

Meridian City Council Work Session

October 21, 2025.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, October 21, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, John Overton, Doug Taylor, Anne Little Roberts and Brian Whitlock.

Members Absent: Liz Strader.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Christena Barney, Todd Lavoie, Brian McClure, Jamie Leslie and Steve Taulbee.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☐ Liz Strader	☒ Brian Whitlock
☒ Anne Little Roberts	☒ John Overton
☒ Doug Taylor	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is October 21st, 2025, at 4:30 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item up is adoption of the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we adopt the agenda as published.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to adopt the agenda. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Ferney Subdivision (Franklin Storage and Franklin Flex) Pedestrian Pathway Easement (ESMT-2025-0118)**

- 2. Ferney Subdivision (Franklin Storage and Franklin Flex) Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0119)**
- 3. Pura Vida Ridge Ranch Subdivision No. 1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1(ESMT-2025-0120)**
- 4. Final Plat for District at Ten Mile (FP-2025-0009), by Kent Brown Planning, generally located at the southwest corner of W. Cobalt Dr. and S. Ten Mile Rd.**
- 5. Final Plat for Brundage Estates Subdivision No. 2 (FP-2025-0023) by Engineering Solutions, generally located on the east side of S. Linder R., 1/2 mile S. of W. Victory Rd.**
- 6. Fiscal Year 2026 Net-Zero Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$523,218.00 to accept the Fiscal Year 2026/Program Year 2025 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Award**
- 7. Subrecipient Agreement Between City of Meridian and The Jesse Tree of Idaho in the amount of \$43,483 for Program Year 2025 Community Development Block Grant Funds for Emergency Rental Assistance**
- 8. City of Meridian Financial Report - September 2025**

Simison: Next up is the Consent Agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we approve the Consent Agenda. For the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

9. Fiscal Year 2026 Budget Amendment in the amount of \$182,988 to fund the Employee Benefits Plan Trust

Simison: So, I will move on to Item 9, which is a Fiscal Year 2026 budget amendment the amount of 182,988 dollars and this will be presented by Ms. Barney. Good afternoon.

Barney: Good evening, Mayor, Council. I stand before you with the budget amendment we discussed last week. I did only bring forward the -- the deficit on Q2. The remaining deficit will be back in front of you once we get the final numbers for our Q3 and, again, likely for our Q4, but the remaining deficit for Q2 was 182,988 dollars. So, I stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks for bringing this. I like at least we are on a cadence of seeing you guys at least every quarter, whether it's for a deficit request or just to keep us updated as how things are progressing with the trust. So, with that, Mr. Mayor, I move we approve the budget amendment in the amount of 182,988 dollars to fund the Employee Benefits Trust.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 9. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

10. Fiscal Year 2026 Fee Update Next Steps

Simison: Next item up is fiscal year 2026 fee update next steps. Turn this over to Mr. Lavoie.

Lavoie: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. We are here as a follow up to the previous presentation we did a few weeks ago. We opened it up for

communications between the two branches. We sent out a request for information. We provided the context of the request, again, I think on the 13th for this meeting today. So, we stand here for any discussions that you have. Hopefully we can answer it for you today and we are looking for action on this Item as it was presented last month to approve the fees as presented. So, we stand or sit for any discussions or questions that you may have from the meeting last month and continuation of that discussion.

Simison: Council, I wasn't here for that conversation, but just here to see if, yes, do we have any additional thoughts? Are we prepared to bring forward a resolution for consideration?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: For -- for thoughts, my -- my opinion hasn't changed. I'm not supportive of what's being presented before us. We are going to be subject -- you know, providing some subjectivity about when we are going to collect these fees and how much to have in here. You know, a 2,700 percent increase to me does not make a lot of sense. So, if this is what's being proposed I will not be in favor of it and I would encourage staff to go back and bring us back a -- a revised recommendation that would allow for a slower increase of these fees seeing how we have not kept up with the pace of what we have communicated to the public we would be doing.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just have a quick question. I -- I missed the meeting, but watched -- watched it, but I had a couple of questions. A lot of the fees that increased the most were kind of tied into the community development and planning departments. That's where some of the biggest fees were. This year we had a -- we were in the red there, but I know that users kind of -- and the -- the income that we derived by the staffing that's required to process application fees, et cetera, kind of fluctuates. I'm just kind of curious when you were doing the full cost recovery model did you -- are some of these big spikes in the fees as a result of -- we have had less activity, therefore, we are kind of are running in the red or is this reflecting just the work that's needed to process those fees?

Lavoie: Mr. Taylor, the fees that you see are based on what inputs we got back from the departments on the actual time and I guess materials it takes to process each transaction. So, the number of transactions per se do not come into play. We are asking how much times does it take to do this? Okay. And, then, we record that. So, in that way when somebody asks to do that we can tell the user it costs us this much to do that every time. We don't do a -- on average it costs this or this on some -- on those particular fees. There are some fees that we will use -- how many times do we do something divided into the total cost and, then, that's your average cost that we will

spread, kind of like property taxes. Both -- the ones that you are looking at we did ask your -- your -- your departments how much time does it take to do X and are there any other materials or fees or things like that we need to associate to each of those particular transactions. I apologize. Does that get what you are looking for?

Taylor: Yeah. That's helpful. Thank you.

Lavoie: Thank you.

Taylor: Which -- which suggests, then, no changes based on the -- the activity. These fees stay the same, because that's what's used to recoup the cost to process that service.

Lavoie: I would agree with that statement.

Taylor: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, just a quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Kind of curious. The other area where the fees seem to be pretty significant where I would -- I -- I see as really affecting a lot of the -- the citizens who might be looking for a temporary permit. You know, those went up significantly, right, from 85.50 up to, you know, several hundred dollars in all -- most -- in most cases. Did we get a sense from Parks and Rec on -- on -- is that just staff time? Is that the -- the -- I mean it's everything that's included, but is that going to actually, I guess, drive down the number of people that want to be using -- or fees. I mean that's one of my biggest concerns if I had to apply for a -- you know, a fee and it cost me 242 dollars I -- yeah, no -- no. Thank you. I'm going to go to a church parking lot or -- you know, I don't know, but I'm just kind of curious if there was any analysis done by our departments as to what the expected impact would be in terms of more usage, less usage.

