

Meridian City Council Work Session

June 6, 2023.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:31 p.m. Tuesday, June 6, 2023, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Brad Hoaglund.

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Kim Warren, Steve Siddoway, Laurelei McVey, Tracy Basterrechea, Kurt Blume and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is June 6th, 2023, at 4:31 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: First item up is adoption of the agenda.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I move we adopt the agenda as published.

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the May 23, 2023 City Council Work Session**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the May 23, 2023 City Council Regular Meeting**

- 3. Artemisia Subdivision Water Main Easement ESMT-2023-0077**
- 4. S. Benchmark Way and W. Cobalt Dr. Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 ESMT-2023-0081**
- 5. S. Benchmark Way and W. Cobalt Dr. Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2 ESMT-2023-0082**
- 6. Lost Rapids, Lot 8 Water Main Easement No. 1 ESMT-2023-0083**
- 7. Final Plat for Stapleton No. 3 (FP-2023-0003 by C4 Land, LLC., generally located in the NE 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 25, T.3N., R1.W.**
- 8. Final Plat for Stapleton No. 4 (FP-2023-0006) by C4 Land, LLC., generally located in the NE 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 25, T.3.N.,R.1W.**
- 9. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Chimney Peak Subdivision (SHP-2023-0002) by Centurion Engineers, Inc., located at 4853 N. Chimney Peak Ave.**
- 10. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order for Denial for Crowley Park Subdivision (H-2023-0006) by Riley Planning Services, located at 4135 W. Cherry Ln.**
- 11. Agreement between the City of Meridian and West Ada School District for School Year 2023-2024 School Resource Officers**
- 12. Interagency Agreement with Ada County Highway District for Project Number 222010, Bridge #1120 - Topaz Avenue Adjacent to 1385 S Topaz Ave.**
- 13. Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Meridian and Meridian Dairy Days and Stock Shows, Inc.**
- 14. Fiscal Year 2023 Net-Zero Budget Amendment in the amount of \$4,000.00 to Receive Donated Revenue for Walking Club, Do the Right and Mayor's Youth Advisory Council Programs**
- 15. Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$117, 937.00 for Opticom Emergency Vehicle Preemption**
- 16. Resolution No. 23-2391: A Resolution Vacating the Southerly 0.5 Feet of the 5-Foot-Wide Side Yard Utility Easement Along the Northern Boundary of Lot 37, Block 1, Sky Mesa Highlands Subdivision No. 1,**

Being More Particularly Described in Exhibit "A"; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Next item up is the Consent Agenda.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: There are no changes on it, so I move we approve the Consent Agenda as published. For the Mayor to sign and Clerk to attest.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second and Council Woman Strader for discussion.

Strader: Thank you. I apologize. I was hoping we were going to remove the pathways item off of the Consent Agenda for discussion. Let me just check what item that is.

Cavener: Number 17.

Strader: Yeah.

Simison: Would the motion maker like to amend their agenda -- or amend their motion?

Borton: Yeah. Let's -- let's do that. Let's amend -- let's remove Item 17 from the Consent for discussion on the next item and, then, amended motion to approve the remainder of the Consent Agenda.

Simison: Second agree?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I believe Councilman Overton made the second.

Overton: Second agrees.

Simison: Second agrees. Thank you. All right. So, I have got a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda with Item 17 removed. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the Consent Agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

17. Resolution 23-2392: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian, Amending the Pathways Master Plan; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: So, moving on to items that were removed from the Consent Agenda. Item 17. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I -- you know, I think there may have been miscommunication, but at least my impression was that following our meeting regarding the pathways map that we were all going to review each of the maps and, then, provide feedback and have a subsequent meeting to discuss and so I thought we should pull this off the Consent Agenda, because at least I had feedback on the map overall and the location of the pathways. So, I didn't just view it as a question of updating the map or talking about an app, but I actually felt like there were substantive comments about the locations of the pathways and specifically I would like to recommend that we have some type of pathway that runs through the city north to south and I think there are some good reasons to consider doing so. But, anyway, I -- I thought it was worth having a discussion to make sure I'm not totally off on my own, but I really thought we were going to have a meeting to talk about the locations.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. Kim Warren is here to provide some feedback context for Council.

Warren: Thank you, Mayor Simison, Members of Council. And, Council Woman Strader, you were not confused and just to set the record straight, I did submit a resolution for the Council agenda and, then, I didn't specify which one. Typically resolutions go on Consent, so that was my oversight and it created a little bit of confusion. So, this is absolutely the right thing to be doing, though it's not my call. So, I do have just a couple of slides to refer to for discussion and I might give just a quick -- thank you, Chris -- recap of kind of how we are looking at this data. No problem. We did intend to come back. Thanks, Chris. So, we did clarify -- I would like to focus on a discussion of routes as was mentioned earlier and, then, some next steps, because there is a lot of pathway data. We presented a lot. We talked about a lot last time. So, just a quick overview. I think we have been wanting to focus on routes and this is more of an internal tool. We just want to -- we have been keeping up and we want to make the official existing pathways current, so that we can use it during plan review when projects come in. We have an official map against which we can reference projects and say, you know, this particular application we would require that a pathway be conditioned for development and -- and it's a lot of data that's sort of an example. It's ugly. There is tons of Public Works on there. We have got all -- all data. But it's an internal tool and so the routes and sort of the raw data for that is what we are looking to hopefully make current tonight after some discussion and, then, we also talked last time

about the pathways web map, which would -- I mean it's all the same data set. We have got more than what we look at in GIS and, then, we are thinking about a more clean way to present the information to the community. So, if someone wants to plot some sort of a recreational outing or hopefully at some point a commute, then, that's a useful tool for the public. That's a map on which we show existing facilities and a coming soon option like we talked about and I have been working with GIS. Met with them last week to convey some of the good suggestions that I heard from you and we have another meeting scheduled -- more of the park staff with GIS to look at a next draft of what that map will be and, again, just much simpler, something that might eventually plug into an app that was also mentioned. So, at the pleasure of Mayor or the Council President we would be happy to come back with an update on that if you are interested. But for now coming back to routes and Council Woman Strader's comment, I did provide the map book, which is quite a -- quite a document last time. It's a big -- it's a big city, it's a big area city, not a big population city necessarily. So, this is the same information north and south, just in case we need a reference tool for discussion and, then, at the end I did throw in this -- this diagram, as you can see kind of on the right of the slide, where this is the framework that -- since our master plan was adopted in '07 we have kind of been working toward -- the Five Mile pathway has been a priority kind of cutting diagonal across the city and the Meridian loop -- well, is as noted and we have been looking at routes north and south. So, that's kind of a -- just something to keep in mind as -- as what we have been keeping in mind when we choose these routes or update them. So, I will go back to the maps and stand for any questions and I hope some good discussion. Thanks.

Simison: So, Council Woman Strader, at least from the -- I know you are looking at making a -- recommending an addition to what is being considered today and I guess I'm looking a little bit to the Parks Department as are you wanting that level of dialogue on a -- something that's really not on the map currently in this regards? Is that what you want to do to change where we are today or is that a separate conversation from your perspective?

Warren: Mr. Mayor and Council Members, I think if -- if it's broad stroke information we are interested in hearing your comments. We are open to whether or not this is the best venue, but -- but we would like to -- I'm assuming, since I haven't gotten a lot back via e-mail in the interim, I hope there is commentary. I'm not anticipating a tremendous amount. So, I'm open to either solution. But we -- we would like to hear what you have to say.

Simison: I guess I would like to know what the ramifications are if we were to add Linder in. Is this a one week process? Is this a one month process? Amended on the fly and just say a north-south route down Linder, just so we can understand whether or not we are moving forward with a resolution tonight or we are not moving forward with a resolution tonight. If we need to send this back to the drawing board for more work if the Council is in agreement that we need to do something. That's what I'm trying to figure out, just so we keep the discussion focused.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Just kind of moving as well.

Siddoway: I'm coming to the side one to just maybe -- I think there is a legal question for Mr. Nary, because I believe that we could adopt it by resolution tonight with specific changes. For example, if we wanted to add Linder Road to the rest of the proposed map as noted, but -- or would we need to make the changes and come back with a new resolution, so --

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I mean you can do it either way. I mean certainly you can get a final map and do that. That's probably the cleanest if -- if you want to do that. But you certainly can -- can approve a resolution with that in the record as to what else needs to be accomplished and added at a later date and that's fine. We can acknowledge that on the map itself. We can acknowledge that in the document. You know, adopted on June 6th, final version July 1st. Whatever. So, I mean you could do it either way.

Simison: Maybe one more practical question is how would a north-south on Linder differentiate between what a north-south on Black Cat would be under ACHD's new policy where they are -- any road improvement that they are doing has a template detached pathway? I'm just curious if there -- would you view this as being treated different than other things if we were to designate Linder, as for example?

Warren: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, I know that a lot of Linder has been widened already. We have also been working on routes north from Linder, you know, eventually to the greenbelt. So, one advantage is that it's already kind of been identified as a north-south route, it's just not complete. But I think with the overpass project of the Interstate it makes a lot of sense. It's a little more centrally located and for that reason feels like -- you know, if we were looking to add another major spine or work toward one, that seems to me more -- it's more centrally located than Black Cat.

Simison: I'm just asking -- there is a change, though, in ACHD's development plan if we designate this differently, because primarily it's going to be a roadway pathway. I mean we are not going to be zooming into neighborhoods I would assume, but I don't know that for -- that's what I'm trying to understand is if it's a north-south along a road arterial how does that view differently or otherwise. Mr. Siddoway.

Siddoway: I'm trying to make sure that I have a -- a correct understanding of ACHD's current policy. When you say that they would require along arterials, these pathways are -- are they ten foot? Because I know their -- their previous standard has been five foot detached or seven foot attached. If they are -- if their current policy is -- has changed to a ten foot along arteries and that change would not make -- us adding it to this map would not make a difference in that specific example.

Simison: Or really any road.

Siddoway: But any -- any arterial. Yeah. I just didn't fully realized that it had changed that dramatically.

Simison: Yeah. And it may mean we need to rethink north of Franklin, because to -- to Council Woman Strader, south of Franklin nothing has been improved on Linder and so it would really maybe create an expectation. I do know it will have an impact a little bit on some of the design work that's being done on the Linder Road overpass task force as well, because there is a constraint and a challenge with some of it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I mean I would love just to take two minutes to explain the rationale of why I'm making the recommendation before we go down the new path, but I guess -- like, first of all, I -- we appreciated receiving all the detailed maps and so I thought you were providing the maps for us to review and provide feedback, understanding that the Parks Department and certainly the Parks Commission and a lot of other bodies have reviewed it, but I -- I mean I did review them and my feedback would be we have this kind of realist trail concept, which is recreational in nature; right? We have all the existing canals that primarily run -- excuse me. We have the loop, which is primarily recreational in nature. Thank you. Then we have these canals, which mostly run east and west. Rail with trail is a spine running east and west. I really do think we need a north-south corridor for people who are using these pathways to commute. I have spoken with several people who actually go from north Meridian and connect to the greenbelt near Eagle and they don't have a complete path to get there and so if we had I think something on Linder -- it was right in the middle of the city. That's why I chose that. But I don't know that it has to be Linder. I think you could connect with the greenbelt. People -- it sounds like people can actually get into downtown Boise in about an hour and a half biking from that area and so I think we need to start looking at this not just for recreation, but as an alternative, you know, way to commute and so that's why I was making that recommendation was from speaking with people that commute into Boise on bike and what they -- what their needs were. But it seemed like if we had a way to connect the city -- if it went -- if we had something going north-south and I would suggest something more central than Black Cat, I think that would really help people get around almost everywhere. So, that's why I made that suggestion.

Simison: And just for the record I wasn't suggesting Black Cat. I'm only suggesting how would Linder be different than Black Cat when it's built out if this was designated as a north-south route. That's really where I was trying to go with that comment.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- and that's why I thought we were -- actually was confused why this was on the Consent Agenda. I thought we were going to have like another meeting once all of Council had reviewed the maps where we were going to share each person's feedback, so I -- but, again, if I was confused about that I apologize. It could just be that my wires got crossed.

Simison: I don't -- I -- I don't think your wires were crossed. I do think that there is two fundamental different things right here. There is the map that includes changes that have already been made, because we have worked with the development community to make modifications, which is a lot of what you see within the system and, then, there is the larger question of what's missing. So, yeah, I think that you have definitely hit on the question of is this a missing piece that we need to address, as compared to going into each square mile. I don't know that anyone has identified any square mile connection point that was missed that should be added or provided feedback and that is a much different detail and at least from my -- from our standpoint I know one of our main thing is trying to get the second part, but the first part is definitely part of the conversation which is why we are here.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, I don't know then -- you will have to let me know if this is an appropriate time to give feedback, so -- and this would be something that would be Knew. If I was a -- just a resident looking at this and I wanted to access any of these by vehicle first to drive from my home to a location to pick up three miles of the pathway for example, I -- I notice that we don't have anything that marks where folks can actually pick up -- so sorry. Where folks can actually pick up a trail other than the one trailhead that we have. So, I would really like to see something that shows maybe some potential parking areas where folks can pick up a section and take off from there. I mean the intention is -- I really appreciate Council Woman Strader's suggestion as far as commuting. I think it's fantastic and creative. As far as recreational use, there is a lot of residents that can't get to these pathways by foot, so wondering if that might be something that could potentially be added and if you would, you know, chat with the Parks Department about it and let us know. It's not -- it's not something that needs to hold up what we are doing this evening, but it was -- that's just what my one piece -- piece of feedback on the map, so --

Warren: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, I think that's a great comment and I do want to honor your comments and still be respectful of agenda. So, I think that's definitely -- that feels to me more of a public facing map, but I do think it's a really good point that just -- you know, ideas for where it can be accessed if it's something that you need to drive to, sure, I noted that and when we come back with the public facing map draft, if we are invited at some point, we can talk about that then. But we will definitely put it on the list of something to explore.

Simison: So, I guess, Steve or Kim, would you like to come back and have a conversation about future map corridors and maybe even a little bit of a presence -- because I know we do have -- plan to have a connection plan to the greenbelt and where that -- where you are hoping to make that connection long term. I -- I just don't know what long term is anymore with stuff. So, would it makes sense -- do you want to come back and talk to Council about adding more changes if they were to move this forward? Does that make sense?

Siddoway: I'm feeling like that would make -- make the majority the most comfortable. I -- I feel like we could move forward with the map as presented, but just to cut to the chase, why don't we just say let's not act on the resolution tonight, let's have a conversation about additional corridors, especially in light of the ACHD policy, and let us come back.

Simison: Okay. Then with that do I have a motion? You don't need to vacate the item? Okay. All right. Then -- then we don't need a motion. We will --

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Sorry. Just for the discussion to close the loop, is there a time frame that -- of -- of when we are going to try and do this? I mean it's -- it's -- it's a working project. It never ends, quite frankly; right? So, understanding that we need to do an adoption, you know, move the goalpost a little bit and the work continues. I just don't want us to -- to continue to refine in perpetuity and not actually adopt something. So, is it a 30, 60 day thing or are we way out?

Siddoway: No. I -- I think it's more like a 30 day thing. Kim, do you want to speak to what you see as the logical timeline?

Warren: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Borton, Steve, I do -- I would like to clarify when we come back will it be a -- a route focus discussion? Is that what we would be looking at? Are you expecting the map in its entirety? The public facing map would look really different from the -- the data focused map, because the data, obviously, has all the information on it. So, what is your expectation for when we return? Is it a discussion of routes, almost like a work -- a workshop?

Borton: Great question.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just so I'm clear, before we kick this down the road for 30 days. This map we are proposing tonight is developed not for the public, but for our development partners going forward. If all the development on Linder and Black Cat, per ACHD's new rule, is already going to be at a ten foot sidewalk, why do we need to wait if that's already going to be in place with any new development per ACHD policy? We don't need to designate it. It's going to be done automatically by ACHD and we could approve this for the development community now when we do the public facing portion, what that map is and what we have standing now and if there is an app for it -- if there is some sort of a map that we can do on a mobile device, then, that will more specifically designate what we have now and we can continue to update it. I'm not sure that I quite understand why we have to wait if ACHD's policy is they are already putting a ten foot in. We would be tagging along on their current policy.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yeah. And she said that's fair.

Cavener: No. I thought she said Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Oh.

Strader: I said Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Oh, I thought that's fair. Okay.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. No. I -- so, I disagree. So, I -- respectfully I feel like why provide all the maps and ask Council to review the maps if the purpose was not to -- not only update the existing conditions, but to get buy-in on where the future pathways go; right? Like this is published for the whole community, not just the development community, and I agree if it's just adopting this because we need an interim step for like internal work, I guess we could do that if we are going to have a future discussion about where the future pathways need to go, but I felt like, you know, of course if -- if we are having a holistic discussion about the future plans, which are part of the map, right, it shows where our proposed future pathways are, that I think we should all be on the same page. So, I -- I don't know. Maybe I -- I thought this was more of a brainstorming session than it was, but that -- that's just my take on it. I -- I guess we could adopt it, but, then, I would suggest that if we adopt it we have a plan to discuss again in a couple weeks on where the future pathways go. I don't think we need to hold it up for the creation of an app or -- or something like that, but certainly think we could -- I -- I just -- I feel like we are adopting something that has a map indicating where future pathways go and I -- I guess I, for one, have feedback about a difference of opinion on where the future pathways should go.

Warren: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Can I ask a follow-up question? Are there places on this map you think pathways should be eliminated from or is it just stuff that's not currently on there?

Strader: No. I think it's all just stuff that would be added, not necessarily taken away.

Simison: And I think from a process standpoint what would make sense, then, is to adopt this so it is on there and have a conversation -- more in-depth conversation about what should be added at a future point. That gets us to where we want it -- frankly, need to go, so we don't lose out on something, because I would hate that -- the odds of something happening are probably pretty slim, but I would hate for us to miss out on something because we didn't update our map in time. Yeah. Yes. So, bring it back. It's -- the only question is what's Laurelei going to give up, because I think she's booked out the next month of your workshops and --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: -- get to herself tonight finished either, so -- but, yes, we will -- we can bring them back forthwith. There is a conversation as soon as we find time. It's not a difficult conversation in my opinion.

Warren: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Where am I looking at? Oh. Sorry, Kim. Yeah.

Warren: Council Woman Strader. Just as a note, we would like to -- we -- we have a working layer and I am making edits to that all the time to adapt to development to get things on the map so we don't miss out and so this effort -- we are wanting to incorporate those into an official document, so it is sort of enforceable in a sense, like the UDC or, you know, the zoning map. So, it would be great to move forward in that way. That working layer is always ongoing. I change it as things come up, opportunities arise, or as things, you know, kind of appear to lead in a different direction. So, that working layer is kind of always going and I think that, you know, were we to have a workshop with Council and hear anything significantly different, we could amend that layer and, you know, if we needed to do another adoption for a significant change we could, but it would be great to get this information made official and current, just so that, yeah, we don't miss out. Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I don't have an issue with -- with that, with adopting the new additions to the map, so that you can, you know, create this moment in time where you are kind of stopping in an official way and saying this is what we have right now. This is what needs to go into our official data set that's not necessarily a public facing. This is -- this is like, as you said, internal -- internally working. Some of that information will move into

the public facing. I think we are just -- maybe some of the confusion has been as -- in the conversations and with e-mail information there -- I think what the -- I'm assuming -- can't speak for Council Woman Strader, but if she's thinking the same way I'm thinking, you are actively working with the IT Department to, then, also be updating the GIS -- or, excuse me, the -- the public facing map and so I think we are giving you feedback right now so you can continue in that effort, but it's not going to be -- we understand it's not going to be official until later and there may be more conversations about what will happen in the future. So, just for clarification that's why I'm sharing my feedback on the public facing map right now, because you are already in the process of working with them to develop that and I -- I assume that that's also -- was Council Woman Strader's understanding of -- of the two different pieces of feedback that you are asking for. So, I don't have an issue for me personally in an approval. I assume the resolution is just the -- the data piece that you are talking about. I don't have an issue with passing that this evening if that's what is necessary for you to proceed.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I was just -- it's very much more simplistic than that was like, okay, we are adopting a map. The map has proposed pathways indicated. I disagree about where the proposed future pathway should be and so I'm totally cool with adopting it tonight, as long as we all agree if we have consensus on changes to proposed future pathways that it will have to be adopted shortly again, which is kind of messy adopting it, you know, twice in short order, but if everyone is cool with that, I -- Mr. Mayor, I'm totally fine with that.

Simison: Okay. I -- I think we can do that and, quite frankly, I think that they can easily come back with a north-south recommendation. That's really what it sounds like. The connection -- what is the connection? Where is the parking and what's the north-south recommendation and what would that mean, if anything. You know, what -- you know, what would change, because I think if you look at Eagle Road where they just updated it, they are adding those as pathways along Eagle Road, because they just made those changes and so you are going to have our -- every new road segment is going to do that, but how far can you go? Or do we need to make other changes or other proposals? That will be the question I think they come back and say here is why this corridor may make sense or may not make sense because of whatever reason and at least have that conversation with Council before you decide to add it or not. Make sense? Okay. All right. Councilman Borton.

Strader: With that discussion and direction, let's do this. Let's pass this resolution. I move we approve Resolution 23-2392.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Resolution 23-2392. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the resolution is agreed to and you guys have a direction and can come back and focus on the pathways component.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Warren: Thank you.

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

18. Public Works Week Proclamation

Simison: All right. Thank you. With that we will move on to Item 18, which is a proclamation for Public Works Week. Laurelei, if you would like to join me at the podium. So, Council, it's that time of year again. There we go. It's -- I know. Trying -- trying to get -- get stuff going on, so -- yeah. I -- I'm -- I will go ahead and read the proclamation. I will turn it over to you, Laurelei for comments for you and your team. So, whereas the City of Meridian residents have peace of mind with every faucet turned on, shower taken and toilet flushed, thanks to the professional employees of the Meridian Public Works team and whereas each unseen essential worker, engineer, inspector, operator, technician is committed to protecting our health, safety environment and quality of life through the supply and distribution of clean, safe water, efficient collection and -- and treatment of wastewater and management of solid waste and whereas the dedicated public staff and partners design, maintain and sustain the quality of these critical services and important infrastructure, recognizing their ability to do so dependent on having the support of informed citizens and whereas the Meridian Public Works Department educates the community about the work they do, both in person through their daily work and virtually through informative and engaging public outreach and whereas connecting the world through Public Works is the theme for the 2023 National Public Works Week and it represents the often unseen, steadfast and heroic efforts put forth by the public through professionals across North America, therefore, I, Mayor Robert E. Simison, proclaim the week of June 4th through 12th, 2023, as Meridian Public Works Week in the City of Meridian and call upon on all citizens and civic organizations to acquaint themselves with the vast and complex efforts involved in providing our Public Works services and to recognize the substantial contributions Public Works employees make every day to our health, safety, comfort and quality of life, dated this 6th day of June 2023. And, yes, that was a lot of words for a proclamation. But congratulations to you and your team.

McVey: Thank you, Mayor. Really excited. We are -- if you have an opportunity tomorrow from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. out in front of City Hall we are doing our Public Works Week Expo, which is a great opportunity for family, if you have kids, even adults it's great. Our staff bring out all of their equipment and take a lot of pride in what they do. It's a really exciting opportunity where, you know, different from police and fire where we don't get the daily showing of -- of what we do, but it is something that every single

resident of Meridian uses every single day and so I really resonate with the heroes of the underground and often unseen, but a really important element to keeping the community safe and healthy and so we are excited. Thank you for the proclamation and we hope to see people out tomorrow.

Borton: Hey, Mr. Mayor, while you are walking up, Laurelei, you are exactly right, that -- the Expo and what's out in the City Hall tomorrow is really cool. So, if anybody can reach out in the little social media circles and encourage folks to come down, they are always amazed to see -- it's also -- it's kind of a cool budgetary thing I think, because you got some of the big expensive equipment out, too, and sort of see how some of those devices operate and so it's a great way to connect your crews' hard work to the community. So, it's something to brag about. You have a lot of good successes. So, we are proud of you.

19. Public Works: History and Future of Reclaimed Water Presentation

Simison: Thank you. So, with that we will move on to Item 19, which is Public Works for the history and future of reclaimed water presentation.

McVey: All right. Thank you, Mayor and Council. So, a couple of things. We don't necessarily need official action on this tonight, but would be interested in your direction for the future of our reclaimed water program. Okay. There we go. So, I know all of you are familiar with what reclaimed water is, but for anybody that's watching from the public -- so, you will often hear it -- use the terms reclaimed, reused, recycled. Those all mean reclaimed water and, essentially, what that is is it's water that's gone all the way through our advanced wastewater treatment plant. It goes through really advanced tertiary filtration and, then, also a step of additional chlorine is added. So, really highly treated water. It's also very highly regulated from both the federal and state level. So, we have a permit to do that. It has to meet both quality and also where you can use the water. So, you will often hear it referred to as a Class A -- Class A water. What that essentially means -- A is the highest class of water in the state of Idaho. It means you can use it for the most things. So, you can use it to grow food crops, you can use it to water lawns, you can use it to wash cars -- all kinds of things. But just a couple of things on terminology. So, why did Meridian get into the business of making reclaimed water? So, we have to travel back almost 25 years to get to that answer. So, in 1999 the city was issued a new wastewater discharge permit. So, this had a seven MGD flow cap, which essentially meant that we could not discharge more than seven MGD from the wastewater treatment plant. Well, back in 1999 we had 28,000 people in Meridian and our flow at the wastewater plant was around 3.7 MGD. So, at that point nobody thought seven MGD would ever be a problem. Generally these permits get renewed every five years. So, figured we would get a new permit, those numbers would get updated. Well, EPA got incredibly behind during this period. They actually got so far behind there were so many past due permits in the state that they ended up getting sued by environmental agencies. So, we get to 2004, our permit is administratively extended, but that means it just continues on with all of the same limits in place. So, not necessarily a big deal, but fast forward to ten years down the road, we still don't have a

new permit. So, at that point our population and our flow at the treatment plant had doubled. So, we really had to come up with an option. So, there were a couple of options; right? We could do nothing. That really wasn't an option, because every single day that you violate at the treatment plant you can get up to 50,000 per day per violation fines, as well as jail time for your operators. So, that really wasn't an option. The second was why don't we ask for a new permit? So, we really weren't in control of that timeline. The state had thousands of expired permits. There is also pros and cons with that. So, we knew the flow cap could change, but with the new permit we also knew that we were going to likely get other new limits. So, another option would be a building moratorium. So, stop growth in Meridian. I probably don't need to talk a lot about why that option was not chosen. It's not good for the city, for the residents. Or we could develop a reclaimed water program. So, this would allow us to take -- in those summer months when we get our peak flow it would allow us to take that water and not discharge it to Five Mile Creek and use it somewhere else and we could stay under that seven MGD flow cap. So, in 2009 we started developing the program. So, to have a reclaimed program you really need four things. You need a permit from the DEQ. You need the technology at the wastewater plant to be able to make the reclaimed water. You have to have the pipes to be able to get the reclaimed water to wherever it is you want to distribute it to and you have to have sites that can accept it. So, we started working on all of those things. In 2008 we received our first permit, which allowed us to only apply water at Heroes Park. We had the wastewater discharge line that went down to Chinden and, then, eventually down Linder to the Boise River. We haven't used that in a long time. So, we slip lined that pipe to save costs and welded it at Heroes Park. Then after 2008 -- between 2008 and 2010 we worked on building the technology at the treatment plant and we also worked on furthering our distribution system. So, in 2010 we were issued the first -- you -- you probably heard us say the first Class A citywide permit in Idaho. Well, we weren't the first Class A producer in Idaho, other places had used it. What was innovative at that time was most reclaimed permits tell you that you can water a very specific site, like Heroes Park, or like a farmer's field. Our permit allowed us to apply reclaimed water as long as it met the standards in any area that you see highlighted there in orange. However, we also had to get the water there, which ended up being the -- the primary constraint with this program. So, we had our distribution line that went up and down Ten Mile. We added customers over time and really important -- so, fast forward to 2014, the city still is operating under its 1999 permit. So, in 2014 is when the city first started capping and going over seven MGD. So, every single time that we would have been over seven MGD from 2014 to 2017 we could have had a costly permit violation. Reclaimed water absolutely served a very important purpose to the city in that time frame. Growth still hasn't slowed down. We are now at the plant we are over nine MGD regularly, but something else happened in 2017. We finally received our new discharge permit. So, our 1999 permit is gone. We are in 2017, good and bad. So, the flow cap was removed. So, they generally don't put flow caps on permits anymore. The bad -- well, I don't know if bad news, but the other news as we suspected we got really stringent ammonia and phosphorus limits and they were also year around limits. The reason that I'm talking about year around limits -- it's important. So, reclaimed water is generally only a solution in the summertime when you have somewhere to apply that water. When you get limits that are year around you

have to build the technology at the treatment plant to treat those in the winter as well. So, reuse isn't necessarily serving you a regulatory benefit. So, we received those limits in 2017. We had to comply with those by 2027. So, we came to Council in 2016, 2017 time frame and said so now that reuse isn't necessarily serving us a regulatory purpose, do you want us to keep doing reclaimed water? So, there are some pros to that. You know, at that point we had invested about five million dollars into the system. It does offset some potable water use. There is no cost to the users and there is generally I think community support for this type of program. Potential downsides. This program costs us about 165,000 dollars annually to produce the reclaimed water, between electricity, chemical costs. We don't have a way to recover those costs. So, we can't charge the customers for it and you will see in the graph below the cost of reclaimed water is expensive to produce, compared to other types of water. And, then, it no longer has that regulatory benefit. So, should we continue to do it? The answer was, yes, continue to reuse. We have the infrastructure in place. Let's keep doing it. But if something big changes come back to us and let us know. So, what does the program look like today? So, we have nine sites. Three of those are city sites and six of those are private users. It's mostly used for landscaping today, but we have a couple of other -- we do some toilet flushing at the wastewater plant and, then, also cooling water at our blowers and a couple of sites can do car washing. So, in 2022 we produced 50 million gallons of reuse. That may sound like a lot, but in the wastewater world it's not. That's about 1.6 percent of all the flow that goes to the plant. We are also at full capacity. So, the way our system works it's batch based. We have those two tanks. It takes us about six to seven hours to produce a batch. So, we can't add any more users unless we add more equipment at the plant. So, we have all the users we can today. Another issue that's come up over the last several years is the issue of salinity. So, once you remove all of the things out of the wastewater there is still a salt component. This is primarily -- so, it meets all regulations, it's still safe, but it has had an impact on some of our larger sites as far as vegetation. So, the parks -- the Parks Department has struggled with it. Actually the past several years we haven't used reclaimed water at Heroes Park to try to give that landscaping a break from those salt levels. So, that is what it looks like today and that is what the program would continue to look like if -- if we didn't add to it. So, one other thing has changed. So, I mentioned the 2017 permit had limits that we had to meet in 2027. So, to do that we are currently in design of some really big projects at the plant. So, the big plan expansion, the plant remodel and our tertiary filters will all help us get to those 2027 limits. As we started designing the tertiary filter project the costs are high. This is advanced treatment. And so we started looking at ways to bring the cost down on these projects and one of those ways -- so, there is kind of two ways you can bring costs down. You can install less membranes. So, that picture is a membrane skid. Each one of those skids you pull out, you reduce capacity of the system. They are expensive. Somewhere in the, you know, 1.5 to two million dollars per skid. You can pull some of those out and you can add them back in when you need more capacity. Another way is to install flow equalization. So, at the wastewater plant we get big peaks of flow in the morning and in the evening and so if you install a holding tank where you capture those high flows in the peaks of the day and you treat them at night when we get low flows, you can install fewer membrane skids. So, there is a couple of options as far as equalization. So, one is you

just build a new equalization tank. That's a couple of million dollars to do that. One of the innovative ideas that came up was -- or we could repurpose and remodel and reuse the reuse infrastructure. It's about 750,000 dollars for us to do that and so that would be a cost savings there and, then, it also is a cost savings of about 165,000 dollars that it costs us each year to produce reuse. I want to also note that it does not -- by ending the reuse program today it doesn't preclude us from ever doing reuse again in the future and I will talk a little bit about how that might look different for us in the future. So, what would drive reuse in the future if we were to end the program that we have today? Potentially getting some sort of summer limit. So, you may have heard the city of Nampa is starting a reuse program that will take their flow completely out of Indian Creek in the summer, because of a summer time temperature limit. The -- the type of program to do that, though, has to be full flow and you have to have the technology to -- to take all of that flow out and somewhere to put it. So, their plan is to put it into the Phyllis Canal. The -- the city of Boise is also looking at reuse. They are planning up by the Micron area where the aquifer is different from where we are at, where there is actually space to add water back into the aquifer and so they will be putting in even further advanced treatment, more than -- than what we have, to make it to equality where you could put it in the aquifer. So, these are things that Meridian absolutely could do in the future should there be drivers that would make those projects make sense for us, like it is for the other two cities around us. This is just a map to show you. So, Nampa's proximity to Phyllis Canal is making it so that they are able to discharge into Phyllis Canal. A couple of things that's going to make that program work for them is that they will make up somewhere between ten and 20 percent of the flow in Phyllis Canal. So, the issues that we face, like salt, goes away, because that's distributed and, then, that water is used to water over 17,000 acres south of that along the Phyllis Canal. A little bit different. You might ask, well, why and we put our water in the Phyllis Canal. Well, you will see where our wastewater plant is at that orange star. So, distance to get there is a little bit more challenging than Nampa. Not to say it couldn't happen in the future, but just a little bit different than what Nampa is setting up to do. So, what are our options? We could keep reuse as is, keep it the way it is today. It would benefit the seven existing users. The infrastructure is in place. We have invested in the system. We could keep running it. There is no regulatory benefit to doing that. We can't add more users and there is that ongoing 165,000 dollars that is, you know, spread across ratepayers. What would that mean for my tertiary filter project? We -- we can definitely mitigate that by adding in more skids and adding in a new equalization tank down the road, continue the program as is and, then, we would have to do a permit modification, because we are putting in different filters, but also not insurmountable. We can -- we can definitely do that. Or we could reuse the infrastructure. That would stop reclaimed water production for now. Our existing users would need to connect to potable or surface water. However, we would continue production through summer of 2024. So, this wouldn't be we go back to the plant and shut it down tomorrow. We have over, you know, almost a year and a half to work through these connections, work through communication with the customers and, then, work through permit termination with DEQ. It would simplify our operations at the plant and would bring back regulatory benefit; right? This is going to be used for tertiary -- or to benefit the tertiary filter project, which saves us on -- on compliance. It also would lower and delay additional

project costs; right? So, the additional cost today and, then, the ongoing operational costs. So, what is our recommendation? Our recommendation is to pursue reusing the reuse infrastructure. So, again, we think the cost savings and the operational simplicity, along with getting regulatory benefit back from this infrastructure. It would end our current program, which would definitely, you know, have impact to the existing users, but it does not end future potential for -- for reuse. It would just have -- require us to do additional infrastructure in the future when that made sense for the city. So, with that that is the information that I have. I know it's not necessarily an easy decision to end a program that's been in place for the last 15 years, but things have changed, technology has changed, regulations have changed, the need has changed. We have learned a lot over 15 years. We would do the program different going forward, if that's -- you know, if the -- if the desire is to expand we would have to do different things. So, with that I would stand for any questions and would be seeking your input and feedback.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Had a chance to review this and the -- and the recommendations in advance. I appreciate the explanation for it and one of the things in particular I appreciate is sometimes we get stuck doing something and -- and not having the -- I don't know, the -- the vision to reassess and determine if it still makes sense and to pivot if necessary and this may be one that seems to be appropriate to pivot with the explanations that you provided. It makes sense to me. One question that I had -- and if you said it I missed it, but on the cost savings, is it a capital cost or are there some labor costs of allocation of, you know, limited resources with individuals covering all that you do? So, is it a little bit of both?

McVey: Mayor, Councilman Borton, it is both. So, it does eliminate, you know, ongoing operational costs, power, electricity. It does save us labor costs. So, we have costs both at the treatment plant for staff to produce. We have to test this water daily. We also have costs related to the distribution system operations and backflow testing and so all of that would go away and we could, you know, re -- reuse those labor hours, right, for this system growing in other areas.

Borton: And the second question was whether any of -- there is only seven?

McVey: Uh-huh.

Borton: Are those seven private users or seven total?

McVey: Seven total, with the city being one of those. So, there is six private, plus the city.

Borton: Are there any contractual agreements with those private users that need to be -- need their consent to edit as part of this winding up?

McVey: So, great question. So, we do have users agreements with every user and in those there is language that we are allowed to end the program with 30 days notice for any -- any reason. So, we are -- we are anticipating giving longer than that, because there is -- there is no immediate need for us to shut these down. We are still in design on the tertiary project and so we could continue with production through summer of 2024 to allow people the transition time and most people already have those connections in place, it's just a matter of -- of switching them over.

Borton: Okay.

Nary: And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: On that same note, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council and Laurelei, we can -- we could certainly work with you, too, because I -- I can't remember, besides those contractual agreements, if we embedded them into their land use approvals. So, we can verify that with planning to make sure we kind of make sure that's cleaned up, too.

Borton: Good.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you very much, Laurelei. Couple quick questions about the cost savings as well. So, I wasn't quite sure on the first slide that you had -- had put up, but you -- there is 50 to 60 million for the costs associated with the tertiary installation that is required by the permit. So, if we save approximately four to six percent, minus the 750,000 to convert the tanks, we are looking at about three to five million in savings. How much does that put a dent in what the -- the increase in costs that we have seen since we first started discussing the upgrades?

McVey: So, Council Woman Perreault, we have I think it's close to -- oh, gosh. We have currently planned a little over 48 million in the CFP for the tertiary filter project. So, we are looking to shave, you know, anywhere we can. We have done other cost saving things that I didn't bring up in this, such as changing the building type from brick to metal makes a big difference. We are already progressing down that -- that path. But this would bring an immediate project savings of between three and four million dollars.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, we could currently be approximately 12 million below what we -- where we would need to be to complete it because of cost increases?

McVey: Yes.

Perreault: Okay. So, this would be 40 to 50 percent potentially. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: A couple questions. My first question is if we remove the permit can we get the permit back if we wanted to do something else? That's my first question. My second question is kind of a bigger scale question, which is just -- right? Like water is our most precious resource. We are blessed with our geological location and being in the middle of an aquifer that's very deep. Unfortunately, though, in the future, not just in the next five years, but in the next like 80 years we don't know what will happen, depending on the number of people who live here and how much that aquifer gets used. We are not replenishing the aquifer the same way that we were with irrigation, because of all the development. So, I guess a bigger question is what would an actual, you know, reuse program look like? Are any of our other cities around here trying to look at that and just broad strokes of what's involved, because this seems like a feel good thing that we are doing, but it's so limited in scope that I just -- I think it's not actually, you know, trying to drive toward a solution to that long-term aquifer issue.

McVey: Council Woman Strader, good question. So, first, if we remove the permit could we get it back in the future? Yes. We would have to reapply, because, you know, our technology, whatever we were installing would look different. But I think DEQ is absolutely supportive of reuse permits and I see no -- no constraint in the future to do that. You know, part of the permit application process would be describing what you are planning to do with that water. We did, as Public Works looked at what it would take and where we would have to go to be able to do aquifer recharge, just as a conceptual thing and because of Meridian's topography you have to actually get up and over kind of the -- the bench at the interchange and go out towards Kuna before you actually hit sites that you could -- there is enough space in the aquifer where you could put that water in. So, when we looked at it it's definitely possible, but it does cost a lot of money to pump that many millions of gallons that far of a distance. That's part of why like city of Boise is doing their site specific reuse ideas out in those areas where it makes more sense, where you don't have those pumping and distribution costs to get the water to the spot in the aquifer where it could -- could be reused. You do also have to install more advanced technology to make sure that you are taking out anything that's of concern before you put it back in the aquifer. But we would definitely -- if -- if you want to make, you know, the impact on -- on water in the Treasure Valley, it -- it's all scale and scope. You know, one good example is that -- I believe it's the flow in New York Canal in six days is the same amount of water that Meridian uses in an entire year. So, when you are talking about, you know, the -- the wastewater at the treatment plant

being nine or 10 MGD, that's similar to what Nampa is proposing to put in Phyllis Canal. Phyllis Canal generally conveys over a hundred million gallons of water every day. So, our -- our reuse programs are important. At this point in the Treasure Valley they likely don't serve a water shortage constraint, it's more focused towards regulatory -- meeting regulatory limits, although that could change in the future and there is -- there is technology and ability to move the water to where you could put it in the aquifer.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, would it be fair to say that our existing water reuse program -- like the environmental impact is really negligible relative to the cost. Like the -- it sounds good, but this program really isn't moving the needle in terms of you are making an impact on the aquifer and avoiding the use of potable water. Is that correct?

McVey: You are correct.

Strader: Uh-huh. Yeah. I think that's important for us to -- to recognize. I guess I am actually more concerned about the permit. It feels like there is a value to having the permit. Is it -- we could reapply for it. Is there a way to keep our foot in the door, so we don't give our permit up and sort of scale it back or is it like easy to get a permit? I just don't understand enough about them to understand what we are giving up by giving up a permit.

McVey: Council Woman Strader. So, it -- I would say it's -- it's generally easy to get a permit as long as you have all of the -- the studies and the information in place. So, as long as you can tell DEQ what quality of water that you have and where you plan to use it, getting a permit -- it's, you know, an application process. We -- we have to do it every ten years anyways as part of -- so, the reclaimed permits expire every ten years. So, we have gone through it before. We have -- we have reapplied. So, I don't have concern that we could never get another reuse permit. You know, if we kept it in place, but weren't producing reuse, we would essentially just have to do annual reports that would tell them that we are no longer producing -- or, you know, we didn't distribute any reclaimed water this year. So, it would just be kind of an administrative check box, but I'm not sure that would have a lot of value, because we would have to do a permit modification anyways once we put the new filters in to tell DEQ that, hey, we are using a new technology, it needs to be incorporated in our permit. So, probably not a lot of use to keep the permit just to keep it and -- and I'm -- I feel confident that we would be able to get a new -- a new permit down the road if we enhanced our program.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Strader: Laurelei, just two questions. When does our current permit expire?

McVey: 2027 -- or the reuse permit? Is it 2020 -- I think it might be 2025. I think it might be 2025.

Cavener: Okay. And, then, Mr. Mayor one additional.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Laurelei, I appreciate you talked about what it would take to reapply, but that would, then, come with probably a significant capital infrastructure; right? So, the equipment we have today is what allowed us to get our previous permit. It probably wouldn't necessarily qualify if we were coming in fresh asking for a new permit today; is that correct?

McVey: Councilman Cavener -- so, no, we would still -- the technology we have today still allows us to produce reuse water. Where we are limited today is in the batch process and, then, also the -- the distribution system. So, if we wanted to expand it in the future you could do it with the technology you have today. You would need to install more tanks, so that you could produce more batches simultaneously. We would recommend and also what city of Nampa and city of Boise are pursuing is more of a flow through system where you just install UV technology that's high enough to treat it as it goes through, so you are not making batches and taking that amount of time.

Cavener: Okay.

McVey: We would also need to figure out a place to put it, more application sites if we wanted to make more.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Laurelei, great presentation, by the way, and, again, much like Councilman Borton said, I have had time to study this and -- and go over -- I remember when the first purple pipe was laid it was such a great achievement for the city. I really believe it's come to its end of being that great product. I would fully support ending this program as we see in running it through the summer of '24 and, then, keeping the door open for a future permit and doing it in another manner, understanding that where we sit our water table is pretty low and we can't be pumping it into our water table here and it's cost prohibitive to pump it too far south to pump it into an aquifer that can take it and we kind of sit in the city where our treatment plant sits downstream at the far corner, so it's just because of the proximity of where our wastewater treatment plant is it also kind of limits some of our uses. But I think we have done a great job. It's kudos to your staff over the years, everything you have done. I don't think we ever thought or knew that the salinity in the water would cause us some of the vegetation issues and, you know, that kind of takes away from some of the beautiful green that we wanted to see on the landscaping barriers in Heroes Park. But for the cost savings that we can see moving forward I think

this is a -- although it was a great thing that we were doing, I think it's a much smarter decision moving forward for the city to end our current program and just keep the door open for the future if we want to bring it back.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Put a pin in this. Are you looking for some head nods or general consensus? I think we are not voting, but we are gesturing.

Simison: That -- that would be useful. That way when she brings forward a budget cost in the upcoming budget year it's for the project that is reflective of this direction.

Borton: Perfect.

McVey: And also allows us to start working with the users over this next year.

Borton: Mr. Mayor, you are spot on with the recommendation. The reasons described and discussed by Council highlight them all, so -- my view of it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I -- I at least would like to see some work done around more of a long term -- you know, what does the larger scale reuse program sort of look like? I think there is a risk of eliminating this program that it's limited in scope and, then, we are saving the money and reusing the tanks. But if we wanted to leverage the infrastructure for something else, you know, it's not going to be there. So, I don't -- I -- I'm okay with, you know, talking about eliminating this, but I want to have some discussions of what we would replace it with in the future. That's kind of where I'm at.

Simison: Mr. Cavener, anything to add?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks. I'm -- I'm reluctant to move forward with eliminating the program. There is a certain opportunity cost that we have already got built into a program and to sunset that, then, to begin it again I think could be really really challenging. The cost to continue to operate it is so low to our -- our ratepayers that they wouldn't -- they would not see a savings in their -- in their water bill as a result of this and so I do see some benefit I think as a good user of our most precious resource that this is a good program, recognizing it's maxed out. I think when the permit expires to me is maybe a keystone.

So, if it is '25 I think maybe to Council Member Strader's comments, giving us a little bit more time to process what the future of a program could look like in Meridian, a little less hypothetical, a little more actual, would give me greater comfort.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I appreciate what Councilman Cavener is -- is saying and I don't know if you -- if any of my fellow Council had a chance to chat with Laurelei about how it will affect the users individually, but would you be willing to share with us if you have had any conversations with those users and whether they think it's a good thing or whether they really are concerned about being affected?

McVey: Councilman Perreault, that's a good question. So we haven't had official conversations with them, because we are waiting for direction from you guys. But, you know, over the years we have had conversations with some of the users and there is definitely pros and cons to reuse; right? The pros is they -- it -- you know, they are not paying for potable water. Some of them have access to surface water and so the switch over to that would be very low cost, very easy for them to do. The ones that have to switch over to potable water, they would, then, would start having that cost, although some of them would prefer that. So, there are some challenges with -- you know, because of the water quality, you know, using it on landscaping, there has been challenges. Also having to maintain the signage and additional backflow and metering devices has been a challenge in some locations and, then, we -- we have not started yet, but we have plans to use it in a large automated car wash and so not quite knowing, you know, would it have any impact on that infrastructure. But there is plans to hook that in. It hasn't been connected yet, but --

Simison: And I was saying that from my conversation with Laurelei and she can slap me if I'm wrong, but in a nutshell if you want to make reclaimed water a bigger user in Meridian you have to end the program now. I mean from long since purposes. You can't produce enough in our current system, our current setup, and they wouldn't recommend using the technology we currently have to expand the program. So, from a practical standpoint, if you want to go bigger get out now, let us move forward in a different direction and if there is a -- a desire by Council in the future to invest the funds, which is what you are going to do, a new technology and a greater distribution system, then, that will be the conversation and the question will be at that point in time, you know, what is the ROI from your perspective. Is it because it's the use of the water? Is it because we can provide something to our -- to more people to -- in a different way that has value? But, like I said, we are capped in our current thing and they wouldn't recommend expanding that using our current technology to begin with. Just doesn't make sense. That kills fish, among other things. Sorry. Not to make that on there, but we could use that, because it -- it doesn't have the same use that you thought we would have it.

McVey: And it -- it very much did serve a really important purpose to the city from 2014 to 7/2017. It was critical. That's -- that's changed.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, it's sort of hard -- I mean it -- it's -- I hear you, right, but it's like sort of hard to, you know, move forward without knowing what -- what -- what that could look like. Like is that a goal for the city? Even just broad strokes of like what -- what does a skilled, you know, large scale reuse program look like? I guess I'm -- I'm confused about why we have to eliminate this now to not foreclose the potential of doing a large scale reuse program in the future. Like what -- what barrier are we creating by keeping it now and just taking maybe six months for Public Works to study this and, then, come up with a recommendation of what a future scaled reuse program would look like and the cost? I -- I have no idea. I mean it's a completely huge topic.

McVey: So -- so, ending -- you know, if we -- if we choose to keep reuse, the -- the biggest thing is I have to move forward with the tertiary filter design and so if we decide to keep the program I don't have, you know, six months of time to tell them pause, wait and see. And so we would move forward with those other just capital expenses to keep reuse in place and so I think what we lose out on is that we lose out on that -- on the opportunity to reuse those tanks as part of the project today, because we are going to move forward with other -- other options and, then, you know, down the road if we want to expand reuse or even if we wanted to expand reuse today to what the Mayor was getting at, we would have to invest probably close to three -- two to three, maybe four million dollars to expand the system, even with our current -- our current setup today. So, it is going to take capital cost to do anything other than just leave it as is and, then, the question is if you leave it as is do you lose out on the opportunity to reuse that infrastructure for something else today.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Okay. I -- I'm following. So, let me just ask a question. Can you say definitively today that a future reuse program would not use tanks? Is that technology -- is the use of a tank not part of any type of future go forward reuse that's like up to standard?

McVey: So, I believe if you wanted to do large scale reuse you are going to have to do some sort of flow through technology, like city of Nampa and city of Boise are doing where you just pump it through, you -- you are not storing it, you are not doing batch, it's just dumping directly into either the aquifer or a canal that's large enough to accept it. So, it -- I think the difference between what we have in place and what our -- our current program is, is it's very much -- it was very site specific, very batch based, very small

scale. When you jump up to that larger scale storing it just doesn't make sense, because you would have to have so many tanks and so, then, you just put in the infrastructure to just do flow through with UV technology and you eliminate that chlorine batch contact time. So, going forward if we wanted a bigger program that would be the first thing that we would have to install.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Got it. Okay. So -- now I'm tracking with you. So, there is no purpose in a reuse program for the tanks. Like the tanks can't be used for an up-to-standard reuse program in the future at all. So, it's really a -- like by acting now we have the savings now and there is no chance of it being deployed later, because I think that's where you were losing me, is like I feel like I'm giving up an opportunity I don't know about. I -- I would say if you can definitively say that, which it sounds like you are, then, it sounds like the right decision for the city is to move forward. But I would like to hear about and have the team explore more about what some kind of viable long-term reuse program looks like, so we can seriously evaluate it, you know. But, yeah, I mean if Boise is not using a tank for theirs and they are not doing batches and the whole future of this is all UV flow through and there is no tank involved, then, I -- I guess, then, my -- my concern is -- is not -- doesn't remain at this point.

Simison: Okay. Well, I think we have reached as far as we can likely go. I think you will see budget -- stuff coming through the budget with the direction of reusing the tanks. If there is more conversation to be had please reach out and sit down with Laurelei or myself, to the best I can do. I'm happy to engage. But that's the approach we will proceed with based on the conversation and if we disagree you can not support the budgets, so, then, we will come back and provide that one that will -- will pass at that point in time, because we will have to move forward.

McVey: And I also appreciate it and -- and heard, you know, we will look at that longer term. You know, with this -- this milestone we have more time to look at what the future -- what a bigger reuse vision could look like for the city. So, we will -- we will also keep that on the radar.

20. Meridian Police Department: Patrol Allocation Model Study

Simison: Okay. All right. Thank you, Laurelei. So, with that we will move on to Item 20, which is the Meridian Police Department PAM study. Chief? Or -- do you want to do a quick introduction, chief? No? Okay. All right.

Harig: I can introduce myself. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor, Council Members, for having me here tonight. I'm very excited to tell you about the PAM study that we did with the Meridian Police Department. Just to give you a quick background, I have had my own consulting group for about ten years. I have also worked in government. I

have worked for the sheriff's office. I have worked for Ada county in a number of roles. And one of our focuses is staffing studies. I have done quite a few for law enforcement in the valley. We have used the PAM for Boise police, Meridian police in prior years and the Ada County Sheriff's Office. Also done staffing studies for Eagle fire, jails around the nation, various other things. So, just wanted to give you that background. One of the best parts of being able to work with patrol and traffic studies is they have been doing research on it for 30 plus years. So, there is lots of different models out there that you can select when you are doing staffing studies for patrol. You can have the -- the very simple ones, which say an officer per thousand measure and you have very complex ones that if you are an agency that has uber amounts of data, you can pay a proprietary company a lot of money to run a very fancy one for you. There is also quite a -- quite a few in the middle and the PAM, the patrol allocation model, has been around since the late -- since the late '80s, early '90s. Boise city was actually one of the contributing original members of the research team. So, it definitely has Treasure Valley roots and it's been used nationwide by municipal policing and sheriff's agencies for decades. So, one of the bonuses of the PAM is all of the different data points you can include in it. There is over 20 different data values you put in. There are workload requirements. There are performance objectives. There are personnel policies and roadway characteristics. So, it has a lot of flexibility and it's also very robust. At its heart the PAM is a time based model, so it's calculating the amount of time it takes to do various duties and dividing that by the amount of time that officers have available to them. There are a lot of different formulas in the background, but it really comes down to how much time does the work take and how much time did the officers have. There is four different activities that it's including. The crashes and citizen calls for service, which are the reactive workload. Not a lot of control over when the -- that's -- they are kind of what they are. Uncommitted patrol. This is the amount of time that officers have to patrol, check out areas, check out the highways and be available to respond to calls for service. Administrative duties. We would prefer for officers not to have to spend a lot of time on administrative duties, but it is actually quite a big workload for the officers. And, then, finally those officer initiated contacts, that proactive work that is the hallmark of community policing organizations. So, the PAM model includes all of these. We first worked on the PAM model back in 2017 and at the time with the current data we had it recommended 73 total officers dedicated to patrol and traffic. This does not include any investigations. It does not include specialty teams, like your canines. It is officers dedicated to patrol and traffic duties. Essentially the ones taking the citizen calls for service and crashes. At that time, given the level of authorized positions, this was an increase of seven officers. So, we would like to update it now. We have some updated data from the city of Meridian and we also have some newer research and other information to add to the model and so I'm going to just walk through the model inputs for you, so you can see how varied and really collaborative and intense it really is and, then, I'm going to show you two models, the recommendations for an updated model that includes data from Meridian that's been updated and some recent research recommendations and, then, after that I will show you a second model, which just shows you a -- a model with updated Meridian data only. Anything that's not updated in Meridian data will be excluded. The first section included is operations data, shift length, work week, all of these times that are available for officers goes into the time

model. One of the other ones is the number of officers supervised by sergeants. Back in 2017 we used a seven to one ratio, which at the time was an average for Meridian. Right after we did this study the Police Executive Research Forum came out with a white paper and that had surveyed national -- nationally surveyed chiefs of police and sheriffs and their overall very strong recommendation was for six to one officer span of control as the ideal. So, in the model that we are doing as an updated model we are including the six. When I show you the Meridian updates only it will just have the seven. One of the reasons why I think using the goal of six is a little bit stronger in the model than using the average is because of the high percent of officer time that supervisors spend doing patrol duties. They spend -- at least in the model we are saying they spend half of their time taking calls for service and doing patrol work and 50 percent for doing supervisory duties and coaching. The next piece that did get updated was the average time off per officer per year. So, this is part of the updated Meridian data and average overtime on assignment per officer per year. We did not include overtime last time. We did include it this time, because it is -- it's really consistent for the city and an expectation of officers not working overtime is sort of unusual, but we could absolutely take it out and have the expectation of no overtime to see how many officers we would need. Let me just give you a quick update on this officer time off update. So, it is based on a net annual work hours, which is directly from the time management data from the city was provided. The contracted hours for officers is 28 a year. They work ten hour weeks, 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. According to their time records on average per officer per year they work 1,770 hours. They are on paid time off for 310 and, then, they work an additional 200 hours of overtime. So, this 310 is a bump up from the previous model. You can see here this is just the total average time off for each of the patrol and traffic officers for this period. You can see it kind of rising up until 2020 and, then, it's starting to flatten out, but it's definitely staying higher and there is two primary contributing factors to that. Number one, in October 2019 Meridian introduced two new employee benefits, an increase in vacation accruals, and a parental leave policy. So, these start to have impacts about 2022 and, then, of course, in March of 2020 we have our COVID stay at home order. Meridian police measured the time off for COVID as paid administrative leave and so we are able to track that here. So, in the model I don't want to include any of that COVID, because it was sort of an unusual year. We hope we don't have the weird outliers again. So, we are going to include 2021 and 2022 in this model. The model generally recommends one to three years. So, two years is pretty solid. So, we did jump up from 280 to 310. Did add in overtime this year and, then, the last one was the average on duty time spent on nonpatrol duties per officer per year. This is, essentially, training time in court. It's not administrative duties. And in 2017 we used an average of ten hours per officer per week per month and, then, another 40 hours to meet POST -- POST requirements. It was just an estimate. We don't have great time records of when training is. That's pretty hard to track on a daily basis. This year we used the same and, then, we added in the court data. After the last study in 2017 Meridian started tracking a little bit -- data a little bit differently and their court data that's tracked by their officers is now super consistent when it was not before and so they do have about 40 hours per year that they spent in court and if they are in court or if they are in training that means they are not available in the field to answer calls for service. So in 2023 these are the recommendations for an updated model and,

then, I will show you a different one. The other data that's included in it is roadway data. As you can imagine for traffic and patrol this is a huge time element to any of their work. It includes miles of roadway, performance objectives and uncommitted patrol speed. The miles of roadway by type was taken from the Meridian reports that you guys provide. What are they called? I should know that by heart. Yes. The existing conditions report. Back in 2017 the most recent data was for 2014. Pretty happy that this year we have only -- the data is only a little bit old from 2022. You can see that the arterials jumped up 12 percent, which is quite significant, but not quite as big as those local roads jumping up 25 percent, which is not a big surprise with all of the development in Meridian. We kept the patrol interval objectives the same. This is a performance choice determined by police command and the essential goal for the arterials is to have an officer hit it once five times per shift. That means they are going to pass a fixed point every two hours. You can kind of think of that as if you have a stranded motorist on a highway, they are going to have to wait a maximum of two hours for an officer to come if they were just waiting. For collectors two times per week. So, every 84 hours. And, then, local roads one time a week or 168 hours. So, if I stepped outside my house in Meridian I would see an officer once a week. Another change now is the average uncommitted patrol speed. This is a data request in the model that a lot of offices do not have. In 2017 we did a guess based on posted speed limits and, then, knocked off some mph. We knew at the time that it was probably an overestimate, which makes the -- which makes the recommendation very conservative. You can imagine it would be hard for an officer to patrol at 45 miles per hour all the time if you are talking about Eagle Road at rush hour. So, in 2023 we used a model that -- some data from the Ada County Sheriff's Office. They conducted a PAM in 2020 and their GIS team used AVL, the vehicle trackers, to determine the amount of speed that officers were when they were in available status patrolling roads -- on different roads over a period of a year to give a -- kind of a -- a different types of conditions and times of year and what they found in their study is that for arterial roads the average was closer to 35 miles per hour, collectors 25, and, then, local roads they -- they patrolled those a little slower at 15. I realize that not all Treasure Valley cities are going to have the exact same data, but the sheriff's office data includes unincorporated Eagle, Star, and Kuna and it's probably a fairly solid comparison from Meridian. The next and final piece is the workload data. This is sort of the -- the big piece of the model. This is the crashes and the citizen initiated calls for service. What's included in the model is how many there are, how long the officers spent on them, the amount of time they take writing a report, the percents that are priority two or high -- or higher, which means that an officer cannot be taken off to respond to another call. You can see that the crashes increased 28 percent in the five years and 41 percent for citizen initiated calls for service. That's quite a significant jump. I just want to show you what that looks like. On the top are the crashes and on the bottom are the citizen calls for service. Our data model from 2017 used 2013 to 2015 and this year we are using 2021 and 2022. A couple of things I would like to point out is the -- just the very steady increase of this for Meridian. What that mean -- what that makes it really nice for is doing forecasting, because it is so predictable what next year will be for each of these values and, then, I would just like to point out the little COVID drop in crashes there way down to 2,511. That's one of the reasons we didn't use that year. So, all of the crashes and citizen calls for service go in

there as real data. We don't touch it. It is what it is. The performance goal, though, we put in for proactivity. Proactivity goes down if you are not busy -- if you are too busy. It goes up if you have more free time. So, we are using the International Association of Chiefs of Police recommendation for community policing organizations. Of the 20/20/20, that officers would have 20 minutes of each hour on reactive work, like crashes and citizen calls for service, 20 minutes per hour on their administrative work and, then, have that 20 minutes for the proactive community oriented work. One of the other updates with data was the average time to write a report. In 2017 we did not have real data for that, so we used an estimate -- and estimate based on officer recall. For crashes it was -- we put in 30 minutes and for calls for service we had put in 40. After the study in 2017 Meridian changed some of their practices and started capturing this, so we could have real data this time and when we looked at that we are averaging closer to 88 minutes to write a report. So, I think we were a little bit off and I think the current estimate of 88 -- not estimate, but the accurate value of 88 is right on. Some are only going to take 15 minutes, but some you can imagine if they have multiple addresses, multiple property items, multiple victims, multiple offenders, it's going to take a while to write that. The second piece that was included was a two officer patrol. We did not include this last time, but given the hiring in the valley and the amount of time that officers have dedicated to field training opportunities it felt like it was a -- probably a pretty big piece. So, we took an estimate for 15 officers in both 2021 and '22. That is how many were hired on average in each of those years and an estimate of 14 weeks of patrol. FTO where an officer is taken off the street to be with that trainee and it ends up with the amount of authorized positions that five percent of the patrol and traffic time is on two car patrols and that is the last piece. You can see how much data is included in the model. Lots of it doesn't have a lot of flexibility, but some of it, like performance objectives, do, which allows the agencies to kind of pick and choose what they would like as their priorities. If we put this data into the model we get a recommendation of 97 officers dedicated to patrol and traffic. Fourteen of them sergeants, 83 corporals and officers and given the number of authorized positions right now this is an increase of 12 officers. I told you I would show you one other. This is -- if we update the model to match the baseline of 2017, so we are only going to update Meridian's data. Anything that's not updated data we are going to exclude. We are taking out officer time in court, officer overtime hours, the two officer patrols and we are going to maintain the seven to one officer ratio and higher on committed patrol speeds and in that case the model pops out 91 officers dedicated to patrol and traffic. Eleven of those sergeants and 80 of them corporals and officers. For an increase of six based on current numbers. That is the bulk of what we did. We also did a couple of other analyses to look at what the split would look like for two areas and some forecast for five and ten years out and given the solid nature of the increase of crashes and calls for service those forecasts are going to be good guidance for the next ten years. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you very much for being here and sharing this information. It's helpful to understand -- to have a -- a baseline, as you said. A couple of questions for you. First, what -- if you could share with us -- and -- and this might be a question for the chief. What prompted looking at this right now? It sounds like you -- this information you are saying that we have now could potentially take us ten more years before we have to assess it again. So, we only got five years this time it sounds like or maybe four years. So, that's the first question. The second question is you had given stats based on 2023. We are only halfway through. So, is that really -- is that -- is that like, you know, from May of '22 to May of '23 or are we taking part of '23 and -- and sort of just estimating that, you know, doing an estimate out for the rest of the year. Could you help us understand how you were able to get those numbers, even though our year is only halfway over all?

Harig: All data in the model is from 2021 and 2022. I don't think I have any 2023 data showing. The estimates are for 2023 based on the previous years. Chief, did you want to answer the other one?

Basterrechea: Yeah. And I can answer the question for why we did it now. We knew that when we first did this model we had no data, so we were guessing. So, we wanted to see what actual data would look like once we had it accumulated.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: At that time in 2017, since I wasn't here, what -- was there a predetermined -- determination made that you would look at it at year three or four or five or --

Basterrechea: No, there wasn't. That was a determination made by my command staff when I became chief.

Perreault: What, that --

Basterrechea: That we would relook at PAM to see what the actual data tells us. Rather than just guessing where we need to be, we want to have some data that says this is absolutely where you need to be going.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: And just for the -- the second -- the second grouping of data was kind of my question. How much could we attribute to growth versus how much of the PAM model changes could be attribute to, you know, updated data and other assumptions in that regard. So, I think that's kind of what you are kind of seeing, you know, just from a pure growth perspective six officers to keep up with the growing city. The other six is using the real data that we have addressed of what our numbers are is kind of that second half of my question that --

Harig: You are absolutely correct, Mr. Mayor. If you look at our projections, our forecast from 2017, they are dead on for what we got with the baseline model with in 2013 and the six extra are from the updated data and other elements that we added that we did not have available at the time.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Excellent presentation. Unfortunately, I remember back when we used to do this from the seat of our pants and we did the best guess we could trying to figure out what we needed and it's incredible to see the amount of data that you can get from various sources. It's wonderful to have such a crime analysis unit that can help gather that data and bring it forward, so we can make this type of a predictive analysis of what our needs are now and into the future. It's very impressive. I appreciate it very much.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you also for -- for the report and the recommendations. The one thing that popped out to me was just the amount of time spent writing reports. I'm concerned that it pretty much doubled, if I was looking at that chart correctly. So, just understanding what's driving that and it sounds like you took that out in terms of how it drives the recommendation, if I'm following the logic. But I just -- just want to make sure that we are keeping an eye on that. It's a pretty significant change from 40 minutes to an average of like 88 minutes.

Harig: If I may, we -- that was a complete guess last time based on officer recall and I think it doesn't seem like reports would take that long and when you actually get down to measuring them they are taking a much longer than you would -- you would think, especially with the introduction of the different technology and having to put everything into all the different systems. Chief, did you have something to add to that?

Basterrechea: Yeah. The other thing I would point out is what you will find is -- especially when you look at swing shift units and some of those other units, they will hold on to reports, because they are answering the calls for the service during the busiest time and, then, when your graveyard team comes in those officers will go in and they will work on multiple reports. It's very rare for somebody to take a report, go back to the station, write that report and, then, go back out. They hold on to at least two, possibly three or four and, then, go back and write those reports, which indicates a longer report writing time as well.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Maybe something to share later, not for now, because we have got public hearings coming up, but it would be interesting to see and maybe share it through the chief, the data that if -- if it's a time allocation model and it's about a third each, the -- what drives the recommendation specifically of -- of six new officers as on the screen now, that is if you didn't have the officers the allocation would be out of whack in a certain way. We assume it wouldn't be the -- the proposed recommended time allocation, instead it might be 45, 45, ten. What activities would be more utilized, unfortunately, by an officer if you don't staff up appropriately, but by staffing up they are able to do less of Task A and more of Task B, which -- so, you probably have all that underlying data, but it would be interesting to see how -- what moves when you add six officers particularly. So, you don't have to -- it's -- it would be a pretty good --

Harig: It's a pretty quick answer, though. You are proactive work drops off and we do -- we do have some information on that that shows over the last few years as staffing got a little bit low the proactive work starts dropping off. The reactive work doesn't ever. The officers will always hit that first.

Basterrechea: We will have less interaction with our citizens.

Borton: And -- Mr. Mayor. That was the whole point of --

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: The premise of the PAM model was that added benefit to provide focus on the proactive, getting into the community, into the neighborhood and making sure we recognize the commitment of that proactive value. So, I think seeing the delta of when you don't do it how much it pulls you away from that goal is a helpful reminder of how important it is to stay tethered to some matrix like this.

Simison: Okay. Council, if you have any other questions I'm sure the chief will be happy to take one on ones, e-mails, et cetera, but this is somewhat reflected in the current budget. Obviously at least part of it and that's based upon conversations with the chief on what he thought he could actually attain in this next budget year towards working up to this number. Okay. Thank you very much.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

Simison: Council, we are at the end of our work session. We do have an Executive Session. We just -- do not need to make a motion and just go into adjournment, Mr. Nary? Do we just need to go into adjournment? Do we -- okay.

Nary: It's already on the other agenda as well, so --

Simison: So, then, a motion to adjourn.

Borton: Mr. Mayor, I move we adjourn.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:14 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK