

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:02 p.m. Tuesday, December 3, 2024, 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, Bill Parsons, Nick Napoli, Jamie Leslie, Dean Willis

**ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

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

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is December 3rd, 2024, at 6:02 p.m. We will begin this evening's City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Simison: If you would all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

**COMMUNITY INVOCATION**

Simison: Okay. And it sounds like our person that was going to do the community invocation they had to cancel due to illness. So, unless anyone else was here in his stead.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Simison: We will move on to adoption of the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: A couple of small changes to our agenda. We are going to take Item 19 off the Consent Agenda and move that to our first action item and, then, we are also going to remove Item 31 and place that as our last action item before we get to ordinances. And with those slight changes, Mayor, I move we adopt the agenda as amended.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adoption 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 November 12, 2024 City Council Work Session**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the November 12, 2024 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 3. Approve Minutes of the November 19, 2024 City Council Work Session**
- 4. Approve Minutes of the November 19, 2024 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 5. McDermott Village Apartments Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0139)**
- 6. McDermott Village Apartments Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2024-0140)**
- 7. McDermott Village Apartments Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0141)**
- 8. McDermott Village Apartments Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2024-0142)**
- 9. McDermott Village Apartments Water Main Easement No. 3 (ESMT-2024-0143)**
- 10. McDermott Village Apartments Water Main Easement No. 4 (ESMT-2024-0144)**
- 11. McDermott Village Apartments Water Main Easement No. 5 (ESMT-2024-0145)**
- 12. McDermott Village Apartments Water Main Easement No. 6 (ESMT-2024-0146)**

13. **Apex Northwest Subdivision No. 5 Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0161)**
14. **Apex Northwest Subdivision No. 5 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0162)**
15. **Apex Northwest Subdivision No. 5 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0163)**
16. **Apex Northwest Subdivision No. 5 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2024-0164)**
17. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Treasure Valley Athletic Center (H-2024-0033) by Erik Hagen Architecture, located at 1250 & 1251 E. Piper Ct.**
18. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Treasure Valley Athletic Center (MCU-2024-0003) by Erik Hagen Architecture, located at 1250 & 1251 E. Piper Ct.**
20. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for The Gateway at 10 Mile (H-2024-0010) by KM Engineering, LLP., located at NE corner of W. Franklin and N. Ten Mile Rd.**
21. **Development Agreement (Apex Farr Subdivision H-2024-0014) Between City of Meridian and Smith Brighton Inc.; DWT Investments LLC; SCSH Properties LLC; Brighton Apex LLC; Brighton Development Inc.; SCS Investments LLC; The David & Kristin Turnbull Family Trust Dated August 1, 2006; and The Tomlinson Foundation for Property Located on the West Side of S. Locust Grove Rd., North of E. Lake Hazel Rd. and East of S. Meridian Rd.**
22. **Development Agreement (Calvary Chapel Meridian H-2024-0020) Between City of Meridian and Calvary Chapel Meridian, Inc. for Property Located at 3600 W. Nelis Dr.**
23. **Development Agreement (Keep West Subdivision H-2023-0047) Between City of Meridian and Dawson Ranch LLC, for Property Located at 2625 E. Lake Hazel Rd. and 6519 S. Raap Ranch Ln.**
24. **Development Agreement (Life Church Inc. H-2024-0024) Between City of Meridian and Life Church Inc. for Property Located at 3225 E. Commercial Ct.**
25. **Approve and authorize Procurement Manager to issue the Purchase Order to The Public Restroom for the Not-to-Exceed amount of**

**\$372,534.00 for two Prefabricated Buildings and installation of buildings at Lakeview Golf Course**

- 26. Approval of Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Meridian Finance & Public Works Departments for the ARPA funding for the Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility Biosolids Dryer Project for the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$192,878.46**
- 27. Approval of Memorandum of Understanding between the City Finance & Fire Departments for the ARPA funding for the Fire Station 8 Construction Project for the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$4,411,111.61**
- 28. Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$53,769.00 for Department of Homeland Security Assistance to Firefighters Grant**
- 29. Resolution No. 24-2491: A Resolution Vacating a Portion of the 10-Foot-Wide Public Utility, Drainage, and Irrigation (PUDI) Easement Encumbering Lots 2 and 3 in Block 1 of Medina Subdivision, Being More Particularly Described in Exhibit "A"; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 30. Resolution No. 24-2492: 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 11.246 Acres of Land for the Expansion of Life Church and the Operation of Life Bible College, Generally Located at 3225 East Commercial Court, in the Southwest Quarter of Section 9, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 31. City of Meridian Financial Report - October 2024**

Simison: Next item up is the Consent Agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: With those two items that have been moved I move that we approve the Consent Agenda as presented. For the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

- 19. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Centrepoint Apartments (H-2024-0019), by Nicolette Womack, Kimley-Horn, located at 3030 N. Cajun Lane and 3100 N. Centrepoint Way, near the southwest corner of N. Eagle Rd. and E. Ustick Rd.**

Simison: So, with that we will move on to Item 19.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: A point of clarification. I'm not seeing the public comment on tonight's agenda.

Simison: It is. Public forum.

Cavener: Public forum. Yeah.

Simison: Under future meeting topics.

Cavener: Under future meeting topics. Oh. Fair enough. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I just -- before we moved into Action Items I wanted to -- I think there was somebody that I heard was going to sign up and I wanted to make sure that we -- we got there. So, perhaps I'm putting the cart before the horse. My apologies.

Simison: Okay. So, with that we will move on to Item 19. Mr. Nary, did you want to lead us in on Item 19 or is this planning staff?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, so there were some -- as we prepared the findings on Item 19 there were some clarity that the applicant was looking for. I provided you with a memo they provided to sort of clarify what they wanted when I spoke with Planning. Again, the Planning's intention was they took the findings as they were approved, as they were drafted previously and they just -- again, I think from a clarification standpoint as we continue through the process of the development there is design review that needs to be happened next and so if the Council has, from reviewing that memo, wants to make clear so that Planning knows what they are looking for and what the Council's desire was when we approved the findings, it doesn't appear to me that we are asking to amend anything, but simply make sure that we are clear on what the Council's direction was. And I spoke with Council Member Taylor about that for a bit previously.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: As I was the one that made the original motion I did review the memo, I went back and re-watch -- excuse me -- re-watched the hearing just to ensure that nothing was missed from my intention with making the motion. I'm in agreement with the clarification as presented in the memo. So, I'm not sure if this is something we have -- we don't need to vote on or do we want to make a motion, but it is -- as a motion maker it was my intention that we agree with those -- clarification that is in the memo, so --

Simison: Can you state that on the record for those that don't have the memo in front of them?

Nary: Well, it -- it -- it -- yeah, it has been added to the record. This memo has been added in today, but I think it may be -- Bill could help us with that. Is this the condition I that we are looking at?

Parson: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, I do have the memo in front of me. So, there is -- in -- in the memo it -- it speaks to -- if you recall the elevations were going to be a sloped roof on the two-story building and so the -- the -- the eave of the structure is at 20 feet and as you travel up to the peak of the structure it goes up to 34 feet and so that's the clarification that the applicant wants. So, it is item two and three as stated in the memo. So, right now it says not to exceed three stories or 38 feet in height and the applicant wants it to -- clarification based on what I heard from Councilman Taylor, she -- they have stated that they would like it to be from -- sorry. Here -- let me look here. I thought it was in here. From 30 to 44 feet if it is a peaked roof and not a flat roof. So, I think that's the clarification is the Council gave them options to do -- one -- one building was to have a sloped roof and one -- the three story could have either a flat roof or a sloped roof depending on the applicant's choice and I think that was your intent, Councilman Taylor. So, the applicant just wants that clarification that if there is a sloped roof that that -- that will change some of the variations to the peak of that roof. Currently it's -- it's pretty specific in -- in those DA provisions. So, if that was your intent, then, yes, I can certainly work up -- fix the Exhibit A to reflect your change and, then, get those in front of you for signature.

Taylor: Yeah. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. I think that's an accurate representation of it. Like I said, I reviewed it, went back and re-watched it all and that's in line with what I believe that we were doing at the time. So, if you -- if -- for clarification for the record either -- you know, I -- I could read this in or we can include the memo or Bill's description. I -- whatever you think is needed from me I'm happy to do that.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, since it's part of the record -- I mean if you want to reference that that's fine. I think that's adequate.

Simison: Yeah. I just don't want there to be anymore nonclarity. I just want it to be very clearly stated for everybody, so we all get it.

Taylor: Yes. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Since I referenced the memo that is part of the public record I think that would suffice.

Simison: Everybody over here agree that case -- okay. Just want to make sure that everyone is on the same page of what is being referenced by not referencing it. Okay. With that do I have a motion on Item 19?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I make a motion to approve Item 19.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I will second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 19. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is disagree to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

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

Simison: Okay. Next item up is public forum. Mr. Clerk, do we have any signed up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, just one. Travis Clyde.

Simison: Good evening, Travis. You will be recognized for three minutes.

Clyde: Thank you. Okay. Good evening, City Council. Thank you for this time tonight. As many of you know already my name is Travis Clyde and I'm here tonight to bring something to your attention and hopefully find some resolution. I'm here in the capacity of one of the founders and board members of Exceeding Excellence Education Foundation and Idaho Sports Academy. On September 10th of this year Idaho Sports Academy director reached out to Meridian Homecourt to schedule the facility for a basketball tournament from January 2nd through the 4th. After e-mails and phone calls we were told that the facility was not available the weekend because there was a tournament scheduled for the weekend prior and they wanted to make sure that the court remained free to member's use. With that we proceeded to book other gyms in

the valley. It is important to note that we had already established a relationship with Meridian Chamber of Commerce to partner up and make the tournament a community event. On November 24th, through a text to our director, it came to our attention that Meridian Homecourt was hosting a basketball tournament the same weekend that we had previously requested January 2nd through the 5th. I immediately e-mailed Parks and Rec about it and asked why another organization had been able to book the weekend that we were requested after the date of the first e-mail and -- sorry. After his response was lacked with a demean of good explanation I called Council Member Cavener. What we were told was that there was a policy in place that allows any -- an organization that -- what -- has booked their Homecourt facility to move their event within a window of six weeks prior and/or after their previously scheduled date, making a three months open window for an event. I asked for -- if a copy of the policy would be provided. I have not received anything, nor could have -- find anything online referring to the policy. However, yesterday I received an e-mail from Homecourt with a scheduling philosophy attached. I have copies to -- for all of you for your liking if you like. We have used the facility for -- for scheduling practice times. Procedures -- the procedure used -- used is what I have expected with an event rental. If the facility was booked, then, our name was put on a waiting list. Once the team or organization cancelled their practice time or request to move it the list is consolidated and the first one on the wait list would be offered the first right to refusal and, then, it moves down the list until either the time is booked or the list is exhausted. Like I said, this is the -- what we were expecting. It was -- it is how our facility facilities are run within Parks and Rec for other grounds and facilities. I experienced with -- this with other organizations that I work with. The whole experience has not only enlightened me about the workings of our public facility, but a tarnish on my view of it.

Simison: One second.

Clyde: My director and I, our founders, all felt a bias against us by the Parks and Rec and Homecourt staff and we were not sure how to handle this. This is why -- this is -- it is with this that I am -- I come tonight to hopes of some kind of resolution or change.

Simison: Thank you, Travis. Appreciate it.

Clyde: Any questions?

Simison: No. Can't --

Clyde: Thank you.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 33. Public Hearing for Baratza Subdivision (H-2024-0016) by Ella Passey, The Land Group, located at the southeast corner of N. Black Cat Rd. and W. McMillian Rd.**



- A. Request: Annexation of 80.3 acres of land with R-8 (26.98) and R-15 (53.32) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 347 building lots, 29 common lots and 1 right-of-way lot.
- C. Request: Council Waiver for block length on six (6) street segments that exceed the maximum 750 ft. block length requirement on land that is currently zoned RUT.

Simison: Thanks. Okay. So, with that we will move on to our Action Items for this evening. Next up is Item 33, which is a public hearing for Barratza Subdivision, H-2024-0016. Am I opening the public hearing on this item? Is -- I can't recall --

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I don't believe they have -- they have noticed it properly. So no.

Simison: Correct. So --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm going to look to our clerk that this has been noticed for December 17th for a public hearing? Planning staff. Whomever.

Parsons: I -- it was -- well, they are asking to continue it to the 17th tonight.

Simison: Was it ever properly -- I'm trying to figure out if I open it or don't open it, because it wasn't properly noticed. I can't -- I don't know why we are not hearing it tonight. That's what I'm trying to figure out.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, we are not hearing it tonight. We are still working with the applicant through some details on some of the -- they are working with ACHD on some road improvement enhancements that they want to include as part of their development and we have asked for them to provide a little more time so we can get those right and get those presented in front of you for an -- for an appropriate hearing date. We did not get that information until late, so we asked them to request continuance to a date certain, so that we can have that information in front of you. So, originally we were scheduled to have it for the 3rd. I think it is scheduled for the 3rd. That's why it's on your agenda tonight. But I don't know as -- Matt, have you noticed the site, posted it with the December 3rd hearing? So, it has been posted for tonight's hearing. So, again, it sounds like you should probably open it up and continue it to the December 17th hearing.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I want to make sure because that -- we have heard I think a little bit two different directions. The applicant is requesting a continuance to address some feedback from staff to hopefully bring forth a positive resolution. This isn't being required to be continued because of a noticing error. The applicant has followed all the laws and rules. But in an effort to bring forth a more appropriate application they and we are requesting to move it to the 17th, which is the sign that has been noticed.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, that is correct.

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, I think, then, we would need to open the public hearing.

Simison: Yes. So, with that we will open Item H-2024-0016. Even though we just had comments from staff, does the applicant want to make any additional comments as it pertains to the request for continuance? So, applicant is in agreement with the comments from staff that they were made in advance.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor, I just wanted to make sure. I don't know if there is anybody that's here tonight to testify on this application that wouldn't be able to be here on the 17th. If you raise your hand if that's you, either online or in person. Not seeing any hands in the room.

Simison: And only staff is online.

Cavener: Okay. So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: With that I move that we are going to continue Item 33, the public hearing for H-2024-0016 to December 17th.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to continue Item 33 to December 17th. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**34. Public Hearing for Black Cat East (H-2024-0047) by Sawtooth Development, located at 935 S. Black Cat Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 3.62 acres of land with the I-L zoning district to allow industrial development.

- B. Request: Modified Development Agreement to include this property in the development agreement for Black Cat Industrial (H-2021-0064).

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 34, which is a public hearing for a Black Cat East, H-2024-0047. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Napoli: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next item on the agenda is the annexation and development agreement modification for Black Cat East. The applicant is requesting annexation and a development agreement modification of 3.62 acres of land with the I-L zoning district to construct an approximately 74,365 square foot industrial building. The site consists of 3.62 acres of land located at 935 South Black Cat Road. As shown on the screen the existing -- existing zoning is RUT in Ada county and the FLUM designation is mixed employment. The property -- the property was part of the initial application for Black Cat Industrial in 2021, but was not annexed at that time. The applicant is now seeking annexation to integrate this property into the surrounding development and align it with the broader -- broader planning efforts in the area. While -- while I-L is not the preferred zoning in the mixed employment designation, the City Council previously approved a request for the zone in the surrounding development. To do this the applicant requests the same approvals granted by City Council in the previous application to ensure cohesive and consistent development. In 2022 a traffic impact study was completed with the previous application and was not required with this application. However, the TIS addressed concerns regarding the traffic from this development -- development and was found that the infrastructure will be able to manage the 2.2 million square feet that will be developed within the broader project. This property was included within the scope of the TIS. Additionally, there were thresholds placed on the occupied square footage that will trigger roadway and infrastructure improvements as the development continues to be built out. The surrounding developments have similar requirements and restrictions on the development until certain road -- road improvements are completed. According to the concept plan the predominant use appears to be warehousing and distribution, which is consistent with the surrounding area and aligns with the City Council's previous approval. Access is proposed of an existing curb cut on West Grand Mogul Drive, which is consistent with the original concept plan. The building elevations and landscape plan will be analyzed with the submittal of the certificate of zoning compliance and design review. However, the applicant is proposing a change to one of our development agreement provisions. Staff has worked with the applicant to revise the elevations and have come to an agreement on the eastern facade. Staff's existing DA provision provides flexibility in the form of a design standard exception that allows the fenestration requirements to be reduced. However, after working with the applicant staff is also recommending a change to the DA provision that allows the fenestration to be reduced to ten percent instead of 20 percent. So, on the screen the original development agreement provision that the Planning and Zoning Commission saw is above and this is staff's proposed change. Really, the only change is to reduce the fenestration from 20 percent to ten percent and the applicant is also proposing their verbiage for this for your consideration tonight as well. So, the Commission is

recommending approval and has received written testimony from Clay Sammis, the applicant slash developer, proposing a change to the DA provision in the staff report. And I will stand for any questions at this time.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Can you pull up the previous slide real quick? So, just -- I would like to hear staff's analysis of how our proposed change compares to the applicant's proposal and why it's different from your perspective.

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Council, Council Woman Strader, so, yeah, as far as with this staff's mechanism to reduce ASM standard -- so, this is an Architectural Standards Manual standard to have 30 percent fenestration. However, the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area plan allows for 20 percent, but, you know, after talking with the applicant and working through it really our mechanism to reduce the fenestration is through a design standard exception and that the applicant would like that not to be the requirement here. They would like to bake it into the DA now, so they don't have to do the design standard exception at a later date, so that there is not any uncertainty, because a design standard exception is not necessarily guaranteed, it's something that we look at as staff -- as a staff. I would work with Bill to see if it's something that we would support. And, you know, in this case we worked with the applicant to revise -- to revise their elevations to really provide some additional screens on the facade to really mimic fenestration that we are looking for on this. We understand that it is an industrial building, but it is in a prominent corner of Black Cat and I-84. So, really, the main difference is we want to keep it as deferring to the design standard exception of -- at a future date, because that's staff's mechanism to reduce the fenestration versus if you guys choose to take the applicant's proposed DA provision it would be actually a strict provision in the DA, instead of having a design standard exception at a later date.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I would be curious if there is any legal perspective around avoiding the design review process that we would typically do. I mean it feels like the outcome would be the same. So, kind of -- I love following processes when they make sense, but if it's kind of go to the same outcome I'm sort of -- is there any downside from our perspective of not following the design review process? Like does that set some sort of precedent? Does that undermine us in some way on a broader basis I guess is my question, so --

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Strader, you know, I -- I don't think so, because, again, we are trying to be consistent with the remainder of the

project and bring it just in line with that. So, that's a fairly unique circumstance versus just simply a blanket -- you know.

Simison: And it's my understanding this is not removing the process, this is just changing the lens by which it gets looked at in the process.

Nary: Correct.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Any other questions for staff? All right. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Koeckeritz: Good evening, Mayor and City Council Members. Elizabeth Koeckeritz with Givens Pursley. 601 Bannock, Boise, Idaho. I'm here to present the Meridian commerce part, the last remaining piece of the annexation and zoning for this. I'm here today with Clay Sammis and Brandon Swanson, who are members of the Sawtooth Development team. They will be able to answer any questions that I'm not able to and, as I mentioned, today we are here just for the annexation and rezoning of the final piece of this development. You can see -- oop. I already went too far. Here this was the original submittal for the Meridian Commerce Park in 2022 and in the bottom right there is that building labeled M1 and that is the location we are discussing today. It was originally included within the initial application and, then, for various reasons it was not followed through throughout the entire development process and was dropped before the final approval. So, this is, then, what was approved in 2022 -- September 2022 where this parcel is not included in it and now today this is how the site we are hoping that it looks with your approval of this last site. This is how the current proposal has been developing and is currently developing. It's now labeled L on that bottom right corner. The building and the site -- here you have another view of it. They meet all the requirements of the development code. We are overparked and it does finally provide that final corner entrance that has been missing from Grand Mogul Avenue at this location. As staff mentioned, we are -- ah, it goes so fast. We are in agreement with all of staff's conditions of approval, except for B, which, then, requires us to apply the design standard exception. I think the Mayor -- he really had it exactly right when we are really just looking at how we change the lens at how we look at this. We still would have to go through the design review process, but it just seems to make a lot of sense to have that if it's agreed to right now. We have worked really closely with staff on making this -- sure that this is something that staff really likes, that staff can buy off on and, hopefully, that you will as well. If you look we do have -- the picture on the left is how it would look along Black Cat. The picture on the right is that frontage along Grand Mogul. There is a strong -- it's a false storefront right on the corner there and, then, heading down Black Cat there are these large metal screens that staff has looked at and thought looked good. It actually slightly exceeds the ten percent that we are asking for and so, then, you can wrap around the corner and that's going that way down Black Cat -- wrap around the corner onto Grand Mogul. You can see that false storefront with

the canopy and, then, the actual entrance is located just down the street there. And with that -- here is another view of it. I would stand for any questions.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Ms. Koeckeritz, it's nice having you. We have been seeing you a lot lately. It's nice having you here. I appreciate you.

Koeckeritz: Thank you.

Cavener: I was really excited about this project when it was before us a couple of years ago. During that time ACHD had planned to make some improvements on Black Cat much sooner now than they are planning to do. You got to think better than E right now on Black Cat, not counting a lot of the other stuff that's been approved, but hasn't been developed. So, I'm apprehensive and so I'm trying to get some understanding about how many vehicles trips this is going to generate, what -- when are they going to be coming in and out? What's -- what's traffic generation going to look like, because the Franklin-Black Cat intersection is not great and it's -- I don't want this to be the -- you know, the fly that breaks the camel's back, but it's starting to really feel that way.

Koeckeritz: Mayor, Council Member Cavener, great question. This -- this square footage was included within the original TIS because it was originally presented as the larger development and it was included within that and so this has already been accounted for within that first TIS was for the full two million square feet and so, then, there are -- there have been a lot of developments approved here recently and I have got a slide in here that's talking about when this development -- when the current DA -- so, there is the current DA on the rest of the property and we are asking to have this property added to that within just a couple of little tweaks based on its location. These are -- and the TI -- the current DA -- and this will, then, be part of that -- includes when the developer is required to make certain changes and do certain road improvements and so right now -- and these road improvements have also been conditioned on other developers and so there is a question of who is reaching the stage -- this point first and at what point these will get made. Currently they have almost 600,000 square feet under construction or under occupancy and so it's not that far off before they would be looking at starting to make some of these improvements here. And you look still confused.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor. Not necessarily confused. And certainly -- it's good to know that this was included in part of the previous TIS. But, yeah, this is before us today with the delays with ACHD. As much as I love this product I don't know if I would vote for it and so help me understand -- I think you said you have got -- you are required to have spaces for 35, you are overparked, which is good, but that's what I think -- if I remember

135 stalls. So, are you anticipating 135 vehicles coming in and out? Are these a.m., p.m. peak hour trips? Are these midday? Are these, you know, 7:00 a.m., 5:00 a.m. type of visitors? Help me understand kind of what the traffic flow is going to look like for this particular element.

Koeckeritz: Okay. So, first, another good question, Council Member Cavener. First it is overparked and that is in part -- I mean because there is extra parking here based on this weird remainder piece down sort of tucked under the Interstate. So, there is extra parking spaces there that hopefully are not used on a regular basis. But down in the corner -- if we go back up to a different site plan you can see that. It's -- whoa -- whoa -- whoa. You can see down here that that's just sort of a strange spot. But, then, it is anticipated that it will be following the same sort of general day to day as the other businesses and what else is being built in there, which generally would be business hours or a little before 7:00 to 6:00 or 7:00 at night generally Monday through Friday.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: And just so I understand, this is just getting in line behind all the other -- until certain road improvements are done you can't go above certain square feet.

Koeckeritz: That's exactly right. That's very clearly spelled out in the prior DA. It's included in there.

Simison: You have -- you had it up on the slide.

Koeckeritz: Yeah.

Simison: I just want to articulate that clearly with the record that this doesn't allow more to be built prior to what's in the DA, it's just part of the continuation of once road improvements are reached --

Koeckeritz: Yep.

Simison: -- these -- you can build out to those numbers.

Koeckeritz: Yeah. Once we reach 960,000 square feet of occupied space, Black Cat must be widened to five lanes between the east and west collector and Franklin and the intersection of Black Cat and Franklin must be improved as recommended by ACHD. And the intersection McDermott and Franklin must be improved with a two way left turn lane and so that has to happen between 960,000 to exceed that and, then, 1.5 million.

Simison: Thank you. Council, additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

Simison: Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item? Would the applicant like to make any final comments? Applicant waives.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Nobody else stepping up to make any public comment, I move that we close the public hearing on File No. H-2024-0047.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: It seems like a pretty straightforward request. I'm certainly cognizant of the comments that Councilman Cavener made about the -- a lot of the activity along Black Cat that we have seen, but considering what was approved, some of the history in reviewing that, it seems like more of an administrative thing that we are addressing tonight to move things along accordingly and get the entire project approved and move ahead. So, I didn't really have any questions. In reviewing the application it seemed like it was pretty straightforward. So, I think I'm supportive of the -- what's proposed before us tonight. I probably will have some questions on exactly what it is we want to make sure that we are supporting in terms of the recommended language that was outlined by staff and maybe we can get to that in a little bit.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I find myself also agreeing with Councilman Taylor. This seems very straightforward. It really seems like this was approved. Even though it wasn't part of the original agreement it was approved as part of that original agreement in 2022 and that it will still fall under those requirements and still fall within those traffic thresholds with the rest of the project and I will be in support of this this evening.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.



Cavener: It's just interesting. I -- I find myself in agreement with -- with both my Council Members as well, but I also am trying to remain consistent and I have been pretty direct with some applicants along this area that have generated a lot of traffic onto Black Cat and Franklin that better than E isn't good enough to add additional annexations. I am excited for this project, I believe in this project and I -- it frustrates me that we continue to find ourselves in situations where another agency is controlling our community's growth and success, but because I don't have a mechanism to resolve this particular issue I likely won't be in support of the request tonight.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I look at this -- although it is an annexation I do view it as a continuation of the business plan that was presented to us and I also feel that the consistency that is achieved from letting the annexation move forward is important. I wouldn't want to see an applicant come in ten years with the totally different plan that's not cohesive with what we have already approved here. So, I think for the purposes of consistency and because to me it is not a material amount of land relative to the scope of the whole project, that's why I think it makes sense to move this forward, but I would caution applicants for future annexations along Black Cat that we are really struggling with the traffic situation on Black Cat and it's going to be really challenging for us going forward. We are going to consider each application, but just for anybody that's listening, just so that they understand the reason -- at least in my mind why I would vote to approve this is kind of what I described. I'm not troubled by the applicant's request in terms of their proposed condition. I think we end up in the same place and it's not going to impact any other surrounding properties. It's really just a question of getting something kind of flagged ahead of time and I think it makes sense in this instance. So, that's kind of where I'm at on it.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Since everyone else has weighed in I will weigh in as well, because to me it really does feel like we are just finishing a necessary project and so I will be for -- the statements already said -- in support of the project.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I would be prepared to make a motion, but I would like to clarify -- just in terms of making the motion what we are agreeing to. So, in reading through this here indicated that staff has worked with the applicant since the P&Z hearing and has come to an agreement on the language, so, in making the motion is it sufficient to just approve

the file number with the staff report? Is that sufficient to accommodate the agreement that P&Z -- or that staff made with the applicant?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, so as far as with that I think it's really just a matter of staff's process as far as with us. Really our mechanism for it is a design standard exception versus -- they wanted to be, you know, in the DA right now first and I think they would still be willing to do a design standard exception with future with this provision, but as far as with staff, really, our mechanism forward is that design standard exception, unless you guys choose otherwise to adopt their DA provision. So, it really in your motion if you want to put it in the DA now with the ten percent fenestration you would go with the applicant's provision over staff.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I'm personally comfortable with putting in the -- the development agreement with the -- the proposed changes of the applicant, but just making sure that any of my other fellow Council Members are okay with that and that that's the understanding that we are okay with that. Okay. So, hopefully, I can get this motion right. I have struggled recently. Mr. Mayor, I -- I would move that we approve File No. H-2024-0047 to also include the changes in the fenestration from 30 percent to ten percent, the language recommended by the applicant for the development agreement. Did I capture everything? Is that sufficient?

Whitlock: Second.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Do I have discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: Five ayes. One nay. The item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY.

Simison: And for the record I wasn't in support of this project initially. I have had great conversations with the team since then, but this is a great way to continue and to finish it properly. So, thank you for bringing this forward and making it implement well.

**31. Resolution No. 24-2493: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Adding City of Meridian Standard Operating Policy 10.10,**

## **Regarding Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI); and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Okay. With that we will go back to Item 31 for conversation. Mr. Tiede, would you like to come up and make any comments?

Tiede: Mr. Mayor -- Mayor, Members of the Council, thank you for having me this evening. What you have before you is a policy and procedure for the responsible use of artificial intelligence, specifically -- more specifically along the lines of artificial or generative artificial intelligence. You have a memo before you. As an organization we feel like AI is very powerful and has a lot of benefits, but at the same time we want to make sure that we have some good side boards around its use as an organization. So, some of the key points in the policy are regards to approval, so that if we are expending city funds, especially city funds that are on our reoccurring expense, that there is appropriate approvals for that, that we maintain security -- cyber security as a whole and that artificial intelligence use does not compromise that and that ethical use is included. So, there is more details in the procedure, but that is kind of the gist of the policy. I would like to thank our City Attorney's office, Human Resources Department, our leadership team and the IT Department for helping craft this policy and procedure. I feel like it's a little bit past due at this point in time, but I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I have a pretty good amount of things to chat about, but maybe starting with -- I think -- you know, I understand that the Council agreed that we would split our operating procedures and our policy review and that policy review is typically the purview of City Council and we don't tend to get into the weeds on operating procedures. However, in this case where this is a brand new policy, I personally would feel much more comfortable if I had a copy of the operating procedures that went with this, because the kinds of things that I'm looking for are AI risk assessments as part of the implementation of -- of AI products. I want to understand how this interfaces with our vendors who may use AI and I actually think that the policy scope here needs to be broadened, so -- and maybe I will just start with I guess my -- my first comment is I think we need to look at the procedures to inform our decision about the AI policy. So, that's like my first comment. My second comment is that the definition of artificial intelligence within the policy is insufficient. I -- I think we need a clear definition of it to help avoid ambiguity and to help our employees and part of the reason is that I guarantee you that our employees are already using AI right now. I use AI now almost on a daily basis. It's a very powerful tool and I think we need to define it, so we want to talk about, you know, systems and tools that simulate human intelligence, machine learning, natural language processing, like however you want to define that, but I think -- I think digging into that definition is really important as we kind of step through this. So, that's another comment

that I have about the policy. And, then, I think -- yeah. Again I think understanding risk assessment, understanding how we are going to monitor and kind of look at how we bubble up concerns; right? So, as we are implementing a new technology -- again, this is like nuts and bolts kind of stuff, but I really do think we need to understand the procedure. Mitigation plans. I care a lot about transparency and auditability. So, I really want to go there, but I would like to start with something more positive, which is I would love to -- and this may be happening already, but I would love to hear from each department here are our top use cases of how we feel AI could be beneficial, how we could do our jobs more effectively with fewer resources in the future and just really get a flavor for what that looks like; right? So, is it the MUBS folks and folks in utility billing want to have a chat bot, you know, to deal with some customer inquiries? Is it that the police force thinks there is already a really good use case for some types of AI, but, then, we have issues of understanding how the AI itself might be looking at people and things. But the kind of core principle I come back to is any kind of critical infrastructure ever in the City of Meridian that uses artificial intelligence for me has to have a human as part of that loop. So, those are some of the things that I care about. I just -- I think this is a great start. Everyone has to start somewhere and this is where we are starting and I think it's a great start, but I think it needs to be more robust overall. So, that's just kind of a general comment. I would be happy to take time to chat with you, whether it's Dave and the City Council liaison for that department or however we want to do that, but, you know, it's definitely a topic I'm very interested in, but I think there needs to be a little more meat on this bone just generally is kind of my initial look at it, although could be with the standard operating procedures that -- that those concerns may be mitigated to a great extent. I just don't know. So, anyway, that's kind of my feedback and why I asked the Council President if we could pull it off of the Consent Agenda.

Tiede: Council Woman Strader, thank you for those comments and questions. I will say that I was under the assumption that the procedure would be presented to Council, as well as part of this, so apologies if that did not happen. But we do have a procedure that goes along with it, so we can definitely forward that on for your information. Another point that I wanted to bring up is that this is a -- this is kind of a first evolution of a policy and procedure at this point in time. As AI continues to, you know, affect all different aspects of everything we do this policy will need to evolve and transform as well, so that we are keeping up with the times. So, something we are aware of and know that it will need to change and adapt as we do.

Simison: And, Dave, I think -- can you speak to the definition that you use? I recall when you presented you said this was the standard definition from your viewpoint, at least of what -- maybe that's the government, I don't know, but --

Tiede: Absolutely. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, so we do have a definition in the procedure section that was moved to the procedure section intentionally, because it didn't feel policy -- really policy driven. But we did talk about how artificial intelligence is technology. Usually software that enables computers to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, so learning, reasoning, research, writing, analysis, we had a lot more detail in there at one point, but we have tried to reduce the complexity, because

if -- as you know with AI there is a lot of different technologies. There is machine learning. There is natural learning. There is language learning. All those different pieces and, quite honestly, some of our buzzwords -- some of them change and are adopted, you know, overnight new ones. So, we are intentionally trying to keep it at a little bit higher level, so that we had flexibility, but I can also understand coming from -- from that standpoint.

Simison: And I think, quite frankly, the main thing about this policy was to get a -- an element so employees didn't go out and start buying AI products and utilizing them without people knowing. Kind to the point, you know, we -- we can tell people not to do it, you know, but the policy gives us a little bit more teeth to do it, but that was -- that was the driver of us to get to where we were. We did have some pretty interesting dynamic, robust discussions amongst the directors about AI and what it means and where you should disclose or not disclose or go and I think everyone understands the -- the future potential and the future liabilities along the lines that made it very clear no one ever better send me something that was generated by AI and say that they wrote it, you know, especially if they wanted me to publish it out into the community, you know, unless they tell me AI wrote it, you know, so that there were some very basic conversations, but everyone understands that this has a lot more to it, but the policy was really driven -- yeah, I'm going to just put words in -- we were trying to address issues of people, you know, overextending city budgets on things without having a policy instructing them not to do that. That was the driver to get us -- this conversation moving forward. We could probably talk about AI every week with a different focus as directors, to be honest with you, with the -- with how it changes and moves and how everything is to a certain extent anymore AI. You know, what is AI? I'm sorry, I -- every time I put something in Google and -- apparently Google was AI before AI was AI. But it's definitely now something completely different anymore with the information you receive back from Google, because it's not just a link to a website, you know, it's -- it's a generated algorithm of information that it's now delivering to you and so it's -- you know, we are not saying don't use Google, we are saying don't pay for a service to generate something unless you go through the proper channels to make that happen. That was the driver of the -- of the conversation.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Isn't it using city dollars to purchase technology -- isn't that already covered in our city purchasing policy and technology use policies? I guess I'm struggling to see if -- if the goal of bringing this forth is to govern how employees can or can't purchase items that incorporate AI, I feel like that we have covered that already and, again, we -- to your point, Mayor, we can talk for weeks about this. I am one that is incredibly supportive what are -- whatever you can do to create efficiencies, improve how we do our work. I'm open to those conversations and I don't want us to limit our employees' abilities to find successes utilizing machine learning. I don't see this policy as a way that does that, but some of the comments that I hear lead me to think that maybe that's

not maybe the approach that we want to go with with the city and I -- I -- I guess I just would respectfully disagree.

Tiede: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, while -- from my perspective cost was definitely one factor that we wanted to consider. There are many other factors in here that we felt were important consider -- important to consider, especially as we visit with other municipalities, other companies that use AI on a day-to-day basis that we felt were important to have some type of policy that, you know, put sideboards around how employees use that. A good example is one of the items that Council Woman Strader brought up, which is transparency, so that is part of the procedure that we have in here. We have statements on accountability. We have things around approval, confidentiality of data, quality control -- again human review as part of what is produced, because, quite frankly, sometimes AI isn't perfect, so --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Dave, in light of some of these questions, comments, talk to me about operational impacts if the Council delays adopting this policy this evening.

Tiede: Councilman Cavener, I don't feel like we have operational impacts for delaying the policy other than, again, with any software that is freely available for people to use, it is really hard for us to have controls in place without a policy that gives us some accountability.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow-up.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Free software on employees own devices; right? I mean you have got policy right now that guides how city computers how -- city's machines -- okay. We will make sure we are on the same page.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: This is a really interesting discussion and it's ever changing and so to your point I think we need to stay in tune with how -- the advancements of AI, how the city should use it appropriately. I think it's an ongoing discussion that all departments really need to be engaged in, so -- and I do appreciate you kind of taking the lead on this. You know, as I read through it it seems like what we are doing here is -- it -- it -- it's hard to get our arms around what it all is and so we are introducing a level of accountability to make sure that department heads are engaged actively and kind of what's happening, especially with the expenditure of funds. To Councilman Cavener's point about do we

have existing policies that kind of guide that already, I mean it would seem reasonable that, yes, that's the -- that's true. That said, AI is -- it's different today than it was a month ago and six months ago and -- and so -- it's really interesting. My brother is actually an AI technology consultant and I talk to him regularly and it is a -- the -- the speed at which this changes is truly astounding and we would also be remiss if we didn't figure out how to harness that as a city to leverage that, because I think there is some real cost advantage -- benefit to the city, especially as we serve our constituents. So, you know, I'm -- I'm -- it kind of feels like a broader discussion at some point is -- is appropriate, but it seems to me like this policy is pretty simple, it's just getting us started and seems like we are just introducing a level of accountability that seems reasonable to me, but -- so, I don't have any -- any concerns with approving it as it is, but I -- I do think that -- my intention would be if I said, yes, let's approve this policy as is, with the understanding that we are going to stay actively engaged in and that this policy evolves as -- is kind of, you know, necessary and deemed appropriate.

Tiede: Council Member Taylor, Members of Council, Mayor, that is one thing that we -- as we looked at industry standards, best practices around AI policies and what organizations are doing and what other governments are doing, we have found that, again, the start simple and continue to evolve was kind of a normal approach, because, again, it is evolving so quickly and so rapidly. So many large cities that have adopted a policy started with, you know, something that was pretty high level, simple, to the point and, then, have continued to evolve that overtime. So, that is -- that is our intention as well. So, thank you for those great points.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Again, I probably echo what Councilman Taylor just said and maybe give a different perspective. I wrote a lot of policy in 27 years and during that time one of the things I discovered is we wrote a lot of policy sometimes on things that were very dynamic. Taser policies, body worn camera policies, and did we have to modify those as technology changed? Absolutely. But if we would have waited until we would have got it all right we would have spent a long time with no policy in place and I for one think that getting this policy in place now while constantly improving it as technology changes, is the smarter decision. I think there is a lot of validity in what's been said on things that should be looked at, but I also think there is a lot of validity in getting this policy on board, getting it started and, then, continuing to work on what the next version is going to be and the next upgrade to that policy.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I think it's really important to look at the operating procedures and that's because like while this policy I think is a good start, if the operating procedures

make it so that functionally it's not really workable to use AI -- like I would have a -- an issue with that. I -- I would like to see -- I would like us to look at the -- what I would recommend is that we take at least a couple weeks and take a look at the operating procedures, understand how that interacts with the policy and, then, I think we could figure out how to move forward if there are areas that need to be improved or just how the operating procedures in the policy interacts with itself, because having not reviewed that I don't think it's a fair request to approve the policy. I would not recommend that -- that we do that with a brand new policy and not understanding that interaction. So, that's I guess something that I think is important and I'm -- I'm -- I'm maybe a little bit more around the -- I do think we need to have some guardrails around some of the biggest risks. I think that's important. But I'm pretty optimistic about AI. I really want us to leverage it and -- and try to use it -- its potential, especially with like -- we have seen how our budgets are extremely constrained, especially operating costs. I can't think of a better way of reducing operating costs and leveraging AI going forward. I think it's going to be phenomenal. So, I don't know, I would like to just continue the discussion for -- for a couple of weeks, look at the operating procedures and, then, we could do this at the end of December, we could do this in -- in early in the beginning of next year, move this forward with a better understanding of how -- how you, Mr. Mayor, are looking at this, how you have crafted these operating procedures and, again, it's not that Council needs to get into the weeds too much, but I think we need to get into the weeds a bit with a brand new policy. So, that's kind of where I'm at.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I recall when I was employed when the city set their social media policy and that was very much a work in progress, because that world was changing very very rapidly. I think, essentially, both things can be true. We -- we should probably work towards getting this implemented sooner rather than later, with the acknowledgement that, Dave, we will probably be looking to you and Mayor, the directors, to come back with revisions. My organization has revised our AI policy three times the past 18 months. So, I would expect to get as things continue to evolve that you are going to want to come back with changes and lessons learned. That's what I think -- maybe giving ourselves 30 days to review, provide some feedback. It sound like procedures were supposed to be provided get us a copy of that. I don't like to typically weigh into procedures, but certainly given this kind of new and emerging technology it probably makes sense for us to make sure that procedures are in line with our intent behind policy. So, Mr. Mayor, I -- I don't want to slow the conversation, but perhaps maybe continuing this to January 7th would give all of us with our unique flavor on this an opportunity to review a little bit more and provide any feedback to Dave. If that makes sense.

Simison: Okay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?



Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move we are going to continue this item to the January 7th workshop.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to continue this item to January 7th. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

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

- 35. Ordinance No. 24-2067: An Ordinance (Calvary Chapel H-2024-0020) for rezone of a parcel of land being all of Lot 4, Block 2 and a portion of the west half of West Nelis Drive as shown on the plat of McNelis Subdivision, Book 100, Pages 13082-13084 at the Ada County Recorder; said parcel being located in the south half of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 8.41 acres of land from the I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district to the C-C (Community Business District) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next item up is Item 35, Ordinance No. 24-2067. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This an ordinance for the rezone of a parcel of land being all of Lot 4, Block 2 and a portion of the west half of West Nelis Drive as shown on the plat of McNelis Subdivision, Book 100, Pages 13082-13084 at the Ada County Recorder; said parcel being located in the south half of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 8.41 acres of land from the I-L zoning district to the C-C zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor?

Taylor: Move that we approve Ordinance No. 24-2067.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 35. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 36. Ordinance 24-2068: An Ordinance (Life Church H-2024-0024) for rezone of a parcel of land located in the southwest quarter of the Section 9, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 11.246 acres of land from I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district to the C-G (General Retail and Service Commercial) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next up is Item 36, which is Ordinance 24-2068. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance for rezone of a parcel of land located in the southwest quarter of the Section 9, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 11.246 acres of land from I-L zoning district to the C-G zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing

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

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 24-2068.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 36. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 37. Ordinance No. 24-2069: An ordinance (Keep West Subdivision – H-2023-0047) annexing a parcel of land being a portion of the west half of the northeast quarter of Section 5, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 16.25 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the R-2 (Low-Density Residential) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next I move is Item 37, Ordinance No. 24-2069. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An ordinance annexing a parcel of land being a portion of the west half of the northeast quarter of Section 5, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in

Exhibit "A"; rezoning 16.25 acres of such real property from RUT to the R-2 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 a read in its entirety? Hearing and seeing none, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 24-2069.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to approve Ordinance No. 24-2069. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 38. Ordinance No. 24-2070: An Ordinance (Apex Farr H-2024-0014) for rezone of a parcel of land located in a portion of the south half of the northeast quarter, and a portion of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, and a portion of Lot 1, Block 5 of Shafer View Terrace Subdivision (Book 128, Pages 20722-20730, Records of Ada County, Idaho), all located in Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 38.45 acres of land from R-4 (Medium Low-Density Residential) to R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) (31.27 acres), and R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) to C-C (Community Business District) (6.42 acres), and R-2 (Low-Density Residential) to R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) (0.76 acres) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in**

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

Simison: Next item up is Item 38, which is Ordinance No. 24-2070. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance for rezone of a parcel of land located in a portion of the south half of the northeast quarter, and a portion of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, and a portion of Lot 1, Block 5 of Shafer View Terrace Subdivision (Book 128, Pages 20722-20730, Records of Ada County, Idaho), all located in Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 38.45 acres of land from R-4 to R-8 and R-15 to C-C and R-2 to R-8 zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Move that we approve Ordinance No. 24-2070.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 38. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**FUTURE MEETING TOPICS**

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Quick reminder before we adjourn. It's Christmas in Meridian. Our Parks Department is doing an exceptional job with so many great events this weekend and this week. Reminder we have got the holiday parade and tree lighting on Friday and I think you all saw the news, Former Council Member Borton, former Parks and Rec Commissioner Sharon Borton, are the grand marshals, like bacon wrapped in asparagus, they are just better together and I'm so happy that they are our Grand Marshal and if we are planning to attend the parade make sure you let Shelly know and we will see those of you that are attending on Friday. With that, Mr. Mayor, I move we adjourn the meeting.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:08 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

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

ATTEST:

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