Lavoie: Fair question, Mr. Taylor. So, again, the tolerance level is going to be a factor that we did -- did discuss, you know, will there be a positive or negative reaction to these fees. Our job within the Finance Department and our policy is we will provide the full cost recovery method and how much it cost to do the job and inform you that this is what it costs to run the city. You have every right to reduce the rate down to anything below the full cost recovery method. You have every right to do so. Hence why we present it to you and I think there was even one fee that even the Mayor says, you know, we cannot charge 753 dollars, because we believe the tolerance would not be acceptable. So, Robert did ask us -- what is the regional average of X, Y and Z and we got that regional average. Hence why you see one rate as I think it's 250 dollars for the large TUP, because that's the regional kind of going rate for that. Our true cost recovery is what we presented to you. For us to do this job this is how much it costs. As long as we convey that to you that is our task for the finances, convey what it costs to run this city. We understand there is -- there is tolerances of political and business and economic. We understand it and that's why that's in our policy to give you that tolerance

toggle. I understand what the math is, but no way we can charge this. We still need to run a business and that's what this is doing. So, again, I would say the answer to your question is, no, we did not do a complete poll out there. If we increased X, would it impact Y? We did not go out and ask those questions. Will it impact it? We don't know until I guess we put the -- if we put the fee out we won't know until then. I apologize.

Simison: And maybe it might be good if I weighed in on -- on some of this as well, because, again, I wasn't here for the conversation, didn't get a chance to provide at least my perspective for the steps I went through in looking at -- at all these fees. And I reviewed every single one and anyone that had a large deviation I asked them to come in and explain to me what those deviations were and I think in the community development department ones -- you know, there were some that were bifurcating the processes through that and swapping some of the fees, so they look really big, but, in essence, if you put them both together they are not as -- it's not that far or that big of a difference. I'm overgeneralizing. I haven't had that conversation for quite a few months. So, it's like, you know, digging back in your brain. But I have also heard most of this Council very much talk about how community development needs to run like a business. Growth should pay for growth. Costs should be what costs are. And so I didn't feel it was appropriate to make any modifications or adjustments or recommendations based upon the actual costs from that department, even though it was part of our General Fund. However, in what I'm going to say is our city clerk, because they are the ones that actually process the TUP applications, kind of lead that, those are things that our community has been paying and I will say this, I had a different view on the golf course and the Council said, no, charge full cost. We are not going to take a ramp up time, we are just going to put the cost of where we think the cost should be. In this case I did make a recommendation that based upon, you know, how much of a tolerance just to exact this exact point and I also used the -- the -- the -- the variable here. Those are things that we impose upon our citizens. Those aren't required. We don't have to have them do those things. Unlike building permits, unlike land use applications, those are things that are required for people to do. We could charge zero for any CUP -- or any TUP application. We don't have to recover any costs. We choose to. We ask people to come in and do certain things and we do impose obligations on them for their event to run successfully, but we don't have to provide -- have them pay for that advice and that consent unless we want them to. So, that one I didn't feel was necessary because of the high cost difference and -- and I tried to value proposition in a lot of ways. When you look at Boise who is the outlier of the regional large event costs, but I think that their regional events are much different than our regional events. I -- I -- I don't -- I don't know that we have anything quite to the level of their criterion of, you know -- what's the big music one that they do. I don't even know what that is. Tree Fort. I -- I think that some of their events go -- are very large in scale in both the -- the breadth, as well as the impacts to our community. I'm not going to say that, you know, Oktoberfest -- I heard the members say there were about 15,000 people in downtown. It's not in -- it's not small, but it's also pretty geographically contained to a short time period and doesn't have as much impacts. It was some of that rationale why I recommended to -- don't go up to the full cost recovery on those from that standpoint. But if Council thinks that you want full cost recovery, yes. As someone who has done

events through the city for my own personal things, I share your concerns. I'm already concerned about the cost of, you know, permits and required activity to do an event in the city and the more it goes up the more I'm inclined to maybe not. Find other alternatives. Maybe that's okay, too. So, thank you for letting me share my perspective on these before you.

Taylor: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, if I can.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: And I appreciate that. That's -- that's helpful context. I was kind of wondering, too, that may -- or maybe you can shed light -- or Todd, but we are looking at kind of four different department fees here; right? We got clerks, fire, police, planning and I know we look at, you know, there is other fees that we have -- kind of see regularly that we have approved. Is it our intention tonight you obviously -- there is a -- a desire to maybe adopt these fees holistically. Is it our intention or your intention to -- to suggest that we would look at these fees sort of segmented out each year? Like we would look at all the police fees as one motion, we would look at all fire? Because I -- there is some things that -- most of this makes sense and I can agree with the rationale and I understand it and I think it -- there is an argument to be made that we want to have full cost recovery. But in some of them I -- I know I'm not quite there yet. So, I'm just kind of curious. This is a lot of fees in one big boat and it's hard for me to say I can -- I'm -- I'm getting there. You know, any reason why we don't do that now or that the future we might not say we are going to -- hey, here is all the police fees for the year to look at them. Here is the suggested changes and move on?

Lavoie: Mr. Taylor, we are happy to do that. If we need to take small bites of this large beast -- we have no problem presenting to you one or two departments for over a -- you know, a month period. Every week we will be in front of you with one or two departments. We are happy to do so. Whatever works for you guys on conveying or getting you the information so you can make a comfortable decision, we are happy to do so. Our intent in the Finance Department, as we continue to get farther into this project, annual -- analyze each fee every single year and present to you anything that has made major changes for you to review. The big shift is always going to be year number one, which is right now. Year number two, year three, is probably just going to be small little things, because things don't change that drastic between year over year, but we have no problem adapting, adjusting to however the information needs to be conveyed to you in the most comfortable way. We are very comfortable. We are going to move forward with our to do list, which is get these all done annual basis, present presentation, we are happy to be flexible and work with you guys.

Simison: And maybe just to piggyback on that a little bit, I would say if you need to take time now to get them right to where you want them let's take that time now, right, to get them where you want them, because to Todd's point, next year, hopefully, he is going to go to the police department and say, these good? Okay. Salaries went up by X. We are going to move all these up by X because of the salaries and in theory, unless we

add a new fee, get rid of a fee or change a process that impacts a fee, you are not going to see much of a change next year, except for whatever the personnel costs or other costs associated with it that might go up. That's our intention. That's our goal.

Lavoie: Agreed.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Initially when you first look at this you get a little sidetracked by the proposed percentage of change and I would really look at the fee amounts to -- to -- to kind of avoid looking at the percentage of change and look at the bigger picture of what we are talking about, because if you focused on the 2,930 percent change and, then, realized that if you just went up a few lines the same dollar amount in planned unit developments and in final plat costs, if you add those two up it's almost the same amount in a reduction of fees for those. You can get sideways if you just look at the percentages. When it comes to the current fee, proposed fees, and the fact that almost 40 or 50 of these fees are actually reductions in our current fees, not additions, and that we are making a lot of corrections moving forward, I got to believe this is the right first step and there is only one that's got that enormous percentage behind it. Most of them I believe are very valid and we probably should have done this in the past and we are a little behind on getting caught up on this and I think we are the Council that has the opportunity to make this change, catch up and start fresh and I would support this change. If we need to move some we can move some, but I would support this the way it looks.

Lavoie: Appreciate that, Mr. Overton. You are correct. The 2,900 percent one it does, you know, stand out. Completely agree. And we did send an e-mail on that particular item after that meeting last week that talked about -- it was offset by something else, because we did -- as Robert said bifurcate it. We kind of moved some things around. But -- so your net overall change, if we implemented this using what Mr. Taylor is talking about, how many units did we sell using averages of -- averages, we think that this will generate 45,000 dollars of new revenues for the City of Meridian and your total annual revenue is 90 -- 90 million. So, you can see it's not a gigantic change, but, yeah, percentage is scary looking. I'm not going to disagree with you. But, again, we think that based on the numbers we think this will generate about 45,000 dollars in new revenues for the City going forward.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Well, I really appreciate that we took the pawnbroker's license with precious metal dealer endorsement from 30 dollars down to \$10.25. I think that's good. I worry about the special event for folks that went from 85 to 245. I don't -- I don't generally

appreciate the concept of taxpayers subsidizing activities that other people do; right? So, that's where I'm -- when I look at fees you should be paying for the services you derive I think that's a more fair and equitable way to do it; right? Like I -- I think that makes a lot of sense. Instead of taking General Fund fees that I might pay and I would never do some of these things and we are subsidizing it, so as a general rule I -- I think that's the right approach. I think the sticker shock on some of this is going to come back to haunt us a little bit if we just drop some of these big fees in one year. I mean I kind of go back and forth on whether or not to phase a few of these in. I would like -- going forward in the future I think I would like to look at these segmented out by department. I think that would be better than looking at this massive change and to your point after we adopt a big change and the big pain is over there is going to be less pain as we look at some of these adjustments. So, I think that -- I understand that. But I really think that, again, some of our -- our constituents and citizens are going to let us know how they don't really appreciate -- appreciate that and I'm kind of going back and forth on some of these fees that are really born by individuals that are trying to enjoy the amenities that they are paying taxes for already. So, that's -- that's kind of where I'm at.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: For Council's benefit on -- on September 16th I did ask our Finance staff to engage with the impacted departments and bring back a proposal for a gradual increase over time for any fee over 130 percent. So, that was my recommendation at the time. They didn't do that. I -- I understand they have got their own reasons. They didn't think they needed to do that. But I think to me that addresses both the subjectivity of some of the stuff through the clerk's department, as well as the large percentage increases that we are seeing proposed. So, I -- I still stand by. I think that's the right approach. Again, bummed that that didn't happen. Looking forward to understanding why down the road.

Simison: I think we are just looking for consensus from the Council. That's -- you know, how -- how do you -- how do you want to bite this apple? If that's what you want to do we can do that. I -- I get it. I think that -- I wasn't here. I don't know that they heard that from three other people as well. So, I think that's the question is if that's what Council wants to adopt an approach they can bring that back in a resolution and -- and make that approach.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yeah.

Cavener: I'm not trying to air dirty laundry, but that e-mail wasn't responded to. So, either the request from a Council Member has chosen to be ignored or directed to be ignored. I don't know what's driving that. I'm disappointed by that. It did take a substantial follow up before I heard from our CFO about my feedback. I think we could

have solved this problem a long time ago if staff were a little bit more proactive in communicating and responding to e-mails from City Council.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: To see if we can move forward from that point, Council President Cavener, are you proposing that we move forward, but we cap the increase at 130 percent?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council Member Overton, I -- what I -- I had hoped for is that by tonight that our staff would have brought back -- that they would engage with our department directors, so we know -- so, that we can make an informed decision. That -- that piece hasn't happened and so it's hard for me to say thumbs up, thumbs down when maybe what I think is that crucial piece. You know -- I would -- I'm curious to understand why a large scale event we are only wanting to recover at 49 percent, I believe, and a large scale event in the park is at a higher percentage. I think those are important questions that we should be asking our department before we adopt anything. I -- I don't think that that step has happened and so that's why I'm -- I'm reluctant to support anything, because I have got strong feelings about this process and what we are doing, but we are missing that crucial piece of that impact from our directors. We are just -- we are trying to do what we think is best, but we are missing that crucial -- crucial piece of information.

Simison: If I could -- I don't think our departments care what the fee is. The -- the fee is what the Council wants to recover from those costs. They have -- all they have expressed is this is the cost to do the work. I don't -- if -- if it goes -- I don't even know if the TUPs or CUPs -- if they go to your department, they go to the parks, it's not their bottom line budget that it really impacts, it's just -- it -- so, that -- that -- that point I don't think is -- that's -- it's really what does the Council want from your philosophy. If -- if you want us to drop down anything that's, you know, in those areas, again, it's not that big of an issue. We are happy to do whatever this Council as a body wants us to do on how you want to recover the funds. But the departments don't live or make their budgets based upon these numbers.

Cavener: And, Mr. Mayor, on -- on the 16th I laid out what I wanted.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Based on President Cavener's statement, for the rest of Council, I have no problem with asking Finance to go back and cap the increases at 130 percent this year, but at the same time you are going to have to go back and correct some of the decreases that were done in anticipation for some of the other increases and, correct me if I'm wrong, when I look at some of the community development fees that went down, while others went up --

Lavoie: Well, Mr. -- you -- you are correct, they do go up and down, but they are independent to themselves. We don't use one to offset the other. So, if there is a cap to 130 -- it's just we are going to cap everything at 130, if they still went down -- because we still want to charge a true cost -- it's just like Mr. Taylor said, if the cost is to do X that's what we are presenting to you is what we call full cost recovery. This is how much it costs to run this business. You, as Robert was saying, you get to decide what the actual fee is. We have just provided you what it costs your departments to run this particular transaction independent of each other's fees. So, if some go down that's what we are presenting to you based on our input is that's how much it costs to run that part -- part -- that particular business unit. If they went up that's how much it cost to run that particular -- independent of each other. So, I would recommend if you do cap it let's not adjust the other ones, because, then, you are charging more to offset the others, which I don't think is a good business practice in my opinion. But, again, it's your fees at the end of the day. We will work with you on this. But if you cap at 130 I wouldn't recommend raising others to offset the reductions, if I was hearing you correctly.

Overton: So, Council, with that said and with -- Councilman Taylor, you make a really good point. We shouldn't be putting a lot of these expenses on the backs of taxpayers to pay for things that people come and get and if we cap these at 130 percent and some of these increases, instead of being passed on to who should be paying those fees, but, yet, we have other fees now we are going to substantially lower, we are actually going to increase the burden to our city. We are not increasing it -- we are not -- we are not -- we are not catching up and we are going to continue to be behind and what I'm saying by that is if they are independent of each other and we are lowering some of these fees by substantial amounts, because there are some substantial amounts being lowered and there are some that are being increased, but the only thing we do -- we don't -- we are not capping the amount they can decrease, we are only capping the amount they can increase, I think we need to make sure we are still going in the right direction for trying to obtain this cost recovery model as a city.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Councilman Overton, I -- I really agree with you on this and I think -- and that's -- that's why it's frustrating, because we don't have that analysis about which fees are being impacted by others. Again that was the piece that I was -- I have been trying to get. I -- I -- I do push back a little bit that -- that we are -- we are doing something -- we are going backwards. We are -- we are really maintaining the status quo; right?

This was something that was laid out that Council was told five years ago they were going to do. Staff moved slow to get us there. So, we are -- we are just maintaining where we are at. It's a -- it's a slower build to get to where we should be trying to be really sensitive to the impact to our customers, both our citizens and the development community. It's not their fault that we took long to do this and we certainly wouldn't, you know, propose, right, a 2,700 percent increase on our temporary use permits. right, because we understand the impact that's going to have on our residents. Likewise I -- and I -- and I hear you about we are going to move something over here and that's going to be offset over there, but there is a lot of fees that are there that are proposed. Not all of them do that and -- and we haven't received any of that information about how these are all impacted and so, again, that's where I'm -- I'm not comfortable with approving anything, because there is -- for me still a lack of information that should be provided to us before we make a decision.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Other option. You can leave everything where it is and just do a cost of living adjustment moving forward.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I don't think that's the case either. I think we want to do it right. So, it's not -- let's -- let's rush and get it done now. Like let's -- again -- and I'm -- and I'm -- I recognize that I'm -- I'm continuing to kind of repeat myself and I'm not trying to be punitive, but if -- if this request would have been responded to a month ago I think Council could have had that information available to them to make a decision one way or another. So, it's not a case of let's just do a cost of living or let's not approve it or let's approve it as presented, it's -- man, give your City Council the information that they need so that they can make -- make the best decision. I don't feel like that -- I -- I don't feel like I was asking for a lot on the 16th. Maybe I was. But I didn't hear back from staff, so I don't know. If I am I would love to hear that and, then, let's -- let's work together as a team to solve this.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Could be wrong, but just doing my quick counting of -- if we picked 130,000 as sort of the cap -- I think I'm only counting about ten or 11 fees that would exceed that. Four of those are temporary use permits; right? Those are people who want to use the parks at different events. Maybe it's a business. Maybe it's a person. I think as a general philosophy I think the right thing is to move there towards this cost recovery model. It sounds like -- you know, prior to me coming on Council and -- that was a decision that was made. We want to move towards that and I think that's the right thing, because I think that's a fair way in which we run the -- the city. I -- I'm comfortable easing into that just a little bit more. I like the suggestion of, you know, not increasing some of these fees beyond the 130 percent -- or maybe it's 150 percent or some -- some number that we think feels fair, but it's -- it's a -- it's ten or maybe a dozen fees

that exceed that. So, the majority of these fees are going to be adopted, increased, decreased on -- on -- in many cases. I would feel much better having --

Simison: -- the other things that you learn through this -- and this one was brought to my attention -- is the -- the -- Easter egg hunt that Capital Christian or -- does, first time they did that event took a lot of staff time to make it happen. Now, five minute approval for a very large scale event, because they are basically resubmitting the same information. You are not having to go through it. So, you know, you are -- you are charging the cost no matter what the workload is based on averages, not what the actual workload is based upon reality, first year versus year ten when you can just -- it's kind of like the parade and you can dust off the parade route each year and if you don't change the parade and you don't change what's required, not a lot of extra work that goes into it, so it -- it is a little bit of a swinging skill on how -- on any event that you do in the city first time versus the fifth time and those costs, so -- as I have been informed. I think we got a plan? What we were hoping for? So --

Lavoie: Mayor, we can easily get you two reports, one under 130 percent, another report with the ten transactions and, again, as Mr. Cavener said, if he wants to hear from directors on any concepts we can easily have the directors available. We will go ahead and send out the e-mail to the Council and directors, hey, please prepare to -- to your directors -- please be prepared to answer these questions and hopefully you can get the answers before the meeting, so that you will have the data before the meeting and just get it approved accordingly. No. But definitely doable. I mean there is -- the whole process is give you guys the fees, review them, give us inputs, thoughts. We -- we will adjust accordingly. Our job is to convey to you what the true cost recovery is, which we have done. We need you to give us guidance on what feels right to you. That's -- that's the ultimate goal. So, what you are doing here is exactly what we need. If you have questions or concerns on process let us know. We will work with your directors. We are kind of your messenger. These -- you know, they are not our fees, they are the city's fees and we are doing the best we can to communicate 763 fees to you guys. So, again, we appreciate this.

Simison: Okay. With that you will be bringing back something next week or next two weeks, however long it takes to get something put up on the ones and we will schedule the others as appropriate around -- I think is it MDC next week? So, probably won't be until the week after or into November for the other ones, so -- okay. Council, anything else or do I have a motion to adjourn?

11. Service Accessibility Tool Use in Development Staff Reports

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: We have got the service accessibility tool use and development --

Simison: Oh, I'm sorry.

Cavener: -- still on our agenda.

Simison: I apologize.

Cavener: That's all right. For Brian. I know you are probably hungry, Mr. Mayor, but this -- I know this is -- Council wanted to hear some feedback.

Simison: I'm absolutely not. I just thought that that was going to be the one that was going to take the most time. With that we will move on to Item 11, service accessibility tool use and development staff report. Turn this over Mr. McClure.

McClure: Mayor, Members of Council, I'm here to talk about the service accessibility tool and department reports, aka the service impact tool, which is part of growth priority areas. The confusing title is a little intentional. The purpose of this discussion is to follow up on a request to review the service accessibility tool and the department report. Much of the focus here will be on where it came from and how things have changed. There is a lot of names and references really since 2017 with original concept and implementation varying. I will try to describe this as just the tool -- or service tool, but I will probably slip, so it's -- it's all service something. This is an outline of the presentation and discussion. Number one is origination of the tool. Number two overview of the tool itself. Number three criteria and metrics. Number four implementation. One other note here. But the process period here is years as I sort of alluded to. I'm going to refer to council throughout. It's understood that the people in council change and that the council persons may each have their own individual opinions on a lot of this. The short here or there, though, is that City Council body has seen and directed every major element of this tool and so this can be a moving target for staff. Made much more complex when staffing changes. The tool goes back to the concept of growth priority areas in which were a significant topic of discussion and -- and a priority of Council when developing the 2019 Comprehensive Plan. The tool was budgeted as part of the scope of work of the plan and was important enough to warrant several paragraphs of text and policies. This was, again, largely driven by the Mayor and Council at the time. Changes of topic of discussion later, but sort of a segue and I only learned this a few weeks ago, but in city code the term growth priority area only shows up once in Title 8 for infrastructure reimbursement. All previous mapping efforts for that topic, now years ago, were done through IT and none of that was formally adopted or approved a condition of that code. As an aside, other core analysis wrapped up into the tools that were developed with the Comprehensive Plan were marketing, corridor analysis, growth priorities and concept was the bow on transportation corridor and market analysis and, then, timing. Here are some related policies. Some of these have gone different directions or fallen out of favor with other work priorities. It's entirely up to the Mayor and City Council. This is context. Regardless, the tool was developed and integrated into more generalized workflows, including part of the department reports that you guys have seen. Miranda Carson, now with West Ada, also worked with Council on some of the reporting when she was in Community Development, including

the colors reporting and, then, highlighting areas to consider and not just assume good or bad. More recently staff worked with Council on integration of this tool into the department report. I have some text on some of this in the next slide. I apologize. These are the most relevant progress of text in the Comprehensive Plan. I'm skipping the intro section for this tool and several other related tools. The short here is that the tool is called -- as called out as doing what was envisioned, it's just sort of not getting quite as far. It's doing -- it's checking all the boxes, we just don't use it to its fullest. I will leave this here momentarily and, then, move on. Moving into overview. The tool ranks all parcels in the city for readiness. Apart from formal and clear growth priority areas it was implemented as a reminder of the -- for the entitlement process, considerations like efficiency in the context of location. Metrix being reported out and this is sort of a stress for this presentation, does not mean a project is good or bad. The project in a good location could be a lemon. A project with some challenges could also be mitigating all those impacts and efficiencies or even improving it. Again, the original sort of scope and purpose here was -- was larger than a project. It was a citywide analysis. This tool reflects existing conditions, not what is being proposed in front of you. This is where we start and, then, a developer or staff can, then, compare. Ideally an applicant uses the baseline to demonstrate value to the city, improving connectivity, improving efficiency, whatever that is and especially in the context of the policies and the comprehensive plan, which staff do reference. These are high level scoring categories. Bold and italics also in green were prioritized by Council and have the largest weight. There are actually 18 separate geospatial models that are part of this tool. Often with their own dependency work and -- and, then, server processing that's on -- on top of that. And a few of these, like location and plats, are combined into the -- into the final report. So, these don't align one to one with the report that you see in staff reports, but they -- they cover all the general topics and they reflect what was sort of driven forward as part of the Comprehensive Plan. Some of these are modeled and measured in very similar ways and others are very different. Before going into some of those measurement types so a few notes on items that have been discussion areas with Council more recently. Emergency services for police are not drive time. At least I think obviously patrol and while there could be some considerations like efficiency loss with some development patterns, this is understanding crime statistics from several different categories within reporting districts. Generally section miles. They have service goals, but response times -- or isn't a key matrix for all those categories. Similarly -- or, actually, the opposite. Fire -- for fire response times is important in this tool, but that includes call processing, turn out time and travel time, it's not just how long they take to get outside once they leave the station. All of this is modeled using street network, including intersections. I noticed -- I noted previously, but there is several different ways to -- some of these are measured and I think this will help with some of the questions previously. Two primary that may be helpful are boundary edge and centroid. Boundary edges are -- only include the data within the boundary. So, sewer analysis, for example, is not just a distance from the project to mainline, but the distance from the project to the mainline in the trunk shed that project is within. So, you can't just jump over a trunk shed easily. There is a whole lot of extra work that goes into that. Police reporting districts, as mentioned, are -- are the same as well. Only data within a reporting district is considered. If no data -- red is simply not green or yellow. We don't know what we

don't know. Related the reporting districts use level of service modeling the police department was already using prior to the tool. It's not new reporting, it's just included with a bunch of other matrix. The other primary measurement tool is the centroid -- what is generally the center of a parcel and, then, the distance measurement from that to a feature of interest. Usually that is using the street network model again, so distance along roads, not as the bird flies. Centroid was used to consider an average for projects. Again, citywide parcel analysis and particularly for larger projects. You don't, for example, have a project that touches the edge of a -- of a park walking shed and say everything within that project is walkable when 99 percent of the units might be -- fall outside of that. So, we use the -- the parcel center as an average. All of this data updates nightly through automated sequel procedures and GIS modelling that's accessed directly from the server. The data is always the latest and it's the same information we use for all other systems. Data that is not ours, like parcels or center line, is updated no less than monthly. Stations, parks and schools are all kept current. The City Council approved these through multiple meetings prior to the Comprehensive Plan adoption and, then, was reviewed again in the last few years with Miranda. The reports are also -- collapse for simplicity. Each matrix is sometimes actually a series of models with their own scores that sort of rolled up. Colors have been a topic. They have been a topic in the past. Which doesn't mean we can't revisit them. Red is simply stopping to consider context though. It's not stop and go away. As I understand it it's like a single red flashing light in the middle of an intersection. You stop, sometimes you wait, sometimes you go and, then, you go. Hopefully, this overview today helps a little with that. Really was never intended to be bad and other options considered by Council had less support. Related, this is consistent with other direction. Current planning staff have been explicitly asked to include more formatting reports, like color, bold, underline in their staff reports for emphasis, be it good or bad. Moving into implementation of the tool. This is what the report looks like. You have hopefully seen this in -- in the department reports. Keep in mind, again, that these are single line scores and there is a lot more going on in the background. It's difficult to wrap your head around all of it. Access to the tools for staff is either in a server sequel or power BI report. Staff generally access these directly from GIS links when they -- and, then, these are supposed to be given out to other staff and applicants with pre-application meetings when requested. I will get here in a minute, but please note the name on this -- on the left here. It's called Service Accessibility and, then, this report here for curious -- is just for City Hall. The complete report is usually an attachment towards the back of a department report. Closer to the front with the other infographic -- infographics that Council requested with the department reports is a color graph. Again, this one here is for City Hall. The title on this one is Service Impact Summary going back to a comp plan policy, but I think it's confusing. Time -- time brings change. After years of Council discussion, integration and enterprise databases, pandemic and changing priorities and prolonged development of the department report, a finished product that's not quite as originally envisioned. Concepts like growth priority areas that become more conceptual than formal. Staff do believe the tool has value, though, when used consistently through the development review process, starting at a pre-application meeting. Everyone needs to be on the same page, though, and so, again, hopefully some of this helps. Some additional change may be helpful still. From recent experiences additional

notes in the department report possibly being moved up to the chart or graph. I'm not planning to flash another wallet text with you, but we also do have the department report notes that we could revisit in general. Related to that graph in the report. Institutional memory for staff needs to change as well. It's been a struggle for staff to sort of build back the pieces to be able to explain some of this with other people having been involved for -- for a while. Perhaps more onboarding with new council persons would help. We are also happy to take suggestions. I think maybe, for example, could generally be improved. With that I'm happy to have a conversation on any of this. We also have -- we did also meet with fire and PD. We have Deputy Chief Taulbee and Captain Leslie here. They can help me with fire and PD considerations if needed. But I will do my best to answer any questions or take feedback.

Simison: Thank you, Brian. Council, questions, comments?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Brian, thank you very much for that. I think one of the things that really got the discussion going one night is we were dealing with bare dirt, bare ground, no roads, no nothing, but yet fire came out yellow and police came out red. But yet there is no -- nothing there. So, there had been no activity for the police to ever respond to. So, crime was zero. So, we were really trying to figure out how did we get red, but there is no roads for the fire trucks to get there either.

McClure: Madam Mayor, Council Woman, yes, the tool definitely reflects existing conditions and not what's being proposed by a development. Modeling for a street network and fire is especially telling there, because you see how long it would take a developer -- fire engine to get there before they extend roads and that might be a very different picture when they improve connectivity in the area. They might have new points of access. They might not have to go through a long way down arterial roadways. Police reporting. That goes back to -- red was intended to be -- and I will just be honest I don't like the colors, but red was intended to be, you know, just -- we don't know what we don't know, we are calling this out. It was not intended to be bad. So, usually they have some text notes in the -- in the report that says we don't have any data in this area. Maybe that's one of the areas that could be improved, though, better notes to go along with those. I don't -- I don't know what they all say.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Along those same lines, in one of the first slides I saw at the bottom it stood out to me when it said not a development review tool.

McClure: Do you remember -- Councilman, do you remember which slide that was?

Overton: It was the second or third. It was actually italicized. It was -- I wrote it down right as it was -- it is not a development review tool. Bottom statement. It reflects current conditions. And I -- I -- I sit there and I look at that and I think it's in our packets and we are looking at a development and we are reviewing that application with a tool that says it's not a development review tool and, then, we get into a situation where I have comments from police and I have comments from fire and I got there the green light, you know, we got a -- a new station, we got a new fire station, we got a precinct, we got cops close, we got all these things close, but yet I have got this tool that to all of us that know the colors, looks like caution, and I got -- admitted, I was probably one of the most frustrated up here when I saw that, because it -- it's not that I don't like the colors, I was struggling to find the usefulness of the tool itself. When I see an area that's all single family and it gets a low score for transit, of course it does. Transit's going to be looking for areas where they can get the highest ridership through mostly areas of multi-family. I mean that's -- I have sat -- had coffee with the CEO. I know what she's striving for in transit. But, yet, we have a tool that designates our areas like we have got a problem with that in the tool and I'm -- I'm not sure that putting it in these staff reports is the right place for it and I'm not sure where the right place is, because it sure puts us in an awful position when we are up reviewing a plan when we are trying to say it looks good and we are staring at a page that's got that green, yellow and red and, like you said, you don't like the color red. Well, I don't like the color red when from that location on the map I can see a police department and it says I don't have any response. So, there is -- I think that's where there is a disconnect between how the tool has been built and how we are currently using it and how it's being interpreted on the dais and we need to make sure that we somehow fix that so we don't have those miscommunications. I don't mean I want to go old school, but, my gosh, when we got police representatives and fire representatives and I saw that chart, I threw that chart away and I went straight to the source and they said we don't have a problem with that area and I feel good moving it long. We were in good shape. But I feel terrible that we invest this kind of time in a tool that I wasn't getting good information from that helped me that evening.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, the words on the screen here are mine. I -- I didn't -- perhaps could have worded it differently. It definitely does not review the marriage of a development coming through. It's being used now -- again that's not necessarily the original concept that we had, but it's being used now as here is the baseline where we are starting. This is what exists out there right now. So, there may be a police station across the street, but it's -- they don't have enough data out there right now within a large area to report anything. There might be a fire station across the street, but that doesn't mean they can get there, because it's an 80 acre parcel and they haven't provided all the roads towards the center of it yet, you know. Have valid points and concerns. I -- I -- I'm not the decision maker on how this -- we should use this. Can certainly talk about it more though and you have Caleb here, but I -- I will say the data in there is -- is solid. There is reasons why it does that. If we need to get into more of that detail we can do that as well. It's pretty gnarly, but we can get IT here. I -- so -- so, yes, it's -- it's used informant. Here is where we are at. That's -- that's all. And, then, people -- someone, I don't know who, staff or an applicant should be saying this is where you

are at and these are all the things we are improving for you and are we still missing anything after all is said and done. That's not the tool though. That's -- that's analysis by staff, that's narrative by an applicant, that's traffic impact studies or whatever those things are, that's -- those are those other things. The -- the -- the service impact tool, again, it's -- it's been repurposed from what was originally growth priority area is to understand where we wanted to grow and prioritize those areas to something slightly different. It's related, but it's different.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, you say it's -- it's -- it's based on good data when there is data and I think the problem we had in some of these cases is there is no data, because we are annexing an open field and I know for a fact if it's causing this group of six issues, it's got to be causing confusion at Planning and Zoning as well and I just -- I almost wonder whether we should be taking this out of our staff reports until we get this tool right where it actually is helping us move forward with our applications, because I don't want to see anything in our applications that's a -- that's a data-driven tool that's causing us more concern than helping us progress with the right decision. Just my thought.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Brian, thank you for the -- the update on this and I -- being the newest member of the Council would agree that this is probably a very good review with the onboarding of any new council members in the future, because I certainly didn't understand and I was experiencing the same thoughts and feelings that the other members had. Red to me meant stop. But I appreciated your -- your comments that it means stop and consider the context, not stop and go away. But how are we supposed to consider the context? And, again, I am not a sequel server magician and I have no idea what happens every night when it updates with GIS data and everything else, but at some point I need the context and I need either notations or something that says while this has -- it indicates red or this indicates yellow, here is the context and -- and that's what would be helpful to me if we are going to utilize the tool. Just a red, yellow green, it -- it -- it's simple in nature, but it's very difficult from a utility standpoint without the context.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Brian, thank you. I will share the same thoughts with Councilman Whitlock and maybe even suggest how to read a packet for new council members, because it takes a little bit of work to understand it. I am guilty also looking at that and thinking this was an

analysis of the application, as opposed to -- what I really like is the location readiness. I kind of flagged that. When I think of it, the feedback is this is what the current status of this location based on these metrics. That's helpful for me to understand and I -- it's a new revelation to me to understand how that tool is to be used. Is there -- my question is is there any way to marry up the proposal and the connectivity, the new roadways may be being proposed and how that might change the scoring on this metrics to say current readiness of the project is this, the new development with the proposed changes would change it to this. Is that something that we could do or would that be a little bit inappropriate, because that's assuming a decision that maybe we haven't made?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, the -- the tool is using pretty cutting edge tech, but the concept of the tool is a little dated now. There is other better tools that do what you just said and re -- to repurpose a tool we have now to do analysis on a project, I would have a hard time justifying as being a worthy endeavor. There are other tools that do that other agencies use, including even in the valley, but we don't use them now. We don't have them immediately available. So, I don't really -- not a great option for doing a compare and contrast right now. It's -- it's technically possible, but it would be a huge lift and I'm not sure would be the best outcome.

Taylor: That's fair. Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Mr. Taylor.

Taylor: Is it -- does this tool require a significant amount of staff time and coordination to feed the data into it or is it a lot of it automated, because you have worked on it and you kind of set it up? I'm trying to get a sense for the utility of us on Council, the utility for staff to use it and how much -- how many resources are being required to kind of keep up to date. Can you give me a sense for what that looks like?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, yeah. So, the -- the tool itself is -- no. Things happen in IT; right? And they break. We do an upgrade of any sort and something breaks that no one expected. So, the tool has broken before, because we upgraded our GIS system and they -- and as we depreciated one of the things we were using and we had to -- have to reconfigure it. But for a daily, weekly, monthly sort of snapshot of -- of use, there is no update, there is no process, it's all completely automated.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Brian, couple just quick questions. In the interest of time if you want to follow up later, too, that's okay. Who are the top three users of this tool from staff's perspective? Council? Planning and Zoning? Is it applicant? Is it other staff? I recognize in your presentation you feel like to a degree it's -- it's doing what it's intended. Is that doing what it's intended for the intended audience I guess is maybe a bigger question that I'm -- I'm curious about and to maybe take it a step further, what

kind of grade would you give it for each audience? Because, right, you have got a Council here that is feeling like, man, we are relying on this information -- important -- it's included in the staff report to help us make a decision and if -- if we are not feeling like that -- that information is meeting our intention, I think that's part of the reason why we are talking tonight, but if it's meeting Planning and Zoning or it's meeting staff or it's meeting the applicant, again, as an audience, I think that's also a good piece for us to hear; right? We don't want to make drastic changes if it's meeting -- if we are giving A's as to these other intended audiences and maybe the Council might be a B minus or a C plus. So, I'm trying to be inclusive as to who all these, you know, users are and if -- if the Council is the only outlier that's -- that's struggling with the benefit of it.

McClure: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Cavener, in 2017, 2018, I would have said this tool is bees' knees and it's awesome and we should be doing this. I did. Some degree. Now, not so much. You know, it's -- like I said, it's cutting edge tech, but it's not -- it's not being implemented and well. We have -- we have diverged past from where it was intended to go and gone somewhere else with it. So, I think it has -- and I'm going to get myself in trouble. I -- I think it has a lot of value for staff and for an applicant. I know these are the things that we should be looking at and these are the things that we should be addressing in our narrative and our application and making sure that when we propose something to our decision makers the city's kept whole and everyone understands that this is a good idea. I -- I think there is a lot of opportunity there. I don't think we are always doing that as well as we could be. For City Council, you know, we -- we haven't had a lot of screen time on this. It took so long with all the different things happening to get this in front of you and if I were to rank the limited discussion I have seen of this it wouldn't -- I don't have -- it wouldn't be a C or higher. It -- it -- it hasn't -- it's not doing -- it could have value. As it's being used right now I don't feel like it has a lot of value as it's implemented right now and there is my keeper.

Hood: Can I -- can I maybe just add. Brian's in big trouble. No. Quickly -- and I realize you have a pretty good size agenda this evening. But just back to your -- your question, Councilman Cavener, for the most part. I -- I think it does help staff initially in the pre-apps and that gets -- Brian mentioned it a couple of times, but an initial cold called us, you want to meet with us next week, here is a snapshot of where our services are now and we -- honestly, we as staff kind of do use it as a little bit of a scorecard. Oh, look at red sewer. Sewer's a mile away. That's going to be an issue. Public Works, is it really an issue? Can we mitigate that issue? Some things like it's a low density subdivision we don't expect transit service to be awesome or it's a field with no parks nearby. That's probably okay. We know the context of that. So, back to the -- you know, staff and applicant early on, it's a -- I think it's -- I will give it a B plus even. It -- it can be a nice tool to say this is the condition of your property and where -- how long it takes -- if you dialed 9-1-1 from that property today here is how long it takes fire to get there. There is where the nearest park is. There is where their school is. It helps set that stage. When it gets to your -- you know, how you should use it and -- and we can have that conversation. We just looked at the staff report template, so maybe we take it out of that and we just leave it in the notes from staff at the pre-app and say, look, we shared that and -- but we really do work with the agencies today. Then there are conditions of

approval. Say we will mitigate that our response time is 15 minutes or that sewer is a mile away or whatever. So, the conditions of approval also provide the context for that. We can provide those services. Here is what the developer is doing. They are bringing that sewer to the property. We don't have the tool. We can't do that it -- well, we could. We don't have the resources to do it, but that's really -- so, I -- I kind of do at this point, too, question if it's appropriate for the staff report. We are trying to get you to understand how it's being used, though, and it isn't the -- I think Brian's intent with that. It's not a tool for development purposes. It doesn't spit out the answer for you. It doesn't tell you if you should approve a project or not, it just says -- and sometimes a date is missing and we have talked about that and maybe we use brown, it's missing data or whatever, like, hey, red isn't bad, it's just a pause and why is it red? Oh, it's because we don't have any data. How -- how can we relay that information better? But, anyways, that's --

Cavener: I appreciate it. Mr. Mayor, just real quick.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think maybe because I was here when you guys were kind of conceiving this and I -- I do see that it is a valuable tool for staff, for applicant, but I also think that with some -- in context it can be really beneficial for the City Council. So, I'm -- I'm not in the spot of saying let's do away with it, what I'm saying is let's -- let's provide maybe some of that extra analysis. Example. Right? My thermostat says it's 63 degrees. Now, the temperature is a hundred outside my house is awesome. It's great. I -- I -- I want that to be -- my house to be 63 degrees; right? If it's 35 outside, man, I want my house to be warmer; right? The -- the data point is the temperature; right? The information that you guys provide there is data points, but particularly for some areas -- and to me -- and I think it's areas that are probably in yellow and in red and brown or whatever, some extra analysis for Council as to what's driving that, so helping us to understand here is the why and these are the things that you as Council should be thinking about that this is -- it's I think a great partnership between staff and the Council is to help us see through your guys' eyes why those things are being rated the way that they are. So, just for feedback. I -- again, If Council wants to -- to -- to dump it that's fine. I -- I think there is a value there. I think there is merit for us and for our Planning and Zoning and I just think it -- it's more about leveling it up a little bit. Now that we have used it for a little while you have got some feedback, let's make it meet what you guys had hoped it would -- it would do for Council when this was first conceived.

Hood: Mr. Mayor, if I can just quickly respond again. And we can do a better job. I think we -- we glom onto some of the things from the report. We don't always tie it back to the report, though, too; right. If it is an area where we anticipate transit we can say, hey, this density may be okay and -- and -- but we don't then tie that back to and it was red on the service side and this is something that we are -- you know, it would make it yellow or green even. So, good feedback and we can -- we can sort of use it more and not develop a tool that automatically spits out the answer, but says, hey, look by what the applicant's doing in the conditions of approval, this somewhat mitigates the red or

the context is sprawl and that's why a lot of this is red is because we don't have any facilities out there. Really, Council, though, do you want them to build a mile of sewer or not? I mean it's infrastructure we didn't have to maintain. I don't know that planning staff will do that analysis; right? That may be something more for Public Works and how do they put that in context to mitigate their service and the accessibility or readiness of that service? We can share that feedback. But, again, it's a tool that's in the planning staff report, but it really is a lot of inputs from other service providers, some of them internal, but, anyways, good -- good feedback and I will talk to the team and figure out how we can use it better and more and change notes and make it clear where data is missing or --

Simison: Caleb, maybe one other thing that -- I don't know if this Council has any interest or desire, but who -- who set the standards of red, yellow and green? Do you want Council to -- to have feedback on that, so that there is an agreement -- even understanding is that one person's green may be another person's red. Can you really align, so that you even understand what that means? I will -- I will throw that out there, because I -- I don't recall a conversation where you all said, well, here is what this should be and here is what this should -- you know, here is where the standards should be altered or where it matters, but --

Hood: Mr. Mayor, if you don't mind, I -- we did do that in '18, '19, right around when the comp plan and -- and with the recommendation from, again, those sort of -- you know, Public Works said half a mile seems reasonable or within 1,200 feet, that's when it should be -- you know, anything adjacent that's green. It's readily -- if someone went to and through the property, green, quarter of a mile more yellow, but that was vetted through, again, Council at that time. But your policy, you -- if you want to change where those lines break between green and yellow or yellow and red, yeah, but -- so, it is maybe -- it's older at this point --

Simison: Or at least discuss it, so there is a general understanding of everybody about --

Hood: Or we can just report that data and not do red, yellow, green, we can just say -- it's 500 feet. You can determine if that's red, yellow or green as individuals. It's just -- it's -- it's a data point. It's there. It's this far away.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: This is really helpful, because it's helping me understand the data I'm getting and what I should learn from it. I wouldn't want just a static number that I don't understand from your perspective in context, what does it mean. You guys know a lot more than I do. I need some context on some of this, but just this presentation to help me understand how I should maybe use it is good. I think we can make it more helpful.

But we do want to see context from you, because you guys deal with -- deal this -- with this every day. So, I -- I wouldn't want you to get rid of it entirely.

Hood: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, anything else? Brian, Caleb, you good to take it from here for whatever you are going to take that from? Okay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: We are to the end of our workshop agenda. I move we adjourn.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:44 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK