

Meridian City Council Work Session

June 17, 2025.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m. Tuesday, June 17, 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, Bill Nary, Steve Siddoway, Garrett White, Kurt Starman, Shawn Harper and Steve Taulbee.

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 17th, 2025, at 4:30 in the afternoon. We will begin this City Council 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: Mayor, Members of the Council, it always impresses me we have so many high school students in our attendance, even more so during summer vacation, and so while we have some great proclamations to read they are currently on our agenda at the end, so, Council, Mr. Mayor, I move that we actually move those up on our agenda to after items after our Consent Agenda. So, we have that listed as proclamations -- a proclamation for Mountain View High School Girls State Track Champions Day and, then, following that Mountain View High School Boys State Track Champions Day and with that, Mr. Mayor, I move that we adopt the agenda as amended.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as amended. Is there any 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.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the June 3, 2025 City Council Work Session**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the June 3, 2025 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 3. Vanguard Village Subdivision No. 1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0009)**
- 4. Wadsworth Meridian Subdivision Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2025-0034)**
- 5. Ada County Highway District Facility at 2023 Franklin Rd. Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0055)**
- 6. Western States Equipment Water Main Easement Release (ESMT-2025-0057)**
- 7. Frontline Subdivision Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0063)**
- 8. Aviation Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0064)**
- 9. Final Plat for Apex Phenomenal (FP-2025-0005), by Brighton Corporation, generally located 1/2 mile east of S. Meridian Rd./SH-69 on the north side of E. Lake Hazel Rd.**
- 10. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for CentrepoinTE Apartments (H-2025-0009) by Mike Maffia, MGM Meridian 2, located at 3100 CentrepoinTE Way and 3030 N. Cajun Ln.**
- 11. Temporary Right-of-Way Easement Between the Ada County Highway District and the City of Meridian at Apex Southeast Subdivision No. 3 (South Side of Discovery Park)**
- 12. Development Agreement (Core & Main H-2024-0066) Between City of Meridian and Core & Main LP for Property Located at 299 S. Black Cat Rd.**
- 13. Development Agreement (330 N. Linder Rd.) Between City of Meridian and Rinker Properties LLC for Property Located at 330 N. Linder Rd.**
- 14. Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Amendment in the amount of \$(11,600) to accept donation from Boise Area Pickleball Association**

- 15. Agreement for Use of Kleiner Park for Meridian Fine Arts Festival**
- 16. Ada County Highway District Cost Share Permit for Landscape Medians on Ustick Rd., Black Cat Rd. to Ten Mile Rd.**
- 17. Resolution 25-2520: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian to Amend City of Meridian Standard Operating Policy 4.5, Regarding Bereavement Leave; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 18. Resolution No. 25-2521: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian to Amend the Future Land Use Map of the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan Concerning 5.0 Acres of Land for the Expansion of the Black Cat Business Center, Generally Located at 299 S. Black Cat Road, in a Portion of the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 16, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 19. Resolution No. 25-2522: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Appointing Members of the Compensation Committee; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Up next to 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 agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

PROCLAMATIONS

- 20. Mountain View High School Girls Track State Champions Day**

21. Mountain View High School Boys Track State Champions Day

Simison: So as was noted we will move down to the podium for our proclamations. If I could have the coaches and the team join me at the podium that would be great and we can do them all men and women at the same time or we can do them separately. I will let you all decide how you want to approach that. That way everyone out there can see it real good. Whatever works. They are not going to like spread out themselves. They like to get comfortable, so -- all right. I -- I think we are -- we are getting everyone squared away officially. So, when these first came across my desk they were one proclamation to begin with, but I said no, no, no, no, we -- we got to separate these out. So, we are going to read two proclamations and, then, I will turn it over to the coaches for any comments and afterwards we will ask each member to come forward and just state their name and what year you are in school and what activities -- or what events you participate in through that process. But as a proud southside member wearing my -- my -- my kicks for the colors -- it's about as close as I could get to -- for -- for -- for Mountain View, but what -- what -- the fact that we get to have you all here today. So, with that we will first do the boys proclamation. Whereas being a Mountain View High School boys track team member is more than sprints, relays, hurdles, field events and achieving state titles, it is training to build leadership, character, confidence, teamwork and resilience, all traits needed to succeed on the field, in the classroom and in the real world and whereas the Mountain View Boys Track won the District 3 State championship with a score of 117 points and stole the show at the Idaho State 5A-6A championship meet with a one hundred point score that allowed the Mavericks to knock eight time defending state champion and whereas multiple student athletes achieve personal records and contribute to an unforgettable team victory to bring home the first boys track and field state title in program history for Mountain View and whereas the leadership, training and discipline of their coaches helped all team members to focus their talents and passion, become a winning team, with each player making valuable contributions to their victory. Therefore, I'm, Mayor Robert E. Simison, hereby proclaim June 17th, 2025, as Mountain View's High School Boys Track State Champions Day in the City of Meridian and call upon the community to join me in congratulating the Mountain View Mavs on their remarkable athletic achievement and for representing Meridian so proudly in the state tournament, dated this 17th day of June 2025. So, let's give a round of applause for them. And now we will do the one for the ladies. Whereas being a Mountain View High School Girls Track Team member is more than sprints, relays, hurdles, field events and achieving state titles, it is training to build leadership, character, confidence, teamwork and resilience, all traits needed to succeed on the field, in the classroom and in the real world and whereas the Mountain View Girls Track and Field Team won the 6A meet with an impressive 93 points, making a statement that the Mavericks are the team to beat and whereas multiple student athletes achieved personal records and contribute to an unforgettable team victory to bring the first girls state title for The Mavericks since 2018 and whereas the leadership, training and discipline of their coaches helped all team members to focus their talents and passion, become a winning team with each player making valuable contributions to their victory. Therefore, I, Mayor Robert E. Simison, hereby proclaim June 17th, 2025, as Mountain View High School Girls Track State Champions Day in the City of Meridian and call

upon the community to join me in congratulating the Mountain View Mavs on a remarkable athletic achievement for representing Meridian so proudly in the State tournament. Dated this 17th day of June 2025. Give them a round of applause. And now I will invite the coaches up to say some words. I just want to say, you know, I know it's summer, but we definitely appreciate everyone's time coming out today. So, coaches.

Alexander: I just want to say thank you. Thank you to the kids. And thank you to the Mayor for this honor. I appreciate you.

Genette: My name is Cashton Genette. I did the 100, 200 4-by-1 and 4-by-2.

Johnson: I'm Taysia Johnson. I'm a senior and I ran the 4-by-2.

Stewart: My name is Beau Stewart. I'm class of '27. I did the 100, long jump and the 4-by-1.

Osman: My name is Omar Osman. I competed in long jump.

Keller: My name is Quincy Keller. I did the 4-by-1, 4-by-2, 100 and 200 and I will be a senior.

Scott: My name is Behr Scott. I did the 100, 200 4-by-1 and 4-by-2 and I will be a sophomore.

Stoor: My name is Marcus Stoor. I did the shot put and discus and I'm a sophomore.

Rice: My name is Kelby Rice and I did shot put. A senior.

Geiser: My name is Kristin Geiser. I did high jump and I will be a senior.

Walmsley: I'm Lilja Walmsley. I was a pole vaulter and I will be a senior.

Utz: My name is Austyn Utz. I did triple jump and I'm going to be a junior.

Brewer: My name is Keilana Brewer and I'm a pole vaulter and I am going to be a junior.

Malan: I'm Lydia Malan and I did pole vault.

Hart: I'm Jace Hart. I'm a senior and I did the 110 hurdles.

Jensen: I'm Benjamin Jensen. I did the 1,600 and 4-by-8 and I was a senior.

Walbuck: I'm Kellen Walbuck. I'm a senior and I did a long jump.

Van Dahlen: My name is Koda Van Dahlen. I did the mile, two mile and 4-by-8 and I will be a junior.

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

22. Community Center Design Update

Simison: All right. With that we will move on to Community Center design update. Invite Mr. Siddoway up.

Siddoway: Thank you, Mayor, Members of Council. I'm not sure I can top that, but I will -- I will try. I shouldn't try. That was pretty cool. I just wanted to offer a few remarks before I turn the time over to Garrett for the -- the actual formal presentation. But we thought it would be helpful to come tonight ahead of the budget discussion next week to give a design update, a project status update, so that we don't have to spend a lot of time answering design questions and product status questions when what we want to do is focus on the budget next week. You will probably find that not a lot has changed in terms of the big picture; right? It's still -- the site plan looks very much the same. It's still the same uses, the same uses in the building, but we have been heavily focused with the architects on the details within that building, shifting walls a little bit to get the -- the sizes right. Making sure the IT room is the right size and shifting the wall between that and the storage and just on and on, different decisions that we have been trying to do to -- with -- with the construction manager and also involved to help us find ways to simplify some of the design elements, cut costs, stay within budget. We had a great meeting today. I will just say with the architect Team Fire and IT were also there. The progress on the plans is moving along really well. Things are on schedule, on track to be ready to -- to bid this fall, which has been our timeline and Garrett will go over the details of that timeline. But I was pleased to see that there -- there really has been forward thinking, planning ahead. One -- just one simple example. They know that we asked for and -- and to -- to -- we were saving space for a potential future gym expansion. Well, not only did they do that, but they have already sized the drain fields under the parking lot to be able to handle the additional drainage that would come from that expansion if and when it happens, so we don't have to tear up the parking lot and we can minimize disruption to the site when things -- and if things expand in the future. So, it's great to see some of that forethought. We have also spent a lot of time on access control and to make sure that we have ways to use the building with contracted instructors when the building is unsupervised and so, you know, finally, staffing, which isn't a big part of the design, but I know it's a big deal to Council and we have talked about it before, but I just want to reiterate, because I know it's -- it's a big deal that we have planned for a way to open this building by using just a couple of internal promotions, so that we can grow into the facility over time as the budget allows. But with that I'm excited about the -- the -- the -- this project and its future and what it can mean for the community and with that I will turn it over to Garrett, who is our project manager. Thanks.

White: All right. Thank you, Steve. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, thanks for having me tonight. Chris, you have loaded that up, ready to go? Awesome. Thank you. So, I want to start off just by talking about the proposed timeline. Like Steve said, we started last summer, fall of 2024 with the schematic design and kind of worked our way through. Had some public outreach meetings, those types of things, and I kind of highlighted where we are at right now, which is City Council check in the spring and summer of 2025. In doing that, like Steve said, we are going through the design development stages with a higher level of detail. Everything for, like Steve said, working with IT, going over where we want, you know, badge readers to be on certain doors and lighting in certain classrooms and those types of items. Flooring in each classroom and each program and each flex space and those types of things. So, we are really kind of getting into that and, like Steve said, today we had a pretty good meeting with our architect team and our internal team on that and kind of deciding what we really wanted to go with here on out. Through this presentation I will show you some elevations. I will show you some different floor plan stuff that we went through and, like Steve said, not much has really changed the floor plan, but I will kind of discuss kind of what we want to do in each room and why we are doing certain things from ceiling heights to, like I said, outdoor expansion, those types of things. Right here is the access control stuff that I got from IT. You can see all those different colored dots there mean something different, whether it be a badge reader, to cameras, to wall data drops, to phone access, to where we are going to put our computers -- all that kind of stuff, because the access control portion is very important to us, the fact of -- like Steve mentioned we are only going to -- we are going to try to open this facility with only using two internal promotions, as well as existing staff to go over and staff it Monday through Friday, 8:00 to 5:00. In the evenings we still would be using it with our instructors like we do our current basics and our current Community Center and the fact of instructors will have badges to either a code to get in, those types of things and they can have access control through that, as well as security cameras throughout the whole facility. So, I'm just going to want to touch base on that and kind of show you all the details that went through there. This is -- I will show you a better floor plan here in a second without as many lines, but this is -- just shows all the detail. This -- this is a pretty quick slide that I'm going to go over. The red line there is the fiber. So, we have fiber now. We are getting ready to put fiber in through our park and we are going to stub it up to the -- right there close to the ball fields, so that we will be able to access fiber right there for a little disruption as we do through construction, but that's just kind of our fiber line and you can kind of see it goes straight to the building and, then, it shoots over to the dog park, restrooms, in that and the fact that we want security cameras and stuff like that over there as well with access locks and things. So, want to make sure fiber got over in that area. Building elevations. So, the top one there is from the west. That's if you are looking at Venable, looking at the front end of the facility. You can see that we have different elevations there. You can see the gym in the background and it's not just a big plain wall there, it literally has some character to it instead of different colors. Variations to it. The little colorful -- I will say art piece there in front is really just an alternate -- and I will touch base in the art piece a little bit later, but that is really just a placeholder for public art with that and we will be working with Stephanie Inman and Cassandra on that as well. The north elevation is basically if you are looking from Cedar Springs toward -- towards the facility.

You see the -- the gym wall there and that looks like the fire outreach area there as well, kind of towards the right of that. The bottom one is from the east. If you are looking from the ball fields to the Community Center, again, on the back portion of that you will see that colorful piece. Again that's another piece for public art or for future public art for that and kind of see the landscaping there or the -- the building design there. The bottom piece, obviously, is looking now from the south or where the dog park is on the -- on the site plan you can kind of see that the areas there and, again, some more of the design of the building and what it is going to look like. Here is the overall site plan that we tentatively have and you will see that it has a lot of parking. I will be meeting with MYB here on Sunday is their next board meeting to kind of try to finalize an agreement with them to help pay for that parking lot and the two parking lots there towards the ball fields. The big thing that we heard -- we did the public outreach, as you guys know, we talked about before was they really want to know about parking -- parking -- parking -- parking. So, we are working with them -- MYB -- on that to get that completed. The whole site plan has about 347 spaces. The big thing we really want to do here is make it convenient for people that are using the ball fields to be able to park there; right? Because right now they are parking in Cedar Springs because it's convenient. So, try to make it as convenient as possible also by giving our park staff access through that parking lot as well to the main shop area that they have up there. Over on the dog park side we have kind of did some value engineering on that and kind of shrinking the -- the concrete area and making the -- the shelters a little bit smaller here and there to kind of match where the restrooms are and -- and just kind of making that fit a little bit better for the small dog park and large dog park and those will be planned to be very similar to what we do over at Storey Park where you kind of go from the concrete to gravel and to turf and those types of things, so that you can close certain areas during the winter when it's snow, but keep also some of the areas open. On the building itself you can kind of see we did some -- some different design in the concrete in the back patio and as you move over to the -- the north I will say or to the left kind of back around the building where the backside of the gym would be, we needed some fire ladder truck access there and in doing that you have to put a bigger concrete slab around there and we originally wanted to be on the -- the north side of where that kind of turnout is by the sally port on the -- the left side of this picture or the left side of the building there, if that makes any sense. Instead we moved it to the back and we put two half-court basketball courts in. One of the big things that I have done -- that I have heard in the last 15 years of being here is why isn't there any basketball courts at Settlers? We have everything out there, but there is no basketball courts. So, one thing we wanted to do is put some basketball courts out there, too. And in doing that it allowed us to kind of keep the same design on that north side or the left side of the building right there for the sally port for the fire to be able to pull in and pull out there. So, we put two half-court basketball courts back there and the reason why it's two half courts and not one full court is if you put the two poles in a different location fire can't use it now, because there is poles in the way. So, we made it two half court poles there, so -- and, then, you can see the dark area there is where the fire outreach facility is going to be. On the left side on the open space area that's about as big as a soccer field just for reference and what we kind of did there was kind of put a berm kind of towards the bottom there or towards Venable so to try to block something, you know, not necessarily a big -- a fence or

anything, but more of a berm to where it will stop soccer balls from rolling too far, those types of things, to try to do that along with the pathway to provide some buffer between the -- the homes there in Cedar Springs and the ball field there or the open field space. So, those are the types of things we have been doing regarding the -- the site plan itself. One thing we are kind of really liking right now is the -- the play structure. Since the last time you guys have seen this we have shrunk the play structure to make it kind of a more unique play structure area and you can kind of see the picture of kind of design right now of what that will look like. I showed that picture to my youngest daughter who is 11, she is like that looks pretty cool, you know, so kind of getting some value play out of that. But it looks -- it looks pretty cool, so we are excited about that as we move forward through the -- through the design. One of the things, too, is we wanted connectivity. Again, so, the pathways kind of -- connectivity all the way through it, but one, again, kind of going back to the parking lot and convenience, so we wanted some connectivity from -- also the north parking lot up by their shop. We have pathways going into the park to connect to existing ball fields and, then, one over here on the south parking lot also connects over there between a couple of the ball fields there as well. So, we wanted, again, three different connectivity points from those parking lots to the ball fields, again, for convenience for people to park. Next -- next slide is really the floor plan and as I go through this I will probably just kind of work from the right over to the left. So, on the top right of the -- the building right here is our yoga room or kind of a smaller fitness room. That room's going to be more soundproof, for lack of better words there, and so it's harder to -- if you are having yoga you want it quiet, because in the room right next to it is the exercise room where you are going to have the Jazzercise classes and those types of things. So, we are very cognizant of the fact that we want sound not to travel very far between rooms. Just across the hall from those two rooms you will have a cooking -- kind of a cooking kitchen classroom that we could have there and that has all the tables and stuff there in the bottom right of the -- the picture here. We kind of set it up to where you have a big island -- cooking island right there for -- where you can teach from and those types of things, but we also have it where there is a curtain kind of comes across there to where you can use as a dual purpose into another classroom itself if need be and just turn the tables around however you want them into another classroom area. But it gives us that flexibility for cooking classes or regular classes during that time. Kind of moving there on that same side of the hallway. You have the arts and crafts room that kind of leads into a kiln room. We plan on having two or three kilns in there for just different pottery classes and arts -- arts and craft stuff, working -- working in there. A lot of storage as well. And the restrooms. And kind of getting back to the access control, like I mentioned before -- I don't know if my mouse can see where I'm showing here. Kind of. Right here where my mouse is, that's one of the access control doors. So, we can split that wing off of the Community Center if need be, like I explained a couple months ago, to where one side will be kind of the education wing to where instructors will be able to get in that far south door and be able to get in there and access their classrooms however they want. The middle section where the office is and lobby stuff are it's going to be able to be shut and blocked off, so people can access that area and, then, as I move more to the left we, obviously, have mechanical, office, some storage areas and stuff like that into the lobby area and, then, on the right you can kind of see my mouse here. Here is the other access control door

to kind of separate that wing from the rest of the building as well. So, on that side we obviously have a big flex space that has the ability to have pickleball, basketball, volleyball. We have a stage on the end of it, so you can have some kind of a smaller special event when it comes to Treasure Valley Children's Theater or Huckleberry Theater or those types of accesses to that as well when it comes to the stage and storage areas there. So, the idea is to have that available and when I have talked to like the Treasure Valley Children's Theater and those types of groups they were like love the space, love to have the ability to actually use a space like that, have it accessible to us. We appreciate the -- the flexibility that you are having with this flex space. Talked to them about stage size. This is about what they need and what they want. Kind of on the smaller side, but they said we would love to use whatever we can. So, they were appreciative of that size of a space as well. They said it's more about the width than is the depth, but this right here, just for reference, you are looking at about a 24 foot width of the stage and about 20 feet deep and maybe a little bit -- a little bit bigger. So, that worked very well for them. On the other side of the gym space from the hallway is another classroom. We wanted to put a classroom over there in case in the future we wanted to have a summer day camp or whatever. We could have a day camp there where they have access to the gym and classroom as well. But it's just a standard multi-use classroom. And, then, you have the fire and outreach area on that other side. So, that's kind of the floor plan. Not much has changed, like I said, since the last time I talked to you, but I kind of wanted to talk to you about kind of how it is and what we are designing in through there. We have talked about cabinets, storage, cabinet size, ADA sinks, restrooms -- how we want everything and where it should go for that. So, getting a lot of the detail. The next slide I have here is just potential art locations. Like I kind of mentioned before, we worked with Stephanie Inman, as well as Cassandra Schiffler, our arts and culture coordinator to kind of look at future areas for public art. We kind of took that in front of the arts commission and said, hey, what -- where would you guys prioritize these things and this and that and this is kind of the list that they came up with. That welcome entry piece is kind of that front color picture I told you guys about when you first walk in. Could be any kind of thing. The lobby installation -- and this picture here to the right kind of shows a history wall. As you walk in the front door this is the lobby you will be looking into and that's just kind of a mock up. It's not Meridian's history, but it's similar to what we could see there if it came to the history side of that thing and what we really wanted to do is have this public art kind of tie into the theming of Settlers -- the Settlers Park and Settlers. So, there is past and the history here. And, then, we have just different hallway interchangeable displays and those types of things. Some of the things we are looking at doing, too, is just wayfinding. When it comes to like, well, if I rent the gym at night -- you can obviously see the big gym at where you should go, right, but if you are not sure where the classroom is, the gym side could be the blue side and the yellow side on the -- the right side where the classroom. So, we are looking at different wayfinding signage and stuff as well when it comes to the future public art and how we can tie that stuff in. So, with that I will stand for questions and feedback.

Simison: Thank you, Garrett. Council, questions, comments? Donations?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Garrett, I want to make sure I'm tracked with this -- really questions about just the design for today. Other questions about the Community Center as part of our budget process. Is that what you are looking for?

White: Sure. I mean I -- I have some answers for you. I'm sure if you want to know some before budget I can try to answer some of those, but --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, maybe just one. So, to make sure I'm tracking. You and Steve did a great job meeting with Council all before the end of the year and talking about what an operational plan would look like for this facility. So, I just want to make sure I'm hearing. You are anticipating, then, roughly about 300,000 dollars in increased cost to be able to operate this facility moving forward, plus as -- as staffing needs grow has that -- has that number changed?

White: I think we have been talking about like a full subsidy when it comes to staffing and expected revenues and stuff. That being about 150,000, roughly, a year. After revenues and everything bring it in.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I want to make sure I have this right.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Only 150,000 dollars in an increased cost, meaning what we are paying now, we open this facility it's going to cost us 150,000 dollars more to operate it. That's not operating it.

White: That's the projection, yes.

Cavener: Okay.

White: Yeah. So, when I -- I just put the slide up here. I thought I might get a question like this and I wanted to be somewhat prepared for it. So, staffing like Steven had mentioned before we are trying to do it with two promotions and moving existing staff over. So, that exists staff in today's dollars is about 101,000 dollars with a promotion between those two. As you kind of go down, the total O&M we are looking at about 44,000 and some change and so on as we go down that list. A lot of those are still kind of -- they are -- they are good estimates based on what we have at Homecourt and other city facilities. The electrical, gas, janitorial, those are kind of still, again, good educated guesses based on what we have at Homecourt and those types of things. The janitorial portion of it -- it really depends on are we cleaning it three days a week, seven days a week, four days a week. I do know that we are looking at other revenue sources as well that we haven't necessarily looked into yet and -- for this facility, but

those revenue sources are a beverage contract potentially in the future or advertisements in the facility on the scoreboards in the gym or those types of things we haven't looked at. Those are drops in the bucket at the end of the day, but everything adds up. Like you said, every dollar matters. So, we are looking at all of that stuff.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Garrett, thanks. This is -- this is a better number than I anticipated seeing. So, I -- I appreciate that. And, then, just because you -- you had touched on some of the amenities that are going to be installed within the facility. Kitchen equipment. Kilns. So, as I understand right now if I'm a -- if I'm a -- if I'm teaching a community class I say the class costs 50 dollars. We say, okay, it's 50 dollars, then, plus an administrative fee. Do we anticipate evolving our fee structure because there is a different cost to the city to purchase a kiln and operate that versus gym space for a Zumba course or a -- you know, a volleyball clinic, et cetera. So, how is the department planning to handle that? Because there are added cost to the taxpayer to purchase these items and want to make sure that when you guys are taking into your fee recovery that we are taking those into account as well. So, I assume you have already contemplated that and have a -- a good explanation for me, so I can have some good confidence.

White: Mr. Mayor -- yeah, Councilman Cavener. Yeah. We -- we can look at all of our programs when it comes to a cost recovery philosophy and all of our cost recovery items. Right now if we were to have an art class we don't hire an instructor as a city employee, we contract them out as you -- as you know. The current split is a 70/30 split that we have there. The instructor gets 70 percent. We get 30 percent. So, if we need to sit down and -- and really look at those numbers say, okay, if it's going to cost us X, Y and Z to have these kilns, you know, do we -- do we look at a 60/40 split? I know it depends on what others are doing to make sure we are covering our cost, but we do want to cover our cost the best that we can, yes.

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

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Garrett, I think that's important. I think that the cost I look at it that is the split is to cover with a -- you know, a city facility; right? It's a facility and an administrative charge. This is an amenity that we are -- we are specifically purchasing for those vendors and so I do look at the cost is different and it would be really important to me that any fees that we put together for these programs contemplate that as well.

White: That's good feedback. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just to confirm. Outside of the operating cost still planning to pay for the construction of this facility with impact fees?

White: Mr. Mayor. Yes, that is absolutely correct.

Strader: Okay. And, then, help me understand what -- I'm not advocating for this at this point, but what would a delay cause at this point? If we get through our budget and even though it -- listen, an incremental operating cost of 150,000 dollars relative to our budget is not hugely material. Like I'm shocked and very amazed at what the team has managed to put together in terms of a very marginal increase in our operating costs using all of our existing staffing, but I just want to understand it. It doesn't have to be in this meeting, but when we get to budget time I want to understand the push and pull of what a delay of a year would mean for this facility. Yeah.

White: Great -- great question. Mr. Mayor. Councilman Strader, so talking to a construction manager, considering all the things that are going on in the valley right now construction wise, they estimate between five and ten percent a year in inflated cost. So, our budget request right now is 19.7 million dollars and do the math, whatever -- if it's five percent, it is what it is. So, it could be anywhere from a million to two million dollars each year in inflated costs.

Strader: Thank you. That's helpful. If you -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: If you wouldn't mind -- if you have more precision around that by the time we get to budget time I think it would be helpful for sure. And, then, just to kind of come back to the design and the concept. So, this operating budget assumes -- if you could just run through it with me again. This is Monday through Friday, 8:00 to 5:00. So, this wouldn't be full service to the level that we would want to get to eventually on weekends and stuff like that; right?

White: Mr. Mayor. Correct. Yeah. So, what this does is our staffing model right now would be Monday through Friday, 8:00 to 5:00, like you had said. Access control in the evenings, like our Bay 6, Bay 5 in the current Community Center are -- we could run into a youth basketball group or adult basketball, whatever it may be, and we would set it up, could get a badge, they could access the gym at 8:00 o'clock at night if need be. However we wanted to do it to where we can make sure that there is still access control to where we can still use the facility into the night, into the evening, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor, one more.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: While you are exploring other potential sources of revenue to help offset the operating costs, I was curious if you all have considered rental revenue as, you know, renting the facility out to groups and so forth, if that's been a part of what you are exploring.

White: Mr. Mayor. Yeah, Councilman -- Council Woman Strader, yeah, absolutely. We are open to all that revenue source at this point. Because we really don't have a rental room what we would do is, again, look at different rental rates around, the comparables, and come back with you guys through our fee schedule and do fees and stuff like that. And, then, if the classes aren't being used with a youth class or whatever it may be or adult class, then, absolutely, if somebody wanted to use it for an HOA meeting or whatever it may be. Absolutely we would be able to try to rent something.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: I think Steve wants to continue to answer.

Siddoway: Mr. Mayor, yeah. I was going to add to that just briefly. We were originally anticipating a much bigger rental structure and being a kind of an event center and trying to host weddings and things like that. We brought that to Council three, four years ago and were told don't do that. So, we have -- we have certainly pared back on the idea of what it might be rented for. We got rid of the catering kitchen, warming area. We got rid of some of the things from the earlier concept based on previous Council feedback. That said, this thing is flexible to be able to be rented in different ways as the council may see appropriate in the future.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. My feedback so far -- I -- I love the design. I -- I feel like it -- that aspect is on the right track. I -- I have always been a proponent of this, but the only question I have been continuously asking myself is what is the right timing. So, that -- that's my feedback so far. I think we need to get into our budget discussions and really dig into those, because there, obviously, is a much broader context for this.

White: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Garrett, thank you. Great presentation. Like what I'm seeing so far. Just one pretty simple question. It's related to Meridian Youth Baseball and for the parking arrangement. I know you are going to be meeting with them and working on it. My question I guess is -- is it our understanding or their understanding if they are going to

help to pay for some of the parking that will be provided, is there -- is that parking in the back going to say reserved for Meridian Youth Baseball parking? Is it just going to be open for all? I just kind of want to know what the expectation or understanding is at this point.

White: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, yeah, it will be open first come first serve all the way around through the whole parking out there as well. Nothing's going to be specifically reserved for them, because we want it to be public use, not just for Meridian Youth baseball. Part of the agreement is to show that those fields can be used by the public and not just MYB. We want to make sure that there is -- I mean the city is using those fields for our wooden bat senior league. Now we are using it -- I want to designate times and show different times, so where it's not just Meridian Youth Baseball using it, it is a -- it is a park. It is on city property. The city puts a lot of money to that. So, we want the public to be able to use it. So, to have it designated times or designating for a parking lot is right now it's just open. That's just a first time first serve type of thing. Very similar to the other parking lot. You know, to -- I mean that's -- that's existing over there off of Ustick that, you know, people use it for tennis and pickleball and other just park uses. We want the same for the whole parking lot. Yeah. Good question. Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Garrett, Steve, and -- and your whole team, just kind of a comment here. I appreciate all you have done keeping us up to speed on this project from the -- the moment the site was selected to where we are at today. I'm going to comment on something that I don't normally ever comment on and that's the arts. I like what you just said with Stephanie and Cassandra working on the art. I mean we are sitting in the middle of Dairy Day's week, our 96th year since 1929 celebrating our history and the fact that we are looking at art it helps to celebrate the past and where the city came from couldn't make me happier. I don't get into a lot of the flowers and other type of art all the time, but that type of art I can really relate to and I appreciate you looking at that for the building. Thank you.

White: Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Garrett, thanks. I know this was a back pocket slide in case a question came up on operational cost, but there is a note it says Settlers Park expansion will have similar O&M costs. Can you explain that line?

White: Yeah. So, I -- I'm focused more on the Community Center itself and -- and what it's going to cost. The park expansion itself also comes with a little bit of operation and maintenance cost as well. We can get more into that in the budget stuff, but it does come -- and there is some one time costs up front that's closer to 50'ish thousand dollars one time cost and, then, after that it goes down to very similar to -- I -- I don't want to quote a number. I don't know if Mike wants to come up and quote a number on the park side or not, but if that's something we can get more into in the next week in the budget stuff, but there will be some more operating costs for the park itself as it would be --

Simison: All the -- all the normal -- I think next week we -- we can cover the more details, so you have the slides, which will showcase all that information, but just these are Community Center costs, not park operational costs.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: The word similar is what threw me off. I just -- just wanted to make sure it wasn't similar to the 150,000 annual operational cost --

Simison: It is.

Whitlock: Okay. So, the expansion of the park itself will have about 150,000 in that --

White: Roughly, yes.

Whitlock: -- so you didn't want to quote a number.

White: Yes.

Whitlock: Okay.

Simison: Council, any additional questions, comments? Thank you, Garrett, very much. Love the look and feel on paper.

White: Thank you, guys. Appreciate it.

23. Homecourt Fee Discussion

Simison: Yeah. And you can probably just stick around for the next one. Okay. And the next item up is Homecourt fee discussion. Let's see if we can make up that 300,000 dollars to help pay for that operational cost.

White: Chris, do you mind pulling up just -- do you have the -- just whatever is online. Thank you, Chris. Appreciate it. Sorry to put you on the spot there. So, Homecourt --

so, as you guys all know that the users of Homecourt are all kinds of youth, adult, seniors, all the above when it comes to the noon ball, basketball. Pickleball is big in the morning. We have a bunch of community education classes over there. We have some basketball tournaments, volleyball tournaments, martial arts tournaments. It's a very well used facility. Just day passes, looking at the 2024 volumes, that's the last full year that we had. So, looking at those volumes we had almost 49,000 just day passes sold -- check-ins, which is the current day passes I will get into are two, three and four dollars, based on where you live and your age, but the memberships sold as well we are at about 3,400 -- a little over that that use that. Those are primarily noon ball and pickleball in the morning and, then, evening drop in play as well. So, that's kind of the -- just kind of want to go over the users and -- and who is using it. When it comes to fees, our fees were adopted back when we bought the facilities September 30th of 2016 and we adopted the fees that the YMCA currently had, because that's who we bought it from and a lot of the same users came over to use it, so we didn't want to have a -- any kind of a price change for them as we -- as the transfer came over and if you remember right we lived with them for about 18 months while they were building South Meridian Y. So, those fees, just in talking with some of the YMCA membership back then, those fees were already kind of established. So, I don't know when those actually were established, but we adopted them in '16. So, I don't know if they adopted them in '14 or '15 or not, but they are -- they are -- they are years back. So, in doing that we want to look at price increases and really what it is we want to try to keep up with the -- the subsidy and the cost recovery of the facility. The cost recovery is not where we want it to be. We want our cost recovery to increase and in doing that we are looking at so many different ways of -- of trying to increase that cost recovery philosophy there. But in doing this the fees are going to be the ones that really help us do that. So, our proposal really is to raise the fees in two different phases. Phase one would be to raise it from two and four to three, four and five and, then, have the membership increase with the same ratio that the break even point of seven is kind of what it is currently, so we wanted to be -- kind of match that. So, we would increase the membership to a 21, 28 and 35 proposal. On top of that we also want to make sure that those that are -- are using the facility -- renting the facility to where the public can't necessarily use it, want to make sure they pay their fair share as well. The current rate right now is 45 dollars an hour after tax to reserve one basketball court for like a youth basketball practice or whatever it may be. Because the public can't use it we want to make sure that we -- they are paying their fair share, so our proposal to raise that to 65 dollars for practices and, then, if you are closing the whole facility and making sure the public can't use it for the whole facility for day drop-in passes, we want to raise that to an event fee of 75 dollars per court. That's our proposal in doing so. And, like I said, those fees -- the original fees have been in line for about ten to 15 -- or ten years now, so -- and phase two, which we would want to come back to you at phase two, to -- in the next summer to kind of explain those to you and see where we are at when it comes to cost recovery and stuff, but phase two the idea right now is to, then, raise it again another dollar for the day pass fees and, again, the memberships to keep that same ratio of seven with that. And we will again for phase two of the fee increase -- we would, again, review what our -- what our costs are when it comes to practice rentals, where we are at in our numbers and our volumes based on 2025 and 2026. Before I started talking about fees

here I probably should have said that, you know, right now today I'm really not looking for any action from you guys, I'm more looking for feedback, head nods, thumbs up and, really, what will happen is if we are all kind of good with the proposal we will post them and come back for a public hearing on this. So, this is more of me just giving you guys information on what our proposal would be. If you look at our current cost recovery, like I said, it's not where we want it to be. We want it to improve, we want it to grow. In FY-23 our cost recovery was approximately 49 percent and those are actuals I got off our -- from our Finance Department. FY-24, same thing. It kind of went down, wages go up, costs go up. We went down to 45 percent and, then, in this year, in FY-25, we are projected to have a 38 percent. So, again, we want that to be higher. We need it to be higher. So, we are -- we are looking at different ways in doing that. I think fees are our first step, because they haven't really been raised in ten years. Again, these are projected numbers based on FY-24 volumes. So, keep that in mind when we are going through this. The one thing I did want to point out there -- and I kind of showed that -- you know, we had a decrease in revenues from FY-24 to FY-25 projected. The church moved out. They were providing some -- these payments and stuff like that for the Bay 6 area. So, that was a chunk of revenue decrease there. The FY-26 and FY-27 phase increases, those, again, are based on FY-24 numbers. Don't want to be held to those in particular, but this is FY-24 number stuff is the best data that we had to come up with those numbers. With that to lower our subsidy increased revenues, staff has talked about increasing day passes and memberships like -- like I just said. We have looked at our hourly operation and where we could potentially reduce times on our low volume times, do we really need to stay open if there is only a handful of people in there? Yes, we want the facility to be accessible to people to be using those things, so we are really monitoring that as well. Hourly court rates we want to increase like I mentioned. Community education classes. The more community education classes we have, whether they are in Bay 6 and in Bay 5, we want to make sure a portion of that goes to help pay for the Homecourt facility. So, we are working on doing that as we speak to try to transfer that over. A specific percentage needs to go and pay for that facility in that area. Operational costs, again, we are -- our janitorial costs are just going way high, because that building is, obviously, used quite a bit. So, one thing we did is we worked with Max Jensen and his team and the cleaning company and for the next budget year we will reduce that to 75,000. So, we are already in a good start where we lowered it about 60,000 dollars from the anticipated stuff. So, we are already working on that. Just this year we are saving 52,000 for the FY-26 and maybe more. Additional -- additional revenues, kind of like Council Woman Strader said before, we are looking at different ways to either bring in revenues, rent the facility for more events, those sorts of things during the summer when the low use times are. Sponsorship program. I know Councilman Taylor mentioned like way back when with sponsorship on ball fields and stuff like that, why can't we do that in the gym areas and gym spaces? So, we are looking into that as well to get more revenues coming in when it comes to the signage up on the scoreboard or signage below the scoreboard or in the facility somewhere. Not looking for a big billboard area, but just more of just strategically sponsored areas that we can bring in revenues there as well and, then, we are looking at a potential beverage contract with a different Coke company -- Coca-Cola company or some kind of a -- a drink company to where we can get exclusivity in Homecourt or maybe at

Settlers Park and working with Meridian Youth Baseball and those types of things for all of our concessions in our parks to where we can sell those certain things and some of those revenues can go to a Homecourt, to the pool, to the Community Center, those types of things in the future. So, we are looking at different ways of doing that to really try to lower the subsidy and increase our revenues at Homecourt. So, timing wise I would like to -- like I said, tonight I'm just really looking to get feedback from you guys. Do you like the -- the proposed fee increases? Do you -- do you want to comment, give us feedback on those? And, if so, you know, like I said, we would post those fees, come back to you guys in a few weeks, have a public hearing, let public weigh in on it. We would want the phase one fees, if were -- they were to be approved and done, we would want them to start in September -- September 1st, right around there. And the reason I say that is is that's right after we close the facility for the annual floor resurfacing. So, it's closed for two weeks and this year have the HVAC replacement project as well. So, in August. So, this also gives us -- so, right when those projects are done we open and new fees are established potentially. What it also does it gives our staff the next month, month and a half to be able to communicate with people -- different users of the facility, hey, these are coming, plan on them. Just let's us communicate that. And, then, like I said before, phase two, if we were to look at phase two to try to increase our revenues and things like that for next year, which I'm sure we will, would come back to you guys next summer, similar to what I'm doing right now. Here is our proposal. Get feedback and, then, do the same public hearing process. So, with that I will -- I will stand for questions, feedback, head nods. If we are -- if we are good we will post the -- the phase one fees as proposed, like I said, and come back. But right now I'm just looking for feedback and for thoughts.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Thank you, Garrett. Council -- Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Little -- pretty simple question I think. Just in thinking how it had been, you know, nine years or so since we last -- well, since we adopted the fees and we hadn't raised them. Don't really need to get into why or why we didn't raise fees over that time, but I'm looking at having -- you know, we got two phases of raising the fees. Certainly in the future I would still anticipate needing to raise fees as costs go up. So, why not just -- why would you propose two phases right now instead of just saying here is what we would like to propose for this year and, then, come back a year from now and say here is what these -- the new fees would be, because there is kind of a -- I don't think you mean to imply, but it -- I read it and I kind of think, oh, we are going to do two -- two adjustments and, then, are we done for a little while? I'm just kind of wondering why you do not just focus on the fee increase for this year and, then, we can come back next year in phase two when you do it and consider what that fee structure would look like.

White: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, I will try to answer that. So, really, what it came down to is we are -- we are, basically, almost going to -- phase two doubles our current fees. So, in doubling our current fees -- yes, they are small, two, three and four dollars and it does -- you know, if we were to go to -- the phase two fee goes to four and six.

So, it basically, doubles or comes close to doubling that. To keep our same volumes. we didn't really want to just jump it up right now in the lower volume, so we are trying to be strategic about it in raising it and trying to keep our same volumes and just kind of grow that into it, if that makes any sense. That's really the -- the purpose behind it, but we are -- we are open to thoughts and ideas.

Siddoway: Mayor, if I may. Part of it was that we -- we were -- we were starting with a goal of trying to get the cost recovery overall above that 65 percent. We wanted it -- we were trying to get it higher than that. We are trying to push it as close to full recovery as we can. But when we were looking at those -- those steps, jumping it from two, three, four to be four, five six, just seemed like too much for -- to propose for one. We said that -- our proposal is to -- to go to -- to that four, five -- the -- the second phase. I mean we are proposing that, but we would formally bring that back. But we -- the -- the idea is to bring it to you as a two-step process to get where we are going -- where we are trying to get to, if that makes sense.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I have a couple questions, but maybe starting with how many nonresident memberships do we sell approximately per year? Just kind of curious like rough numbers. Yeah. Thank you.

White: It's right there. Kind of gives you a breakdown of them.

Strader: Would you mind going -- Mr. Mayor, if you don't mind. If you wouldn't mind going back to the phase one and phase two -- yeah. Fee structure. My feeling with it generally is if we are keeping it at five dollars and below for all of our residents, I think that's a phenomenal value. I actually think it would be okay to go directly into phase two proposed fees if that's the objective you need to meet, as opposed to phasing this in, because our cost recovery got so far off track of what we need to be targeting that actually just think this level of complexity is not needed. I think we should consider just going directly into the phase two proposed fees. My sensitivity actually would be more around our residence fees. I care a lot more about that. I think the City of Meridian is subsidizing this so much that, if anything, I think the nonresident fees going above five dollars I'm okay with that. It's really for our residents that I just want to see those at five or below. I still think that's a phenomenal value. So, just to maybe feedback for me is I'm a little bit more flexible on the phase one, phase two. I think if we have gotten that far off track that we are subsidizing this this much, maybe it might make sense to go further actually than you are proposing.

White: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Garrett, appreciate the update and I'm going to -- I'm going to correct you just a little bit, because you said something that I -- I don't think you meant to intend, which is that first thing you went and did is looked at increasing the cost of fees and I don't think that's accurate, I think actually you and the team first went and looked at reducing expenses and I -- I want to commend you for that. I think that it's always easy to say let's just raise the rates and continue on. You said no, no, let's -- let's see what we can be doing about the cost that we are spending. I want you to know how much I -- I appreciate that. My question is a little bit of -- to quote the great council member Dave Zaremba, maybe a sideways question. Do we at the city provide a discount to nonprofits, whether they reserve a ball field, a class, a lesson, anything like that? Do we delineate between for profit individuals and nonprofits?

White: No.

Cavener: Okay. I don't think it's an exercise for it now, but a more -- I apologize. You come and answer one question, I come -- I challenge you again. It's for us to look at over maybe the next year as we prepare for our -- our -- our fee schedule for next year, to look at what options and what the impact would be to our revenues if we offered a -- a different rate structure for nonprofits, recognizing like some of our larger scale renters -- I think of PAL, those are nonprofits, but I think being able to -- for us to at least consider something like that could be a difference maker. They are providing a valid service that meets a need in our community that we are not having to provide and if we can partner with them I think it's something that's at least worth exploring. So, appreciate your great work on this. I look forward to our -- and I think Council may be a discussion is do we want to post fees with the -- the phase two and, then, we can have a -- a -- a discussion at the public hearing about that and ultimately land on something. In light of hearing from a couple council members that may be the more prudent. Just because that's what we publish doesn't necessarily mean that's what we would approve. So, I appreciate the -- the good discussion. I appreciate bringing this presentation.

White: And you are right, we -- we went through all of our -- our operating costs, tried to cut those before we raise fees, obviously.

Cavener: Yeah.

White: Thank you for correcting me on that.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Not to belabor the point too long, but I -- I considered it coming in tonight, but I actually think I agree a little bit with what Council Woman Strader mentioned about we are, essentially, adopting phase two. We are -- we are saying we want to get to phase

two and I appreciate the -- the goal behind kind of phasing into it, but, really, what we want is phase two. I would rather just say that's what we are going to charge, because I don't -- I like the practice we have with our other fee structures we have in -- in the city where we propose it, we look at it, we hear it, we adopt it kind of an annual basis I would prefer to do that. I would prefer to say -- I mean, essentially, what we are looking at -- we want phase two to get to the goal of the cost recovery. I don't like sort of doing the phased approach, because I know we are trying to make up time for several years of not having made any adjustments. So, I -- I think I would probably if -- and I'm not sure where everyone else -- if they agree with that, but if that's what we are trying to get to, then, let's have a hearing on that. Let's propose that and let's discuss that. I think that's a more straightforward way of doing it. I know we are trying to make up for time. I don't like voting or approving a phased approach for a couple years -- if it was over a couple of months maybe that's different, but I would rather just say this year this is what we are going to look at for fees. Next year if we want to adjust those fees what would it look like. That would be my preference.

White: Mr. Taylor, thank you.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Garrett, thank you so much for your presentation. I think even if we go with phase two it's still one of the best values available. Question for you. Do you have any pricing regarding like the larger basketball tournaments and things what they pay elsewhere? I'm thinking that 75 dollars per court is still the deal of the century, knowing how much parents and grandparents and spectators pay to come watch those kids play, especially if we fold in a discount for nonprofits, because we know we have got some pretty profitable teams --

White: Sure.

Little Roberts: -- in this valley.

White: Mr. Mayor, so -- yeah. So, what others, like comparable ones, like it's metal -- the metal facility over in Nampa, they are a BIG4 basketball court, indoor facility, very similar to Homecourt. Just a little bit different layout. They are all multi-purpose floorings. Ours are hardwood. Their charge an hour per court is almost 64 dollars an hour after tax. So, we are going to be right there. We think our facility with being hardwood floors, kind of a great place to play. We think it's worth the 75 dollars as well. That's what -- we propose that -- a portion of that and our practice fees would be basically right at the 65 dollars is what we are proposing after tax to get to the -- the same as there. The Treasure Valley Athletic Club is the same price as metal. So, they are all right at their -- right close to 64 dollars an hour for their courts and, again, they are a multi-purpose flooring as well and it only has three basketball courts inside. So, as a tournament director I used to run the sports leagues around here, I kind of -- you

want as many fields and courts or -- in one location as possible; right? So, having the four is really nice. So, we -- we agree. So, to answer your question, 64, 65 dollars is what they are charging per hour per court.

Little Roberts: Thank you. I think we are the best value around.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Garrett, thank you for the presentation and we have spent a lot of time in your conference room and I can share with my colleagues that you have really left no stone unturned and you have looked at every option. So, we appreciate that. In some of those meetings Jake and others have offered some informal, unscientific polling data as we have talked to residents who come on a regular basis and have come for the last nine plus years on a regular basis and they have talked about the deal of the century --

White: Yeah.

Whitlock: -- and the opportunity and -- and almost asked when are you going to raise the fees? So, it will -- we will wait and see how the public responds to it, but I think the feedback that you have received tonight is complimentary of the work that you have done and I think it also complements our residents and their desire to have a -- a top notch facility and -- and they are willing to pay for it. So, we will see what the public hearing says, but I -- I also support coming back with a phase two recommendation.

White: Thank you. Mr. Mayor. Yeah. And when Jake and his staff has been talking about, hey, the fees are coming to -- to Councilman Whitlock's point, yeah, they -- they all expect an increase. They know -- they know it's due.

Simison: Council, any additional questions, comments? Thank you, Garrett. And I do want to thank Councilman Cavener for helping push this conversation at the Homecourt. You know, a lot of conversations over a lot of different issues. We understand a lot of different paths for a lot of different purposes. Hopefully we will have a positive outcome overall. You know, we are talking about this cost recovery, but it is ultimately, you know, it's -- it's a system, you know. Here, Community Center, wherever they go are -- you know, gyms with the West Ada, you know, they all have a -- a value -- a use. Some we pay more for, some we pay different for. There is an average cost over all these things that we have to have us all pay for, you know, in order to be operational to -- to get both what we want, because it feels right, but also what we need, because it's necessary. So, look forward to that next phase of this conversation. Appreciate you and the team and all the -- all the hard work.

White: Thank you guys very much. Appreciate it.

24. Potential Ballot Question Concerning a Levy to Provide Funding for Firefighters, Police Officers, and a Prosecution Unit

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 22. Well, I think -- I guess it's probably Item 24 now based on how we renumbered. But the -- the discussion regarding the potential ballot question concerning a levy to provide funding for firefighters, police officers, and a prosecution. Council, for those who were here last week, you know, there was information that was presented by legal and -- and Kurt is here. So, whether you were -- I know those who weren't here probably went back and watched it and they are up to speed and maybe it generated some questions or you definitely have people here ready for those questions, if there is generalized comments or questions of another nature. I like to think that I am all commented out after the State of the City to really articulate the -- the why, but I'm happy to go into further comments if Council would like to on any of those. So, I guess I will first turn to those that weren't here last week and see if there is any level setting information that you felt you would like to get since you weren't present to ask any questions of legal.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Always go first and acknowledge, despite my best efforts, I have not been able to watch your speech yet or last week's meeting. So, it is on --

Simison: You told me you upgraded to the expense of Wi-Fi.

Cavener: And the expensive Wi-Fi did not -- well, I got about six seconds of the speech before it would shut down and so despite it being the expensive streaming option it did not actually stream the speech. So, just getting back into town, planning to get caught up on that this week. So, I -- I don't want to have the Council that was here and was present have to go through the same presentation. So, I will handle that piece on my own. But maybe what would help me -- and this may have been covered and at least my one question is what -- should the voters pass this levy what would be the process that the Council could take to, essentially, reduce that amount over time? Is it -- can it be done piecemeal? Does it have to be done all at once? What action is required from the voters, if any? Because I think that to me is a -- is a critical piece of what our plan would be to -- however long term that is, to remove the levy off the -- off the taxpayer.

Simison: The very next year you could reduce it down. You have the authority to set the budget of whatever you want. If you want to reduce our budget this year by five million you have that power. So, no Council is beholden to make this stay forever as a budgetary number.

Cavener: That was my one question for now. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Okay.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. I did have a chance to watch your speech, hear your argument that you made. Also listen to last week's presentation and, Kurt, I learned quite a bit about it. So, I thought that was a great, succinct presentation. I appreciate it. I think -- I only had one kind of question and I didn't -- I don't think I remember hearing it come up and, Mayor, maybe you can answer it or Kurt. A question I have -- if we are going to increase the levy by about five million a year for these stated purposes, is that -- how do we ensure that that money -- that five million always goes towards public safety? Does it -- is it kind of earmarked for it? Is it something we just agree to do? I'm just trying to make sure I understand as we go forward with the budget is this amount always going to be dedicated towards the five million or is it kind of fungible, because it's General Fund? I guess I'm understanding -- wanting to understand the mechanisms of how that looks year after year after year, if this is -- we are looking at a permanent ongoing levy. I just want to have some clarity around that. That was really kind of the only clarification and question I had tonight is kind of structurally or mechanically how that works with the budget year after year.

Simison: I think the answer goes back to the very -- it's almost exact same answer that I gave to Councilman Cavener. You know, in -- in the context it goes towards what we say it will go towards, but if it -- the following year you all decide, no, we don't want to provide our own prosecution, we would like to go back to the other way and -- and there is no guarantee that that -- and, then, that Council at that point in time said, well, let's reduce down our amount or they would say, no, we don't. So, Council ultimately has the final say about all the revenue in terms of what it is for long term. But assuming that it passes, then, you know, the things that you will see in the following budget would be the fully funding of those 13 police officers. It would have a prosecution team in the budget and it would have the increase in police sworn salaries. All I can do is tell you what will go in there. If you all want to go down and -- if it gets approved and passing a budget and, then, go reduce down the sworn police officer salaries at that time, that's on you, not on me, but ultimately it is Council's discretion at that point in time about what stays in what location over the period, but there is nothing we can do to I guess earmark it in that context, if for whatever reason something were to go way in the future that that money would not go away unless that council at that time said we no longer need that revenue. We no longer have that purpose. Make sense? Okay. Thumbs up from Finance, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I had asked last time and was just curious to hear a bit more from Mr. Nary about kind of what his game plan would be on the prosecution side, how he would

-- how he would staff that, what that would look like. Could be high level, but I just really wanted to get a sense of that component.

Nary: Sure. Sure. Certainly. Council Member Strader, Members of the Council, Mr. Mayor, so go back a few months and the folks that are -- are interested can go back. We talked about a prosecution team at some point in the future. What do we currently have and what's being currently provided and how if we were going to move that to a permanent in-house service how would that look and what would that be. So, currently, we contract with the city of Boise. They basically have a prosecution unit and they staff currently approximately two prosecutors per courtroom. So, judges in this -- in this -- in this district -- judicial district are divided into the criminal court -- or the misdemeanor criminal court system and there is a number of courtrooms that are staffed on a daily basis. They have courtrooms for arraignments, for sentencing, for court trials, which are traffic tickets, infraction types of offenses, as well as jury trials for misdemeanor criminal offenses, such as DUI, domestic battery and those types of cases. You have pretrial. So, they have a number between five and six active courtrooms every single day that are staffed by currently two attorneys for the city of Boise per courtroom, based on the caseload volume. We are a little -- we are less than half of their total volume, but we are somewhere between 20 to 30 percent of their volume. So, we incorporate a portion of that cost of personnel that they have as what we contract for -- for both the in -- in-court personnel of prosecution, as well as the out-of-court personnel for administrative support to prepare discovery, you know, send all the information, evidence required by -- by code to be sent to defense attorneys and things like that. So, we pay for that portion of that cost. If we were absorbing that entire cost now we, then, have to staff the courtrooms that are active each day, so that would be five or six active courtrooms daily that need to be staffed by a personnel from the city and, then, of course -- so that's at least one person per courtroom on a daily basis, again, plus the out-of-court personnel to support that. So, we are looking at somewhere in the area of five, potentially six, depending on, you know, again, the court is always evolving. I spoke with a Boise city attorney last week and she told me that the court system -- the Fourth District Court is looking to ask the legislature to fund another magistrate in the next year or two, which would, then, expand the criminal system. So, again, having to be responsive to that. Now, our only real -- I wouldn't say pushback -- our only real response that we can help alleviate some of that impact is if the court would be willing to adjust their scheduling some to narrow maybe where the Meridian cases are and the number of courtrooms that we have to be in. Currently they don't do that, because they really only have two agencies that they are really satisfying Ada and the city of Boise. So we haven't explored that, but, obviously, it would be a conversation we would have between now and when this would take place to see if that's a possibility, but, otherwise, we would be looking at staffing, essentially, five or six courtrooms daily, as well as the necessary support staff. So, we have built some models with Finance on what would that look like and that's where the numbers have come from. The numbers that we have proposed in this levy are both the cost that we anticipate, in addition to the contractual costs that we would -- we would save by no longer contracting with an outside entity. So, when you take those two numbers together that is approximately what we estimate it could cost us, because if you remember when we had this conversation earlier one of the -- one of

the challenges with this type of endeavor is that you can't really slowly grow into it. Really, the way the court system is set up they have an expectation, courtrooms are set up, calendars are set, judges are set, they set up these calendars and they don't really -- aren't really designed to do a little at a time and go from one or two to three, then, five, then, six -- that really isn't the way the court system works. So, you really have to staff it at not quite full build out, but fairly close to it just to open the door. It just really is the only way that it can function. So, that's what we sort of built this team from the outset is what we take. Now, how we transition that and how we coordinate that with our current contracted entity of the city of Boise -- we have had a lot of conversations of what that would look like. So, we have some thoughts on that. But that's really what -- from the public's perspective that's what this prosecution would look like is essentially five to -- five prosecutors, essentially. We already have one position of the police attorney that you funded for this current fiscal year that would be part of this unit, but it's not a prosecutor. That's a separate position. So, that's one of the unit -- people in the unit, but the rest of it are all prosecutors and support staff and it's between five attorneys, approximately, and four to five support staff to support that.

Strader: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- I guess I would like to hear what -- what would it look like to move this process forward? Like what would the public process look like? If we could revisit that. I think we touched on that a little bit the last time, but I -- I think that would be helpful. And, then, I do have some comments.

Simison: Well, from the public process, you know, what we have put out there is to have two meetings where the public's invited to come and provide feedback on this proposal and that would be, you know, next Tuesday, as well as July 8th or is that the 9th? July 8th or 9th. Whatever that Tuesday is -- off the top of my head. I don't have a calendar that I'm looking at. So, that -- that would be the general opportunity. It would be our desire on that second one that Council would say yes or no, that they would like to put this on the ballot for consideration. There is still an official process after that that would take care -- that would take place, but I think it would be good to have a general inclination that this is something that we are moving forward on or not going to move forward on at that point in time.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I would be happy to provide a comment on my -- at least my initial impressions of this. I think that from what I have heard so far from my constituents and I would like to hear more from them -- I hope they show up to these public hearings. Really to me public safety and that investment in our public safety is the foundation of a successful city and I -- what I like about this levy discussion so far is it really does center

our voters in the driver's seat and allows them to have a really strong voice in what they want to see in the city. So, for that reason alone I'm -- I'm supportive of this process. Very strongly supportive so far. I would love to hear from the public and hear what they have to say and hear their feedback. It really feels to me like we are -- and I think a lot of cities actually are just at an inflection point where they need to decide how important public safety is to them, specifically with the Police Department, you know, hearing your comments in the State of the City certainly one of the most difficult professions out there and I think it's great to allow our voters to have a voice on what they want PD's pay to be. I think that's really important. I think it's important for our voters to have a voice about maintaining our 13 firefighters that we got with our SAFER grant and -- and to hear from them on how important that is and, then, I do think with the prosecution services that's, obviously, a big change for us. That would be a big expansion of what we are doing. But what I like about that is our ability to chart our own course and really be in the driver's seat on -- on the other side of -- you know, after arrests are made. So, those are just my initial thoughts. I -- I want to listen. I want to get feedback from the public. I think that's really important. So, I'm in support of moving the process forward and hearing from the public.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I appreciate you kind of outlining what the -- the process would look like. One of the things I think our city does really really well is we listen to our bosses and providing ample opportunity to hear from them, both on their opinion on this proposal and, then, certainly if it's something that was out to the voters having that opportunity to weigh in. Last year when we were having some really heavy conversations about the budget I put together a postcard that I sent across my district saying, listen, I want to hear from you, what are your priorities? And it was police and it was fire and it was parks and it was public art, but I also included an option, because I thought this is what I would want to hear. This -- I thought this is what I would hear from my bosses, which is don't increase taxes at all and I was really surprised that the vast majority of the cards and the surveys that I got back said, no, we are willing to spend a little bit more for police. We are willing to spend a little bit more for fire. We love that we live in a safe community. And so to me that was eye opening. I didn't expect that. And it's a good reminder that we need to go into this process with -- with two ears and really hear from our -- our community. So, I'm looking forward to hearing from our residents, these two public hearings, and I think that their feedback is going to be really really critical for how we best move forward. I appreciate you, Mayor, kind of lining out that process, very clear, very transparent with lots of access and options for people to be able to participate. You know, summer sometimes is hard with vacations and I think giving people two bites of the apple, at least, is a good way for us to hear and certainly we can take testimony via text or via e-mail or calls into City Hall. So, making it super easy for our residents to let us know how they feel. Mr. Mayor, just -- I want to make sure that I am clear on this. Because this is Council acting legislatively, there is nothing that prevents us from any ex-parte communication and meeting with people, talking about

this. So, Council, if you want to meet with individuals or folks and get their opinion or people grab you in the supermarket -- want to grab you, also totally okay.

Simison: All perfectly legal.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I know it won't surprise anybody up here, but I'm completely in support of this public safety levy for all three reasons stated. Our fire department, for our police and our prosecute -- prosecution attorneys. It's been years I have been hoping that we could get to the point that we could have our own attorneys prosecuting Meridian cases and prosecuting Meridian cases the way we want to see them prosecuted. We do things just a little different in the City of Meridian and when we talk to people, whether it's National Night Out or other events, one of the first things I always hear from residents is they like our quality of life. They like being able to walk in our parks. They like the feeling of being safe, whether it's in their schools, their neighborhoods or where they are shopping and that comes with a price tag and due to things that have been beyond our control we find ourselves in a position that we need to bring forward a public safety levy to try to continue to keep that high level of service in our law enforcement and our fire department and our prosecution services and it can't be understated when we talk about prosecution services that we can have a phenomenal police department, but if we don't have a system of attorneys that didn't take all those cases and follow them through all the way through that court process, then, we are not doing the job. So, if anybody is confused by how that all works it's -- it's -- it's part of the same operation. You can't have one without the other. So, I'm completely behind this. I don't take it lightly that it's an increase I wouldn't be supporting if I didn't think it was absolutely necessary for our community to try to keep the standards, the level, the professionalism we have in both departments. Trust me when I tell you if we lose people because we can't pay them what they are worth it costs us ten times as much to, then, hire new folks and spend years trying to train them up to the levels of service that it takes to match what we have got today. We got some of the best people in the country and we need to try to make sure we can keep them right where they are at. Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I just want to speak to the process. I think -- I mean the state has boxed cities into a box and we -- we can't get out of that box on our own. We can't make decisions here outside of that box. But the state has also provided an avenue by which we can get out of that box and it involves our bosses. It involves the taxpayers. So, I think the process is sound. I think it gives -- it gives us the ability to -- to state the issue, like you so eloquently did at your State of the City address, to -- to lay the issue on the table and let the voters have their say in this. So, that's the way out of this box that we

find ourselves in. So, I just -- I support the process. I also commend the staff, which has been through this with a fine tooth comb down to the penny and I appreciated the presentation last week and the opportunity to reflect on that over the -- the past week and I -- I, too, hope that the public will come out and share their views and their comments and we will take that very seriously as we consider a path forward on how we get out of the box that we find ourselves in.

Simison: Thank you.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: I can't state it anymore eloquently than my colleagues already have, but I do think -- I just can't stress enough the opportunity that our -- our bosses, our citizens get to basically say how this goes and there is nothing more important than having such a wonderful city that has grown extremely fast. We have not kept up with public safety and this is their opportunity to say this is what we want and I hear that time and time again -- I mean at my district south of the freeway is growing like mad and I hear time and time again our taxes are lower than we ever thought they would be when we moved here and that they don't have a problem contributing -- especially when they know it's -- I mean we have got a great city. They love the amenities. But they love knowing that it's going directly to public safety and the prosecution team. I always kind of add that, because it seems like when you are talking to people they have picked up on police and fire and, then, they have like -- I think they are not real sure what the prosecution involves and so they really focus on police and fire, because when they dial 9-1-1 and they are expecting police, fire, they want as quick as possible and that's what we will continue to be able to do is to keep those officers and -- there when they need them and that's I think the whole goal. But to have citizens be able to say that is crucial.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I'm going to speak to the process as well a little bit. I think one thing that's interesting is the ultimate -- whether this is successful or not is not actually going to come down to those of us up here, it's going to come down to if the voters vote to approve it. What we are being asked to weigh in on is do we want to bring the question to the voters. I think that's very unique. A lot of times legislators, policymakers are the ones whose vote makes the decision. That's not the case here. We are being asked to present the question to the voters. So, I do appreciate the transparency in the process. I like that we are going to have two public hearings. I like that we had a presentation. We have some follow-up tonight. I hope the biggest message that comes from out -- from tonight's meeting is a real robust invitation to the public. We really want to hear you, because the question we will be considering is do we put it on the ballot? And so I

would really -- I hope that our -- our citizens, the constituents we have, will come out, will let us know what they think. Very eager to hear what they have to say. These are weighty matters. It's significant. Not just to where we stand with the budget process, but to the long-term view of where we go as a city. So, very hopeful for that, that we get that feedback. But I do -- I think the -- the process is open and transparent. We see a lot of cities looking for ways to find revenue through different mitigation fees and other things that, frankly, I much more appreciate the idea of -- of posing the question and letting them weigh in. So, I think the process is good, but I would like to use this opportunity to really a robust invitation to our constituents to, please, come out, tell us what you think, give us the feedback because, again, we are not making a decision if it's passes or not, it's whether we are going to put the question to them. So, anyway, I appreciate that.

Simison: And in a lot of ways -- you know, this local option tax it is -- at its core in -- in concept, you know. There is certain things I think that Council understands, their base responsibilities to do, but you don't always ask the public for every -- every decision that you make along the way. But in -- in this case there are definitely -- you know, we -- we could still continue to have our prosecution services handled. You know, that's a core that we are able to meet them. But if you -- if we want to do it the right -- the way we want to do it or -- we still could have three people on each engine, you know, moving forward and have all of our fire stations currently staffed. But if we want to have the best response force available -- and I think the chief, you know, highlighting that information -- Chief Butterfield to kind of showcase what you get for -- in results. You know, I think the -- the groundwork has been laid in a lot of ways for what the outcomes can be through this process and -- you know. So, while this is the process the legislature has outlined for us, I have always been a proponent of asking the voters where it makes sense to do things, especially, you know, when they just had that -- their wisdom to expand from four to six Council Members, you know, some -- sometimes, you know, we operate fine with four, but six just is that much better in that context and it's great input points in that context and if I misspoke earlier and I said 13 officers, I did mean firefighters in that context, just so we are clear about what we are -- what is going to be coming if this makes it onto the ballot. But I -- I -- I hear what all Council is saying, they want two hearings over the next three weeks to be the predominant, but I'm sure you will have plenty of conversations here and there and everywhere along the way as we consider this. We will get a press release out officially highlighting the -- the two weeks that we will be taking public comments on this topic, so that the community has it. It will go out in our immediate newsletter -- electronic newsletter. Unfortunately, we can't really put it out in our utility billing, because it just doesn't coincide with when things hit. So, that won't make it to the utility billing inserts, but what we reserved future engagement through that means if this does make it onto the ballot appropriately. So, we will take those steps and we will have a conversation next week on this topic. Thank you. Appreciate it.

25. Intergovernmental and Joint Powers Agreements Concerning Countywide Development Impact Fees Discussion

Simison: So, with that we will move on to the Intergovernment and Joint Powers Agreement concerning countrywide development impact fees discussion. Ask Kurt to come on back up.

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. Kurt Starman with the City Attorney's Office. So, this is a topic that is well familiar to you at this point. We -- we had an in-depth presentation regarding the potential for countrywide development impact fees in December and, then, you had a conversation about two weeks ago as well. Back this evening for a couple reasons. One is to bring the topic to a head and to see how the Council would like to proceed or if you would like to proceed at all. But also there were some questions two weeks ago in particular relative to the coroner -- the proposed coroner development impact fees, so I want to provide a little bit of information about that this evening. I believe Leon Letson from the county is available remotely as well if there is some questions for him. So, I will do the best I can to articulate the county's thought process relative to the coroner fee and, then, really this is set up as an action item tonight. If you would like to take action you may. If you -- I will describe that a little bit later, but you can take action tonight or perhaps we can make some -- some last minute adjustments, in which case we can bring it back to you in a couple weeks on the Consent Agenda or whatever direction you might have for us. I'm going to ask -- oh, Chris is always ahead of me. Thank you, Chris. Appreciate it. So, with regards to the coroner fee, some discussion relative -- just maybe for context. The three fees that the county is proposing that would require the participation of all the incorporated cities include a fee for the jail, an impact fee associated with the EMS district and, then, a fee relative to the coroner's office and the services provided by that -- by that office. So, under the -- the statutory framework that we all operate in, which is known as the Idaho Development Impact Fee Act, the purpose of that act is to fund public facilities and emphasize that particular term public facilities that are needed to serve growth and we have had discussions in the past about, you know, that philosophy of growth paying for growth. So, that's what this -- what the Impact Fee Act is about. And importantly for our discussion about the coroner's office in particular is that the term public facilities has a very precise definition within the statute and there are multiple categories. I'm not going to talk about all of them, because it's not relevant to our conversation tonight, but it is things like water or sewer or parks and things of that nature, but the one that -- the category or the portion of the definition for public facilities that's relevant to our discussion is the one that's in that last bullet point that defines public facilities as including, among other things, public safety facilities, comma, including law enforcement, fire stations and apparatus, emergency medical and rescue and streetlighting facilities. So, you will note that just on its surface it doesn't say anything about coroner -- coroner facilities or coroner functions, which leads you to kind of one of two ways to approach this. One is an argument that the coroner function falls under law enforcement and I think that's really the county's take on this. A different way to -- to possibly look at it is that -- to read the language in saying it includes public safety facilities and there are some examples provided in the statute, including law enforcement. I think that there is some risk in interpreting that way. I like the -- you know, better that the legislature include a specific subcategories were best. It's more prudent to stick within those particular subcategories. I think the county is really making

the argument that the coroner function does fall within law enforcement. In discussions with the county, you know, this goes -- stems back to last year prior to that December presentation, the county really -- when they articulate why they believe that to be the case and why a fee for the coroner's office would be defensible, they really point to two portions of the Idaho Code or sections of code that they -- that they think fits within that category. The first is Title 19, Chapter 43 of Idaho Code. That's the -- one of the main areas of Idaho law that talks about what the coroner does. It basically -- and so these all relate to law enforcement and, you know, arguably, they may or may not constitute law enforcement, but the forces -- you know, the coroner that -- just a summary -- high level summary of what Title 19, Chapter 43, talks about are the bullet points on your screen here right now. Is that the coroner is required to investigate certain deaths and it explicitly talks about homicides and it talks about suspicious deaths. So, that's part one. Part two is the coroner has quite a bit of authority in terms of conducting inquests and really performing almost judicial or quasi-judicial functions, including summoning jurors to serve for the inquest. Can issue subpoenas for witnesses to appear at the inquest. Can compel witnesses to attend -- to attend and testify at the inquest similar to what a magistrate or a district court judge would be able to do and if the jury finds that the person in question, the deceased, was killed by another, the coroner is compelled by law to actually -- and has the authority to issue an arrest warrant for that person that is suspected -- or that the jury in the inquest determined was responsible for the death. So, those all sort of have the -- the fill and flavor of law enforcement or at least maybe a judicial type fill and flavor. They don't speak -- they don't precisely fall in the definitions per se of law enforcement, certainly kind of have that -- kind of have some overlap there. The other section of law that the county has pointed to in past conversations of why they believe the coroner's function is encompassed when that -- within the definition of law enforcement, therefore, eligible for impact fees is Title 31, Chapter 43, which has some interesting provisions in terms of what happens if something happens to the sheriff and the first one is when the sheriff -- whether he or she declares a conflict of interest in the topic, this particular section of code basically authorizes the coroner to act as the substitute for the county sheriff and when he or she, meaning in the coroner, performs that role, the statute is clear that the coroner possesses all the same powers as the sheriff during that point in time. So, clearly that does, you know, bleed into the law enforcement category so to speak. The last section I will point to -- the county hasn't really mentioned this, but I will mention it, because it does -- it's similar to what we just talked about. But in this case the example I just gave you a moment ago is when the sheriff declares that he or she has a conflict of interest, then, the coroner steps in, this is similar, but this is where others determine that the sheriff has an issue and -- you know. And Idaho has an interesting provision. Basically the coroner is the only elected official or individual that can arrest the sheriff and so that's, essentially, what this language is about is if the sheriff is a party to an action -- this is an artful way to say it -- that if the sheriff was a party to an action or proceeding and, then, the process and orders that are related thereto fall to the coroner and that includes the potential for arresting a sheriff for unlawful activity. So, those are the sections. The first -- the first two I mentioned in particular are the sections that the county points to that as to why the coroner's function fits within law enforcement and because it fits within law enforcement it is one of the public facilities that can be paid for or category of public

facilities that can be paid for by impact fees. The long and short of it is this is -- this has never been litigated to the best of my knowledge. It's never been challenged. And so that we don't have a bright line rule. There is no good definition in the Impact Fee Act or elsewhere about what law enforcement means and so there is -- as you often hear from attorneys there is lots of gray area and the room for argument here. So, the county I think has -- you know, has made a fair argument as to why the coroner fee could fit within the Impact Fee Act. It's certainly not a black and white question or a black and white answer. There is risks. There is -- Mayor Simison spoke about a couple weeks ago. You know, really until you are challenged and the court makes a decision we don't know the definitive answer and that's sort of the circumstance we are dealing with. So, the three agreements you have before you tonight that you may or may not wish to act upon, the -- in this book the two agreements you have before you tonight. One is the agreement between the city and the EMS district and just to refresh memories and, then, for those that might be watching now or later, we talked about a four step process for the city to be a good partner with the county, along with other city -- incorporated cities in Ada county -- a four step type process is incremental and sort of, you know, the judicious way to proceed would be to enter into an agreement with the county that basically says not much more than we are going to make use of the county's impact advisory committee as our committee for this purpose and that we will commit to considering the possibility of adopting the CIPs for the coroner, for the EMS and for the jail. Step two if we proceeded would be actually to consider the CIPs that would come later. It would be part of a public hearing process and an actual amendment -- formal amendment to the city's Comprehensive Plan. Step three we would pause until other cities catch up and every -- because this takes all the cities to participate to make this work and so we would pause at that point until other cities have adopted the CIPs and adopted ordinances to implement such a fee and, then, step four for us at that point would be to consider the possibility you are not committed. This Council and future councils are not committed to do anything, but you would consider as part of step four the possibility of adopting an ordinance that would implement the countywide impact fees within Meridian. We are talking about step one only that includes two agreements. The first is with the EMS district. That stands by itself. There is no correlation or any connection to the coroner function and so that agreement really is not impacted by this -- the issue of the coroner's office and whether it should be included or not. The second agreement, however, also between the city and the county, does deal with both CIPs, one for the jail -- that's associated to jail and one that's associated with the coroner's office and so to the extent the City Council does not wish to entertain the idea of a fee for the coroner's office, you have a couple ways -- or you still have questions about that you know, you have a few ways to potentially approach that. I have listed three. You may have some other ideas here tonight as well. One is there is really -- even if you still have some concerns relative to the coroner's office, there is no real -- real impediment necessarily or downside to use that phrase of even -- of approving the agreement as it sits, because, really, all it obligates the city to do is to consider the CIP out of another date as part of a public hearing process. So, on the one hand you could even approve that agreement now, even though you may have some lingering questions relative to the coroner's office and it doesn't -- doesn't commit the city to do anything and you can have a more in-depth conversation about that topic when you actually consider the CIP.

So, that is an alternative. Converse -- or as an alternative to that, if -- if you are convinced now that the coroner's office ought not be included and we don't -- we don't want to waste people's time and that's just the conclusion of the Council, yet you want to proceed with other aspects of the county's proposal, a different alternative would be number two listed there, which is we can direct staff to modify the agreement with the county to delete all references to the coroner's office and the coroner's CIP. We need a little time to make that happen. We bring it back to you in a couple weeks on the Consent Agenda, minus any references to the coroner fee and we proceed accordingly. And, lastly, you may decide that you don't have enough information yet about this topic or other topics to do any of those things and perhaps you need to hear from the county, you know, in more detail tonight or another -- another setting. So, those are a few potential alternatives. You may have some other thoughts as well on how to best proceed. As I mentioned I think -- if he -- if he was good enough to hang with us for the night he was -- Mr. Letson was on -- was going to join us remotely, so I'm happy to answer questions you might have. Hopefully Mr. Letson is available if you have questions for the county and, Mr. Mayor, I will turn it back to you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions, comments?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: A comment and, then, I do have two questions. I -- I do think there is some harm in considering an agreement if we are not going to get there. Like I -- I don't want to lead on like partners in government to count on something that they think is coming from us if we are not going to get there. So, I -- I do think there is a risk in that. My -- my questions would be, number one, if we decided to move forward on the coroner CIP and we are wrong, what is the risk to the city. And, then, my second question would be can we just, you know, maybe get -- proactively ask the Attorney General or someone else to provide a legal opinion about this matter. Like is there a resource available to us that we could use to try to get to the bottom of the coroner piece specifically?

Starman: Thank you. Mr. Mayor and Council Member Strader, excellent questions. So, with regard to -- let me start with the last question and I will work my way backwards. You might have to remind me to -- to the topics. I have given some thought to as -- well, I think the county is in the best position to do that. They choose. Those are two thoughts that are one of the two things you mentioned or thoughts that occurred to me as well. Potentially the county could ask the Attorney General's office for an opinion and the attorney's -- Attorney General may choose to do so. So, that's an option that the county could choose to pursue. Probably make sense for the county to do so, since they are proposing their fee on a countywide basis and we are one piece of that puzzle. The second potential alternative would be to go to the District Court now with the declaratory judgment action and ask the court basically to decide now, absent a disagreement, but as a matter of law, you know, does the coroner's -- does a coroner impact fee comply with the Impact Fee Act? So, under Idaho law, you know, parties,

including counties, can -- can seek a declaratory judgment that declares what the law is with respect to the rights under that law. So, those are a couple options that might be available to the county. With regard to -- I think this -- working backwards. Second question in terms of risk to the city, there is probably little -- little risk to the city in terms of considering the coroner CIP in the sense that it's a planning document that says, you know, that the community is growing in a certain way at a certain rate and it has -- generates demand for facilities. Here is what that looks like. Here is the analysis. And to the extent -- certainly no harm in considering such a CIP and even to the extent we adopt the CIP and included it as part of the Comprehensive Plan, that that really is just a planning document and doesn't have, you know, a force of fee ordinance or any ordinance behind. It is a planning instrument. So, I don't think it's risk to the city or significant risk to the city relative to the CIP. Where the risk comes in is if that last step is taken, which I referred to as step four, if the city adopts an ordinance and we start to -- under the force of law collect impact fees for -- from people that are developing in our community and a court that later decides that is illegal, then, that has lots of legal implications for the city and for the county. As we talked about briefly in some previous discussions, one of our requirements of the county is that we have an identification and hold harmless provision, but I don't want to -- you know, without getting into great detail about that -- there are some limitations to that under the Idaho Constitution and I don't want to, you know, completely rely upon that as a safe harbor for the city. So, we should proceed, you know, with our eyes wide open to the extent -- particularly to the extent we actually get to the point of considering implementing a coroner related fee that might be challenged.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Kurt, can you go back to -- it might have been your first slide that was referencing the section of code -- back a little further. Right there. Public safety facilities. In your research was that term defined in the law? Because it would seem that a coroner facility could fall under either law enforcement or is it a public safety facility? Did you look at that or examine that at all?

Starman: And so -- thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council Member Taylor. So, there is no case -- no case law on this, so -- or at the appellate level. I'm not aware even at the District Court level, but no appellate cases, so -- and the legislative history is not particularly helpful. The legislature clearly went to great lengths to narrow what these fees could be applied to and we had this discussion frequently in the context of school districts, for example. The legislature has explicitly and intentionally left school districts off this list, you know, and so the list -- you know, the list that the legislature has provided is -- is somewhat narrow and closely defined, but to -- to answer your question, you know, directly, there -- I -- I have not found anything that provides a better definition in terms of public facility or law enforcement than what you are reading here. And this is directly -- that -- that is a quote out of the statute, but there is no additional clarification beyond that.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Appreciate the -- kind of walking us through the coroner's responsibilities and duties. It was very informative. I felt like I learned it. I understand why it's kind of a bit of a gray area. Seems to me it's -- I feel like it's pretty sound in terms of -- that a coroner would -- could be considered a law enforcement entity, given the responsibilities that they are allowed to do under statute. I guess the question I would have for you would be if we get to a point where we are collecting impact fees and the court says, no, you can't do that, is the liability with the city or would it be more so with the county, because it's their impact fee and we are more of a facilitator of collecting them?

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council Member Taylor. Likely to be both, because -- in the sense that the county for sure because, you know, they are front and center collecting the fee and spending it or collecting it for particular purposes. But the city -- city and other cities, if they choose to participate as well, and we have always said that, you know, sort of all need to participate or it won't happen. So, other cities would be in the same boat. I guess we wouldn't be alone. But I would say -- to answer your question, the city would be directly involved in that litigation, because it's a city ordinance that allowed -- or is compelling the payment of that fee and so, you know, we are likely involved directly in that litigation. We would turn it to the county and contractually point to our contractual provision that says they need to defend and identify the city and we would rely upon that to put the county in the driver's seat to -- you know, to defend the action and to the extent there is an adverse judgment to actually make the city whole as well. As I indicated, there is some limitations on those types of clauses under the Idaho Constitution.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Kurt, I appreciate it as you went through this you said public safety facilities comma --

Starman: Yes.

Whitlock: -- including law enforcement, fire stations, but in all the subsequent slides it talks about duties of the coroner and I don't know that apparatus or emergency medical or rescue or streetlights are treated similarly in Idaho code with definitions of duties. So, I'm still in a gray area into public safety facilities, when all we have referenced in other sections of code are duties related to if the sheriff has a conflict of interest or a coroner's inquest or things like that versus here is an apparatus, here is a fire station, here -- here are streetlights. So, is there anything you can do or say to help bridge that gap for me or -- or get past this comma?

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council Member Whitlock. I fully understand your -- your point and your question. I think the most conservative -- and I'm not sure I can bridge that gap. Really, the -- the most conservative direct way to read that language from my perspective would be -- if the legislature went to -- basically has said you can use impact fees for certain things, water, sewer, parks and this category and what -- the way I read this language -- and, you know, the way sort of statutory interpretation works, I would read it to say public facility, public safety facilities and the common meaning really -- this is going a bit far, but I'm going to say for this to make the point -- limited to law enforcement, fire stations and apparatus, emergency medical, rescue and streetlighting functions. Because they didn't say including -- they didn't use the language of including without limitation or including, but not limited to. They used the word including and so that sort of gives you -- this is your subset that you are going to work with. So, if they use language like, including but not limited to, or without limitation I would have a different interpretation about it. So, really, that's one that -- that lawyers could argue about and different judges could likely come to different conclusions about, but the most conservative reading of that language is if you want to just sort of be in a safe harbor would be we know the legislature has intended that law enforcement is a public safety facility. Fire stations and apparatus both qualify under that definition. Likewise for EMS and streetlights.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- I think I'm still struggling. I think -- I think similar to Councilman Whitlock. I'm still struggling and I do feel like this is an example where I think the county being proactive and getting some clarity on this is the best thing to do to me. I -- I don't want to go down the path of considering an agreement saying, well, we can consider this agreement, but the real risk to the city is when we actually implement an ordinance. Once you get the ball rolling on something it kind of takes on a life of its own and I -- I don't want our partners at the county to rely on us on this coroner one specifically if we haven't gotten clarity. It sounds like there are two paths to getting that that they could pursue. They can get an opinion from the Attorney General. That's an option that they -- you just said that they could do. Or they could go to a District Court it sounds like. I -- I would love for us to go back to the county and say, hey, we would like -- we would like you to try to pursue one of these two options to get some clarity on this, because we are concerned we think it's a gray area. I just -- I -- what I don't want to do is like go all the way down the path, embrace our own interpretation and, then, end up taking on risk to the city because ultimately we end up implementing these impact fees. Like I -- I think we should just get clarity on this. That -- that's where I'm at on the coroner one.

Starman: Mr. Mayor and Council, as you are thinking about that and deliberating, maybe that makes perfect sense and the Council will make that decision. Sort of a corollary to that thought process would be, then, you know, what -- you may want to think about it as you are thinking about this and deliberating. If we pursue the -- the thought that Council Member Strader just presented, the corollary to do we want to do

anything with the other two fees at this time, EMS and the jail, or do you want to keep them all together until we have better clarity relative to the coroner? So, that would be a related question that you may want to think about as you do a break and -- and reach your decision.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Kurt, on that line of thinking, if we opt to set aside the coroner question and pursue the others and we move down that path, if we do get that additional clarity that gives us assurance that all is well, do we just come back with another agreement that's specific to the coroner that we would pass and, then, kind of beyond that does that create problems for the county working with other municipalities who have maybe chosen a different approach? Because I'm just wondering if Star -- or, you know, Garden City, Boise, Kuna, they pursue kind of the similar path and we have kind of got a bit of a different way of getting there, does that create a problem if we all have sort of different pathways to getting to the same goal or does it need to be the same with every municipality?

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council Member Taylor. I think it was sort of two questions there. Basically with regard to -- I will answer the first, which is, you know, if we -- let's say hypothetically one of the scenarios is we leave the coroner's fee out of the agreement today, but let's say hypothetically the county gets an opinion from the Attorney General's office in six weeks and says that this is acceptable, to answer that part of the question, yes, the city could either enter into a new agreement at that time or amend the agreement that excluded the coroner's office and we could -- we could catch up with the process there. To the second question as to impacts with other cities and the county overall, what I heard the -- what I heard the county say in previous discussions and just makes sense to me, you know, the 10,000 foot level, is that -- I think Mr. Rutherford in particular made comments very similar to what I'm going to say now. It's sort of -- we all -- all the cities need to participate or it won't happen. So, I think the county is essentially -- what I have heard the county say is that, you know, as we get farther into the process if a city chooses not to participate hypothetically in the coroner's fee, likely, the county -- what I heard Mr. Rutherford say is likely the county would not pursue that fee, because they want unanimity, need unanimity to have, you know, a county -- truly a countywide fee. So, I think the county -- I don't want to speak for them. Mr. Letson, you know, may be available online if he would like to speak. What I have heard is that if all the cities are not in agreement on a particular fee, the county would not likely pursue that to the finish line.

Letson: Mayor, this is Leon Letson with Ada county.

Simison: Mr. Letson.

Letson: Sorry. I have been on mute trying not to step on Kurt's toes as he presented to you. So, thank you for your time and, Kurt, thanks for a very detailed presentation on the coroner. When I read it I was like, well, this is pretty clear this works as an impact fee. But, you know, I understand we are still kind of wrestling with that gray area. You know, I -- pursuing an advice letter from the Attorney General -- General on this issue, we are happy to pursue that. You know, I would like to back up and just remind Mayor and Council that this agreement is really more of a pre-agreement than anything else. It -- you know, you still would need to go through the process of amending your Comprehensive Plan to bring these CIPS into your guiding document, the -- the comprehensive plan. So -- so, I -- I guess I would ask -- give us an opportunity to prove that this actually fits. Let's not stop the process now or -- I mean best case would be alternative one here, where we can have you agree to consider all of them. In the event that this advice letter comes back in some negative take on the coroner, then, that's pretty easy for us to remove it from everybody's consideration, because we are, obviously, not going to do anything that violates state law. I guess alternative two we could accept as well. We have had Eagle and Star already adopt the coroner CIP into their Comprehensive Plan. Again, that doesn't affect them in any way until they actually establish an ordinance and -- and start collecting a fee. It's really just -- we acknowledge this plan is relevant in terms of how the coroner functions and serves our community and -- and what we should do to protect it really. I mean that's a rough paraphrase of what the purpose of the CIP and the comp plan does, but that is what it's doing there. So -- so, again, I -- I would hope we could go for one here and give us some -- a chance to -- to pursue that advice from the Attorney General if that's the -- the will of the Council here. But I guess worst case I would hope we could get to number two tonight at least to allow us to continue making progress on the other two CIPs and the services provided through those.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I -- I think it's really just so everyone is going in with their eyes open; right? So, if the county understands that we are still considering the agreements, but that the city -- at least I'm the only one so far. I don't know if other Council Members want that opinion from the Attorney General. I -- I would like something like that personally. That -- that would make me feel more comfortable. But I would be okay with -- as long as we are communicating really clearly to you, our partners at the county, like this is something that we would like to see, an outside opinion to interpret this. I'm okay with still pursuing it, as long as you understand that, you know, if we don't get a favorable opinion, then, that would jeopardize, you know, that -- that agreement -- that component. I just don't want to lead -- you know, lead somebody astray. That's all.

Letson: Sorry. Sorry. This is the trouble with virtual meetings and virtual attendance. Yes. No. I -- I get it. And, again, you know, the law is the law and we are going to follow it. You know, we -- we believe we are in a good place on the coroner here and -- and, again, I would point to some of the things in Kurt's presentation that -- that got us

there. But, yeah, I mean at the end of the day we -- we have to follow the law. We -- we can't -- we -- we wouldn't -- we would remove that immediately if it was determined to not be a legal -- a service eligible for impact fees.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Hey, Leon, you can stay on if you want. Can you just give Council some understanding -- because this question has come up a little bit. So, kind of walk the Council through what actions have you taken to try and seek some clarification on the coroner piece and if you haven't done anything that's fine, but I think it's important that before we take an action tonight to have some understanding is what the county's actions are -- would be following tonight's decision to start working towards providing some of us that clarity and confidence.

Letson: Yes. Mayor. Thank you, Council Member. So, you know, I -- I will just speak to the hours and rooms with our attorneys and Kurt and his team to hash out this. I think we produced -- I can't remember how many pages that document was, Kurt, in terms of your questions about the impact fees and -- and our thoughts on how -- how we would answer those questions and there was an extensive section dedicated to the coroner. So, I mean at this point it hasn't risen above the level of our respective legal -- again, I -- the Attorney General option is -- that's the first time I have heard of that and I'm happy to go pursue that and I don't know how quickly this -- he is turning out advice letters, but as quickly as I can get one I will work to get it to you. Again, I -- if we need that as the final say on this, then, we will -- we will work hard to -- to give that to you, because it, obviously, better our position with every jurisdiction that we are working with. But at this point it's just been the -- the legal teams of Ada County and Meridian kind of kicking this back and forth and -- and, you know, obviously, we are coming down on different sides of that a little bit and -- and that's -- yeah, that's where it's at.

Cavener: Thanks for that, Leon. I appreciate it.

Simison: So, Council, would you like us to put something on the agenda in the future for further feedback or do you want to move forward on anything at this time?

Cavener: Mayor, I will just -- I will weigh in on kind of my thought. I'm supportive of moving forward with this process. I -- and I want to commend Council Member Strader, she -- what I was hearing from her is we don't want to lead our partners astray in saying by agreeing to do this that means we have bought all in and, then, to come back and say, hey, we have got some concerns here and to say, well, you told us early on that you were in support of it. I appreciate I think that -- that level of diligence and reminder toward our county friends, I look at this as beginning the process. I'm supportive of having the conversation. Quite frankly, I'm going to need more than just a letter from the Attorney General or from a District Court weighing in. I'm going to want to hear from our citizens on this. I mean I think this is a long process that's going to involve a lot of

engagement with a lot of different folks, but I'm open to at least beginning it. So, for where I'm coming from, Kurt, I'm in support of moving -- you know, approving the agreements, beginning this process, recognizing that before any action would be taken on any impact fees, coroner or otherwise, there is going to be a robust process where Council will feel very confident in any decision that we make, whether it's in support or in opposition.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. I'm in agreement with Councilman Cavener on that. I -- I think it's important to get the process moving. I know that by doing that we are not tying our hands completely to -- to the end goal here by the county, but I -- I think it's been discussed enough. I think there has been a feedback. I'm comfortable moving ahead with what we have, but, you know, getting the -- getting additional outside clarification on this question about the coroner and those fees, that's great. That's just going to make us more comfortable. I think everyone will -- will like what we hear -- or at least we will know what we should do based on that and I -- I do think that that responsibility lies with the county to clarify that. Obviously, we -- we can read the law, we can -- we can have our opinions about what it means, but if we need that additional clarification I think we should emphasize to the county that that's their responsibility to -- to get that clarification, but we are going to need that to reach that final conclusion. So, I am supportive of tonight moving ahead with these agreements.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Not to make this drag on any longer, but it's been very well discussed and torn apart here tonight and very simply I agree with moving ahead with these agreements at this time.

Simison: Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I don't know if we are going to vote, but I'm fine with moving forward so long as the county's been on -- and I appreciate you joining the meeting, by the way. Thank you very much. They have heard us. They understand and it sounds like they are willing to pursue an advice letter or a District Court judgment of some sort to weigh in on it. That's okay to me. As long as you guys understand that that's something that at least -- at least one person definitely would like to have. So, I'm okay with that. As long

as everyone's expectations are set and people won't be disappointed if it's not the outcome they want I'm okay with it.

Simison: So, Council, what -- would you like to -- is there a motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: To come back on --

Cavener: Why don't you bring the agreement back on Consent and that will give Council an opportunity to review before any vote is taken.

Simison: Okay. All right.

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council Members.

Letson: Thank you very much, everyone.

ORDINANCES

- 26. Ordinance No. 25-2086: An ordinance (330 N. Linder Rd. – H-2024-0048) annexing Lot 3 of Heppers Acre Subdivision (a recorded plat on file in Book 20 of Plats at Page 1298, records of Ada County, Idaho) and a portion of the southeast quarter of Section 12, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 0.983 acres of such real property from R1 (Estate Residential) 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. With that we will move on to our ordinances. First up is Ordinance No. 25-2086. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to 330 N. Linder Rd. – H-2024-0048) annexing Lot 3 of Heppers Acre Subdivision (a recorded plat on file in Book 20 of Plats at Page 1298, records of Ada County, Idaho) and a portion of the southeast quarter of Section 12, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 0.983 acres of such real property from R1 (Estate Residential) 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 read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? 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.

Simison: Next up is Ordinance No. 25-2087 ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor on, the last item there was no motion.

Simison: Oh, I'm sorry.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Make a -- I would move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2086.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2086. Is there discussion? If not clerk call the roll -- oh.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Is it Ordinance 25-2086 or is it Ordinance 25-2087? Sorry. I'm a little confused.

Simison: We are back -- we are going back to 2086 that didn't have an official motion.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: 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.

- 27. Ordinance No. 25-2087: An ordinance (Core & Main – H-2024-0066) annexing a parcel of land located in a portion of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 16, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 5.0 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: Now, we will go on to Ordinance No. 25-2087, ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance annexing a parcel of land located in a portion of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 16, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 5.0 acres of such real property from RUT to the I-L 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? Seeing none, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2087.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2087. Is there discussion on the motion? 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.

Simison: Council, we have reached the end of our agenda. One last item.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Two quick last items. Just a reminder it's Dairy Days and so lots of great activities to be participating in and look forward to seeing some of you at the parade. And with that, Mr. Mayor, I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:42 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK