

Meridian City Council Work Session

July 22, 2025.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, July 22, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Liz Strader.

Other Present: Tina Lomeli, Bill Nary, Linda Ritter, Nick Napoli, Clint Dolsby, Tracy Basterrchea, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Whitlock
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Little Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is July 22nd, 2025, at 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: We had no one sign up for the community invocation.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we adopt the agenda as presented.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Madam Clerk, anyone signed up under Public Forum?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. No one has signed up.

COMMUNITY PRESENTATIONS [Action Item]

1. Meridian Police Department - Officer Rodriguez recipient of the Enrique S. Camarena Award

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move on to Item 1, which is a community presentation from the Meridian Police Department regarding Officer Rodriguez, recipient of the Enrique S. Camarena Award. So, I will turn this over to Chief Basterrechea.

Basterrechea: If you don't mind I will turn the dais around, so -- I would rather look at them than you. Sorry. So, the reason that we are here tonight is to recognize doc -- Officer Robert Rodriguez, one of our school resource officers. He has been named the 2024-2025 recipient of the Enrique Kiki Camarena Award for the State of Idaho. He was formerly recognized earlier this summer by the Idaho Elks Association at a convention held on June 7th at the Center of the Universe, Wallace, Idaho. And we are here to honor him tonight. This recognition is presented annually by the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks Awareness -- Drug Awareness Commission, which is very involved with the Meridian Anti-Drug Coalition and we are very thankful for your involvement with that. It honors law enforcement professionals who demonstrate an unwavering commitment to drug prevention and education. Officer Rodriguez was selected by his peers for exemplifying the principles and values championed by DEA Special Agent Enrique S. Camarena. Sacrifice, integrity and dedication to public service. For those of you who don't know Special Agent Camarena was -- life was tragically taken in 1985 while fighting drug trafficking and he remains a symbol of courage and purpose in the law enforcement community. The award bearing his name continues to honor those who work tirelessly to protect and educate their communities. As a school resource officer with the Meridian Police Department at Mountain View High School Officer Rodriguez has dedicated himself to building trust with students, promoting healthy decision making and creating a safe and supportive environment for Idaho's youth. His ability to connect with children and provide a positive impactful presence in their daily lives is recognized as a rare and invaluable gift. This marks the second time a Meridian Police Department officer has received this distinguished honor. In 2021 Officer Leroy Sonata was also named the Camarena Award recipient underscoring the department's ongoing dedication to the meaningful youth engagement

and substance abuse -- abuse prevention. One thing I would point out, too, is this really highlights the work that our school resource officers do every day in West Ada School District and the high bar that they set for those other school resource officers around the state and we are very appreciative of all of that. So, with that we would like to congratulate Officer Rodriguez on his well-deserved recognition and thank him for his ongoing commitment to public service and to the students and student advocacy and for drug prevention and drug awareness. So, if you would come up, Robert, we will present you with the plaque from the Idaho Association. We also have the bust that will stay with Robert for over the next year and another plaque that will have his name on it as well, with the other awardees.

Rodriguez: I just want to say thank you to Susie and -- come on up here, Susie. To Susie with the Elks Lodge, also a member of the MADC and thank you to the gals over at the MADC. You guys are amazing. And, most importantly, my wife. Come on. Nope. Come on up. For putting up with my 17 year career in law enforcement to date. For being an amazing woman and best friend, so -- I really don't have a whole lot to say. I don't speak a whole lot. I just want to mention how large the print is for the chief to read this stuff. I will be there one day I'm sure.

Stertz: We are very proud of him. We are very proud of him and we sure had a lot of fun in Wallace.

Rodriguez: You said you weren't going to tell anybody.

Stertz: Oh, I didn't say anything.

Simison: Well, Officer, on behalf of myself and the Council, congratulations and I will just say this. Whenever we would go to Mountain View you make a world of difference for everyone around you and it's clear. So, appreciate what you do and horns up.

ACTION ITEMS

- 2. Public Hearing for Idaho Power McDermott Substation (H-2025-0008) by KM Engineering, LLP., located at SW corner of McMillan Rd and Owyhee Storm Ave.**
 - A. Request: Annexation of 2.69 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-15 zoning district.
 - B. Request: Conditional Use Permit to allow the development of an Idaho Power Substation.

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to the rest of our scheduled work for this evening. So, next up will be a public hearing on Item H-2025-0008 and we will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Okay. I was giving everyone a chance to funnel out. So, good evening, Mayor and Council Members. Linda Ritter, Planning Department. So, tonight we are here for an annexation and conditional use permit for property located at the southwest corner of McMillan Road and Owyhee Storm Avenue. The site consists of two and a half acres of land. It's -- we are annexing 2.69 acres of land from RUT in Ada county to R-15 zoning district and a conditional use permit to allow for the development of the Idaho Power Substation. So, this application went through a record of survey in the county to parcel out this two and a half acres, because normally county property -- it's five acres per lot, but they allowed this one time split for the two and a half acres. So, that they are proposing the construction of this new substation to enhance the reliability and resilience of electrical services in Meridian and the surrounding areas of Ada county. Currently customers in this region are served by Can-Ada Substation in Nampa and the Ten Mile Substation in Meridian. So, the rapid ongoing growth throughout the Treasure Valley has placed increased demand on these existing facilities leading to service strain and reduced reliability. The proposed substation is particularly designed to accommodate future growth and development, while also alleviating pressure on the existing infrastructure. While rerouting service lines, the new facility will not only serve new residents and commercial customers, but also improve service continuity and reliability for current users. The site is proposed to be developed with the substation that includes up to two transformers, each to serve four distribution feeders up to two breakers beneath the transmission termination structure of the two metal clad structures, which managing -- managed to switch to distribution feeders. One small control building, which houses racks of switches and communication equipment and one transmission dead-end structure, which connects to the -- with the transmission line on McMillan Road. So, the public utility major public infrastructure is a permitted use in the R-15 district upon approval of a conditional use permit and compliance with the specific use standards for the UDC. Staff has determined that the proposed project align with these standards and is essential to support the area's long-term utility needs. Access to the property will be via McMillan Road and Owyhee Storm. So, it's designed to meet the standards in accordance with the ACHD requirements. These two access points are necessary to safely accommodate the maneuvering of large transport vehicles during frequent -- Infrequent deliveries of major electrical equipment, such as transformers, breakers, metal clad switch gear to the substation. Under typical operation conditions a single access point would generally be sufficient to support routine inspection and maintenance activities. The substation yard will be graveled to allow for safe operation of the ground grid system underneath the service. The gravel is specific for utility use. It's a typical three inch rod that also allows for water drainage. Since no vehicle parking occurs within the substation the applicant is not proposing to pave the surface inside the yard. Although the development of the power station is located within a residential zone, the applicant is proposing a 30 foot landscape buffer along the west side of the property to mitigate any noise that may generate -- along the west and south side to mitigate any noise that may be generated from the substation. Although there is no building the applicant is proposing an eight foot tall precast stamp concrete wall along McMillan and Owyhee Storm Avenue frontages. Staff is also requiring the wall to be extended around the whole substation. Basically because it is abutting residential zones. So, they will be required to go through a certificate of zoning

compliance and design review prior to building permit issuance for the wall. The Comprehensive Plan goal is to require appropriate building design and landscaping elements to buffer screen, beautify and integrate commercial multi-family and parking lots into existing neighborhoods. Although this has not been developed yet, but this is zoned for residential and we are looking at development applications that may come in for residential in this area. So, the maximum height of fences involved within a residential zone is six feet. The applicant is requesting alternative compliance through a separate permit outside of this process to increase the height of the proposed wall to eight feet in order to maintain site security and deter trespassing. So, at a later date, upon approval of the annexation. So, they had requested barbed wire on top of a fence for them, but barbed wire is not allowed within residential areas, so staff is not in agreement with that. And, then, also the applicant will be asking for a DA provision that would allow deferral of landscape installation until development occurred within The Fields District, citing the lack -- the current lack of available water in the area. But, however, there is water within the Owyhee Storm Avenue. There was a 12 inch water line and it goes to the intersection of Owyhee and McMillan Road. That does not have a timeline for when the development, particularly on properties adjacent to the subject site, will move forward. While irrigation infrastructure is not available yet, city water is available within the Owyhee Storm and there is an existing irrigation ditch and box that is located along the northern portion of the property. The applicant has approached Public Works staff regarding temporary use of city water for landscaping until an irrigation pump can be installed. Public Works doesn't have any objection to enter into an agreement allowing the use of city water for a five year period, after which the irrigation pump must be operational. Per UDC 11-3B-14 all required landscape and irrigation system and site features must be installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan prior to the final project approval, as there is no separate occupancy approval process. So, staff does not support the applicant's request as there is no mechanism to delay this landscaping installation, which is required -- which is a required component of the development. Deferring the landscape would hinder the establishment of mature -- of a mature vegetative buffer, which is essential to provide adequate screening for future adjacent residential development. So, the Commission recommended approval with the conditions that were outlined in our staff report. This issue of deferring the landscape -- I don't think it was brought up at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. We did talk about the wall, but this came after the hearing, so just wanted to put this front and center before you. We had no one commenting on the application, other than the applicant and the property owner. Again, the only discussion that really took place was about the concrete stone wall surrounding the entire property, rather than a chain link fence on the south and west side of the property. We have had no comments since the hearing and other than that staff will stand for any questions that you may have. But I do have Clint here to talk about the water in the roadway if you have questions.

Simison: Thank you, Linda. And, Clint, you look so much happier to be here than on vacation. Council, any questions for staff?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Linda, just one question for you about this request. Forego the landscape buffer until developments occurred in The Fields District. Is there any specificity provided about that? I mean there is development that has already occurred within The Fields District and so I'm trying to figure out what -- what it is they were trying to accomplish. Was it, again, more about maybe a miscommunication about the lack of services or was there something else that was driving it?

Ritter: The applicant will be able to explain this more to you. We have been in -- we have had a meeting. It is my understanding they have talked with Nampa Irrigation District because -- first I thought this was under Settlers Irrigation, but it's under Nampa Irrigation District. There is water that flows through here, but I think it floods the field for irrigation right now. It flows across the field from the south of the property. But, again, there is an irrigation box and irrigation also flows from this side across through here and on through and, then, there is some kind of concrete ditch along here where water flows, but I don't know if it's just flooded. I didn't get a chance to talk to anyone from the irrigation district. I think -- I'm not sure. I think the applicant can better explain why they would like to do this. It's just not something that staff is in support of.

Cavener: Okay.

Ritter: We would like to see this corner looking nice.

Cavener: Thanks. I have no other questions, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? All right. Then would the applicant like to come forward?

Hopkins: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. Stephanie Hopkins with KM Engineering. Our address is 5725 North Discovery Way in Boise.

Hazel: David Hazel. 1221 West Idaho Street. Idaho Power.

Hopkins: Thank you for considering our request this evening. I'm here with Idaho Power to request annexation into the R-15 district and a conditional use permit for public infrastructure for the McDermott substation, which is in northwest Meridian. Linda did an awesome job of giving a -- an overview of our request and we will keep our presentation pretty -- pretty short. Did you get my presentation? Thank you. Am I able to control it or -- okay. So, Idaho Power has worked with the adjacent property owners in this area to locate the substation in this -- in this area specifically. They plan to build the substation here to serve this area of Meridian and Ada county. As we all know, Meridian specifically in this area is growing very quickly. This is in The Fields sub area plan, which is anticipated to include a mixture of uses. Industrial, commercial, residential and multi-family uses and there are projects that are being contemplated currently that will be directly adjacent to this site. So, that's the -- when I think staff was

saying Fields District, that's probably the project that they were speaking of and that's what our request is for pressurized irrigation and landscaping, which we will provide more information about a little bit later. So, the -- the objective of this is to provide reliable and adequate electricity in this area and for all of Ada county. So, this is a graphic just to show how this all works. Substations are the point in which Idaho Power serves their customers directly. As this graphic shows there are multiple ways in which power is generated. It's moved from a larger switching station to transmission lines and, then, to businesses, homes and users. Idaho Power's objective is to meet the demand of existing and future customers in this area, while we are leaving existing facilities. Currently customers in this area are served by the Can-Ada substation, which is Nampa and the Ten Mile substation in Meridian. The -- this substation, McDermott substation, will connect to the existing Northside substation with a new 138 kilovolt wire from the existing 230 kilovolt transmission line poles, those large apparatus along McMillan. This is located at the southwest corner of Owyhee Storm and McMillan, close to Owyhee High School. There is proposed to be -- or there are proposed to be two points of access, one to McMillan and one to Owyhee Storm. Both will be secured with gates. There will be -- the entire yard will be securely fenced and as staff mentioned initially we were requesting to have two of our boundaries with chain link and since, then, commission has recommended that those boundaries, the -- the south and west boundary of the site be -- include the precast concrete wall, which is what's proposed on the north and east. We think that with this addition that the -- a request to defer landscaping will be a little bit more palatable. It will be a presentable and nice project until landscaping is installed and future development comes through. So, the -- let's see. The internal yard is going to be graveled. There -- the site is designed to include two transformers, two breakers, two component metal clad. Transmission will come in from the dead end, which will go into the transformer, which steps the electricity down from 138 kilovolts to four 12.5 kilovolt distribution feeders that will go out to customers through the metal clad. Commission recommended that we include the precast concrete walls mentioned and our request this evening is to -- we have two requests. So, we would like to request that a DA provision be added to allow landscaping and pressurized irrigation to be deferred until future development comes in. There are several projects in The Fields District that are being contemplated currently and within a certain time frame they will come in and bring services with them and we just think that it's realistic and logical that that landscaping be installed with that development, so it's all cohesively done at the same time. Our second request is to extend the conditional use permit time frame from two years to five years, just to allow this -- a little bit more time to commence the use of the -- the public infrastructure. They anticipate that it will happen within the two year time frame, but it would just be -- it would be nice to make sure they have a little extra time if needed. So, we really appreciate Linda and Public Works' coordination and help on the different components of this project. We have been working with them and did mention it in our last meeting with the Commission that we were hoping to defer -- or work through some kind of solution to defer the pressurized irrigation and landscaping and just working with them in general on all of the components of this project has been great. So, really appreciate that and thank you for your consideration this evening. We will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Your request -- the second request to have the CUP granted extended from two years to up to five years. Is that because you need the time to install the new transmission line and all the permitting that's required or like -- can you just give a little more detail about why you would need that extra time to -- for that kind of buffer that you are looking for?

Hazel: So, we are kind of working off our proposed timeline right when this project was kicked out and there is a lot of variables leading up to this project that could extend our time frame. I dearly want to complete this project within two years, but if there is an issue with equipment or something else within the site that could extend our project duration out. I think that's kind of why we are asking for the extension is if we do run into those issues as we are getting materials coming in, you know, something pushed on our side as far as design that we are still covered if we push a year or two.

Simison: And can you say your name for the record, please?

Hazel: David Hazel. Idaho Power.

Simison: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: On the landscaping pressurized irrigation being deferred, so, you know, I understand the staff commenting like there is really no way for us to sort of make sure you do it; right? If -- other than on my honor I will do it kind of a thing. So -- and I think that's a good point. Obviously, Idaho Power is a good, wonderful company, track record in -- in the state, but how -- how do we have any assurance that it will get done and done right if we don't have any way to ensure that it gets done if we give you that ability right now?

Hopkins: So, Mayor, Councilman Taylor, I think you bring up a good point. Idaho Power is a different -- I would say partner -- community partner with the city. They are not your typical developer. They are perhaps in a different circumstance than most developers and I think that there is an opportunity to probably work through some kind of agreement with them, maybe, you know, through this application, through the development agreement maybe there could be a memorandum of understanding or something that's attached. We are asking for a situation that's not typical, right, and I think that that's merited based on the public utility component of it. We have been trying

to create -- I think of solutions, too, and I think a development agreement is the easiest way up front, with maybe in the provision we say that there has to be an agreement on the site that's, you know, checked up on or -- or something along those lines. I don't know if the city attorney maybe has any ideas, but --

Simison: Yeah. Mr. Nary, would a surety not work in this situation?

Nary: A what, sir?

Simison: A surety bond. Would that not work in this situation?

Nary: Well, we certainly can. I mean there is usually a time limit --

Simison: Correct.

Nary: -- for those, but, otherwise, yeah. that's -- that's one method you could use.

Simison: So, surety bond would work. It's a time limit, but they either -- they could either pay the entire amount to pull it or a portion of it, depending upon the time frame that's identified.

Hopkins: Mayor, I think Idaho Power is amenable to that and, you know, maybe just -- we could discuss further with staff to see what the parameters on that are or -- they are willing to work with that. I think that would be a favorable outcome.

Hazel: And I think that kind of helps relieve some of our irrigation landscaping concerns as well if that's deferred I should say.

Hopkins: Yeah. Absolutely. If we were able to do a surety to, you know, put up a bond for the amount of money that would be required for the landscaping and the pressurized irrigation I think that would give Idaho Power the ability to defer it in the way that they want to and making the city able to actually make it right eventually.

Simison: And I will defer to Council's viewpoint and staff and -- staff on how easy that is, but --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I appreciate I think you are giving a creative approach to this. I -- I am curious to kind of hear how our staff would respond to this type of request and their ability to manage that as well. It's an important consideration.

Ritter: So, Mayor, Council, we have been in that situation before. We have a project that is at the corner of Ten Mile and McMillan Road that was a plat that was approved

and they did the same thing, bonded for their landscaping, and to date that landscaping has not been installed and that bond is still there. I don't know how valid that bond is, but the city has -- not saying that Idaho Power would do this, but the city has been burned by putting in -- having someone bond for the landscaping and never put in the landscaping and as far as this project, if we are waiting for the development that is adjacent to this, we just don't know when that will come in. I know we have been working with the property owners looking at doing some development there, but the phases that are close to this property are not something that is immediate, that won't happen anytime soon, so I don't know how far out that development would be and if we waited for that we don't know when that landscaping might go in. So, staff has talked internally about this and the -- we just don't -- there is no time frame for when that development will come in and as, again, our code says with development this is all supposed to go in. The city has offered an option for irrigation for the landscaping that should assist with putting this landscaping in, because we would like to see some mature landscaping on this property, because you have a 30 foot buffer to the south and a 30 foot buffer to the west to help mitigate this substation for when the residential development does come in. We don't want it to be like new landscaping that's coming in that's not going to provide a sufficient buffer for this residential. So, we have been upfront with the applicant that we are not in support of this based on our code and some of the issues that we have had with bonding for landscaping. So, again, you guys get to make a final call. That's just staff's position on this. Well, it depends. I imagine -- I don't want to talk about the other situation in that context, but if -- but if people are not adhering to their bond we have a different issue to address, because we should be able to execute that bond and go do -- have the work done if it's past due, but if it hasn't reached the requirements of the DA that's a different story. So, I think it depends on how it's determined, because you can do a bond that says you have five years and within five years we will -- you will either put it in yourselves or we will execute the bond for you to have it done for you, because to me you are like asking for up to five years. Well, it seems like five years is a great time frame. The landscaping needs to be put in one way or the other. If that's what you are asking for I think it's fair for us to achieve that same outcome however we choose to -- to alleviate the points that have been raised by staff. But in two cents. Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Can you just walk me through, again, the reasons why you want to defer? Is it just the uncertainty of timing? Is it the uncertainty of access to pressurized irrigation water? Would you just remind me kind of why you want that deferral?

Hazel: Yeah. I can field that one. So -- I mean it's really the lack of pressurized irrigation and there was that depiction of -- earlier I think, Linda, you pulled up with the irrigation box on the north side of our property. So, I was able to meet with Mark Phillips. He is a private water owner out there. That water is part of the Nampa-Meridian system, but they don't own that ditch is my understanding and so, basically, meeting with Mark that vault that was shown on that drawing -- I don't have it up here, but basically that's just a drain. So, we don't have any surface water readily available to us on our property, because he is flood irrigating from the south to the north up to our

property; right? So, basically, our surface water is going to end at our substation, so we are not going to want to flood our whole yard; right? So, we don't have an option to drop a pump into that vault like we were talking earlier unfortunately. The other option I think was the city water as well, right, which we are open to. I guess the -- the biggest challenge I see there is I'm kind of hoping for like a final solution with this; right? So, if we are putting in city water and we are going to be required to come back and hook up to the pressurized irrigation system once it's available, we are going to be spending additional dollars to reconfigure our system to tie into that; right? So, I guess the point I'm trying to make is our hope would be -- is that once that pressurized irrigation is available we can start our plantings out there and meet the code requirements associated with that.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I think that sounds reasonable, but you are also asking for a window of two to five years. So, if you are hoping for some certainty about what your configuration is for the -- the pressurized irrigation, like -- and I -- and I understand that seems like there is a few moving parts here that we don't have all of our arms around in terms of what's where and what we have --

Hazel: Right.

Taylor: -- my understanding would be that the city water would be sufficient pressurized water for that and it may be two, three or five years or beyond before you would have access to pressurized irrigation water and I don't know how that would -- issue is going to be resolved. If we required you to -- if we didn't give you the deferral and you are required to have the city water, there is no objection -- you could do that, you just don't want to have to change that configuration maybe in whatever time frame that is when the pressurized irrigation comes back. Am I tracking correctly?

Hazel: Right. And I mean it's the bigger picture, too; right? It's all kind of falling back on the cost associated with this stuff and trying to rework stuff that we have already put in. You know, I mean I just don't want to go shell out additional dollars if we are reworking something just to get us by in the interim, if that makes sense, versus having a complete system that's readily available, we can tie into it and do what we need to do on the perimeter of our yard.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, do you have any idea what it would look like to move from a pressurized system supplied by the city to irrigation? Because --

Hazel: I mean it's -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Taylor: Just to finish my point -- because the irrigate -- you know, the -- the irrigation, you know, system to provide the water, that's not going to have to change, it's just going to be how you are going to tie into it.

Hazel: Right.

Taylor: So, I'm having a hard time tracking how expensive that might be considering the significant scale of infrastructure that's going to go into this anyway. So, help me understand -- do you know what it take to switch from city pressurized water to irrigation? And I don't know if you know the answer to that.

Hazel: Well, let's -- I'm going to throw out a round number, right, that I'm going to ballpark off the top my head. I'm going to say 15,000 dollars. Fifteen thousand isn't nothing; right? I mean that's something that we are going to have this project closed out, this is going to be in operation and, then, we are going to have to come back and spend that additional money for stuff that we already have functional to tie into that PI system when it's available. I guess what -- what I'm trying to avoid is just the additional rework; right? The additional dollars associated with that. So, if we come off the city water, if that's the final solution that's -- you know, we can do that, but I think the -- the preference would be is to come off the PI system once it's available. So, we are not, you know, using water from the city water to feed our planting.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Either one of you, Stephanie or -- just talk to -- if you don't want to landscape it what is it going to look like?

Hazel: So, that decorative concrete wall is -- I mean there were some depictions up there earlier, but that's basically what the parameter would look like. It's a -- basically a precast wall. It's stamped. It's got some decorative elements in it, depending on, you know, which route we go. But that would be kind of the -- the focus of the substation; right? Is the -- that concrete wall. You wouldn't have the trees on the perimeter. We were talking about putting maybe xeriscape and some perma bark down on that 30 foot swath, potentially, which we could still do without the water there. I guess that answered your question?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Well, it does and it doesn't yet, because the trees do need water.

Hazel: Correct.

Overton: And you are putting in xeriscape landscaping. I'm just curious how are you watering the trees if there is no water out there?

Hazel: Like physically? Is that what you are asking?

Overton: Yeah.

Hazel: Well, if we have a source as of being either the city water or the PI system, we can set that up on a regular schedule off a drip system to water our plants.

Overton: So, use the city water for the trees on the xeriscape landscape --

Hazel: No. Sorry. Let me back up. I'm saying the xeriscape is what we would try to do as part of the interim period between that and the pressurized irrigation being available. Once the pressurized irrigation is available we would use that water to plant those trees and keep them alive.

Overton: Okay. My mistake is I'm looking through --

Hazel: If we hooked up to city water we -- we have the same thing, but it goes back to the point of -- I'm trying to avoid the rework and additional cost if we possibly can; right?

Simison: How about we trade you landscaping for moving the poles on McMillan over just a little bit to allow that road to be widened. It seems like a deal to me. Okay. All Right. Did anyone sign up to provide testimony on this item?

Lomeli: Mr. Mayor, no one has signed up.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody in the audience that would like to provide testimony? Just so we at least know where we stand. I'm not seeing anyone coming forward or raising their hand. So, we will let you stay there until Council is either done with questions or ready to close the public hearing, unless you have any final comments that you want to try to make at this point. I heard a pop in the system. He has got Bill's.

Taylor: Can you just tell me -- and maybe staff can help, too. I'm curious about the conversations with the Nampa Irrigation District. Is there -- I mean it sounds like some changes to the system have to be in place for you to have access and I'm not totally tracking what all changes need to be. Do you -- can you provide some insight like what will have to happen before you will have access to that? And I don't know if -- Linda, if you know the answer to that or, David, if you -- what conversations you have had where you have any idea what they are going to have to do to -- in order to provide you with that?

Hazel: You just mean the PI system?

Taylor: Yes. Correct.

Hazel: They just need to kind of get it to our property. I believe it's coming from the west to the east; right?

Taylor: And did you have any sense of time frame from them, like -- how that's going to happen?

Hazel: It's kind of up in the air at this point.

Taylor: Because it seems like we just have no clue when you are going to have access to that. It could be next year. It could be in five years. It could be like -- Nampa Irrigation District will just do whatever they want, because water rules everything; right? I'm just having a hard time tracking when we could have any expectation of that and it just seems very vague and open-ended and, Linda, I don't know if you have had any communication with them that -- because I read their letter on that -- in the application. It's very unhelpful.

Ritter: Mayor, Council Member Taylor, correct, that irrigation district did not provide much information and I think from the conversation we have been having are you guys waiting for the development to occur that's adjacent to you to bring that over to your property or --

Hazel: Yes. That's my understanding.

Ritter: And I guess that's the city's issue. We don't know when that development is coming and so we don't have a time frame. We don't -- there is a lot of unknowns, so that's staff's position on it, so --

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Still trying to grasp my head around what this is eventually going to look like. What landscaping is your final plan?

Hopkins: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, we do have a landscape plan that shows 30 feet along the west and south boundary and, then, if it's on the screen now there is a variety of vegetative ground cover and a mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees that's shown on the landscape plan. So, this is what, you know, is required by code and this is what's being provided as far as part of the conditional use permit. There is an option in code to xeriscaping, which is kind of what David was alluding to, would provide, you know, same vegetation -- similar vegetation, more rockscape and -- and there are certain standards you have to meet. Still requires pressurized irrigation, obviously, to keep the vegetation in place and -- and healthy, but would require less water. So, that's an option I think once pressurized irrigation is available. But our

request to you is that there be a DA provision or something -- some kind of agreement that would allow them to defer the requirement for pressurized irrigation and landscaping, just currently period, essentially, until development to the west comes in and brings in pressurized irrigation, so that it could all be completed cohesively and together at the same time, so -- and we recognize that the timeline is tricky. That's the big thing that we have been trying to wrap our minds around, too. And I think that's where, you know, it's important to remember that Idaho Power is not a typical developer and I think there is an opportunity to kind of work through some -- something -- some kind of agreement or solution that would work for everyone.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, if I'm looking at this picture on the left, talking greenscape, if you had irrigation water as we went through this right now and you -- you put everything in, it wouldn't be xeriscape, am I correct?

Hazel: Correct.

Hopkins: Mr. Mayor, Councilman, yes.

Overton: So, is there any reason I shouldn't logically figure that if you pay the money to put in a xeriscape and, then, you get your water, you are not going to also, then, pay to have all that removed, so you can go back in and do the landscaping right? And it might be cheaper to pay the 15,000 dollars to hook up to the irrigation? It seems like if you are putting in xeriscape now and you are going to have to yank that out to put in the greenery in the future --

Hopkins: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, I -- maybe I will restate how we -- so, the xeriscaping is really another option if pressurized irrigation is available. It wouldn't be an option without pressurized irrigation, because you wouldn't be able to keep the vegetation healthy and alive. So, right now we are proposing to just defer any kind of landscaping until pressurized irrigation is available. So, the xeriscaping would be an option that we had considered that would require less water in the future when they do hook up to pressurized irrigation. Does that make sense? It's a little convoluted.

Hazel: I might have made that more difficult when I stated my answer earlier, too, when I said xeriscape. I was just referring to before we put the plantings in, before we get water, we could put some rock mulch on the -- on the borders of this thing and make it look pretty until we have the water to get the plants in.

Hopkins: And, Mr. Mayor, Council --

Overton: So, I'm trying to tie up. I want to -- because, obviously, I don't want to see this as dirt.

Hazel: Right.

Overton: I want to see it landscape. But if you are landscaping it -- and I see this picture on the left and it's all green -- and, then, I see the gravel, I'm just -- my logic is you are going to have to rip all that back out and put in the landscaping that you would initially intend to put in.

Hopkins: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, I think that there is an image in our presentation that shows some like substations that have a similar -- it's kind of a rock mulch that they put out in front of -- it is really common in Ada county. So, the project on the right with the trees, obviously, wouldn't be included if we were to defer the landscaping, but the rock mulch would be included with the eight foot precast concrete wall and that does -- I mean it provides a nice frontage in the interim we think. It's a good -- I think a good solution while they wait for pressurized irrigation to come. So, that's what they would propose. It would be the -- kind of decorative rock mulch with the precast concrete wall.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow for staff.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Is that consistent with the landscape plan that was submitted that was seen by Planning and Zoning?

Ritter: No, that's not what was -- the landscape plan that -- this is what was recommended for approval by Planning and Zoning Commission. And I just want to make a clarification. So, it's not xeriscape, it's water conserving. So, what it does is reduce the landscape buffer by 50 percent and you do more water conserving plants within there, but it -- it's kind of more like a simulated riverbed, boulders, and things that go along there, but you still have to have your irrigation system. But that's not what was proposed with this development. If it's something that they are asking for, because what we would look at is what was approved with this DA with this -- what you guys would approve. So, this is the landscape plan that has gone through the process. We don't have anything different. So, if they are proposing something different that is something that we need to look at to make sure that they are meeting the requirements and, again, it doesn't take away the irrigation obligation, so -- I don't know -- it's like I don't know if -- and I keep hearing you say that you would have to go back and redo all this. I don't know if it's something that can be looked at ahead of time as far as how you layout your irrigation to say when that irrigation comes how you would hook up to what you are putting in with the -- say if you did use city water and then -- but plan it for when you do hook up your pressurized irrigation that you don't have to -- to realign your lines with that, but --

Hazel: And I understand what you are saying there. I guess my comment was I'm thinking of a bare minimum; right? We got to get something out there to dig these pipes up once the pressurized irrigation is in. Kill everything, basically, and, then, tie

everything back into what they have done previously. So, I think that 15,000 dollar number, right, I'm just using that as kind of like a ballpark right now; right? But I mean at the end of the day it's still additional costs that we are incurring and that's what I'm trying to avoid.

Hopkins: Can I just mention one thing, too? I think the Mayor brought up a really good option that we had kind of considered, too, was the idea of a surety that would be placed with the city and would really give you the reassurance that this would happen in the future and I think, you know, that could be tied to the development agreement in a way that would be easy to enforce or easier to enforce than maybe some other things. So, that's probably what we would defer to as, you know, a preference if -- if that's something that you are all amenable to.

Ritter: Mayor? As far as the surety -- because you did mention that there is a timeline on the surety and so we have not established a timeline at this point. So, do you guys have a timeline that you are looking at? Because that's the thing that staff doesn't know. We don't have a timeline and so it can't be out there for infinity, so --

Hopkins: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council and staff, I think -- I mean we have acknowledged that it's tricky; right? We don't know exactly when things are going to develop. We don't know when pressurized irrigation is going to be available. And so that's why we are kind of asking for solutions and trying to think creatively how to, you know, marry both the city's -- what the city wants and what Idaho Power is hoping to do and I think we all serve -- you all serve the same constituents and the same people. So, the goal is to try to give their customers rates that are great and -- and try to make sure that the city is getting what they want on property, too. So, I -- I mean -- but we -- yeah, we acknowledge that the timing is tricky and we don't know if -- I don't have a solution for that unfortunately.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I just got to throw this out there. It's not usual that we end up with an application in front of us that's been changed since it's gone in front of Planning and Zoning have been approved and in this case we also have a situation where that development could happen in six years and we could put a surety bond on for five years. You are still paying 15 grand -- or maybe you are paying 25 grand, because it's five years from now and it costs more money. I'm having a real hard time justifying why we need to do that and not stay consistent with how we operate as a city.

Hopkins: Mr. Mayor, Councilman --

Simison: I think it's going to cost them more for a surety bond long term, but that's how they want to do it. That's -- that's their -- their choice -- or your choice. I don't want to say it's their choice. Then if it's not even an option don't even put it out there.

Hopkins: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, I want to just clarify -- we haven't changed anything at the application. The landscape plan that's still -- that's in front of you right now is what we presented with conditional use permit and that is what Idaho Power intends to install once pressurized irrigation is available. Our request this evening is to add a DA provision to the DA to allow them to defer that landscaping. So, if you were to approve it tonight without that DA provision they would be required to install this landscaping. They are not proposing xeriscaping, it's just something that code allows and that had been contemplated at one point. This is what's being proposed.

Hazel: And I guess I would just like to add -- I mean if it is a requirement that we are to put this landscaping in, you know, as part of our build out, certainly possible with the city water. I just want to be clear that we are -- Idaho Power is incurring additional costs to try and reconfigure stuff that isn't necessarily there or we are hoping is going to be there; right? I think that's just kind of the main point. I mean if we have to tap onto the city water and we have to have irrigation I understand that. I guess I just kind of want to, you know, make it clear that we are incurring additional costs that, in, turn we can --

Hopkins: Thank you for the conversation. It's really nice to be able to discuss and kind of figure out --

Simison: Well, you are getting more money from me each month now with the new PUC rolls on solar, so consider that my contribution to the project. Sorry. That was for you, Paris.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Council Member Whitlock. Council Member Whitlock, yes.

Whitlock: Thank you, Mayor. Stephanie and David, thank you. Just to build off of what Councilman Overton was asking, just in my mind if -- if this gets the green light tonight with a development agreement that at some point you will put in the landscape, once you get out there, starting put -- start putting the transformers in, you put the eight foot decorative wall up, what will be on that 30 foot buffer to the north, south, east and west until development comes and you are able to tap into the -- the PI? What -- what will this look like for five -- up to five years if this gets the green light tonight as is --

Hazel: Some of these --

Whitlock: -- with the development agreement that you are --

Hazel: Yeah. Sorry to interrupt you. Some of these images that you are seeing up here right now, if you can see them, is basically what it would look like without the -- the trees and everything. I mean the image on the right has trees in there, but we could just remove those and you would have the rock mulch and the concrete wall.

Whitlock: Mayor, just a quick follow up. So, again, the concern that this just would have a nice decorative precast wall and be surrounded by dirt is not what you would envision for the next two to five years once -- once this substation goes in?

Hopkins: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, that's correct. Yeah. It would be the rock mulch.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we close the public hearing on Item No. 2.

Taylor: Second.

Simison: I 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: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: Council, I will just weigh in.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Mayor. Sorry. I appreciate that. Council, I -- I -- I see this as a -- as a really simple application that I'm generally in approval of. Stephanie and team, I appreciate the request. There is just not a clear path here and you -- you install vital infrastructure that is incredibly necessary and important for our community. That vital infrastructure isn't always the most appealing for development to occur next to and if you said, hey, five years, ten years -- if you gave me a pathway so that staff could track this I think I could get there. Without knowing what that looks like it's -- just for me I default back to -- to what our code is. So, I'm approving the application. I'm not in support of waiving the -- the delay on a landscape buffer. I recognize that may require you to connect to city services and use city water to take care of that until PI comes. Just without a clear path it always makes me a little eerie to get outside of our regular routine and without a clear path that just can't be supportive of that particular piece. So, Council, that's where I will be tonight.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I will be quick. Support a lot of what Council President Cavener said and consistent with how I have done it in the past and I have to remember they are one of the first ones out to this area, but they also want to be good neighbors to the residential

that's going to grow up around them and having that mature landscaping as it goes is a pretty important part I think of being that good neighbor to the residential going around them. I am in supportive of this application. I'm not in support of deferring the landscaping.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I'm in line with what was said and I don't like to impose additional costs if we can avoid them certainly on businesses who are investing millions of dollars to provide a critical infrastructure. So, I appreciate you -- the ask and I think it was warranted, but -- and I'm okay with the -- extending the conditional use permit time frame from two years to five years, I think that seems reasonable to allow you the flexibility to do the business that you need to do, but I think having installed sprinkler systems and before I -- I just don't quite think that the cost is so significant that we would kind of want to jeopardize what we would want to see here without any sort of surety. So, I think it's a good application. I will support it, but not the deferral of the landscaping. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Unless there is any additional comments I would be prepared to make a motion that we approve -- after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move that we approve File No. H-2025-0008 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of July 22nd, 2025, with the addition of extending the time frame of the conditional use permit from two years to five years.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there a discussion on the motion?

Overton: Yes. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: This motion includes that they will hook up to the city water?

Taylor: Yes. Mr. Mayor, thank you. I think -- correct. To -- to hook up to the city water for the irrigation services. Thank you for clarifying.

Little Roberts: Second concurs.

Simison: Okay. Further discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carried and the item is agreed to. Have a good evening, everybody.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for Mogul Industrial Park Subdivision (H-2025-0006) by The Land Group, generally located at the northwest corner of Black Cat Rd and I-84.

- A. Request: Preliminary Plat to subdivide two (2) existing parcels into eleven (11) building lots across three (3) phases in the I-L zoning district on 88.20 acres of land.

Simison: Next we will move on to Item 3, which is a public hearing from Mogul Industrial Park Subdivision, H-2025-0006. We will open this public hearing with staff comments. Nick, nice to see you.

Napoli: Good to see you, too, Mr. Mayor. Good evening, Mr. Mayor and Members of the Council. The next item on the agenda is the preliminary plat for Mogul Subdivision. The applicant is proposing a preliminary plat consisting of 11 -- 11 building lots across 88.2 acres within the I-L zoning district. The plat excludes the parcels containing the St. Luke's Building, Building J and Building M. Development is proposed to occur in three phases. The site is generally located at the northwest corner of Black Cat and I-84 and as shown on the screen the existing zoning is I-L and the FLUM designations are mixed employment and low density employment. This property was annexed in 2021 at which time the development agreement and -- a development agreement was established, including specific requirements for road improvements, limited uses, timing thresholds for extending a collector road through the site. It's important to note that subdividing the property is not a requirement under the current DA. The applicant is choosing to do so primarily for project phasing of additional buildings. This is the existing conditions out there for the preliminary plat. This would be the St. Luke's building, Building M, and all these buildings on the frontage are actually currently under construction -- or this Building J. Building M will be here and these buildings are under construction currently, which will be included in the plat with this back section. Might give you a little clearer image right there. Although the configuration of the parcels may not appear connected, the applicant has legally constructed boundaries through a series of adjustments. According to the Ada county surveyor, as long as the parcels are connected via right of way and the plat is signed by ACHD, the entire area can be treated as a single preliminary plat. So, it will be these six parcels back here and the parcels fronting on Black Cat right here. But these three parcels right here will not be included in the formal subdivision. The surrounding parcels, while not a part of the plat, are also part of the broader development and are governed by the CC&Rs ensuring shared responsibilities for landscaping, roadways and cross-access. The Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan requires the collector roadway to be built within the part of the development. The east-west collector, known as Grand Mogul, has already been partially constructed and partially deeded to ACHD for the constructed portion. North-south collector roadway is

also a requirement and this will give you a better idea. This will be the north-south collector on the very west boundary. Part of -- part of the north-south collector will be proposed on Lot 3, Block 2, which will include a turnaround approved by ACHD. However, as the city anticipates future development in this area there is a concern about whether -- whether the connection at Franklin Road will align properly on the north and the south side. Staff has presented an alternative along the east side of the Rosenlof Drain for logical city service expansion, but acknowledges the applicant's valid concerns about the cost and feasibility for smaller developments on that side. So, as a result of that staff has worked with the applicant since the -- the Commission hearing to revise the condition to allow for future collaboration on the roadway alignment prior to the final plat of phase three for this development. So, the city, the applicant and ACHD can figure out what is the best alignment for that road at the time that the final plat for phase three comes in, which is anticipated to be I think several years down the line and regarding access, the entire development -- regarding cross-access, the entire development is covered by CC&Rs, which will include a provision for cross -- cross-access among parcels. As a -- as a result staff is comfortable allowing a reference to the CC&Rs in the plat notes. Staff and Commission have recommended a few modifications to the conditions of approval and I have displayed them on the screen for you guys' reference. So, we will want condition 5-D to be struck, because it's a repetitive primarily modification to 4-D to allow for the plat note to either have a blanket cross-access easement or for it to reference the CC&Rs and, then, a modification to condition three to allow for -- with the final plat phase three to allow for coordination for that alignment of the north-south collector on the south and north side of Franklin Road. And I would -- finally I would like to note that no public comments were received for this application and staff is recommending approval with conditions and I will stand for any questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening. State your name and address for the record.

Densmer: I might be too tall. Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, thank you. My name is Jason Densmer. I'm with The Land Group. I'm here -- my address is 462 East Shore Drive in Eagle and I'm pleased to be here tonight representing the applicant for the Mogul Industrial Park Subdivision. We appreciate Nick and your staff's work on this application over the past several months as we brought it forward with them. Generally tonight we are in full support of the staff report as written. I did want to give you just a quick update on the project, because it has been in front of you before since it was originally annexed into the city and entered into a development agreement. Things have been going really well with the project. The Meridian Commerce Park has constructed the St. Luke's building. Recently completed Building J and four additional smaller format, light industrial buildings along the Black Cat frontage. We have also improved the Black Cat frontage according to ACHD's conditions of approval for the project and constructed about the first third of Grand Mogul, the east-west collector road. Your approval, hopefully, tonight of the Mogul Industrial Park Subdivision will allow us to continue moving forward in a -- kind of a methodical, logical development of the overall project, still consistent with the development agreement and adhering to all

of the conditions that we know we have to do. The -- the Planning and Zoning Commission -- we were pleased to have their recommendation for approval and, really, the only things that we needed to talk about with them were this north-south collector road that Nick mentioned will occur with our phase three of the development on the western boundary of the project. There is just a lot of kind of haziness in the crystal ball for that area of the project and the exact alignment of that roadway we think is best deferred a few years into the future until there is a little bit more clarity about development of the property to the west of us and where the intersection of that road will need to align on Franklin Road. So, we are in support of the revised condition of approval that was recommended to you by the Planning and Zoning Commission and the two other minor modifications to conditions that Nick mentioned earlier. So, a lot of words just went by. Hopefully you follow them, but if you have any questions I'm happy to answer them. The short story is we are very happy with the recommendations of staff and your Planning and Zoning Commission and hope to gain your approval tonight for the preliminary plat.

Simison: Thank you. Counsel, any questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. No one has signed up.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody who -- who is present who would like to provide testimony on this item? Or online? Seeing no one coming forward, would the applicant like to make any file comments? Council, turn this over to you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move that we close the public hearing on Item H-2025-0006.

Little Roberts: 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: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Pretty straightforward application with it being a preliminary plat. I just -- I want to note for Council, I know we spent a lot of time last week talking about the service impact tool. This didn't exist in 2021. This came when this came in. It is there

today. I did hear from -- from fire and planning today again. Similar set of circumstances. It's kind of away from town. Current conditions with access will likely be resolved as development occurs, so I don't see any compelling reason why we would want to delay at least getting the preliminary plat approved. So, Mr. Mayor, I'm going to move that we approve Item 3, preliminary plat for H-2025-0006 as presented in the staff report, notating the changes as presented by staff. Include all staff and applicant testimony.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve item 3. Is there discussion on the motion? If not clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Have a good evening.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing for AOCI Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (H-2025-0029) by City of Meridian, located citywide and at 12504 W. Amity Rd.

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (CPAM) to modify the boundaries of the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), along with a subsequent request to Ada County to re-establish the modified boundary of the Area of City Impact (AOCI), which includes the removal of 38 parcels totaling approximately 507.34 acres and adds one 5.06 acre parcel.

Simison: All right. Next up is Item 4, which is public hearing for area of city impact Comprehensive Plan Map amendment, which is H-2025-0029. We will open this public hearing with staff comments. Good evening, Carl.

Anderson: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. My name is Carl Anderson, long range associate planner here with the city. Tonight's presentation we are going to go over the city's request to amend the city's future land use map -- comprehensive future land use map amending the boundaries of the land use map itself and the city's area of impact. I will go through the reasoning behind the request, detail some of the areas that are being impacted and the city's next steps. So, the why behind the request -- in 2024 the Idaho state legislature amended Idaho Code 67-6526 pertaining to areas of impact. There are a couple key components here that I would like to detail. One of those is establishing kind of a timeline that the city needed to address modifying the boundaries of its area of city impact. So, there are -- the timeline -- the deadline, essentially, for that area to be modified is December 31st of 2025. The city

has been in contact with Ada county and we are anticipating meeting that timeline. Requires areas of city impact to be within two miles from city limits. Considerations for service planning were also amended within Idaho Code as well. Essentially also established that areas of impact are within the jurisdiction of Ada county. So, the request will be followed by a request to Ada county to reestablish the city's area -- current or proposed area of city impact. Additionally one point of clarification within Idaho Code is that it does clarify that city may adopt a comprehensive plan, conduct infrastructure, capital improvements and other planning activities beyond its current area of impact. So, while we are pulling back some of our boundaries due to the two mile radius from city limits, we do anticipate that we will continue to plan for those areas for -- anticipate future growth within those areas. So, being a citywide application this -- this request was noticed for a public hearing. Courtesy notices were sent to affected property owners that -- whose properties were subject to the request. The removal -- the removed parcels impact 38 total parcels, 507 acres and some change parcel acres. So, this does not include right of way. With the addition of one parcel totaling 5.06 parcel acres. This was a request supported as part of this application where the city of Boise recently removed a parcel on Amity Road from its areas of city impact. The resolution -- resolution for that action is with -- included within the staff report. The proposed properties would be included in the area of city impact for Meridian with a future land use map designation of medium density residential. There are no development proposals with that request at this time, so as that property develops in the future the applicant would need to come forward with their request to annex and develop the property at that time. Additionally, entryway corridors would be modified accordingly with this request. Where areas are being removed or added those entry corridors that are impacted would be either extended or removed accordingly. So, the map on the left details the area that's being removed from the city's area of impact. You will see the change in the acres. This is 512 acres and some change that's inclusive of right of way from that area. This is located generally the southwest corner of the City of Meridian boundary -- area city impact boundary and future land use map. Of note there are parcels included in this as permitted by Idaho State Code where that buffer might bisect a parcel. If it's bisecting that parcel it may be included in the AOI boundary, so those parcels are included within -- within our proposed area of impact. The image on the right is the area to be added, 5.07 acres. That is the parcel to be added to both the FLUM and the city's area of impact with the designation, again, of medium density residential matching those properties to the west of the subject parcel. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the request on the public hearing held on July -- June 26th, 2025, and forwarded their recommendation to City Council. The next steps following Council decision tonight, staff will be requesting the renegotiation with Ada county to reestablish the city's area of impact pending Council approval. We will be back before you for a resolution, either within the coming months or after that decision. Some of the timing related to resolution is still up in the air a little bit, but we are working through that. With that I'm happy to answer any questions that the Council may have.

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

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Carl, will you just help me understand -- when I was on the Council previously we spent a lot of time talking about clean lines and this looks like it does just the opposite, but I know there has got to be more behind it than what I'm understanding. I'm just curious.

Anderson: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Little Roberts. So, again, this is just removing those portions from the city's current future land use map and area of impact that extend beyond that two mile radius. There is an exhibit in the staff report that does detail what that buffer looks like as it bisects those parcels. So, those parcels are within the city's capital improvement plans and future planning efforts. So, we would like to keep them within the city's area of impact in future land use map where possible. So, what you are seeing here -- maybe at the north most portion of the area to be removed where it doesn't -- the lines don't necessarily square up, that's generally following parcel boundaries.

Simison: The intention is to eventually include this in our area of city impact. Probably in five years we will -- maybe have annexed far enough that we would -- next time we update it we would include it. So, it would still be a nice clean line eventually.

Little Roberts: Great. Thank you. Thank you.

Anderson: Yeah.

Simison: Okay. Madam Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. No. No one has signed up.

Simison: Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item? Seeing no one coming forward, any last comments from staff?

Anderson: No, Mr. Mayor. Thank you.

Simison: Council, what's your pleasure or direction?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Seeing no comments, I move we close the public hearing.

Cavener: 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. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: This is pretty straightforward. It's keeping us in alignment with the new state code and I would be happy to move forward with a motion.

Simison: Okay.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, after approving all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2025-0029 to remove the subject 507.34 acres from the city's future land use map and area of city impact and include 5.06 acres as described to the area of city impact and future land use map with a designation of medium density residential and authorize staff to request -- apply with Ada County to re-establish the boundaries of the city's area of city impact.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing: Proposed updates to Title 4, Chapter 1, Meridian City Code per Idaho Code section 50-344(2), regarding temporary and project-specific solid waste collection

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 5, which is a public hearing for proposed updates to Title 4, Chapter 1, Emergency Code, per Idaho State Code Section 50-344-2. Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. You had this presentation in front of you last week. So, for the record and for the public that may be watching, this is a desire for our code to now match up to some changes that were put into place by the last legislative session that does allow, even in areas where the franchise for solid

waste collection, like we have in the City of Meridian and the mandatory requirement to use our franchisee for most solid waste collections, there is an exception that's been created by the state legislature that allows that to be done by other entities other than franchisees in -- in areas that are defined by the city. So, we have done that in this particular case in creating, basically, an exception that allows for these to be done by anybody, including the franchise -- or -- or -- either the current franchisee or any other entity with a limited basis for a limited period of time. We have created a way that can, then, be tracked and collected and adjusted through our system. Anyway, this allows for an exception that's been created by the legislature and allows us to define what that is and that's what this does, so -- we haven't had any additional comments since the last presentation. And, again, we have vetted that through our Solid Waste Commission, as well as with our current franchisee. So, we are ready to move this forward and, again, whatever your pleasure is.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. This is a public hearing. Do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Lomeli: Mr. Mayor, no one has signed up.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we close the public hearing on Item No. 5.

Taylor: Second.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and 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: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing: Proposed updates to Title 1, Chapter 7, Section 9, of Meridian City Code regarding City Councilmembers' Compensation

Simison: So, with that we will -- have under ordinances -- you want to move on to the next couple items? Okay. With that next item up is Item 6, public hearing proposed updates to Title 1, Chapter 7, Section 8, of Meridian City Code regarding City Council Member compensation. Open this public hearing with staff comments.

Nary: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, so we -- again, as the presentation was last week, former Council Member Hoaglun is here as well if you have questions from the committee. This is a recommendation from your citizens committee to both recommend an increase to the City Council over the next two years and also in that -- and I appreciate the Councils have taken a look at this and giving us some feedback, some of the information in the transition and trying to get this on for this week a couple things got missed, but we have corrected it. The one that is in the packet for your approval tonight -- or can be delayed if you wish -- is reflective of what was presented last week, which is an increase to the Council for both next calendar year in '26, as well as another increase in '27 and, then, a condition that after those two years, then, the Council increases would align with the city's general employee compensation increases, if any, that are provided, would be the same amount as those would be going forward. The recommendation is not in this, but the ordinance still would be in place that allows the committee to reconvene each election cycle to evaluate those to a market analysis and bring back any other suggestions, if any, to you, but -- so, that wouldn't change, but this would be a two year change in compensation for Council Members, as well as an ongoing method that's already, then, going to be in ordinance to allow for increases without any other additional changes.

Simison: Thank you, Bill. Council, any questions for staff?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Bill, thanks for the explanation and if Mr. Hoaglun is still there, again, thanks for the presentation last week. My microphone wasn't quite working, so I didn't get to express my full appreciation then, so I will do it now. Just a question, Bill, in terms of the ordinance which has dollar amounts fixed in it and, then, Subsection B, which two years from now allows for an increase commensurate with the city employee pay increase or COLA. Is there a reason why we couldn't just do Subsection B at this point or do we have to amend Subsection A and change dollar figures at this point?

Nary: Well, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Whitlock, actually you can do whatever you wish. The recommendation from the committee was to move the total compensation for the Council up to those dollar figures and, then, subsequent to that, then, the increases. So, the desire was to move the -- the value of compensation for each of those positions up to those numbers and -- and if you recall former Council Member Perreault was here last week as well -- in the targeting that 20,000 figure is what they were looking at, but they recognize that getting to that over a two year period was more palatable and so they want to do that, but, then, after that the secondary was also, then, to build in that increase that was built into the system that's already in place for compensation with, again, that adjustment or evaluation every couple years. So, that was the intent of the committee. Certainly this Council could do whatever you wish. So, you can certainly make it the -- just the -- the percentage increase only and that's it, but I mean that's certainly your call. If I misstated that certainly Council Member

Hoaglun is here as well and he could certainly correct that, but that's what I recall the discussion was.

Simison: Council, any further questions? Is there anybody from the public who would like to provide testimony on this item? Seeing one coming forward.

Hoaglun: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Brad Hoaglun. 2470 West Trestle Drive here in Meridian and I had the pleasure of serving on the committee and just wanted to remind you of a couple of things. First of all, it's really not about you, it's about the future and those that come after you and -- and that's one of the things the committee had a good discussion about. We wanted to have fair and competitive compensation going into the future. We want people who -- who come after you to be compensated in a way that -- they are not going to get rich. We know you aren't doing it for the money and people in the future I'm pretty sure aren't going to be doing it for the money, but there is that aspect that you are taking valuable time and time away from your family. In fact, I think I characterize it as spousal appreciation pay and that's what happens to that. Council, I will speak to the Council salaries here, because we have a separate one for the Mayor. But in 2023 the committee had made a recommendation that was turned down. It was not acted upon. So, 2024 and '25 there was no increases. So, that's why we wanted to go to 1,500 dollars for this coming year and a following 1,500 dollars the next year. That way we hope we would, then, have the Council move forward with the recommendation of having the general -- whatever the general employee population receives that will also be what the Mayor and Council receive and that way we kind of take the politics out of this. People look at it say, oh, they are just self-serving when they get to vote for their own pay increase. That's why you have the committee. We look at it. We looked at all the amount you are receiving since 2000. We looked at other cities and did that comparison. Now, it's a little hard sometimes, because you look at Nampa, the third largest city, Meridian is the second largest city and there is a big difference, but -- in their code they are required two meetings a month. You have four. Twice as many. So, there are discrepancies like that that we kind of ferreted through and said, okay, this is why we think you should be paid this amount. So, again, you are not going to get rich on it. I think I said last time it was 54 dollars per pay period increase and that's before taxes. So, not a whole heck of a lot. But it's very important. We also had made the recommendation that if you don't want to go 1,500 per -- per year, at least go 500. There has got to be some increase in there. We need to keep up -- otherwise you get so far behind the committee after us will come and make -- have to make a recommendation that's even larger. But we hope by accepting this recommendation for the next two years and, then, beginning in 2028 that cost of living increase that employees get would also be received by Council and you just move forward that way and, then, every two or four years, whatever was decided for that, we can look at it from a market perspective, just like HR does, does there need to be a market adjustment. But everything is built in, whatever goes to the general employee would go to you. So, that's what we did. We hope you agree with that and I stand for any questions.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Maybe a question for staff. So, I'm looking at the ordinance here. Are we tonight would be voting on this ordinance, am I understanding correctly is this all updated with how it was portrayed to you last week with how to draft the ordinance as in if we accepted it this would be the ordinance and this would be what we would do tonight?

Nary: Yes, sir.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up. If -- if we had -- if we would like to make some modifications to this tonight would we -- what would that process be? Would we -- we just indicate that we want to come back with maybe a slightly change to that? Because I know we took the recommendations -- the recommendations were drafted in the ordinance as it was and here it is before us, but we didn't have a very -- much of a discussion at least about -- if we would like to see any tweaks or changes to that. So, the process, if I understand it, would be if we wanted to make some changes tonight we would offer that up, we would vote on it and, then, we would potentially have it redrafted to come back next week or the following week; is that correct?

Nary: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Taylor, if -- if -- that's exactly correct. The direction was bring forward what we have proposed. If the Council does want to make changes we can, then, bring it back to a subsequent meeting. If the desire is to bring it back next week, because you are going to be comfortable with those changes, that's fine. Next week we weren't intending to have another public hearing, but you certainly can. Or we can bring it back on the 12th of August for a public hearing. We do need to have some final action by -- and, again, I apologize, I -- I think by at least by the 12th we would like to get that finalized to make sure we meet the timeline that's required by state code. So, it can be done this week, it can be done next week, it can be done on the 12th. If you want to make changes you can certainly do that.

Taylor: Yeah. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: To make sure that -- I think now would probably be the appropriate time to sort of have some of the discussion, even though the public hearing is open. Appreciate the work of the committee and -- there is some things in there that I really like and I want to support and there is some things I just -- I can't support today for the reason that's pretty obvious, which is if we are considering a -- asking the -- for a public levy increase, I have a hard time asking for an increase. Though I do support the idea of tying future decisions to a percentage increase with the employees. I think that -- to me that makes a lot of sense and I agree it also makes sense to keep market adjustment discussion in

there as we would deem appropriate. So, you know, I don't want to bury the lead as it were. I -- I can't say -- I wouldn't support this tonight, but I would -- what I would like to see is -- is essentially that we adopt the second half of the -- the ordinance where we -- actually starting next year we would start tying our salary increases to the percentage increase of that. But I'm not in favor tonight of the increase in salary, just because we are in a unique situation this year and I would -- I would make the argument -- when was the last time we had a permanent public levy that we were potentially presenting to the -- the city to vote on and approve? To me that's what qualifies extraordinary circumstances by which I don't think it's appropriate. I always have considered budget documents and -- and for of the budget process as a laying out our priorities to the citizens and to me it's a confusing argument to say we are going to take us an increase in pay and we are going to ask for more money from you for the levy. Again I'm not trying to be difficult, I'm not trying to be a naysayer, I'm trying to be productive in the discussion. So, I just wanted to kind of state that's where I am at this point. I could support something that was only the second-half of the ordinance, but not the entirety without some modification.

Simison: So, I know my comments are going to fall in deaf ears, because no one likes to have a conversation and just like I won't speak up when you are on the next item, but I'm going to challenge Council to say, you know, part of the -- the conversation that I have had about the levy, you know, as well as the SAFER grant, I said I wouldn't let it impact our current operations and our current needs. These -- to me these are not competing issues. You know, the levy's been put forward and to say if you would like us to retain these additional firefighters, if you would like to pay your police more, if you would like to do prosecution ourselves, this is how we can go about doing that. But to me -- and maybe you can make your own arguments about whether or not that rings true, but this is no different than the other thing that went through our budget process. We want competitive salaries for all of our employees. We did not back away from any changes to our employee compensation this year because of the levy conversation. If there was a market adjustment that was necessary, if there was a step plan that was going to be made, if there was a cost of living increase that was going to be done, we did all that and that's all included into our -- into our budget. So, I know you feel like you -- you may feel like it's being hypocritical in this -- in the context, but I think it actually -- you know, what is hypocritical is we will call it the Council opposition oppression vote to say no to increase wages, so that no one wants the job, because you don't get -- you don't get compensated for this to the level that's necessary, but I know it's a tough conversation. It's a tough vote no matter. It's a tough conversation. But at least I want to be the one to say some things, because I -- I think, you know, you can take it, you cannot, you can vote however you -- you want, but my viewpoint on the levy is we would not impact our current operational components and this is the recommendation and I'm not going to say because they got together and gave their time to give their recommendations that you should have to do it, but if you are not going to do it I would say let's get rid of this code. Let's no longer go to a committee that's going to evaluate and make recommendations if it's really something that's not going to be what's going to make that driving factor or take it out of your hands and let other people make that decision throughout -- let me make the decision for you. I'm -- I'm serious. You know,

it's like there is other ways to do this, because it's never comfortable to have this conversation about your own salaries. I get it one hundred percent and it's not easy in that context. So, I'm going to stop right there and --

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: It didn't fall on deaf ears. It was well received. I just cordially disagree.

Simison: Correct.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor and Council, this is definitely something I go back and forth on, because as Brad pointed out, we -- we are the ones making the decision and so the first thing we do is take -- how do we feel about it in consideration and it's tough for me to say raise my salary for whatever reason, because I'm here because I love the city, but I also know that I have talked to so many people that possibly could be up here someday and they think, well, that's kind of not in my wheelhouse because it really isn't paid, especially if they are younger, in their 30s or 40s are like that doesn't match what I'm even remotely considering as a part-time salary, because we do end up working more hours than we anticipate and to me there is a lot of things to look at and I don't think we could have had a better committee. I mean our committee was made up of people that have sat in these chairs and wrestled with the decision -- two of our esteemed former colleagues, as well as people that are very versed on what we do, how we do it, how much time goes in it and, then, my HR side of me says we kind of missed out on not keeping up with salaries every single year. So -- so I think in the long run I am supportive of this. It's got so many angles and I don't believe that it's tied in with the levy. I think we have got to consider everything. But I think that your words definitely rang true for me that those are two completely different issues. So, thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Say a lot of words I think I said last time we talked about this. We voted on this a couple years ago. I was brand new on Council and at the time I was like very very uncomfortable voting on my own pay increase. I was brand new to Council and I was still discovering just how much time it took for my week. Not just to do this job, but to do it right, to put the homework in, to spend the time looking through everything. So, after voting no two years ago and getting to this point now I realize what we are doing is we are digging a hole and we can keep digging that hole. We are not doing ourselves a favor. We are not doing future councils a favor. But I think I have to go back to the

bottom line that was said is we are not doing this for us. This isn't -- this isn't in front of us for us, this is in front of us for city council's now, future -- everyone to look at so they are adequately compensated for the work they do to do the job and it's -- it's a tough one. I don't -- I don't like voting on something for myself. I made that quite apparent two years ago. I kind of get it now and it helps that there were former council members on that committee that can look you in the eye and sit there and they are not getting compensated for it now and they are looking right at me saying you need to do this and this is why and they spent their time up here sitting on this dais making decisions for the city and doing the work and based on those conversations I think it's the right thing to do to support it and I would move forward. I think we can always find an excuse for not supporting this. You can always find it. So, I will support it this year going forward.

Simison: And maybe just piggyback off one thing that you said. I often say this to other people about -- said the reason Meridian is success -- successful in what we have in the Public Safety Training Center and our amazing parks and our fire and things is because Council at one point in time had made a very tough decision to implement impact fees. Quite frankly, this Council, the job that you have to do, is made so much easier, because some council 20 years ago made some very tough decisions to put additional costs on the back of growth and development that allows this Council to be successful. Myself included. This is maybe one of those times where you are especially setting something up -- catching up and a path moving forward for the long run for those next councils as well at this point in time. But I -- I just think it's -- sometimes these are things that doesn't feel right, doesn't feel comfortable, but I think it's important to consider, so --

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Started the evening on the fence on this issue and, unfortunately, it was a picket fence, so I'm going to have to figure out which side I want to fall on and part of me wants to fall where Councilman Taylor is, because I agree with that and this is not in conflict with what we may or may not decide next week, but it is juxtaposed to what we may or may not decide next week with the public safety levy. So, I have to look at the full picture of that and yet the other side of the fence I totally agree with what you just said. We need to make some decisions about the future and, frankly, if the public safety levy fails, somebody's going to be making some really hard decisions on this Council and they ought to be compensated for making those tough decisions. If the public levy -- public safety levy passes, then, we are able to make that a priority for our city as we move forward and deliver on what the citizens say that they want. So, again, I'm -- I'm -- I'm trying to figure out which side of the fence I'm going to fall onto, because this picket fence is not a comfortable ride right now. I would like to hear the rest of the discussion, but I -- I appreciate the -- the counsel from you, Mayor. I appreciate the concerns from Councilman Taylor. I agree with both sides of that. So, if anybody else can help me get off the fence I would appreciate it.

Simison: Your cleanup hitter is coming in, Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I don't know if this helps Council Member Whitlock one way or another. I think this is the fifth time that I have been a part of one of these and I will be honest, when I very first got on Council I was a no unless proven otherwise. Just -- I showed up, my mind was made up, I was not going to vote to support a salary increase and at the time, quite frankly, I think because of these committees, I have tried to be much more open minded. I have even voted to support a salary increase, I believe, once in my time. So, I'm not always opposed and I -- and Mayor, I -- and, Mr. Nary, I want to commend you. I think this is the best committee we have ever put together since I have been on Council and like my good colleague Council Member Whitlock, I -- I have swayed back and forth and, Council Member Little Roberts, you hit the nail on the head, I don't -- I don't think that -- that a salary increase for the Council is tied to a levy, but I also don't think that we can make those decisions in a vacuum. I think we have to look at the real world implications and former Council Member Hoaglund I think, you know, put it best, it's not about us, it is about -- got to take the person out of it and, Council Member Little Roberts, you talk a lot about, you know, positions, not people, and that has sat in the back of my head a lot. It's not about Council Member Cavener or Council Member Taylor, it's about future council members who will send these seats and so I have -- I have wrestled with that. The part that I have landed for me is -- and you have heard me ask about this at various budgets and as we have talked about compensation for our employees. I want our employees to be paid a fair and equitable wage. I don't want to compare it necessarily to this city or that city. We want to be selective. I want to make sure their employees receive a fair and equitable wage. Likewise, I want to make sure that our City Council receives a fair and equitable compensation. Our Mayor receives a fair and equitable compensation, knowing that we have never met -- I have never met anybody that's ran or sat up here that said because we have increased our wage 1,500 dollars, that was the ticket to get me to run or because you didn't take an increase I decided I wasn't going to run. I don't think that our voters want candidates that are focused on compensation. I do agree with Council Member Hoaglund, my wife has had a few make-up dinners purchased probably with my City Council salary and flowers for saying, hey, I told you to be home at 8:00 and didn't get home until 11:30, that happens. But are we paid a fair and equitable wage for what we do and I think the answer is yes and so I -- I likely won't be in support of an increase this year, not because I don't think the -- the committee makes sense and not because I don't think it's deserved. Quite frankly, all of you that are up here deserve to be paid a hundred times more than what you are paying, because you care about this community and the time that you put in. It's not about that. It is are we receiving a fair and equitable amount of compensation for the job that our community asks of us? I think right now the answer is yes.

Simison: The public hearing is still open.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, while I don't see anybody here and I have to say I -- I'm going to convey a little bit of disappointment. Our state legislature took up compensation increases. There was lots of chatter and lots of people had strong opinions and one of

our neighbor cities took up compensation increases. It was a packed, you know, council chambers. We don't have anybody here, despite I think this being promoted very well. Used to have a council member who sat right over here and says if -- if nobody's here that must mean everybody's in agreement. I don't necessarily share that same opinion, but I'm disappointed that there is nobody here in our community, outside of a good committee member, to provide any testimony on this one way or another. But that said, Mr. Mayor, I'm happy to make a motion that we close the public hearing on proposed updates to Title 1, Chapter 7, Section 9, the Meridian City Code, regarding City Council compensation.

Little Roberts: 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: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: So, Council, I don't know if you want to continue discussion before we get to the ordinance to know whether or not we are going to take up the ordinance or not. Any further -- or just go to the ordinance when we get there and see what happens? Okay. Right. I think that's what we will do.

7. Public Hearing: Proposed updates to Title 1, Chapter 6, Section 5, of Meridian City Code regarding Mayor's Compensation

Simison: So, with that we will go to Item 7, which is a public hearing proposed updates to Title 1, Chapter 6, Section 5 of Meridian City Code regarding mayor's compensation. Turn this over to Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Again, as the prior one, we -- our citizens committee did meet and made these recommendations for these increases for the Mayor's compensation. Basically very similar conversation, very similar discussion. Again, it was looking at trying to be consistent, trying to move the wages up periodically as necessary. That's a very common compensation method is to do that to avoid these discussions where you have to make drastic increases. There was a desire by the committee to move this number up to what they felt was a more reasonable and equitable approach for compensation for the mayor. Again, the committee is currently configured that it meets every couple years during an election cycle, so the next time it's scheduled to meet again is in two years before the actual term of the Mayor is over before the next Mayor term would begin. But this is trying to, again, keep it up and move it along. Again, there have been -- and they looked at a number of past ones over the last 25 years of -- the Mayor has increased more incrementally more often than the Council. There have been occasions where they have not. But here, again, was the same idea of not looking at the individuals, not looking at the individual person in the job, but the job itself and what the expectation the committee felt as a community, as the

committee members, as their expectation of what they believe, as well as what they think the public is looking for and what they think is a fair compensation. So, that was where those numbers came from. That's what the intent was to move that along. And, then, also same thing, to put this in future opportunity for those to increase on a regular basis annually along with that periodic market adjustment with the election cycle. So, that was the intent for this one as well.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Nary. Council, any questions for staff? Would the public like to come up and provide any testimony on this? Or committee member?

Hoaglund: Yes, I would, Mr. Mayor. Brad Hoaglund. 2470 West Trestle Drive, Meridian. And that's one thing about the committee -- all residents and they want to be good stewards of tax dollars. I mean that's really what we want and when it came to the Mayor's salary the recommendation was 3,500 dollar increase of 2026 and 3,500 dollars for 2027. And, again, also, then, tying into for -- starting in 2028 the -- the general employee increases as well. One of the things about the salary now for the Mayor, he is not paid what a CEO of an organization this size, with a budget of this magnitude, would be paid. They are much higher. And -- and, of course, bonuses and other things. You are in government work you don't get bonuses. That's just the way it works. That's fine. And, again, it's -- it's not about this Mayor, it's about that position and -- and the future of that position. I -- I do know having been in private business and -- and private entity that the level that's currently at it's not even a vice -- vice-president level. It's not even at a director level. There are people who are directors in organizations that make far more than this. So, we thought it was imperative that we increase that a bit and still not even going to make 150,000. It would be after 2027 it would be at 146,387. So, with the direct reports that he has, the budget he manages, the day-to-day affairs, we thought it's the best we can do at this time, but, then, if we tie it in moving forward that would be helpful for whoever is in that position in the future, so -- any questions happy to answer.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Is there anybody else who has been hanging out all night that wants to come forward and talk about this item?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: If there is anything I try to be consistent, so I don't need to repeat what I said before, because my position is consistent, but that said I will take the opportunity, as I have learned about -- over the last year and a half of being on Council, the responsibilities that the Mayor's seat has. It's significant. It is a large organization. It does require a lot of time and I -- I absolutely agree with you, the notion that we want competent people to be interested in this role, not just now, but in the future as the city grows. There is a lot of challenges. You do have to face a lot of difficult decisions, some of us thrusting it upon you, some of your own making, but it is a -- it is a challenge.

Simison: Come on. My own making? What's up with that?

Taylor: And I recognize that.

Simison: I'm kidding.

Taylor: I will compliment you. I think that the city is being run well and it -- my position on this issue isn't reflective of your job performances, as much as being consistent with what I have said before about how we present these things to our constituency.

Simison: You could have just closed the public hearing, too. Sorry. I'm having a good night tonight. I don't know why. Well, a lot of iced tea today. Any -- any further comments or a motion to close the public hearing?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we close the public hearing on proposed updates to Title 1, Chapter 7, Section 5 of the Meridian City Code regarding Mayor's compensation.

Overton: 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. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 8. Ordinance No. 25-2092, updates to Title 4, Chapter 1, Meridian City Code per Idaho Code section 50-344(2): Amending Meridian City Code section 4-1-3 to add definitions of "household waste" and "temporary project"; amending Meridian City Code section 4-1-4, regarding compulsory use of solid waste collection franchisee's services; amending Meridian City Code section 4-1-8, regarding collection of solid waste and recyclable materials, specifically temporary project service and on-call service; amending Meridian City Code section 4-1-10(G), adding an exception to compulsory use of franchisee for temporary project solid waste collection; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 8, which is Ordinance No. 25-2092. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Ordinance No. 25-2092, updates to Title 4, Chapter 1, Meridian City Code, per Idaho Code Section 50-344(2): Amending Meridian City Code

Section 4-1-3 to add definitions of “household waste” and “temporary project”; amending Meridian City Code Section 4-1-4, regarding compulsory use of solid waste collection franchisee’s services; amending Meridian City Code Section 4-1-8, regarding collection of solid waste and recyclable materials, specifically temporary project service and on-call service; amending Meridian City Code Section 4-1-10(g), adding an exception to compulsory use of franchisee for temporary project solid waste collection; repealing conflicting ordinances; 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 this entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2092.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2092. Is their discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

9. Ordinance No. 25-2093: An Ordinance Amending Title 1, Chapter 7, Section 9 of the Meridian City Code, Regarding City Councilmembers' Compensation; Providing a Savings Clause; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Next item up is Ordinance No. 25-2093. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An Ordinance Amending Title 1, Chapter 7, Section 9 of the Meridian City Code, regarding City Councilmembers' Compensation; providing a savings clause; 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? If not, do I have a motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2093.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2093. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: Three no's. Two ayes. Motion fails.

MOTION FAILED: THREE NAY. TWO AYES. ONE ABSENT.

10. Ordinance No. 25-2094: An Ordinance Amending Title 1, Chapter 6, Section 5 of the Meridian City Code Regarding Mayor's Compensation; Providing a Savings Clause; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: With that we will move on to Ordinance No. 25-2094. Is there discussion -- or ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An Ordinance amending Title 1, Chapter 6, Section 5 of the Meridian City Code regarding Mayor's compensation; providing a savings clause; 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, do I have a motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2094.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2094. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: Three ayes, two nays, and the motion is agreed to..

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO NAYS. ONE ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just a good reminder to our team, special meeting next Tuesday. Make sure it's on your calendar. We will be talking all things public safety levy. So, look forward to seeing you all next week.

Simison: All right. With that is there a motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we adjourn the meeting.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:56 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK