

Meridian City Council Work Session

July 15, 2025.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m. Tuesday, July 15, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Doug Taylor.

Other Present: Tina Lomeli, Bill Nary, Emily Kane, Jamie Leslie, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Whitlock
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Little Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input 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 is July 15th, 2025, at 4:30 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item up is adoption of the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: No changes to today's workshop agenda, so I move we adopt the agenda as presented.

Strader: 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.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Vanguard Village Subdivision No. 1 Pedestrian Pathway Easement (ESMT-2025-0076)**

- 2. Agreement for Use of Kleiner Park for Island Festival by Idaho Pacific Islanders Inc.**
- 3. Bittercreek Sewer Connection Agreement Between the City of Meridian and the City of Kuna**

Simison: Next up is the Consent Agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

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

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

- 4. Proposed updates to Title 4, Chapter 1, Meridian City Code per Idaho Code section 50-344(2)**

Simison: So, we will move on to Department/Commission Reports. First item up is Item 4, which is proposed updates to Title 4, Chapter 1, Meridian City Code, per Idaho Code Section 53-442 to Ms. Kane.

Kane: Hello, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. I'm Emily Kane. I'm a deputy city attorney in the city attorney's office. I'm here to talk to you about a proposed change to city code. The -- oh. Yeah. Okay. This code change is necessitated by a new piece of legislation that was adopted this spring. It's a change to Idaho Code Section 5344, which is the provision that governs city's authority to operate solid waste collection systems. So, a new provision was added that says that notwithstanding any franchise agreement any person may contract with a solid waste collection provider of the person's choosing for the use of solid waste collection services for temporary projects. So, containers that are temporary and project specific as defined by city ordinance. So, this is -- this is a change for us. We do have a franchise agreement in place, so we

need to look at changing our ordinance or adding to our ordinance to react to this. The -- I'm going to start with some things that won't change. The -- we do have an exception in our compulsory use provision. So, everyone in the city has to use our franchisees -- our franchisee Republic Services solid waste collection services and there are some exceptions and one exception that we already have on the books is for construction projects and landscaping projects. So, those companies -- or those -- those projects can haul their own solid waste. So, they -- and they often do. Sometimes they contract with Republic Services, but they sometimes haul their -- their own waste from the site. So, that's an exception to our compulsory use provision that will not change. So, this really doesn't relate to construction projects or landscaping. Our franchise agreement does not need to change. It has a provision that says that our franchisee does their service in accordance with city code. So, a change to the city code will be adequate to -- to govern the new -- the new way of doing things. There are provisions that -- that govern how we do the change -- how we make the change to Title 4, Chapter 1, which is our solid waste code and we have complied with that. So, the proposed update -- we would -- well, there are a number of changes that we are proposing. They are all to achieve this -- this -- this accommodation of temporary projects. So, I will kind of hit the highlights here. We would add a definition of temporary project and we are proposing that we define temporary project as an activity that is 90 days or less in duration that generates solid waste. We would propose a change to clarify that the compulsory use provision does have exceptions. That's something that actually would clarify our code overall. So, we would, then, also add an exception for temporary projects. So, it would say any person may contract with a solid waste collection provider of the person's choosing for the use of solid waste collection containers and collection services for a temporary project. So, that language closely mirrors the state code, so it's clear that that is -- that is the purpose of the exception. As part of this we would establish some minimal standards for the temporary haulers that are now an exception to the exclude -- or the -- the franchise agreement. So, we would -- we would say the temporary project container can be used for no longer than 90 days. If it's longer than 90 days now we are back in the world of the -- our franchisee. So, any project longer than 90 days would still have to use Republic Services. There can be one temporary project per property per calendar year. The container could not be used for other kinds of waste or especially not prohibited waste. The temporary project container would identify the provider's name and phone number and this would help the city contact that -- that provider if we -- if we needed to. That's something new. The temporary project waste would need to be collected at least once a month or if necessary with more frequency and, then, no wheeled carts. We would also clarify that on-call service by Republic would include projects that are longer than 90 days, but aren't quite permanent. So, in the event that someone has a project that goes for longer than 90 days there is a plan. This is a service that's already provided, so this is just bringing the code into alignment with what's happening and kind of acknowledges that sort of medium -- that medium need. We have gone over this proposed code with the Meridian Police Department Code Enforcement Division, since they are the ones that are often contacting the temporary haulers. We have talked to Finance, the Utility Billing Services, since they do the billing and we bundle our franchise service billing with our utility billing, so that there is some impact there. But they are -- they are on board with the change. This has been

presented to the Solid Waste Advisory Commission at their June meeting. Sayard Schultz, our solid waste coordinator, has been in touch with Republic Services throughout this process and since the legislation has gone into effect, so they are aware and on board and she's also been in touch with other Treasure Valley cities and agencies about what they are doing and the big one is Boise and their -- their code is very similar to ours. They are using a 90 day limit for their temporary projects and the -- the only difference really is that Boise is going to regulate the size of containers for temporary projects and we are not proposing that. If and when you are ready of course I will take any questions, but the next steps would be that I would prepare an ordinance for your adoption, incorporating these changes. The Meridian Utility Billing Services would sunset the existing temporary project accounts that they are currently administering with Republic Services, so our -- we would still administer on call and regular services that we -- that we are typically -- that we are already doing pursuant to our franchise agreement, but this is one little piece that would go away from our administration and be transferred to Republic. So, everything is lined up for that to happen that we are going to sunset the account -- the temporary accounts that we are currently administering and just let those kind of run out and when those are done, then, Republic would take the -- take the baton. So, at that point Republic Services would administer -- administer its own temporary project accounts and they would be in just the general marketplace with the other temporary haulers for temporary projects. So, they would be one choice among any others. That is the end. Are there any questions for me?

Simison: Thank you, Ms. Kane. Council, questions?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Emily, thank you so much. My first question was kind of -- I have got a friend that's kind of in this process right now of a project of like gutting their home after a loved one passed away and how do you determine what's normal, so you put your normal trash in the trash bin and -- I mean that just seems really complicated to try to figure out as you are cleaning out a house what should go where.

Kane: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Little Roberts, good question. I'm not sure that it's necessary in that instance to be super strict. I think certainly an event like that -- or like a remodel or any kind of project that is truly temporary -- I think there probably are in that instance going to be some things that might otherwise go in the toter bin, but the -- the purpose of this distinction is that it's not a substitute for regular pickup service. So, it's not so much the co-mingling that we are worried about, as the supplanting the regular service with just a temporary hauler. So, it's -- certainly no one's going to be digging through and checking to make sure your eggshells didn't go in the project garbage or something like that. It's -- it's really just a matter of distinguishing the regular weekly pickup and the household waste versus project waste.

Little Roberts: Great. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thanks, Emily. My questions are actually more around just communication and kind of an outreach plan for the MUBS customers that would be transitioning back over to Republic. Have there been discussions with utility billing and internally and with Republic about how we would -- if we were to move this forward how we would kind of publicize this and communicate about it?

Kane: Uh-huh. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, yes, there is -- there is a plan. We have about 350 temporary accounts. There are 19 that are older than 90 days. So, it's a relatively small percentage of our temporary account holders that would really be -- that might really even notice a change or would need to be shifted over. So, I guess I can't speak to exactly how those people will be contacted, but we are aware that they are there and so whatever happens next we would need to reach out to those folks and let them know that they are kind of in the -- they are now -- they need on-call service. That really -- it will change to a degree how we administer those, but it might really just be on paper, so they might notice very little impact as well and, then, the other accounts we -- they will just sunset and use Republic for this need and, then, when they graduate, then, it's kind of the open market. Everyone's doing the same thing then.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm a little bit curious what was the thinking about why we would like all kind of temporary projects transitioned over to Republic, as opposed to saying if you would like a temporary project through our franchisee you could still contact us at utility billing and we will still organize that, but under the law certainly you are welcome now, right, to contract with another provider. I guess I'm kind of curious about why the decision was made internally that we did not want to administer these accounts going forward?

Kane: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, the -- the thinking is that Republic in this context is one of many other options. So, where Republic is acting outside of its franchise agreement that's not something that we do, that's something that they do. So, thinking really is that we administer what is covered by our franchise agreement and not what is not. So, they are -- they are in the -- there -- it takes this particular service out of our franchise agreement and makes it kind of the market controls that, instead of our franchise agreement controls that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: But I guess I'm curious from a legal perspective is there any issue with kind of administering billing on behalf of a franchisee as kind of a provider for ease of use? The reason I'm asking is I have like these add on subscriptions that Republic bills quarterly; right? And I find it very cumbersome that we can't just be like a one stop shop for billing everything and that we need to divide it up this way, because just from a customer perspective, right, I don't -- I don't know that they care that much about who is doing it, but it's much easier for them to go to one place, as opposed to like having separate phone calls and all that. Is there a legal reason that we can't do that or is that just kind of because we wanted to keep it clean? I just want to understand like legally what's the -- is there a legal basis why we wouldn't administer still temporary dumpsters and stuff as -- as a service to people when we have a franchisee like --

Kane: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I believe the answer for us lies in accounting and so that's certainly not my forte, but we -- we, obviously, are two separate entities and so we do the accounting for the city and Republic does the accounting for Republic. There is -- Karie I believe would have to speak to our -- or someone in Finance would have to speak to the percentage that we -- I can't remember if it's take or keep or bill for the services that we provide Republic. So, our administrative cost fluctuates or depends on what -- the services that we provide to Republic on behalf of our customers, which is the bundling of our utilities and garbage. So, I think I would have to phone a friend to talk more about the specifics of exactly how that percentage is allocated and billed with regard to our services that we provide on behalf of Republic. So, legally, perhaps maybe a little bit, because we can't provide services for Republic when it's serving only Republic. We can provide services that are -- that are serving the city and our customers, which is what we do within the franchise agreement. But anything beyond that really is up to Republic.

Lorcher: Your friends have arrived.

Kane: Oh. Yea. Oh. Karie.

Glenn: I'm sorry to interject. I was paying attention in my office. The question regarding the why goes back to the franchise agreement. With our services being held to the property we wanted to focus on the charges that were required. If it's an optional service we were looking at keeping it separate, because if they don't pay the bill on a required service we can shut the services off, meaning the water, the sewer, the trash. Where it's an optional service if they don't pay the bill -- trying to keep that debt tied to the property was an issue in my mindset. I think that was yours as well.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Karie. I appreciate that. I think this for me is maybe a takeaway. Maybe we could chat about it offline. But this is kind of the -- the main question that I have is just around convenience for people and the trade-offs of having the city kind of

administer things holistically on behalf of Republic, as opposed to contracting out for individual services all the time. I just think from a customer experience standpoint I think that can just be very cumbersome, but I understand more your rationale now, so that's very helpful. I will follow up with you after this meeting.

Glenn: We were putting it in line with -- like you said the subscriptions, the glass and the extra things like that, the grass, glass.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Did have maybe just one question for Emily and it really breaks down to the enforcement side. Does this follow like our traditional process of its complaint driven? Are there people that are monitoring dates and are doing assessments? Is there a requirement for a vendor to -- to give us a date that they start and, then, let us know when they have ceased? How do we handle -- how are we going to manage enforcement?

Kane: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, the -- it will follow our format of being complaint driven. So, it's -- it's really a hybrid of complaint driven and if a code enforcement officer drives by and it's, you know, the -- it's there for New Year's and it's there for the Fourth of July, then, maybe that would -- you know, we might start noticing and following up, so -- but other than that a complaint really is what it would -- would take. We -- there are options like registries and licenses and permits and things like that, but those are pretty administratively intense. So, the -- and really not in need. We are not seeing an overwhelming issue with these who people really want to do their project and, then, have it leave.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, maybe a quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Emily, can you walk me through maybe some of the mechanics of that where it's going to be complaint driven? So, I get -- I get one of these at my house. I'm doing a remodeling project and three months goes by and I'm slow and my neighbor calls code enforcement say, hey, this is going on at the Cavener's house. Code Enforcement makes contact with me and they say you have got 90 days and I have to prove that I have not been there 90 days. Is it my word against my neighbor's word? I just -- I want to make sure, because I think some of this -- we are going to -- our citizens are going to inquire about this; right? And so I want to make sure that we have kind of flushed out the SOP about how we will make sure that if it is 90 days it is 90 days and not 90 days after the first complaint is initiated or something like that.

Kane: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, each case is probably a little bit different with regard to proof. So, I think some neighbors might say, oh, that's new, take a picture

the first day. It's date stamped and, you know, they can do an affidavit and they are an excellent witness and they know exactly the first date and the end date or we can ask for records from the temporary hauler or there are different scenarios where we can figure out how long it's been there without, you know, starting on day zero. I think there -- there probably is the case where that's the only way to just say, well, okay, we know it's been here longer than 90 days, because I last spoke with you. You know, I spoke with you every month for the last three months. So, there -- that does happen depending on just witnesses and really what's the evidence that's available to the code enforcement officer in their investigation? It's -- it can be tricky. So, we are going to run into that as we do now with regard to how long has that been there or how long has this been going on or how -- how long has this been a problem.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: And, Emily, know that it was -- we are not taking an action tonight. That's -- I think it's going to be my feedback, because that greater clarity, so it's not as squishy, because, again, certainly if you are the person who has it and you think you haven't had it 90 days, you want it for your full 90 days if that's what you need. Likewise, if you are a neighbor and you feel like this has been a visual obstruction to your quality of life, that 90 days may feel like we are way past that and so some consistent way for us to look at all of these the same way I think is -- is important when it comes to this. So, I know what we are trying to accomplish. Some of this is not by our own doing. This is, you know, as adhering to what the State -- but I do think it is an opportunity for us to kind of level up who we would handle this to provide, clear, consistent direction to both those that are using them for their own use and those who feel like they wish me as their neighbor wouldn't be using these hypothetically.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Mr. Nary.

Nary: Maybe to add on top of that, though, is, again, ultimately if we get to the point where they are going to want to issue a citation from code enforcement, we are going to have to prove it criminally, which means they are going to have to have more than just a perception that it's been there long enough. I mean they are going to -- so whether -- like Emily said, we went, okay, we have been here a number of times, it doesn't appear to be moving, okay, the first day I was here was this day. That's day one. Here you go. You got 90 days from now. Not 90 days from when you called -- somebody called us three months ago and we didn't come out. So, I mean they are going to have to be pretty specific to prove to a court or a jury that this is really a violation. So, they are going to -- they are going to have to be more specific.

Simison: It can -- maybe just if -- and if I'm wrong -- I look at what's our current practice now?

Kane: Mr. Mayor, if we see an illegal temporary hauler, code enforcement does their best to contact them immediately.

Simison: Right. Well, let's go to not illegal. Let's see -- we have got a Republic legal thing put in someone's driveway. Is there a 90 day limit currently?

Kane: No.

Simison: Is there a code enforcement action that can be taken legally?

Nary: No.

Simison: So, the code enforcement action currently is not about whether people like it or not, it's whether or not it's there by our per -- our provider or not. So, I think that maybe is a distinction that -- what are we -- are we really solving a neighbor's issue or are we solving Republic's issue under the law or under our ordinance, because we don't want to have people to have these in their -- that might help at least determine whether or not this is the right approach or not.

Cavener: Yeah. I guess, Mr. Mayor, where I'm coming from is we are now creating a timeline. They are allowed to exist. And what I -- right now if a neighbor were to call, they say these are -- legally they are allowed; right? This passes they are legal allowed for 90 days and so at the 91st day I call this, say, hey, this thing has been out here for 91 days. It needs to be gone. City code enforcement goes out and we don't have any way to prove that it's 91 days and so now instead of 90 it's now maybe 120 or 180, because code enforcement has to be able to -- they would provide their findings before a citation and so that's the part I'm just trying to overcome, is that how we are going to be consistent in the enforcement over what is something that is somewhat subjective in terms of how we are going to enforce it.

Kane: Mr. Mayor --

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Kane: Oh. Excuse me.

Simison: If you have a response, Emily, go ahead and give a response to --

Kane: I will defer.

Simison: Okay. Councilman Overton.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, Council, Emily, great job on this. I'm completely reminded of the fact that on a small scale code enforcement deals with this every week on vehicles that are parked in front of a house for over 72 hours and people call in and tell us they have been parked there too long and when we get there we start the clock then. It's the

same type of enforcement that we will have with these. It's unfortunate that the 90 days could be doubled to do an investigation, but I will tell you that in the case of illegal dumpsters you may find that the people calling them in may not be code enforcement as much as our franchisee, who is helping us enforce if there is issues going on in the community. One follow up, Mr. Mayor. On the issue of the holistic approach of trying to handle billing for things outside of our franchise agreement, I think I would be concerned on the other side, which is if we started handling the billing for things outside of our franchise agreement could we not also, then, get hit up by the other companies saying, well, if you are going to do that billing you should do it for us, too. I would be a little concerned that we could get tapped for that business as well and now we are doing a lot of billing for a lot of things that we have no control over, no enforcement on, adding to our workload of our staff. I think the cleanest way is the way it's been brought forward where only if it's under our franchise agreement do we handle the billing currently.

Simison: Just to maybe go -- circle back to my comment. I think this is important for Council to -- them going back -- if someone wants to have one of these in their driveway for 180 days from Republic right now under this ordinance is that allowed?

Kane: Mr. Mayor, yes.

Simison: So, it's not about how long it's allowed in the driveway it's about who has it from another source in the driveway. So, I think just from a -- again, going back to that what is the Council's understanding and intention of these changes as it pertains to enforcement of them or not?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I'm having a little bit of a hard time, because we have a health and safety rationale that's specific to other providers that limits to 90 days, but we don't have a limitation under our code with Republic. Like I'm struggling a little bit with that. If that's the case.

Kane: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, that's not correct. The -- Republic would be a temporary hauler among any others that are out there. So, they are governed by this same -- these same provisions and they are under the exception. They are not operating under our franchise agreement at all in that instance. And that -- just for temporary projects.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, that's important. So, I just want to make sure we are on the same page. So, currently there is no time limit right now from my understanding on -- let's just say getting a dumpster temporarily in front of someone's home currently; right? Is there a time limit for them to do so?

Kane: Mayor, Council Woman, that's correct.

Strader: Uh-huh. And so then under these changes what would happen is Republic would be considered one of multiple providers then and would be subject to the 90 day limitation as well?

Kane: Correct.

Strader: Okay. Then I'm starting to feel like we are more on the same page.

Simison: Is that accurate, though, if they are -- I thought the restriction was -- didn't pertain, it was only for people using them outside of the franchise -- the way the franchise -- so, I guess that would be a question mark. Is there no longer a franchise component to the dumpsters? Are they all gone? Or only for certain types of uses?

Kane: Mr. Mayor, so the -- in the first 90 days Republic is a temporary hauler. They are one of many. There is a scenario -- let's say the project is a one hundred day project. So, in the next ten days Republic would either come and get that container and bring a new one or they would change the billing and that would be an on call service. So, it would no longer be a temporary project, it would become an on call -- it would enter that medium range, which on day 91 it is the franchise agreement. So, if Republic is your chosen hauler, I guess you are -- you are still dealing with the same company who is -- who is handling that -- that dumpster and that project. But it's a different account. It's -- it's no longer a temporary project, it's an on-call account.

Simison: Clear as mud?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I have to think -- I may have to think about this for a bit, I think. Just -- just initial reaction is just -- I understand the distinction, but the practical reality is that we are creating -- we are creating a limitation -- a timeline limitation on other temporary haulers that would not apply it sounds like to Republic to the extent that it is no longer temporary. I just -- I need to wrestle with this a little bit, because I -- I'm -- I guess that you feel like there is a distinction, but I'm not sure I'm really seeing it I think is the issue.

Simison: I will actually say I think that's the intention. The intention is that you can -- you can contract for 90 days someone other than Republic, but if you are going to be more than 90 days it should be with Republic at a minimum. But you can do the 90

days with them as well. That -- that is the intention of this is to -- so the people don't use a permanent hauler for longer -- or another hauler that's not Republic for a longer term -- a longer period of term, because now we are getting outside of, you know, what they should be entitled to under the franchise

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, if I may? Emily, that -- that's what's dictated by state code now; correct? Like we are just adhering to the actions of the legislature when it comes to this -- these dates? So, even if we had a different philosophy we would have to adhere to the state code; correct?

Kane: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, yes. We -- we do need to define temporary projects.

Cavener: Okay.

Kane: If -- I mean if we want to regulate. The alternative is to do nothing and, then, it is -- everyone does whatever they want for 90 days without restriction and with no -- no regulation, which I would not recommend. I think that this helps literally everyone, because, then, we are all working together, including I think the temporary haulers, because, then, they are on the map, everyone's legitimate. Everyone knows who everyone is. But, yes, the state code does allow for temporary projects. However, that's defined by the city that can be anyone, not just the franchisee.

Simison: And not everyone is adhering to a 90 day in this valley. Some are going much lower than that in some other places, but I think this is standard for what Republic's doing with their other franchisees in the valley. That's my understanding, but --

Kane: Mine as well.

Simison: So, Council, this is current state law, so we are in a place where time to get something on the books does matter in that context. I don't know if you are going to want to think and have Ms. Kane come back for more discussion. If there -- Ms. Kane, if you think that there is more to look at based upon this conversation for clarity -- I want to make sure we are moving forward expeditiously, appropriately.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I don't want to -- I know we don't have a council member who is here, but I'm satisfied -- I have some -- still think there is some mechanics of how we are going to handle enforcement needs to be better fleshed out, but with time being of the essence is it a public hearing for feedback and action next week or are we waiting until, essentially, August 12th I think would be the next time that we could add this on our agenda. So, I would look for any feedback from Council and give some direction to Ms. Kane.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think we could go ahead with our public hearing. I just -- it -- for me it's just like a handful of maybe follow-up questions, but if I -- you know, if I saw something that raised some red flags for me I would let you know. I guess that's the feedback I have at this point.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I'm definitely ready for a public hearing next week. That would be great.

Cavener: Does that work for you?

Kane: I will not be here next week, but Mr. Nary will.

Cavener: Okay. All right. Everyone's okay with that? Thanks, Emily.

Kane: Okay. Thank you.

5. Mayor and City Council Compensation Committee Recommendation

Simison: Okay. Next item up is Item 5, which is Mayor and City Council compensation committee recommendation. I see, Mr. Nary, your name is here. You also got some other folks here joining you.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I told them I would kick this off initially just for the record and for the public's perspective. So, just so the public's reminded, every two years as part of our normal election cycle we have a committee that is made up of citizens from various walks in the city. We have used -- a number of the people on this committee have been on a number of committees over the years to try to maintain some continuity. So, we have six members on the committee this current cycle. Four of them are here today to discuss their discussion, what they considered, the information they evaluated and considered and, then, a recommendation that they want to bring forward to you, but the four -- the six members are Steve Cory, Brad Hoaglund, David Ballard, and Jessica Perreault, Clint Shiflet and Jo Greer. They are all members of various commissions of the city and have been involved in the city and other capacities as well. Anyway, they have -- four of them are here -- or, yeah, four of them are here tonight. Three to present what their recommendations are and I told them I would just start that off and, then, I think Mr. Cory is going to start the discussion.

Cory: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I am here to kind of kick this off. A lot of this material is in the package that you received. So, we will just talk about some of the key

points on it. First, just to kind of review the committee's discussion, it was very important to every member of the committee that we had -- shall we say maintain a competitive compensation process. We recognize how much time you are being asked to commit when you go ahead and do this work and people who in the future are going to be performing these activities will go ahead and have an extensive amount of time and we want to make sure that we are getting the best and brightest from our community to go ahead and participate in the -- in this venue and we don't want to get to a situation somewhere along the line where they have to go ahead and consider -- I have got the same type of commitment from these two deals, but this non-city activity will give me a little bit more money and that's better for my family and everything else, so I'm going to get -- dedicate my time to something that's not part of city governance. Anyway, that's why we were kind of looking forward towards something that's competitive. The committee evaluated and discussed an ongoing annual increased methodology that will be discussed later. The committee reviewed the recommendations from the last term in 2023. The committee in 2023 recommended increases for both the Mayor and City Council and I'm just bringing forth the history here. City Council declined the increase back then and the proposed increases for the Mayor's position in '24 and, then, in '25 were approved. So, that puts us in a situation where the last increase for the Council was in 2023 and we actually went back and looked at the history for compensation back to 2000 and considered how it's happened in the last 20 years. One thing that was of concern to us was where we maybe go through increases that were one, two, three percent or something like that, but all of a sudden we end up being way behind the market and we have had to have sometimes with five, eight, ten, 11 percent increases and we felt like that there was a need going forward to try to level that out, so that the increases weren't scatter shot and we did look at the prevailing rates at other similar -- well, other cities within Idaho to see where we fell. This is a quick slide for the Mayor's position on some of the corresponding cities. You note that we are second largest city and we have got commensurate pay. We -- what's not in here is to identify that Boise will be jumping up in January 1st to 171,000. So, talking about particulars with the committee's recommendation in regards to the Mayor, we felt like it was -- well, there was some discussion about how maybe the target might best be reaching about 150,000 dollars in a couple of years. We felt like the jump was a little too high on that. So, what we are recommending is a 350 -- 3,500 dollar raise next year and, then, again, the following year. So, it would jump from 139,000 that it currently is to 142,887 and, then, it would jump in 2027 to 146,387. We recognize that this is just our discussion on this. This is going to be turned over to you, but we felt like beyond this it would actually be good to go ahead and implement an annual change that was similar to the kind of change in salary that employees are getting and, then, allow the compensation committee to move over to looking at if there is any market rate adjustment or something like that needed to happen. More on that later in the presentation. I think it's important to say we kind of felt like things were right about this, that it was similar to universities and such where department chairs and coaches and whatever may get paid more than the -- the head of the organization, but it was important to recognize that the Mayor is more or less the CEO of the operation, so they should be getting something close to those pays and those were kind of the things that drove us to get to these recommendations and with that I'm going to turn it over to

former Council Woman Jessica Perreault to go ahead and take over with the portion for City Council.

Perreault: Good evening, Mr. Mayor and Council Members. It's a pleasure to be here. Thank you for the opportunity to serve on this committee. As a former council member I'm really privileged to do that and excited to make our recommendation for City Council compensation for the next couple of years. Bill just handed you all the specifics on the compensation increases for the last 25 years. I had asked the committee to review these. I just wanted to look for patterns and what we found was that the considerations that were made for City Council compensation, Mayoral compensation and staff compensation was all being decided in very different ways, different -- very different philosophies and so as Steve mentioned we would like to see a little more consistency in how that's done and Brad will go into more detail -- excuse me -- Mr. Hoaglund will go into more detail on that after I'm finished. What I would like to point out to you on this is that -- as you will see from 2000 to 2025 there was several instances in which the City Council chose not to take compensation and, then, there would be a year in which they -- the compensation would increase by a third. That happened twice and, then, in a few other years it was around 11, 12 percent and so just looking -- we looked at that as the overall picture and, then, we focused a little bit more on the last five years and noticed that the personages that were taken in '22 and '23 were at seven and a half percent and we felt like that was reasonable to consider that again, given that there were not -- was not any compensation taken in '24 and '25 that would actually put the recommendation that we are making at about 3.25 percent over the last four years -- or, excuse me, over the last two years and then -- and, then, the same for the next two years. So, that brings me to our slide. Who is -- am I running this? Okay. Let me see, how do I go to the last slide?

Lomeli: The arrows on the keyboard are more user friendly. On the keyboard. Down.

Perreault: Oh, it's covered up by a word. Okay. Thank you. This is the first time I have had to use the presentation screen. So, just very quickly this is what is -- is current -- the current compensation for area -- our area and also some other cities in the state and just to make note that in 2026 the Boise City Council will be up to a little over 31,000 for their compensation. So, they will be increasing the mayor's compensation and city council's compensation next year. And so -- now we will look at the bullet points on this slide. As I stated, we wanted to -- to look in detail at the data and we did. The -- and we said that the increases have been consistent and so we would like to change that process. The committee discussed where we would like to land at the end of -- of 2027 and what the future compensation committee will have to decide -- what decision -- the decision that we made this year, how is that going to affect the decisions of the future committees, depending on if Council decides to take our recommendation or decides to take a portion of what we recommend. So, we are recommending an increase of -- to Council compensation by 1,500 dollars for 2026 and 1,500 dollars for 2027. There was unanimous agreement amongst the members of the committee that we would like to get to 20,000 dollars in compensation by 2027. And so, then, as Steve also mentioned, we would like to consider implementing an annual increase for 2028 and beyond that's

equal to the same percentage increase for general employees in the subsequent budget years. So, we have a proposal for a change to Mayor's compensation, a proposal for a change to City Council compensation and, then, a proposal for a change to how the -- the compensation -- conversation will go 2028 and in the future. The rest of what we will be addressing will be done by Mr. Hoaglun. Oh, before I leave do you have any questions for me? Okay. Thank you.

Hoaglun: For the record Brad Hoaglun. I'm glad to be here and talk about this fun subject and I know it's something that everyone always wrestles with every two years and we are coming about and -- and that's why I'm going to talk about how do we kind of go beyond that? And whatever you guys decide for -- whatever the Council decides, you guys, okay, it's a work session, we are always more informal; right? Whatever you decide I -- I hope you decide that there is increases. We want to make sure that this is something that people look at and say I can do that above and beyond my current work and I look at it as spousal appreciation pay is one way to look at it, because they are the ones that bear the burden of you being gone and in meetings and you even maybe at home and you may be going through a packet that's going to take an hour or two, like Destination Downtown just as an example. Throw that out there. Those are the types of things that, you know, that compensation goes to is there something for them, you know, and for the family because you are giving up a lot of time. One of the things like in the council comparison that I found back in 2008 when I first served, I was thinking, wow, Eagle and Meridian they get -- Eagle council members get paid the same as Meridian council members. Okay. That's fine. I didn't -- big deal. Then I found out that Eagle has two meetings a week and we had four -- I mean two meetings a month and we had four meetings a month. That's what you don't see on that chart was the number of meetings. For example, Nampa, very similar in population, they are required to meet the first and third Mondays of each month. I know you are here every Tuesday night, except for those fifth Tuesdays, which, gee, ACHD liked to meet. Oh, the school board wants to meet. Well, we have these different things that come about. So, there is a lot of time that goes into this. As Councilman Perreault I know -- and I and you all feel the same, you don't do it for the money. It's not about the money. That's not why you ran. You want to serve your community, make it better. So, I hope you move forward with these requests and, as Council Woman Perreault -- former Council Woman Perreault pointed out, at a minimum for Council, we are looking at 500 dollars. We really think that needs to keep pace, but we -- we think it's justified to go to 1,500 for the next two years. Then for budget year 2028 -- to kind of move off this yes-no and, then big increases several years later and it's just this back and forth -- is starting for that -- go at the same percentage that you're giving general employees. So, that would increase. If it's two percent for general employees, cost of living increase, it's going to be two percent for Council and Mayor. So, that would move forward. Every two years, though, we still have this committee that would, then, look at it as a -- from a market survey, because there might be changes in the market and this is what HR does. Debbie was very helpful in that, suggesting some things that you take a look and make the comparisons. Are these jobs still similar? So, that's what this committee would do. The salary portion would be kind of almost on autopilot to a degree, but if there is a need for market adjustment, then, we can go in and make that recommendation, come back to

the Mayor and Council and say, hey, this is what we recommend, because there have been changes in the market. So, that would be for 2028 and -- and, then, if a market adjustment is needed just the base salaries to -- to what is fitting. So, whatever the outcome is on the salaries, this is separate from that. But just kind of a way to move forward. Nampa and Coeur d'Alene already do this. So, it's not unusual. You are not breaking new ground here. But that's how they look at compensation moving forward. So, anyway, I -- I think -- oh, I just want to breakdown for that 1,500 dollars for the year for Council, that breaks out to just over 54 dollars per pay period -- 26 pay periods. That doesn't include the taxes that come off and everything. So, yeah, you can -- you can buy a nice lunch after -- after that increase. So, just a couple of thoughts on that. If you have really hard questions and want to get into percentages and whatnot, David Ballard is here. This is his fourth compensation committee meeting, so he is well versed in it and can -- can answer any of the really hard questions. So, that's all I have.

Simison: Thank you, Brad. Council, any questions for Brad, Jessica, David, Bill? It looks like Steve left.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, yeah, Mr. Cory had a birthday dinner to -- to head out to, so, unfortunately, his apologies, but, yeah, kind of -- kind of important for him, so --

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Comments more than questions. First off, a huge thank you to all the members of the committee. I mean what an esteemed group to meet and discuss this with all the city history behind it. I will admit, what, two years ago I voted against that increase, but, then, again, I was kind of a new, excited member of the City Council, and I certainly wasn't here for the pay. Two years later I think my wife would want to have a say so in this matter and she would disagree with me. It does take a lot more time than I initially believed when I got on City Council to do the job right and seeing how inconsistent we have been since the year 2000 on compensating our positions, I appreciate what you have done and what we decide on as what that looks like I would definitely be in favor of increasing the compensation for City Council, but I have to tell you it's a struggle to vote on your own pay increase and I really wish that process was not in our hands. To get through this one this time and to put it onto autopilot in the future definitely seems like it would be the smartest move in the future as well, to take that off our shoulders every two years, but I have a tremendous amount of respect for the process you went through, the history you dug up and what brought us to today and the last two years we have had no increase and I think we need to out of respect for the position and the workload, which is certainly not getting to be less, accept your sage advice and I would be willing to move forward with an increase that was agreed upon by Council.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Maybe I will -- I will start with I guess Bill. Bill, thanks for putting together this committee. This is a who is who of people that it would be really hard to not accept the recommendation they bring. These are people that really care about our community, have served our community, so I also think bring a variety of perspectives. I have two questions, either for you, Mr. Nary, or for the committee. Question one. I think two years ago, Council Member Strader proposed an idea for Council Members -- I guess a mechanic to forego their salary. Was that discussed by the committee? Has there been any suggestions or recommendations on an action the Council could take to say, hey, here is the salary, but we don't want it and it -- it can go to wherever and, then, my -- my second question is -- and -- and maybe even for the panel or, Mr. Nary, if you want to give a summary. Certainly the Council has been discussing at great length the past couple of months a public safety levy. Did that play into any of the conversations with the -- the committee about how the levy and at the same time that the -- the Mayor and City Council may be taking up pay increases?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, I will -- I will -- I will take the first stab at it and certainly if the committee members want to chime in. On the first question I did -- we did not discuss that at the committee level. I did discuss it with the Finance Department and is there a way to do that and without doing a whole lot of research, their answer generally was, no, that they couldn't do that, because, again, wages are so regulated as to how those are done and they didn't have a comfort level of diverting wages. They -- their feeling is -- and I think the law does require -- they have to pay them. Where the individual that receives them diverts them to wherever they want to they can do that, but the city doesn't have the power to do that. So, they -- again, without us doing a whole lot more work, but that was really their initial blush is we really don't have the ability to divert wages of anybody pre-tax. All of it has to get taxed. All of it has to be reported. And, then, from that point forward they can -- they can send it anywhere they want. On the second question, yes, there was some discussion about the different things that are going on and the levy was certainly a conversation point and I will add a point that I think the committee brought up a lot, so I don't think I'm speaking out of school, but the -- the committee talked about it a lot. Their whole conversation -- and they sort of intimated that in their discussion today -- was not about any of you. It wasn't about any of you in the positions, it wasn't about any individuals at all, it was about the job and the expectation both as members of the public that all of them are and what the public is expecting, the type of pool of talent they are wanting and the -- to attract or want to do these jobs and that was really the whole focus of where the discussion on value and what the compensation should be for both the Council and the Mayor position. So, it was definitely not about individuals, but more about that and understanding that there are other things going on, like the levy conversation and like other things that are needs of the city, but they felt as a group -- and, again, certainly they have a different -- they have a different perspective, but as a group they felt like this was important, too. I mean it maybe not more important, but at least as equally important to them as members of the public that these positions do have a fair and adequate compensation, that they do -- are valued and they should have compensation adequate to reflect the amount of

work that's expected from the public. So, that was kind of where it was. So, it wasn't that it wasn't discussed, Councilman Cavener, but it really was sort of like, yeah, we get that, we also think this is important.

Simison: I think -- I think you're going to get a second answer on this question.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Council President Cavener, yes, we discussed sort of the budgetary and -- and political, if you will, environment at length and how Council would be making this decision, the types of concerns that you would have, and we came to ultimately two conclusions in that. The first was, as Bill mentioned, there is -- there is kind of always going to be stuff popping up in the budget. I mean Brad's done how many budgets now? I have done a few. And it seems like there is going to be a conversation about that. Every single time this decision is before you there is going to be something. Not that -- not that we are minimizing those concerns in any way, we just realize there is always an opportunity to not take this increase for a reason, like the levy or a political reason or financial reason. The second is that, again, we -- we felt like the many times that Council opted not to take an increase it just put them farther and farther behind and that puts the burden of taking a larger increase on future Council or a future decision that's made and, then, we are not talking about a -- a seven percent, we are talking about a 12 percent and you can see that that was done over the history. So, any questions for me?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Jessica, I think there will be a question for you. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. I'm intrigued by this idea of trying to tie it to some kind of cost of living adjustment or general employees, just because I can kind of see what you are saying. I feel like it sort of sets up a trap a little bit for people where like if they don't take anything -- and it could be that they feel very strongly that that's personally their conviction; right? And I totally get that. But, then, it kind of -- it kind of does set up a future council, then, that might feel differently to have to make these huge adjustments. Is that part of the thinking? Is it like -- because you looked at the history and you are saying, okay, you know what, it would have been better if people would have just stayed at a steady state of like two to three percent, as opposed to like zero percent for five years, then, it's 33 percent. You are trying to address the lumpiness and kind of smooth that out. Is that part of the thinking?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Council Woman Strader, yes, absolutely, that was part of the thinking. If -- and we did have the conversation that had that approach been taken for the last 25 years this would have been a very different conversation and so we had many discussions regarding future council members, those that will be elected in the future and what this decision making process -- process is like for them and as Mr. Nary described, the opportunities that future council members have to campaign for this office and what's entailed with that and the responsibility. In addition what we noticed was that many of times that the decision was made to not take the

compensation, it was because the Council Members had concern for their staff and whether their staff was receiving increase and that's been something that I have appreciated about this Council is that they have always wanted to be sensitive to whether staff was receiving that increase and sometimes -- oftentimes, especially during the recession and during COVID, Council sought not to take those increases to be sensitive to what was happening with the staff. We feel like if we -- if we set it up such that the Council, then, is receiving a similar increase through market adjustments, then, that conversation can kind of be taken off the table.

Strader: Thanks for explaining that. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I have a little bit of a reaction so far, kind of like Councilman Overton. On the one hand I -- I do tend to agree, I think taking an increase is something we should take a hard look at. I am struggling really hard with the timing of going to the voters with our levy at the same time that we are considering this, I just think that's really hard and I think that -- part of that's political reality and part of that's just sensitivity. So, I don't know, it's something I think we are going to have to all wrestle with quite a bit. I do have reaction to the -- to the Mayor's salary. I feel like -- I see a compression issue between senior leaders and the mayor and I know it's not -- it's not unusual to have situations where you do have a CEO that's making a little bit less than other leaders, like that does happen. I thought those were good examples, but I'm a little bit just -- I do feel like it would be wise for us to try to get the mayor's salary up to 150,000 at some point soon, just because I feel like we are getting so far out of whack relative to Boise and I think to me it is a compression issue and it's an incentive issue and it's also just ensuring that that's an office that, you know, continues to attract the highest talent is really important to me, not just as a Council Member, but as a citizen and I -- I have seen up close now for more than one -- one and a half -- almost one and a half terms that it's a critical position. I think it needs to be compensated that way. So, I guess I have a little more openness to increasing the Mayor's salary at this point. Definitely gives us a lot to chew on. So, I think this was -- this was helpful.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I would just chime in with my appreciation -- thank you.

Simison: I have some thoughts and comments, some of it related to phase one, some of it related to phase two, but I guess, Bill, what's the process that you are -- that we need to have accomplished by when for the Council moving forward?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, so we -- to comply with state code we have to have this approved 75 days before the election and I didn't -- I didn't get the count that -- it's basically about towards the end of August. So, if we want to wait until August

12th for a public hearing, that's fine. I just need some clarity or -- of what you would like to see the recommendations that they have made for the Mayor. You wanted the recommendation for the Council. Again, you can always change it, but if you want at least that to be the draft for a conversation I can prepare an ordinance for the 12th of August for that. If you want me to include also the subsequent years for the increase to -- based on the general employee compensation -- however you would like to fashion -- I can do basically all that's been proposed to you. You can, then, you know, cut back some of it if you wish to for -- to pass. We don't, obviously, have to pass the one you do, we just would not tend to want to increase something that you have, you know, had a public hearing on.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: So, Mr. Nary, I want to make sure I'm hearing that right. We could publish a memo that would show the numbers that are recommended by the committee, but to Council Member Strader's question, if the Council was supportive of elevating that number for the Mayor's salary to 150, we wouldn't be able to do that, because kind of like our budget we published a number lower than maybe what we would potentially consider?

Nary: You could. So, the only -- the only question from Finance was they wanted a -- at the highest number you would propose, so they can make sure to put it in your budget that's going to come back to you on the 29th for the amount of money we are anticipating spending in the next fiscal year. So, that's the only number they cared about. I was saying from a public hearing standpoint and the ordinance, we can publish any number you wish, you can always change it and you can change it up or down. There is not a prohibition on --

Cavener: So, the one I was hearing on, I --

Nary: Yes.

Simison: Maybe just some feedback on what was suggested from -- from my perspective, at least on -- as it pertains to the Mayor's compensation component. I did the math, it's roughly 2.39, a little bit -- yeah, pretty close to what the cost of living is for this current year and when Bill came and asked me -- or actually -- I don't know if you came and asked me. I think I volunteered the information. I said I felt like the position was well compensated, that, you know, looking at the cost of living would be appreciated if that's what they came forward with. Wasn't expecting it, but that's really where I felt like the job is. The pay has been elevated quite a bit over the last half dozen years. So, that -- that to me -- it feels in line, but still moving forward and not stagnating the position, but if the Council does wish to go to something that's yearly and, then, looking at a market adjustment to where I would suggest, Council Woman Strader, your stuff would come into place would be in two years. You know, every four

-- I think every four years is when you should look at a market adjustment with the committee, not every two years, because, really, you are -- you should not -- you know, we do three years for all the other employee positions. I don't think that you really are going to see market conditions change every two and if you tie it to when the Mayor's position is up that way you are putting in what you want to attract at that point in time, that that's the time to make those type of changes would make sense, so -- and I say this not in light of our -- I know Todd is going to say that this is all very immaterial to the larger scope of the budget and their cost, but I think that that would be the right time if we think that -- if there is a market concern two years from now when that position would actually be considered by the community for -- for election is when that conversation I think would be more appropriate to be had. I already agreed to the job with what the current rate was with all the understandings.

Cavener: Good point.

Simison: So, you should make changes to your compensation as well, just for the record. I have said it. I don't vote unless there is a tie, but I do think it's important to stay moving appropriately forward.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I recall from -- I think our conversation last week we are basically down a council member I think every week through the month of August, either -- we have got somebody who is unavailable each Tuesday and so this is I think an important vote of the Council and I would just want to make sure that we take that into account, too, about where we would want to schedule a public hearing and if it is important for all of the members of the Council to vote on this -- if those that have less of a strong feeling or more of a strong feeling about that, just -- before we pick an arbitrary date I just -- sitting in the back my head the mechanics we went through last week about a special meeting around the levy, I look at this as also I think an important part of the Council to make and we just want to make sure that we are inclusive of everybody's schedule as well.

Simison: Well, it sounds like if that's the case you only have one date to put on if you want everyone to be there. Between now and the 14th.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, it would need to happen that you said in August.

Nary: Yes.

Simison: No later than. So, we have one meeting scheduled in August currently. We have one meeting on the 29th where everyone is planning to participate. If you are accurate there is no other meeting between now and that date where everyone would be present. That's -- again, I wasn't aware that people were going to be gone in August, but --

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: We may have had a schedule change. There is a good possibility -- and I could even make it happen that I could be here next Tuesday.

Whitlock: And, Mr. Mayor, I could remote in.

Cavener: So, then, Mr. Mayor, if that -- if that works for everybody for next Tuesday, then, let's -- Mr. Mayor, maybe have the city attorney put together a memo taking in to the recommendations for Mayor and Council compensation as presented for a public hearing and action next week during our regular city council meeting.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, so just so you know it will be a draft ordinance. Okay? So, it will be an ordinance with the -- just as it's currently in our code with the proposed wages or compensation for each of those positions over the next two years and I will also include, then, the provision about the -- after that two year period -- of those two cycles, then, it would go to the same as what the other ones, the annual adjustments. Yeah. I will have that on for Tuesday

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Thank you, committee. Thank you, Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you.

Simison: Appreciate you all.

Cavener: All right. With that, Mr. Mayor --

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: That does conclude our business for the work session. I move we adjourn our work session.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:42 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK