

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, February 20, 2024, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Joe Borton, Luke Cavener, Liz Strader, John Overton, Anne Little Roberts and Doug Taylor.

Others Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Sonya Allen, Linda Ritter, Brian McClure, Scott Colaianne, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Joe Borton
☒ Anne Little Roberts	☒ John Overton
☒ Doug Taylor	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is February 20, 2024, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: It looks like we do not have our pastor here for community invocation or -- he is not a pastor, but a representative.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: So, we will go ahead and move on to adoption of the agenda.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: There are no changes noted, so I will move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Strader: 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: ALL AYES.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Public Hearing for Pathways (H-2023-0061) by Mussell Construction, Inc., located at 965 E. Ustick Rd.**
 - A. Request: Annexation of 1.11 acres of land with an L-O zoning district.
 - B. Request: Conditional Use Permit for an education institution that takes access from an arterial street without a safe, separate pedestrian and bikeway access between the neighborhood and the school site.

Simison: Okay. So, with that we will move right into our Action Items this evening. First item up is a public hearing for Pathways, H-2023-0061. We will open this public hearing for any comments by anybody regarding the request.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: The question I had was if it's just -- there is -- one of the missing items is an ACHD report. Is one week really sufficient to get it and utilize it, even if it's a relatively straightforward application?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council -- Council. I'm a little leery of only a week, but that's what the applicant requested and I'm not sure when we will have that ACHD report. So, if you continue it to the 27th as requested it may need to get continued again. They are -- they are in a time crunch. They are trying to get open this -- this fall and so that's -- we are trying to accommodate that and trying to expedite it as much as we can, but I'm a little concerned for the same reasons.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: As long as you are not -- your department is not shortcut in the ability to do what you do, to receive it, review it, interpret it, provide guidance. If we have to continue it twice I would rather try and accommodate the applicant in hopes that it's quick, understanding that there might be challenges if it comes in late.

Allen: I know it's under review by ACHD.

Borton: Okay.

Allen: I tried to get an update today and I did not -- was not able to get one, so --

Simison: And I know -- notice we -- I don't think we have anybody from the applicant present to provide any guidance or feedback. So, Council, what's your pleasure?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Question for Sonya. I can't recall -- was there anybody in attendance for this application at Planning and Zoning?

Allen: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Council, yes, there was.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Maybe just a quick follow up. I was wondering the challenges -- we were trying to kind of strike being responsive to the applicant's needs. I do urge a little bit of caution. I don't -- I would not otherwise be in a position next week where we continue it again for yet another week. I don't know -- I can't see the audience, I don't know if there is people that are here to testify. I'm very sympathetic when people give up time to -- to come and be here. So, just a point that I think is worth addressing.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Mr. Mayor, I just -- I didn't think anyone is present in the room today for this item. Is there? Okay. Okay. So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: The other side of the spectrum is if we are reluctant to take any action one way or the other on this or any item in a similar situation because we don't have some critical reports that staff utilizes to give us direction, we can -- it might be inefficient use of time and for the public's testimony, because while you may end up coming back, if we receive testimony and, then, we end up continuing it, because we want to make sure we have all the information, would you rather come back twice? That's -- that's the challenge sometimes. So, I'm -- my -- my general reaction is to not -- not take action on it. Generally to continue it in hopes that there is a one singular presentation of all the information. But if folks are here in reliance upon a scheduled hearing --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: And apologies if I wasn't -- seemed to kind of make comments. I wasn't suggesting necessarily that we would take testimony this evening. My reluctance is to continue it for next -- to next week without strong confidence that we will have the ACHD staff report at that point. So, to me I think two weeks is probably more what I would be recommending and give the applicant and ACHD and staff a little bit more time, rather than finding ourselves next week -- ACHD wasn't able to get the report done in time or staff hasn't had the opportunity to review it like we would like and so we are continuing it yet another week and the public have come down with the expectation of being able to testify and asking them to come back now for a third time.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I appreciate that clarification. That would be Tuesday, March 5th. If it ensures that it might be the best opportunity for a single hearing, so the public knows they are not down here an additional time. One of the challenges, as I understand it, was some posting of the property, which is applicant led. So, I'm more inclined to continue it for two weeks to March 5th as well. Curious what the rest of Council -- any concern with that?

Simison: Okay.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: With understanding we are going to do this to have one efficient hearing, so everyone can hear the same information together and make the decision in front of the public, who we appreciate coming down to be present for this. We want to get it right, not rush it, so with that I'm going to make a motion that we continue Item H-2023-0061 to Tuesday, March 5th.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to continue Item 1 to Tuesday, March 5th. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

2. Public Hearing continued from February 13th, 2024 for Mixed Use Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment - Mixed Use (H-2023-0057) by City of Meridian, located City Wide

- A. Request: 2023 Mixed Use Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment Mixed Use to update and/or replace certain text and graphics associated with the mixed-use sections, including other minor revisions, terms and a new appendix.

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to the next item, which is Item 2, which is a public hearing continued from February 13th, 2023, for Mixed Use Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment, H-2023-0057. We will continue this public hearing with staff comments.

McClure: Mr. Mayor and City Council, I'm here for the third time to talk to you about the mixed use changes to the Comprehensive Plan. As a recap of the last meeting, there was a -- there was a desire for Council to consider public comment. While there were some broader ideas discussed than what's covered in this application, the comments specific to mixed use generally revolved around the concerns for removing the square foot limitation in mixed use. Related, the existing and proposed text considerations for building height. The first bullet point here is staff and commission recommendation to Council to more broadly address building site context and transitions. There are several policies that support this. Staff previously considered public comment and while it's difficult to disagree with the concerns, it's our opinion that the proposed text is very appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan. That is not to imply there aren't opportunities for improvement in the process. The second bullet here is an additional guideline that may respond to some of the public comment. The text is intended to help in discussion. The public feedback was based on comments received from several Council persons and would not contradict the recommended -- recommended text above. The last bullet is just some other options. With that I will leave it to Council or I can proceed.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I would love to help provide a little bit of context. So, have followed up with Brian and the planning office a couple of times and tried to go through and be responsive to the public testimony that we have received and try to craft with Brian's

help this additional guideline and I think it does a great job of memorializing something that we already seem to do in practice, which is for the most part when we see single family neighborhoods directly adjacent to a different type of use or to multi-family, for example, trying to see a transition that's not a disparity of more than one story or that equivalent height and -- and I think that this kind of a guideline holistically in the Comprehensive Plan would not only be responsive to the public testimony that we have received, but I think it would help substitute for the building area guideline that we had before. It creates a bright line. We could use that I think pretty effectively and it's general guidance, so, you know, there can be exceptions. But I think that it would help address the comments that we have received, I think some of the concerns around transition I think a little bit more effectively. So, that's kind of where that -- where that recommendation is coming from in that second bullet point. So, just to summarize, I think the -- at least from where I'm coming from -- I'm curious to hear other people's thoughts, but referring back to the previous memo, you know, as opposed to going with the option three, that instead we, you know, use this recommended guideline about transition. The first bullet point. This new additional second bullet point I think also helps to kind of address this in a -- in a more meaningful way. Brian, did I miss anything? I don't want to misrepresent it, but --

McClure: No. I think that was clear.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: So, is the -- is the action to how to -- to proceed as presented by staff with the -- the single edit from the last hearing being the red inclusion of the word should? Is that accurate?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: No. So, this would include these additional guidelines. So, the first bullet point is a new section regarding transition that will be added to the Comprehensive Plan. The second bullet point is new to this discussion. So, this is a new addition. So, give you a chance to review it. But instead of what Planning had offered us before in their memo under option three, was a very specific kind of a mechanism where every floor height disparity would reflect an additional setback and I think the public didn't feel that that adequately addressed their concerns. I agree. I also think it was overly prescriptive. So, this is in lieu of that. This is a new guideline that would, essentially, limit -- I will just let you read it. I mean read it for yourself. But one of the buildings on pad sites adjacent to the existing single family neighborhoods should have no more than a one story disparity of building height or floor height equivalent and it talks about features, differences in grade and other context. I think that's important. And what you could have, just speaking broadly, if you had a large site, right, you could have single family

next to a two story townhome, next to a three story multi-family building and this would still allow for those different uses, but what it would do is it would create some better guard rails I think around the -- the building height directly adjacent to someone's single family home. That was the goal. I think this would address a very large amount of concerns that we have heard in the past and I also think that it's pretty consistent with how we have approached transition when it comes to land use.

Simison: So, for clarity for myself or staff, is it to the meet the one house, the two house -- which house do you choose? Or is it the zone? So, residential has a 35 foot high zone with a -- you know, you can do three stories, you could have a three story, a two story, and a one story all along a commercial site. Which property do you choose or is it the zone that dictates the height element?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, the -- the wording here is pad sites and the intention is to be specific to a building that's been proposed, not the entire development.

Simison: Understand that. I'm trying to understand on the residential side which piece of -- which parcel are you using on the residential side to determine the commercial pad? Is -- there is two that are adjacent. Do you use the one that has the higher or using the zoning for that entire -- which, again, could be two or three stories, could have a DA mod -- or DA that wants it to one. What's your -- what standard are you applying for people? Because commercial properties are normally larger than residential. You know, especially in the back. You know, they are getting skinnier and so you may have four or five different properties that you would be selecting from.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, this is the difficulty in getting overly specific and, then, defining something in the Comprehensive Plan when it's broader than 2,000 square foot elevation. I would assume here the -- the text is -- says should and, then, has some considerations for sideboards and I believe that would be up to staff and Council -- up to staff to recommend and up the Council to decide, which one of those residential buildings should apply.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: To work right off the comments of Council Vice-President Strader, I have also had conversations with Brian and maybe to take it one step further on what she's suggesting, we have to remember that what we are looking at here is should. These are not standards. These are guidelines. And that if there is a disparity, as you have pointed out, depending on how that piece of property looks, it could come down to Council to make that decision. Ultimately that's our job. That we don't want to have these guidelines be so specific and so rigid in nature to make that call for us. I want to commend Brian and his staff for everything they have done. But also commend everyone from the public who put in all those very detailed comments. Very well thought out. One of the things I wanted to make sure that they did was that Brian read

them, they took them into consideration. I know there was some early concern that we weren't listening to the public's comments, but he's assured me not only he did, but there were changes that were made based on some of those public comments as this thing was put together and I think this edition will fit fine. I just think we all have to remember that it's not a standard so much as it doesn't say shall. It is a suggestion. It is a guideline with the word should, which is advisory, and that's what we are building here is something that is advisory on how these projects come together in our city and eventually it will come to us for clearance as it goes.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: That explanation makes good sense. The way we use this and described perfectly by Councilman Overton, so I think the explanation makes sense to me. I know I was absent and I caught up from the last hearing, but this -- this compromised edition does seem to capture what the public was -- had some concern with and Council Woman Strader's created a good solution that retains the flexibility and planning staff is on board. Do I need to proceed?

Simison: Yeah. I don't know how often it's going to come up, but it's -- I live in a situation where I have got a three story, a one story and a two story. Those are the three houses in my block and just want to make sure that they have enough guidance to give the development community on what standard would should be applied in that situation. Yeah. That's what I saw on this. I feel like they have that from this and can apply that. I guess it will be up to each individual planner to make that determination somewhat and tell Council what is in. Further discussion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Seeing as there is no more --

Simison: We haven't asked for public -- we haven't asked for public testimony yet, so I will see if -- is there anybody that signed up on this item, Mr. Clerk?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, no.

Simison: Is there anybody from the public that would like to provide testimony, either in person or online? We have a couple of people online. If you are online for this purpose if you can use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one coming forward and no one raising their hand online, Councilman Overton.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Borton: For our public testimony, I would move that we close the public hearing.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I move that we approve Mixed Use for Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment For Mixed Use H-2023-0057.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Did you just look at your screen? Do you feel like you were -- that --

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I changed my screen on me.

McClure: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. McClure.

McClure: If I can help a little bit here. If you -- if you go with what's on here and, then, if you like the text previously or something else, also indicate that and, then, in two weeks or so we will come back with a resolution that includes everything.

Simison: Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just for discussion, I think your intention, Councilman Overton, was to include the recommended holistic text changes, the new standard, and also -- I actually thought all the changes on that slide were good. I think it would make sense to include that in your motion if possible if that's your intention.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: That is correct. So, I will redo the motion. Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve H-2023-0057 as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission amendment to the text of the Comprehensive Plan and including both the mixed use and general text modifications.

Strader: Second.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and second. Does the second agree to the revised motion? The original second?

Little Roberts: Yes.

Simison: Okay. Is there -- are we good? Okay. Is there further discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and Item 2 is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: So, as mentioned, Mr. McClure, you will bring -- bring stuff back in the coming weeks for final adoption moving that forward?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, yes.

3. Public Hearing for Robertson Square Subdivision (SHP-2023-0006) by Tamee Crawford, Centurion Engineers, Inc., located at 588 W. Broadway Ave.

- A. Request: Short Plat to subdivide the property consisting of 0.43 acres of land into two (2) building lots in the R-15 zoning district for Robertson Square Subdivision.

Simison: All right. With that we will move on to Item 3, which is public hearing for Roberson Square Subdivision, SHP-2023-0006. We will open this public hearing with staff comments. Linda, are you doing this one?

Ritter: I am.

Simison: Excellent.

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor and Council. I am Linda Ritter, associate planner. Brian has this all messed up, because he's sick, so we are just trying to make sure we are staying safe over here. So, tonight I'm here to talk about a request for a proposal to

subdivide property consisting of 0.42 acres of land into two building lots in the R-15 zoning district, located at 558 West Broadway Avenue. The proposal density of 2.76 units per acre it's consistent with the density desired of three to eight dwelling units per acre in the medium density residential future land use map designation for the site. So, there is currently -- there is a duplex that is currently under construction on the south side of the property. The duplex complies with the setback requirements of the district and is connected to city water and sewer service. Access to this property is via Broadway Avenue and the other one is on -- access to this property is via Broadway Avenue, but this portion is via West Idaho Avenue. So, as you can see from the slides presented, the proposal meets with the existing development in the area and the staff sees no issues with the proposed project. So, at this time I will stand for any questions that you have.

Simison: Thank you, Linda. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Is the applicant with us this evening? Would the applicant have any comments that they would like to make? All right. Applicant waives any comments. Mr. Clerk, did anyone sign up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present in the audience or online that would like to provide testimony on this item? Seeing no one, the applicant waive closing? You are waiving comments at the closing of this public hearing? Okay. So, Council, what's your pleasure?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I move that we close the public hearing on SHP-2023-0006.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. 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: ALL AYES.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Very straightforward application. Appreciate the applicant's work in -- in our downtown. The staff report is crystal clear. There are no issues that need to be resolved. So, it seems to be straightforward and worthy of an approval. I will make a

motion that we approve the short plat request SHP-2023-0006 as presented in the staff report of February 20, 2024.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 3, SHP-2023-0006. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

4. Public Hearing for Watts Meridian Medical Partners (H-2023-0075) by Rigby Watts & Co., located at 1256 S. Rackham Way

- A. Request: Development Agreement Modification to modify the existing Development Agreement (H-2015-0024), Inst. # 2016-106278; H-2019-0016, Inst. #2019-028379) to remove the subject property from the agreement and include it in a new agreement with updated conceptual development plan.

Simison: Next item up is Item 4, which is a public hearing for Watts Meridian Medical Partners, H-2023-0075. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next application before you is a request for a development agreement modification. This site consists of 2.53 acres of land. It's zoned C-G and it's located at 1256 South Rackham Way. This property is part of a larger 73.5 acre property that was annexed into the city back in 1995. A development agreement was required as a provision of annexation and it was recorded in 2016. It was later amended in 2019 and that was for the overall property. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is mixed use regional. The applicant is proposing to modify the existing development agreement to update the conceptual development plan for this site. Because the land governed by the development agreement has been subdivided and is now under different ownerships, the applicant is proposing a new development agreement as part of the modification that will only apply to the subject 2.53 acre property. The existing plan as shown here depicts one commercial building pad on the site. The proposed plan depicts two two story office buildings, consisting of 22,000 and 15,808 square feet and associated parking and landscaping. A perspective drawing of the structures and site was also submitted as shown. The proposed uses. Healthcare or social services or professional services are principally permitted in the C-G zoning district. A cross-access easement and maintenance agreement exists for the overall development, including this site, which allows shared use of abutting drives and details the associated maintenance

responsibilities. Staff has reviewed the existing DA provisions and most have either already been satisfied or not applicable to development of this site. Staff is recommending provisions for the new development agreement as shown here and included in the staff report. Staff is recommending approval. Written testimony has been received from Adam Watts, the applicant. He is in agreement with this report and he is online. Answer any questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Mr. Watts, I know you are online. Would you like to make any comments?

Watts: Sorry. I'm here. I apologize. I was trying to figure out how to -- to jump online. Can you guys hear me?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Watts: Yeah. We -- you know, we have been -- we have been working hard on kind of all aspects of this project and, you know, we are really excited to bring it forward here and, you know, I know we are just talking about the development agreement piece, but, you know, we -- we have been working hard on all aspects of the civil engineering and things and feel like you have got a really great project here with -- with a couple of different partners and tenants and so we are hopeful that, you know, we can remove this parcel from the existing development agreement and be able to do two separate buildings here, instead of the one long -- elongated building that James Kistler kind of had envisioned back in 2019. So --

Simison: All right. Thank you very much. Council, any questions for the applicant? Okay. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up on the item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody that would like to provide testimony on this item? There is nobody coming forward. Mr. Watts, would you like to make any final comments?

Watts: I'm sorry, say that again.

Simison: Would you like to make any final comments?

Watts: No. Not unless Council has any -- any questions for me. Happy -- happy to answer anything.

Simison: Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much. Council, what's your direction?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we close the public hearing.

Simison: I have a motion to close the public hearing. All --

Overton: Second.

Simison: And a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have **FUTURE MEETING TOPICS** it. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Relatively straightforward DA modification. Nice to see this type of development happen in Meridian. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2023-0075 as presented in the staff report for today's hearing date.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve H-2023-075. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carried. The item is agreed to. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Watts: Thanks, guys. Appreciate it.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Have a good night. Council, any future meeting topics?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'm not quite sure if this is a future meeting topic or potentially maybe a memo. I will leave it to you and Council President to determine. But in a lot of the public feedback that we received in regard to the comp plan changes, there were some other recommendations and suggestions that didn't necessarily fall

within the context of the Comprehensive Plan, but staff had previously mentioned it may be worth exploring at a later point in time. I -- I don't know if that is a future meeting topic or an update for Council about what that timeline looks like. There is a host of items that are -- that are suggested in the correspondence that we received, everything from new staff to new approach to the work. One area that I do think is maybe worth some focus is really in that citizen to Planning Department liaison and that may be -- already be covered by our community liaison, but there have been a number of instances that I have been aware of over the past few months where there were some mistakes and missteps and errors that occurred along the way that were caught by our community and I don't want us to continue to have to rely just on our community to flag those and I think one of the things that we all heard in the correspondence that we received was how appreciative the members of our public were for our planning staff and so I believe the intentionality is there, but there seems to be some process that's missing. Again, I kind of go back to when this was first presented and Council really had to encourage some public engagement. I do think that there are some issues there that are worthy of considering. I recognize some of that is operational and doesn't actually need to fall to the Council, but it all to me kind of comes together that there is maybe an opportunity for us as a Council and as a team to address maybe that lack of citizen collaboration I think that is really really important. So, I will leave it there. I'm happy to fill in with some added details if Mayor -- or if you or Council President want that at a later point in time.

Simison: Okay. Thanks.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Along the similar vein, you know, one thing I heard come out in the -- in the public feedback was that -- I think it's a challenge for members of the public to be part of a group of mainly development professionals and be the only voice on some of those committees and working groups. So, it may be worth considering, you know, a separate community feedback type of group, something for all of us to think about. I think chew on that idea. But there could be something fruitful there.

Simison: All right. Anything else in the future meeting topics? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Move we adjourn.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:37 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK