

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m. Tuesday, September 10, 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, Caleb Hood, Bill Parsons, Bruce Freckleton, Lacy Ooi, Emily Kane, Chris McGilvery and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Brian Whitlock
☒ Anne Little Roberts	☒ John Overton
☒ Doug Taylor	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is September 10th, 2024, at 4:30 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next up is adoption of the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Don't see any changes needed for today's agenda, so I move we adopt the agenda as presented.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. **Approve Minutes of the August 20, 2024 City Council Work Session**
2. **Approve Minutes of the August 20, 2024 City Council Regular Meeting**

- 3. Approve Minutes of the August 27, 2024 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 4. Adler Building 514 Water Main Easement (ESMT-2024-0121)**
- 5. Avani Subdivision No. 1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0113)**
- 6. Avani Subdivision No.1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2024-0114)**
- 7. Horse Meadows Water Main Easement (ESMT-2024-0112)**
- 8. The Oaks North Subdivision No. 13 Full Release of Pedestrian Pathway Easement (ESMT-2024-0116)**
- 9. U-Haul Overland Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2024-0115)**
- 10. Final Plat for Apex Northwest Subdivision No. 5 (FP-2024-0017) by Brighton Corporation, located near the northwest corner of S. Locust Grove Rd. and E. Lake Hazel Rd.**
- 11. Final Plat for Avani Subdivision No. 1 (FP-2024-0013) by Conger Group, located southeast of Franklin Rd. and Black Cat Rd., North of I-84**
- 12. Final Plat for McDermott Village No. 1 (FP-2024-0003) by Kimley Horn, located at 3235 N. McDermott Rd.**
- 13. Final Order for Pebblebrook Subdivision (FP-2024-0014) by Hayden Homes, LLC., located at 5725 N. Meridian Rd.**
- 14. Final Order for McKay Farm Subdivision (TECC-2024-0001) by Sam Johnson, Scentsy, Inc., located at 5875 S. Eagle Rd.**
- 15. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Firenze Plaza (H-2024-0007) by Aaron Zuzack, Browman Development Company, Inc., located at 3182 E. Mount Etna Dr.**
- 16. Development Agreement (Vanguard Village H-2023-0072) Between City of Meridian and Endurance Holdings, LLC (Owner), Challenger Development, Inc. (Developer), and Ten Mile West Commercial, LLC (Owner/Developer) for Property Generally Located 1/4 Mile South of W. Franklin Rd. and West of S. Ten Mile Rd.**

- 17. Approval of Agreement for Supplies and succeeding PO to Dubois Chemicals, Inc. for Sodium Hypochlorite (12.5%) FY2025 for the Not-To-Exceed Price Per Gallon of \$4.52**
- 18. Approve award of multi-year contract to Lawn Co. for Landscape Maintenance Services for the Not-to-Exceed amount of \$368,338.00 for Fiscal Year 2025**
- 19. Resolution No. 24-2469: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Establishing the Reappointment of Charlie Rountree to Seat 3 of the Meridian Board of Adjustment; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 20. Resolution No. 24-2470: A Resolution Approving Lease Agreement Concerning Patio Area in Generations Plaza; Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to Execute and Attest Said Agreement on Behalf of the City of Meridian; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 21. Lease Agreement Concerning Patio Area in Generations Plaza**
- 22. Resolution No. 24-2472: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Appointing Doug Taylor to Seat 6 and Reappointing Steve Vlassek to Seat 3 and Nathan Mueller to Seat 8 of the Meridian Development Corporation; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 23. Resolution No. 24-2473: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Approving City Council President's Appointments of City Council Members to Serve as Department Liaisons; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: First up is the Consent Agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

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

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

24. Years of Service Recognition

Simison: So, we will move on to Department/Commission Reports, which will be years of service recognition, which I will do from the podium this evening. So, Council, typically when we do our years of service in the department for less than this, the 25 year, we are in the department, the directors are there. So, Bruce, first come on up, please, and join me up here. Because really the directors are the ones that spend their time, get to know the employees and can typically add a lot more than I can do, but I think we are seeing -- we see a pattern when we look out here with the people that are here to support our years of service today and that's longevity. You know, I think Community Development might be our department of longevity more so than many others in that context, because you see the history of the city sitting right here and the amount of people that have been here as long if not longer than myself is quite impressive in that context. But we are here to celebrate two of Bruce's employees. So, what I'm going to do is I'm going to read what was written up and I'm going to turn it over to Bruce to say a few words, but let's start off with Mindi. Mindi, if you would be so kind to come join us up at the podium. So, Mindi has been a very valuable member of the staff in the Community Development. In years with the city she has grown and developed tremendously with her knowledge, skills and abilities. She is always willing and quite able to share her knowledge and education with others. Mindi enjoys reading. Loves to travel. Especially if there is a beach to visit, whether it's in tropical climate or the Oregon coast. Mindi is a very dedicated daughter and mother to her daughter Harley and, you know, I can -- you know, Mindi is one of those people that I think that for many years she probably regretted every time I was going to call down there, because it meant that there was something going on with our report that talked about how many permits we have done and what the valuations were and it's like, oh, no, here we go again. But anytime that there is an issue you were -- you were there to fix it with a smile and help Mayor Tammy get the numbers she was looking for for an upcoming presentation to a group or otherwise and I know that's just one small area where I interacted with you over the years, but I know also your valuable role you played in many of the processes and transitions that have occurred over the years. So, you are a true asset to the department. So, I'm going to turn this over to Bruce for any comments that he would like to add.

Freckleton: That was coordinated. Thank you, Mayor. You know, it is really cool to see Daunt Whitman made it out today. Daunt goes back to --

Mindi: Before me.

Freckleton: Before Mindi. And, you know, the Mayor talked about longevity and -- and Mindi's been there. I mean she has been there from the start. I think about the old Legacy software packages we used, old DOS based programs that -- it's just crazy how far we have come and Mindi has been so instrumental in everything that we have done to get us to where we are today. You know, she is the resource that everyone looks to for support and help. Our customers just love her and she's just a member of the family. So, congratulations. It's been a great ride and glad you are here. Do you want to --

Mindi: Thank you, everyone, for coming and supporting me and I just love what I do. I love the City of Meridian. I love the family we have in Community Development. My employees are all here. I couldn't do what I do without you. So, thank you.

Simison: Next up Steve. So, Steve is another one of our 25 year -- not -- I want to say nominees, but 25 years of service for the city today. But Steve is quiet, but a very present person in a lot of ways and I think that we probably passed each other more coming in and out of City Hall than most anybody else over my tenure here and it's always a pleasure to see him. He has always got a smile on his face. So, with that Steve has extensive knowledge and experience and performs his job duties at a high level. He provides technical support and guidance to the other members of the land development team. Steve is an outdoor enthusiast. He loves spending time outside, riding his bike or hiking amongst nature. Steve takes pretty remarkable photographs while out on these adventures. He also loves to be outside when in downtown Meridian. You can find him most days showing our streets at 10:00 and 3:00 p.m. That must be when I come in and out of the building. I'm here at work before that, Council, don't worry. Steve is one of the most principled people. He believes deeply in treating everyone fairly and equitably. These attributes have served him well in his role at the city. Steve is always there for his coworkers and friends and is always looking out for his coworkers on and off the clock. He is truly an amazing person to work with and his coworkers feel blessed to call him a friend. Bruce.

Freckleton: Man, I was going to say how much I appreciate -- no. Steve is -- is -- he is that steady -- steady guy on our team. I mean he is -- he is so fair and equitable with people and that's something that he brings us all back to at times. You know, we will be in a discussion about the way somebody is approaching a project and Steve will say, well, it's really not fair that this guy gets to do it and this guy doesn't or whatever and so it's a -- he's just a steady voice of reason that we appreciate greatly. You know, Steve is -- he is quiet and he is just -- he does his job, he does his work and he does it at an extremely high level and everybody looks up to him for support and guidance. Just love having you on the team. Seems like we have been here forever together, so -- but very much appreciate Steve and all he does. So, thank you.

25. Proposed Unified Development Code (UDC) Changes

Simison: And with that for those -- there is some refreshments out in the lobby to help celebrate. Hope you will stay and celebrate with these two wonderful and valued

employees. All right. With that we will move on to Item 25, which is the proposed Unified Development Code changes. Turn this over to Mr. Hood.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. You should have a memo in your packet that I sent to the clerk. I will be largely working from that as some talking points. I drew the short straw, so, yeah, I get a talk, but I -- but I am supported here. It's been a team effort. Emily's back there. She's been -- been part of the team at this table with Lacy and Bill. But, again, I will kind of MC, facilitate this discussion a little bit and look to them when I say something -- not inappropriate, maybe inaccurate or, hopefully, I don't say anything inappropriate. But we did want to give you a heads up. So, this -- this kind of corresponds with what you will actually see on your regular agenda later. Bill Parsons presented to you a current round of UDC changes and part of that the request was to come to Council earlier with some of these as a heads up, so you can start to think about the next round of changes that are coming. So, that's what we are here to do. Need some direction, kind of give you a flavor for where we are headed with things, but an opportunity for Council to chime in and say, well, have you thought about this way or -- or you don't like the direction this is headed or whatever the case may be. We will still vet that direction and our, you know, thought process through the UDC focus group and, then, through, obviously, the Planning and Zoning Commission through a public hearing before it comes back to you. These ones are, you know, ones that we have been -- when -- we have been talking about. Some of them for months. Some of them even years. Honestly, I don't know that we will ever get it right, but that's largely because there maybe isn't a right or a wrong answer, it's what's best for our community. So, that's kind of what we are trying to touch base with you on is, you know, as we evolve as a community what -- what is appropriate as we regulate some of these things going forward. So, I think we will go ahead and start. I'm going to share kind of some of these -- these topics that we have. A couple of examples, like they say, a picture is worth a thousand words. We have about ten pictures, so, hopefully, that will save 10,000 words or so for me, but -- so, the first one I think we will talk about is fencing. And maybe before I -- we jump too much into this, Bill, yeah, if you can share the fence examples. Generally the way things work, right, the UDC, Unified Development Code, you are all familiar with Title 11 of city code, planning uses that tool to condition and regulate projects, both residential and commercial. We rely pretty heavily, obviously, on code enforcement to, then, enforce that if someone builds a structure -- a fence in this case that isn't code compliant. They are the strong arm of enforcement, right, of our police department. Sometimes when there is an interpretation question it comes back to planning and legal oftentimes, too, to say, you know, is this a fence or not in this case so -- but at a high level when there is question of a Code Enforcement Officer saying, hey, you know, there is gray area here in the code, how have we worked with this before? That's where planning kind of gets back into the game and -- and helps that conversation and a lot of times it is a conversation of does -- you know, how do we apply this, what's the intent of this code in this case and fences is a tough one, you know, and the two things I think we really want to -- and, again, Lacy's here, she is going to see this with her team more than -- than -- than we do in planning, but the height is an issue a lot of times and the materials used as an issue. So, we really are going to try to define that better in the UDC about what -- what materials are appropriate

and what aren't and, again, on the screen you can see some of those materials that are questionable anyways and beauty is in the eye of the beholder a lot of times and we are trying to police or play referee between neighbors. Esthetics are one piece of this. There is a life safety concern, though, that really we -- you know, that -- at the heart that's what we try to -- you know, safety first and, then, we will look to the code when there is an esthetic or a question about the appropriateness of some of these structures and fences and people saying, well, no, it's not a fence. It's art. Or, no, it's not a fence, it's a trellis or, no, it's not -- you know, whatever else they are going to try to call it. So, again, those are some of the examples of where we want to tighten up that definition for screening purposes. So, if you are screening, you know -- and maybe this is a good place to just explain or acknowledge that if it's a -- if it's vegetation, if it's live material we do not regulate that. So, there are a lot of things so a property owner, a homeowner in this case, a lot of these are in residential districts, can do to screen themselves, to buffer themselves, to provide some of that barrier between various properties. When it's not just vegetation, though, that is largely when our code comes into apply and, again, you can't use boxes, cardboard, you can't use -- and, again, back to the height, berming that up, building up three -- three or four foot with -- with, you know, dirt and, then, putting a six foot fence on top of it, we see some of those similar examples where it's like, okay, that's not the intent. It's the grade. You can't build up the grade and, then, build your -- your fence on top. So -- but, again, back to, you know, the safety piece of this and I will also say we have talked about this philosophically, we are not trying to be in people's backyards. We really don't want to regulate what they are doing and I'm speaking for code enforcement here, but I have heard that from code enforcement. Do what you want to do in your backyard. Keep it below six feet. It's when it gets above that and your neighbors now can see it and, then, complain to us, that's where, okay, now we got to regulate those things, because you are infringing on some of their -- to a certain degree; right? That's not everything all the time, but that's when typically we are going to get those complaints is, hey, this is right on the property line and they built it 12 feet tall and have to look at the backside of this thing. So, that's I think some of the examples. I'm actually looking at these for the first time myself where they are affixing things to existing fencing that does -- that does comply or, again, the materials just aren't of the Meridian quality I will say and we do have some of that today, again, where we -- we prohibit boxes, sheet metal, other unsightly materials in our definition. So, one other thing before -- before I look for maybe some -- some direction on this. We changed our process about three years ago I think, something like that. Three or four years ago where we went to an automated fence permit process. We think we need to go back. It's one where it's sort of on the honor system, I guess a way to -- to paraphrase that. You apply online. It's only ten bucks, so it's not -- it doesn't really cost anything, but it walks you through that permit. But we don't inspect them. You basically get your own permit and you build it and you say this is what I'm going to build and where it's going to go and we have a record of that, but there is no real oversight of that and I don't know that that's working well, so that's part of what we are going to talk about actually with fencing and actually we are going to talk about limited duration signs here in a little bit in a very similar tone with that. So, I want to just put that out there, too, that we are going to probably go back to doing those -- you could -- you still apply online, but there is a human component where we go out and inspect what you have

built to make sure it's code compliant, rather than relying on the plans that you submitted, if you even submitted plans, to be compliant with code. So, maybe before I turn it back over for any feedback you have I will look to the rest of the team to see if there is any other information regarding the first couple of parts with fencing that we should highlight.

Ooi: I think that that covered most of our concerns is that clearer definition for us is what we are looking for. I don't know that I ever tell planning, but I tell other people that we consider ourselves to be in a marriage with planning, so we enforce the code, but they have to interpret it and so we need that two part relationship and if we get people that are coming to us saying it's not a fence, then, we send that back for interpretation. So, if we had some clearer definition it would help us on the enforcement side and save time for both of our -- our teams. The other thing that we are looking at is there is a definition that just says that the fence has to remain in good repair and it's kind of as arbitrary as customer service or common sense -- that we would like that to be more defined as to what that is and look at the safety side of what good repair means and what that means between your neighbors. If the fence is falling down or dilapidated.

Hood: Maybe I will just run through -- so, we have three issues in the memo. So, again, hopefully, you have it kind of pulled up and I'm going to just throw the third one on the table now and, then, maybe look for feedback and, again, kind of the approach we are taking with that -- with that third piece of it is really the location of that and, again, back to sort of the philosophy of we -- we really don't want to be in people's backyards. If you can do things in the building envelope, it's basically -- you know, so keep it outside your setbacks. You can do those things. The other part of that, though, is we currently allow a shed to encroach, one, to encroach within your rear setback. So, you don't -- there really isn't a setback for a shed as -- so long as it meets the other building code requirements. It's not 250 square feet. It has to be 200 square feet or less. But it can encroach and you can have one of those. One of the changes we are looking at is to still allow one of those encroachments, but you couldn't have a fence -- a double fence -- you couldn't put up -- if there is an existing fence on the property line you can't put up another fence, a dog run and a shed. You get to choose what that thing is that gets to encroach into the setback. So, that is a little bit newer option that I didn't come up with it, so I'm not going to take credit for it, but one of the things I think that said, hey, within that typically ten or 12 foot rear setback on most homes you can put something there, again, a shed, a dog run, another fence, whatever that thing is, but you get -- but you get one of them and you can't litter your backyard, your rear yard with that and all those things can, again, be within your building envelope, so if you are outside the five foot -- typically five foot side, ten or 12 foot rear -- and, again, you start attaching it to your dwelling, then, you need a building permit. You start doing these other things. We are talking about detached, standalone structures, if you will. Fences. That's kind of where we are headed with -- with some of the -- so, I think I just -- I'm checking my notes. Yeah. You will still have to comply with all the other standards in building code, planning code and whatever. So, anyways, that's -- I think that's teed up and we will look for any feedback or questions.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Caleb. Thanks, everybody. So, how would this change work for people that already have like multiple structures within their setback? If we make this change is that, then, enforceable or would this -- or would people be sort of grandfathered, quote, unquote, under the previous code or how would that work?

Hood: Yeah. And I will -- they are talking about it, I will maybe kick that off, though, and just say -- and, again, this will even come up when we talk about limited duration signs more. Historically -- I mean recently -- most recently anyways, you know, code enforcement works off of complaints. If it's been there it's not like we are necessarily going to advertise this to everybody and now you get to rat your neighbor out that's had two sheds in their backyard forever. It's typically when something new goes in; right? So, going forward I imagine that's where we are going to see most of the complaints is going forward when someone changes something on their property, not for ones that have already been there for months and years. So, again, I don't -- I don't -- we are not looking to go out and make everyone, then, comply with any new standards. Typically we get contacted when something changes on the property and a neighbor says, hey, check out my neighbor, they are doing something new and different. We think it violates code.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I understand we are not looking to create problems where problems don't exist, but I think this may be more of a legal question for Emily, but does making this change in the UDC, then, make it enforceable upon people that previously had these structures? I'm just concerned that there is an individual that may have like a dog run and a shed, maybe also a fence and, then, suddenly now this is something that someone could complain about.

Ooi: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, this is -- depending on the scenario. It might already be a violation of the UDC and this would be a clarification to make it -- to make it more obvious what is and what isn't allowed in the setback. Often that setback is protecting an easement or just giving space between properties. So, generally the scenario that you are setting up is probably already illegal, but to answer your question, depending on -- so, there are land uses and, then, there are kind of behaviors that -- that violate the UDC and depending on which -- we would -- we would have to kind of do some analysis, but the -- there -- we don't really have grandfather rights in Meridian. So, if the code changes we don't surprise people, we don't, you know, go looking to find who violates this brand new code, but if the code changes sometimes existing use -- not uses -- sometimes the existing behaviors are, then, illegal. It doesn't happen very often that we change the code and, then, we surprise everybody. It does happen and that comes up a lot with parking or kind of the more ephemeral uses of property and this is probably more on that side.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I promised this is my last one. I think why I'm more concerned about this is when it comes to something like parking -- or at least the things I remember that we have dealt with in UDC changes, they have been things that could be remediated easily. Like, you know, don't park your RV in front of your house for three days, et cetera, stuff like that. Here, though, if there are already a bunch of existing structures -- like I'm a little more concerned about someone having to comply and, then, it being costly, difficult, et cetera. So, I -- maybe I'm overthinking it, but -- I don't know. Just kind of came up as a concern that I have.

Ooi: Mayor, Council Member Strader, I -- I don't think this is -- you are going to see that come up. It's -- so, one -- you are allowed one shed in your setback as it is, but we are -- we are trying to move more toward a model that is -- that doesn't look so much in people's backyards and allows people to generally do what they need to do in their backyards, while still protecting the setback, which is, again, typically an easement or just a buffer between properties. So, I wouldn't say you are overthinking it, but I don't think we are going to see an uptick in neighbors ratting each other out or code enforcement going to look for things. Really, backyard code -- code enforcement issues are everyone's least favorite. It's -- we really would like to facilitate people doing what they need to do in their backyard.

Simison: Maybe a direct question, because I had -- double fences. Are double fences illegal currently? They are currently illegal. So, anything that's there now someone could go and address if they wanted to.

Ooi: That's correct.

Kane: Could I -- could I add a little? So, in two sections is one that this is talking about the fences, but the accessory structures and the setbacks is already enforced in different sections and so it actually is just adding clarification that you can't call your dog run a fence in your fence code. It would already allow one structure in your rear setback, whether that's a shed, a play set, a dog run -- and of those are your -- your violations for the accessory structures. The fence would actually be allowing that to be one of the options you could have in your setback in addition as an option. So, they are still separated, this just allows you to have one including a fence as an option. It would actually allow you to have one that currently -- you couldn't have a double fence in your rear setback at this point.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just a quick question. This is maybe a little bit more on -- for code enforcement. Can you give me a sense of how big of an issue this is in terms of the amount of time you spend responding to complaints about fencing and, then, as a quick follow on I'm curious with these changes maybe as proposed or some small modifications, are you hoping it would reduce the number of complaints or just give you more clarity about how to, then, proceed when those complaints come in?

Ooi: I don't think that it will reduce complaints. I don't know how many we get -- how many complaints we get right now, but they are time consuming when we do get them in the investigation side and the fact that they are between two private parties and it's normally a civil situation, you have to get compliance from one party or the other or both to see the fence, if it's not visible from public view, so they are something that we hold open for a couple of months. We have one that's been sent to prosecution right now and the prosecution set for summons is usually approximately three months before we see it go to court if they screen it in. So, I think if we had clearer definitions, better answers, more options, then, we could alleviate some of those maybe from seeing them go to prosecution in the first place. It would be nicer for us if we had those clear answers that we can say, yes, that's okay, that -- you know, we have other definitions that are holding that height is really the one that gets us. It's just when people decide that they are not calling it a fence and it's something else, it gets difficult, because, then, they can allow height to be different if it's not a fence.

Parsons: Mayor --

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Parsons: -- Members of the Council, too, just -- the reason why we show you these examples is a lot of the complaints that planning sees is the fact that people want more privacy and so what they are really doing is they are extending their fence and, then, they get very creative with the way they -- their terminology. Some call it art. Some call it a hedge and it's a fake shrubbery. So, we put this in here just to show you all the things that we deal with and that's why it's important for us to say, hey, do we have our code right? Because Caleb is correct, the majority of our complaints is when they are adjacent to a common open space, they want to do double fencing, or they want a taller fence, because they want more privacy. I do also want to let the Council know that we also have the alternative compliance process for our fencing as well. So, there is always weird anomalies out there, so we still have that option for homeowners to take advantage of, too. So, I just at least wanted to bring your attention to the first graphic here with the two homes. You can see where one homeowner is complying with -- the fence is right at their backyard and the other one has put it right up against the sidewalk. So, that's -- in this particular scenario you can see here that person that done it right wants the opportunity to use their side yard, but because of our current fence code they had to put their fencing up along their backyard, which is -- exposes their side yard. So, just want to leave you -- give -- give you some of -- some of the complaints or some of the questions -- or questions -- comments we get from homeowners as they look to erect fences on their property.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor? Oh.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Mr. Mayor. For all three of you over the years we have -- we have done this dance so many times and each time that I have seen it done I have seen planning and code and legal all come to the table and we are working closer each time trying to clarify problems that we didn't really see before, but now we are seeing. We are seeing -- I don't know what it is about people wanting to do things, but they seem to get more creative as time goes on on things that don't fit the code and what I -- the way I look at this is from a lot of history is the three of you respectively working together trying to make sure that we can be more efficient from the planning department and as much as I love technology, I am really glad to hear that the human touch is going to come back into those fence permits and from the code enforcement point you depend upon clear language that's approved by legal, that's included in planning documents and from a legal perspective -- Emily, you have always been great in bringing these things forward and making sure that we try to find a solution, because our goal, if I'm not mistaken -- and we should probably say that -- is it's compliance. It's still first and foremost compliance with enforcement being what we have to do when we cannot gain compliance with the situation and someone's in violation of our code. Would that be a correct statement? Thank you.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. I think that the intention was to introduce these things, not necessary for us to litigate or debate and so I appreciate this and I think it's more -- let's run through these and, then, Council will likely be capturing questions that we can send to you that could, then, be answered as maybe part of a more formal presentation.

Hood: We are going to tie those pretty formal, so -- I mean -- but, no, that's great. Thank you, Councilman Cavener. I will take whatever comments you have now, but, yeah, in the interest of time we will move on. Feel free to e-mail, call any of us. Let's -- we will move on to the -- what's a secondary dwelling. So, again, as the outline being the memo, this one really -- so, we have had in our code for some time secondary dwellings as an allowance. A lot of you may recall, although some of you are newer, that we looked at this as part of the housing affordability kind of equation over the last few years and how can we, you know, as one of the levers to potentially pull to address the housing crisis was our accessory dwelling units or secondary dwelling units, what we call granny flats. Been before the Council in previous years to get some idea of how much, if any, leniency there could be on the secondary dwellings on existing lots. We ran numbers. It's a very small percentage of existing lot with their existing homes on them that can actually fit an ADU on it and still meet all the setbacks and the parking requirements and all that. So, part of what -- what the -- the presentation or -- or discussion is today is just to further that conversation a little bit with the feasibility for the ADUs. What the coming subdivisions -- where they are coming before Council, maybe they are similar, but different standards for those when accounted -- when they are

laying out a subdivision and the lots need to be a little bit wider so you can fit an ADU on it, but that's more and more happening in our society today, we are planning for the mother-in-law's quarters, not just, oh, we got to figure out how to fit a mother-in-law's quarters on later on. So, that's kind of where we are headed with this code is that it's sort of a two prong approach where in existing neighborhoods, recognizing and respecting the character of that existing neighborhood and not changing that too much or you just drive down and like, well, there is an ADU, there is an ADU and there is an ADU. How do they blend in and fit in? Not 19 additional cars or anything like that. So -- but one of the things that was talked about, again, with the previous body, but some of you were part of that discussion -- was the parking requirement. So, our code today requires car parks based on the number of bedrooms and -- on the property. So, not just in this case, it wouldn't just be your -- your single family home, it would be plus the ADU. So, depending on how many homes you have already in your -- in your home you could potentially add one more bedroom and not have to provide any additional parking, because they are grouped. Bill can correct me if I'm wrong. I didn't actually put this, but I think it's up to two -- it's two in a car -- in a garage and, then, two in a parking pad, then, three and four is grouped together and, then, five or more bedrooms is the next level where you got to have basically a three car garage and three pads. So, that's how it's currently worded in code. Again previous direction was, nope, that seems appropriate. We don't want to modify that. But I just wanted to check in and let you know that's how we are operating. Is, no, you would still have to meet the parking requirements per the code, just like everybody else and, then, the other one that I don't know that there was consensus back when we got the feedback from Council and this is where -- why I'm here again -- there was some notion of, well, if you got the neighbor to say it was okay -- so, the neighbor or neighbors -- we didn't get that far down the line. Maybe the setback, you know, would be okay. If the neighbor's like, okay, yeah, we are okay with you encroaching in the rear setback with one of your ADUs. If you got something in writing from that neighbor saying it was okay or some form of a variance to that, maybe there -- we -- maybe the setback could be some -- some alternative compliance or some variance. I shouldn't say variance, because not necessarily hardship. But to the setback. So, again, not really proposing any of that. A lot of this is to clean up so it marries with our building code. We get quite a few of these where someone says they are building a garage and the garage is really nice and it looks like you could fit your mother-in-law in it and they say, nope, this is my garage. So, we are trying to tighten that up a little bit, too, to say if you have a bathroom, you have, you know, a nice patio looking over this -- you know, again, they -- it quacks like a duck. And so we are trying to marry up terms and -- and codes with our building code as well. So, again, we can -- a lot of it comes to neighborhood character; right? Enforce that, make sure they have the parking -- the adequate parking that meets all the setbacks as if it were another dwelling, so -- and, then, part of that is also mirroring the -- the building permit process. So, we have an ADU permit you pull now, but we are going to really make it, again, feel like -- it almost mirrors the single family permit. So, if you are building a new residence it's the same thing. Our processes are the same. It gets routed to the same people to review, so we ensure that it's on a foundation, it's hooked up to our sewer and water, all of those things are present. So, I think --

Simison: Caleb, a question on this your setback. What is the utility setback requirement? Because is it -- is that the same as the city setback requirement or are they two different -- five feet for utility?

Hood: Mr. Mayor, it does vary and it does vary by zone a lot of times and what the utility need is. Typically -- so, your R-15 and R-40 zones you can go down to three foot setback. So, typically that utility that easement, then, the public utility drainage easement is smaller. Most of the time that's platted with your subdivision. So, it's on the face of the plat and it's something that's dedicated at the recordation on the subdivision. But those -- those do -- the width of those do vary widely. Typically the exterior boundary is ten foot. That's pretty standard and has been for some time. The exterior boundary of a subdivision is typically ten. Some irrigation easements, though, can be up to a hundred feet. As small as five or ten. But, again, typically they don't, so, again, they are not the same setback, it's not an equal easement, but a lot of times they do overlap and are real similar, if not the same, particularly in their --

Simison: And that's where I was going to get Council -- it's like even though your neighbor says it's okay, you still have a certain limit that you are not able to get into --

Hood: Yeah. And, Mr. Mayor, I think that's a good point. I will also add to that, your HOA, a lot of our subdivisions have CC&Rs and you may not be able to do it with your HOA either. So, some of this thought process was, well, let's -- let's make sure the city regulations -- if it's not a life safety type of a regulation and whatnot, let's get out of the way and let -- let the HOAs police themselves and if they allow it per their CC&Rs what do we care? Don't violate easements, but provide the required parking for whatever standard the city -- citywide standard is, but -- that's a good point, Mayor, and, again, just to piggyback on that, you still need to go through if you have an HOA, get their approval for whatever this thing's going to look like. But we are trying to -- again, kind of clarify that and unify that, make sure it's clear what our process is and what the standards are when you want to build one of these.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just from a practical perspective, I'm curious how do we prevent someone from building within a utility easement? Is there some sort of a check in our process? Because we might permit it, we don't want -- from a practical perspective we don't want someone building something that can't be there.

Hood: Council Woman Strader -- Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, yes, so that is part of our -- and why I said it's going to really mirror the single family review. You basically have the recorded subdivision plat you are looking at, okay, where are the easements or encumbrances. You know, most of the time it parallels your property lines. Sometimes it doesn't. It can go to a 45. So, we are -- should be -- looking at those plats when we are reviewing the building plans and they are supposed to put

them on their site plan where the easements are, but we are verifying them against recorded documents to say, okay -- now, if you don't pull a permit and you just build it we aren't verifying that, obviously. So, there are, like some of these fences, they didn't pull a permit. There is swimming pools. There are other encumbrances that aren't adhered to. But, again, to answer your question, we are verifying that, that's one of the main reasons for our process. I will just say we don't have this totally figured out yet and we still have some questions with addressing. So, some of these -- you know, do we give them a separate address? Is it and a half street or, you know, 33 and a half or how do we do these? Does it matter if it's turned sideways and attached to the single family dwelling? So, we got to talk with EMS some more, make sure we are unified in that and some more things. But, again, just getting this back on your radar a little bit and we will take feedback when your thoughts -- or any feedback you have. Again, did I miss anything with that one you guys want to add? Okay. I think, then, there is nothing, now I'm going to jump to the third one we wanted to cover today and that is our limited duration signs. So, again, I mentioned it already. This one's automated. I don't know a percentage. I don't know how many are out there. A very small percentage, though, I will say actually pulled permit anymore, because it's sort of on the honor system and we are like, you know -- and back to, you know, the three E's; right? We are trying to educate people to know that. You know, this is necessary, but a lot of times it comes down to enforcement when there is a safety concern, you put this right on an intersection and it's blocking your ability to see oncoming traffic, code enforcement will step in or if businesses say, hey, there is 19 of these in front of one business, why do they have one every five feet, we will go check it out. But this -- but this one is -- I don't want to say it's becoming more and more of a problem, but it's been -- and I will let Lacy -- maybe I will just turn it over to you now and you can tee this one up, because this one -- I will just say, too, this one we have some differing opinions on what's appropriate here, so some of that direction might be good for Council.

Ooi: So, historically -- and I'm going to guess that we have someone in this room that's an expert in the history -- is that this is the one code in the UDC that code enforcement would proactively enforce and so before snowfall and after snowfall, usually around October and March, we would go down and go to every main intersecting street, all the way down, then, through all of our jurisdictions, how we have our areas assigned and go inform all of the business owners that they are required to get these permits or remove their signs. It's very time consuming. I mean when I say October and March that's what we are doing in October and in March. 2020 came along and there was something that happened during that year that created less contact and so in a way of trying to be creative and enforcement of contact and how to continue these is that we stopped going in October and in March and having business owners go in and get their permits and, instead, looked for other violations of the regulations and so the regulations have standards and the requirements that they only post one limited duration sign, but they are so far away from any other permanent sign or another limited duration sign, that they stay in good repair. Another time I think we used the word good repair. So, when we see these other violations we enforce upon those instead of all of them individually. So, my -- my dream and my -- my first option of looking into rewriting this section would be to write it similar to our yard sale and garage sale codes. We do

have regulations that restrict yard sales and it keeps people from having them too frequently or for too long, keep all of those standards and regulations that we currently have in the code, but, actually, remove the requirement for the permit and just deal with the violations of other standards and regulations that become a problem of a sign that's in a clear vision triangle or causing a hazard. So, that would be one -- one way of handling them, that, without the permit, would likely remove the time restrictions and that's where we get a lot of a little bit of our discrepancies. They are called limited duration signs. But without a permit you can't really tell what the restriction of time is. So, a second option would be to remove the permit requirement and make them all for the maximum time of 120 days, which is what the current code allows for. You can get them in different increments, but, basically, go with them for 120 days and find a way, probably using one of our record keeping systems, to either allow the business to apply for an application and just say that they are posting it on the state to start that timeline or for code enforcement to become aware of the sign and deal with it for the different things that we would do that ourselves and start that timeline for that 120 days or the third option is to keep it the way that it's written. The -- the problem is is that we just don't have the staffing on either side to realistically go and spend two months out of our time and it's the only code that we do proactively enforce in the UDC.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you. Can you -- can you just walk me through a little bit more -- like what's the process? And I mean this was a new -- I had to Google what's a limited duration sign when I saw this on the agenda. Like what is this? So, I don't understand internally our process, kind of what it's for and its purpose. So, if you could give me a -- you know, limited duration signs for dummies talk I would appreciate it.

Parsons: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Taylor, happy to do that. That was what -- that was part of our internal discussion side. Same thing. If I'm a business owner, I go to our website, I see nowhere on that website how to apply for a limited duration sign. So, there is -- there -- there is one -- there is problem number one, is business owners don't know that we have a permitting process. Two, as Caleb mentioned, it's automated. So, it isn't -- we built a series of questions. They answer those -- those questions appropriately, they get a permit issuance. Just like you are approved. But they don't have to provide any documentation on site that they got an approval from us. So, code enforcement goes out there, they don't know if that sign's approved or not, unless they look in the system or they go ask the business owner. So, to ask, three, if you want to apply for a permit and I had this e-mail with Council Woman Strader, so she's very aware of how cumbersome it is. A business owner has to go on to our website, find our online portal, make sure they know which department they create an account, create a password, get on and know exactly where to find your permit and there is three different departments. There is land development, there is building, there is planning and they need to go under planning, click on planning, go in and accept the terms of use, the disclaimer and, then, search for your limited duration

sign and now you have to go in there and physically fill out all the questions they ask you and upload your drawings as what those are and, then, again, if you meet that criteria it gets pushed out to an approval and no one even reviews it or approves it. It's the honor system. So, it's -- it sounds great in theory, but in practice we have realized it has not worked as well as we had hoped. It -- yes, has it relieved some -- some review time for staff and freed up us to do other things, yes, it has. But are we getting rich off of it? No, because no one's applying and, two, no one's verifying. So, it's actually created more work for Code Enforcement I would say than it has -- and reduced less work for planning, but I'm with Caleb, I think at some point we need to redirect this, open up our lines of communication, get with the Mayor's office, figure out how we can better advertise this and help educate people and, then, teach people how to use the system better and we are having those conversations.

Hood: Mr. Mayor?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Hood: Can I just continue on that just real quick, a little -- a little finer point. So, at its heart -- so, our sign code has been around for a while now and its current version largely, with some -- with some smaller tweaks, but I will say 15 years or so. The limited duration was meant for those promotional events, a weekend, a holiday or whatever. Limited duration; right? A weekend, 30 days, 60 days, up to 120 and we have said, you know, let's simplify that, you can just get 120. You don't have to use all 120, but you can get up to 120, but the limited duration, that's the part -- it's supposed to be -- it's not your -- it's not your permanent brick and mortar sign. You get one of those. You also get these banner signs, these flag signs, a frame sign. So, there is regulations that talk about -- they are portable; right? That's -- that's the idea with these. So, the concern, though, is if you don't have any limit to that duration that they are out there, you are just going to get littered with a whole bunch of temporary and sometimes dilapidated -- I mean some of these are in disrepair. That's not really what you want to see driving down the road necessarily. I don't know where that line is; right? No right or wrong necessarily, but I think we need to be a little careful with this, but that's the intent with these is, yep, we recognize you are going to have, you know, a Black Friday sale, those types of things. You can do some extra advertising. They shouldn't be left out. 24/7. 365.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. So, I did go through this process with a local business owner that lives near my district. I was trying to help this person -- without getting into their specific situation now to navigate this process and I found it to be extremely cumbersome and not intuitive at all. I think a lot of this could be handled by streamlining the process, talking about what you don't want to see. So, like it would make more sense to me to have a process where I think we will all think about it more, but maybe a process where

someone has put the date on their sign somewhere that they have posted it, you know, similar to like, you know, we require certain types of verbiage on campaign signs and stuff, something like that that has the date maybe taped on the bottom of the sign or something and, then, I think just a list of where you can't put a sign; right? You can't put a sign in a vision triangle near an intersection. You know, I think if we stick to more what you can't do and try to err on the side of supporting our businesses I think that would be helpful. You know, if they are in disrepair where we might take them from you, you know, things like that. But just the -- the way the process is now I totally agree it has to be reworked. It is -- for anyone that's just trying to follow it, it's completely confusing and what I thought -- the funniest thing to me, just like maybe one piece of feedback, like the affidavit of legal interest, for example. Like a business owner -- it -- you know -- and what's funny is that actually is not necessarily required for certain things. It's very confusing what is required. What came out through the wash to me was at the end of the day if you go on Google Maps and print that and draw a circle where you are going to put your sign and send it to us, that's ultimately what we were looking for. I think maybe if we just figure out what parts of the process we are actually using that might be a way to attack it or a way that the sign itself would indicate where it was put out or something. Like I get it, we don't want to see signs everywhere, but at least like from a practical standpoint for a business owner they need the ability to promote their business if they are having special events. So, I really do think we need to make this a little more user friendly like it's a really difficult process the way it's currently happening. So, I appreciate you trying to tackle it. I'm not sure if -- if we have gotten to the answer yet, but definitely we need to rework it for sure.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, the other component is the business owners don't know the setbacks for the signs, because we do specify they have to be 50 feet apart from one another. There is a certain size criteria depending whether or not it's on the building or along the street and so, again, all of that was built into the system to help try to guide them, but if they don't apply for a permit or they don't know how to get to it, it's -- it's a moot point. They don't know what they don't know. So, I -- after you shared that e-mail with me I could see this was -- I see why people aren't getting permits anymore, because I -- as a -- I know -- I like technology, I like things to be easy and intuitive and it's not and when you don't have things that are focused on the customer, then, you don't have people applying for things. So, I -- I totally get that aspect.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Maybe just some initial feedback, too. To me it's such a strange concept to get a permit to advertise. I mean I get it. I understand the reasoning behind it and I understand it's not unique to Meridian at all, I just -- it's just a strange concept. My -- my feedback would be how do you make it so that it doesn't become a more burdensome time consuming exercise for code enforcement, for planning either. I'm wondering if there is a way where there is sort of a -- and, again, how many business owners know they have to actually apply for a permit? I have no idea. It just seems totally strange. I

would think most business owners, especially small business owners, wouldn't think that they even need to do that. They might maybe find out from -- from us, hey, you are not in compliance. So, maybe would probably want to think on this, but it would seem -- is there maybe a way where there is sort of a default, yes, you can do this for a time, instead of having to apply for a permit, there is just a time restriction on limited -- I don't know. Again, just kind of thinking out loud, but I would hate for you guys to be involved in temporary sign permits when there is so many other things that you guys have to do, it seems just really odd. So, I would be very much interested in finding a way where it's more streamlined simple and maybe you are just automatically in compliance. You can -- you can do that up to a certain amount of time. Maybe 120 days is too long. Maybe we can shorten that time frame. I don't know. But it's just some of my initial thoughts on -- on that.

Hood: So, Mr. Mayor, we will -- we will -- I think kick that around a little bit more. I think that's kind of where Lacy is wanting to head with this, is like yard sales, you don't have to have a permit to have a yard sale. We are kind of watching to make sure you don't put it in the vision triangle and make sure you don't have a yard sale every weekend. So, it is some work. We are not going to get totally -- you know, we got to do some monitoring, but that's kind of where it's headed. Maybe you don't have to pull a permit, but you got to comply with the code. So, appreciate that feedback. If there is anymore comments we certainly can. I know you have executive session, though, too, so I -- I don't know how much time you want to spend on this and --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just a couple quick comments, then, as -- as we wrap up. Thanks for bringing this early. I think this helps. It gets kind of the wheels turning. You kind of tell us what you are going to come tell us, then, you will tell us, then, we can -- we can deliberate. Some suggestions, things that I would like to see maybe as we move forward. I love the memo where we have got the issue, proposed solution, miscellaneous information. A couple -- if you can, I think a couple of additional pieces that I would find very very helpful. One is this a life safety issue or is this a quality of life esthetics issue? I think for me to be able to -- sometimes I look at something as, oh, that's just, you know, to make it look pretty, but there may be a life safety element. So, being able to call that out and why specifically it is life safety or why it is just esthetics or quality of life. I think there were some good questions that came up about some of the historical decisions about this. I was looking for a copy of the minutes, but a -- you know, a twitterized version of this was the last time the City Council addressed this. Here is the history then. It gives us a little flavor for how long it's been since we have addressed this or how short it's been since we have last addressed it and I love -- in there you bring a proposed solution. I would almost challenge you if you can when it makes sense to delineate -- this is a proposed solution for Council action and here are some proposed solutions from staff and specifically some of the feedback that Council Member Strader provided, some of the context, Caleb, you provided about making

some changes to our fence permitting, giving us a little of that flavor, too. It's not just a Council where you need to do this, it's these are the things we are doing internally to address some of this as well.

Overton: Mr. Mayor? About 30 seconds.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Little history just to make sure we understand what we are all trying to accomplish here. Fifteen, 20 years ago when we looked at this what we really looked at is what we didn't want to be is a city with sign pollution everywhere and that was the term we used, because people were putting signs up, sandwich boards everywhere they wanted to. There was very little regulation. When the regulation started we needed to level the playing field on the type of signs people could put out and it wasn't so much that it was all about being government regulating what you do, most of those complaints were coming from their fellow business owners who were their neighbors, who were looking at their signs being spread all over that common area or that corner and they knew that -- they knew the rules and they were trying to do things right, but someone else decided to just put signs up wherever they wanted to. Hence, here we are. Here comes the police department, here comes code enforcement, because we got to come in as the referee of the game and say there are rules here and this is why we have to do this. And, unfortunately, marketing companies have gotten amazing at making these beautiful brilliant signs and selling them to people and they don't care when they sell those signs whether it's legal or not legal to put them up and for how long they can put them up and it's not a little task that you have in front of you, because it continues to get tougher because this city is growing much faster than your code enforcement team and I know how much work you guys have got and that's -- it's a lot to haul, but, you know, we got to remember that at the same time that we trying to regulate these signs, we are trying to keep it as fair as we can to all the other businesses that are following the rules and doing things right and protecting their rights as well to exist in the city.

Simison: Great sage advice to end today's conversation.

Hood: Mr. Mayor, I don't want to necessarily -- Councilman Overton did a great job, but if I can just sort of wrap it up. I just want to call your attention really to the second to the last paragraph. So, we will be back at another workshop on these. One of them, though, you could potentially take action on tonight, because, like I said, Bill's on the regular agenda for the continued option. You mentioned home occupation, swim lessons. We don't have time now, but we are prepared tonight, if you are ready to act on that. Not time to dialog about it now, but he has got a presentation that he will make as part of that tonight that you could potentially act if you are comfortable with that. Planned unit development stuff, kind of to Councilman Cavener's point, we are doing some stuff as staff, but the PUD ordinance just doesn't get used anymore, so we are trying to figure out a way to revive that. We will come back at another workshop with that. And, then, the last one I wanted to just highlight is MDC is updating their

destination downtown plan and there are some code implications to what they are doing with that plan, but I think Ashley Squyres will be looking for some face time with you all to have some of that discussion, which, again, has potential implications for the UDC, depending on how Council reacts to that plan. So, just -- read that paragraph, please, but we will be back with some more UDC changes here in the near future. Thank you for your time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION [Action Item] per Idaho Code Sections 74-206(1)(c): To acquire an interest in real property not owned by a public agency; and 74-206(1)(d): To consider records that are exempt from disclosure as provided in chapter 1, title 74, Idaho Code.

Simison: Thank you, everybody. With that --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we go into Executive Session pursuant to Idaho State Code 74-206(1)(c) and (1)(d).

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to go into Executive Session. 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 carries and we will go into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (5:32 p.m. to 6:01 p.m.)

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move to come out of Executive Session.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to come out of Executive Session. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and we are out of Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I move to adjourn the meeting.

Simison: Have a motion to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay?
The ayes have it and we are adjourned from our work session.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:01 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK