

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 24, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Tina Lomeli, Bill Nary, Warren Stewart, Shawn Harper, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is June 24th, 2025, at 6:01 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

**COMMUNITY INVOCATION**

Simison: We didn't have anyone 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: As we all know we didn't quite get Item 24 from our work session resolved by the end of our work session, so I'm going to move that to Item No. 2 following our public hearing this evening. With that, Mr. Mayor, I move we adopt the agenda as amended.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and second to adopt the agenda by moving Item 2 to be a potential public-private partnership for sewer line installation. Is there discussion? If not all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted as amended.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

## **PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics**

Simison: Madam Clerk, anyone signed up under public forum?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We have one person that signed up online. George Thoma. I don't know if they are here. I don't see that name online. They are not there under that place online at this point in time.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **1. Public Hearing regarding Potential Ballot Question Concerning a Levy to Provide Funding for Firefighters, Police Officers, and a Prosecution Unit**

Simison: So, with that we will move on to tonight's Action Items. First item up is a public hearing regarding the potential ballot question concerning a levy to provide funding for firefighters, police officers and a prosecution unit. We will begin tonight's conversation with a presentation that will be led by Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. Just have a brief presentation, kind of give some background for yourself and the rest of the public under what this potential public safety levy that is being consider and being discussed tonight, what -- kind of the -- how it works, how mechanically how it functions. So, again, in the Idaho Code there is an opportunity for cities to request an increase to their existing levy and that's what this conversation is about. The proposed levy would be used for three things. They have been -- there are current positions in the fire department that are funded by a grant. This would help maintain those positions when that grant expires. Also it was proposed to be used for police officer wages for both recruitment and retention of the police and, then, also to fund and begin a prosecution unit -- in-house unit for the city to prosecute criminal offenses that are generated by our police department. If the City Council does decide to go forward with that ballot measure, then, the election would be held on the same date as the general city election, which is November 4th of this year. If it's on the ballot voters, again, will decide and it does require a 60 percent approval rating to get approved. So, currently under the Idaho Code the city's existing levy -- if it's less than a .004 the city may increase its budget if approved by the 60 percent and the current levy is below that threshold .004 and as you see the number here on the screen it is .002 and another string of other -- of numbers. But .002. Under the code also, then, certain codes are required and that's kind of the purpose of both this process, as well as the information that's been provided to date to the public. Purpose

of the levy. Date of the election. The amount to be collected from the levy. The estimated annual cost to the taxpayer per 100,000 dollars in taxable value of their individual property and the length of the time the levy would be in effect. So, this potential levy that's being considered, based on that -- that requested levy amount, would collect approximately five million dollars and some change. That number is up on the screen \$5,018,125.71. Additional revenue will be used to provide funding for the police and the firefighters and the prosecution units I have identified and the estimated average annual cost to the taxpayer would be a tax burden of \$20.11 per 100,000 dollars of taxable value per year under their current conditions and, again, the conditions can vary based on homeowners exemptions and property values and the property values change, so hard to get beyond that specific number, but that's what's required by code. Again if approved the levy would go into effect October 1 of 2026, beginning of the city's next fiscal year and remain in place thereafter to serve as an ongoing funding source for those purposes as identified in the levy documents. And this is the potential ballot question that we would consider and be on the ballot for public consideration. Again shall the City Council of the City of Meridian be authorized and empowered to increase the city's budget and levy pursuant to Idaho Code section as identified by \$5,018,125.71 to provide funding for the firefighters, police officers and prosecution. So, as we have identified that would be the ballot question that we would propose to the voters. If that is the decision to go forward. This would be the official statement. Again, the levy will be used to retain this to -- for those three identified sources or for those identified uses. The date of the election as we have identified is November 4th. The amount that's being requested. The fiscal year it begins and the increase -- or the estimated average annual cost per property taxable value. So, again, everything as we have identified is required by law to be brought forward in this manner so that the public can consider all of these when they make that decision if that's the decision of this Council to move forward. Timeline. Again, there is a couple of things on here that we have done to date and right now we are at -- as is identified here and highlighted, the first public hearing. So, tonight is the first public hearing we identified to receive input from the community. We have also anticipated and, then, scheduled a second opportunity on July 8th for, again, the public input hearings and they can be submitted either in person or in writing. We will collect all of that data for the Council's consideration. Again on around the July 8th date, which is the next Council meeting that's currently scheduled, the City Council can decide to move forward with this ballot measure on around August 12th the City Council will decide to proceed with an adoption of a resolution concerning the ballot measure. So, basically the direction would be to go forward on July 8th or not. If it was to go forward we would bring back that resolution by the 12th and, then, we have a deadline of August 29th to submit that ballot language to the county for consideration to be added onto the ballot for November 4th and, then, as I said previously, the election date is November 4th. So, the Public Integrity Elections Act is just to make clear to the public. Again, if it decided to put this ballot -- this question to the voters on the ballot, then, the city will not be using any of its funds to promote that. We can educate and inform people, so they know what they are -- what is being asked of them, but the city cannot use its funds to promote that ballot measure and that they can't use any mass communication for that. That levy must include the disclosures listed above. Again the intention is to inform and educate. We can do that if

it is a ballot measure, but any advocacy of this measure has to be done by other folks and other people that are for it or against it, they can do that. Again, we have some sources on the website, e-mails in some other places that folks could reach the city online and, then, obviously, as I said, both tonight and on July 8th it's an opportunity for the public to actually come before you and make their feelings known on this subject. Again here the forms that we have online are available. Again, we have links on our website for people to look at. Again it provides additional information and outlines again the same process I just discussed with folks again -- again this is all again available on our website, all you Council Members, all the contact information, so people can reach out to you if they wish. Provide this as part of the record so that, again, all of the Council can consider that when they make this decision going forward and, then, again, we have these links that folks could get more informed and more information about this Levy. That's all I have.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Nary, maybe just a couple quick questions. Some of the feedback or the questions I have received from members of the public are largely around the concerns that it's -- it's kind of permanent. So, could you walk the Council through what steps the Council could take at a future time to essentially undo the levy or to reduce the amount that we are asking as part of the levy?

Nary: Sure. So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Cavener, I'm going to probably leave it to Mr. Lavoie on -- on the future. So, the levy -- the levy changes as -- as property values change. So, the levy will change some anyway, but I think Mr. Lavoie can answer that better. But, again, the Council -- the Council always, again, sets what the budget can be annually. So, they do have that decision, but -- do you have more to that, Todd?

Lavoie: Thank you, Bill, Mr. Mayor, Council. The question at hand is can you undo or do the budget in future discussions? Every year the legislative branch has every right to set the budget at their will. So, if you wish to reduce to make a budget 50 million, 60 million, or whatever the value is, you have every right to -- just like this year you can reduce the budget to the amount of money that you wish the city to operate under. So, it's your choice. There is no -- the state statute that says you have to do this or that. It's your discretion on how you wish to set the budget up. We just tell you what the maximum is. That is our job to keep you within the maximum values. You can always reduce it any year.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Lavoie, then, if I'm understanding things right, future councils, when they set the budget, they will set their budget that is both -- again kind of looking at past years. Are -- are -- these are base budget. Budget requests. This is the amount of money the city has, some kind of property tax revenue. This is what the city could receive in terms of new construction, property tax increase, but, then, also the city would also see the amount that we could generate from the levy and should the Council want to reduce that amount as part of our annual budget we can do that.

Lavoie: Mr. Mayor, Council Member, the display of information -- again, that's something we can work on in the future. What we display to the citizens will be what is the total amount of revenue you wish to collect from the citizens for property taxes? How we display that, again, that is up to us. If you wanted to show those different revenue sources we have every right to do so. We will figure that out as we go if this levy goes through and if this levy passes. We haven't determined how our budget document would look for communication at this time.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, additional if I may?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I guess what I'm -- what I'm getting at is that should this Council want to reduce that amount over time they can do that on an -- on an incremental basis. There is nothing that prevents them from saying we are going to do nothing this year, but ten percent next year, 50 percent the following year -- we have the ability to reduce that amount should we want to.

Lavoie: Mr. Mayor, Council Member, the answer is yes for any reason, levy or not. The legislative branches has every right to set the budget. Legal and Finance provide you the maximum value you can request. You guys can reduce it to any value for any reason that the legislative branch sees every year.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Bill, just a quick question on the 60 percent threshold. Is that tied to the -- any request under .004 percent or is it just simply asking for an additional levy has to meet that 60 percent threshold and if it's ongoing or permanent? So, my real question is if we put a time -- if we had this time bound into five years or ten years or 20 years, instead of permanent or ongoing, would we still be subject to that 60 percent threshold?

Nary: I believe the 60 percent is -- is set by statute, so that wouldn't change.

Simison: If we were to do a different type of levy --

Nary: Yes.

Simison: -- that was temporary for purposes defined by law, it could be a different number that could be up or down similar to the Foothills Levy. But this is a permanent for an ongoing expense.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I think it was last week I asked a little bit about is this money earmarked specifically towards public safety and we had a little bit of a conversation. I have had a couple of constituents in the interim who have asked me how do we know that this money only goes to public safety, that there is not mission creep, that there is not other things brought into it? Maybe not this year, but years down the road. I'm anticipating part of the answer is it's up to the legislative branch. But can you add any more context or color to that -- that question about how constituents -- how can they feel confident that this money is for public safety and always remains for public safety?

Lavoie: Mr. Mayor, Council Member, you are correct. The answer will be up to the legislative branch. I cannot guarantee any decisions of the future council members' decision on how they wish to spend their funds. So, every year it's going to be a question how do you wish to spend the property taxes that we collect? So, I cannot guarantee anything out of future council members decision -- or council board's decision. Can we communicate via budget document? Sure, we could. We could show that here is your revenue source. Here is some property taxes from that levy rate. Are we making sure that these funds are going towards public safety? We might be able to put some documents together, but future council decisions we cannot control that at this moment in time. There is no guarantee function at this moment.

Nary: Yeah. And maybe to put another point on that, Council Member Taylor, I mean certainly this current Council could direct a -- a certain amount or a percentage or whatever type of earmark that they wanted to direct this budget would contain. Would that prevent a future council from changing it? No. Would that give some level of assurance to the public that that's at least the intention and target of the funds for this and that's what it would be used for and that it would at least take future council action to undo that and change it? Yes, that would be a way to do it. But could it guarantee it? No. It would be no different than putting it in your code and requiring it in your -- in Meridian Code. You could do that. Future council could change it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. That was going to be my question was can we hold our own feet to the fire? Can we direct the Finance Department to, you know, sort of track this -- under this

Council to separately track it and, you know, I know we don't usually earmark things, but could you?

Lavoie: Mr. Mayor, Council Member, that -- we could track anything for you, but we can do a budget documented, a form like you stated. Next council can ask me not to do that.

Nary: You could hold your feet to the fire. You can also move the fire.

Lavoie: Yeah.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Sure. But, you know, as you know, councils don't take action behind closed doors, they would need to do that in a public meeting and we could certainly set up our own kind of approach to at least tracking it. I think that would be wise. Thank you.

Simison: Any additional questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

Nary: Thank you.

Simison: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up on this item?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We have Terry Dennington.

Simison: Okay. And if you come up you will be recognized for three minutes.

Dennington: Yes. My name is Terry Dennington. I reside at 4581 West Big Creek Street in Meridian. Mayor Simison and Council Members, I appreciate you having this hearing and of the comments. There has already been some discussion a little bit from representative -- Councilman Cavener and Taylor and Whitlock, because my concern is I'm a -- I would really like to see some kind of sunset clause. I'm just not a big one for just kind of keeping things ongoing forever in perpetuity, because we -- again, you guys all change over the years. We are all going to be gone and there is going to be other people in these places. So, I believe a sunset clause is something that's important to look at or consider and the language that you are going to put out there. The other piece of that is, again, talking about the -- how it's going to be used and how it -- I like to know that if I'm going to be putting some kind of tax out there that I'm going to have to pay and put onto the public forever or for a period of time, that I know how it's going to be used. So, I would rather say -- know that it's going to be public safety. It's going to be for the firefighters. It's going to be for the legal -- looking at the legal pieces, the police department, those kinds of things. I would rather see something that was specific. So, I don't know if that's -- again, I don't know the legalities of that and putting it in -- into the actual wording of the levy to know that it's going to be sunset in five or ten

or however many years and, then, also specifically that it will be used for these, rather than leaving it up to you guys to have to decide how we are going to use these funds. So, that's -- that's my input and hopefully that all make sense. Thank you.

Simison: Terry, I think there might be some question. I know I have got some questions. But, Council, any questions? I guess my question, Terry, for you is on the sunset. Knowing that this is -- you know, this is going to officers' salary increases, are you suggesting that we cut their salaries with this? How do we either add the people -- the additional firefighters long term or pay our police officers more money with a sunset? That's essentially saying that at a certain time frame we are going to not pay them that money or we are not going to have those positions if we add a sunset and that's why this is a permanent forever ongoing levy is because it's the expectation that the police are going to be paid at that level and the expectation that we are going to have all those firefighters. There is little fungibility in this conversation about, you know, reducing the amount. I mean people can play games all they want in the future to try to justify, but they lowered something down or did certain things. It's really about how much money is the cost to provide the service. What's that? So, how do you -- how do you suggest that we, you know, balance your thoughts on a sunset with our expectation that these are forever. You know, these are costs that we are anticipating paying our officers or having these firefighters forever. What's -- what's the -- your outcome on that?

Dennington: Well, just kind of listening to the discussion in this hearing, Mr. Lavoie talk about the fact that you guys are kind of -- set your discretion right now whether you are going to do zero levy next year or we are going to do it at the highest amount or we are going to reduce it by ten. That's another -- it sounds like it's already kind of discretionary as to how you will get those tax funds anyway. So, I'm not sure how -- again it's almost kind of sunset if you said we are not going to take that levy. We are going to do zero levy this year. We are going to do zero levy next year. So, I'm not sure -- or if there is some way to take those funds and set them aside, somehow build a fund that sets aside some monies for future. I'm not sure how that looks. But, again, it seems it's a little -- it's not specific right now, so --

Simison: I think -- I mean the levy itself is very specific in what it's going to do, but I think what Mr. Lavoie was trying to point out is a future council could say we don't want a police department anymore. We are just going to cut the entire department. That -- that's what councils have the ability -- we want to reduce our officers by ten next year. We are going to reduce that down for whatever reason why. We have gone to robot drone dogs and they replace -- you know, we don't know what the future is going to hold I think is kind of the point that you have as technology individuals. I mean I have had great conversations with Todd about changes in the accounting department with technology and, you know, you may not have as many people doing the same work as you did last year, so you can reduce that down. So, I think that's kind of the -- a little bit of the chicken and egg in the -- in the context of you don't know what a future council is going to do. But I also don't want to put an expectation to our firefighters or police officers that this is a temporary increase in salary or a temporary -- that we are going to



keep these positions -- at least from this Council's perspective. So, that's why I'm trying to navigate that, you know, expectation where suddenly I want to reduce this off town. What it really means is you are not going to take as much of an increase in the future as you may have otherwise done, because you feel like the revenues have come in to accomplish that same goal for what you want your service level to be and I get it, it's a difficult conversation for the community to grasp those type of conversations, but I'm trying to balance that -- what you think you are hearing and saying with what the actual reality of how -- what this is intended do long term. So, I appreciate it.

Dennington: And, again, I think what you are saying there is, again, somehow if you are going to structure that with the accounting department of maybe setting aside in your budgeting -- if you are going to take that levy and set it aside so maybe it will meet those -- those future costs. Again, I don't know what that looks like exactly, but maybe that's a way to do it, take those funds in, have a bucket that's going to sit there to keep paying those officers, firefighters, the different people and make sure that those people are not going to be, you know, left hanging or -- but, again, like you said you could actually say we want no police department. We are done. So, shut it down. We are going elsewhere. Anyway, I just don't know what that looks like, but I'm just trying to think in terms of how we can do it without just putting a blanket out there for being the top dollars and, again, being very specific and I think it should be very specific that it needs to be for these specific things, so that it doesn't get put into the general pot and, then, spent on other -- other kinds of things. So, that's -- that's my input and -- yeah.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Dennington: Any other questions?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Terry, just as a councilman -- as a lone councilman sitting up here, we don't take it lightly to put something forward like this, a levy that brings in five million dollars. If I saw that the revenue formulas five, seven, ten years down the road were changing significantly enough that we no longer needed that levy, then, I don't think I would want to see that levy existing just because we can. This whole reason for this levy coming forward is because we need it, because we need to be able to keep those firefighters, we need to be able to pay those police officers what we can. We can't afford to keep losing them. We need to have our own prosecution staff and we don't currently have that funding to do it. So, if that gives you any sense of hope -- if we ended up with changes in how the state funded municipalities and started to make up for that shortfall that we now suffer, I can very easily see us saying we don't need this anymore, we want to walk away from it, but if that doesn't happen I see this continuing into the future until something different does happen.

Dennington: So, Councilman Overton, what I -- the issue is that I trust all of you right now, but in the future, like I said, these spaces are all changing, including mine. I'm not going to be here either, because, Lord willing, at some point in time I'm going on, but I'm

not sure where the other people that are coming up in the future and the people that are filling these positions will think like that. Will say, hey, we can just get rid of this levy now, because we are in good shape and we got all the money we need, I just think in our human nature that lots of times people, if they have got money coming in they don't say they want to stop it. They want to take it. And, again, very specific, if it's for specific things and maybe looking to that and that language says specifically that it will never go into just a pot of money that we can use however we want to use it, I just -- it's -- that -- those are -- those are my concerns. I believe that you guys all have all of this great intention and they are going to use it for what it needs to be used for, but future members may not be as honorable as you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I get that fear. I guess what I would say -- one thing I have noticed just -- the city of Meridian has a like long history of financial philosophy or, you know, we have not had any debt, for example, and I think there is a pretty good track record in this Council and past councils of not taking up to the full three percent allowable property tax increase and I feel like part of my thinking on it is that in years where we don't need it we don't take it and we are not trying to pad the revenue side; right? So, we have many -- a track record of many years where we didn't take the full three percent and now we are in a different place and these pressures -- I wish that they were around one time money, because it would totally solve the issue you are talking about. The biggest issue I think -- and that's part of why it's been so hard is that the pressure is really around our operating costs. That's where our hugest issue is and so I think that's a big part of why it has to be a permanent levy increase in terms of accomplishing what we need, which is that we need a reliable source of ongoing revenue. That is the same characteristic of the three percent allowable property tax increase. That is also an ongoing source of revenue. So, in future years, at least if you looked at our past history, I think you would feel pretty confident that there will be years where if we don't need it I hope we don't take it. That's been our history. That's what I would hope to see from future council members and I do think that the City of Meridian has a pretty good track record of holding Council Members accountable on that, at least that's been my experience. So, I know that doesn't totally solve your concern, but at least a little perspective just from what I have seen.

Dennington: I appreciate that, Council Woman Strader. I -- again, it's just that I know the people in the seat right now and those change over the years and you just have different philosophies. People's philosophies change. Their world views are different and that changes as time goes on and how -- the way people move forward in their beliefs and all that and so I'm just -- I'm just concerned that we just need to be prudent in what we are doing. This is the people's money that we are taking and deciding how we are going to use it and right now I think it's great, I think we need the services that we have and I want to support those, but I just want to try and figure out how we can be really diligent in how we are going to put that out to the public and say this is not just

money we can take forever for whatever we want, because in a way that's kind of what I'm hearing. You know, that once it's there and available the money is -- as Mr. Lavoie said -- the money is yours to decide how you want to use it. You know, it's there, it's up to you Council Members to make that decision. So, that's my only concern is that right now I believe that all of our ideas and philosophies are in that place and that's what we want to do and support, but I'm just not sure that the way it's worded right now is just leaving it as an open end is really the best way to do this and, again, legally I don't know how that looks or how it gets set aside or set up, but that's -- that's my input, so --

Simison: Well, thank you, Terry, for not just being one of the few people that pays really close attention to our budget for being here and providing comment. We really appreciate you.

Dennington: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

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

Simison: Is there anybody present that would like to come forward? Come on up, sir.

Shackleford: Good evening.

Simison: Good evening. State your name for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

Shackleford: My name is Brian Shackleford. I live on Sugar Maple Way in Meridian -- northwest Meridian. I just want to say that, A, I support the idea of the levy. I think it's fiscally prudent for us as homeowners, for us as land owners as well, because we want to be able to attract and retain the best and the brightest for public safety and for those kind of things and I think, yes, it's an increased cost for us as a homeowner, but at the same time what happens when our public services decline, when our response times are lower, our quality of -- of people we attract are lower. That's going to have an impact financially on us as well. So, we have to be prudent and -- and to address a couple of concerns I have heard. Number one, I guess how do we ensure that this is used? Well, we as constituency make sure we -- at the voting booth. You have made the -- Council Woman, you have made the point that we have a track record of holding the Council responsible and I think we do that with our vote and ensuring that we have the right people in your seats to ensure that we continue to use these funds that are earmarked for that purpose. A thought -- side thought. Even if we put in the legislation -- or the levy that this is solely earmarked for public safety and that may be the case, but that doesn't prevent a future council from saying, okay, well, they have this money earmarked, we are going to take some other budget monies away. So, say -- saying in the -- in the levy that this is solely for public safety; right? But that doesn't prevent a potential shortfall somewhere else. So, I'm a big supporter of the idea. I just want good public services. I want good response times and so I just want my voice to be heard to

you guys that I think it's prudent, both fiscally and otherwise, and I was so shocked, quite frankly, that there is so few people here, that the apathy seems to be so great about our city and whether yea or nay, there just seems to be such an apathy and it's -- that it was -- I was a little surprised, I expected to be a lot fuller. But I appreciate your time and I thank you and I would urge you guys to push the levy forward.

Simison: Thank you, Brian. Council, any questions? Appreciate you being here.

Shackleford: Thank you.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide comments on this item at this time? And, Council, there is -- other than the city staff member and the KTVB representative we don't have anybody online either that would, in theory, be ready to provide -- although Mr. White is a city staff -- or is a Meridian residence, so I guess I will say if there is anybody online, please, use the raise your hand function to provide comments. Okay. No one else at this -- at this point in time.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: We got another public hearing scheduled for July the 8th. Certainly would encourage those who are here in the room and our media partners that are here to help encourage people to come and share their perspective. I applaud, I think this Council has tried to walk into tonight in this process with two ears. We want to hear from our community and we hope that we hear from more of them on the 8th and certainly recognize it's hard on a Tuesday night, particularly when the weather is so nice, to come into City Hall. They can, obviously, reach out to us via e-mail or the form or reach out to any of us individually. So, Mr. Mayor, I think that concludes Item 1, the public hearing. We will keep it open for our July 8th hearing.

## **DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]**

### **2. Potential Public/Private Partnership for Sewer Line Installation**

Simison: We will continue that -- and maybe that's how it looks on the 8th is continued from that standpoint for the conversation, even though there is no court -- quasi-judicial process in that, but to keep the record together. So, appreciate everyone that did come, whether it is to listen or comment on this item tonight. So, with that we will go back to -- we will move on to Item 2, move back to that and we will pick up our conversation on the potential public-private partnership for sewer line installation and Mr. Stewart had concluded his presentation and was here for Council -- Council questions and comments.

Stewart: Mayor, if you don't mind, Council, before you start -- I guess one of the things I didn't necessarily make clear is what we are looking for for tonight and, really, it's just

twofold. One is just to provide you with information regarding this type of potential agreement, so that if you hear about it in the future it won't be a surprise to you and, two, to get maybe some feedback as to whether we are spinning our wheels and wasting our time or whether you want us to continue to have these conversations and with that I will answer any of your questions.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Warren, thank you. I did have an opportunity to discuss this a little bit with Laurelei and -- and get some more information, so maybe some feedback that's beneficial to you and to Council. I -- it feels very complicated in terms of getting it right with all the nuances of the contracts and agreements between the city and a private party, ensuring that legally it's sound. I know you guys have done a lot of work and I -- I anticipate that Council may have a variety of very specific questions and as you were presenting it kind of ginned up some additional questions I may have about just ensuring that both parties are protected in a way that makes some sense. That said I think as I view it from a bigger picture and sort of an idea and a concept and if there is merit to it, I like this idea of a public-private partnership, because if I'm synthesizing your presentation in my own words in 30 seconds here is an opportunity to have a private partner expedite some critical infrastructure. The net cost to the city will be half of what we projected, because they will be paying for it. It's not expediting the calendar by which we are projecting to pay the funds, because we will only reimburse them in the time frame that we originally had planned in the out years. It's not putting anything in front of us that we are not planning to do, because if it's not within that five year window we are not going to do it. So, it has to be something we are looking at doing in the next few years and the private sector is taking on all the risk initially in putting it up and, then, counting on the city to keep its obligations to fund the reimbursement. To me that -- we all know construction costs go up. I think there is some savings there. Think that makes -- I like that idea of -- of working with partners to kind of get that going. So, there is a lot I like about this. I was wondering in my mind is this a -- is this a -- just -- is this a policy we would kind of implement or is this a practice that we would sort of say we are open to these agreements and it seems to me with a very limited nature where this is something we would do it would be a practice the city would be willing to engage with the private sector. But, again, it's going to save the city at least half the cost of the project. It's going to expedite it. It's going to open up some development. Just as long as we are ensuring we are following all the legal practices that are required to protect the city I think it's worth exploring. That said I can appreciate there is probably a lot of specific details about getting the agreements right that, you know, we kind of leave it up to the -- to you and the professionals and staff to make sure we do it right, but I think that's just kind of some of my feedback, because I like this idea.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Warren. I have a ton of questions. Maybe starting with do you have a map of the area in the city that this would open up for development? I think that would be the first thing I would need to see, because anytime we extend a sewer trunk shed it's going to open up a huge part of the city for development. So, I would like to see that and kind of understand I think in a better geographic way like what am I looking at here? I guess that would be the first thing. Do you have that handy?

Stewart: Mayor, Council Woman -- Council Woman Strader, I don't have one with me tonight. I could get that. I can generally describe the area, but that might not be --

Strader: Mr. Mayor --

Stewart: -- useful.

Strader: That's okay. I would really prefer to see it on a map, like what -- what area of the city will this specifically open up for development when it's complete? I think that's my -- my first question. I would like to understand as well just -- I think it would be helpful to see a map of all of the sewers that are planned again. I think I have seen it in the past. I'm sure I have bugged Public Works about it in the past. But if I -- I just want to understand, because it sounds like this has implications for other parts of the McDermott trunk, it has implications for this Elden Gray area, this Victory area. I really want to see that, you know, so that's -- that's something I would like to also understand, because it feels to me like if we do it once, then, these are the conditions under which we are open to doing it in the future. Do we get tied to this kind of an approach where we are -- and maybe this is actually a legal question -- if we do this in this instance, if another developer meets the same requirements do we need to approve another public-private partnership? Mr. Mayor, I think that might be a question for Bill.

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, the short answer to that is no. I mean there is always discretion. One thing we haven't discussed -- and I don't recall -- so, Warren has been working with Mr. Starman from my team on this proposal and one thing we haven't talked about -- Warren talked about it a little bit on future potential partnerships that could occur. We hadn't discussed -- at least I wasn't a part of it if we wanted to put this in ordinance. You know, we have had other situations in the past where we looked at a particular type of project, to answer that very question, Council Member Strader, that you just asked was we decided that it would be something we would consider and we wrote it into an ordinance to allow us to do that, again, creating whatever those rubric is, whatever those requirements that we wanted to put on there to do that, but we hadn't discussed that. This was really -- at this juncture it's just a one off that's being requested, but I think as Warren identified there are potential -- I think he identified like three that could fit into this similar circumstance. But if -- the answer is are we required to do it in the future? The answer is, no, we don't ever have to do it. There, obviously, is risk and I think that's what Warren is trying to identify is that because of the risk of potentially not -- it not being funded in a future year, that's a great risk on the developer's part to forward that. This particular circumstance they are willing

to do that, knowing that is a risk, but I don't foresee that being something that's going to come up as often.

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, Bill is correct, we hadn't contemplated this being some sort of a broader sort of ordinance or anything like that. These public-private partnerships may not -- just because there is an area that might potentially be available for one, so to speak, doesn't mean there is going to be one happen and, two, you have two points that have to happen. First of all you have to approve a budget to do the work. Secondly, you would have to approve the agreement. So, in the future if this -- if we get directed to continue to have these conversations or with this particular developer, you are still going to get a look at an agreement, all the terms and conditions of that agreement and whether or not you want to support it or not in the future here in the next few months. So, there is a couple of -- I guess off ramps, if you will, and as far as the McDermott trunk project there is -- you know, we have plans to build that trunk in absence of any development. We have currently in the CFP to build the various phases of that up through 2032 when that part will be complete. Those are all dependent upon you funding those projects. So, that's not for sure, but that's certainly our plan at this point is for those -- that McDermott trunk sewer line to be extended to a point where we can, then, essentially, allow development to take it and extend it from there. We know that there is a lot of interest in certain parts of that extension, not necessarily all of it, but certain parts of that extension. I don't know if that answers your question, but it was not our intent to make this something that is an automatic you get this. It's just something that we could entertain if the conditions and the situation were something that the Council wanted to support. But it does have the potential to save the city a pretty significant amount of money.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: To that point what is the total estimated cost of this project?

Stewart: The developer looked at this in 2022. We bid it out 2022. It was just shy of five million dollars at the time. Current estimates -- not bids, but current estimates are double that. So, we are talking about nearly a ten million dollar project.

Strader: Uh-huh. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Okay. I guess maybe some feedback for me right now. I feel like this could be a little problematic, because we don't have a ton of time between now and when this -- I guess application is coming. So, I think that the types of information that I need to just assess this idea would be the map that I referenced. I think I would need to see a copy of the draft agreement, at least an idea of the legal document, what the provisions would be to review. I think I want to understand if this is a priority growth area for us

and why and I think that would be helpful to understand from planning staff's perspective and the Mayor's perspective and, then, I think, yeah, I'm just going to have to dig into it a bit more. The memo I thought was a bit light, which is okay and they usually are, but it's a lot of information kind of coming at us in this one meeting, so I think I would have to understand that. Another question I had was around counterparty risk. So, if we start this project based on the geology of this area, the fact that you have got to go 30 feet underground, et cetera, et cetera, you know, usually -- I mean like for example Toll Brothers -- I don't know if it's Bruce Toll or if it's the publicly traded company, like who we are dealing with, but I think it would be helpful to understand from our perspective what risks we might have if our counterparty -- let's just take them out of the picture specifically, but any counterparty in this type of a partnership were to fail -- what if they go bankrupt? What if they decide to walk away from the project because things change? Things change all the time. Interest rate environment can change. We could see really dramatic changes and I asked a lot of these same questions about a different developer on a different project not far from here and haven't been happy with how that's played out despite their assurances. So, I think I would need to really understand like with this type of infrastructure if you are mid-project and it were to fail, is the city going to have to step into the shoes of the developer to complete the project? I understand financially we may not -- we might come out okay on what we would have paid anyway, but is there anything with the infrastructure specifically and the nature of this type of project that once you start it you must complete it? I just want to kind of go through like a failure scenario -- worst case scenario how does this play out. So, I don't expect you to answer that here, unless you have thought about that I would love to hear, but that's something I would really want to dig into.

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, we can talk about a couple of those things. I think the -- one of the questions I had -- you are correct, the memo was a little light and that was intentional. I was trying to be really careful, because I wanted to give you a heads up about something that we were contemplating, because I thought you were going to hear about it potentially in a -- in a future City Council meeting, but I did want to talk in detail about that, because that's for that Council meeting and the agreement wouldn't come until after you had made a decision on whether or not this development was something you were even interested in approving. So, I didn't want to give too much information, because I was -- I had to be careful. There was a line there. I think you understand that that I can't discuss too much. That's also one of the reasons I guess I will ask Bill -- I don't know whether it's okay at this stage of the game for me to give a draft agreement to the City Council or if that has to wait until after that hearing?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I -- I think it probably should wait at least until the hearing. Again I think -- you know, I'm sure Council Member Strader gets this. I guess this is more for the record, but the decision on the land use application can be independent of this; right? And -- and it should be. I mean the decision on whether to annex and grow and add this property and all of that is separate and apart from this. Now, again, I think Warren is correct, it's naturally likely to be a conversation topic because of serviceability. That's always a question that's going to come up in a land use application and so I think it will likely come up as a conversation point. But I think



once you hear that and if that's a desire this Council to say we are interested in the application, we are interested in this concept, but we want to see the agreement, then, that will probably be the better time to see that, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Okay. Maybe a different way of going about this is I will just state on the record that generally for me to ever be comfortable with any type of project or arrangement like this on any land use item at all I would need to see the agreement, so I would highly recommend that the applicant provide that as part of their application if they want to be as persuasive as they can be with me. I guess I will put it that way. It -- it's funny, I get it, but like in terms of how the sausage is actually made, the chances of a project being approved for annexation without critical infrastructure is very low; right? So, I'm just -- we are all here in reality together. I mean I'm just being practical. Okay. Well, I think I have said what I would need, so whatever you do have please provide. Thanks.

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I guess -- you asked another question about a worst case scenario. There are provisions in the agreement -- I can at least say that much -- that, you know, what if somebody fails, you know, what happens if somebody fails. So, some of those things are -- those types of provisions are in the agreement and, yeah, like -- like I say, we -- I'm not here to try and promote this one way or the other or to promote the development one way or the other, that's your -- your guys' decision. I just wanted to make sure that when you hear about this on April 8th you are like what in the world is our, you know, staff been doing? You know, I wanted to make sure you were aware that we were engaging with folks on this type of conversation and get your feedback as to whether or not you were interested.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I mean some of the follow-up questions that come to mind on that point are how are you mitigating that risk? Are you using bonding? Are you using, you know, some other type of insurance or, you know, that's -- maybe start there.

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, yes, they would -- they would have to provide the same types of assurances that say a developer would if he was doing a project anywhere in the City of Meridian, they would have to bond for it.

Strader: Okay. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- I will commit to providing follow-up questions to you after this meeting, because I will have more. Thank you.

Stewart: Yeah.

Simison: And just going through the map that I have seen, I believe it's essentially not including what additional may be done -- is Ustick north, taking in most of the property that's already been annexed for Owyhee High School through that area that brings it into that serviceable area, as well as going back into the other parts of the city which are not yet annexed that are kind of in-fill on the other side towards the city is what I want to say is on the map. I don't know how far west it goes, how far beyond the Owyhee High School property that is served, but I don't think it's very far. So, it's really taking in stuff that's already annexed or it could be annexed on in-fill if this project was completed is what my memory is. But you will see the map.

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, I think that was part of -- I guess maybe a little bit of a question. Are we talking about the area that can be served by this little piece that we are talking about building this half a mile section or the overall McDermott trunk concept? And I can break that up into phases if -- if that would be beneficial. So, I guess maybe just some clarification on exactly what you are looking for.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. It's both. So, I mean I think it's important to understand the map of all of our planned sewer trunks and -- bless you -- and what the timing is expected to be over time, right, just on our side. I think I would like to understand that. But, then, the other piece of this is -- you are correct, what specific areas with the construction of this segment, including any other parts that are along the way; right? What -- what parts of the city does that open up for development? That's the -- that's the question. And I think you can -- you know, the difference to me would be, okay, private dollars can now connect -- I realize everyone has to build a little bit; right? So, you are going to have to think about that, how to show that, but I think if -- I think what I'm interested in is our money will pay for -- you know, our tax money -- our residents' tax money will pay for this segment. We think that opens up these other segments where developers will pay their share in for a little connection to it, but just practically what does it open up? Because I'm guessing it's a large area, but I don't know.

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, for this half mile section you would be surprised, it's not that -- the direct connections that can come from this are not that significant. It's just basically projects or parcels of land that are on either side of it. Now, you are correct, if a developer puts in another, you know, quarter mile sewer line to the east -- it's mostly to the east. There is not much that's served to the west. But if he puts in another quarter mile or as in this case the developer that's -- we are talking about for this Dayspring project is anticipating building a half a mile I think it is -- yeah,

about a half a mile down Ustick and that would open up all those parcels along Ustick. But they wouldn't be open to development without that contribution, which is going to be entirely upon them.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yep. And I think that that's -- to my point of why I need that and part of it is critical infrastructure is big investment. We need to be thoughtful about it. I just want to make sure that we are not spreading ourselves too thin. Right now development is much slower than it used to be, but prioritizing where we want to grow has been very important and I think a lot of our challenges have come from building in a lot of places at the same time. So, I just really want to get a sense of geographically what we are talking about, but I think you have heard me and I appreciate you. Thank you. And I know you are conveying the information. I'm not saying I'm opposed to it, by the way. I just like -- with anything like this I'm going to need to dig in, so thanks.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I appreciate Council Woman Strader's concern about liability with failure and appreciate the answers, Warren, about bonds and other protections that are in place. Mr. Nary, just a question on the flip side of that coin. Why would -- why would a partner in an agreement like this agree to a non-appropriation clause our side of the coin?

Nary: Two reasons. One, we can't do it without it, so we wouldn't even entertain an agreement without a non-appropriation clause. And I guess the other is there is a -- for lack of a better way of saying it, I think there is a trust and a belief that we have intended to fund the project and we likely will. Now, they recognize the risk, as Warren has identified, that things change, economies change, circumstances change and things change and they recognize that and, obviously, factored that decision point in, but if we are intending to do something we are likely to do it. So, even as we have discussed it -- and I don't know if Warren has had the same conversation with Mr. Starman, but what I have seen historically, right, is cities have a tendency to move projects, not completely delete them. So, the potential could be that they would move it a year or two. Obviously, they factored that in as well. But that -- that's my belief is that most likely if we are planning a project and we have it in our CFP, I think they must believe we are likely to do it at some point and they are willing to take that risk. But on the first part without a non-appropriation clause it's a nonstarter, we can't do it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: That prompts a further question for me. Is there any reason that they -- do they have an expectation, to your knowledge, that we would have a development agreement that would obligate the city? Because I -- it may not be part of this agreement, but I'm wondering if that would be part of the development agreement and if the city could be sued under that?

Nary: No. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Strader, no, that's been an ongoing part of the discussion that even though -- even if we were to incorporate this as part of a development agreement there is still going to be the same safeguards for the city. Our only concern is the city is not going to be on the hook to build something that is not intended when it wasn't intended at a funding level that was not appropriated. So, there is no intention on our part to put anything in this to obligate the city and if they were to like -- like you asked earlier and Warren said that we want assurances on the development side that this could get done without the city's contribution, even if they were to walk away.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, Warren, thank you so much for all of this. Did I -- do I remember correctly that design is in the potential partners bucket and, if so, how much oversight do we have on them designing something that's going to be -- becoming part of our permanent system?

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Little Roberts, they are actually designing this project currently on their own dime, because they had contemplated the possibility of doing it on their own. I don't think they -- you know, they have basically said -- they looked at the numbers, they don't pencil, but they are in the process of designing it. But just like any developer project, when the -- when the designs are done they go through our process, so they will be submitted to development services, they will -- excuse me -- they will go through that process. Engineering will have an opportunity to look at them. So, we will do the same type of review on their design that we would do if it was a developer on another project looking to do this work. So, we would make sure that we got what we wanted.

Little Roberts: All right. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Warren, you are our subject matter expert when it comes to a lot of this, so I appreciate kind of you bringing this to our attention. Council Member Strader, I don't -- I don't like the speed at which we are going to kind of have to be -- come to a conclusion on this type of a request and when you were kind of laying things out you indicated, hey,

we never heard of this before, this wasn't something that was necessarily on your radar either. Help me understand from your perspective as a subject matter expert what are the -- what are the risks or what are the concerns you see that cause you some trepidation about going down this particular path?

Stewart: That's a -- Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, you know, there are obviously some risks associated with performance and that's why we would require performance and payment bonds and other things in case they -- they went, you know, upside down somehow on the project before they were completed. Outside of that I don't -- we have talked about that. If we have all the terms and conditions in there up front that we need, that we are assured that they are bidding the project out according to the public bidding process, so that we don't have any issues there and they -- we don't have to actually come forward with the money any earlier than we would have. There is, obviously, a risk if they were saying we want the money now, because that messes with rate model, that messes with our -- our -- our existing funding and that's not something we want to do, but that's not the case. They are willing to wait for their money and it has the potential to reduce the city's cost by 50 percent. So, outside of the, you know, failure to perform on the contract, which we mitigate that the same way we would on any project, I don't know that there are a lot of other significant risks to the city. Potential benefits, yes, but I'm not here lobbying for those. That's up to you to decide one way or the other whether you like that or not.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow up if I may?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Warren, taking maybe the -- the July 8th hearing off the table. Is this a tactic that you and your team -- if this is something Council is supportive of -- is a tactic that you and your team would continue to go out and solicit on your own or would it be your intention to wait for the development community to come to the city to seek these additional public-private partnerships?

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, we have no intentions of soliciting anybody. This is something that we would anticipate if a developer were interested they could come to us and we would have a conversation. But it is not our intent or desire to go out and solicit this type of agreement. I don't think that's our place.

Cavener: Thank you, Warren. I appreciate it.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, just one more.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Warren, apologies. Have you and your team discussed a -- a rubric or a decision tree that would determine in the future if these types of public-private partnerships make sense? And I guess I'm looking at if this is a path we go down we would want to apply the same standards consistently. Is that something that you and the department have discussed?

Stewart: So, Mayor, Councilman Cavener, there was a slide that I showed there that had all the kind of terms and conditions that was sort of our litmus test. It's like, okay, it would have to be this, you know, it has to be in our five year CFP, it has to be a 50-50 split, it has to be -- the city doesn't, you know, have to come up with any money. Those are the conditions that we -- we sort of came up with. And as I also indicated there is really a very limited number of these in the city. As of right now today there is the McDermott trunk and the Elden Gray. That's it. There is not another place in the city where this would apply under the current set of, you know, rules or conditions that we have set for this one. So, there is not a lot of opportunity for one, because we don't engage in construction of infrastructure on the city side, only in rare cases where it's just not something that we can expect development to do.

Cavener: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we are not under any time frame to approve any of this by -- in two weeks from now. This was more of give us a heads up so we understand. I do think, though, that it's -- it's fair to assume that the developer will think that we are fully up to speed and we have made some decisions, so I think all of these questions are really fantastic. I think this has been very helpful and thought provoking. It is a big step I think to -- for the city to engage in this way. I'm open to it, as long as it's done the right way. But I -- I think -- I want to clarify, I don't think we as a Council have to make any decisions on whether we are okay with this by the time they come forward with their application. But, of course, obviously, you know, the applicant may have some assumptions about our knowledge. So, I appreciate you bringing this to us now. I also agree with Council Woman Strader's comments about when you -- when you look at the map, when you look at the trunk line, it's actually very helpful to understand that, because with the McDermott trunk line we are looking at, you know, going out over a decade of how that's going to extend and so understanding where on the map that we are talking about -- we are not talking about a section of, you know, the proposed trunk line that's disconnected from anything, it's an extension of kind of currently where it is, is very helpful. So, I do think it would be helpful if you could provide that to everyone to help us understand kind of the city's plan, because it will -- it is in a part of town where it will -- that McDermott trunk line will open up, you know, one of the largest really undeveloped parts of the city. So, I do think it's a significant conversation, though it is extended out over a significant horizon. But I would -- I think that would be helpful to have that sort of either e-mailed to us with sort of a -- kind of a -- where the current trunk

lines are now and, then, each calendar year or fiscal year the -- what the plan is. I would comment here, you know, we are looking at savings of, you know, four to five million dollars potentially on this project. I -- to the city. That's money not spent by the city, which is not to be ignored. So, I do think it's a worthwhile exercise to look at this as a smart way for us to work with the development community. I do agree with the idea of making sure that the growth is how we want it to be, because we found ourselves with some applications where the infrastructure seemed very very lacking and it made it really hard for us to say okay, because we just found it was creating additional problems. So, that's a very smart conversation piece to have. But, anyway, I do appreciate that.

Stewart: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, I guess I got two questions real short out of that. One was what is the developer's expectation? We have made it clear to the developer that the City Council won't make a decision on this until after the project bids out and we have financial numbers to actually put into the agreement. So, they know that the agreement cannot be finalized until it's bid. They know they are not going to bid it out until they have entitlements, but my guess is on the 8th you are going to hear them say we are going to do a big project to bring sewer and we want to do a public-private agreement in order to make that happen. We just wanted to get ahead of that a little bit to give you a heads up that you are going to hear that and didn't want that to be the first time. We wanted you to hear that coming from the staff. And, then, two, happy to provide the map. In fact, I think we already have one that we have put together that shows the segments and the years in which those segments would be constructed.

Simison: Council, any additional questions or comments? Warren, Laurelei, thank you very much. We have been talking about this concept for a while. I appreciate now actually seeing it and it's -- all the components that you have put into it. You know, I think it makes it -- it actually solves other issues for us up in this area as well if this project moves forward. So, I'm hopeful it does, but getting Council's questions answered hopefully will provide that opportunity, regardless of the situation regarding the annexation. So, appreciate it very much.

Stewart: Thank you.

### **ORDINANCES [Action Item]**

- 3. Ordinance No. 25-2088: An ordinance (Mondt Meadows Subdivision – H-2024-0067) annexing a parcel of land being a portion of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Meridian, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 10.84 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to R-2 (8.48 acres) (Low-Density Residential) and R-4 (2.36 acres) (Medium Low-Density Residential) zoning districts; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of**

**Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to our ordinances for this evening. First up is Item 3, which is Ordinance No. 25-2088. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Ordinance 25-2088, an ordinance Mondt Meadows Subdivision, H-2024-0067, annexing a parcel of land being a portion of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Meridian, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A"; rezoning 10.84 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to R-2 (8.48 acres) (Low-Density Residential) and R-4 (2.36 acres) (Medium Low-Density Residential) zoning districts; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by the title. Is there anybody that would like it read its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2088.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2088. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 4. Ordinance No. 25-2089: An ordinance (Skyranch H-2024-0022) for rezone of a parcel of land being a portion of Government Lot 4 of Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada**



**County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A,” rezoning 24.53 acres of land from the R-4 (Medium Low-Density Residential) zoning district to the R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next item up is Item 4, which is Ordinance No. 25-2089. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An ordinance Sky Ranch, H-2024-0022 for rezone of a parcel of land being a portion of Government Lot 4 of Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A,” rezoning 24.53 acres of land from the R-4 (Medium Low-Density Residential) zoning district to the R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

Simison: 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?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2089.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2089. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 5. Ordinance No. 25-2090: An ordinance (Skyranch – H-2024-0022) annexing a parcel of land located in the south half of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 20.039 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next item up is Item 5, which is Ordinance No. 25-2090. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An ordinance Sky Ranch, H-2024-0022, annexing a parcel of land located in the south half of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 20.039 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2090.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2090. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 6. Ordinance No. 25-2091: An ordinance (Foldesi Reserve – H-2024-0055) annexing a parcel of land located in the north half of the southeast quarter of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 3.31 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next item is Item 6 which is Ordinance No. 25-2091. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An ordinance Folds Reserve, H-2024-0055, annexing a parcel of land located in the north half of the southeast quarter of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, City of Meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 3.31 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance as read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2091.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2091. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

### **FUTURE MEETING TOPICS**

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics or a motion to adjourn?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: No future meeting topics. There is just a couple of quick announcements. I know a couple of us chatted yesterday about helping or attending the pancake feed for our parks volunteers tomorrow. I thought Dave was going to send something out, but I did not see it today. But if you are planning to attend it's at Shelter B1, which is across from the Meridian Senior Center and no one is expected, you don't -- you don't have a role, but if you want to attend everyone is invited and I'm sure you all saw the e-mail from our clerk Mr. Johnson. No meeting next week. So, enjoy the Tuesday night off. We will return on July 8th with what I understand is a fairly full agenda, but I wish you all a Happy Independence Day and, Mr. Mayor, with that I move we adjourn our City Council meeting.

Strader: 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: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:18 P.M.  
(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON  
ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK