

Meridian City Council Work Session

September 7, 2021.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, September 7, 2021, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Liz Strader.

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

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is 4:30 on September 7, 2021. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Very pleased to make a motion to adopt the agenda as published.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I 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 August 17, 2021 City Council Work Session**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the August 17, 2021 City Council Regular Meeting**

- 3. Approve Minutes of the August 24, 2021 City Council Work Session/Joint Meeting with Meridian Development Corporation**
- 4. Approve Minutes of the August 24, 2021 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 5. Wadsworth Meridian Subdivision Sanitary Sewer Easement**
- 6. Wadsworth Meridian Subdivision Water Main Easement**
- 7. Public Art Easement Agreement Between City of Meridian and Meridian Cycles for the Installation of Mural by Ben Konkol**
- 8. Final Plat for Apex Southeast No. 3 (FP-2021-0042) by Brighton Development, Inc., Generally Located on the East Side of S. Locust Grove Rd., ¼ Mile South of E. Lake Hazel Rd.**
- 9. Final Plat for Lavender Heights No. 3 (FP-2021-0041) by LH Development, LLC, Located Approximately ¼ Mile East of S. Locust Grove Rd. on the North Side of E. Lake Hazel Rd.**
- 10. Final Plat for TM Crossing No. 5 (FP-2021-0045) by Brighton Development, Inc., Located at the Southeast Corner of S. Ten Mile Rd. and S. Vanguard Way**
- 11. Final Order for The Landing No. 13 (FP-2021-0040) by Rock Solid Civil, Located at 660 S. Linder Rd.**
- 12. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Creason Creek Subdivision No. 3 (SHP2021-0003) by ULC Management, LLC, Located on the East Side of N. Linder Rd., South of W. Ustick Rd.**
- 13. Development Agreement Between the City of Meridian and 10 Mile Franklin, LLC (Owner/Developer) for The 10 at Meridian (H-2021-0025), Located at 75 S. Ten Mile Rd., at the Southwest Corner of W. Franklin Rd. and S. Ten Mile Rd.**
- 14. Development Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Joint School District No. 2 dba West Ada School District (Owner/Developer) for Prescott Ridge - School Portion (H-2020-0047), Located South of W. Chinden Blvd. and East of N. McDermott Rd.**
- 15. Development Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Providence Properties, LLC (Owner/Developer) for Prescott Ridge - Hospital Portion (H-2020-0047), Located South of W. Chinden Blvd. and East of N. McDermott Rd.**

- 16. Development Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Providence Properties, LLC (Owner/Developer) for Prescott Ridge - Residential Portion (H-2020-0047), Located South of W. Chinden Blvd. and East of N. McDermott Rd.**
- 17. Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Nampa and Meridian Irrigation District for the Five Mile Pathway at Gander Creek Subdivision**
- 18. Addendum No. 19 to Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Boise City for City Prosecutor/Criminal Legal Services Dated November 1, 2002**
- 19. Resolution No. 21-2283: A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Meridian to Amend the Future Land Use Map of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan for 80.7 Acres of Land Known as Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility, Generally Located ¼ Mile South of W. McMillan Road, Midway Between N. Black Cat Road and N. Ten Mile Road, in the North ½ of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Meridian, Idaho; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item up is the Consent Agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: It's a great day when I have the privilege to make a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. For the Mayor to sign and for the Clerk to attest.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I 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 adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

- 20. Public Hearing for Adoption of Proposed Republic Services Solid Waste Fees**

Simison: So, we will move on to Department/Commission Reports. First up is a public hearing for the adoption of proposed Republican -- Republic Services solid waste fees and who is going to be presenting?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, did you say that was Republican solid waste?

Simison: I may have done that.

Remling: Good afternoon, Mayor and Council. My name is Rodney Remling. Business finance manager for Republic Services, Boise, Idaho. 11101 West Executive Drive. And I believe you have a memo in your packet from last week talking about the rates that we are proposing for this year and it's a little bit different than previous years, because we have had unprecedented labor increases. It's been building for a while, but over the course of the last year we had to increase our wages by roughly 12 and a half percent, which exceeds the CPI for garbage trash, which was running 4.34 percent. So, we -- to the best of our estimate, because we don't have a -- a labor component of that index -- it's about eight, eight and a half percent outside of that index that we are -- that we have had to increase wages. Going back to the regular increase -- so, annually the rates are increased October 1 of each year and it's based on a CPI. This year the CPI is garbage trash. It was changed last year. It's based on May and the change in CPI was 4.34 percent. Ninety percent of that is allowed and which brings it down to 3.91 percent. And there are many components of the rate. Not all components of the rate are increased. Disposal is not increased and, then, there is some other components that we will call out. Household hazardous waste is a component of the rate that's not increased. It is 11 -- or, excuse me, it's 18 cents per household per month and that's used to cover the household hazardous waste collection that's done over at the Meridian transfer station. We -- we reconcile that annually and currently we are uncollected -- Republic Services has not collected about 8,000 dollars. The number there is 7,964. So, that rate doesn't quite cover the cost, but increases in households over the next year. We will probably reverse that. So, we will continue to hold that and leave that flat at 18 cents. Recycling processing charge is on residential and commercial materials and for residential it is \$1.03 per household per month, where it has been for the last year. Again, we are not asking for a change there, so it's staying flat. You may have heard that commodity markets are improving a little bit and so rates -- or the commodity amount that we are receiving is going up. However, we are also seeing increasing costs. In addition to that, Republic Services has about 132,000 in uncollected or uncollected costs, if you will, that this -- that this was designed to cover and so we are -- again, we are leaving that flat, asking for no increase or decrease at this time. Recycling process fee that we pay our processor has gone up to \$12.59 per household per month and that coincides with a rate increase for -- for October 1. So, on the labor, the whole country is experiencing unprecedented labor shortages. In Meridian city these shortages are resulting in increases of about 12 and a half percent or about eight percent over increases in CPI. Republic Services increased labor about two dollars per hour starting -- starting with existing drivers and, then, we are asking for 11 cents per household per month on the residential side. Again we mentioned disposal is not increased. Volumetric excise tax credit or the fuel tax incentive that the federal government has provided or returned to users of alternative fuels over the last

several years, this year for Republic -- or, excuse me, for Meridian city that amount was 54,427. Public Works has asked us to roll that into the rate and -- like we did in the previous year and the change from last year from the previous year to this year is an increase of about three cents per household per month and what that means is that the credit went down just slightly from year to year. That's due primarily to the fact of just routes and fuel -- and fuel usage. So, we calculate specifically on how much fuel is used in the contract for -- for Meridian city. So, again, that's 54,427, divided by your customers per month. So, for all the residential MP -- excuse me. For all the residential impact the components are -- in that last paragraph -- the CPI is 79 cents and of that 79 cents the city of Meridian keeps a nickel of that or six percent. Sixty-five cents is CPI, household hazardous waste, again, zero. Uncontrollable recycling commodity. Unchanged. Zero. Disposable charge zero. And volumetric excise tax was three cents. And, then, labor we are asking for 11 cents. In the last page of your packet you can see kind of a breakdown of the residential rate. The CPI increasing their 304,000 or 3.91 percent is allowed by the contract and, then, the alternative fuel tax credit or VTEC is a reduction of 54,000 or seven percent. And, then, the labor market adjustment that we are asking for is 52,489 or .67 percent. So, to kind of put the whole labor thing in perspective for the -- for the Meridian city contract, our labor increased about 214,000 dollars to service this contract alone. So, the 12 and a half percent represents 214,000 dollars and we are asking for residential households to cover 52,489 and that is -- that's -- that is -- excuse me. At 214 and, then, residential are 52,489 and the residential component of that's 39 percent of the actual residential labor. So, we have got Republic Services keeping 61 and, then, we are asking residents to pick up 39 percent. In the other two lines of businesses and commercial and industrial we are asking for about one percent on those. So, about 45,000 dollars in commercial and 35,000 dollars in industrial. So, about a one percent increase up and -- and is due to labor each of those. Any questions?

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Rodney, what's the proposed labor increase for the city of Boise, city of Caldwell, city of Nampa and city of Eagle?

Remling: So -- so, we have asked -- or we are asking each of those cities, as we go into those cities when it's due for the price increase. So, we have calculated the rate -- or, excuse me, we have calculated the usage of that labor by all of our contracts and -- and we will be picking that amount up with each of those contracts as those come up. So, Boise is a larger percentage of our market and will -- and, thus, have a larger piece of that, which Boise will incorporate into their rate structure, which is very different from the Meridian structure. I didn't bring a dollar amount or discuss individual city rates with the city of Meridian. Those amounts, when we -- when we go to those cities will be public record, just like this one is here.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Ballpark numbers for those -- I recognize it's going before them, but just like you have proposed a number to us, I'm just curious what you have proposed to those four other cities.

Remling: So, why don't I -- why don't I give you a global number for what we have got in the market. Will that help you?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Rodney, I'm not trying to give you a hard time. I'm not looking for a global number, I'm looking for a local number. I'm looking to see what -- what -- how the city of Meridian ratepayers are going to compare to the four municipalities that you also serve that kind of touch our borders.

Remling: Yeah. So --

Cavener: And if you -- if you don't have that right now that's okay. I'm not looking for a specific amount, again, just a ballpark would be -- is it ten cents? Is it a quarter? Is it a dollar?

Remling: Yeah. So -- so, when I say globally, I don't mean our bigger countrywide market, I mean right here in the valley. We are increasing our labor rates just about 1.6 million dollars. So, we are going up 1.6 million and 214 of that relates to Meridian city. Roughly three times that would be the Boise city amount, so --

Cavener: Thanks.

Simison: You will have to come up if you are wanting to address that specific question.

Klein: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Cavener, I get what Rodney is saying, because we work on this stuff together, but I think what you are looking for is we did go to Nampa already and they gave us a flat four percent increase, instead of getting more specific here, like we work with your Public Works and utility billing and we broke it down by service level, very granularly, the labor piece, and Nampa it was a flat four percent across the board for their CPI, which included labor. So, it was a little bit more than here. They are roughly the same size community and so I would have to go back and look, but that kind of gives you an idea. We did go to them with the same ask and they said yes and that's the way that they -- they chose to handle it. We asked for a flat four percent to keep it simple and in Boise we -- we take our expenses back to them. It's a contract where they look at our expenses and they give us a margin on it. So, that piece is now -- like

Rodney said, we have that amount and we go to them and that becomes part of our negotiation as part of our expenses that they don't give us, but they will reimburse us on. So, it's a little bit different formula. But -- but the other two communities that border Meridian we will also be asking them the same question. I don't know if that helped at all. Okay.

Simison: Council, any additional questions?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Thanks for your presentation. I appreciate it. I just had one question. How did you get to the split between -- your expenses were at 39 and you are at 61. How did you get to that number -- those numbers?

Remling: Yeah. So -- so, thank you for the question. It's really an attempt to keep the rates as low as we can for Meridian residents. Working with the Public Works Department we worked through a couple of different scenarios and settled on this one. You know, essentially, you know, we would like to capture a hundred percent of our additional costs, but we realize that that's -- that's not really realistic. So, as a good partner we try to split that 50-50. When you look at the three lines of businesses we are really about 50-50 percent. So, I think Meridian businesses and residents cover 51 percent of the 214,000, as we look at the whole of the business and, then, Republic Services keeps the other 49 percent. So, kind of pushing -- pushing more to commercial and industrial for less impact on residential was the idea.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Rodney, help me -- I guess maybe walk the Council through why not come back and ask the city to cover the increased cost for the household hazardous waste, the increase with the -- with the landfill. I mean what's -- I guess the question is why the labor and not these other increases that you guys are choosing to absorb? What's -- why -- why this one?

Remling: So -- so, there is no increase in -- in disposal at this time. So, there was one in previous year and we asked for it then and it was a hundred percent. In household hazardous waste it's reconciled annually. So, the 7,000 -- 7,900 doesn't go away, it remains in the reconciliation. So, you know, if we moved it even a penny it would go the other direction. So, it doesn't really make sense to change it. The other -- the other consideration is is that the City of Meridian is growing so fast and if they don't -- if the residents don't utilize household hazardous waste in proportion the costs won't raise proportionately. So, we may -- depending on how much the city grows, actually roll it

back another penny next year, so -- just an annual reconciliation. It doesn't go away, we just keep rolling it forward.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just maybe a -- a plug for those in the room. That's -- the household hazardous waste program is one that I have received a small handful of complaints about the level of customer service. I think that when our citizens show up there they have a -- correct or not, a preconceived -- preconceived notion that that's City of Meridian and the -- the customer service that they have received has not lived up to the expectation the City of Meridian. So, I'm all for another penny if -- if it gets the level of service that our citizens expect. So, just for what it's worth I -- I hear the rationalization behind it. It makes sense. But I think that's an area that -- I know it's a third party vendor, it's not a Republican piece, but, again, Republic's got a great reputation for customer service. I would hate that a third-party entity is hurting your guys' reputation, just like it's hurting the City of Meridian's reputation.

Remling: We appreciate that. Increasing the rate wouldn't change that piece of it, so -- but thank you for the comment.

Cavener: Yeah.

Simison: Council, any further questions? Thank you very much.

Remling: Thank you very much, Mayor and Council.

Simison: This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to provide public testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Well, I only see one person online in the Zoom. A staff member. But if you would like to provide testimony as also a resident, use the raise your hand function at the bottom and we will be happy to bring you in or anybody else in the room that would like to come forward. Seeing none, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm not going to make a motion to close the public hearing. Just maybe keep it open for a conversation with Council. We had this before us a couple weeks back. Council Member Strader, who is the SWAC liaison, I think shared some feedback -- at least from the SWAC on that. I would almost like to continue this for another week until

Council Member Strader can be here to provide some additional context. I don't -- I know we are up against a time crunch for October, but is there any risk if we continue this out a week?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, Council Member Cavener, no. I spoke with the utility billing manager about the timing, because there is a resolution that has to get done. There is two MOUs that have to get approved that go in conjunction with that and I asked her whether it matters if it was the 14th or the 21st and she said either one of those dates was fine.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I don't know if you have an opinion or anybody has any thoughts one way or another, but --

Simison: I have no opinion on the matter.

Cavener: Then I guess maybe an additional request, either for you or for Legal. If we were to continue this could we continue it to the 6:00 o'clock meeting, to our main meeting where we typically take public testimony?

Simison: No reason why you couldn't.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor, with that I move that we continue Item 20, public hearing for adoption proposed Republic Service solid waste fees to September the 14th at the 6:00 o'clock meeting.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to continue this item until September 14th at 6:00 p.m. Is there any discussion? Mr. Clerk, just to verify, we will have Council Woman Strader back next week to -- especially if Councilman Cavener is hoping for input.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we should -- yes, we will have Council Woman Strader. We will not have Councilman Hoaglund.

Simison: All right. Any further discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and the item is continued until next week at 6:00 p.m. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

- 21. Resolution 21-2284: A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Meridian Reserving the Forgone Amount for Fiscal Year 2022 for Potential Use by the City of Meridian in Subsequent Years as Described in Idaho Code § 63-802, Et Seq.; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item up is Resolution No. 21-2284, resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Meridian reserving the forgone amount for fiscal year 2022 for potential use by the City of Meridian in subsequent years as described in Idaho Code 63-802. Mr. Nary, I will turn this over to you.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Probably this is the oddest resolution we have had to do, because I have never done one for zero, but we felt from a -- from a transparency perspective this is the right way to do this. So, after the budget hearing when the conversation was had with Council about reserving forgone revenue for the future of 454,885 dollars, the Finance Department at that time had calculated that that was basically the remainder of the three percent that we did not take in this budget year, but because of other adjustments we have made and Brad can get to the details if you want to, but other adjustments we made, we have -- we have reached that eight percent cap total that's allowed by the code and so now there is no forgone to take, but we still felt having a resolution at least clears it up from the public perspective, since we talked about reserving it at a certain amount and that's reserving it at zero.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for Mr. Nary?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: So, if Mr. Nary or Mr. Purser could explain, you know, the House Bill 389 -- this is the impact from -- from that legislation, is that what we are dealing with here?

Purser: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, you are correct. This is the result of the -- you know, we had the eight percent cap. If we were to take that foregone, like we were planning on it, that would put us over the eight -- that eight percent cap, therefore, we can't take that foregone amount, which is why we are adjusting the resolution.

Hoaglund: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Brad, if -- the cap is a new -- is -- is that correct? The eight percent cap is brand new?

Purser: Yes.

Hoaglund: So, I guess I'm trying to wrap my head around all the action that went on. I mean this -- this was done at the very last hours of the legislature, so they -- they capped our -- how much we could take for -- for revenue, property taxes on new annexation and development. I'm not classifying that correctly. Annexations and -- I don't have --

Purser: New construction.

Hoaglund: New construction. Yes. Thank you. Thank you. And new construction, which we have always said we want growth to pay and, then, we are a growing community, like Meridian, we -- we have to build -- in this case two new fire stations and a police precinct and yet our budget is limited to eight percent, which I think we came right up to with this year of construction that we are going to kick off, so it really constrains us and there is no way to reserve any the forgone moving forward, so it's -- it's -- it's revenue that it's gone. That's fine, because a lot of years we don't go back and pick up the forgone. But I just -- I guess with the construction, if you can use your crystal ball a little bit, because I know this is not going to be done in -- in -- in a single fiscal year, will we be bumping up against the cap again next year, in your estimation, or have you guys had time to even kind of look that far ahead?

Purser: Great question, Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund. I know we are hovering around the eight percent, so there is some impact there. So, you know, this could happen in the future. We are right around that eight percent from the new -- in our assumptions moving forward.

Hoaglund: Okay. Great. Thanks, Brad. Appreciate it.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I think that to Councilman Hoaglund's -- his point on that lost revenue -- it's almost a half a million dollars this year and that has a compounding effect as well. So, it's important -- I appreciate you putting a bright light on this missing revenue that would have been growth funded, that not only do you lose a half a million, but it has a compounding effect, so it makes it very difficult.

Simison: Council, what's your pleasure on this resolution?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm happy to approve resolution 21-2284, resolution by the Mayor and City Council for the City of Meridian reserving zero dollars of foregone for the amount of fiscal year '22, as described in Idaho Code 63-802 and providing an effective date.

Bernt: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

22. Mayor's Office: American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Funding Opportunities Discussion

Simison: Next up is Item 22, Mayor's office, American Rescue Plan Act funding opportunities and turn this over to Mr. Miles.

Miles: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayor and Council. Give Chris a second just to pull up a presentation that I did provide to you all last week. It should be in your packets as well. Really, my intent today is to try and go through the presentation fairly quick and leave most of this to discussion for feedback to hear from you all. But -- let's see. I have it on my screen here, so we will just go with that. Really I think one of the interesting policy perspectives that you all get to decide on is sort of the use of these funds and whether or not to even use them. So, what we are talking about today, American Rescue Plan Act or what I will refer to as ARPA moving forward and the dollars that are associated with that that come to -- to Meridian and, really, I think the central question is what to do with these funds, if anything. Certainly do nothing is an option that's there. I think there is also sort of a once in a lifetime, once in a generation opportunity for you all to discuss what's best for the citizens of Meridian, the community of Meridian, to utilize these funds to set it in a path -- a better path going forward. So, those are some of the things to consider. On top of that, we do have to account for staffing impacts. As we reported to you all a couple months ago with the small business grant awards, certainly there is a staffing impact to administer those types of programs. So, it's -- in the back of my mind that's always something to consider as we go forward talking about ideas that are out there. Nonetheless -- let's see. I will go through a couple of the details really quick. So, just for terminology, American Rescue Plan Act, as I said ARPA funds, it's combined a couple of different federal funding sources, Corona State Fiscal Recovery Fund or the CSFRF or the Corona Virus Local Fiscal Recovery Fund, the CLFRF -- there is a lot of acronyms here. Those combined make up the state and local fiscal recovery fund program. Again, we will just refer to it has ARPA to make things simple. So, at the level it's over 350 billion dollars worth of funding. To the state what that means is about a billion dollars -- 1.1 billion dollars roughly to the state and non-entitled units, which are governments that are not receiving funds directly through the state. So, other cities that are below -- I believe it's a 50,000 population threshold. To the City of Meridian has a direct allocated funding potential for 12.8 million dollars. So, that's the bucket of money that Meridian is allocated -- or could be allocated if we accept the funding. None of the dollars have been accepted to date by the City of Meridian. We did have to file a report that, essentially, said, yes, we are aware of that funding, we haven't taken any of that funding. That was due on August 31st, which the Finance Department did file and it basically said, yep, we have taken zero dollars as a city. But just so you know that was a requirement of the filing. The federal government, as they were putting together these funds, basically looked at a lot of the Housing Community Development Act requirements as they put together what cities get what level of funding, it takes into consideration the population of the various cities and it takes into account community needs, the extent of poverty, population, overcrowding statistics, housing stock and that's how they arrived at the 12.8 million dollars for the City of Meridian. Through the administration of the funds essentially the payments are paid out in what are called two tranches. One in May of

2021 is available. Again, for the City of Meridian it would become available when the city says, yes, we want that first round of funding and, then, another round of funding in May of 2022 and it's basically split 50 percent, 50 percent, so the city could afford -- what is that 6.4 million dollars in this current year, 6.4 million dollars in the following fiscal year of 2022. The funding does have to be obligated or what they are calling incurred by December 31st of 2024 and funds have to be expensed by December 31st of 2026. Any funds that are not obligated or expensed at the end of 2026 go back to the federal government. So, that's sort of the timing to keep in mind that, yes, there is some time to think about what to do with these funds and what to consider to use them for. Throughout that period there are interim reports. As I mentioned the first one that we already filed through the Finance Department, there will be initial interim reports throughout, as well as quarterly project and expenditure reports. As the name states, filed quarterly. Essentially the City of Meridian would file its first report and, then, from there forward file quarterly reports thereafter. And I know I am going through this kind of quick, so if you do have questions feel free to interrupt me if you like. Oops. Sorry. I keep looking back at the other TV screens. So, what can the funds be used for? There are four general large buckets that I'm sure many of you have seen or come across. Essentially bucket one is to respond to the public health emergency or its negative impacts and there is a whole section of code that talks about what are all those various things and we could talk about some of those. Second is provide premium pay for essential workers. Third is what -- a broad category of providing government services and that's done through a prescriptive calculation in the code that says what is the revenue loss to the city or the agency at the time and that can be used for general services. And last, but not least, there is an investment in water and sewer and broadband infrastructure as the fourth bucket. What does all that really mean? So, I think first and foremost responding to the public health emergency and its negative impacts, that's pretty straightforward. Generally it's characterized in the guidance as testing vaccine rollout, nursing care costs -- of similar impacts for those. Emergency medical -- medical response. Personal protective equipment. COVID mitigating payroll is a potential under that. Communications for COVID. Housing Assistance. Education support because of COVID. And, again, you can see that those are very large in and of themselves, along with just that general bucket. But, essentially, it's -- what would we do because of COVID and that's what those funds are for. Second is providing premium pay for essential workers. Again, you could do -- for those employees that are eligible you could do premium pay as defined under -- what was known as the Heroes Act as similar to the Cares Act funding. Nursing home staffing. Food production services and their staffing. Public health safety staff. And, again, if you think about Meridian, well, we may not have those things directly, certainly you can partner with other agencies through this funding mechanism, as long as all the guidances are adhered to by both of those agencies if you do reach out and start to partner. Third bucket is what I touched on in terms of general services. This is what I would classify as the gates are much more wide open. It's characterized as revenue loss and the Finance Department has done the calculation to bucket ties, what that proportionate share of funds would be, but generally it's general fund relief for projects, programs, and broad economic impact and I think one of the central things to remember is through all this the U.S. Treasury has intentionally written the guidance with broad generalizations to allow the municipalities and the agencies broad interpretation of what that means. So, we have

worked with Legal and the Finance Department, talked, brainstormed some ideas to say what does all this mean, what can we do with these funds. But, again, the government services through revenue loss is a much broader bucket than the other three. Last, but not least, is investment in water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure. That guidance specifically for water and sewer follows the EPA guidance on clean water state revolving fund projects, as well as the drinking water state revolving fund project guidance published by the EPA. So, those two pieces of guidance are several pages long that give example projects that the money can be used for and they are pretty straightforward and I will characterize it right, wrong, or indifferent, as generally anything that's water or sewer related these funds can probably cover us. Broadband has some additional guidance, which we have talked with the IT Department, and specifically broadband is a little tricky in Meridian, just given the parameters that we have to deal with in the guidance according to the IT Department. There is not a ton that we can do with broadband with these funds. There is a potential to do some, so we can explore those further if you do wish. If we get into the funding streams and the breakdown, put up the 12.8 million dollars -- approximately a little more than 12.8 -- the total Meridian distribution is represented by that figure, 4.6 million dollars is representing the revenue loss calculation that Finance Department had done and that's that third broader bucket that can be used for general government services. The remainder of that, the 8.1, is what you could utilize for other -- the three other buckets if the revenue loss utilized its full potential. So, it's a proportionate share if you use some or all of the 4.6, your 12.8 million is reduced down to that 8.1 or some fractional share thereof. So, if we look at the buckets of money that are out there and the buckets of things that the money can be spent on, I sort of just put together a simple matrix to say what could the funds be -- how could they be bucketized. So, for the COVID response the first thing we talked about, as well as the eligible premium pay and the water, sewer, and broadband, the city could decide to allocate some or all of the 12.8 million dollars to any one of those buckets. It could be 12.8 into one and be done. It could be a dollar and, then, spread the money across the rest. The revenue loss, as I stated, you can -- the city can expand up to 4.6 million dollars and, then, the other buckets would be proportionally a share of whatever the remainder was through that. Essentially, again, any of these dollars can be spent in whatever manner the city decides best and how the breakdown works best for the projects that are chosen. I'm too far. So, with that some initial recommendations that we talked about through the Finance and Legal Department and Mayor's Office. As it pertains to the COVID response, sort of the -- how do we respond to COVID, what can we do with it. The initial suggestion is to allocate 160,000 dollars towards air filtration systems for city facilities to improve the air quality through the COVID response in the city facilities and the estimates that were there were generated by the Public Works Department for all city facilities. So, you are talking City Hall, Parks and Rec, water-wastewater facilities and all the fire stations. On top of that suggests holding three point -- the remainder of 3.92 million dollars to see what happens. Are there other COVID impacts that we don't know about yet? We don't know what -- what's going to happen, but we do know that the numbers are increasing. So, the suggestion is put that remainder aside. Haven't really identified anything specific to that just yet, whether that's through partnerships or city direct needs. Don't know yet. Not recommending anything in the bottom left for eligible premium pay. A couple of variables that go along with that. The requirements that are in the guidance pretty much require a

hundred percent dedicated time is required for any employee. So, myself, were one hundred percent response dedicated to COVID that's how I'm eligible for anything related to that bucket of money. So, any employee that has a hundred percent dedication, which I don't know that we have done that exercise yet and I don't know that we have put in that effort and I don't know how many employees we have that are one hundred percent dedicated to COVID, but that's an exercise that would need to be done to determine if there are any and if there are what's that fractional share or total share of that. So, that's why we are not recommending anything in that bucket at this point in time. Certainly something that we could consider. We do recommend putting 4.6 million dollars into the revenue loss bucket. Again, it's a wider net. You can do a lot of things as a city to improve the community and the projects -- capital projects and efforts that we could make as a city to advance the community. And, then, water, sewer, and broadband, recommend putting in half -- the other half of what would be that 8.1 share into the water, sewer, and broadband. What does that all mean specifically? As I mentioned in the COVID response, roughly the 160,000 for the HVAC air filtration systems. I think that's a wise thing for the public -- in all of the public facilities, as well as the employee base. It's what I will call is a low cost, low hanging fruit project in terms of cost for these dollars and recommend that that be considered in the COVID response. You move over into the revenue loss and the water and sewer -- I will kind of handle those both together. Certainly number one is the CFP projects. Anything in the CFP for the next five years in that bucket of money for revenue loss would qualify for these projects as far as we can tell and it would make sense to relieve some of the CFP costs through these funds, rather than the general fund. Additionally, that 4.6 million dollars can also be used on, as I said, just about anything else that the city could think of. Roads and transportation projects are one that has come to the top of the city surveys for many years in a row -- three surveys over time that identified the roads and transportation projects. So, we recommend considering those funds for those types of projects as well. In the water, sewer, and broadband, again, the capital projects that are inside of that water and sewer qualification would qualify for the water and sewer broadband bucket, as well as cybersecurity. The IT Department has identified increased cybersecurity efforts around the SCADA system that operates water and wastewater systems to improve that system, as well as anything related to energy efficiency inside of the water and wastewater buckets, because with the EPA guidance that is out there around the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, energy efficiency projects are identified in those categories and so pretty clear nexus to those types of projects and that could be anything from solar power at the treatment plant, to bio gas and biosolid, gas recapture, energy efficiency studies. Really, those buckets within those water and sewer broadband categories are wide open within and of themselves, if that makes sense. So, those are really the buckets that we see out there and, then, something to get the conversation started at a high level and so I think I will stop there, open it up for any conversation, questions that you all might have.

Simison: Thank you, Dave. Council, questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Can you -- Dave, can you go back to the slide that shows the four different areas that -- the four different categories. The first slide.

Miles: The narratives?

Perreault: Yeah. That. So, has the city -- and I'm not aware of any conversations that -- that we have had regarding new partnerships that we have created or the city providing any of those funds to a public business. Is that something that city has considered setting up or what would that look like? It's my understanding that -- that this -- these funds are coming directly to the city, where most of the rest of the federal funds have been distributed to the state and, then, to the city. So, this is a different scenario than for us as far as managing these dollars. So, what would it look like -- would these need to be partnerships? I mean I don't know that there is any -- I mean how would that work? How would you -- how would it -- how would a city -- our city or another city decide one private company over another to distribute those funds? I mean wouldn't it be set up in an application type of process or how -- just a curiosity question.

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, in a nutshell, yes. So, you are correct in that this is a different funding mechanism than we have faced in the past with the Cares Act in that it is a direct infusion to Meridian, not through the state. How would partnerships work? I believe, yes, we would have to do that through some type of legal agreement with whatever agency or, frankly, private business that we deal with. So, either public agency or private business. As it pertains to the private business, if that were the direction, similar to the small business grant program, I would imagine we would have to have an application process, we would have to have criteria that those applications are scored against, so that it's a fair and balanced appropriation to any of the private businesses. As it pertains to the public agencies, we have had some initial conversations with -- I think a lot of agencies are in our boat as well. I think we might be the first one getting to you all to talk about it. A lot of people are sitting around and waiting to say what's everybody doing? What -- what should we do? Talking with the county, for example. I will use housing affordability as an example. The county is getting 93, roughly, million dollars direct infusion to them. Boise I believe is in the 30 million dollar range. If you look at that on a global county scale and say, okay, what can the county do and what can Meridian do as part of that county, it becomes pretty complex pretty quick in terms of the legal agreements that are needed, the timing alone when you start talking about a project -- we can absolutely do it, I believe. It just takes a lot of momentum, it takes a lot of dedication to figuring out what are all the steps that are required. The grant is very clear that we have to follow all the requirements of the grant and any sub -- sub recipient, then, has to follow that. So, you could have -- in an agency-to-agency instance where, for instance, the county is dealing with their requirements of their funding, as well as any funding that any city were to allocate to them following that requirement as well. So, kind of a double following of the rules, if that makes sense. So, that said, it's possible. It's through legal agreements, it's through following the guidance. All of the reporting is still required and I think the brainstorming is really required in terms of what is it that can move

the community of Meridian, the City of Meridian forward, along with the valley, if it's a partnership type of approach.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, a follow-up question.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Is the Mayor's Office aware of any requests that we have directly received from any of our private sector, since the -- since our grant program ended? Do we -- do we have businesses that are following up with us and asking for additional funds?

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, no direct requests that I'm aware of to our office. I think in general we have had conversations with the service groups, so the nonprofits. They are open and wanting to consider any conversations. I will characterize what they have asked for as just general, yes, we are looking for support. Nothing specific. And, again, they were more keen on -- in the transmission that I -- e-mails that I had with them about being open guidance, flexible programs, flexibility within the funding mechanisms to help them be the most beneficial and -- and leverage the dollars the best. I think, again, we are bound by what the rules say we can do, so I don't know that that flexibility that they are looking for is necessarily there without having further conversations.

Simison: And if I could add -- I mean I have heard business say I didn't know about it. I would like to have applied for it. As a fairness issue, not as a -- I need that for my business to be surviving right now. It's just like other people got it, so I would like to get some of that, too, viewpoint. But we -- it's -- they have been more not asking us to do it again, just that they didn't know about it at the time it was done.

Miles: And, Mr. Mayor, just to add to that point, we have talked with the Chamber as well and asked them, you know, what are the needs that are out there. They have characterized it as there is a lot of federal funding out there on their side of the streams as well. So, coming from business programs more dollars have opened up. So, again, to the Mayor's point, I haven't heard any direct requests since this program has been released for these funds.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Is there a timeline or a deadline in which we need to identify where those funds are going to go and if -- if the situation gets worse and we go back to a mandatory masking and we see our local businesses in the same situation that they were in a year ago, I would like Council to discuss an estimate of funds to set aside to -- to address those concerns potentially through the grant program again, similar to what we did in the past. I don't know. Has there been -- I didn't see that in the proposal, so I'm just curious if that's been discussed.

Miles: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, timeline wise, yes. Again, there are two critical keystone dates. December 2024 and December 2026. You have to have funds obligated by 2024 and spent by 2026. Outside of those two date timelines I think it's incumbent upon the city, for whatever it decides, to meet those deadline criterias. So, I think it becomes a level of complexity if you are talking some big housing partnership you probably need to start today to meet that '24 deadline and the 2026 deadline and --

Simison: If you go back to -- we do -- we have one of the recommendations is to reserve 3.9 million just specifically because we don't know what's happening, so --

Miles: That was the -- so, in the -- in the top left on this bucket the recommendation is to utilize 160,000 dollars now for the air filtration, hold at least 3.9 million for exactly what you are talking about, Council Woman Perreault, what happens if.

Perreault: Okay. I wasn't clear on that from the slides. So, thank you for clarifying that. I -- I assumed that there would be sooner deadlines than 2024, like they had done -- previously they had the deadlines at the end -- well, that -- but that was regulated by the state; right? The state was setting those deadlines for the end of the year for some of the grant program funds.

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, that was still the federal deadlines under the Cares Act program. The federal agency set that deadline for -- lost time. Try and track -- December 2021 for the last cycle. That was a federal designation, it was not the state. But, again, I think that -- that lends itself to what the treasury has done and stated that this is a much more broad program, much more broad guidance, and I think they recognize that COVID is likely an ongoing thing. Evaluate what the impacts are and -- before that time. That said, there is also recognition that these capital projects, if that's the consideration -- they take time as well as you go through design and appropriation of funds. So, I think that's part of why 2024 and 2026.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Dave, anticipated staff time to kind of keep monitoring, reporting? Is this something that's going to be managed out of the Mayor's Office? Is it going to maybe be our CDBG grant administrator, is that something they are going to be asked to take on? What's the staffing plan around this?

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, I think in terms of administration, in terms of reporting and keeping track of the program and sort of guidance research, that's been done between our office, the Legal Department and Finance. Finance will be doing the reporting requirements. Again, Todd, CFO, has been conducting their reporting, along with Karen. It's manageable. Yes, it is a burden. If you get into the conversation of things like the small business grant program that we did before, now you are talking additional

time with Finance and we did utilize Tori through Economic Development and that's a fair -- fair impact -- fair amount of impact in terms of just staff time.

Simison: For projects it's a lot less staff reporting time.

Miles: Yeah. Certainly the number of projects that we accomplish versus one versus many you are going to have different reporting requirements and different time allocations. Mr. Mayor, it was our intent to really report to you all today. Again, happy to stand here as long as you want me to answer questions, but we do have this on the agenda for next week as well. I'm happy to take questions in between now and then. We can come back and get some additional feedback. It's really a pulse check on are we in the right arena? Are we tracking or are there other things.

Cavener: I think it's appropriate.

Simison: And -- and one thing I ask -- oh, Councilman Borton.

Borton: Go ahead.

Simison: I will let you go ahead and go.

Borton: Mr. Mayor, how is -- what's next week? If it's on the agenda next week what's -- what happens then?

Simison: I think it's a little bit of feedback and further guidance after you have thought about it. If there is specific projects you would like to -- you know, quite frankly, what I would prefer Council do is if you have got some thoughts to reach out to Dave during this week, so that he can combine or come back and have a general conversation. If there is those elements from a very practical standpoint. You all know that roads have been an important component of what I think we should invest in and we have a joint meeting with ACHD in a couple of weeks and I think part of the -- the conversation is if roads are something this Council is interested in using the four -- the 4.66 million, if we could get some feedback on that component in case it has any relevance on any conversations we have with ACHD at that joint meeting. I understand we are not going to come up with a proposal, we are not going to be making votes next week. That's not the intention. It's just to continue the conversation on the overall direction, but to help us start formulating conversations which seem appropriate.

Borton: Okay. That's helpful. Mr. Mayor, I think -- and maybe this is a process that's going forward -- is going to happen, but, yeah, at this early stage I guess we don't know what we don't know, so I think it would be helpful to have maybe at the next meeting the background on kind of how you got here and for each of these -- each of these categories, you know, what were the six to eight to ten different items that were discussed and considered and how were they weighed. I kind of need to see the math. The -- you know, how you got to these recommendations would help before we can really weigh in, provide comment. I'm not a fan of funding roads with this or anything else. So, that's one example

of something that would give me concern and I would be curious to see what was on that list that wouldn't be recommended to go forward in -- in light of that. So, I think that background homework of seeing the specific things that everyone brainstorm and maybe Council would supplement it for each of these categories -- would help us make an ultimate decision on how to allocate it. My assumption is -- the first question Dave raised is should we accept the funds. I don't think there was -- I can assume we are all going to proceed as if the funds will be accepted. It's the second question of how to allocate them that we will focus on. So, I think that's helpful for me to know that background. It also helps if we are going to be providing some suggestions of things that could be funded. They very well may have already been on your list amongst the group. I don't know who the group was that -- that came up with these in the first place. So, that would help for next week. Go from there.

Simison: What -- just to answer a couple of questions. All we did was the 4.66 million is the -- is the formula number from the federal government. We divided the rest of it in half. It's that simple from a very practical standpoint. The water, sewer, broadband number could be the entire remainder or it could be in the other category. It just seemed prudent to find a number to hold for the future without knowing where COVID is headed long term. So, there is nothing intent -- it is intentional, but it's not formulaic in --

Borton: Okay.

Simison: -- other than that element. Really anything else is a CFP. That's the -- that's -- I mean you -- you have a funded CFP with all the projects that are in it. So, any dollars that you are using from this you are just adding to your fund balance to pay off a CFP project, but that's what you could do. So, there is -- yes, there may be a few new ideas, such as doing solar at the treatment plant, but there is -- there is not a list of, hey, why don't we go into this idea. You know, there have been conversations such as could you use this for the Nine Mile Creek and the general response was, no, you can't. It doesn't qualify under this -- you can't use it under the water, sewer, broadband. You can't use it in the COVID response. Could you use it for the 4.66 million? Yes, you could from that standpoint. So, it's really -- you know, at this point in time if there is priorities within the CFP the Council thinks they are more important that you want to use these dollars for, even though it's funded, those are the questions, but -- or come with your own ideas that you think would make more sense for the conversation. Maybe we want to build a statue. Nice big art project. We can do that. But it's not on the list. We are just trying to keep it focused on the things that we have in our CFP at this point in time for the most part.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Excited to see where this discussion goes. At the end of the day, in my opinion, this is a lot of money and there is a lot of different things that make a lot of sense that could benefit the community and -- both here at City Hall -- City Hall property or, you know, city properties and different businesses and organizations throughout our city. So, have

we thought about maybe even -- and it doesn't look like there is a real imminent time frame. You know, we have a lot of time to decide what we want to spend this money on. We have a lot of time to spend it if we choose to do so -- and after listening to Council's comments the first thought that came to my mind is what's Council's and the Mayor's desire about maybe even forming like a little committee of some type. Nothing too big or too serious, but just to vet this to maybe a deeper level. Include electeds, include city staff, include the Mayor's Office and just start having a conversation. And the reason why I say that is for me -- I don't know if I'm going to be able to personally come up with different -- I don't know -- I don't know that you are going to get consensus from -- to spend this type of money in a week. I just think it's going to be a little more difficult than that, so -- but, then, comes my thought about, you know, maybe having future discussions through a small committee of some type. Thoughts?

Simison: And I -- I don't think we are looking for consensus. I think we are looking for direction. If that's the direction Council gives, great. It's really to find out where is the desire of the Council in what area. That -- because that will help us determine who should be on there. If it's only spent on CFP projects, we are only going to use city staff. You know, if it's that you want to do housing projects out into the community, then, we should go pull people from the community. I don't want to do unreasonable expectations to a certain extent, but keep it focused on where the relevant viewpoint of Council is, so that we can formulate that. But, yeah, we are not going to be making decisions next week on anything. Again, it's just trying to give you guys an option come back and have more conversation.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think it's -- to Council President Bernt's point, it could be really challenging to say go do this next week. I mean to come back with that, because clearly I think the easy answer is just one CFP and on we go. Is that the right decision? I don't know. Maybe. Maybe not. I think there is some opportunity and I think -- I appreciate Council President's at least suggestion of let's -- let's invite some other feedback from some people maybe outside of this building, involve clearly Mayor's office, council members, city staff. You know, Council Member Borton introduced participatory budgeting a number of years ago and we have done that four cycles I think. Here is -- here is an opportunity maybe to take it to another level and invite the public to participate and share what they think their priorities are, at least for Council to consider that, as long as there is not an immediate need. If there is -- if there is a pressing project, something we want to move forward on right away, that's another conversation, but I'm not necessarily hearing that, so I'm supportive of maybe tapping the brakes, inviting a few other voices to this as a recommending body, perhaps for discussion in our 2023 budget hearing.

Simison: I would suggest we do it before then, because any capital project you are going to do you are going to -- if you want to do a capital project you wouldn't probably have time if you waited until then.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just to weigh in. I think probably we are all in agreement when I say, you know, this is -- we don't want to use funds for on -- ongoing. This is capital projects. These are things that will benefit the residents of this community in a way that saves them dollars down the road, that we can do some projects that work and get to them now and that they won't have to pay for them in the future. I know it's tempting to say let's just send this money back, pay down the debt. This is a massive amount of spending and that's what DC has been doing right now. But, unfortunately, the truth of the matter is it will just get reallocated and spent anyway. So, since we have federal taxpayers in our community we might as well take that opportunity and use their money, since we can't give it back to them, and spend it wisely, so -- and I know in the discussions about cities receiving this money directly and whatnot and, you know, we had the majority leader of the House say that cities are just taking their ARPA funds and spending it on ongoing expenses and so on. I don't know where he got that information, because it's -- like many other communities they are going through this process right now, having that discussion. So, I think we need to make sure we are using it wisely and there are some projects -- and I could channel Council Woman Strader right now and say, streetlights, you know, renovations and that certainly qualifies and things like solar, let's take a look at things that will save our taxpayers and ratepayers down the road and use that money wisely. So, what -- what all of those projects are I don't know, but I have got some things I will throw out there at a later date and see if they qualify or not, so --

Miles: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Hoaglund, you make some good points and I do want to reiterate -- our recommendation is, as you said, to use these on one-time funded projects, not ongoing costs, for the exact reasons that you talked about. To the reference that you made about property taxes and the state legislature, our internal auditor -- excuse me -- our auditor in our Finance side has provided guidance to the Finance team that these funds are not to be used for property tax relief directly. So, we have got differing opinions from our auditors and our Finance Department that they utilize, so that's why we didn't recommend that at this point in time. We can certainly go back and continue that look, but that's the recommendation at this time. As I'm hearing the -- sort of efforts around a committee, we can certainly work with the Mayor and Council President to put together what that framework looks like. From what I'm hearing maybe it's a couple of different stakeholder meetings with various entities, various representation throughout the city, not just businesses, not just service, so we can certainly look into that and see how that goes. I think to the Mayor's point we will get a lot of ideas and certainly how that -- how that plays out and how we evaluate those I look forward to those discussions.

Simison: With that we are at the end of our agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: Motion and a second to adjourn the meeting. 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 5:33 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK