questions for Brian or comments in general, that you would like to make regarding this item?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, do we want to start with -- I mean where do you want to start? You want to start at -- with -- with our thoughts on the roundabout? We want to touch that? I had some concerns about the redesign of the crossings at Dartmoor and Rome that I expressed -- that I expressed during the joint meeting. Those are -- those -- this issue is maybe a little bit smaller, maybe low hanging fruit compared to the roundabout. I don't know if we want to discuss that now or start with the roundabout.

Simison: I would be open to hearing from all members of Council and if they -- what the general viewpoint is to see if there is even -- how far it's worth going down this conversation this evening or not, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I guess I will take a bite. I read a lot of the information that ACHD provided and I -- it has actually changed my mind and my perception a little bit about roundabouts in general. It looked like the data supported, you know, safety and that those made sense in certain areas. I guess the piece in my mind that I feel like I don't have a grasp on -- ACHD themselves are saying that they need to evaluate pedestrian access and walkability more going forward. It sounded like they are planning to do that in the future. I'm not sure if our own transportation, you know, committee really focuses on pedestrian walkability and safety. I guess I'm -- I'm just -- I'm looking for some expertise in terms of if we did look to redesign crossings, if we did look for enhancements, what would those

be and how do we improve that walkability. I guess I'm just concerned that we are thinking broadly in the right ways, but we are thinking of moving vehicles and that there is a safety element, a walkability element, and even just a comfort level that it sounds like people in this neighborhood are not having with the way that these are designed.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. I think Council Woman Strader kind of touched on some things that -- that I think really gets to the -- to the heart of it is, you know, ACHD is tasked with -- with the traffic and moving vehicles and -- and as we grow high volumes of vehicles and they are trying to do it as efficiently and as effectively as possible, with the -- with the ability to do it with the least cost to taxpayers. At the same time we are dealing with areas that people want to have that neighborhood feel, they want to have a place that they feel welcome, that it's not just another area of the city, but it's their neighborhood and trying to incorporate that and they look at roundabouts and some of the access points and how -- how that happens as something that is interfering with that -- that feel and not necessarily that it does, but it's their perception and, then, that's -- that's the problem that I think we have to deal with and I think, Brian, you touched on that, there is that perception out there that, you know, how does this really work. It doesn't look right. It -- I think that's going to be dangerous and -- and I think -- and, you know, I have been involved in communication work over, you know, 30 plus years. In the communication process, whether it's ACHD, the city, or any public entity, you really have to keep in mind the end user and their perception and not that you say, oh, we are not going to do it, because they perceive it as wrong, but, okay, how do we convince them or how do we at least give them the facts --

Bernt: Demonstrate.

Hoaglund: -- to work through that to -- to -- to understand the reasons why and they are very good reasons. You know, I looked through that information as well that ACHD provided and there is very good reasons for the engineers doing what -- what they are doing and that's -- I didn't have any issues with that, so -- so, the three things I kind of boiled it down to was for all of us as we grow, the length of time of the process -- so, when this started in 2018 there is more residents out there, there is new people out there, that's -- that's an issue. I -- I don't know how fixable that is, but it's something we have to be aware of, that there is new people coming in and they weren't part of that process or that information flow. So, somehow -- and, again, this is for all public entities, how do we make sure they know what's going on and understand what's happening. The second one, I always think there is room for improved communication between our staffs, whether ACHD, Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District, other surrounding jurisdictions, we always have room for improvement and keeping that communication flow and -- and not -- not having surprises and making sure -- not that we will always agree, but at least there is understanding of what's taking place and -- and, then, I kind of touched on this -- this third one and that's education of use for the area residents when it comes to the roundabout and why crosswalk areas are designed the way they are in -- in some of these particular

areas, because it's new and it's -- change is hard and making sure that's understood and I think engineers are very very bright people, very good at what they do, but sometimes their thinking is here and not really understanding where the thinking is elsewhere, because people aren't thinking at it -- looking at it to -- a problem solving approach that an engineer does. They just see it as their perception of, oh, I don't know if I will be able to see that pedestrian crossing on that right turn. So, how do we solve that? I think that's going to take an education component, making sure people understand those things that are taking place. You know, do roundabouts work at every location? You know, I look at some and so, hum, that's going to be interesting 20 years from now and the problem is it's a no win solution for ACHD, because 20 years from now if we add that much more traffic we are back to where we are right now with inadequate roadways and some things like that, so -- but that's why we are doing it with civic area, so we can do transit; right? So, it -- it is -- it is difficult and I know our staff works hard at trying to resolve these things and I know ACHD staff attempts to -- to resolve these things, but their goal is a little bit different than our goal and somehow we just have to kind of make sure we are meeting more together in the middle to make sure we understand each other's goals, even though we are -- what we want to accomplish is a little bit different, we still have to have that understanding of why we are doing what we are doing and see if there is room for some accommodation or flexing, because we have some great, great bright people who work on -- in both entities and I think we can always come up with -- with a solution, but I'm just an optimist by nature.

Simison: And, Council, I'm --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Oh. Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Maybe -- Brian, I hate to put you on the spot. Just out of curiosity, what year was that first roundabout built?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman, I'm not sure. I would have to defer to someone else who may know that. I think it's been out there probably borderline a decade, though.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow up if I may.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks. Here is -- here is I think the crux, is that -- that roundabout was first designed for what the highway district anticipated the traffic volumes were going to be and the use out there. I think it's been out there less than a decade. I think it's probably closer to six or seven years. But, nevertheless, it's -- it's being redone because of the growth and changes that are going over there and Council Member Hoaglund hit I think on the important point and to me it's -- again, it's the power of local government. Commissioner Lancaster talked about how everybody thinks that they are a traffic engineer. I think that our body is quite the opposite. We know we are not traffic engineers.

We know we are not land use planners. We are elected members of our community to represent our fellow citizens and we rely on the feedback and guidance from engineers. We also bring the perspective of our citizens and just because a traffic engineer says this is the most efficient, if our citizens are uncomfortable with it and they won't use it or -- or their cautious desire is counterintuitive, we create a lot more problems. I think the crux is I don't know what direction for us to go tonight. I think that the way the roundabout is designed is probably not going to meet our needs ten years from now. The highway district believes it does. I'm not sold. So, we can -- we can support the recommendations from traffic engineers, support the plan from our highway district friends, and, then, come back to this conversation a few years from now or we can resist that, delay it, potentially do it the right way, but prolong some other -- another critical infrastructure project. So, I'm not quite sure where the Council wants to go. I'm not quite sure where I want to go. I'm looking forward to the future and conversation from my colleagues.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I think Councilman Cavener brings up an important point is -- is delay -- there is -- there is -- there is a cost component to this that we also have to consider. In delaying or redoing there is going to be a cost to the taxpayer to do other projects that -- that make it difficult to say, okay, let's blow this whole thing up and start over. I mean that -- there are consequences to that that are both financial and impacting other -- other projects. So, that makes me reluctant to go down that -- that path, but like Councilman Cavener, I would like to hear from the members of the Council and their thoughts on that.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I -- I can understand that -- the frustration with our friends from ACHD in maybe having these conversations right now. I know that we have been trying to -- we have asked to have discussions awhile back and things have pushed dates out and so on and so forth and that happens and, you know, we are busy and they are busy and we have a lot on our calendars and a lot of things we are dealing with. So, I get that. But, you know, I guess the problem that I -- you know for sure the last minute surprises -- you know, consistency, that's something that we always try to avoid and we always try to stay consistent with everything that we do, but reading the tea leaves I just don't think right now -- I just don't think there is support with changing the roundabout. I have some concerns with it. Same concerns that were discussed at the joint meeting. However, there are -- there are -- I do have some major concerns with the crosswalks at Dartmoor and Rome and -- and certainly a lot less expensive, both in design and change orders than totally redesigning a full roundabout, but when I was originally contacted by a citizen that lives in Tuscany, those were his concerns, his main concerns, and I'm not saying that these things weren't discussed in the past, I don't remember specifically talking about these issues. but certainly would like to discuss them further. I don't know if it's something

that we need to delay a project over. Certainly would like to get some -- some feedback and some direction from the commission -- the ACHD commission and what they are willing to talk about and what they are willing to -- to do. When I was expressing my concerns during the joint meeting, Mr. Wallace mentioned that he was going to provide some -- some data that would support -- I don't know, do you call them, Brian, Z crossings where -- at least across the crosswalk -- where the crosswalk is behind the first stopped car. I don't know if you call that a -- is that what you call a Z crossing?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, the Z crossing is the Eagle Road crossing east to west where the Ten Mile Feeder Creek canal is, so that's a little bit different. The -- the crossing here referred to -- that you are referring to and we are referring to as the -- the multi-use crossings. So, the Z -- the Z crossing is -- is for the city's pathway.

Bernt: Okay. So, not the Z crossing, but the multi-use crossway, that's what you would call the crossway at -- at -- at Dartmoor and Rome?

McClure: Correct. Yes.

Bernt: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I wanted to be clear. So, those are my concerns and -- and I -- and I was looking through all of the information in the packet that was sent over by Ryan and others and I didn't see any data in this information that supported that type of multi-use crossing behind parked cars, so I just -- I just think that -- not parked. Excuse me. Stopped cars at -- at that -- at that intersection -- those intersections. I just think they are incredible -- I just don't see personally -- and before I go any further, I'm not questioning for sure that the engineers at ACHD or our city staff or those that have worked diligently up until now -- Mr. Cavener mentioned that, you know, we -- we work and we serve the citizens of Meridian and -- and so when I have -- when we have citizens come to us with concerns, I'm just expressing what I have heard from the concerned citizens that live in the -- in the Tuscany area. But for me I can't see how -- how it's safer for a pedestrian to walk behind -- on a crosswalk behind a first stopped car where potentially there is cars going south and could take a right into Tuscany and maybe not see that pedestrian because of that -- that first stopped car and could get hit and I understand that Mr. Wallace mentioned that this is -- this is common practice. It's not common practice in the City of Meridian. This is the first type of crosswalk of these kinds that we have seen and I was hoping to get some data to be able to look at the data and be able to see why it's justified. I just don't see it personally and there is -- there is -- there has been a fatality over there somewhat recent with the little boy and so I know that there is cars going fast. I know that, you know, people in a hurry, you know, maybe in the morning going to work or, you know, trying to get home late at night and it's a little bit different when there is a median in the middle, you know, maybe that -- a potential pedestrian could be protected a little bit by standing on that median or going over that median. But that's just a major concern and I hope that we can maybe talk more about that and, hopefully, the commission's open to some change orders. I don't know if I'm in favor of, you know, asking the commission to -- you know, to cancel the project or to stop the project or to delay the project, but I would hope that the commission would be open to talking about that low hanging fruit at Dartmoor and Rome. Those are my concerns.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. I think it's important to note a couple of things. As I recall, I think that was a major piece of communication from the neighbors at the neighborhood meeting about this project was -- was that crosswalk specifically. It's -- as I recall, it -- and, again, I may -- I may be misremembering, but staff had voiced their concern about this numerous times. This was the main topic of the recommendations from our Transportation Commission a couple of months ago about the -- those projects was -- was the crosswalk. So, I feel like there have been ample opportunities where representatives of the City of Meridian have -- have voiced their -- their concern about this particular piece, so I struggle a little bit that that -- that particular comment is coming late in the game. I think that we have been pretty consistent with our -- with our concern about this. Mr. Mayor, to Council Member Bernt's inquiry about trying to get some added data, I see that Mr. Wallace is on the call. I don't know if he is listening as a participant representing ACHD or he is just listening as a member of the public, but I think it would be fair to give him the opportunity to walk us through some of this information before we make any -- any conclusions.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Cavener. If we can let all Council Members speak and, then, if we need to go into conversations with ACHD we can definitely go down that direction. I know Councilman Borton was unmuted and ready to speak a second ago, so I wanted to give him and, then, Council Woman Perreault if she would like an opportunity to speak. Councilman Borton.

Borton: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I will be brief. I think Councilman Bernt summarized the crossing concern very well. I agree with him on that point. It is, frankly, academic to have the conversation right now. ACHD -- it's out to bid. It's -- it's going to be approved tomorrow going forward and I think there is enough empirical engineering data that it supports it going forward. So, I'm not -- I'm not supportive of even recommending that it get delayed. Even if we asked for it it's not going to happen. So, the reality is it's going forward, it's getting built, and if there is some of this -- this crossing alterations that can happen later on through redesign, if it's through change orders, looking at bullet number 3-F, that's the -- the only viable option to try and address some of those more specific concerns that Councilman Bernt had highlighted. So, if there is a -- if there is a problem with communicating the city's concerns or ACHD receiving and acting on the city's concerns on these types of issues, way, way, way upstream from a conversation like this today, we can address those. There is -- there is some other separate disconnect. But for the purpose of this project I don't think we even recommend to delay anything, we are just trying to assess these crossings at a later date.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault, did you have anything you want to say at this time?

Perreault: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Yeah. I have -- I appreciate everything that ACHD sent over. I did look through -- I did look through everything that was provided on our agenda

and I anticipate this to be a -- would hope it would become a highly pedestrian area. I want our pedestrians -- I want our residents to be walking to Albertsons, to be walking across to the YMCA, that's my desire and hope for our citizens and I think there is -- there is the question of what's going to specifically happen at this roundabout, but also a bigger question of why do our -- why do our citizens feel less safe crossing a roundabout when the statistics show that it is safer than a signalized intersection and I think that's just because we all need to be better communicators about the facts and I would really like to see if ACHD and -- and maybe they have plans for this -- they proceed and they -- and they move forward as expected, that there would be some sort of effort made to better educate our -- our residents about the safety elements. So, there was a slide -- a slide -- a set of slides that was provided in the agenda that showed the pedestrian safety statistics and if I was just your average resident I wouldn't know that, I wouldn't -- I would not say that I have heard it on a regular basis from ACHD and -- and I don't know that I would even know where to go find out that information specific to this roundabout. So, I would -- I would like to hear from them about what kind of communication is happening with the public regarding roundabouts, because as we know the plan is to continue to put more and more of them in over the entire county and I'm not sure that -- that a good job is being done of helping residents feel safe. Personally I feel safer at a signalized intersection, because I know at some point that traffic is going to stop. I'm guaranteed that traffic will stop. When -- when motorists are moving through and where you see where they cross on the -- on the slide with the -- the design that was shown you can see that the -- the crosswalks sit quite a bit farther behind -- or in front of -- however you -- whatever direction you are going -- from when the vehicle enters the actual roundabout -- enters the actual circle and so as I -- in my driving experience with roundabouts cars are not slowing down as they approach those crosswalks. Not even close. They are trying to get into that circle as fast as they possibly can and get around it as fast as they can. They really don't want to yield. They don't yield unless there is another vehicle in the circle. And so just -- I'm just talking as a -- as a lay person who has no -- no expertise in transportation whatsoever as to what I see going through roundabouts every day, because I have one near my home and near my office and it's very common for -- for motorists not to yield, not to stop, and if I'm a pedestrian I am not feeling safe. So, I say that, because I -- I would like some more reassurance from ACHD that even though the statistics say so, that we can somehow collectively get our residents to also come to the same conclusion, because, otherwise, then, I don't feel comfortable -- I don't feel comfortable with -- with this design as it is.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Strader: Maybe a quick question for staff.

Perreault: Council Woman Strader.

Simison: Oh. Sorry. Yes, Council Woman Strader. I apologize.

Strader: It's all good. I guess -- I guess my question would be with option three, if we -- if we ask ACHD to take a look at the crossing specifically and enhancing those change orders, can we be specific about some recommendations -- you know, are the recommendations to widen the multi-use pathways and try to work with them to annex some land into the city. Are there other safety enhancements that staff thinks would -- would improve this. I would love to take the opportunity to improve the -- the safety factor here. I'm not causing necessarily a delay or stopping the project, but really to try to address the concerns.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I don't think there is -- I don't know what ACHD's appetite is for change orders. I think potentially there are many of them. I do not think that the eight foot sidewalk issue will be resolved with this project if it moves forward currently. There is the potential that ACHD could address some of that in the future, particularly on a property that they own. For the multi-use crossings, staff's concerns could potentially be addressed through enhanced signage, wayfinding, additional contextual solutions that sort of prevent people, for example, from crossing where they would normally cross, rather than where they should be crossing. Some additional signage and wayfinding for our signage for vehicles to stay the heck out of the -- out of the crosswalk and unlike, you know, what we typically do at a crosswalk at a normal intersection, they could look at just moving the whole thing up further assuming they can overcome some of their engineering concerns and safety concerns with that approach. But I really don't know what ACHD's appetite is and you would have to discuss that with them. It just is a smaller change that seemed more nimble and flexible mid -- mid process to adjust, rather than the other option, which is to delay the whole thing. Did that help at all?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Thank you very much. That does certainly help. I -- again, I -- I don't think we should let like our perception of ACHD's appetite to make or not make change orders dictate how -- how we act in this meeting or what recommendations we make. I think if there are enhancements that we felt we could suggest, it would be up to them if they want to do those. They certainly understand how critical this project is. I would hope that they would be open to those, because the magnitude of a change order is nowhere near the same as delaying or stopping a project and I even think offering up that annexation solution to widen the pathways is something we should -- I personally think we should offer that solution to work with them on doing that. They don't have to take us up on it, but we are showing them a solution, you know, to get to the right answer and that's how I would like to proceed personally.

Simison: Council, any further comments or would we like to hear from Mr. Wallace or Mr. Lucas, if they are so desired to providing comments to the information they have heard?

Borton: Sure. Yes, sir.

Simison: Mr. Wallace, I don't know if you have -- if you would like to provide comments or not.

Wallace: Mr. Mayor, can you hear me?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Wallace: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak and we certainly do appreciate all the comments of you and the Council this evening. This is an important issue and it is certainly the intention of ACHD, one, to make sure that we are in sync with our community partners and, two, that we ensure the safe operation, not just of the roadway, but for all users. Communication is something that's critical in everything that we do and it's unfortunate there is a perception that we weren't clear on all this. The only thing -- and we pledge to continue to do our best to improve that in the future. So, we look forward to a continued strong relationship. The only thing I did want to address, because you have a lot of stuff in front of you and I didn't want to go all -- through all that stuff -- was the crossing. I'm looking at my telephone for a record of what I believe we sent you and if this didn't appear in there, then, it somehow got dropped. It has to do with the displaced crossings that we have been talking about. Now, there was a PDF file in there, excuse me, that listed a couple of -- of items that make this attractive and safe. The separated path, horizontal curves, slows pedestrians and cyclists down as they get to the intersection. That's the whole idea. As was discussed earlier by several Council Members, the slowing things down and people down improves success and safety at intersections. Pedestrian and vehicle conflicts are removed from the intersection corner. It limits the vehicles from waiting in the crosswalk to enter high -- a high speed roadway and this will be a wider roadway when all is said and done. Pedestrians and cyclists do not have to move closer to the high speed roadway to avoid vehicles entering traffic and, finally, pedestrians are now in the driver's full vision and not in a potential blind spot. That's the whole idea is to move them away from the intersection. We have talked about -- there you go. That's the one I'm talking about. You have the technology to do that tonight. Dealing with your version of Zoom is beyond me. So, there you have it. Yeah. I just read those items off there. That's the whole idea behind it. I don't have the images to which I referred the other night when Mr. Bernt and I are going back and forth. There are locations -- and they may actually be in the Meridian footprint -- where we have instituted something very similar to this. I will admit this is the first multi-use path concept here and that, if I could, is -- is the other thing about this. We are doing our best to ensure just what a couple of Council Members might have mentioned about ensuring that people can walk to the destinations along here. The only final thing I was going to say -- and I will leave this topic alone -- is that our design horizon for anything that we put out there is 20 years. So, you are all right about how long it takes to develop these things. I think in today's Idaho Statesman Project Manager Ryan Cutler, who I believe is also on this meeting tonight, commented that we should consider that something we are going to build on 2025 is being planned right now. It takes a while. The permits, the -- the permissions, the easements, the right of way purchase, the -- the discussion with all the citizens involved in the project take time and we have worked very hard to try and make that happen and I will just say that it's a shame that it appears that we haven't. So, I think I

can speak for the rest of the leadership at ACHD, we -- we look forward to continued strong relationship with Meridian and all our -- our partners and with the people who live there. We live here, too. So, thanks for that. That's all I had.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Thank you, Mr. Wallace. I -- I appreciate that clarification. I was looking at the same exhibit. I believe it's Exhibit C that's -- that is on the TV and if what you are proposing looks like what's in this PowerPoint slide, we are good, but that's not what you are proposing. I -- all of these bullet points that you -- that you spoke of, I don't think that there is anyone that would disagree with any of those bullet points. The issue that I'm having is -- in what you are proposing, that multi-use pathway goes behind the first stopped car and that's the issue that I have. I get how you want to curve it to slow people down. That makes sense. Every talking point makes sense. But this PowerPoint slide does not -- does not match what your -- your -- what -- what our concerns have been for some time now, as long -- as with -- as -- as well as the -- the Tuscany residents that I have spoke to. If you can comment on that I would really appreciate it. Thank you.

Wallace: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Mr. Wallace.

Wallace: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Bernt. I think it was Mr. Bernt who was talking.

Simison: Yes.

Wallace: This is a stylized version of what we were talking about and, to be honest, again, I -- I don't have the drawing to put in front of you. I think in the package we had the slides that Ryan Cutler had put up the other night. What -- what you are looking at here. I think the -- the disconnect may be where the stop bar is and where the vehicle will be and don't -- the -- the point here is that you will have -- the vehicle will have to stop before getting to that crosswalk. I believe you will see that. And, then, everybody -- all of us will want to get ahead of that to see what in heaven's name is coming down the street. So, yes, you will have a stopped vehicle and it's entirely possible a vehicle stopped at the street, you know, beyond that crosswalk, if you will. The whole idea here is that the -- both the pedestrian and the cyclist, if that -- that crosswalk were exactly parallel with the street, would have to come to several decisions, one of them being which side of this car that's stopped right in front of me do I go around. This solves that problem for them. First of all, it's a more abrupt turn than is displayed here for the cyclist in particular. Second, if you will, please, consider that the cyclist is not moving at a walking pace if it is allowed to continue straight. So, those of you that are cyclists that do that regularly can probably do a level ground speed of approaching 20 miles an hour, but let's say it's 15. At 15 miles

an hour it's many times too fast for the vehicle to respond in time to stop to keep from hitting that cyclist. In this case the cyclist will have to slow down to make a sharper turn than you see depicted here. That's the whole idea. So, my -- my point is that this is a safety feature that has been designed in here. That was all. Did that answer the question? Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I guess a follow up for Mr. Wallace, if he's open to it. It sounds like we have this dilemma with the eight foot pathway that -- it's very unfortunate. It sounds like it's not ACHD's fault. I think we all know ten foot pathways are better. It sounded like city staff had a potential solution to help ACHD annex some property into the city. Are you guys open to doing that on this project or going forward?

Wallace: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Wallace.

Wallace: And Councilman Liz. That's way beyond my paygrade. I think with respect, please, address that to my commissioners. The -- the eight foot pathway is -- honestly, this is something that we in the last year I have just discovered going, what, you got to be kidding me. We couldn't agree more. Ten foot is the right width and I think we are -- we are eager to try and get the legislature to see the error of its ways, but, again, that's above my paygrade, too. So, that's a question that we could certainly direct to our commission if you don't mind.

Strader: Fair enough.

Simison: Council, any other questions or comments at this time? I have -- I have been trying to hold my comments and I will at least put my thoughts on the record and ACHD to comment in a second, but I want to make sure you all get your questions answered or thoughts out there.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: It's my -- my concern hasn't been answered, but I feel like I -- I am just extremely repetitive in what my concern is and so maybe -- maybe I'm just not doing a really good job of trying to explain myself. I -- but if you want to, you know, share your thoughts maybe you can bring some clarity to the discussion.

Simison: Unfortunately, I will probably muddle the waters more with my comments than clear them, but they will at least be heard on record from that standpoint, so -- yeah. I

think -- as I stated at the joint meeting, I'm -- I would be in favor of recommending delaying at the cost, because I think it's about getting it right. Like any development that we do, we are approving buildings, annexation for 50, 75 years. There is nothing that says that this roadway won't last for an equivalent amount of time in this design and it is about getting it right. So, from that standpoint -- but I also agree that by doing that I don't think ACHD is going to change direction on this project, just so we are clear. I'm not expecting that to be an outcome of what occurs from this conversation today. Perhaps there are some things that can be addressed, but I think we have a -- in some respect -- I'm not going to speak for all of Council, but I think that there is a general -- a general disagreement of opinions on several issues regarding to what is safe and what is not safe, despite what the information states and I think if I asked everyone here where would you rather cross the road, at the corner of Locust and Pine or on Pine at the roundabout. And that's with only one leg currently functioning. I think if each of you answered honestly you would tell me Locust Grove and Pine. I don't think anyone said, yes, I want -- I want to cross at the roundabout. That's not -- you know. And that's not a very highly traveled roadway at this point in time. With not a lot of conflicting components. Some of this is about location. You look at the -- the way that people maneuver on this and, yes, it will change over time, but right now it is a race to get in and out of the roundabout. The only people that are slowing down are those that don't know how to drive and, then, they are stopping. You know, that's -- that's how they are functioning through this roundabout and a double lane roundabout will, in my non-traffic engineer opinion, it's really not designed to limit these points. We all understand that constricting roadways slows people down. You know, great roundabouts in other cities that do just that and make it no problem to cross at these intersections. In my opinion this is not one of them and when you put this in a location where it can be surrounded on potentially three sides with a streetlight, it just makes me beg the question to ACHD is twofold. Would a streetlight function effectively in this location? Does it prevent the movement of traffic in an appropriate manner? Does it stop traffic from flowing when timed with other movements in the area? I think if they answered that they would have streetlights all around this entire valley. They would have to say, yes, it would work and it would function and it would perform its job. It may not be their preferred option, but it would work from that standpoint. So, maybe the larger question -- I'm not going to put Mr. Wallace or Mr. Lucas on -- on this question right now, but at what point in time if -- if Meridian were to send a note to ACHD tomorrow that says for all future designs do not consider roundabouts, would they take that direction? At what point in time does the city's input truly matter in -- where you have the land use and transportation intersecting. I'm not going to say that's what the city's position should be, because as I have said before, Locust Grove and Victory, great place for a roundabout. Makes a lot of sense for a lot of different reasons. You know, it's kitty-corner to this one on the same square mile. No issues. It's what's -- it's the land use around it that is really dictating from my perspective this conversation and I'm really kind of -- I would really like to see the traffic models to understand how southbound Eagle Road to west on Amity is all of a sudden it is going to be huge traffic in that third lane, third conflict point, because I'm really -- you know, honestly, I'm like where are people going and why are they -- why are they -- why are they taking this route to where? What is it about the current traffic pattern that's been designed in this area is pushing those -- that turning movements in that direction, as it's not residential, to my knowledge, that would require a right-hand. Is

it a lack someplace else in this network? Is this a short term? Is this a long term. I don't know. I mean we are not engineers, but those are the types of things when I look at this overall as a user in this area -- and I think that's the -- the challenge from all of us. We all know what we see, we all know what we drive, we all know what we do and we -- you know, I don't know how many other people regularly drive through this roundabout as part of their -- it's not part of my commute, but I do regularly use this roundabout to maneuver through the area. So, you see that -- you see how people use it, you see what's -- what it's going to do, but more importantly see how it's impacting other areas. So, we want to make impacts where we can and if we can ever get them to understand your points, Councilman Bernt, you know, the -- the way that these are designed for the crossing behind -- when I go drive into my subdivision we have a roundabout on Zaldia, you know, about three quarters -- or halfway down at that point in time, it's a single lane roundabout, you know, and to your point I don't see people until I'm entering the roundabout. Granted, you are going slow enough, but that's what that's designed to do. It's a very tight, concise roundabout that I don't see people until I'm in the roundabout working my way around from where they may be crossing. But at five to seven miles an hour, which is what it's designed for, that's great. This double lane roundabout it's not that. That's not what this is about. This is not about constricting and slowing traffic to a slow rate when you are making turning movements, to my understanding. I don't know -- maybe I'm misconstrued in what that is -- how that's being viewed, but that's not what I envision this roundabout as being and being from other parts in other cities where you see double lane roundabouts versus single lane roundabouts, you see how they function differently and that's where my comments are. They are on the record, so these people have heard them, but I would much prefer to have -- engage ACHD if we need to moving forward. If they are willing to -- if they want to defer roundabout versus lights to the Council early on and let them make that determination and they design it to that, I think that would be a great approach. If that's the partnership that will work, maybe there is other things that make sense as well, but, I don't know, that's -- that they are willing to give that up from that perspective, because roundabouts is their preferred direction that they are headed as an agency by everything that they have -- they have said and put on record. So, maybe this is an uphill battle where this does or doesn't make sense, but I have said my piece. I'm done. Happy for further comments from anybody else or we can move on.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I think we have all expressed our -- our concerns and our points of view. The decision that -- one of the decisions that we need to make tonight is what is the message that we are going to convey to ACHD tomorrow. What does that -- what does that look like. So, that -- that's -- that's the ultimate decision that we need to come to this evening. They specifically asked us to convey a message to them tomorrow, so --

Simison: I don't disagree. I just -- to my point earlier I don't think whatever message you convey will have an outcome on their actions, but it may have -- may help direct them in the future.

Bernt: True. So -- go ahead.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor? Oh, sorry.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I don't necessarily disagree with what you are saying in terms of the response that our request may or may not be fulfilled from ACHD. I also don't think that means that we should not convey our feelings and opinions to them regardless. So, if we feel one way or another, I think that we should put together either a letter or a statement to them. So, at the very least -- Mayor, to your point -- so, that we are on the record and I think your point about making some additional requests alongside, that makes sense. I also think -- you know, Brian brought up some really good points about giving staff some greater direction about what Council wants to see and -- and, frankly, I think we should be meeting jointly with ACHD three times a year. That are standing meetings that don't get moved and rescheduled and re-scheduled and re-re-scheduled. They are standing meetings, so that we don't -- so we can all jointly eliminate some of these communication challenges that both sides are acknowledging we are experiencing.

Simison: So, Council, with that does anybody have a direction that they would like to recommend be made to ACHD for consideration at their meeting tomorrow?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: To Councilman Cavener's point of view, I think that we have made it crystal clear this evening some of the talking points that we would like to see going forward, whether that's communication, education, meeting three times a year -- I think those are all fantastic, wonderful ideas and, hopefully, we can get organized and get these -- get these meetings on the books and have greater communication between staff members for sure, so that, you know, we can eliminate these last minute concerns. I wouldn't really call them last minute concerns. We have had these concerns for a while. But having these discussions the night before -- before decisions need to be made. I just don't see how that is effective in any way. My concern that I would like to bring up to the commission is these -- these crosswalks multi-use pathways along Dartmoor and Rome, to this point with all due respect to Mr. Wallace, I have no idea what in the world he is talking about. I'm looking at these talking points and I'm looking at two separate diagrams that look completely different. I agree with the talking points. The diagrams are different. I would like to have the -- the crosswalks look exactly what Exhibit C looks like. If these crosswalks -- Mr. Wallace can say these crosswalks are going to look like Exhibit C, then, I'm good. If they are going to go behind the first stopped car, then, we need to discuss this more and whether they are changed at the future redesign or whether they are changed in -- in a small change order, I think that's -- it's just -- it's just a small ask and I think it's a reasonable ask. So, that would be my recommendation. I invite thoughts from my Council Members.

Simison: Councilman Bernt, I wouldn't disagree with you. I think the practical matter is no car can enter a roundabout from that far back and that's why they are never going to stop there. That's why they are going to put the crosswalk behind it. He can't get into the roundabout from back there, because you -- you can't see what's coming and, unfortunately, that's the inherent conflict that's going to exist all the time. You can put a stop sign there, but, then, they are going to pull up and they are going to be either blocking or in that first -- that first place anyways. That's what -- that's how they are going to function, so -- but I wouldn't disagree with you. I think that this -- this design, if it could function, would be great.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I don't believe that this is -- is this -- is this approaching a -- I don't think this is a roundabout. I think this is just a normal -- yeah.

Simison: The only other thing I want to -- just for the record for everyone is I think it's important -- communication, regular meetings are important, but four of the seven people up here weren't here nine months ago and that's going to be an inherent conflict with -- when roads are designed four and five years in advance, that there can be community change. We have some of our communities that go and purchase a building. They build -- they make it available to the community, a new election comes in and they turn around they sell that. Elections change viewpoints and I think that I would encourage our transportation partner to recognize that, that it may not be comfortable, but that's what happens on both sides. We recognize that. You know, new commissioners will have different viewpoints and different plans. New Council Members will have different inputs and different thoughts and these will be inherit conversations. So, I digress. So, I just didn't want to forget saying that.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just a final thought from me, just a couple things. One, I think -- I think we have adequately expressed some frustration with -- with ACHD and -- and just the inherent issues that we are having and I think roundabouts are not the answer for every area and that neighborhoods are important. I mean that's -- that's the message I want to get across. So, we really have to take a close look at those and, then, figure out where do they fit. As you pointed out the areas that they fit. And last thing I think that's important if -- if -- we pay attention to this stuff and we read the material and if we are struggling with the understanding of how that really works, how does the average citizen who is busy with the kids and family and life and doing this and that and the other, how are they going to understand that? And it's -- it's -- it's much harder. So, somewhere there is -- there is a disconnect in the communication process that we have to get better at. So, that's just a -- I just point that out, that if we are struggling with it and we -- we -- we wanted to be up here and we wanted to understand this stuff and we want to solve the problems and we are struggling with that and our staff is struggling with that, then, we have got to do -- everybody has to do better at making things understood, so -- but as far as, again, delaying this, moving it forward, you know, it's taxpayer dollars. I'm reluctant to -- in this

situation, as much as I would want to do something different, I -- that would -- that's a struggle for me to -- to go there for this one. Let's -- let's improve as we move forward.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe I will try -- try to take a stab at something and see if we all agree on a statement. I -- I will try. I don't know if it will -- if it will work out. I guess I would support a statement that says: City of Meridian understands that, you know, taxpayer money and timing are important for this project. We would encourage ACHD to consider change order enhancements if they will improve the safety of the crossings that Councilman Bernt specifically mentioned. Going forward we would like to communicate more frequently on the -- on the decisions about whether a roundabout or a regular intersection is used going forward on projects and that we would like to see continued information about long term pedestrian accident data information from ACHD about level of service for pedestrians and walkability as they consider these projects.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: That was beautifully put, Liz. Great statement.

Strader: I won't remember anything.

Bernt: You have it recording right now.

Simison: Okay. Council, do the rest of you concur with that general sentiment enough to convey that through those from ACHD who are here this evening?

Perreault: Yes.

Simison: Or anyone object to that general statement?

Cavener: No objections on my part.

Borton: Sounds good.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 3. Ordinance No. 20-1902: An Ordinance (H-2020-0017 and H-2020-0018 Quartet Northeast and Quartet Southeast - CITY WELL LOT ONLY) for Annexation of a Parcel Situated in a Portion of the South $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment "A" and**

Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 0.974 Acres of Land from RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of This Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required By Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Okay. Well, there you are. Thank you very much. Okay. Thank you, Brian. All right. Next item on the agenda number -- is Ordinances. Ordinance No. 20-1902. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is an ordinance related to H-2020-0017 and H-2020-0018, Quartet Northeast and Quartet Southeast - (city well lot only) for annexation of a parcel situated in a portion of the South $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment "A" and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian, as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 0.974 acres of land from RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Would anybody like it read in its entirety? Hearing no one, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1902 with a suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 20-1902 under suspension of the rules. Any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 4. Ordinance No. 20-1903: An Ordinance (H-2020-0017 and H-2020-0018 Quartet Northeast and Quartet Southeast) for Annexation of a Parcel Situated in a Portion of the South ½ of the Northwest ¼ of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, and a Parcel of Land Situated in a Portion of the North ½ of the West ½ of the Southwest ¼ and a Portion of the South ½ of the Northwest ¼ all in Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 90.99 Acres of Land from RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) (70.68 Acres) and C-G (General Commercial) (20.31 Acres) Zoning Districts in the Meridian City Code; Providing That Copies of This Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item is Ordinance No. 20-1903. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is an ordinance related to H-2020-0017 and H-2020-0018, Quartet Northeast and Quartet Southeast, for annexation of a parcel situated in a portion of the South ½ of the Northwest ¼ of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, and a parcel of land situated in a portion of the North ½ of the West ½ of the Southwest ¼ and a portion of the South ½ of the Northwest ¼ all in Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 90.99 acres of land from RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) (70.68 acres) and C-G (General Commercial) (20.31 acres) zoning districts in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Council, you have heard this read by title. Is there anyone who would like it read it it's entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1903 with the suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 20-1903 under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The motion is adopted and the ordinance is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 5. Per Idaho Code 74-206A(1)(a) To deliberate on a labor contract offer or to formulate a counteroffer; and 74-206(1)(d) To consider records that are exempt from disclosure as provided in chapter 1, title 74, Idaho Code**

Simison: Next item is Executive Session.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

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

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I second the motion.

Simison: Motion and seconded to enter into Executive Session. The Clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (8:56 p.m. to 9:32 p.m.)

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I move we come out of Executive Session.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: All in favor say aye. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I move we adjourn.

Hoaglund: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to adjourn. All in favor say aye. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:32 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK