

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, November 21, 2023, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Joe Borton and Liz Strader.

Also Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Sonya Allen, Shawn Harper, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<u> </u> Liz Strader	<u> </u> Joe Borton
<u> X </u> Brad Hoaglund	<u> X </u> John Overton
<u> X </u> Jessica Perreault	<u> X </u> Luke Cavener
<u> X </u> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is November 21st, 2023. It's 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Tonight's invocation will be delivered by Joe Hiller with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. If you would like to come forward. And for those in the audience if would like to join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection.

Hiller: Our Dear Father in Heaven, we express gratitude at this season of Thanksgiving for the privileges that it has to live in freedom and liberty and to enjoy the opportunity to choose so many things about the way that we live. We pray for thy blessings to be upon the proceedings of this meeting and others as we participate, that thy guiding influence might be for each. We are thankful for the opportunity to seek thy hand in our lives that there may be an increasing desire. We pray for those in our community who are in need that we have eyes to see and hands to help and we pray for these things in the name of Jesus Christ.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, no.

ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Public Hearing for I-84 and Meridian Road (H-2021-0099) by Hawkins Companies, generally located at the northwest corner of S. Meridian Rd. and I-84**
 - A. Request: Annexation of 18.30 acres of land with a C-G zoning district.
 - B. Request: Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment to change the future land use designation on 70.4+/- acres of land from Mixed Use Community (MU-C) to Commercial (34.3) acres and Medium High Density Residential (36.1+/-).
- 2. Public Hearing for Tanner Creek Subdivision (H-2022-0048) by Engineering Solutions, LLP., generally located 1/4 mile west of S. Meridian Rd. on the south side of W. Waltman Ln.**
 - A. Request: Modification to the existing Development Agreement (Inst. #108131100) to change the development plan from commercial to a mix of residential uses.

- B. Request: Rezone of 41.89 acres of land from the C-G to the R-8 (12.16 acres), R-15 (12.27 acres) and R-40 (17.46 acres) zoning districts.
- C. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 130 building lots (83 single-family, 45 townhome & 2 multi-family) and 20 common lots on 38.05 acres of land in the R-8, R-15 and R-40 zoning districts.
- D. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 280 dwelling units on 15.88 acres of land in the R-40 zoning district.

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move on to our Action Items this evening. So, it's our intention to open up both public hearings together. I'm going to ask both applicants to, please, come forward up to the podium just to concur in that direction. So, if the applicants for Items 1 and 2 would like to come forward and just affirm that it is your intention and understanding that you are okay with opening both items together.

McKay: Becky McKay, representing Challenger Development, Inc. And, yes, Mr. Mayor I am in agreement to applications being heard together.

Simison: Thank you, Becky.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, I'm Ethan Mansfield representing Hawkins Companies and I, too, am in agreement with the plan tonight.

Simison: All right. Thank you very much. Then with that we will go ahead and open public hearing for I-84-Meridian Road, H-2021-0099, as well as public hearing for Tanner Creek Subdivision, H-2022-0048, and we will open these public hearings with staff comment.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The first application before you tonight is a request for a Comprehensive Plan map amendment and an annexation. This project was heard by City Council in June of 2022. Council remanded it back to the Commission for the following reasons: The preference for this property and the abutting property to the west, known as Tanner Creek, to come in together or concurrently with a master plan for the overall area that demonstrates consistency with the existing or proposed future land use map designation of mixed use community and mixed use regional. Desire for the transportation issues to be addressed before a development plan is approved and desire for changes to be made to the concept plan to be more consistent with the general mixed use guidelines and specifically the requested mixed use regional designation. Some changes were made to the plan, but not substantive enough to be deemed consistent with the general mixed use development guidelines, the existing mixed use community, or the proposed mixed use regional guidelines and, therefore, staff recommended the applicant change their map amendment request from mixed use residential -- mixed use regional to commercial and

include the Tanner Creek project to the west in the amendment with the change from mixed use community to medium high density residential. Revisions to the conceptual development plan and associated exhibits have been amended to address previous comments in the staff report and discussion from the hearings. The property associated with the future land use map amendment consists of 70 acres of land, shown there on the map on the left, and the portion associated with the annexation on the middle zoning map, consists of 18 acres of land. The general location of the property is at the northwest corner of South Meridian Road and I-84 on the south side of Waltman Lane. The current Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is mixed use community. The applicant is requesting an amendment to the future land use map and the Comprehensive Plan to change the land use designation on 70.4 acres of land for mixed use community to commercial, which is 34.3 acres, and medium high density residential, which is proximately 36 acres. The adopted land use map shown on the top on the left and the proposed land use map is shown on the bottom on the left. Based on the analysis in the staff report staff finds the proposed development plan is generally consistent with the requested future land use map designation of commercial for the subject property and medium high density residential for the adjacent property to the west known as Tanner Creek. Further, the proposed future land use map designations provide for a better transition and uses from existing and future residential uses to the west and northwest and are compatible with adjacent future land use map designations and land uses in the area. The applicant also proposes to annex the southern 18.3 acres of land with a C-G, general retail and service commercial zoning district, consistent with the proposed future land use map amendment to commercial. The boundary of the annexation is shown there on the exhibit on the right. The subject property is part of an enclave area surrounded by city annexed property. The original plan that you reviewed last go around is shown on the left. The revised conceptual development plan shown on the right was submitted that depicts how the property is proposed to be annexed, as well as the area currently zoned C-G is planned to develop with two big box retail stores totaling 233,800 square feet, four pads and five shops. The areas shown on the concept plan on the bottom south portion of the development area below the red line is the portion of the site currently in Ada county proposed to be annexed. The area on the top, the north portion of the development plan, is the portion of the site currently in the city and it's entitled to develop in accord with UDC standards. regardless of whether or not the proposed annexation is approved, as there is not a development agreement in effect for that property. Sole access for the development is proposed via three accesses from Waltman Lane, a collector street, in accord with UDC 11-3A-3A2, which supports limiting access points to collector streets and requires a cross-access ingress-egress easement to be granted to adjoining properties where access to a local street is not available. Staff is recommending a driveway is provided alongside the proposed pathway across the Ten Mile Creek to the west, unless otherwise waived by City Council, which will provide interconnectivity between developments and that would be in this area right here. The applicant has submitted an emergency access easement agreement with the property owner to the west for secondary emergency access to Ruddy Drive and Waltman Lane. Ruddy Drive is the stub street here at the west boundary of the proposed Tanner Creek project. At no time should construction traffic associated with the development of the site be allowed to

access the site using Ruddy Drive through the landing and Tanner Creek Subdivisions. Improvements are required to Waltman Lane, including reconstruction of the bridge over the Ten Mile Creek west of this site within the -- or with the Tanner Creek project. Improvements to the section of Waltman that abuts this site will be determined by ACHD with a future development application, since this is only an annexation request. The extension of Corporate Drive to the northwest of this site designated as a collector street on the master street map, including construction of a bridge over the Ten Mile Creek from the north to Waltman Lane -- and that is the dashed blue line here -- is proposed to be completed with the first phase of development of the Tanner Creek project prior to issuance of building permits. If the Tanner Creek project does not go forward and complete the improvements to Waltman Lane and Corporate Drive as planned, staff recommends these improvements are completed by this developer through a cooperative development agreement with ACHD as noted in the staff report. Based on the findings of the traffic impact study for the proposed project, which included the Tanner Creek project, the Meridian Road and Waltman Lane intersection would exceed ACHD's acceptable level of service thresholds. In the previous development applications for the Tanner Creek property ACHD did not recommend any mitigation -- mitigation at the intersection due to right of way constraints, impacts to adjacent businesses, and substantial intersection redesign and construction, making the recommended mitigation infeasible. A letter prepared by Six Mile Engineering, dated 1/23 of '23 in response to comments and feedback during the City Council hearing for this project was submitted to ACHD proposing phased alternative improvements at the Meridian Road and Waltman Lane intersection to address traffic impacts from these developments. A three phase concept design was proposed in which the first two designs did not require any additional right of way dedication and the final phase did. ACHD reviewed their proposal and does not recommend any modifications to the intersection, as under all design concepts these modifications would negatively impact existing operations of both the interchange and ramps. ACHD's concerns also extended to the impacts the proposed modifications would have to the Central Drive and Corporate Drive intersections at Main Street and Progress Avenue. While the proposed improvements may benefit both of these project developments in the short term, they will likely negatively impact already congested area roadways and intersections. These improvements without significant widening increase corridor travel times and interchange queue lengths, further compounding existing congestion in this area. ACHD believes there are other alternatives that may be considered, such as converting Central Drive and Waltman Lane and Corporate Drive to a one way couplet, which is anticipated to reduce both queue lengths and the impacts to the Meridian Road and the I-84 interchange system. Construction of the Linder Road overpass, three-quarters of a mile to the west, scheduled in ACHD's five year work plan for construction in 2026 and '27 should improve traffic conditions on Meridian Road by providing another north-south connection over I-84. The Commission -- excuse me. So, the City Council should consider if higher levels of traffic and congestion in this area are acceptable when acting on this application. If not, consideration should be given to the inclusion of a provision in the development agreement which limits development to the large retail -- retail one store at this time and delays the retail two building and pads three and four until such time as the Linder Road overpass is completed or other area improvements occur that

allow for an acceptable level of service to be provided as determined by ACHD. I will go through the Commission hearing. The Commission did recommend approval of this application. Summary of the Commission public hearing is as follows: Ethan Mansfield, Hawkins Companies, testified in favor of the application, along with Leah Kelsey from Six Mile Engineering. The following folks testified in opposition. Kelsee Lorcher. Joe Lorcher and Joey Lorcher. Clair Manning commented on the application. Key issues of discussion were -- they were against the project due to the impact on traffic in this area from this development and the extension of Ruddy Drive and concern pertaining to the safety of area residents with the traffic that will be generated from this development and the residential development to the west when Ruddy is extended to Waltman Lane. Key issues of discussion by the Commission were as follows: The applicant's request to not be required to provide a vehicular connection to the west across the Ten Mile Creek to the adjacent residential development and the applicant's request to not construct a driveway access to the out-parcel at the northwest corner of this site at this time. The Commission made the following changes to the staff recommendation. At staff's request they modified DA provision A-1-I to require the extension of Corporate Drive to be constructed as required by ACHD, instead of as recommend -- as recommended by staff. The Commission is not in support -- excuse me. The Commission is in support of Council granting a waiver to UDC 11-3A-3, which requires vehicular connectivity between the two projects via a cross-access easement -- to not require a connection and that is DA provision 9-A-1-C. Modify the requirement for a cross-access easement and driveway to be provided to the out-parcel, to only require an easement at this time. The easement should grant consent to the owner and developer of the out-parcel to construct the driveway on the subject property in the future at the time of development. The only outstanding issue for Council tonight is that the applicant requests a waiver to UDC 11-3A-3A2 to not be required to provide a vehicular connection and cross-access ingress-egress easement to the residential development to the west for interconnectivity. Written testimony has been received since the Commission hearing from Ethan Mansfield, Hawkins Company, the applicant's representative. He is requesting deletion of DA provision 1-C, which requires, as I mentioned, the vehicular connection and driveway to be stubbed to the residential property to the west and 23 letters of testimony have been received in opposition to this project. Concerns pertained to traffic and congestion on area roadways and at the Meridian-Waltman intersection worsening from this development. Impact on area schools and the community's quality of life and inconsistency of the proposed development plan with the mixed use community future land use map designation, commercial zoning and vision of destination downtown for this area. Staff will stand for any questions. The applicant is here tonight to present. ACHD is also available for questions from Council. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya. Council, any questions on this application for staff?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglund: Just want to confirm something. The -- where it talked about entitled to develop in accordance -- in accordance with the UDC standards for the northern portion of this commercial site. I think I read in it somewhere that they are entitled to approximately 400,000 square feet of commercial already currently. I just wanted to confirm that. I can't remember who presented that -- or talked about that in the minutes, but I -- there is an entitlement to that commercial portion on the north at city -- in the city limits already. Correct?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, Council, if you see on the right here on this map, everything north of the red line is currently entitled with C-G zoning. So, it's entitled to develop in accord with the zoning schedule of use for the C-G district. I'm not sure about that number you mentioned. It's not associated with this development. So, I'm not exactly sure where that came from.

Simison: If I remember this could be going way, way, way back -- is that there was a limitation placed until the extension over Corporate was put in place. You know, that -- that -- that could be going back to old City Hall days. I don't know.

Allen: Yeah. There is -- there is not an existing development agreement on that property. But I think you are right, Mr. Mayor, I think there was some ACHD requirements there associated with the size of the development. Possibly the existing DA for the Tanner Creek project.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, just to wrap that up then. So, we really aren't sure about a number, if there is a number, but there is an entitlement to commercial on that.

Allen: There is. Yes. Thank you.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff at this time on this project? Okay. So, I assume you want to do the next one as well before we go to the applicants.

Allen: Thank you. The next application before you is a request for a development agreement modification, rezone, preliminary plat and conditional use permit and these are for the Tanner Creek development directly west of the aforementioned project. This site consists of 38 acres of land. It's zoned C-G and is located west of South Meridian Road on the south side of Waltman Lane and north side of I-84. A little history. Two similar development applications were previously denied for this property in 2018 and 2020. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is mixed use community with a request for an amendment to medium high density residential with the I-84 and Meridian Road project. The -- I should mention that the reason for the previous denials on this project were inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan and mixed use designation at that time. We couldn't -- we couldn't guarantee and we didn't want to saddle the adjacent property to the east with all commercial uses and we couldn't determine consistency with just a residential one land use type for the mixed use

designation. So, anyway, just a little explanation on that. The applicant is requesting a modification to the existing development agreement, which allows commercial, office and hotel uses to develop on the site as shown on the concept plans here. Both of these concept plans were included in the development agreement. They want to replace it with a new development agreement, allowing a mix of residential uses, including single family residential detached and attached dwellings, townhouse dwellings and multi-family residential apartments as shown on the proposed conceptual development plan. A rezone at 41.89 acres of land is proposed from the C-G to the R-8 zoning district, which consists of 12.16 acres, the R-15 district, which consists of 12.27 acres and the R-40 district, which consists of 17.46 acres. A preliminary plat is proposed consisting of 130 buildable lots and that contains 83 single family, 45 townhome and two multi-family lots and 20 common lots on 38.05 acres of land in the R-8, R-15 and R-40 zoning districts. The plat is proposed to develop in four phases as shown on the phasing plan on the right. The applicant is requesting flexibility in the phasing to adjust the number of lots, combination of lots, the number of phases to reflect changing market conditions. Staff is amenable to this request, unless otherwise restricted in the cooperative development agreement with Ada County Highway District or as otherwise approved by City Council tonight. Because noise from I-84 will greatly affect future residents in this area, staff is recommending noise abatement in the form of a berm and wall is constructed per UDC standards in its entirety with the first phase of development as a provision in the DA. The detail on the right is of the buffer area with the wall proposed along I-84. Access is proposed via the extension of Ruddy Drive at the west boundary of the site and via two accesses to and from Waltman Lane at the northern boundary of the site. The applicant proposes to construct the extension of Corporate Drive, a collector street, off site from its current terminus north of the Ten Mile Creek to Waltman Lane as shown in the blue dashed line within existing right of way with the first phase of development. The construction of Corporate Drive will include the construction of a new bridge over the Ten Mile Creek. This will provide additional access to the site and provide for additional access while the Ten Mile Creek bridge on Waltman is being reconstructed. The roadway should be constructed as required by ACHD and completed prior to issuance of any building permits on this site. In accord with UDC 11-3A-3A2, which supports limiting access points to collector streets and requires a cross-access ingress-egress easement to be granted to adjoining properties for access if a local street is not available, staff is recommending a driveway is provided alongside the proposed pathway across the Ten Mile Creek to the east, unless otherwise waived by City Council, which will provide interconnectivity between developments and that is the pathway or connection that I mentioned earlier with the previous application in this location right here. The applicant is proposing improvements to Waltman Lane in accord with ACHD requirements with a ten foot wide detached sidewalk within the street buffer. The improvements to Waltman Lane will require reconstruction of the existing bridge over the Ten Mile Creek and should be completed as required by ACHD in a collaborative development agreement. The proposed qualified open space and site amenities meet and exceed UDC standards. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for their proposed single family residential homes and townhomes as shown. A conditional use permit is proposed for a multi-family residential development consisting of 280 residential apartment units on

15.88 acres of land in the R-40 zoning district. Private streets are required for addressing purposes within the development. Proposed qualified open space and site amenities meet and exceed UDC standards for multi-family developments. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the apartment and clubhouse buildings. As mentioned with the I-84 and Meridian Road application, the construction of the Linder Road overpass half mile to the west, scheduled in ACHD's five year work plan for construction in 2026 and '27, should improve traffic conditions on Meridian Road by providing another north-south connection over I-84. In an effort to mitigate traffic and congestion in this area, the Commission recommended inclusion of a DA provision requiring the Linder Road overpass to be completed prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy within the multi-family residential development. The single family residential and townhome portions of the development are allowed to develop at this time if approved. The Commission did recommend approval of these applications. The outstanding issue for City Council tonight is the applicant's request for a waiver to UDC 11-3A-3A2 to not be required to provide a vehicular connection and access easement to the residential -- excuse me -- to the commercial development to the east for greater connectivity. I got my pages swapped here. Hang on just a second. I will just go through the summary of the Commission hearing. Becky McKay testified in favor of the application, Engineering Solutions, the applicant's representative. No one testified in opposition or commented. Written testimony was received from Heath McMahan. Key issues were that they were not in support of this project due to the high density proposed and the negative impact on traffic in this area and safety of area residents with the traffic that will be generated from this development and the commercial development to the east. The key issues of discussion by the Commission -- the request for the applicant to not be required to provide a vehicular connection to the east across the Ten Mile Creek to the adjacent commercial development. The Commission was in favor of Council granting a waiver to not require connection. And concern regarding the phasing of the development in relation to construction of the Linder Road overpass. The Commission made the following changes to the staff recommendation. At staff's request they modified DA provision 1-B to require the extension of Corporate Drive to be constructed as required by ACHD. And they included a development agreement provision that requires the Linder Road overpass to be completed prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy within the multi-family development. As I mentioned a bit ago, the outstanding issue for Council tonight is the applicant's request for a waiver to access across the creek to the commercial development. Written testimony received since the Commission hearing was received from Becky McKay, Engineering Solutions, the applicant's representative, in response to the Commission's recommendation and she is requesting the following modifications: DA provision 1-D, to change the timing of construction of the noise abatement and wall and berm along I-84 from the first phase of development to the first phase that's plotted adjacent to I-84. Removal of DA provision 1-H, which requires the Linder Road overpass to be completed prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy within the multi-family residential development and deletion of preliminary plat condition 2-C, which requires a bridge to be constructed and a vehicular connection provided to the east across the Ten Mile Creek for interconnectivity with the commercial property to the east. Twenty-three letters of testimony have been received in opposition to this project.

They were the same as I noted previously. Concerns pertain to traffic and congestion on area roadways and to the Meridian-Waltman intersection worsening from this development. Impact on area schools and the community's quality of life and consistency of the proposed development plan with the mixed use community future land use designation, commercial zoning and vision of Destination Downtown for this area. Staff will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya. Council, any questions for staff on this application?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks. So, just one, maybe two questions. In your overview you talked about private streets. You said for addressing purposes. Can you help me understand what you meant by that?

Allen: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, Council, that was pertaining to the multi-family development for addressing purposes and wayfinding for emergency services. Public streets would be provided in the rest of the development.

Cavener: Okay. Mr. Mayor, just one follow up.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Sonya, what is the update on the Corporate Drive extension? I don't recall seeing anything about that. I -- there is a lot of history on this project and so my brain is a little blurry, but can you give us any update about what the development plan is or what ACHD has planned or what anybody's planned, because I see it was depicted on one of the exhibits, but I just -- I'm not tracking with what the status is on that.

Allen: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, the applicant is proposing to extend Corporate and -- the blue dash line there -- with the first phase of development prior to issuance of any building permits.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff at this time? Okay. Then I will invite the applicants to -- to come forward, however you want to divide up your 30 minutes. I assume you guys have collaborated on that process. So, we will be, essentially, following the same process for Planning and Zoning. Thirty minutes. And we will provide each individual six minutes for their testimony as well through this process.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, I'm going to go ahead and kick it off. My name is Ethan Mansfield with Hawkins Companies. We are the developers on the

eastern portion of the site. And I will -- I will let Becky talk a little bit more about the history, since Tanner Creek was the initial applicant, you know, on this -- these two pieces of land. But I will go ahead and just kind of start by giving an overview of our proposal and how it works kind of together with Tanner Creek. So, what we are proposing is a comprehensive plan amendment to commercial on the Hawkins portion of the site. That's roughly 34 acres. And a Comprehensive Plan amendment to medium high density residential on the Tanner Creek portion, which is 36 acres. In addition, as Sonya pointed out, we are requesting annexation and a rezone to general and service commercial on the 18 acres on the southern portion of the site and I will kind of graphically depict that in just a second. So, a little bit of history about our application. This was first heard by City Council in June of 2022. Council remanded the application back to Planning and Zoning Commission and -- mainly because they wanted our application to be heard concurrently with Tanner Creek's application and after the traffic impact study was accepted by the Ada County Highway District. In June -- late June, early July, ACHD accepted the traffic impact study and drafted staff recommendations. We, then, spent the next year working with Tanner Creek and working with Sonya and the city staff to come up with a -- a site plan that we think and staff thinks works a lot better for our development and really I think complies with what we heard from Council last year. In July 2023 city staff expressed support for and accepts our updated site plans for both Tanner Creek and our proposed commercial development and, then, in October staff recommends that the commercial land use designation be applied to our section -- the medium density residential land use designation be applied to Tanner Creek and we think that works great. The site plan does not change from what we had proposed in June 2023, but the Comprehensive Plan land use designation is recommended to be commercial, medium density residential -- medium high density residential. And, then, in November 2023, as Sonya mentioned, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval of this application. So, what that looks like on a map is the commercial designation on the corner reflecting the similar commercial designations of the other three corners of this interchange and, then, a transition away from commercial to medium high density residential to provide a buffer between the medium density residential further to the west. So, here is kind of an overview of the site. As Sonya mentioned, the northern portion of our piece of the site is already entitled C-G. You can see the subject of our annexation and rezone request applies to the 18 southern acres and, Council Member Hoaglun, I believe what you were referring to is that there is a current entitlement for 400,000 square feet of commercial on this western portion, but is now slated for residential development and we, frankly, think that makes a much better transition to the subdivision to the west and think it reflects a more appropriate kind of land use pattern of development than putting 400,000 square feet of commercial immediately adjacent to the single family homes. So, let's talk a little bit about how we changed the site plan. So, you can see on the left side here -- this is the old site plan. What we did is we took staff's recommendation directly from the staff report to place the big box stores on the southern end of the development, kind of tucked back in there. You know that there is a big grade change from that interchange down to the site, you know, we are going to take advantage of that grade change to kind of tuck the big box back into the site and -- and push the kind of community serving pedestrian-oriented uses up along Waltman, which was another recommendation of

staff. Another thing we did was activate the western boundary of our site to make it more pedestrian friendly, pedestrian bike friendly, and also to kind of activate it more by not just providing kind of, you know, the backs of the big box buildings. So, overall this is what the site plan looks like and I think, you know, this Ten Mile Creek serves as a really nice natural buffer between the residential and commercial uses, but also allows for the connectivity with the pedestrian pathway and just the proximity; right? You don't have to jump in a car to get between these developments and that we believe is the intent of creating both residential and commercial project -- product on -- you know, within the same vicinity. So, here is how the pedestrian and bike circulation works. You can see these open space amenities are kind of strategically placed around the site to kind of reflect where we think people will actually be and spend time. Importantly, this plaza area that connects Tanner Creek and the commercial piece is kind of a critical linkage for us. In your packet I believe there is Plaza A and Plaza B examples. So, I'm not going to spend time on those here. I have them if you would like to take a look at them. But I really want to talk mostly about the bike-ped plaza connection. So, here is some renderings about what we envision kind of connecting the two developments. There will be a ten foot bridge -- a ten foot wide pedestrian crossing. It will connect to a larger multi-use pathway on the eastern -- sorry -- western side in the Tanner Creek site. It will also connect to the shops, kind of a community serving shops building on the eastern side, and we think it really, you know, ties the development together nicely. Here is a few other views. I'm looking both into Tanner Creek and, then, into our commercial development. Notably -- and the reason that we are requesting a waiver from the requirement to provide a vehicular connection is that this is about the amount of space that a vehicular connection with associated pathways would require. As you can see it completely blows up the kind of nice pedestrian gathering space that we have created between the two developments and it does that so that we can get cars between the two developments and we think, frankly, that cars can get between the two developments using Waltman quite easily and we are also trying to encourage, as per the Comprehensive Plan principles -- multiple comprehensive plan principles, you know, pedestrian infrastructure, comfortable places for pedestrians to spend time and so we think that our plaza concept achieves that -- those principles better than a vehicular connection. Again, I just quickly want to touch on something that the Planning and Zoning Commission kind of already recommended -- is the requirement to construct a stub driveway to the edge of the property line for future development. That poses some challenges for us, mainly because of drainage. The way the grading works on this site -- you are essentially draining this hardscape kind of off into the other property and we don't particularly want to or really feel it's right to do that to the adjacent property owner, you know, at this time. We also don't -- and we are not exactly sure where that driveway is going to connect. We would like the flexibility to allow that connection where the future site plan deems it appropriate both in the site plan review phase and just for -- for economically speaking where it maybe works best per the site layout of that future development. So, we are absolutely committed to providing future cross-access. We can absolutely record an agreement -- or record kind of an acknowledgement that we will provide cross-access, but we think it's best to construct the actual, you know, piece of infrastructure at the time of development of the -- of the future -- the future development of that site and Planning and Zoning Commission did

agree with us on that. So, as you can see Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendations, which we are extremely willing to comply with, is to waive the requirement for the local roadway connection. That's where we had the pedestrian site. And, then, also to provide cross-access to the future development and allow construction of that future driveway on our site. So, I would just like to speak a little bit about the connectivity of the -- kind of the overall connectivity that will be provided when we develop this. So, you can see that we are planning to extend Corporate Drive across Ten Mile Creek to Waltman. We are planning to improve the Walton Road to a collector roadway, install a ten foot multi-use path -- multi-use pathways along the entire exterior of the site and, you know, we are planning to install transit infrastructure for a future transit stop on the corner of Waltman and Meridian Road and I should note there is a little discussion in the staff report about coordinating with ITD -- or, sorry, with Valley Regional Transit and, actually, early early on in this development when we were first site planning we -- I picked up the phone and called Stephen Hunt, who is their director of operations, and basically asked him where he wanted it and that's where he said he wanted it. So, that's why we kind of placed it up there in that northeastern corner. Again, we are happy to continue coordination with that. We think the transit -- future transit stop is going to be a great amenity for the site. So, you can see overall here kind of the sequencing of these improvements. We are proposing to complete these -- all of these improvements prior to occupancy. As we heard from Sonya, ACHD and ITD are planning to construct the Linder overpass. We checked in with them to see when that construction was going to take place. It's likely going to start in 2026 or 2027 and as you can see right now, assuming no additional -- or I should say assuming no hurdles in the development process, the estimated opening of retail one is summer 2026. So, that I think kind of helps share a little bit about our kind of anticipated timeline relative to these improvements. So, this is kind of an overall map just showing how the additional connectivity that this development provides is going to kind of change the game at this particular intersection. You can see north-south connectivity on Corporate, it really opens up that northwestern corner of the city. Not everyone has to come through Waltman to get to where they are going and I think that is a critical piece of this development. Right now it's hard to envision anyone getting here or leaving, except from Waltman and I think it's important to look beyond that and think about people coming and going from Corporate, potentially coming and going from Ruddy, you know, accessing from the -- from the quickly developing southwestern part of Meridian, you know, using that Linder overpass to get into development on Corporate. There is a lot of different ways that this development can be accessed. Once we -- once we complete these very simple strategic, you know, improvements to the transportation system. So, I will turn it over to Becky, unless there are any immediate burning questions that you have for me.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just one question and it will probably go to both of you -- ask you individually. One of the things I heard -- I believe staff mentioned was a recommendation -- I believe

brought by ACHD as a possible solution to the traffic issues at Waltman and Meridian, with the potential to make it a one way loop coming down Waltman and, then, going back on Corporate. How does that happen if you take away the connectivity between these two projects?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, I -- I am unsure what you mean by connectivity. We do have connectivity between the two projects on Waltman.

Overton: If you leave that map open. I'm assuming -- and this is assuming. It's early in the evening and I'm going to be asking this again, but I'm assuming if it's one way -- if that's a possible solution to try to help with the intersection of Waltman and Meridian Road and it's made a one way street it's going to be -- Waltman Lane is going to be the one way coming in, looping around to Corporate to be the one way going out and, if so, is it the opposite way?

Mansfield: It is the opposite way, Council Member Overton.

Simison: Same principle applies. I see where you are going.

Mansfield: Right. Not to detract from the original question.

Overton: I'm just trying to figure out with the one way how everyone is getting to every other place and how -- if it's a one way how does Southeast 5th and Corporate ever become a way for traffic to get out? If we make it a one way to try to alleviate traffic, we are actually only giving them one way out now; is that correct?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, I think you hit on a critical challenge with creating a one-way couplet, which is the goals of connectivity are actually kind of quashed by that and as such the commercial development that we are proposing is pretty infeasible, frankly. Like we may not be able to attract tenants to a site. Very likely we could not attract tenants to a site that has that sort of transportation network, simply because of the concerns that you are bringing up now.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: And, again, it's early in the evening and I know this is going to be mostly directed at ACHD for advice and questions in the future, but, obviously, my biggest concern is trying to figure out how we are going to deal with all this traffic coming up on an intersection that's already overwhelmed at different parts of the day. Have -- and this goes for -- for both you and Becky and when Becky gets up, but have either of you two come up with a solution for what your best idea is for moving traffic through this area?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, we did come up with -- we worked with Six Mile Engineering to come up with a -- a solution that we think works really well to

help alleviate some of the -- well, the traffic concerns and we actually are pretty proud that we are able -- I'm kind of proud of Six Mile, frankly, for coming up with a solution that enabled us to do it without taking significant amounts of right of way and not widening the road, but adding lanes and so here is the schematic design. It allows for two northbound left turn lanes -- we have actually got Leah from Six Mile here to kind of explain -- to kind of walk through this. It might be a little more eloquent than me.

Kelsey: Hi. Yes. I'm Leah Kelsey with Six Mile Engineering. We worked with Hawkins and Engineering Solutions on developing these phased improvements. Just a little bit of background. We -- my firm initially worked on the design -- the analysis and design of this intersection back -- starting back in 2006. So, we are very familiar with the -- the design and the right of way constraints. So, some of the key elements that we worked into these phase improvements -- so, phase one, first thing is developing a second northbound left into Waltman Lane and, then, adding a -- widening on Waltman Lane to provide dual right turns out, so eastbound to southbound. And, then, adding a second receiving lane on Waltman Lane for that dual northbound left turn lane. So, that's phase one and that requires no right of way and the second phase also doesn't require right of way and that is restriping the northbound lanes to provide a -- an additional through lane to -- up to Corporate where it traps as a left turn lane and that just provides more capacity for that movement. So, there is more green time to redistribute to the other movements of the intersection. So, both phases one and two don't require any right of way, just restriping movements and just with phase one alone was predicted to reduce the average vehicle delay at the intersection at full build out by about half.

Overton: Thank you.

Simison: And with that I'm just going to piggyback off Councilman Overton's question. By eliminating the cross-access via Commander does it limit the ability to make future transportation decisions 30 years from now, if a one way is ever warranted or can that be rectified in the future in theory? That's really -- that's what I thought I was hearing him saying is like if one way becomes what ACHD wants to do, that is basically forcing everyone who wants to enter the one park, if they are in the apartments or down, they have got to go all the way around, because we have gotten rid of cross-access. That's what I was trying to infer what I thought he was saying. You don't have to answer that now. Someone else can answer it later. But just from that perspective if that's what ACHD wants to do with the roadways.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes.

Bongiorno: Piggybacking off your piggyback, Mayor and Council, also I just want to put it on record, the -- the one way thing is the first time I have heard of this and without that cross-access they wouldn't have the proper fire access. So, it would be one way and one way out and they can't have that. They need two points of access for their development. So, if it's going to be a one way loop that won't work for the fire

department. They are going to have to have something down near the freeway that crosses -- or somewhere so we have two points of access to get to that property.

Simison: Any other questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Just a quick question on the two retail sites. Staff had presented that the two box stores will total approximately 234,000 square feet. I just wanted to double check that that is -- that is the two retail stores -- that does not include the pads or the shops, that is the -- the total square footage for those two approximately 153,000 for one and 80,000 for another; is that correct?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault, that is correct.

Perreault: Thank you.

Simison: Any additional questions?

Harper: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Lieutenant Harper.

Harper: I just want to also add in regards to the one way, I -- that's the first I have heard of it as well and it does bring on some significant challenges for police response into that development or into that community of Tanner Creek. I mean all it takes is -- is a lot of congestion and it's going to significantly reduce our response -- or increase our response times and challenge us to be able to provide that service.

Simison: Thank you. And just for the record, some -- is there anybody from ACHD who is here present this evening? Okay. That's -- it's hard to see with the hat on. I didn't want to make assumptions back there, so -- okay. Perfect. Thanks, Justin. All right. Thank you. And, Becky, if you want to come up and -- maybe they add back in a minute and a half to their time.

McKay: I only have a minute and a half? Can't even say my name. Becky McKay. Engineering Solutions. 1029 North Rosario, Meridian. I'm here representing Challenger Development. Before you guys this evening is a rezone, preliminary plat, conditional use permit and development agreement modification for Tanner Creek Subdivision. It's approximately 38.05 acres. As you know it's located -- as you know it's located just west of Meridian Road and south of Waltman. I inherited this project. It was not initially mine. Mr. Schultz brought the project through 2018, 2020. The Council at that time said, you know, we believe these applications are premature. We want to know what's going to happen on the property to the east. We want to see a true mixed use type

development that has a residential component, a retail component, an office component and we want to see the big picture. We don't want to just see part of it and until we know what's going to happen on both parcels, we are reluctant to approve anything at this time and -- and so it -- it was denied twice. Prior to Mr. Schultz's passing he had submitted application for a third time to the City of Meridian. It was not deemed complete. We were asked to step in, review it. So, as Ethan indicated, we spent over a year working with your staff, working with the architects, working with each other to come up with what we believe is a very well integrated plan and that kind of hits on the critical key points of this area, creating a more pedestrian friendly development, creating a multi-use pathway and as Councilman Hoaglund mentioned in 2008 this property was annexed and zoned C-G. It's commercial right now with a development agreement for 400,000 square feet of retail. Is that what we want to build? No, it's not. Could this area support the Hawkins development and another retail development? No, I do not believe it can and that's why I think the Tanner Creek is a good fit on this parcel. It's only going to generate I believe 32 percent of what was initially proposed in that 2008 annexation and development agreement. This area has always been an area of contention. Since 1992 -- I read through minutes today that Shari Stiles, who was the planning director then, printed for me and it was discussed by Commissioner -- or Councilman Tolsma what are we going to do about Waltman Lane? When are we going to get some interconnectivity? Well, this is our opportunity from a planning perspective, from a transportation perspective, to get interconnectivity. Once we have that Linder overpass that's going to take place and begin construction in 2026, anticipated completion in 2027, that's, obviously, going to give us a critical north-south way over the interstate. One of the things that we have suffered in Meridian is the fact that we are bottlenecked at our north-south connections over Interstate 84. It is a natural barrier. Before we just had Eagle Road and, then, we begged for Ten Mile. We got Ten Mile. Now we are going to get a Locust Grove overpass and now we got State Highway 16 that's in the process. So, we are finally reaching the point where we are getting that north-south interconnectivity. The extension of Corporate Drive is critical. Absolutely critical. And it is a condition of ACHD that before anything can be occupied that Corporate Drive has to be extended. ACHD already owns the right of way. We will have to construct a bridge over Ten Mile Creek. Do a no rise. Do 404 permits. We will have to -- after we complete that, then, we go reconstruct Waltman Lane, build a whole new bridge there, go through the same hoops through the state and federal agencies and local agencies. So, this is, in my opinion, an opportunity where we can have two development companies working in tandem to improve the traffic in this area. The Landing Subdivision located to the west of us is off of a dead end Locust Grove Road. There is no vehicular crossing over Ten Mile Creek. If there is blockage at Linder, there, is no way the fire department is going to get in there. There is no way in. And with the extension of Ruddy Drive into our project as a collector road, that is going to not only help our projects, but help them from an interconnection and the ability for fire protection better service as far as response times for police. You can see that the two projects and -- and we worked with the common landscape architect, so you can see what we are doing here. As far as Waltman, we are going to construct a ten foot detached sidewalk. I'm only required to have a 20 foot wide landscape berm along Waltman. We have 37 feet. So, we have added additional. We have a 50 foot landscape buffer. We will have

a nine foot high berm, a ten foot wall along I-84. We also have a ten foot multi-use pathway that's going to go east and west from the west side to the east side of our project and, then, we have to build a 14 foot multi-use pathway along Ten Mile Creek. Just kind of a blow up and as you can see we have created two plaza areas that are mirrored -- mirrored on the Hawkins side and mirrored on our side with that ten foot pathway going east and west and going north and south. So, we can accommodate bicycles and pedestrians. So, we are asking to rezone from C-G to R-40 for the multi-family component, which is transitioning from the commercial component. Then we have a townhouse -- townhome component in the middle of the project and then -- that's R-15 and, then, we have single family around the perimeter that is R-8. Oops. Sorry. As far as our single family development, our qualified open space is 17 percent. We have got a 1.7 acre park in the middle of our single family with a play structure, basketball court, pickleball court, benches and pathways. In the multi-family area we have got 21 percent qualified open space. We are going to have a full clubhouse with fitness facility, kitchen facilities, conference room, community gathering area, offices. We are going to have covered patio with barbecue and outside kitchen area. Plaza area next in our greenbelt. We will have a swimming pool. Hot tub. Cabana. Pool deck. We have a children's play structure and a picnic gazebo in the southern portion of the multi-family, along with a pickleball court. And we are going to have an indoor bicycle repair station and an indoor dog washing station, which I thought was cool. And, then, we will have EV charging stations, along with our linear parks micro paths. This kind of shows you the townhome elevations that were proposed. I will kind of go through really quick here. That shows you the alley load. We have alley load product. We have front load product. We have attached product. Detached product. So, as far as a variety, all the homes next to Interstate 84 will be single -- single story. No two story. We have a two story building that will adjoin Waltman to kind of keep that bulk and -- and wall effect down. The remainder of the multi-family buildings will be 24 unit. There will be three story. There are 11 of those and one two story. This shows you the clubhouse, the pool facility -- the pool facility and the cabanas and, then, that kind of shows your interconnectivity between Tanner Creek and the Hawkins facility. So, one of the things that's critical here is we want to embrace each other's projects and we felt that a vehicular connection would really ruin the multi-use pathway, because Ten Mile Creek multi-use pathway is -- we want it to be a pedestrian safe corridor. So, we want that east-west and that north-south connection. As far as the one way couplet, that was just thrown out there and in talking to our traffic engineers, all that would do was put pressure on other intersections and cause them to fail. I do not, in my professional opinion, nor did my discussions with the traffic engineers at Six Mile, did we believe that that is a viable option. We need to provide multiple points of access in this section. We got a section that basically has been bottled up for years and we are trying to solve that and this pedestrian interconnectivity -- these two plazas that mirror each other with planters where people can congregate, they can get in the shade, they can go get a burger, they can go get ice cream, sit down, walk, bike, whatever between the two projects -- I think is really a lot better plan than relying on vehicular connection. We have Waltman. It's a collector. That is our vehicular connection. We have Corporate Drive. That is our vehicular connection. You can see Ruddy Drive -- hold on. There we go. There is a stub street here in The Landing to nowhere. We are building a collector

with detached walks all the way up here. Then people would come on to Waltman, they could go north on Corporate or go -- ah, dammit. Sorry. I just came off of two weeks of COVID, so I'm just a little off. So, what -- what we believe here is we have addressed the primary concerns. We have got a darn good project. We have got 83 single family dwellings. Our lots range from 3,850 to 10,000 square feet. We have got 16 alley loaded, 67 front loaded. I got 40 foot lots, 50 foot lots, 60 foot lots. We got 45 townhomes. They are alley loaded. They range from 2,400 to 3,800 square feet. Our overall density in this project is 10.72 dwelling units per acre. Over in the R-8 portion we are just a smidge over four. So, we transition that density, we go from four to seven and, then, we go to the multi-family, which is 17. But our overall density is 10.72. Hang on. Let me get my -- as far as parking. We were questioned about our parking. This was designed, even though submitted prior to your updating your parking standards, this is designed with your current parking standards. The one bedrooms, which we have 94 one bedrooms, have 1.5 spaces. We have 152 two bedrooms. They have two spaces. We have 34 three bedrooms. They have three spaces. We have 28 guests parking. We are at 581 parking spaces. This is the -- the most parking I have ever provided in a multi-family project in Meridian or Boise or anywhere, where two -- I think we are 2.02 parking spaces per dwelling unit in the multi-family. You guys have sewer -- a 12 inch sewer line out here right in Waltman. You have got a 12 inch sewer line that runs along Ten Mile Creek. There is a 12 inch water line. There is an eight inch water line. These two projects and with the Corporate Drive extension will be extending water down to this area, so it's going to loop your water system. We will loop into Ruddy Drive, which is a dead-end line now. We will loop up the water to Corporate. We will make connections to Waltman. So, as far as creating or improving the infrastructure out here, the burden is upon us and we accept that burden gladly. I know there have been questions about what kind of traffic is going to go east and west and north and south. One of the questions I got from some of the neighbors -- we did have an -- I did have my own neighborhood meeting and I did go out a thousand feet and I had it here at City Hall. The -- the staff wanted me to introduce myself, because the previous neighborhood meeting had been done by Matt prior to the submittal and so I did meet with them and some of the people asked about, you know, what about people cutting through The Landing. More people are going to come from The Landing than are ever going to go from Tanner Creek into The Landing. But one thing you need to keep in mind is the trip capture that we are going to see. Right now if you live in The Landing and you want to go to Target, you got to go clear over to Chinden and Eagle Road. That's -- that's a big drive and that's a lot of -- a lot of miles on our street network. Now they can just pop down -- pop through Ruddy Drive out to Waltman, go over to the Target. It's going to be a full service Target and -- and they are excited to be there. They want to be part of -- of Meridian's downtown core and I guess one question that -- that I brought up with the Planning and Zoning Commission was if -- if -- if not this, then, what? And if not now when? You guys have been talking about this since 1993. Lastly, I wrote a letter to Council asking for deviations on three conditions of approval for the development agreement. One, I respectfully request that we build the berm whenever we build a phase adjacent to. The reason being is I got to generate a lot of material, because my fence and my berm combination has to be ten foot above the centerline elevation of I-84 and so we are working with Hawkins to try to get dirt from them. If they

have excess material when they X out their -- their big box, but I will also have to -- we are going to have to -- have to have time to get the berm built and I don't want to bring a whole bunch of gravel trucks through downtown Meridian or down Meridian Road. I don't think anybody wants that. Secondly, the Commission asks that we be limited to only building one phase and not being able to obtain any occupancies for a second phase and I guess my point to you is -- my first phase only generates 553 vehicle trips per day. My second phase is only a thousand. That's a total of 1,570 trips. That's well below existing local street threshold and I just don't think that it warrants it. At full build out we are only 22 percent of the overall traffic. And, lastly, I would ask the Council to support the -- the pedestrian connection versus the vehicular connection. Waltman should be the vehicular connection. If somebody wants to drive over to Target. We want to promote people walking, biking, skating and I think we need to not make it as convenient by making them go to Waltman. Maybe they will get on their bike and that's what I would prefer. Thank you. And I hope the Council can see to support this project.

Simison: Thank you, Becky. Council, questions? Okay. No questions at this time. Council, we could go right into public testimony or do we need breaks before we do that? All right. Then, with that, Mr. Clerk, who signed up?

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. First one Joey Lorcher.

Simison: And as noted, if you want to come forward and state your name and address for the record and you will have six minutes to speak on both projects.

Johnson: And she's getting the presentation up.

Lorcher: Thank you. Hello. My name is Joey Lorcher and I live at 5110 Dandridge Way and I want to talk to you about the overcrowding that Tanner Creek development will cause to the West Ada School District, but more specifically Meridian Middle School and high school. Development is not only the reason why schools are -- it's not the only reason schools become overcrowded, but it's the most preventable and on this slide is the West Ada School District's formula for predicting how many school-aged children will be housed within a residential development and that formula is the number of homes times 0.8 and divided by 13, which 13 is representative kindergarten through 12th grade and I have calculated -- not just Tanner Creek, but six other developments that have already been approved in order to see an accurate impact of the reality that Meridian Middle School and high school will face the next few years and as you can see -- if you added up the estimated new students from the already approved Newkirk, Gateway, Outer Banks, Vanguard Village, Foxcroft and Mile High Pines developments, there will be 1,735 new students added to the West Ada School District and if you take that number and add the estimated students from the Tanner Creek development, which is an additional 328 students, you will get a grand total of 2,063 students added to the West Ada School District. Now, taking the mean total and dividing it by 13 for each grade level, you get 158 students per grade. Meridian Middle School has grades six through eight. So, their student population will increase by 474 students and as you can see on this slide, that, number of increased students is a big problem and if you add the

current enrollment at Meridian Middle School and add the estimated 474 students, that pushes the student population over capacity by almost 300 students. This will be a dangerous situation for not only the students, but also the faculty. West Ada School District's formula is simple math and mathematics don't lie. The fact that Meridian Middle School will be overcapacity even before Tanner Creek would be completed should be a red flag that this development it is not right for Meridian. Our schools simply cannot keep up with the estimated 2,063, new students. Our community does not desire overcrowding, which will inevitably -- inevitably diminish and compromise their children's educations and this development does not reflect our community's vision for our future children. The development also doesn't preserve the character, quality of life, livability and sustainability that the residents of Meridian are trained to hold on to and this slide shows the West Ada School District's facility plan for high schools from 2016 to 2028. This shows the running projection of the percentage of students that are over capacity in Meridian and as you can see in five years every high school in the region is projected to be over capacity. The City of Meridian has only built one high school since 2016 to combat this problem and that's simply not enough. Tanner Creek will only worsen Meridian High School's seating capacity problem and on this slide we continue the West Ada School District's facility plan for middle schools from 2016 to 2028 and as you can see in five years every middle school in Meridian is projected to be over capacity. Meridian has not built any new middle schools to combat this problem since 2016 and, again, Tanner Creek only worsen Meridian Middle School's student capacity problem. This pattern continues with this one. This is the West Ada School District facility plan for the four zones of the elementary school districts and as you can see three of the four regions will be overcapacity in the next five years and this requires five new elementary schools in the West Ada School District and only one school has been built since 2016 to combat this problem and the Tanner Creek development will, again, only make this situation worse for everybody that has a child. And on this slide we have the bonds -- timelines for West Ada School District from 2018 to 2026. Only one of the bonds has passed in the last five years and this is a big problem for West Ada School District and the City of Meridian and since the City of Meridian has a difficulty passing these bonds we are falling behind on keeping up with these new developments in neighborhoods. There are no plans of fixing this situation of which the City of Meridian has created with these density populated apartment complexes in neighborhoods and Tanner Creek will only worsen the situation, because we just can't -- Meridian schools can't keep up with the influx of people and so, in conclusion, I want to reiterate that development is not the only reason why schools become overcrowded, but it is the most preventable. As you see I have used simple mathematics to prove to you that big developments like Tanner Creek are causing overpopulation issues at all levels of primary education in the West Ada School District. The Tanner Creek development will especially affect Meridian Middle School and high school, which is already struggling with being overcrowded. The City of Meridian so far have not been able to keep up with the school bonds and buildings. The population influx that you have created with these high density residents and developments is ruining the living quality for our community. The Tanner Creek development high density plan is not right for this area. A low density neighborhood, mixed with low dense density offices and some type of community center and a bigger park would suit this area better for our community and

the City of Meridian. The Tanner Creek development does not reflect our community's values, character, quality of life, livability and sustainability. That is why I'm asking this tonight is --

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

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. Joey, you talked about that briefly. If you could elaborate -- you talked about better low density options. So, are you talking more just single family homes?

Lorcher: Yes. Yes. Exactly. Get rid of the apartments and just all single family homes would make the intersection better, less populated and it just -- it would be a better fit for that area.

Hoaglund: Okay. And follow up, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: That -- that Tanner Creek location is, you know, entitled to commercial already from previous agreements.

Lorcher: Right.

Hoaglund: So, then, if we talk about the Hawkins property farther up, if that is moved over there is that -- well, what are your thoughts on the commercial side of things?

Lorcher: I wouldn't mind more commercial. As long as it wasn't another big box. You know, just office spaces, you know, dentists' buildings and stuff like that, so --

Hoaglund: Okay. Okay. Thanks, Joey.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you very much for sharing this. We really appreciate it when members of the community come and they have really done their homework. It's -- it's a lot of information to gather, isn't it?

Lorcher: Yes, it is.

Perreault: I just wanted to clarify very quickly for you that the City of Meridian is -- is not the entity that attempts to pass bonds on behalf of the school district. So, just wanted to clarify that. The school district does their own work on that.

Lorcher: Okay.

Perreault: And we really don't have any involvement in it at all.

Lorcher: Okay.

Perreault: Other than maybe to offer support to them in ways that we can certainly help.

Lorcher: Right.

Perreault: So, I just wanted to give you that clarification real quick.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Lorcher, nice to see you. Appreciate you being before us tonight. I know you have been active in your testimony about different projects and different iterations in and around your property and I appreciate your patience to come before us and share some thoughts. I appreciate that you said some -- some really good written correspondence I know the Council read. You said one that was kind of similar to this presentation you gave tonight, but your -- your other letter that came to us talked a little bit more about some of the transportation challenges. I think that's -- and certainly the school issue is something that I expect we are going to be talking a little bit about later on tonight, but wanted to just give you an opportunity to maybe share your particular perspective about transportation impacts from these particular projects.

Lorcher: Well, as it is right now if you are sitting at the light at the intersection and you see a police officer or a firetruck trying to get through, they will have to sit through at least two lights just to get through the intersection and that's right now.

Cavener: Yeah.

Lorcher: And so with the increase of all these developments that will just make it worse. It doesn't matter how many other access roads you put through to Waltman Lane, they are going to try to get -- even just to get to the freeway -- like if there is a crash right off the off ramp, they are going to have to go through that intersection, it's going to take them a lot longer than it should. In fact, I actually called for -- there was a fire on the interstate -- on the interstate one time. We called it in as I was going to Waltman and we watched the fire truck go through two lights, took more than five minutes to get

through and that's not very safe in my opinion and the Tanner Creek development will just make this worse.

Cavener: Thank you, sir.

Simison: Thank you very much.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next to Steve McCarthy.

Simison: Good evening.

McCarthy: Hello. Oh. Hello, Council and Mayor. My name is Steve McCarthy. I'm at 10685 West Paddy Street, Boise, Idaho. I will be addressing the traffic congestion and the Linder -- oh, actually we should probably wait for you guys to get their stuff going. Okay. Yeah. As I said before, my name is Steve McCarthy. I am addressing the traffic congestion and the Linder Road overpass. We have had a lot of topics about traffic tonight, so I want to definitely talk about it a little bit more. Is this just -- okay. The arrows -- okay. On this next slide -- on the first slide, actually, I wanted to show you the COMPASS Idaho report. This map shows the top ten congested network segments in Ada county during peak periods in 2022. As you can see I-84-Meridian is number one. Franklin Road to I-84 interchange and Meridian Road is number seven. So, Meridian Road has officially passed Eagle in regards to worst levels of congestion in Ada county and to me that's pretty bad. So, I wanted to get the next slide here. This slide shows the vehicle trips per traffic impact studies from Hawkins. Hawkins shows that 10,801 daily trips are going to be happening on those interchanges. Seven hundred and forty trips per a.m. peak hour and 949 -- 950 trips per p.m. peak hour. And, then, with Tanner that will also add another 3,014 daily trips within that graph. So, who in their right minds would want to add 13,000 vehicles per day to number one and number seven congested road segments in Ada county? Moving on to Linder overpass. Linder overpass providing relief is questionable at best. In the P&Z meeting Becky brought up that Mindy Wallace from ACHD stated that the Meridian and Waltman intersection will operate better than reported in the traffic impact studies once all our connecting streets are developed. Where is the study for this? Where is the data to backup Mindy's claim? How much relief and how long would this supposed relief last? In the City Council meeting with Hawkins in 2022 Mayor Simison mentioned the Linder overpass and stated: My hope is that the Linder overpass reduces some of the traffic in this that makes some of these turning movements okay. But for how long? In regards to Linder overpass, there is no access to I-84 from Linder Road. Relief, if any, from the Linder overpass is likely temporary, lasting maybe a couple of years if at all. Ten Mile exit offered Meridian Road relief for a couple of years, but look at where we are now. Meeting Meridian Road and Meridian Road configurations probably for a couple of years, but, again, look at where we are now. What happens when the congestion returns or becomes worse after the Linder overpass has been built and these two developments have been built, what's our plan then? In regards to the neighborhood between Linder and Waltman Lane, commuters heading east would most likely cross Ruddy Drive and take Waltman to access I-84 on ramps. Driving across to Overland

and doubling back on Meridian Road seems very impractical. Stores like Winco and Home Depot across Waltman Lane will likely lead people to prefer Ruddy Drive over Linder overpass, increasing traffic at the Meridian-Waltman intersection. Now, into the Hawkins trip generation and distribution with Linder overpass built. The trip generation from the Hawkins study shows that ten percent of trips going to the Hawkins site originates from west of Franklin. Some of that ten percent would come from Linder. This will show how Linder overpass is insufficient. Even with the Linder overpass built Hawkins will still contribute 9,802 daily trips to Meridian and Waltman, including Tanner Creek -- adding Tanner Creek brings the total to 12,816 daily trips. Infrastructure will be overwhelmed. The existing infrastructure in this area is inadequate to handle this influx of traffic, even with the Linder overpass. So -- so, in conclusion, I want to summarize. The excessive traffic impact, introducing over 13,000 trips a day with over 950 cars per hour during peak hours to Ada county's most congested area is not smart growth or sustainable growth. The traffic uncertainty, the exact number of vehicles passing through Ruddy Drive from the west neighborhood to I-84 via Waltman Lane is unclear. The uncertain impacts, the potential traffic impacts of Linder overpass on Meridian in the future are unclear. The risk of uninformed decisions -- making a significant decision without adequate information is not sensible or wise approach, posing potential grave consequences to our community and our safety -- as our two guys over there definitely showed. An inappropriate location. The current area is unfit for high density residential and big box development, lacking the necessary infrastructure. Meridian deserves better. The entrance to Meridian and the well-being of our citizens deserve more thoughtful and elevated approach than what is currently proposed. Please deny both of these applications and for the sake of safety and common sense I hope all of you will listen to the data. Thank you.

Simison: Council, questions?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: As to your last point on the -- talk about a more elevated and thoughtful approach, can you tell me what that means to you?

McCarthy: As an elevated thoughtful approach to which --

Hoaglun: To -- to the property.

McCarthy: Oh, to the property.

Hoaglun: It's bare ground.

McCarthy: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

Hoaglun: One portion is already entitled. What should it look like then?

McCarthy: I going to refer to kind of like what Joey said for the property, to have more office space, a little less residential, a lot more maybe the commercial idea or something, so that we don't have so much traffic going through that area constantly and creating, you know, safety hazards and so on and so forth.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

McCarthy: Yep.

Simison: Just a question for you. You mentioned your address is Boise. Do you have a connection to this property or --

McCarthy: I do. Yeah. My wife is Kelsee Lorcher.

Simison: Okay. Just wanted to make sure I understood.

McCarthy: Yes. Definitely.

Simison: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

McCarthy: All right. Great. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, the computer down here is having a small meltdown, so I will be fixing that right now. We have another person with a presentation, so we are trying to get that ready.

Simison: Okay. So, why don't we go ahead and take a break, so we can try to get the computer situation figured out. So, we will take a ten minute recess.

(Recess: 7:31 p.m. to 7:43 p.m.)

Simison: All right. We will go ahead and come back from recess or you can listen to my standup routine and I'm not very funny.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Joe Lorcher.

J.Lorcher: Hello. My name is Joe Lorcher. I live at 740 Waltman Lane. My property is the farm property just north of Tanner -- oh, there it is. This property right here. Been farming it since 1975. My land is devoted to agriculture, so as long as I keep more than five acres I can't be annexed by the city, even though it seems like I'm here a lot with you guys. I am not part of the city. I wanted to stress that this Greenhead Street stub probably will never be developed, either because of me or my children that you have already heard from and will hear from. We have no plans of dividing up this property. So, that leaves Ruddy Drive as the place where everybody is going to be coming through. According to Tanner Creek's traffic impact study 636 vehicles per day will go through Ruddy Drive. This does not include Hawkins projected generated trips traveling on

Ruddy Drive. That is over 636 chances a day a child, pedestrian, or bicycles will get hit or swiped by a car. As you can see on this the Ruddy Drive turns and is a blind corner right through where they just wanted to put the park and anybody who has been around on Waltman Lane for a long time, we have lots of pedestrians, lots of children, lots of small families that walk up and down Waltman Lane and I'm concerned for their safety. That's the main reason I am here. How do I get this to turn?

Johnson: The right arrow on your keypad. Keyboard.

J.Lorcher: There we go. This is the statute I was talking about that, why I am going to keep my place a farm as long as I can and not -- not join the lovely City of Meridian. I want to talk about safety. On this slide here Ruddy Drive turns and where they -- once they have the park and, then, it gets up to Waltman Lane and comes across Waltman Lane and even now we have lots of pedestrians. Obviously, if they put this many people they are going to have more pedestrians, but there is no safety crosswalks designed to go across. Right here is a walkway -- the walkway that goes behind the Haddocks, that is a pedestrian walkway along Ten Mile Creek to the north. No comments have been made about safety crossing that street to get over there and also nothing has been said about this property here that's not part of the development. The ten foot sidewalk that's supposed to be built on the side -- south side of Waltman Lane, how is that going to be built with that property not being part of the construction? The ten foot sidewalk would probably be right over their well where it is now and they probably don't want to lose their well water. Again, 636 vehicles a day going through Ruddy, working their way towards the infamous intersection up at the top of Waltman Lane and right currently The Landing Subdivision has four access points out onto Linder Road to get around over to the freeway off of Franklin and as soon as Ruddy Lane is punched through everybody in this subdivision is going to be coming through Ruddy Lane going through the park area and down Waltman Lane towards the freeway to get to Boise or to -- to Winco or to Home Depot and this is -- my main concern is just the safety. The number of vehicles going through here, working their way through the intersection that's already the number one worst intersection in Ada county and this is just going to add more to it. We talked a lot about the access going through my property. The Corporate Drive right here. I'm sure cars will come down or go through here to get up on the Corporate Drive. But eventually they are still going to drive down Corporate Drive, turn on Meridian Road and just be part of that intersection just from a different direction. It's still going to add trips per day to the worst intersection in Ada county. Talked briefly about the bus stop that was just brought up. The bus stop right now is -- they are planning to put it right on Meridian Road right after the intersection. It's kind of causing cars coming up from behind them to even congest more cars to try to get around the bus stop. If they are really going to put a bus stop in here they need to put the bus stop into the development and off of Meridian Road. In conclusion, with only one access point, all traffic coming from the west neighborhood will be concentrated at Ruddy Drive and, then, add to the development's own traffic on Waltman Lane and Corporate Drive. Safety issues for children, pedestrians and bicycles are our main concern with increased traffic going through Ruddy and on to Waltman Lane, especially because of the lack of crosswalks and location of the

proposed park. I'm not opposed to developing these 36 acres. We have been here a few times. What I'm opposed to is the density of this development. There is -- if they just did plain houses we would not be here fighting for this because of safety issues. I have lived and worked on Waltman Lane since 1975 and would love to see this gateway to city be more high -- more than high density apartments. It should be a gathering spot for entertainment and small business. Even with Linder Road overpass Waltman and Meridian will still be an F grade intersection and police and the fire departments will get stuck on Meridian Road even more. Please deny both of these applications until they can come up with a better low dense plan that better serves our community and the gateway to Meridian. Meridian deserves better than this. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Lorcher. Council, any questions?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Mr. Lorcher, good to see you again. We have talked a little bit -- have asked the question I want to make sure I understand. Low density I understand. But you talked about low density and mixed use development for the site. What does that mean to you?

J.Lorcher: To me it means single homes, even if they are the skinny homes that's in the R-15 section, that's fine. It's the apartments. It's the high density apartments that we just oppose. There is not enough space for that many people, that many cars to -- the acre and a half park for that many people? That's a joke. They are going to be everywhere else, except there. And so just the single family homes mainly and, then, not so much the big box store, but just smaller offices, smaller businesses, some kind of entertainment, some -- something -- a gathering spot for the city. A convention center maybe or something like that or just some kind of entertainment -- something for the city that everyone would enjoy.

Hoaglun: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you very much.

J.Lorcher: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Kelsee Lorcher.

K.Lorcher: Kelsee Lorcher. 2099 West Snyder Drive. Before I start my presentation I wanted to point out Waltman Lane will be three lanes and -- per their proposed collector. So, it will be three lanes and when it will be finished it's going to be a level of service F per their traffic impact study and also ACHD recommends that Waltman Lane be five lanes. Also all proposed mitigations to the Waltman-Meridian intersection by traffic -- by the traffic engineer Six Mile were rejected by ACHD, because it would be a temporary

solution, but harmful long term and traffic to and from I-84 is priority, according to ACHD, and not this development. I would like to go ahead and start with a quote from the Comprehensive Plan. Without guided growth and development overcrowding congestion, safety community identity and overall deterioration of the current quality of life and living may result. I also just wanted to point out the FLUM designates this area as a mixed use community. Some agency comments. The Meridian Fire Department. They said we don't have a total response time that meet the NFPA standards. Our current City of Meridian adopted standards is a risk factor of four in which current resources would not be adequate to supply -- to supply service to this proposed project. This entails a greater risk for the occupants, as well as first responders. COMPASS comments that transportation infrastructure may not be able to support the new transportation demands. Meridian Development Corporation said very little, if any, of the vision that was laid out in the destination downtown is being accomplished. MDC does not anticipate the vision changing much for their southern gateway through their updates and, please, hold these developers to the vision. Also what was not said today during the staff report is that there is also 83 public comments that I did a survey and I put it out on social media and they had the option to say, please, deny or please approve this to you guys and I had 83 respondents say please deny and of those 83 respondents 46 expressed additional concerns in the comment box and this is in the public comments. It has been submitted. Issues and concerns from past meetings. Obviously, Borton and Strader aren't here, so I'm just going to skip over them. In regards to the three acre strip on the west side zoned as residential and floating it across the whole entire property, Council Member Cavener, you expressed your concerns and took issue to the practices of floating land use designation to setting a precedent for future developments, that this practice is okay. Council Member Hoaglund, when you were highly concerned about the -- about having only one left-hand turn lane into Waltman Lane from Meridian Road and the traffic congestion on Meridian Road and Waltman Lane. Per ACHD only one left-hand turn is going to stay and now Hawkins brings over 10,000 more vehicles per day. Again, Borton is not here, so maybe I will do your quote. Quote from the Hawkins 2022 City Council meeting. Mayor, you said we have invested a lot of money between the MDC, the city, ACHD and the road network configurations. We don't want this to turn into a traffic jam for everybody all the time, especially from 4:30 to 7:00 p.m. And, then, one thing I did want to say from Council Member Borton, he did say what I think would be helpful for me is the mixed use community designation. I see these -- they are adjacent uses. They are not mixed uses and that's a big distinction. Previous this month at the Planning and Zoning meeting Becky and Ethan -- Becky and Ethan both mentioned how both of their properties are already annexed and zoned for C-G. They said if these don't -- these plans don't get approved someone can swoop in and buy the properties and build commercial without the city's approval. While true, Corey Barton Homes and Hawkins Company know the value of this property. In addition both companies have put a lot of time, money and resources into the applications. So, let's get real, CBH Homes and Hawkins are not going anywhere. Furthermore, Becky and Ethan said that these plans are as good as it gets. I believe this is not true and, honestly, kind of a slap in the face of the comp plan and the FLUM. There is room for a permit and I believe rejecting this development -- these developments may prompt them to re -- re-evaluate their densities

and encouraging more thoughtful consideration of key issues in alignment with the FLUM and com plan. Quote from Mayor -- from Mr. Mayor, State of the City address in 2020, which I believe still holds true to this day. In 2019 the city completed a nearly two year process of updating our Comprehensive Plan. This is the growth and plan for our community that they stated they wanted for Meridian. As a city we need to let the plan be our guide and limit how often it should be amended. So, any changes can be looked at in the context of the full plan. We have spent over 200,000 dollars and countless hours of staff time engaging with community about this plan. It needs to mean something and it should not be changed much for the first five years. Please adhere to the comp plan that was carefully curated for the growth of our city. Please uphold the MUC designation from the FLUM. Please echo the same concerns and issues you have voiced in the past. Please save this area from the very inappropriate high dense development that will become detrimental for this area. These developments will cause overcrowding, will cause congestion, will compromise safety, will negatively impact the community's identity and will overall deteriorate our quality of life in Meridian. Please hold these developers to the high standards that this unique gateway to Meridian deserves. Please deny both applications. Thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Clair Manning.

Manning: Hi. Clair Manning. 650 West Waltman Lane. So, I would ask for your careful attention and consideration of this application. This isn't another subdivision to just rubber stamp. This is kind of the flagship interest of the city and it will have massive repercussions on the entire community. So, we -- we do need real leadership here and it is tempting to buy into maybe this is a place for commercial or regional use, but the fact of the matter is that you just don't have the infrastructure to support it. You know, the developers have done a really nice job representing their clients and, you know -- but, unfortunately, what maximizes corporate profits isn't necessarily what's good for Meridian. So, you really need to represent the taxpayers that are -- elected you and make sure they are -- you know, not just say yes, because you need to put something there, make sure that the right thing goes there. Okay. So, kind of seeing a lot of this, so I won't spend too much time there. You know, you have a lot of traffic coming in from this adjacent subdivision that can only go down Waltman. You have 16 acres of R-40 and tons of R-15 that is contributing to this traffic, as well as major commercial development and don't forget the high density apartments just to the north. So, there really is kind of a problematic entrance to -- to the Waltman Lane. You can kind of see that there really isn't a lot of room on Corporate Drive here before you turn around, but the real albatross of this development is this really small sliver of a turning lane onto -- into Waltman. So, you know, the developers know this is a problem. Your staff knows this is a problem, you know, but after all the engineering and all the consultation there is zero path to improving this. Every -- I mean they have -- they have tried, but it's been rejected, so -- but if they do try and improve this it's just going to interfere with the interchange. So, this is -- this is what you are going to have to work with and that's what makes it so infeasible to actually put commercial and -- and high density there. So --

and, then, I would also say that, you know, there is a lot of talk about the Linder overpass and, you know, some -- some connectivity, but that's not going to fix this entrance. It's not going to make anything easier to get into, so don't hide behind the -- the Linder overpass, it's not going to fix the issue. So, I just want to show you like some pictures of the area, so you can see -- I'm kind of back as far as I can be, because there really isn't a lot of area -- a lot of runway here where you started -- before we start backing up cars and cutting off an entire lane into the city. You can see to the right there that doesn't take very many cars to fill it up. A better shot there. So, this is kind of looking back to the freeway. You can see it doesn't -- there is not much runway to the freeway and, you know, don't tell these guys over here, but I do massive illegal lane changes just to get to the freeway every day. And, then, you can see here that once you are on -- on here there isn't like a huge runway either. So, you are going to start backing up traffic onto this area here, so -- and, then, how about this Corporate Drive that we are going to put everything down? Here is -- here is a picture of Corporate Drive. You can clearly see this is not ready for collector traffic. It's wildly insufficient for that. So, if you are wondering what it's like today in case you don't live here, I'm pretty sure you do, this is the -- this is the commute that I see every morning. You can see even going back into this area today you are -- you are often blocked being able to even get there, because traffic's already backed up on a green light. So, you know, it really isn't a big surprise that you're at level of service level F after this. So, you know, bottom line it would be completely irresponsible to allow commercial and R-40 into the area. You know, more appropriate use will be single family homes in the Tanner area. Community level businesses. I mean ideally the next density, but in absence of that maybe some small businesses, things that aren't going to totally kill the traffic, but you probably do need some commercial there. So, I would support that. You know. And, of course, the developers are going to have a rebuttal with flowery statements about, you know, improvement area, you know, entitlements to Corporate -- to Corporate -- to -- the current entitlements, you know, connectivity. But what they are really doing is they are asking you to jump off a bridge and say I don't believe in gravity and I'm begging you don't jump.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Manning, thank you for that presentation and similar to others about where you see the property being developed. I guess my question to you, then, is there is an entitlement already on the property to the west abutting the homes that is commercial. There is -- there is a gamble here and that is that an entity comes in, no -- the name Target has been thrown out. That it goes, okay, that's where we have to go. We are going to go there. What's -- what's a better alternative? Is that the alternative that neighbors are ready to zone for?

Manning: You know, I'm in county, I'm entitled to shoot a .30-06 out my back door, but that doesn't make it any less than irresponsible. I don't think that a reasonable corporate person is going to come in and see if they can actually make that work. I think what you guys need to hold out for is single family residential in that area, lower density, so you don't like overpopulate what the -- what the commercial component of that is inevitably going to be and I recommend that you keep the commercial area, you know, a little less stringent, so, you know, essentially, getting in and out of that is going to be so problematic that you are really going to back up the traffic and you just -- infrastructure is not there. They know it. They have tried to fix it. They have been blocked. There is no path.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Manning: You're welcome.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Kurt Lee.

Lee: Kurt Lee. 365 West Waltman Lane. Fancy presentation. We have the last house left on the Hawkins property. It's my grandpa's old dairy. And there has been so many developers on all this land it's ridiculous. Each one tries to get something done and gets denied. That -- that land is nothing but coyote and weeds. All of it. And it's nice somebody's going to do something, but the traffic is going to be bad. The city years ago approved those two -- that huge subdivision off Franklin Road with only one outlet and they expect these developers to make the outlet and come down Waltman Lane. The Ruddy, that would stop a lot of the traffic if you don't improve the Ruddy Road coming through the Tanner project. Get another outlet onto Franklin Road from those subdivisions. It's going to help the Linder congestion and it's going to help them, because they have got to have another outlet. It's ridiculous. Thousands of homes, one outlet that the city approved years ago. I know that apartments were everybody's sore thumb. I would like to see a nursing home and a motel and single -- single homes rather than apartments also. But I know you got to have dual usage nowadays. In case one doesn't work the other one does. A nice high end restaurant in the corner where Hawkins is that would be nice. But there -- is that's got to -- I know it's going to be commercial, because it's location, location, location. Ten Mile is so far ahead of them. They tried to develop that Lane 30, 40 years ago and nothing ever gets done. Ten Mile got it done in ten years. So, they say it's the infrastructure. While you can build infrastructure, that's ACHD's job. That's all. Thanks.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? All right. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, William Kissinger.

Kissinger: Good evening. I'm William Kissinger. 420 Waltman Lane. First of all, let me say that I appreciate our Mayor and City Council taking the time to get this important decision right. Obviously, I'm not a public speaker, so I hope you focus on what I'm saying, rather than how I'm saying it and everything else. So, I know there is very little I

can say in the next three to six minutes that will persuade this Council. You may have already made up your mind on the subject to a large extent and I certainly realize growth and development is inevitable. However, I do find it somewhat sad that what we have previously planned as a mixed use community area under the Comprehensive Plan is now being proposed as a combination commercial, high density residential project that we all agree will lead to even more traffic congestion in the area. It is also not exactly what many of us envisioned for this high profile area as the gateway symbol welcoming those to Meridian. I'm here to tell you it's not too late. So, with that in mind I humbly ask that before you vote on such an important proposal that you take the time to ensure the overall project is done right, that we do not settle for ACHD ignoring this issue with the hopes that it goes away, but, instead, hold them accountable for the necessary improvements to nearby streets, intersections, that they admittedly already rate as an F. To reconsider limiting the developer's proposed density permanently or at least until other improvements to mitigate congestion, including the completion of Linder Road overpass, happens, something already recommended I believe by ACHD. That you consider the ultimate impact that the residential component brings on our over -- already overcrowded schools, in which case a new Fred Meyer might be preferred. Not a lot of kids associated with that additionally in the area. That you hold these developers accountable for improvements to all the surrounding streets, sidewalks, and pathways, including those that were outlined in conditions of approval as drafted and previously -- drafted and proposed by Kim Warren. From what I can tell they have not. And I asked that if you have not already previously -- already previously done this, each of you take the time to visit the project area to appreciate Waltman Lane. It's not a street. It's not a road. It's a lane. To truly understand that what you are being asked to approve before you concede your authority to these developers. Therefore, we as citizens would ask that you consider denial of this request or at the very least postpone this decision until you feel you have necessary assurances that the project being proposed has been planned in the best interest of our community. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I don't have a question. I just want to say that you had mentioned that -- that our minds might be made up and I have to say I -- I often come and -- I think I can speak for my colleagues -- with very much an open mind wanting to hear our community. This is a really important process and appreciate that you have noticed that we are slowing down and taking some time to do this. I would like to mention just really quickly -- and with all of the testimony that we have received a couple of things. As Council President Hoaglund has mentioned this evening, the Tanner property is already set to be commercial, which is a heavy use, and, then, the -- the Hawkins property is set for mixed use community. That's the current comp plan designation. That designation allows for apartment complexes. It allows for retail. It allows for offices. So, it's not that that isn't going to allow for commercial as well, it's just the current comp plan has it on

just a little bit smaller scale. But currently these two properties are entitled to already allow all of those uses. So, as we have heard from folks tonight about our preference being single family homes, that there is already approvals that are -- that allow these applicants with -- before this application to go ahead and make decisions that are much more intensive use than a single family home. So, I just want to clarify that for everyone, not just for you, because we do want you to understand how this decision is being made and sort of what we have to keep in mind as we go through this process. So, thank you very much.

Kissinger: If I may comment on that. I recognize that. I am -- as I said I'm sad that we didn't stay mixed use regional or mixed use community, because those would have been way less density and that's what we are really opposed to here is the density of this, not necessarily the type or the project in general. It's the fact that they are trying to cram too much into a small area.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, the mixed use -- and you meant mixed use neighborhood. Mixed use neighborhood is the less dense -- and that's okay. I still get them -- I'm still going to be confused and I have been doing this a long time. The -- the applicant Hawkins -- excuse me. Ms. McKay with -- with Tanner had stated that their intended density is a little over ten units and -- and a mixed use community allows for six to 15, depending on -- so, I'm not saying that to -- that I'm saying in any way that I'm supporting that, I'm just clarifying for your sake that the applicant believes that they have met that, because that's what -- and it doesn't look right to have, you know, three story apartment complexes and, then, have -- and it does -- it feels like there is more density than there actually might be and so hopefully they will -- they will have a chance to address your concerns when they come up here and talk about how that density will actually work out in terms of numbers of residents, because they could potentially do all townhomes and -- and -- and -- or -- or, you know, a different design of residential and still have the same amount of density. So, they can probably share more about that, because we are hearing your concerns. I'm hearing your concerns for sure. I just want to make sure that we are all kind of speaking the same language with it. Thank you very much.

Simison: Council, additional questions? All right. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, the next person signed up his Ken Freeze.

Freeze: Good evening, Council Members, Mr. Mayor. My name is Ken Freeze. I live at 195 East Rosalyn Drive in Meridian. And what my concern is is that you go out Ten Mile, you go out Overland, Fairview, north of town, south of town there is building. There is building everywhere. And I'm really concerned about what all this building is going to have on the future impact of the infrastructure of all of Meridian. We have talked about this project here, some very good testimony has been given about traffic, overcrowding of schools. I would like to see this project stopped right now, but I would also like to see where all projects are stopped for a while -- for a breather to give

Meridian a chance to just sort of sit back, let all these projects that have already been approved get built, so that we can sit back and see what their impact is. I know the planning department goes through and they -- they estimate and they do a good job of estimating what the impact is going to be, but what they think it's going to be and what it turns out to be can often be two different things and I would just like to see just a little bit of -- a little bit more conservative on holding back and -- and just letting all these projects that have already been approved -- or in many cases they are -- they have been in the pipeline for years and they are approaching approval, just let's -- get those out of the way. Let's -- let's clear the board and just sit back and take a breather for a while. I think this -- this project in itself is probably not -- it looks very nice. It's probably in the wrong place in my opinion. We have got some really bad traffic problems. I will ask you Council Members, how many of you go through that intersection every day around 5:00 o'clock? You don't want to. I'm retired. I don't have to, but occasionally I get caught going through it and it's a mess. It's a real mess. And you -- we heard about how just restriping it could help that. I understand that restriping it would sacrifice the bike lane that's currently there. Frankly, I think you are crazy to try to ride a bike through there. Even in a bike lane. I see videos all the time of people getting hit in bike lanes. If I was riding a bike through there I would get up on the sidewalk and ride my bike or walk my bike. I think if -- if -- just restriping that now could alleviate a lot of the traffic problems. Maybe -- maybe these people that are testifying against it might have to look at it a little bit differently than they are today. But, again, I would just like to see the City of Meridian take a breather, let's -- let's stop approving so many of these projects. Let's let the projects that are already been approved get built and let's see what the impact is. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Freeze: Can I answer one question that I know keeps getting asked, like what would I like to see there?

Simison: Sure.

Freeze: Yeah. Okay. Good. Actually, I would like to see a convention center of some sort. I was trying to put together a program for actually kind of a mining trade show and I had vendors who were willing to come. Two of them from Europe. I had -- I had people -- I had everything but a venue. I could not find any place in this valley that wasn't already spoken for and -- say a 20,000 foot convention center there would fit a lot of -- I think it would get a lot of use. Still have the traffic issue, though, because, you know, it's going to bring people in, but, frankly, that's what I would like to see. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone that signed up in advance.

Simison: Is there anybody present -- present or online who would like to provide testimony on the item? If so, please come forward now or if you are online use the raise

your hand feature on Zoom and we can bring you in. Seeing no one coming forward, would the applicants like to come and close.

McKay: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Becky McKay. I understand Waltman Lane situation. I mean there is 210 trips a day on -- on Waltman Lane and those people who live on Waltman Lane -- it's like a dead end road, even though it's designated on the master street map as a collector. Change is hard and -- and I recognize that. Respect that. But one thing I would like to mention is some of the facts that were given to you in some of the PowerPoints are incorrect. It was stated that we will generate 327 students. This is from the West Ada School District on their current methodology for calculating student generation rate and it's .7 for a single family dwelling or townhome, .1 for multi-family. How many children will this generate? A hundred and seventeen I believe is what I have here. Hundred and eighteen. Sorry. A hundred and eighteen students. At build out 118 students or nine students per grade. So, the number of students that will be generated was overstated by 209 and this was from West Ada's own current formulas. It was talked about -- oh, well, you can do access improvements, but it's not going to -- it's really not going to make a lot of difference. It's going to make all the difference. Corporate Drive will be signed no parking. Right now they are allowing people to park on it, just like when we moved our office out off of Hickory and they were letting people -- trucks parked everywhere, because there was nothing out there. When it comes through ACHD will sign no parking, collector roadway, and Corporate does go out to Meridian Road, but you can also go north out to Franklin. So, there is a north outlet that goes to Franklin Road if you look at the vicinity maps. It was mentioned that, you know, 13,000 vehicle trips. Gosh, that's a lot. Well, these projects are phased and they are phased over long periods of time and it always depends on market. Right now we are experiencing higher interest rates, which people are saying, oh, just go build office. Well, I have heard office financing has just went poof. That there -- the banks have really tightened up. So, we need to build a project between the two of us that has mixed uses and one -- one person discounted what Mindy stated in her memo to the Council and to us and I don't think that they should have discounted it, because she, obviously, consulted with their internal traffic engineers, their design engineers, and she said the intersection of Meridian Road and Waltman is anticipated to slightly exceed ACHD's acceptable level of service thresholds. It is likely the intersection would operate better than reported in the traffic impact studies once the stub streets to adjacent neighborhoods are connected and Corporate Drive is extended to intersect with Waltman, making this a viable alternative. So, ACHD has not slammed the door, they have stated that they think these improvements and what's planned for the future with Linder overpass, with State Highway 16, is going to change our patterns in Meridian. I drive Eagle Road every day and nobody can tell me that that isn't operating at a level service F, but you know what, I got to get to -- I got to get to work and I got to get home and I live north of Beacon Light. So, I get it and I sit at those lights three times and I see your emergency services trying to get through, but it didn't stop approval of additional apartments over next to The Village with the hope of capturing traffic and getting people to live where they work and that's what we want to do here. As far as safety is concerned, Waltman Lane -- we are going to be making significant improvements and putting a ten foot

detached walk with eight foot landscaping separating that from those travel lanes. There is a four foot pathway that is north along Ten Mile Creek at Waltman. We could do some type of a pedestrian crosswalk there, so people could use our to -- our 14 foot multi-use pathway and connect to that -- and get across Waltman safely to the four foot. The density is 10.72. Council Woman Perreault made the comment with the current mixed use community you could go up to 15. So, the existing designation would allow for a higher density than what we are proposing, because we are capping it at 10.72. We could go to 12 based on the designations we are asking. We are technically downzoning this property. It was mentioned fire response time. If they went to the third page, Mr. Bongiorno indicated that there would be a four minute response time for an aerial truck and Council in 2016 adopted as their acceptable response time as five minutes. So, based on that I believe we are, obviously, going to improve the options for fire and for police to get into this area. Right -- this area for -- since the '90s has been a bottlenecked area and we have an opportunity to fix that. We are not floating our land use designations. That's why the staff asked us to do a comp plan amendment and these comp plan amendments -- if the current -- if the existing Comprehensive Plan designation and the existing C-G zones that are out there, if those were viable why was it zoned 15 years ago and approved for 400,000 square feet of commercial and nothing happened? And as the gentleman indicated, Mr. Lee, developers have come and gone and come and gone, but the one stumbling block was getting Corporate Drive built and getting connections in alternative routes and that is exactly what we are doing. I think we have a good project and as far as the number of trips, we are going to get about 1,320 possible trips coming out of The Landing coming down Waltman Lane. That's what's estimated. As far as the trips that we will be sending, it was testified that we would be sending 636 to the west. That is incorrect. Three hundred and one. Only about ten percent. As these projects take shape and evolve and phase ones are built, we get Linder Overpass, we get State Highway 16 -- like I said, it's going to change the entire trajectory of our transportation system in the City of Meridian for the better and I believe in that and I think ITD and ACHD believe that, too, and the city, because you guys have lobbied for these projects hard for so many years. Ten Mile is clear -- it was in your 1978 comp plan, the Ten Mile interchange, and how many years did it take us to get that? And I think this is an opportunity that we don't want to waste and my traffic, like I said, is significantly less than what it would be if I were any other use. They are bagging on the apartments. The apartments only generate 6.49 vehicle trips per day. Single family dwellings generate 10.57. So, when you look at the reduction in traffic, the downzoning, I think basically -- and what Hawkins is doing, I think we are going to have a good integrated project and I think that's the whole intent.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, if I may, I just -- I will be really quick, if that's acceptable.

Simison: You have got 11 minutes. You take as much or as little time as you want.

Mansfield: Thank you, sir.

Simison: Only 11 minutes, though.

Mansfield: So, I would just like to address just a few really quick things. I am not sure if it's possible to bring my presentation back up, but I do have some traffic information that I think might be helpful to contextualize. While Sonya is doing that, I would like to just read a few items from the previous staff report that we really took to heart when designing this site plan and the uses on the site plan. First, the staff report notes that a large retail anchor could easily be integrated into this project, but for this site in this location it would likely need to be located along the interstate. We redesigned the site to achieve that configuration. Now, how did we do it? Well, we eliminated the office building, but we eliminated the office building at the request of the staff report. They said -- well, staff, Sonya and Brian McClure -- McClure, long range planner, said that while uses are also desired, there is a considerable amount of it being constructed elsewhere in the community and it could be rededicated and we think that's true and we acknowledge that it is extremely difficult in this economic environment to construct office. There simply is not a lot of demand for office and the demand that there is being fulfilled in other locations. So, we agree with staff here. So, we eliminated that office building and by doing that we created space for 32,000 square feet of community serving shop spaces. Those things could be space for entertainment venues. Recreation. They could be space for a dental office. Any sort of healthcare office. It could be a community serving kind of restaurant space. In addition to the shop spaces, we have a pad that we have kind of called out a space for a sit down restaurant. Of course, you know, we cannot guarantee that a sit-down restaurant will come along and say this is exactly where we want to be right here right now, but, you know, we think that that is the most likely scenario for that particular pad and that's right on the entrance corner and it's about 7,000 square feet. You know. And we have also dedicated a space, if we can find a user, for a hotel user. The gentleman speaking most recently or one of the last to testify mentioned that a motel or hotel would be a desired use. So, you know, we -- we agree and if there is a demand for a user we have space for it. So, thank you, Sonya, for pulling that up. And one more quick thing I would like to note is that staff also noted that Waltman is the ideal location for community serving users that do not need and cannot afford the visibility of the interstate and Meridian Road. The site needs to realize better clustering of nonresidential uses to frame and benefit relocated open space and, again, we took that to heart, you know, we have -- we have created a plaza area right on the entrance corner. We have created a plaza area that the shops near Tanner Creek -- closest to Tanner Creek can utilize. So, I think, you know, as far as the uses that are available here on this commercial site, we have -- you know, we have opened the door for community serving uses. Again, sometimes -- it's very difficult, but often these aren't even possible without an anchor tenant and vice-versa. So, there is kind of a symbiotic relationship between the anchor tenant and the community serving uses and that's what we are seeking to achieve with this site plan and this configuration. And, then, finally, if you will give me a few minutes to get through all my slides, I would like to just talk a little bit about trip generation. We are getting deep. I apologize. I would really like to find that and, I apologize, I may not have actually included it in this particular slideshow. However, what I can say is -- oh, it's actually here. So, this table shows trip generation based on a 382,000 square foot site plan. Our current site plan shows less. We always like to overestimate how much square footage we are going to provide, because we want to ensure that we are

providing the amount of mitigation that our maximum extent of the construction would -- would create to mitigate those impacts, just so we are not underestimating. So, the current site plan really -- based on this kind of mix -- and, again, it's not perfect, but based on this mix is roughly 9,270 trips. Now, if you took the same mix and you extended it to the entitled 400,000 square foot development, that would be 11,400 trips. So, really, the question I'm seeing is there is currently an entitlement for 11,400 trips roughly. Our current proposal generates 9,270 trips roughly. We are not -- I think -- I mean that statement I think speaks for itself. So, you have a current entitlement for something that has much higher trip generation than what we are proposing and so with that I would love to answer any questions.

Simison: All right. Thank you. Council, any additional questions for the applicants or comments?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So, my -- at least my first question -- and there may be some more later -- dovetails on kind of that last comment about trip generation and so maybe an easy question for you. Does your proposed project, with your transportation network improvements, does your trip generation meet, fall below or exceed ACHD's acceptable level of service at Waltman and Meridian?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, it does fall below level of service with the mitigation. It may be worth noting that it currently is not operating well either. So, the improvements to the transportation network still have the potential to -- if not improve, at least kind of maintain the existing kind of state of things.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor, I'm going to touch on this, because I guess this -- there has been a lot of conversations and a lot of comments made about trip generation and traffic impact and -- and there have been multiple letters by ACHD, but on their letter from July ACHD says -- the study shows -- that your folks conducted shows the intersection of Waltman Lane and Meridian Road exceeds ACHD's acceptable level of service. That's reinforced in the letter in October when they say -- after getting the information ACHD does not recommend any modifications to Meridian Road and Waltman Lane intersection. What it tells me is that it already exceeds, but I have not been able to draw a correlation how your project improves the transportation network that it would lower what ACHD already says exceeds their level of service and, again, you guys are the experts, so I may need a little one on one on this, but I just -- I can't connect the dots and I'm looking to you, the experts, to do that.

Simison: And, Councilman, this is one thing I failed to do. We do have ACHD in the room. If there were questions specifically for ACHD we could call Justin up if that's something that any Council Member wants to do, just as a --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I appreciate that. I think -- I tend to want to understand kind of the numbers and how the applicant has drawn that conclusion first.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, I -- so, the conclusion I came to is I think similar to ACHD's, which is, you know, with our mitigation we do exceed level of service thresholds. I think the important thing to understand here is that these roughly 10,000 trips are not being created out of thin air. They are not -- they are not just being created because 10,000 more people are saying I want to go out to eat somewhere.

Cavener: Correct.

Mansfield: They are being created because they are being captured from another location. As a -- as a family, right, I'm saying you guys want to go out to eat tonight and they say where do we want to go? You don't say I'm only going out to eat to this one place that's located on this one corner or I'm not going out to eat at all. So, a commercial development in that way in my mind, right, looks -- we look at a study area and we look at the increased number of trips in that study area and those trips -- again, I don't know if they simply just appear out of thin air, I mean you have to have an increase in population, which is, you know, an increase in households to actually truly increase the number of trips. That's my understanding, because -- anyway, I will leave it there.

Cavener: And, Mr. Mayor, if I may.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think what I hear you are saying, right, is -- so, I live in south Meridian; right? I need to go to the grocery store, I'm likely driving to the Walmart that's there on Meridian and Overland, which already exceeds I think ACHD's level of service. Instead of driving to Walmart I'm going to drive to the Target. So, instead of driving to one place I'm driving to another. I hear you on that. I think that we are going to have a lot of conversation about it, at least where I'm coming from, is that the roadway network already can't support the traffic that is generated in that area and so why would we want to encourage a magnet that would bring more traffic to an area that is already overtaxed?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Commissioner Cavener, I think you may want to approve a development that increases connectivity throughout the area. These improvements do not occur without a development coming in to make them.

Cavener: Right. I agree with you on that. I hear you on that and I think that is a very important point of consideration for the Council to take in when rendering a decision tonight.

Simison: And maybe that might be something I would be interested to hear if Justin could comment on as -- it has been either 11,000 more trips that are happening on

Meridian Road or they are -- of all the trips happening on Meridian Road are 11,000 people making turning movements onto this network now that weren't going that direction before. I -- I don't know if there is a way to -- it -- when they do TIS's if they really make a distinction to that level of how many of them are captured from people already going that direction versus they are brand new, because they would not -- but for that there they would never have gone to that place in the first place when it comes to the numbers.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, I actually just checked with our traffic engineer Leah and she mentioned that the retail component there are pass-by trips that are already on the network that just make the left movement.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: On the traffic engineering portion and this might be a question for Leah, because I brought this up before. The left turn lane from -- you are on Meridian Road heading north and you want to turn left onto Waltman, is that still -- and it was brought up how short of a lane that is in photos. Is there going to be -- I was trying to remember from your report was there going to be double turn lanes going left onto Waltman as you are headed northbound on Meridian Road to turn left?

Kelsey: That was part of our phase one, two and three improvements, yes. So, the existing single turn lane has about 500 feet of storage and we were proposing doing restriping to increase that to about 475 feet.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Kelsey: Per lane. So, that would be a total of 950.

Hoaglund: Okay.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, if I may, I will say that Hawkins is committed to constructing phase one and two improvements and phase three improvement cannot be constructed at this time, because it requires a right of way take and a condemnation of a building, frankly. You can see in blue here what it would require. However, we are also providing space on our site plan for a future right of way take to allow that southbound lane to continue along our property. So, that is another kind of -- to go back to Council Member Cavener's question about why, you know, we are willing to create conditions for future expansion when that time comes and ACHD finds it appropriate to -- or the site across Waltman from us redevelops.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. To follow up. I have another question that's perplexing and we have this situation in other parts of our community and that's Ruddy Lane where it connects into the subdivision to the west. Waltman is designated as a collector and it would go into a subdivision that is not a collector and, like I said, we have got experience elsewhere. Does that have to -- can that be emergency access only -- and this might get a question for Deputy Chief Bongiorno. Does that have to be through? Because one of the things I see is I will -- I -- and it's been pointed out -- I think more people from that west subdivision will use going to Meridian Road that way, then, let's not make a change here if we can make that emergency access only, they continue doing what their routine is already and that makes one component of less traffic put that in place. But I don't know if that has to be emergency or if it has to be open at that Ruddy Lane connection.

Bongiorno: Yeah. I think in the other times that this has been brought through that was -- sorry, Mr. Mayor and Council, that -- that question was -- had been brought up. It needs to be open. It really does. Because anytime -- especially once we get Linder overpass through, that now gives Station 6 a route to get through there, because -- because currently right now that whole subdivision is one way in and one way out through Linder. So, for some reason if Linder gets blocked off our only other option is over off Ten Mile at Verbena to get into that subdivision to get all the way across. So, it really needs to be open.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Hoaglund.

Overton: And, chief, as opposed to emergency access? I mean -- I'm just trying to figure out what -- what works for both purposes here. Not having through traffic, but having -- allowing fire trucks to get through when -- if there was an emergency.

Bongiorno: Again, I -- sorry. Mr. Mayor and Council, Councilman, I would rather see it open open, like no -- no blockage. Because, again, gates, bollards, chains, all of that causes delays and everything that we do is time sensitive and if we can just get through, then, that makes it a ton better.

Hoaglund: Okay.

Bongiorno: So, that connection, the connection to Corporate, the connection of Waltman, it's all part of the grand scheme of things to get an effective firefighting force to that area in case something happens and when we have a structure fire in a multi-family dwelling, it's all hands on deck and we need everybody there as quickly as possible.

Hoaglund: Understand.

McKay: Mr. Mayor, if I -- if I could also chime in on -- on Councilman Hogan's question. Ada County Highway District -- our -- our conditions of approval state that we shall connect to Ruddy Drive and we -- Ruddy is a collector through us. So, I have no front-on housing on Ruddy. It goes -- Ruddy goes in, turns into Kearney, it's all collector, detached walks, no front-on housing, so -- so, it would not put any burden. The other thing is -- Ethan mentioned -- if we are going to capture traffic in their commercial development and reduce the number of trips on the arterials, then, we want those people to come over to Target, instead of going to another store that may be further away, such as Fred Meyer or Albertson's, but they can come to Target, they stay on the collector network, go back in through -- so on our collector and back into their subdivision and we are reducing trips. So, I think the big issue is trip capture and I think Councilman Cavener -- you know, he is trying to wrap his mind around capacity issues and thresholds. I mean we have a lot of intersections in the City of Meridian right now that exceed ACHD's threshold during the p.m. peak or the a.m. peak. It's not unusual. Go over to the mall at Christmas. Now, that's -- that's the extreme. But -- but what I'm saying is if we can capture traffic I don't think you are going to see 10,000 additional people driving down Meridian Road to go to Target. But you are going to see people that are already on Meridian Road and going, hey, there is a restaurant, there is Target. Let's whip in. We will eat, then, we will go to Target, we will buy groceries, then, we will head south after this traffic kind of, you know, filters out. You know, we -- we are trying to balance everything and I think that's -- you know, we are -- we are -- we are mitigating and we are going to be spending -- those bridges are six or eight hundred thousand apiece and we have got to build two of them and we are building collector roadways and detached ten foot paths and 14 foot detached paths. We are doing everything we can to maximize the interconnectivity and the ability for people to come and go in this area and in this section and if we do nothing, then, I guess we have all failed I think, because this is an opportunity to do something to make this a better connected section. This section has always been problematic. Forever. As long as I can remember. So, I don't think you are -- in my personal opinion you are not just rubber stamping this saying, oh, well, I guess this is as good as it gets. We have worked our tail off to get where we are today and they are still going to be working with ACHD and on what -- you know, there are other options, other -- other things that we can do and we have hired the best person to do that. She's designed your whole Meridian downtown network, so -- so we feel confident that -- that we have got the best team put together and we will be working in tandem to mitigate. Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Don't go too far, Becky, please. Change the topic just quickly from traffic to housing. Can you share with the folks here about how you choosing -- how you chose the housing that you chose and the number of multi-family versus the townhomes and the single family and the way that you did it, so that there is understanding? And I'm asking that, because as Council President Hoaglund kindly asked all of our folks that gave testimony what they would prefer to have there, can you -- can you give a contrast

to -- to doing single family versus what you have chosen to do? And -- and the reasons? Why is it -- is it, you know, financial? It doesn't pencil? Is it -- is there something to do with, you know, vehicle trips or just -- kind of give a context for how you chose what you did, so -- so, there is some understanding for myself as well.

McKay: Madam Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, that's -- that's a good question and I -- I believe it stems from the fact that it was -- in your Comprehensive Plan it promotes a diversity of housing and especially the fact that this had been designated as a mixed use community. So, the staff -- if you read some of those definitions in your Comprehensive Plan, it talks about alley load townhomes, attached, detached single family and multi-family and so, obviously, in today's marketplace doing just single product is not wise, because we are trying to provide housing for different size families, different lifestyles and definitely different incomes and, you know, if we can do like a cottage type home on a small lot and a newlywed couple can get into that, great. If somebody can't afford that and they have to rent, then, we can provide rental. If we do all single family the trip generation goes up, because single family is like 10.57 vehicle trips per day. Whereas the multi-family and the townhomes are less, because the families are obviously smaller. We need to have sustainable developments and diversity is the key, especially if we continue to have high interest rates or we slip into a recession next year. Obviously, we want to create projects that can -- are not just another subdivision with a single product and they are all 5,000 square foot lots or 4,000 square foot lots -- something that can provide housing opportunities through different economic climates.

Simison: Council, additional questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I do have a question for ACHD when it comes to the -- the traffic plan as presented by the applicant's representative and problems with phase one, phase two, that they are proposing to build and get your insights into that, Justin. Thank you.

Lucas: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I apologize for my attire tonight -- although I am wearing the brand. I'm a brand ambassador. But we were doing casual week at ACHD and so I didn't -- I didn't put on a tie for you. But I have been here so many times I thought you would forgive me. My name is Justin Lucas. I'm here representing the Ada County Highway District and glad to do my best to answer any questions you may have.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor and Justin, the applicant is proposing a phase one and phase two that they would be funding and to make happen and say that's going to -- at least allow this development to function and we know the problems with the interchange and -- and the lack of functionality at peak times. What -- I just want ACHD's perspective on that and -- and your -- your views.

Lucas: Mr. Mayor, Council President Hoaglund, so ACHD -- and I do want to just reference the record. That's important, because I can't really go beyond the record

when it comes to ACHD's comments on this application. I will reference the letter from October 18th, 2023, where ACHD provided a response to the phase one, phase two, phase three proposal -- or concept proposal from -- from the applicant and in that response we -- we basically say, in summary, that we are not -- as part of this application recommending that the phase one, phase two, phase three improvements be part of this application. So, that's what our letter says and that's what I can represent tonight. So, although the applicant provided that information to the city, ACHD -- and I recommend you do -- if you have an opportunity to read that letter. We did not revise our staff report or our conditions of approval and we did not recommend that those improvements presented by the applicant be included as part of any conditions of approval. The basic reasons for that are outlined in the letter. The analysis provided was very targeted to the Waltman Lane intersection. As most of you are aware, this is a complicated area when it comes to transportation. We are directly adjacent to the ITD interchange. There are other intersections in very close proximity to this intersection that operate all in tandem and so we were, essentially -- based on the analysis and what was provided to us, ACHD was uncomfortable recommending that those improvements be included as a condition of approval or some type of approval -- for this approval. To be clear, I'm not saying that there may not be -- the improvements are not needed in the future at this intersection. I'm not saying that at all. What I am saying is ACHD is not recommending that the proposal as presented by the applicant be included as part of their approval.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Follow up, Justin, then. To make sure we understand the process completely, because you do have the jurisdiction of the roads and I have no idea what the Council is going to do here. I'm conflicted myself on this. But if this were to go forward and we say, yeah, we think phase one and two, that -- that really helps. What -- what -- does that put you in a bad spot? Does that -- do you say, no, you are not going to do that? Help me understand that scenario.

Lucas: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, I think it is -- it wouldn't be ideal to place the applicant in that position where they have presented a proposal that has, essentially, been rejected by ACHD and for the city, then, to require that, I think it places the applicant -- the -- the applicant in a difficult situation. As I said, this is -- there is -- this is kind of a nuanced response. I'm not saying that this area is operating today or will operate in the future without congestion. That's not what I'm saying. I'm just saying that the potential solutions likely fall outside of this one intersection and will be part of a larger improvement that would be looked at -- as a -- as a larger project for overall improvement in this area and that can include a broader analysis of a much larger area, including the Meridian interchange, the intersection at Overland, the intersection at Corporate, both of those intersections, and maybe even beyond that looking at widening beyond just the intersection. The proposal, as I said, was very targeted and I think ACHD is just uncomfortable allowing minor modifications with striping and things like

that, which is presented at a very high level in this document that you -- that was provided. At this time we are just not there and maybe we get there over time, but we didn't feel it was appropriate to condition that on the applicant.

Simison: Maybe Justin --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: -- would it be safe to say that once ACHD is aware of what's going to be built in this location at that point in time might be the most appropriate time to evaluate the full needs of this area for long term improvements?

Lucas: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I think so. This application -- especially the application related to -- I think what is referenced as the I-84 and Meridian Road project, is an annexation, rezone and a Comprehensive Plan amendment. At that level ACHD is basically just providing a high level feedback. You will notice that we don't provide -- when we get to a preliminary plat, something like that, ACHD kicks in a more -- a higher level of feedback when we have more information and more details. I think working with the applicant when it comes to right of way dedication, that would occur during the platting phase, not during this phase of the -- of the application and so -- and I'm specifically referencing the Meridian -- the -- I just want to make sure I say it correctly -- I-84 and Meridian Road project. So, yeah, there are going to be future opportunities to look at this, whether the applicant is directly participating or they are participating through our impact fee program, which, you know, all of development pays impact fees and maybe there is a broader improvement needed in this area. We would want all of that to be very transparent. I think we would need a deeper level of analysis, conceptual designs. I think it's not -- it would only be fair to the city for the city to see these impacts and potential changes to the -- the network out there and with this application we just didn't feel it was appropriate to require that and that's what we explained in our letter and staff report.

Simison: Sorry, Councilman Cavener, I don't know if I cut you off. If you had a follow-up question.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, you asked the same question I was going to ask much more eloquently. So, thank you.

Simison: Okay. So, Council, any further questions for ACHD or the applicants at this time? Okay. Hate to do this everybody, but I have had a request for another recess. So, we are going to go ahead and take a ten minute recess. Does that work or -- Councilman Cavener?

Cavener: That would -- Mr. Mayor, that would be helpful. I have got a seven year old that's up a little past his bedtime, so if I can get him put down to bed, then, I won't have any more interruptions this evening.

Simison: We will try to continue at 9:15. Should give you 13 minutes.

Cavener: I should be -- I should be good for -- for that. Thank you very much.

Simison: Thank you. We stand in recess.

(Recess: 9:02 p.m. to 9:15 p.m.)

Simison: All right. Council, we will go ahead and come back from recess. If you remember correctly, we left off where Council appeared to be finished with their questions, but I will let you pick it up for whatever dialogue you would like to have or direction you would like to go from discussion, closing the public hearing, continuing to ask questions, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Yeah. I think if the Council is supportive, at least leaving the meeting open for at least some initial deliberation in case a question pops up that we need maybe better clarification of the applicant or Justin or someone else in the audience. So, if there is no objections I think let's -- let's go ahead and maybe just move into deliberations.

Simison: Okay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm happy to at least start and a couple of us I think have talked at length tonight about the amount of times we have seen different variations of, you know, an application request in this area and there have been some that I have been enthusiastically supportive of and some that I have been pretty lukewarm in supportive. I think it's a -- before maybe I even begin in my deliberations I just -- I want to thank Becky for picking up this project and trying to bring it to the finish line in light of Matt's departure. I know this was a project he was working really really hard on when we lost him and I know that this project probably carries a lot of emotional toll on Becky as well in -- in light of Matt's passing. During Becky's kind of introductory comments she asked I think a really fair question, which is, you know, if not now when and that has been the question for me that I have been struggling to answer all night long, because I have -- I have some big concerns about this project. I have traffic safety concerns. Certainly heard saying -- maybe added concerns from police and fire. I recognize I think that the impact to the schools is somewhat smaller compared to what we maybe initially thought -- what I initially thought it would be. It's still going to have an impact on our schools. But I just think that this project has a unique ability to negatively impact the quality of life

of so many of our residents and it's through no fault of the applicant. I know we say that sometimes like I love the project, I just don't love the location, but to me -- for me this is the biggest challenge with this project is not the multi-family or the single family or the commercial or the retail, all of that I think is really well thought out, which has been consistent with -- with Becky, with Hawkins' reputation -- it is just the amount of negative impact and this really cool project that will generate a lot of interest -- will have on an already exhausted corridor and so I could mirror your question of -- of the highway district to meet answers the question Becky asked, which is if not now when, and as much as it pains me, I think the when is we have a better understanding and, frankly, a funded plan from the highway district about the way we are going to circulate traffic in and around this particular project. So, it's unlikely I will be supportive of the request tonight. Not because I don't love the project, it's because I think it has the potential to be so successful that it's going to exacerbate an already glaring problem.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just -- just some thoughts that I have kind of jotted down as this has been going on. You know, one of the things that I look at this project, you know, this is kind of part of our city core. It's -- it's right here within this main boundary and we are being asked to approve -- which anytime we have in-fill development we like to do that, because that's closest to the services, all the infrastructure is in place, that is what we want to do, we want to grow from the middle out and we take a project that is in that circle, if you will, and say, no, we are not going to do that, what we are doing, then, is taking development and pushing it out. So, that's a conundrum I have there is going, okay, we want things closer to the middle and not pushing things out, which will have an impact on that intersection. It's just we are -- we are putting it someplace else, mitigating it to some degree, because they can use Linder Road overpass one of these days and Locust Grove and different things, but if you put 20,000 people or 20,000 cars in south Meridian, there is going to be impact and some of the comments about, well, these are pass through, they are going to be going somewhere, they are doing something here, you know, there is -- that's -- so, there is that conundrum for me, pushing it to -- to the outer limits and also to that I think Councilman Cavener, you know, brings up some good points about what is the plan and we need to have that plan put in place and sometimes we have to push it to make that happen. Otherwise, it never gets done. You know, that kind of plays into it. Okay. What are we -- what do we do here? There were a couple of comments I think -- I don't know if Ken Freeze is still here. He talked about a convention center. Would love the idea. Absolutely love the idea. Where is the money coming from? We are looking at some plans for that, working with people to see what we can do for something in the future, but that's quite a ways down the road. Pausing development, take a breather he said, we looked at that as Council here a while back and talk to -- and asked counsel can you give us the tutorial on moratoriums. You know, we are governed by state code and, the Local Land Use Planning Act and that's one of the things -- we just can't arbitrarily say, oh, we are going to stop. We are going to stop, let things catch up. There is private property rights

involved. We have a Comprehensive Plan as required by the state of Idaho. We have those in place and that's why there is entitlement on that now. There is a commercial designation that someone can come in and use and, then, ACHD would get involved at a more granular level, those types of things. We don't want to have commercial right up against residential. That's why some of this plan is very attractive to have residential and have it move and get larger and, then, have the commercial end and that's kind of what the Council was looking at early on was we were trying to look at different things separately and mixed use in one -- one hand, you know, and -- but yet doing them in separate -- separate applications. So, that's why we kind of brought this together trying to figure this out and that's the thing about this Comprehensive Plan, there was a lot of mention -- single family homes. Single family homes. Doesn't meet the definition for what this FLU is for that area. That's not what it's going to be, so -- and we do want to provide a variety of housing in our community. So, those are just kind of my thoughts that I'm working through, trying to figure out what -- what does this mean for our community. Is it do nothing? Is it doing something where we add other connection and activity to? But is that the best we could do? Or is there something better? I don't know. It's -- it's one of those tough ones. Just some of my thoughts on this.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Along that same theme, initially, just because of my background, I got caught up in looking at the traffic -- and don't smile, Justin, you know that's what I do. I understand the intersection of Waltman and Meridian. It's made of concrete with rebar. If it was just asphalt it would be pretty easy to talk about how we could reconfigure things, but we built this to last for a very long time and really not be changed. So, now we want to bring in a big development, but we don't really have that means of just changing the intersection. We don't have any extra right of way to purchase. We have got a very expensive roadway that we built and it doesn't appear that it's going to live up to the demand. The one thing I do like -- and there is several things I like and don't like. There is one thing I do like is the amount of connectivity that this brings to that area. We keep talking about Meridian and Waltman, but in reality what you are doing by turning Waltman into a collector and, then, connecting it to Corporate is you are -- you are bringing two different roadways back out to Meridian Road. You are also allowing traffic to use Southeast 5th and go straight out to Franklin Road and, then, use Ruddy to go west out to Linder. If it didn't have all that connectivity this would be a really easy decision. I wouldn't be supporting it at all. But looking at the fact that you have got four different ways out at a minimum to get through and if you use Ruddy to the west you, then, literally have four different roads out onto Linder Road and, really, in thinking about it -- I don't think this is a situation where we are going to have a lot of people from this new development driving west through those residential areas. In fact, I think we are just going to be as people from those residential areas to the west driving back through the apartments, through the single family, through the R-15, because they are going to be trying to get to the Target store. They are going to be trying to get across to the interstate to get on the interstate. They are going to be trying to get to Winco and

Home Depot. Not too many people are going to be headed west to try to get to an overpass over Linder when it's completed. I do think the Linder overpass is going to have a big significant impact, just like Locust Grove did when it was built. But none of us know what that impact is going to be. It's going to take cars off the road for those people that know that they can cross the interstate. Those are not the folks that need to get on the interstate. I watched Locust Grove. I lived right off of it when it was built. When the estimates came up for what the traffic count was going to be and they opened the doors and that thing took off, it exceeded those literally from the first week. If you build it they will come and that's what's going to happen to Linder Road overpass. I come from a subdivision where I have stood in front of this Council, as you did, and complained and worried and warned about a project coming through that was going to bring traffic through the development I live in and I commend every one of you for doing what you did and for doing the homework that you did tonight. The bottom line comes down to at some point something's going to go in there and having a project that's designed to this level, it's not huge warehouses next to the residential, but actually designed in such a way that you have got a buffer of single family next to the residential and, then, it buffers to R-15 before R-40 and still, because of all the amenities they put in place, still only has a 10.72 units per acre total development. It is pretty impressive. And I got to admit when you are making a run at how to try to fit this in and buffer that residential, I don't know that you are going to get a better option at any point in time. To, then, put the commercial next to it, it completely makes sense. I still would like to see a connecting road between the two of them, even if it was tucked back closer to the interstate. But I think these two work well. My -- my overwhelming concern I'm still struggling with is how that's going to impact that traffic on Meridian or Waltman. I have to remember -- we keep focusing on two times. We keep focusing on this window of time in a.m. and this window in time in p.m. and the day is made of 24 hours and a retail store generally does not hit that a.m., p.m. They are open all day open to close. And I think sometimes we get a little tunnel vision when we only worry about those certain amounts of time in the day and we forget about the rest of the day when those traffic numbers are well within reason and they flow well. I don't know what the long range plans for this intersection can be and, obviously, ACHD right now does not either. We can't make any promises about changes to the intersection and I think it would be improper for any of us to try to make -- even best guesses on what it will be or what it would take, but I think the way you have laid out Corporate, the way you have laid out the connectivity around that, I just don't think for the neighbors and people involved, that you are going to find a better project than what's in front of you now. I think you can continue to hold out to try to find one, but I have done that and you -- sometimes you have to understand that what you are looking at is the best project you are going to have for that area and, like I said, I'm still trying to decide what my final decision is going to be on this, but I think the developers in this case -- both of you working together, coming together, presenting together, showing how you are working together and how all this is going to work and how these roadways are going to be built has gone a long way to showing your partnership together and how you want to make this work in the community and I appreciate it.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I really appreciate hearing from my fellow Council and their well-spoken thoughts. I echo the gratitude for having you here this evening. It -- I have never been at a public hearing -- and I have done this for seven years. Have had more well researched crowd than this one. I had the opportunity to chair the Planning and Zoning hearing for the Costco that went in on Ten Mile and even then we didn't have folks that came with -- with such great stats. So, thank you all for the time and effort. This is a dream for us to have residents come and share with us these things. We often sit in this room without much feedback making very large decisions for our -- our 135,000 residents and so thank you very much for being here and thank you to the applicants for all of the time invested to answer your questions. Sort of guessing what we were going to want to know, knowing how our Council makes decisions and trying to come as prepared as possible. I agree with Councilman Overton that it was exceptionally rare to have two -- I have never done a hearing in this many years where both of them are open at the same time, like we are doing tonight. It just doesn't happen and it doesn't happen that we have two developers with different ideas, different projects, totally different concepts to come together and work together like this. So, that is not the reason that I'm making my decision, but I just think that it's a -- it's a pretty cool thing that is -- just doesn't happen. So, myself and my fellow Council, all have different things about this project that we really appreciate and really like and things that might be challenging for us in the decision. For myself, my -- my main concern I think is the -- is the Comprehensive Plan -- plan map -- Comprehensive Plan map amendment. It's a mouthful. Anytime that we make a change to the comp plan it's a huge -- hugely important decision, because of the nature of the comp plan. I had the privilege of being involved in that at the beginning and we do take changes to those very seriously. There was a quote that was presented of our Mayor about that and he has stuck to his -- I think it was -- it was intended to maybe be a negative quote, but -- but what he said was is we were going to make it harder for comp plan amendments to happen and -- and we have. He -- he made a proposal to only allow those amendments to be made twice a year and that didn't exist before he brought that to us. So, he did -- he did hold to his promise to our community to make comp plan map amendments a more rare thing than they used to be and I kind of doubted that that would actually be -- I was concerned that that would limit our development community, but it hasn't. It's actually -- it's real work -- worked out really well. So, when we have one of those amendments before us I take it very seriously, because that document is a very clear statement of what our public has communicated to us and so to that end, moving away from the mixed use community for me is the biggest concern. I really like the designs and the concepts of both of these projects. I like the pad sites and the shops and everything about the commercial area, except for the large retail, because I think that everything else about that represents a mixed use community, except for those large retail and it's not so much even the amount of square footage. We can have 234,000 square feet of retail, but in several fewer types of -- of buildings than a large -- than a big box store. So, that's the main concern for me in regard that. That to me ties into traffic. That's where the traffic concerns come from me. All of the same concerns as my fellow Council in terms of turn lanes and actual design and ACHD's presentation, but for me the -- the driving factor in

all of that is probably the big box store style and it's -- it's nothing to do with my purse. I shopped with them. It's nothing -- I'm not like an anti-big box store person that, you know, buys everything online and not -- not one of those at all. But I think that that is the challenge for me that I'm having with this application and -- and that being the location for those. We are going to have a ton of folks coming up from Kuna to use this and they are going to cross over that Meridian Road intersection, which will be something they might not have done before, maybe they would have gone to the Walmart and stayed on the south side, and so I think that's an element we have to consider. We really can't say exactly whether people are already driving over that intersection to go to work or to go home. We don't really have a way to know that. So, I think that that -- you know, those folks that are coming from the -- from Kuna area and the south side, I absolutely believe that with a big box store, which is a store that they can't get going elsewhere, they can't -- there is not another area for them to go to get to that store than this one. Whereas if you have smaller uses, like the mixed use community design, there might be other options for those folks and that they wouldn't come to this area, because there isn't a big box store there that they have access to with other street designs that might accommodate more of the traffic. So, like Councilman Overton, I'm still thinking this through, just sharing a couple of my thoughts and the things that have been the most challenging for me, which is just really taking into account that comp plan change and being really thoughtful about that. I don't have as much concern about the annexation request. I think that that is -- is not -- really not that concerning to me to consider annexing -- or that the applicant would need the annexation without approval of the other request. I think it's -- like I said, I think it's -- it's pretty great to have these two applicants and applications be heard together, but I also think that that's created limitations for them as well in that we are not now allowed to vote separately on them, where -- where we may have -- it's my understanding that we are not permitted to vote separately on them.

Simison: I believe that we will have to take two separate votes on both of them.

Perreault: Okay. I apologize then. We will have separate votes on each one. So, we could approve one and not the other.

Simison: Correct.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you. I apologize for that misunderstanding. And really that's -- that summarizes my thoughts at this time.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. And Council Woman Perreault brings up an interesting point about the big box stores and that's the thing that troubles me, too, is there is an entitlement already in place for that western property and it is something that a retailer could come in there and say we want to be there and even though it's not up against the freeway, if

we don't annex all that, they can -- they are entitled to that and that's something I don't want to see, because we have experience with big box against residential and it's -- it's not a good thing and what control do we have over the access points and the requirements and all those types of things -- where here we have a player who is coming in with their two plans that blend together that although ACHD would be a party to this, then, they figure out the road situation and -- and there is things at play where the developer is a participant with their wallet as well. So, that kind of comes into that as well. So, it's -- everyone could lose here. You walk out, if it gets denied you think you are a winner and you end up being the loser. So, it's just one of those things that having served on Council previously as well and seeing things as they develop and what think happens doesn't happen and vice-versa, you know, we -- I want to make sure we have a project that -- that is better than what it could be -- and -- and I lean that way with something like this. So, just -- just a thought regarding that entitlement that -- because that weighs heavy on me.

Simison: So, just some thoughts because this is what's great about, quite frankly, it's a fascinating project in, you know community design, community development and what will happen versus what may or may not happen all the way around. You know, I think that we should all put our best thoughts -- maybe we did on the record in a time capsule and say 20 years who got it right in terms of what occurs. Question was asked by someone earlier who drives to the intersection at 5:00 o'clock. Well, I can tell you for the last year and change I had to. Locust Grove was closed. That's my normal route -- route home. I drove through here, along with everyone else, who normally took -- took Locust Grove. Traffic was completely different than what had previously -- previously been the two years before that and, you know, we are constantly -- constantly evolving, changing traffic patterns, because of all the road construction that's occurring throughout south Meridian, north Meridian, all over Meridian and so, yeah, I got to -- got the fun of going through that every, you know, two times a week at 5:00 o'clock when I got to go home with those hours, but at the same time, you know, it's, oh, Kuna has got to go there. Well, great. That means instead of getting off the interstate and going left and backing up the -- trying to get -- trying to get over Overland, they are going to go right and they are going to go in there to shop and I don't think that they are going to go down to Kuna, then, turn around and come back and make additional trips -- it's going to disrupt the traffic pattern. I don't know what it's going to do, that's -- but that's just -- you know, it's going to be different. That's -- it may make it so much easier for people heading south on Overland, because so many people are going right and turning in here. I don't know. But it won't be the same I can tell you that, one way or the other. If this were to occur and all these changes exist and State Highway 16 goes in and Linder Road -- for how long, that's what my statements were before, you know, it's -- you know. But that occurs on Eagle Road every day. That occurs on Locust Grove every day. I was so excited -- thank you, Justin, for two lane road down Locust Grove. Now, I -- I never used to have traffic jams on Locust Grove. Now I get them. More people are driving that road, because it's been nicely improved. So, that means that -- that means Eagle Road actually has fewer people on it right now, because people have transitioned. That's what's going to happen with all of our roads. So, if -- we are trying to outguess what's going to happen by our -- the decisions -- the road network, I don't

think we are going to be able to do it as a Council. I don't think ACHD can do it. We can predict a model. We can AI. We can darkhorse it. Whatever we want to try to figure it out. But I don't think we are going to know for a fact until each retailer goes in, until each decision point is made for this area. So, that's just one aspect of the conversation. I think my comments earlier to Justin was -- we all know -- Waltman -- I have been with the city since 2007. Waltman has always been a problem. Even when we got it reconfigured Waltman is still -- has always been a problem. That intersection. Until we know what's going to happen there I don't think that we are really going to figure out a long-term viable solution for the entire area. That's just my two cents. It may be full of concrete and rebar and they all need to be dug up and redone in five, ten years, maybe the other, because until that develops we don't know what the impacts are going to be for that area. The other element kind of going back to the Meridian Development Corporation Destination Downtown entryway to our community. I actually feel like our entryway to the community was -- has been set in stone or set in place for as long as the Corporate Park has been there on this -- on the right-hand side. I don't think you are going to create a monument destination entry point on the left-hand side -- and I'm blind on my right. So, I only have -- I only -- I only look at my left eye, you know, but I -- what I see when I drive in is what I see. I see the auto oriented district of Meridian's entrance in -- into our downtown and that's the way it was set up with the split corridor. That's the way it was -- you know, all -- all the businesses north of Franklin are designed to be driven to, not walk to. So, even as we talked about the mixed use desires for the Waltman area, it's contrary to the transportation network that was set up and designed to deliver people via cars to those areas. If it is a Target, with a Home Depot, with a Winco, with Taco Bell, all -- all the restaurants are right there and they are all there and they create the intersection that -- again, you talk about all the problems in this area, you know, try to get out Wendy's and Taco Bell out of that -- in and out of that parking lot with the -- you know, I don't know if Sonya was here, if she approved that, you know, with -- with those -- it's -- it's a mess, you know, especially during certain times of the day. Especially at lunch hour, you know. And this is just a long way of going through to say there are challenges in this area that are -- been in the making for 30 plus years. The -- the future of this area I think was set in place 30 plus years ago. We have tried to make the -- figure out the best we can. There is still changes that are going to have to evolve in this area over the next 30 years, probably, before -- hopefully it gets right and sometimes that's what it takes is you got to get everything put in place and, then, build around it how you can actually truly navigate and move through it. Kudos to the team of working together. That's -- you know, you delivered what -- what Council asked for, a picture vision and now it's just a matter of whether or not that picture vision meets their desires, their goals and the outcomes for the City of Meridian and we will see where that goes. So, thanks for letting me ramble.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Could we hear from staff or the applicant -- I assume from staff -- if one of these applications were to get approved and the other would not, all of the

improvements wanted to be done I assume by both applicant -- applicants collectively. I don't know how they had chosen to, quote, unquote, divide the responsibilities regarding infrastructure improvements. But it sounds like Corporate Lane would be required to go through whether either is approved; is that correct? And how does that look for everything else that will be required in terms of sidewalks and whatnot?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, Council, Tanner Creek is -- is planning to complete the improvements for the extension of Corporate. If they failed to do so, the applicant of I-84 -- the developer of I-84 and Meridian Road is on the hook for it through their development agreement. Remember that you have a comp plan map amendment for both properties associated with the -- with the I-84 and Meridian Road project. So, you can't just approve -- I don't know what you have in mind. You can't just approve the Tanner Creek without at least the map amendment for it -- for it to be in. So, they are -- they are intertwined to some degree and -- you know. And if you don't approve the map amendment, then, the proposed development isn't consistent with the-long range plan Did I miss anything, Bill?

Nary: No, I would say the same thing as Sonya stated. I mean I guess to maybe move more specific for Council Member Perreault's question, the first -- the first question really is the Comprehend Plan request. If that's not something that Council is in favor of, that does drive the -- the item number two. The annexation is, obviously, independent of that. I mean, again, you can annex the property and not agree with the comp plan amendment, but what that means it, then, would come with whatever it was currently designated on the comp plan. So, that isn't what has been requested, so -- I mean it does make it a little sticky, but certainly you have the ability to do that separately.

Allen: Just another note, if I may, Mr. Mayor. I really don't know which direction you are contemplating on this, but if you would approve a map amendment for both properties and change the land use designation, you have a development -- or if you would not approve the Tanner Creek property you have a development agreement that -- approved uses that would not be consistent with the future land use map designation as well. So, it's kind of a slippery slope if you don't move both of them forward.

Simison: What I'm hearing is either yes or no to both is the preferred way for the city's approach.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun,

Hoaglun: I was going to ask this earlier for Sonya -- for staff here. There was something in your application for the Hawkins proposal about the construction of the Linder Road overpass scheduled in their work plan -- in ITD's work plan and consideration should be given to inclusion of the provision in the DA which limits development to a large retail store at this time and delays retail two building and pads

three and four until such time as the Linder Road overpass is completed and that was something -- it was at a staff recommendation. I'm trying to remember. Did the Commission agree to that? Is that just something that we should think about?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, Council, the Commission did not agree to that. That was a suggestion by ACHD of how you might mitigate some of the traffic impacts for now.

Hoaglund: And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I might have the Hawkins representative come. Ethan. Kind of address that situation. Maybe the timing of what you have in mind.

Mansfield: Yeah. Absolutely. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund. So, first of all, the Commission did not place -- not recommend placing any restrictions, just to clarify. Secondly, our retail one has an agreement with -- or a requirement, rather, for co-tenancy with retail two. So, we could not do this deal if there was a restriction placed on the -- frankly, the pads -- the one retail to the challenge is that, you know, we invest in the entire center and if we don't have certainty that we can bring shops, pads in with the retail one, that makes it financially unviable for us to really develop the center.

Hoaglund: And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Follow up. And also, really, the uncertainty exists to the economy. I mean we can -- if we were to approve this and let you go at it, that -- it's not to say that it's just going to be done boom, boom, boom, so --

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, that's absolutely correct. I mean as it is now we are looking at a 2026 -- spring of 2026 completion for retail one, but if there is uncertainty at all outside -- I mean there is, obviously, economic uncertainty as you say. Additional statutory uncertainty -- or I guess additional imposition of certainty really throws another wrench in whether this deal ever gets done.

Simison: And if I could just add, you know, in perspective, I think the benefit of Linder Road overpass is that it alleviates congestion at the Meridian area overall generally. I don't know that it contributes mightily to allowing access to or from the site location long term and -- and we are going to get that 4.3 million from the state. So, one step closer to making Linder a reality.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Glad we kept the public hearing open. Something that's still floating around in my head is this presentation by our ACHD representative here and he said that ACHD didn't approve this phase one, phase two, phase three concept as it sits and so that being said, is there any chance -- and I don't know if -- if -- who you would like to invite up here -- maybe Lucas could come up here, if that's okay with the Mayor, and let us know if there is a chance that the applicant's proposal would be denied once they officially presented plans to ACHD. So, if the applicant -- in other words, if the applicant chooses to move forward with the design that ACHD isn't saying no to right now, but hasn't said yes to, I don't know where that leaves us is essentially what I'm trying to get it. I'm not able to say yes to the -- I don't -- I'm not a traffic specialist, so I can't say, yeah, phase one, two and three will solve the problem and that's what, essentially, I feel like we are being asked to decide in our decision making.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, I think it's worth noting that -- a couple of things. Number one is that without some sort of more concrete understanding of what's going on that property, it's impossible for us to move forward towards a solution with ACHD. That's -- you know. And that's kind of what Justin and I talked about recently after he came and discussed. He came over and I said, hey, we are -- we are willing to work with you to understand what you guys need here and we understand that -- you know, that -- that you don't have enough detail here. We can provide more, but we -- we understand what we can actually construct here, what we can get close to building, because without a land use approval we can't make progress with ACHD and we are committed to -- absolutely committed to making progress with ACHD. Our -- our shopping center tenants desire these improvements and we want to deliver them. We are not simply trying to take the path of least resistance, we are trying to make this thing work and so that's my commitment to talk this commitment to making it work. We want to talk more with ACHD, but it's first without some sort of land -- you know, what we need to talk to ACHD about a specific proposal.

Simison: And to add in -- I'm going to put words in Justin's mouth, but there is also the Federal Highway Administration -- there is many other people that are going to be involved long term to figure out what would need -- what could or would be done, not just on the local roads, but the impacts to the other roads around there. So, it's a larger conversation that if this is approved I think that they are going to have to work hard to come up with something before things move forward with a better plan.

Lucas: Yeah. Mr. Mayor and Members of Council, I don't really have much more to offer, except for what's in our letter. Just to reiterate, we -- we reviewed all the information that was provided. We provided our analysis and findings to the city through our standard process and staff reports. One of the challenges with this development -- and I came to the -- the -- for Meridian development is -- is all that has been requested in front of the city today, essentially, is an annexation, rezone and Comprehensive Plan map amendment, which the detail available to ACHD is limited at that level and we don't have the ability to directly apply conditions until we get to some other type of application. So, I'm not trying to, you know, dodge the question, I'm just -- I'm just trying provide the context of how it's not always a perfect system, we -- we

provide all the information we can, but I do want to be clear both to modify Waltman Lane and Meridian Road -- as of right now are not accepted or approved by ACHD. Could the applicant provide further information and further analysis and seek some sort of subsequent approval or hardship at ACHD to do something to support their development, I think that's certainly possible and it appears that's what their intention is, but I'm not going beyond that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: We are talking about a concept plan.

Lucas: Right.

Perreault: And I get that. If -- if the intersection were to be altered per the proposed -- proposal tonight, the different phases, or something similar, adding an additional lane north and south at some point, additional turn lanes, do you anticipate that that would not -- that would not, I guess, benefit the future long-term decisions that need to be made in this area? In other words, if you -- if you come to an agreement with the applicant, that sounds to me -- what I heard from you before was that may or may not actually work well in the long term. Even if you come to an agreement with them once you do have more detail, that is something that -- I'm not in your shoes and I can't make that decision for you, but as we have all mentioned here tonight, it's -- this is critically important for us and so we have -- we have sat here many nights and talked about decisions that we didn't make and now we are trying to fix a problem that we had made, that we -- you know. So -- so, we can't look in the future, we are not prophets, but we can ask the right questions at the time that we are making the decisions and so if you truly believe that there is not a single type of -- I'm not putting words in your mouth, but if there is not a solution that the applicant can present in any way, shape, or form, that will benefit the future of this area for -- from the transportation department's perspective, that is important and I know you -- you can't say that, you know what's even going to happen, because you all haven't designed that. But if you have hesitation and there is concern that we are going to be redoing this intersection again or that it's going to negatively affect what might be done in this odd interaction in our community, I think it's important for us to know.

Lucas: Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Perreault, you know, once again, I -- I don't mean to do this -- to try and be evasive, but ACHD provided a letter with all of our analysis on this specific question and related to the phases and all that, so -- and I have to be careful, because when we make decisions and we are issuing these statements, this is ACHD's official position and I'm here tonight to attempt to try and clarify where I can and so I bring us back to that documentation, because in the end that is ACHD's official position and that being said, I can provide I think this context, which is sometimes -- it's easy and I think in a land use decision to connect a specific improvement at a specific intersection to a specific developer. That's -- that's easy to

do, because that's what we are here talking about tonight. But it is very fair to say that this development is one portion -- if approved is -- certainly would add more traffic to what is an area that already has a lot of traffic and so I think what the data actually does show that we have shared is that regardless of what happens with this development, ACHD, working with the City of Meridian based on your priorities and your priority lists, may need to seek improvements at this intersection regardless of what your decision is tonight. I mean I think that's a -- it's a fair -- I think it's a fair assumption based on the data that has been presented to you, because as the city continues to grow and develop there will be more growth and traffic across the city, including at this development, and I really appreciate what the Mayor said earlier as you contemplate these decisions and as you consider the traffic information, it's a growing and changing and dynamic system and the impacts of new overpasses and new highways and major projects on -- in other parts of the city, new growth to the south and to the north and to the northwest and how all of that works together, we are all, you know, in this together and it's -- it's a dynamic system and so I think that, you know, you -- you have -- your -- I don't envy your position to have to, you know, make these decisions, but we do our best to try and provide as much data as we can with the information that has been presented to us and I think there is a limiting factor in this specific case where we have provided our feedback based on the information that we have and it's -- if the city wants more than that I think we would need to -- you know, it's -- it may not be -- the applicant may not even be able to provide the answer, because the answer may fall to an analysis that goes above and beyond, you know, even the influence of this one single application as you consider all of the things that are happening in and around an interchange. It's a complex system. So, I hope I'm not -- I'm not trying to be evasive. I'm just trying to maybe put it in a little bit of context as you consider your decision. Once again, ACHD does not recommend approval or denial of applications based on traffic impacts. That's not our role. We try to explain the impacts. We have -- we call our level of service -- we call it a planning threshold, which is we want to be transparent about the increase in traffic that's occurring, but traffic in and of itself is a value judgment and a judgment call that everyone -- and there is lots of differences of opinion about what is the level of traffic that is acceptable and this is a struggle that we will continue to have as a community over these next many years as we urbanize. I grew up in southern California, I'm very familiar with traffic and I love it here and we do have certainly increased congestion during certain parts of the day in our county, there is no doubt about that. Comparative to other areas, it's a whole different ballgame and we are all just working together to try and figure this out and decide if -- if -- if it's always wider roads and increased width of the road and more lanes and there is positives and negatives to those approaches and I think that's all the kinds of things that we struggle with and with that I have probably said too much in the context of this application and I appreciate the answer to respond anything else.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I beat you to the punch. Thank you, Justin. I think the problem is we are trying to ask for information months ahead of the time you guys would be able to give it to us, just because we want to have as much as we can at this moment in time to try to make the best decision. So, I understand what you are saying and we live with it.

Simison: Yeah. Thank you, Justin. And my comments earlier about Locust Grove are -- ring true and it's -- it's just a microcosm of life where I used to not go down Locust Grove at all, because it was nothing but Meridian High School students trying to get into Meridian High. You couldn't go that way. Now you can drive right past and not worry about it. Now you got to wait one traffic signal light to turn left onto Franklin in the morning. Problem is two miles down, but not really a problem, just a different -- a different experience, a different time and location. So, yeah, fix it off for us everywhere. That would be great. Council, close the public hearings? More dialogue? You need another break and order some late night snacks?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I move that we close the public hearing on H-2021-0099.

Perreault: Second.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public on H-2021-0099. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Yeah. This is the one that this Comprehensive Plan map amendment and the annexation portion does have one outstanding issue, requesting a waiver regarding the vehicular connection -- not providing that and just doing the pedestrian between the two. So, Mr. Mayor, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2021-0099 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 21st, 2023, and that the request for a waiver to UDC 11-3A-3A.2 be granted and that only a pedestrian experience path would be needed for that area.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Do I have discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglun, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, nay; Perreault, nay; Strader, absent; Overton, yea.

Simison: Mayor votes ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: TWO AYES. TWO NAYS. TWO ABSENT. MAYOR AYE.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Moving on to the next one, H-2022-0048. Again these are decisions we do not make lightly. There was good testimony as brought out and trying to balance what is the best for this property and for me the entitlement that weighs on this and what that would -- how that would impact people. There are issues with the access in terms of the amount of the -- the amount that they are bringing to this project is -- is something that is good and I think the work with ACHD I think will drive a solution down the road that is much needed for what we have right now. So, with that explanation, Mr. Mayor, I would move approval of -- I will close the public hearing on H-2022-0048. That's my motion.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on H-2022-0048 Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Okay. Mr. Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Now that we have closed the public hearing -- get into my head to much. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2022-0048 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 21st, 2023, with modifications that the construction of the noise abatement wall and berm -- could -- will be moved from the first phase of development to the first phase of development that's platted adjacent to I-84. The removal of DA condition number 1-H, which requires the Linder Road overpass to be completed first completion of occupancy -- certificate of occupancy. Sorry. Certificate of occupancy within the development and also deletion of condition of the preliminary plat number 2-C, which requires a bridge to be constructed for vehicles, but it would require the construction of a pedestrian pathway at that site.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Item H-2022-0048. Is there discussion? Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglun, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, nay; Perreault, nay; Strader, absent; Overton, yea.

Simison: Mayor votes aye and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: TWO AYES. TWO NAYS. TWO ABSENT. MAYOR AYE.

Simison: Thank you very much. Appreciate everyone's time and interest and being here on these projects.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 3. Ordinance No. 23-2039: An Ordinance (Petsche Rezone H-2023-0039) for rezone of a parcel of land within Block 5 of F.A. Nourse's Third Addition to Meridian (a recorded plat in Book 6 at Page 289 of Ada County records) within a portion of the northeast quarter of Section 7, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 0.60 acres of land from C-C (Community Business) zoning district to O-T (Old Town) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 3, Ordinances. First item up is ordinance No. 23-2039. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance for the rezone of a parcel of land within Block 5 of F.A. Nourse's Third Addition to Meridian (a recorded plat in Book 6 at Page 289 of Ada County records) within a portion of the northeast quarter of Section 7, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 0.60 acres of land from C-C (Community Business) zoning district to O-T (Old Town) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this Ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, we need a motion.

Simison: Oh, sorry. If not, do I have a motion?

Perreault: I'm eager to get out of here, too. Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve Ordinance No. 23-2039.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 23-2039. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Perreault, yea; Strader, absent; Overton, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

- 4. Ordinance No. 23-2040: An ordinance (Ringneck Place Subdivision – H-2023-0009) annexing a parcel of land located in Government Lot 3 of Section 5, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A;” rezoning 1.73 acres of such real property from R1 (Estate Residential) to R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next item up is Ordinance No. 23-2040. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance annexing a parcel of land located in Government Lot 3, Section 5, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A;” rezoning 1.73 acres of such real property from R1 (Estate Residential) to R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this

ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody who would like it read in its entirety? Then do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move to approve Ordinance No. 23-2040.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 23-2040. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Perreault, yea; Strader, absent; Overton, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Not a future meeting topic, just I wanted to pass along my appreciation to you, Mayor and Council, staff and those in attendance. Apologies for the added delays tonight with me and Lincoln. Wife had something unintended that was a conflict. We didn't have childcare. So, in addition to me being thankful for you guys all year long, I was especially appreciative of you all tonight and indulging me a little bit with a couple of extra breaks. So, thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move we adjourn our session.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:17 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____/_____/_____
MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK