

Meridian City Council Work Session

May 2, 2023.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:33 p.m. Tuesday, May 2, 2023, by Council President Brad Hoaglun.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Joe Borton, Brad Hoaglun, Jessica Perreault, Liz Strader and John Overton.

Members Absent: Luke Cavener.

Also present: Joy Hall, Bill Nary, Caleb Hood, Bill Parsons, Todd Lavoie, Laurelei McVey, Scott Colaianni, Kris Blume and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Borton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brad Hoaglun	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Perreault	<input type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Hoaglun: I will call this meeting to order. It's our City Council work session. For the record it is Tuesday, May 2nd, 2023, at 4:33 p.m. And Mayor Simison is with us, but his voice is not well, so he will be joining us and speak if necessary. So, first off for this meeting we will start with roll call attendance, Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Hoaglun: Next up we have adoption of the agenda.

Borton: Mr. President?

Hoaglun: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move adoption of the agenda as published.

Perreault: Second.

Hoaglun: We have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as published. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Any opposed? The agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve the Minutes of the April 18, 2023 City Council Work Session**

- 2. Approve the Minutes of the April 18, 2023 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 3. Approve Minutes of the April 25, 2023 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 4. Aviator Springs Subdivision Water Main Easement No. 1 ESMT-2023-0067**
- 5. Teakwood Place Subdivision Pedestrian Pathway Easement ESMT-2023-0062**
- 6. U-Haul Moving and Storage (LDIR-2022-0067) Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 ESMT-2023-0053**
- 7. Findings of Facts, Conclusion of Law for Alexanders Landing Subdivision (H-2022-0084) by Kent Brown Planning Services, located at the southeast corner of W. Pine St. and Black Cat Rd.**
- 8. Development Agreement for Prescott Ridge Residential (H-2022-0058) Between City of Meridian, Boise Valley Land Holdings LLC, and Prescott Ridge Properties LLC, for Property Located East of N. McDermott Rd., approximately 1/4 Mile South of W. Chinden Blvd.**
- 9. Acceptance Agreement between the City of Meridian and Solomon Hawk Sahlein, on behalf of Sector Seventeen LLC for Meridian Pool Mural**
- 10. Approval of Task Order 5040.0200.a to Brown and Caldwell for the WRRF Biosolids Dryer Project (Alternatives Analysis & Design) for the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$298,047.00**
- 11. City of Meridian Financial Report - March 2023**

Hoaglund: Next up is Consent Agenda.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve the Consent Agenda, for the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Perreault: Second.

Hoaglund: We have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Any opposed? The Consent Agenda has been adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Hoaglund: There have been no items moved from the Consent Agenda.

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

12. Valley Regional Transit Annual Update

Hoaglund: So, we are at Department/Commission Reports and up next is the Valley Regional Transit annual update with their new head of VRT Elaine Clegg. Welcome former council member and good to have you here.

Clegg: It is a pleasure to be here. Really excited. Is this on?

Hoaglund: Yes. We hear you.

Clegg: Good. Good. Okay. And how do I advance slides?

Hoaglund: We recommend the arrows on the -- on the --

Clegg: The arrows?

Hoaglund: Yeah. The -- the mouse is a skating mouse. It -- you never know where it's going to end up.

Clegg; Oh. Okay. The mouse works. There we go.

Hoaglund: You can try the mouse, but the arrows work better.

Clegg: Great. Well, thank you. It's really exciting to be here. I am still getting my feet under me in terms of, you know, helping all of you understand what has taken me probably 20 years to understand, but, hopefully, if you have any questions, you know, feel free to interrupt me in the middle or whatever works. Okay? I don't know that -- there we go. It's not up here, so if I keep looking back that's why. I apologize. So, today we are going to go over the accomplishments that we had in 2022. Ridership trends for both 2022 and 2023. The better bus initiative that we have undertaken. And what our 2024 budget objectives are. So, the 2022 accomplishments, we are going to start by telling you -- there we go. I will be able to see it -- I think. That will be good. Maybe. Still not there. But we will get there. So, 2022 accomplishments. We had a really successful grant cycle in 2022. Lots of folks helped support the raise grant and the Low No electric fleet grant. I know that you guys were part of the match on the electric fleet grant and really appreciate that help. It would have been much harder to get that without that local match. Are you guys seeing the presentation yet? Okay. Good. Additionally, we got some capital project funding. We are expanding the lot.

Thank you. We are expanding our parking lot at Orchard where we park and charge the new electric buses and that expansion will allow us to get more of the electric buses in the future. We also worked with CCDC or the urban renewal district in the city of Boise to build transit islands on Fairview. Those are important, because they offer an example of what transit islands will -- will look like. Okay. Thank you. Now, I have got it. All right. We completed a bunch of studies. We did a public transportation study for the city of Kuna showing what it would take to provide service on Highway 69. We did a full facilities master plan for the Orchard facility. Completed a study about how to improve the bus stops through a typology that we will adopt. We did a regional van pool study, which is still underway. We are now taking the recommendations from that and developing further recommendations. The biggest one was to create a committee. We are working to update the integrated mobility plan. That includes not just the fixed route transit, but all of the van pools and all of the specialized transit that we do, as well as first mile, last mile, things like scooters and bike share. And, then, finally, specialized transportation, which includes much of the service to our senior centers, some of the service to healthcare providers and we are looking to actually make that service more efficient and offer more rides to more people. You will see a little bit more about that later in the year. We had good ridership trends. In 2022 you can see those trends are -- oops. Go one more. Are trending up. We are excited about that and later in the year compared -- or compared to 2021 you can see how much higher it is. The early returns for 2023 are even above that. So, we are not back to where we were pre-COVID, but we are getting a lot closer. Specifically on the routes that show up in Meridian, we had good ridership on route 42 and 40. Those only -- all of these routes only travel in peak hour. The thing about the 40 and 42, though, is that most of those boardings and lightings were not in Meridian, they were either in Nampa-Caldwell or Boise, with very few in the middle. Where we did see a lot of boardings and lightings were on the 30 and the 45 and, of course, those were both -- 30 was new this year, the 45 was redesigned this year and you can see that -- that redesign on the 45 seems to have worked and the ridership on the 30 is up quite a bit over the first quarter. And here is an example of how that ridership on the 30 is playing out in terms of exactly where people are getting on and off. No surprise, there is a lot of people getting on and off at The Village, but also near downtown and, then, of course, over at Franklin and -- and Linder. So, kind of exciting to look at that and yet, despite that, it's still below what our goal would be for boardings per hour. So, as we look at our service plan update we will take comments on the 30 and if there are specific ways that we can improve that service we will work with your staff to bring those back to you later in June. The better bus initiative is something that I started when I came on board, knowing that we had to change service provision this year. We have had some headwinds in terms of cost increases and as a result wanted to understand what kinds of changes people would better support and specifically talk about the changes -- the vision that is presented in our Valley Connect 2.0 plan that you see here. That vision really does talk a lot about frequency, improving frequency, improving connectivity in the system and looking to provide on demand service in those areas where the shaded areas are to provide a little bit of coverage. So, what does that all mean? Let's talk about what those terms mean. So, first of all, we will talk about how the current service at The Village doesn't reach very many people, frankly, in a timely way. So, the inner circle is 15 minutes. So, within

15 minutes people within that inner circle can get somewhere. The next one is 30. The next one is 45. And the last one is 60 minutes. Sixty minutes is -- is still, you know, quite a -- a leap for most people to -- to assign to a trip if you will and so you want that 45 minute circle especially to get bigger if you can. If we are able to implement the full vision of Valley Connect 2.0, this is how that -- that map changes and so that's why it's so important we think to begin working toward that as we do these service changes, rather than just saying, gosh, we have some cost increases, we are just going to cut service here and there and, instead, look to consolidate that service in ways that can build ridership. So, the better bus initiative talks both about -- about all of these things. Better routes. How do you make those routes better. And asks the question would you rather have less routes that are more frequent or more routes that are less frequent. And 80 percent of the folks who responded to that survey said less routes that are more frequent. And so part of what you will see in the -- in a little bit here responds to that. Better bus rides. We are already providing wifi on board. We are beginning to provide real time information. We are getting new video boards this year that will provide even better real time information and, then, offboard we have got apps that also provide information for when the next bus is coming, those kinds of things. All of those things make the bus ride better. Better bus stops. We will talk a little more about that in a minute. And many of you have heard that I have been working hard to begin to bring regional rail to this region, including what you might call express or commuter rail on the track that's right outside your door here. We think that's going to be a very exciting thing. So, let's talk about frequency and -- versus coverage. Frequency is an important concept in the bus world and the more buses that are available per hour, the more likely people are going to be to ride that bus. Fewer buses less likely. Passengers have to wait longer when you are worried more about getting to more places. They have to wait less when you serve fewer places, but serve them better. Transfers between buses are faster if you get off a bus and you are going to wait for the next one. If the next bus is frequent you don't have to think about, well, when is the next bus coming, you know it's going to be there and, then, of course, you know, all of the other things that go along with -- with riding -- trying to figure out what the schedule is, trying to figure out where to wait, trying to figure out if the next bus is coming or not. Also if we can improve ridership we can improve fare box return and the more we do that, the less we will be asking all of you and our residents for more money. So, we are going to move toward more frequency. So, let's pretend for a minute that you have a car that has software in it that only allows you to start your car for one minute every 60 minutes. That's what a 60 minute bus route is like. Not very convenient. Now you have got a software upgrade and now your car starts every 30 minutes. So, if you miss that 60 minute you can go out 30 minutes later and start it. Oh, wow, now we got a super software upgrade and now I can start my car every 15 minutes. I can probably get most places I need to go pretty conveniently if it's every 15 minutes. So, I use that just as an example of, you know, what does frequency mean to people in their everyday lives and it can be really important. The bus stops themselves. This is an example of those islands on Fairview in Boise. They are higher platforms, which makes it easier to get on and off the bus, because it's near level with the floor of the bus. They are bigger, longer, which means you can board both doors, front door and back door. They all have a shelter. Those shelters -- many of them have benches. There is a trash container. The fence protects

you from the bikes behind you. All kinds of things. And the high curb prevents -- hopefully prevents a car from running over you while you are on the platform. But you can see the signage is still not great. So, I will talk later a little bit about how we are going to improve the signage as well. So, let's talk about the 2024 objectives. As I said, there has been a few headwinds this year. Cost increases. Our wages are up, just like yours are. Compressed natural gas has gone up 61 percent over the last year and a half. Our insurance doubled. We were able to renegotiate with our insurance provider and bring that down some, but it's still up. And we have some lower performing services and so we know that we are going to need to restructure some because of those cost increases and we are looking at those lower performing services as a place to maybe make those changes. We know that this is painful. So, when I say better bus, I know that that doesn't mean that every bus ride is going to be better for every person. What we are trying to look at is overall as a system are we making the system better and more responsive. We have also had some advances. We have increased our fare revenue a fair amount with those rider increases. We have almost doubled our advertising revenue. I think we will hit a million dollars this year in advertising. With our fleet electrification those buses are a lot quieter, a lot cleaner, a lot nicer to be around. However, they have come with some challenges on the charging side and so we are working now to upgrade some of the charging. So, this year in response to all of that we are going to really improve the signage on the bus stops, so that it will make it easier -- clearer for people to ride. With those two grants I mentioned we are going to be implementing some infrastructure improvements that will help the system run more smoothly and, then, as I said, on the revenue side we are going to try to repurpose some of those routes, so that we can get more fare revenue and we are doing a lot to control costs where we can, such as the insurance negotiation that we were able to -- to work on. Because we understand, just as you do, that budgets are a -- a tough thing and we need to keep them in control however we can. This is an example of the new signage that will go on the bus stop. So, you saw that little sign that was on the bus stop earlier. On the left is the big sign that will be on all of those poles on the bus stops. Going forward we are hoping to change out all of them within the next year and a half. If there is a green circle it means that we have got a frequent route and that at least some of the day there is 15 minute service on that route. So, those are the ones that you really want, because those are the ones that are easy to use and -- and we know will be there more often. The ones with the yellows -- with the white circle are ones that come every 30 minutes most of the days. Sometimes in off peak hours some of those are 60 minute. And, then, if there is a purple circle and you are waiting at a bus stop and you are waiting for that bus and it's not peak hour, the purple circle tells you the bus isn't coming anytime soon. It's only going to come during the peak. So, we think that that will help a lot with people understanding, you know, when the next bus is coming. But to help even more on the sign there will be the supplemental information that really talks about each of the routes in detail. There will be a QR code so you can hit it with your phone and look at -- look at all that information on your phone and, then, many of the stops -- not all of them, but as soon as we can make it to all of them -- many of the stops will have bus arrival information. When is the next bus coming. And it will tell you in minutes when the next bus is going to arrive. So, we think all of those things are going to make it a lot easier for people to use our buses. They will make the stops more

visible so drivers will understand where the bus stops are, as well as the riders. With that Low No grant that I talked about, we will also be installing on route charging. Right now we only have charging at the station out at Orchard. We will put it -- be installing charging -- fast charging at Main Street station, ultimately at Town Square Mall, potentially at a stop somewhere on State Street and, then, we will look for one out in this region over the long term. That will extend the range of the electric fleet and make it a lot more useful over time. And, then, this one isn't moving forward anymore. I don't know why. What did I do? There we go. So, that gets us to the system redesign and what it is that we are proposing. You can see that URL there. If you go to that you can go to a website that shows all of the information. I think you got that e-mailed to you earlier. This is the current system and in Meridian you have got the 45, the 30, the 40 and the 42. A little bit of the 43. All of these are peak hour service. None -- oh, now it's -- no. Now forward. Forward one more. There we go. Sorry. I thought it got there. So, all of the service in Meridian today is peak hour service and we know that because it comes so infrequently it's not very convenient for folks, unless they are in one of those peak hour trips. So, one of the things we are trying to do is understand is there a way we can provide at least some service all day long. So, we are building two scenarios -- well, three scenarios. Two of them impact Meridian on how to redesign the service. In this one we have combined the 40, 42 and 43 into one service that runs all day long. Instead of those three running just peak hour, just one service will run all day long. It hits all of the stations that have the most boardings and lightings. It loses just a couple within Meridian, but those average less than two boardings and lightings per trip. So, we think that overall, because of the all day service, it will offer much more service to the residents of Meridian than it might otherwise. We are not proposing any changes to the 30 or the 45, since those were only instituted last year. This scenario does include a fair number of cuts, especially in the Boise region and some out in Canyon county, in order to reach the budget, because there will be fewer hours of service. But as you can see we are moving toward that frequency based service where green is every 15 minutes, blue is those 30 and 60 minutes and the purple indicate the ones that are still just peak hour.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yes. Hi, Elaine. Thank you for joining us. If I could just ask a question. So -- and I'm looking at this -- I guess I'm not seeing any frequent service that would hit Meridian. Is that right at this point?

Clegg: Not yet. So -- yeah. Let -- I will talk about that in just a minute if I'm --

Strader: Okay.

Clegg: Does that work?

Strader: Perfect. Yeah. I just wanted to hear kind of a preview of -- if we were to get that when that would be and what would make sense.

Clegg: Where we -- you bet. I appreciate that. So, this scenario -- this second scenario offers 30 minute service all day in Meridian. It doesn't hit the middle of Meridian where the Pine and the Fairview run, I recognize that, but at least it does hit some parts of Meridian with 30 minute all day service. As I noted the 30 -- the route that's on the Pine and the 45 got changed last year. We are reluctant to change those again, because it takes a while for people to understand where those are. However, as we take input from folks, if there is -- one of the things we have wondered is there a possibility to combine those two routes and make them all day service, as well as the -- the 40, 42 and 43. I don't know that that's the case, but we are going to watch those comments that we get from your residents and work with your staff if we get comments that show that that might be possible within the budget that we are already proposing. So, we wouldn't go over budget with this, but we know that all day service would -- would provide quite a benefit to your residents if we can figure out how to do that. And I have all of the list of stops that will be removed. If -- if you would like to see them I can e-mail those to you. But, like I said, they are all less than two boardings per hour or per trip. There is a third scenario -- oops. Sorry. We will stay there. There is a third scenario. It doesn't impact Meridian. It does impact Boise, especially where you see those -- those real frequent trips. The green ones. Makes those less -- a little less frequent and provides some on-demand service to fill in the holes that are being lost in service there. But, like I said, that doesn't impact Meridian. However, we will watch the comments and see if there is a way to positively impact Meridian based on the comments. That's -- that would be our goal with that. The other thing we are doing -- and I talked about this a bit earlier -- is redesigning the services that serve our senior centers and some of our disability community. Right now many of those are run individually by senior centers with shared vehicles that VRT owns. In doing the process, including all of our providers, we believe we can provide more trips to more places more often by combining all of those services and running them ourselves. We will still serve all the senior centers. We will still serve the trips that are being served today. There are some that will continue to provide those trips themselves, because they own their own vehicle, but in places where we own the vehicle we are proposing to combine the operators under VRT's logo and under one -- right now you have to sign up on five different databases if you want to ride. There would be one place to go. It would all be tracked through there. All of the trips could be trip changed, so if there is two trips that are nearby each other they could happen more frequently and we are looking to move to that this October. We think it's going to be a tremendous increase in service to your -- your residence. So, we have been working with your staff on a -- a budget proposal. It's in line with what you expected based on last year. I don't have an exact number for you yet, because we don't know how these service changes are going to play out, but your staff has indicated that -- that budget proposal that we brought forward to them is acceptable and in line with what they were expecting. As we move -- move toward finalizing these service changes what we would hope to do is look to improve service here if we can, but within that budget proposal and unless we hear otherwise from you. And with that I would stand for any questions.

Hoaglun: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Clegg. Appreciate that. Council, questions? Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Council President, thank you. Elaine, fantastic to have you here. Thank you very much. This is exciting. I -- I have to say I don't know that I remember as thorough of a review having been presented since I have been on Council and also as thorough of an explanation of -- of what needs to be done and what changes are in place and it sounds like you have spent an incredible amount of time going through all of this and I appreciate it very much. I have three family members who are unable to drive and so public transportation is really critical for them. So, one question regarding the reports that you presented at the very beginning of your presentation, specifically the integrated mobility plan and the bus stop typology. Can you share what -- what information comes in those, kind of spend some -- a little more time describing what it is that they provide to you as you make these decisions. I'm not familiar with what a bus stop type -- typology report is.

Clegg: Thank you. And we can -- we can make sure you get the full report if you would like it. What the bus stop typology does is identify the attributes at a bus stop that help riders get information more quickly, more intuitively, and more easily and so you saw this -- this slide. So, the typology says if I'm a very small bus stop I'm going to have at least this big sign and the detailed information. If I'm a little bit bigger bus stop I'm going to have -- and a bench. The next step up is a shelter and a bench and perhaps the realtime information depending on how frequent the buses are there. And, then, for the very high frequency routes and the places where lots of folks use it, perhaps at The Village, for instance, you would have the trash container, the bike rack, the bigger shelter and the full higher near level loading platform and so the typology just creates three different types of bus stops and identifies the attributes at each bus stop that would indicate which one to use where and they are designed to be sort of plug and play. In other words, as a bus stop gets more service or more frequency you can lift up whatever is there and put in the new stuff more easily than today. We build a shelter or build a stop and it's kind of stuck in time. Does that make sense?

Perreault: Yes, absolutely. Council President, one more question if I may.

Hoaglun: Yes, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Yeah. That makes a lot of sense. Does -- does that include -- actually two questions. Does that include review of access for hearing and sight impaired as well?

Clegg: It does have sight impaired and I will have to get back to you on the hearing impaired. I don't know if there are audible buttons at these or not. I'm hearing impaired myself and I know how important that can be. So, I -- I honestly don't know the answer to that one. I will get back to you. But it does include the truncated domes and other things that help site impaired navigate the -- the stop.

Perreault: Thank you. That -- that's just huge considering that a lot of the ridership doesn't have the capability to drive and -- okay. So, that's -- that's fantastic. One more quick question. So, when -- you discussed changing the -- that you had a survey that says that the public would prefer fewer routes, more frequent pick-ups. What -- how does that integrate with -- like parking lots? Are you seeing people say, hey, we would rather have -- we would rather have fewer routes and, therefore, we would rather get to a stop ourselves with another type of transportation, park that vehicle there or -- or some other type of transportation and then -- and then take the longer route in -- maybe into downtown. Does that affect how your parking lots are set up now or in need for more or maybe less?

Clegg: So, right now we have four park and ride lots. We anticipate continuing to use those and I do think -- especially if we get the express rail or the regional rail, we -- that system will rely a lot on park and ride. I -- other than -- other than that I would anticipate the rest of the frequent bus network would rely more on first mile, last mile kinds of connections with scooters, bike share, perhaps Lyft connections, those kinds of things and integrating with your land use planning. I know we are working really hard with the city of Boise, because they are in the middle of their zoning code rewrite on understanding where they anticipate the higher density and making sure that we serve those -- those places. As we have anticipated some of the routes in -- in your community we are also looking at that and happy to continue working with you in the future on -- on other land use changes that might impact that.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just two things. One, hopefully you will speak with the Meridian Senior Center and work with them in terms of whether they could be integrated into your network. I know we approved CBDG funds for them to purchase a replacement vehicle and so I think it would make sense to try to include them, if possible, in your expanded service.

Clegg: I wish I could remember. I don't have all of those facts in my head yet. They may be one of the ones that will continue to provide their own service. There is some in Meridian that will and some that won't and I can't remember which are which, but we are certainly meeting with everyone to make sure.

Strader: If you wouldn't mind just following up with us to let us know what the --

Clegg: You bet.

Strader: -- lay of the land is on that. And, then, I couldn't help but noticing this kind of local option to take the Lyft. Is that something that will be available to our residents as well? How are you rolling that out?

Clegg: Well, right now we have -- in the city of Boise we have a special fund that funds what we call Lyft connections and those rides will go from a specified spot -- not your home, but nearby your home to as far as a specified spot. So, for instance, to Main Street station or Town Square Mall, but not, you know, the full -- full ride, typically because the cost of it is -- is capped for the jurisdiction. If you guys decided you wanted to participate in it, it's two dollars for the rider. That rider, then, gets on the bus free if they get to a bus stop. The connection fund pays for up to six dollars. So, up to an eight dollar ride on Lyft. If it goes over that, then, the rider is responsible for any overage over the eight dollars. So, it caps the cost to both us and to the jurisdiction that chooses to participate in it and it is something that might work here if you guys are interested.

Strader: Thank you. That's very helpful. I didn't realize this was separately funded by the city of Boise. So, that's a good context for us to understand how that program works. Appreciate it.

Clegg: You're welcome.

Overton: Council President?

Hoaglun: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I had three questions, all of which have been answered already. I just wanted to thank you for a very comprehensive presentation. It's -- it's -- it's great to see that you are doing such a complete refresh in how you are approaching the changing cities. I mean five years ago where our density has changed and the routes are changing as well and I look forward to seeing how these all integrate together as we continue to have density changes and VRT changes with it.

Clegg: Well, thank you. I look forward to it, too, because it's -- it's been interesting. I -- you know, obviously, I have spent a lot more time out here than I have for a number of years and really impressed with some of the things you guys are doing and how it's impacting the ability of folks to be able to be served by transit. So, good job.

Hoaglun: And -- and, Elaine, to that point, you know, Meridian is in a unique situation, because one of the things we like about this community is we are in the middle of everything. The downside is we are in the middle of everything. But it makes it easy for us to jump in our car, be downtown Boise or go to Nampa or, hey, dinner at Eagle, what -- whatever we want to do. So, I'm trying to think what incentives can we provide our citizens to utilize transit, because we aren't that far from everywhere. We want other people to use transit because they are coming through our community or coming to, which is a good thing, but it adds more traffic due -- due to that volume. So, what -- any ideas at this point yet what we can do to get more people to use transit?

Clegg: Frequency (severe microphone echo) as people have recognized how easy it is to use, they have -- you know, we have been hearing from people -- I chose an

apartment that is served by State Street, even though it costs more, because I knew I could use this and so ultimately I think that's going to be a key. I also think Meridian, because you are in the middle of everything, if we are able to get access to rail you are going to be in the middle of that and that could be a game changer for everyone, not just your residents, but the whole region.

Hoaglund: And -- and to that point on rail, you know, it's something I have always told people that, yes, our -- our goal is to preserve that rail corridor, because someday it will happen and when -- and -- and -- and I think at -- at the BVEP session I didn't -- wasn't able to attend, but I heard there was a session on that. What are we looking at time wise for something like that? Are we way out there or it's -- it's reasonable within a span of ten years or so?

Clegg: Well, you can see the color of my hair and I have been telling people don't count on me for being here all that long. So, if we are going to do this we got to do it soon. At -- at the Sun Valley conference the speaker who was from Amtrak postulated ten to 15 years, but that was really the long distance service all the way from Portland to potentially Las Vegas. There is lots and lots of infrastructure improvements needed for that. In our case we are really only talking 17 miles that need most of that and as I have talked to other folks, either who used to work for Amtrak or still do, and talk to Union Pacific, I have been throwing out five to seven years and nobody's quite fainted yet at that. So, that's my goal. I -- I know it's audacious, it's a little bit bold, but I think it's the only way we are going to get there.

Hoaglund: Great. Thank you.

Clegg: Thank you. Great question.

Hoaglund: Thank you. And we wish you well and we look forward to working with VRT and you and -- and these upcoming projects.

Clegg: Likewise. I appreciate it. Thanks much.

Hoaglund: Thanks.

Perreault: Council President, may I ask one more --

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, we have chatted a little bit about senior services and services to folks with disabilities. What is the communication between VRT and all of the other service providers that also help these individuals with their needs? How is that going and are those service providers aware of these changes that are coming, so they can prep the residents that they work with? And, then, in addition, are you getting feedback from them about the locations and the changes? I assume you are, because they are -- they are much of the ridership. So, can you share --

Clegg: Thank you. That's a great question. And all of those have been involved in the Beyond ADA service plan, they are all continuing to be involved. Changes will be less on the passenger side than on the backside. So, the passengers in most cases won't really realize that there has been a change in service, except that there might be more service available than they have had previously. At least that's our goal. Over the next month or two we are meeting individually with each of those service providers and their boards if -- if they ask to make sure that each of them understand individually what those changes are going to be and how they will impact. You bet.

Hoaglund: Thank you again. Appreciate you coming.

Clegg: Thank you.

13. Annual Fund Balance Transfer Proposal

Hoaglund: Item No. 13 is our annual fund balance transfer proposal. So, I believe our CFO has that presentation. So, Todd, if you want to come on up and convince us of the things that we should be doing with our fund balance.

Lavoie: Thank you, Brad. Mayor. Council Members. Appreciate the opportunity to present to you the annual fund balance transfer proposal. The proposal was submitted to you a few weeks ago that outlined a memo and the presentation I'm going to present to you tonight. So, I'm going to go through the proposal -- or the presentation with you tonight and there are three action items associated to this presentation. Thank you very much. All right. So, tonight's proposal, again, is going to go over the annual fund balance transfer proposal. I'm going to present to you what our fund balance is worth for fiscal year ending '22 or 9/30/2022. My proposals to you for consideration. Then the impacts to the fund balances if you were to act on those proposals. And, then, of course, any questions -- I would stand for any questions for you. So, the City of Meridian finished their fiscal year '22. We presented the audit report on Consent Agenda last week. This is where the city stood at 9/30/2022 or fiscal year end 2022. The General Fund ended the year with 64 million dollars in fund balance. Our Public Safety Fund ended at 4.5 million and our Capital Improvement Fund ended the fiscal year 2022 at a little over 18 million. So, that's where we stand as of 9/30/2022 and here is the proposal estimated to you in the memo. Again, I apologize about the words on -- the amount of words on this document. Following our Ordinance 193 we do have the authority to utilize any excess revenues generated by our Community Development Department. That's the building, planning, economic development -- development departments. And historically we have taken those excess funds and moved them to our Capital Improvement Fund. So, the first action that we have proposed to you is to recognize the excess revenues generated by those departments or the Community Development Department following Ordinance 193 and that request is to move 3.674 million dollars from the General Fund to the Capital Improvement Fund and that follows our ordinance, that follows our practice. Any funds generated we move into the Capital Improvement Fund for future capital projects, i.e., the building, a fire station, a police precinct, another park, that is what we use the Capital Improvement Fund for. So,

again, the first action is to recognize that the Community Development Department did create an excess revenue position for fiscal year end 2022. Those are actual results and our recommendation to you is to recognize those excess funds and move them into the Capital Improvement Fund. The second action item tonight is to move two million dollars from our General Fund to our Public Safety Fund. This is an approach that we have been using here at the city for managing our finances, save before you spend. Our Capital Improvements -- or not -- I apologize. Capital. Our public safety team, fire and police, have informed us through the CFP of their replacement needs over the next ten years. Ladder trucks. Police vehicles. Engines. So forth. And we have a list of those items in the CFP, so we have an idea of what they need over the next ten years. This is my recommendation to you based on the information I have in the CFP about their needs to move two million dollars of fund balance and General Fund to that particular fund, so they can access those funds in future years, so when those engines -- those police vehicles or those ladder trucks come due, future council members have a revenue source at their fingertips to be able to access to help pay for those one time replacement needs. So, again, we had a -- a good fiscal '22. I would recommend -- my recommendation to you is to take some of those strong -- the strong situation we had in '22 to set aside some money for the future to replace those public safety needs in the future at a value of two million dollars for replacement needs and if these actions were taken this is what your fund balances would do. So, the General Fund as I recommend it would have a reduction of 3.6 million and a reduction of two million. The two million would slide over to the Public Safety Fund in a positive position and the 3.6 million would slide over to the Capital Improvement Fund in a positive position if these actions were to take place. Just to let you know, future council -- or current council, you have every right to move funds back and forth in the future. Only Council has the right to move funds. I do not have that authority to move money from fund to fund, hence why I stand in front of you to ask this. So, if something were to change, economic, political, whatever -- environment changes, you have every right to move funds back and forth. If you need to move the money back into the General Fund, you have every right to do so. This is my recommendation assuming that we don't have a catastrophe or anything like that that impacts our need to have these funds. This is my recommendation to you following the ordinance and the public safety needs for replacements at this moment in time. But just want to remind you future council decisions can move monies back based on our decisions. So, again, the little graph just shows what it was on 9/30. If you were to make this action as of today you can see that the General Fund does reduce, the Public Safety Fund does go up and the Capital Improvement Fund does go up. So, again, the public safety funds are there to help replace future needs or even we can use it to build public safety facilities, a new fire station and new precinct if we wish. That is up to future council's decision. Capital Improvement Fund is to build those capital needs of buildings and infrastructures and parks and, then, the excess in the General Fund would remain at 58 million as of 5/2. Again, I'm happy to answer any questions on these particular recommendations. There is one more after this, but it's more of a commitment. It's not moving money around per se. That one is pertaining to streetlights. So, this one is not moving money from one fund or another, but only Council has the ability to commit funds. The CFO can assign funds, but the commitment is a more -- I guess it's a stronger term in our fund balance

acknowledgement. Only Council can move committed money. So, we are making a recommendation to Council to commit funds of our current General Fund to LED replacements and acquisitions and installations. We have talked about it over the last number of years in our budget discussions. We want to make this commitment. This is now putting a financial commitment saying, hey, we will notate, you know, three million dollars to the future replacement and acquisition of LEDs. So, again, it's a commitment from today's Council to our future council's decision. Again, we are not spending it, I'm just going to -- you are going to give a direction towards me as the CFO to make sure that we commit three million dollars somewhere else -- putting in a separate fund, so that nobody else can touch it unless you tell me to uncommit those funds to a separate cause. So, you are kind of earmarking a little over three million dollars for LED and that would fall on the Finance Department's responsibility to make sure we notate that in our annual audit report and make sure that future council has this -- these funds available to them for LED or streetlight improvement projects. So, this is more of a -- I guess a commitment. You are not moving money from fund to fund to say this Council today wants to commit and this is your commitment to your future council's decisions. So, with that those are the three action items I have proposed to you that I'm looking for direction on, so that we can move forward with you. It's going to be the 3.6 million dollars from General Fund to the Capital Improvement Fund, which represents the one from our ordinance for excess revenues. The other one is two million dollars to Public Safety Fund and, then, the third one is the commitment that I just kind of undesignate and commit those funds for future streetlights and LED projects. So, again, I am looking for action on one, two and three and I stand for any questions. Thank you.

Hoaglund: So, Todd, to start out with, really, this is just the -- the fund balance proposal and transfer is basically our -- our -- our philosophy we have had in the city for quite a while to -- to save for things that we know will be coming down the pike and we can build it, we don't have to go out and ask for bonds and save interest and all those types of things. It's been our conservative approach in this community for a very long time to do that. So, there is really no change in this, other than we set aside those funds in those buckets, if you will.

Lavoie: You are a hundred percent correct. We are putting money aside, because we know what's down the future. We are saving before we spend. You are a hundred percent correct, Brad. Thank you.

Simison: Council President Hoaglund?

Hoaglund: Yes, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Yes. And I want to side with the streetlights. There has been conversation over the last several fund years about what's the right amount. What I was trying to do in working with our CFO is say the right amount is this amount for long term. You know, each year over year how much we do -- really that's -- and I see Laurelei is there in the audience. That's really for the Public Works Department to be able to determine how much they can actually accomplish, but if they want to, you know, recommend that they

can do 500,000 in one year, great. If they can only do 200,000 in one year, great. But it is more to say, you know, it gives them the ability to plan long term towards what they want to accomplish with the resources we have in that regards. So, that's -- that's what it was. That way we don't necessarily have to -- each year we can still talk about it if we -- if it's necessary. But if you -- if they put 300,000 in the budget and they come back mid year, you understand that we are not robbing from somewhere else to make that happen, that we have already tried to designate that purpose, at least in the confines of this existing Council.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Todd, can you share with us more about the two million dollar figure, how you came to that exact number, and, then, also as far as the one time replacement needs with Capital Safety Fund, you are getting that -- getting information about future needs from the departments directly. Are they reviewing or looking at some sort of reserve fund studies that have been done for the assets? Are they -- is this -- is this -- are they estimating those amounts based on an actual plan that's been -- that's been put together by -- whether it's the department themselves or a consultant that says here is -- here are the replacement needs over the next decade or however long -- however long that may be and that -- that each department clearly has a plan for how often those needs are going to be met. So, you had -- you know, we -- we know that's happening in some of the departments, but is there -- there actually a document that makes recommendations for best timing, best use and is that what -- is this figure based on what is going to be -- what is anticipated to be allocated for this year or for so many years or is this just a -- a guess? Can you clarify that for me?

Lavoie: Yeah. No problem, Jessica. The two million dollars -- my recommendation you currently have 4.5 million in your Public Safety Fund. The additional two million would get you up to 6.5 million. Grabbing a few items that are coming down the pipe in the CFP, that's where I grabbed this information. That's our tool that we use to plan. Over the next five years you have a little over 2.1 million in -- just in fire engine replacements. You have a vehicle -- vehicle replacements for the fire department -- or I mean for -- yeah, for the fire department, a little over 800 grand just in the next five years. You have a ladder truck at 1.3. You have another engine at 672. So, that gets you to a little over three million dollars. So, that's just over the next five years as we stand today. To answer the question about what documents do they use -- do they follow? I know that police has a practice on when they replace their vehicles. I guarantee you that the -- and Kris is here, he can answer this question. They probably follow a standard practice of what engine should be replaced. Again, Kris or Scott are here to answer any more detailed questions, but I know that working with them over the years in past they have a practice, they have a number, they follow those guidelines. Now, whether or not it's printed -- you said is there a printed document. I will have to let them answer that. I know that they follow a practice and if you guys have additional information -- but those are some quick numbers of why I picked two million to give them still a fund balance of

3.7 after five years and things could change between now and then. But that is how I came up with two million.

Strader: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. I have a few. First one is I always wonder why don't we have this conversation at budget time? Why have this conversation now?

Lavoie: Sorry, Council -- which -- which question? Which -- which conversation are we speaking?

Strader: It -- it surprises me that we don't -- we are not talking about -- and, granted, it's from the last fiscal. But it surprises me that we don't have this conversation closer to budget time, to be honest. So, that's a question that I have. Like why not wait a couple months and have this conversation right before we head into the budget process?

Lavoie: Again, a fair question. I try to separate the fiscal year '24 budget out of the four or five year budget as well. I try to separate the two. I -- my goal has always been to have the Council focus on one budget at that moment in time and, then, we discuss the future forecasting and planning during other meetings. I don't want to integrate the two, so I don't lose track of your focus, because we have to only budget one year at a time. All this other stuff is planning and I try to separate the two.

Strader: Well, it's hard, though; right? Because part of it is -- again, it's all tied up into the CFP and that -- at least for me like that -- that kind of review of the CFP I feel should be a part of our annual process. So, this is helpful. I guess another question I have -- or just a comment. I mean -- and I love streetlights probably more than anybody. I mean I -- I think converting our streetlights to LEDs has been -- it's shown us historically to have over a 20 percent internal rate of return. So, yeah, I love that. But I -- I have always been told that we don't do earmarks here. I -- I mean I -- I have been told that verbatim. This kind of an earmarking kind of a philosophy just surprises me to see. Can you give me another example of where we have committed future councils to any type of program like this, besides our Public Safety Fund, which is automatic and our Capital Improvement Fund, which is also automatic?

Lavoie: Fair question. The Impact Fee Funds are restricted, so that's actually another level of commitment that is above the commitment level. So, we do that on an annualized basis. But from a commitment where I stand in front of you to commit something to a project, I would imagine the last time we did it was probably for this building. It's been a number of years. But that's probably the last time we have actually asked you to commit money to a specific program, so nobody else can touch those funds for a specific program probably since this building was built. Yeah. So, yeah, we don't do it very often. You are correct, Liz.

Strader: Yeah. That just surprises me. So, that's something I would have to give some thought to, to be honest. I haven't seen us do that. And it -- it makes me nervous when we depart from our -- our typical practice. In terms of the public safety needs and replacements and the transfer from General Fund balance, is this in line with historical transfers to that fund? And can you walk us through what we have typically transferred? Has this been done before? What years?

Lavoie: The answer is, yes, I have -- I stand up here and do the transfer request every year. I would have to get my historicals, but you currently have 4.5 million in there. So, I usually do one to two million every single year --

Strader: Okay.

Lavoie: -- to ask you to fund this. So, this is -- the number one and number two are something I do every year. This third one is, like you said, something new, something different, but one and two I'm -- I'm up here usually on an annual basis.

Strader: Well, I know. I'm more concerned about the amount -- if the amount is in line with what we are typically transferring or if it's higher or --

Lavoie: I'm more than happy to send you an e-mail to say, hey, I -- I don't have that one off the top of my head. I apologize.

Strader: No problem. If you could get that, super.

Hoaglund: Any other questions?

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. The three million dollars -- 3.2 million for the streetlights over ten years, is that a proposal to, then, fund a tenth of that each year or is that to fund all of it now for use over ten years?

Lavoie: Fair question, Jessica. Robert was kind of presenting his -- his approach to it is to have a commitment of funds in a fund balance. If the fund balance isn't spent, it's kind of like your savings account and, then, we will use Laurelei in this case. She's the director at that moment of time. On an annualized basis when we stand in front of you I use the '24 budget. She will look at her resources, look at the projects, and say I can do -- or the city can process half a million dollars in X. That's her commitment to you to make those happen. This step would say, hey, we have put away three million dollars. I don't have to present to you a separate funding source, like new property taxes or new sales revenue. You have this little fund sitting there available to that committed project. So, annually the departments would stand in front of you -- I can do 12,000 dollars, I

can do 12 million -- they will present to you the value that they can do that fiscal year based on the resources and availability. If I got that right. Correct, Robert?

Hoaglund: The Mayor -- the Mayor is shaking his head yes.

Strader: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And some more -- so -- and I just want to make sure I -- I understand. So, it -- has the amount of unreserved or uncommitted funds in our General Fund changed and will that number change? Because, you know, I recall us going through it recently and this would seem to tell me we are either taking -- we are either shifting resources out of the CFP that normally would have been there that we are tying something up or the amount of unreserved slash uncommitted funds in the General Fund was actually higher. Can you kind of walk us through that?

Lavoie: I believe I understand what the question is. The amount of fund balance hasn't -- is -- is impacted by the -- any excess or not excess revenues every year. So, that total number hasn't changed. We have five categorizations within every fund. I believe that's what you are referring to. Is it committed, not committed, restricted, not restricted and that's where you are going.

Strader: Yes.

Lavoie: The answer is yes. For fiscal '22 you probably saw a shift from un -- to unassigned to assigned and you are correct, the value didn't change, I just put a different title on it based on the fund balance classifications. That is correct.

Strader: So, if I was doing like a sources and uses of funding for the streetlights proposal, are we changing anything in the CFP in order to offset this?

Lavoie: Negative. No. Still have the same 64 million dollars. We just take the 64 and put it in buckets. We are just moving the money into a committed -- so, we actually do have a committed bucket.

Strader: Right.

Lavoie: We just add three million to the committed bucket.

Strader: Right. So, you are -- but you are taking it from the unreserved funds category.

Lavoie: It would come from the assigned fund -- fund balance.

Strader: Okay. And so assigned --

Lavoie: And go to committed.

Strader: That normally would be funding the CFP over ten years?

Lavoie: It would be more available to that, because it's available to -- so, that category is called assigned for future projects. So, that would be removed from that assigned for future projects to LED committed.

Strader: Got it.

Lavoie: A hundred percent, yes.

Strader: So, if I looked in the CFP would I find three million dollars that was previously in there for streetlights and we are just moving that into the committed category or has some -- I guess what I'm trying to get at is I'm trying to understand what the impact of the CFP would be.

Lavoie: I don't believe there would be any impact to the CFP. I can -- Laurelei could probably tell you exactly. I don't have the number off the top of my head how much is in the CFP at the moment. It looks like she does. So, she will let you know how much is in there.

Strader: Okay.

Lavoie: The funding source doesn't change and whether or not she changes the future projects --

Strader: Frankly, it's all fungible --

Lavoie: Yeah.

Strader: -- in my view. But I just want to understand if -- if our -- go ahead, Laurelei. I'm sorry.

McVey: So, Council Woman Strader, so we have in the current CFP as it stands today about two million dollars, so about one million in LEDs and about one million in the underserved area. So, that's what's planned in the CFP. The funding needs for streetlights far exceeds even this proposal. So, you know, we are working hopefully on the streetlight master plan to get that in front of you guys. But even this commitment is still a fraction of -- of the future needs that will need to come forward.

Strader: Maybe one more if you don't mind.

Hoaglun: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. What is the timing on that master streetlight proposal?

McVey: Great question. So, we are hopefully close. We are working on some final maps to show where the projects exist by district and by area of the city. So, we have the -- we have most of it complete, but I would anticipate in the next couple months my hope is to get it in front of you guys before budget -- budget time.

Strader: Thank you.

Hoaglun: And -- and, Todd, I -- I would assume -- I mean one of the reasons for a commitment is because -- to Council Woman Strader's point, a 20 percent ROI is -- is a pretty good deal. I mean that's -- that's something we want to see that investment made, so we can get that return and -- and have -- have things moving in the right direction. It's -- it's a savings to the community, the taxpayers -- I mean so that's -- that's something that I think we have agreed to you in the past that we should kind of move towards. So, you are saying let's -- since we are in the -- going in this direction let's make this commitment.

Lavoie: You are correct. That is what this is doing is just putting a financial commitment by this Council today to future council's decisions, hey, we have put aside three million dollars so you can make this happen. Again, as Liz stated, it's fungible. Yes. All these dollars are available to your fingertips. If the commitment needs to change, Council has always the authority to move monies from any commitment or uncommitted situation at any moment in time. This is where we stand as of May 2nd, 2023. Our recommendation to you. If something changes next year you have a hundred percent authority to say let's uncommit. We need to use it for XYZ.

Hoaglun: Council, any further questions? Any questions --

Borton: Mr. President?

Hoaglun: Yes, Councilman Borton.

Borton: A comment and -- I don't know if we are taking action to adopt or move or -- maybe we are. I see a head nod. I'm comfortable with it as explained. Obviously, the first two are mechanics -- annual mechanics of what we do. One by ordinance and one by discipline policy. But, really, the -- the overarching principle here is setting aside one time monies for one time expenditures. The Capital Improvement Fund is designed exactly for that purpose. So, while having some commitment -- even nonbinding commitment to do the -- the streetlights, this is that third leg of the stool is a little different. To ensure that we are doing it at a -- at a -- for a capital expenditure exclusively is an important part of it. We are not dedicating funds for ongoing recurring Labor costs, for example. It seems to stay true to that principle that started this process in the first place where we would take -- we are fortunate enough to have excess funds in the capital -- or in the Community Development Department that we were able to put those one-time excess revenues towards one-time capital purchases that we know we have got to make. So, I think the presentation makes good sense and I think it's

consistent with how we have segregated and kind of planned for how we are going to spend these funds, so --

Hoaglund: Thank you, Councilman. And question for Mr. Nary. Do we need three separate votes on this or can it be done with one motion?

Nary: Mr. President, you can do it with one motion. That's fine.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

Strader: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. So, I -- I don't have any issue with the transfer to the Capital Improvement Fund or even the -- the Public Safety Fund. I -- I do sort of question the timing on making the commitment for LEDs before we get our master streetlight plan. I mean if it's coming soon I feel like that might make more sense. I would still vote for it. I think it's a fantastic idea. I just question the timing a little bit. And it does feel a little bit of a departure from what we normally do. So, that gives me a little bit of pause. I would -- I would prefer to have separate votes and sort of think about the third one, to be honest, and maybe give it a little bit of time just to have some discussion. That's just my feeling right now.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I agree. I -- I don't have a concern with voting for the first two proposals, moving the Community Development revenue. We do that every year. Public Safety Fund as well. I -- I would rather myself postpone the decision on the LEDs for at least a week and get some more questions answered regarding -- and this is quite a bit of money to set aside, not having seen what -- the full budget for this year -- for this coming year. I would like -- I would like to really review this amount in relationship to the budget overall that we expect to have coming. But also there is a lot of need still in the city for a variety of reasons and -- and this is no -- I'm -- I'm not making any particular comment on streetlights, I think they are very important. I think they are necessary. I just think that, you know, we -- we have a -- a priority list and I -- I want to make sure I understand how this falls and lists of other financial priorities that we might have that would be coming out of the General Fund in relationship to a variety of things. So, I -- I'm not ready to make a -- to -- to -- to vote myself currently at this time on the streetlight amount, because I -- I would like to see what other considerations were made for that three million dollars for other priorities that we have for the city. So, that's -- that's my thought on that. If we -- if we vote we vote on it, but I would really like to understand more about, you know, exactly how streetlights became to be a three million dollar financial priority or -- or some of the other decisions that we have to make financially.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglun: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm happy to make a couple motions and we could just see if everyone's comfortable. So, I guess for the first motion I move that we transfer excess revenues from the Community Development Fund from FY-22 to the Capital Improvement Fund in the amount of 3,674,538 dollars.

Perreault: Second.

Hoaglun: Have a motion and a second to move those funds in excess of 3.6 million dollars. We will take a roll call vote. Madam Clerk.

Roll Call: Hoaglun, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, absent; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

Hoaglun: All ayes. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Hoaglun: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Mr. President, thank you. I move that we transfer from General Fund balance to the Public Safety Fund for public safety needs in the amount of two million dollars, as outlined by our CFO.

Perreault: Second.

Hoaglun: We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Hearing none, a roll call vote, please.

Roll Call: Hoaglun, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, absent; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

Hoaglun: All ayes. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglun: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I would move that we table -- postpone the discussion and continue it on the financial commitment of three million dollars toward future LEDs and toward streetlight

conversions to LED streetlights and the expansion of streetlights to future areas to a future date in the next couple months.

Perreault: Second.

Hoaglund: We have a motion and a second to table this decision on the commitment for streetlight improvement. Is there any discussion before we take a vote? Hearing none, Madam Clerk, call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, absent; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, nay.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE NAY. ONE ABSENT.

Hoaglund: All right. Thank you, Todd. Appreciate that.

Lavoie: Thank you.

14. Planned Unit Development Process Overview

Hoaglund: We now have a Planned Unit Development process overview by the dynamic duo Caleb and Bill.

Hood: Thank you, Council President, Members of the Council. Mayor. It will live up to that billing, I guess. We are talking about Planned Unit Developments. You saw that on the agenda; right? So -- okay. So, we were asked to come and kind of do an overview of planning developments. There was a project that was before you here in the recent history and just quite frankly it was a little clunky and we will take some ownership of that. I mean I think there were some documents and some tables, some analysis that we could have provided that could have helped that, but you don't see them very often. So, we -- we wanted to take this opportunity to, again, kind of explain some of the history with Planned Unit Developments, purposes, processes, how we interact with the development community when there is potential for a Planned Unit Development. So, I won't dwell too much on that history, but a little bit of storytelling here to start. So, in -- in 2005 the city went from having a standalone zoning code and subdivision ordinance, to what we call the Unified Development Code. Essentially the same format you see today. So, it combined the subdivision ordinance with our zoning ordinance and that was done in 2005. So, Title 11 of city code. In that almost 20 years now that we have had that code there has only been some pretty minor amendments to the PUD ordinance. When I first started with the city, which is 20 years this year, we did a lot of PUDs. In fact, I think probably a majority of the projects were done via PUD. I know Mr. Nary and myself especially -- you know, we are cleaning those up for the over the past couple of decades, because we -- we used to allow up to a ten percent land use exception, which we talk about transparency in government and zoning and it just didn't exist. You would have R-4 properties that had an underlying entitlement for office or something else that wasn't very reflective of the zoning. So, that's one of the minor

amendments. That's probably a pretty major amendment, actually, that we -- that we made to that -- to the UDC PUD ordinance. But for the most part it's -- it's maintained its current form and -- and Bill has some slides and he will get into the code a little bit more. We will try to keep it not dry, but -- but there are some slides that has some of the -- the code language. But, really, the intent of the PUD ordinance is the innovation in design and I'm going to be looking for some feedback here, because I have listened to the hearings and it seems like there was some questioning of how much innovation and getting away from standard is really appropriate and should we -- you know, if we have standards why don't we keep those standards? Why would you have a PUD ordinance? And so some of that was to allow innovation and design without compromising some of the integrity of the code still. So, again, maybe just getting real specific here, I think that -- that the table -- I think lesson learned. Going forward we can have kind of a side-by-side comparison of what they are asking for relief from in the zoning ordinance, whether it be setbacks or lot sizes or whatever, and maybe things that they are doing that up the game from the baseline standard and that trade off that kind of we -- as we see it anyways. But, again, one of the other purposes of the PUD ordinance is to protect kind of your natural features, historical features, those things that, you know, just letting out a -- I will use the term cookie cutter subdivision, maybe goes right through something that should be preserved and protected and if you can make a wider open space around that, so you can have smaller lot sizes that protects a cultural feature that is important to our community. A lot of our PUDs are used in mixed-use context. Not a whole lot of developers will do a PUD just for an R-8 subdivision. There is really not a purpose. But when you are trying to integrate uses, that's one of the purposes. And, then, cost-effective services. So, as an example, if you can put all those sewer connections closer to somewhere you don't have to run that -- that trunk then further to the other side. If it's open space on the far end say, you may not have to run those services. Or the roads. You don't have to construct as much roadway. So, those are some of the things where if you can design a project that saves the general public then -- and -- and us from having to provide those services in a more costly manner, those are the things we encourage or we would encourage a developer to consider looking at a PUD. Today -- so, I was talking about 20 years ago. Today that -- that -- you know, a lot of our projects are moving towards, anyways, in-fill. That is also something that's in the code. But historically it hasn't been used that way. It has been used more on your larger 80 acre mixed-use project. Clustering of development. You saw a little bit of that before, but, you know, that is -- again, you kind of throw the zoning minimum lot sizes and setbacks sort out the door and say, you know what, I'm grouping everybody -- here your overall densities is the same, but you cluster them closer together over your acreage. Again, I have talked about relief from dimensional standards. The integration of uses. So, again, typically in a mixed-use project. And, then, same kind of thought. There is a master plan area. The process -- I will just briefly -- the process is similar, if not the same as our other -- it's not like you have to go through special hoops or get -- get streamlined or anything. It really is very -- very standardized. But the -- the part of that I guess that I would highlight is there is typically a little bit more of a conversation with staff, because there is a little bit of that -- okay, you want to cluster your lots? That's not typical in R-8. What are you giving in return? Oh, we think this is a good horse trade, if you will, for lack of a better way to explain it.

So, there is usually more than one pre-app. So, we are meeting with an applicant usually and they try something -- hey, try this on. What do you think of this, what do you think of that type of a thing. So, the process overall is essentially the same. Usually there is a little bit more consultation. And, then, the rest of the agenda tonight is going to be, you know, again, Bill kind of walking through the code a little bit more and some highlights and some examples of the PUDs and, then, we will circle back at the end -- and this is where I -- I really do want some of that feedback. Again, some of the things I heard. I don't know if that was for that project. If -- again, I will use transparency, because it can be confusing to the public; right? I mean if they are looking at a project and it says medium density on the future land use map and usually that's R-8 and why are you doing this and -- that's an R-8 lot, that's an R-15 lot. How come you are -- you know. So -- yeah. Some ways maybe we can improve the ordinance. As I -- as I transition to Bill and -- and he will cover this a little bit, but our UDC focus group already has this on the agenda even before that project, because, again, when I started with the city we were seeing a ton of these and now we get them so infrequently -- we were already thinking about what -- what do we need to change? How do we -- do we remove it and just take it off of the books, because no one is using it? No. Let's -- how -- how can we make it better, more user friendly for everybody, so it really is a tool in our toolbox. But if we don't go there, the change could be to potentially take it out of Title 11. So, Bill.

Nary: Mr. President. Before Bill I could maybe give a little bit of additional context. I think Caleb really hit it on the head. I mean part of the reason why you don't see this very much is when we had this done early in the early 2000s, before the UDC -- and the UDC sort of then blended into the UDC in '05, it was an attempt to be creative. It was an attempt to do something where our code -- before the UDC was really clunky and really cumbersome to deal with and the PUD was the work around. But as Caleb said, what we found is it wasn't as transparent and there were things like the Selway Apartments over on McMillan that caused a great deal of uproar, because it was unclear what you could put there and so -- so, it was almost ahead of its time, because it was -- it was a creative tool and, then, the UDC gets passed and virtually 75 to 90 percent of the development are 20, 40, 60, 80, 120 acres that are flat and square and they are -- and they have section line roads and they are fairly easy to develop farmland and so you -- you don't need a creative tool when you have 70 or 80 acres to develop. You have got room to do different things. So, it was almost ahead of its time, because it did -- it wasn't really necessary. And, then, when we got some pushback on ones that had been approved and how maybe they weren't quite as transparent, that became the message, this hasn't been as well favored and, again, you have 40 acres, why don't you try to figure it out within the confines of the code now and once we passed the UDC in '05 there wasn't a great deal of desire to deviate very much and so that kind of became the norm. So, that's a lot of the background as to why you didn't see it much, why we had some issues with it that we have tried to clean up, but I think it's better and why now as we are now developing further to the south, which is less square, less flat, less -- less of what the north side of Meridian is like, you know, maybe that is the reason we are having the conversation. There may be more ability or need to do it, because of the

way the land breaks out further south than it has been in the north. So, that provides some context.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Thank you, Bill. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. If you don't mind I just have a couple thoughts I wanted to get your feedback on and try to understand a little more and I just want to say I really appreciate you guys bringing this back and having the discussion. The table would be really huge for -- at least for me, maybe others. I guess I'm getting a little lost. So, if we are -- if we are using this to protect historic features or environmental features, that feels easy. Okay. That -- that feels easier. I think I'm getting hung up on what innovative design means and what that bar should be. So, like I feel like we should be forward thinking enough that street oriented design should be probably what we expect out of a lot of mixed-use developments and I'm not sure that that bar is what's innovative anymore. Like I -- I don't know. I think about innovative. To me it's like -- I have heard of a couple of developments in other cities where there are no cars in the middle of the development; right? Like they have cars maybe on the outside of the development and shared vehicles and that -- like that's really innovative; right? Like that -- you would say for sure I could hang my hat that that's innovative. That's totally different. We have got a car based community. We have never seen anything like that; right? And so I -- and I'm not saying that's what we should do, but I'm just -- I'm trying to point out -- like I feel like what the bar for what innovative means is what we need to define, maybe to work on a -- a vision together and I hope that that UDC focus group could really help us, too. And, then, my other I guess concern or just thing I want to understand is -- I feel like instead of protecting features we have now used this to say if we feel a developer has been hamstrung because of the existing features of the property that they have acquired, this relieves them from the characteristics of something that they have already purchased and so that's where I'm kind of -- am I off base on that? Is that the purpose of how this was meant to be used? So, if you could just reflect on that -- sorry -- stream of consciousness I just sent toward you, Caleb. But that -- those are some of the thoughts that have been keeping me up about this.

Hood: Yeah. I will let Bill respond, too. I -- certainly I don't -- it wasn't the intent is that there is a hardship on the property and -- and, therefore, you should be able to do something like this. I think to your first comment or request -- and -- and I think this is where -- and this is going to be difficult I think almost by definition if it's -- if you are defining innovation, is it? I mean if you can define it, I -- you know. And -- and is it innovative for Idaho or is it innovative just in general? You know, is it -- is it different than what we typically get? So, I think there is a challenge there and that will be our challenge I think going forward. I'm going to ask Bill just to maybe go forward a little bit. And here is where I will -- I'm kind of punting your question a little bit. Can you go forward a couple more slides. I want to -- so, there is -- there is findings and discretion; right? And that's where I guess I would challenge us as staff and you as the decision makers to define that sort of on a case-by-case basis. I don't think we are going to get

there fully defining it in code what innovation means. I think to me -- and it's going to vary a little bit, too; right? I think we can help put some sideboards on that and get people thinking outside the box a little bit and maybe even to those -- and I will just say we don't have a whole lot of natural, cultural, historical resources that, you know, are just dying to be protected or preserved. But even our irrigation facilities that go through these there are opportunities I think to embrace those things and design around them and do things that are a little bit different. But, you know what, I'm putting the front of the house on this creek or whatever and parking actually is on the next block over, because we want as many homes as possible to have this backyard or front yard or whatever it looks like. So, I think there are some ways to latch on to some of the limited, again, natural or cultural, historical resources we have. But, again, on this that discretion -- and, again, I'm not -- not I'm not trying to get off the hook from answering your question, but it's a hard one. We can get real philosophical about -- about what that means and I think there is a lot of discretion here and these are the guiding principles that I think we will be looking at as we get into it with our -- our focus group a little bit more. But, again, back to your -- your kind of initial question. I think historically maybe not so much recently, because we just haven't seen a lot of them. I mean Bill would probably know the numbers better than I do. I don't think we have processed but a handful of them over the last decade. I mean we really just don't get a lot of them anymore. Developers know what can go through and it's straightforward. It's black and white. This is a little more squishy, so --

Parsons: Yeah. To your point we haven't done more than a handful in the 20 years or so that -- that we have had this ordinance in effect and, to be honest with you, we have tried to steer people away from it, because a lot of times they are wanting to use it as a tool for density, not innovative design. So, that's why you see so few PUDs from -- from staff is because we are like you are not meeting the intent of what we want. It's -- if you are just wanting to do higher density just because you want multi-family, that's not the purpose of this code. You can do a comp plan change. You can do something else. You can change the code. But just to get more density -- get -- get density sake isn't what the PUD is for and so a lot of developers have -- have steered away from that. I can tell you with my interactions with the UDC focus group -- and to Caleb's point is right now we want to make it more flexible, so that we can get to those innovative concepts that we want. You are right, design is different to many different people. What might be great to one Council Member, one of you might not -- might disagree, don't like it at all. It's similar to that project that we recently had, some of you felt that it was innovative and it was different and they weren't using that as an excuse to get out of something and some of you did and that's -- going to Caleb's point, that's the discretion that you have as part of the PUD process. But I can tell you -- and you -- you can recall during that hearing we did meet with the applicant for over a year trying to fine tune that. I would also mention to the Council that as part of a PUD the applicant has to pay for the number of deviations that they are asking to get relief from. So, there are checks and balances that they have to -- and that's where to -- to Caleb's point we need to be more transparent and also get some of those design concepts and those tables to your point showing what they are deviating from, so that you guys understand what -- what they are asking for as part of that PUD process.

Strader: Council President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think part of the purpose of the table and what it could kind of get at is I think it could at least indicate to us hypothetically, without the PUD process, here is the density they could have achieved and with the PUD process here is the density that they are achieving -- at least to give us some sort of -- more apples to apples. I mean it's hypothetical, but at least it would be something where we could measure, okay, here is how much of a relief or enhancement of density we are trading off and, then, ask ourselves a question what innovation am I getting in return and I -- I totally get it. It's hard to define, like innovation, but maybe what would be interesting, not like for this meeting, but I would love to hear, you know, here are some examples, Liz, of things we have seen across the country that are really innovative or even here -- to even like -- like hive mind this, you know, UDC focus group and ask the question like, you know, what do we think is super innovative that we haven't seen that we want to see more of and just like honestly more of a brainstorming on where is the bar nationally and for here on what -- what innovative means. Because, I don't know, I sort of see something like a street oriented design and I sort of go, well, shouldn't that be more what we expect? So, that -- I don't know. And I don't mean to hog the mic, but that -- that was kind of where I was getting hung up.

Parsons: And I think that's what some of the discussion that we are having today -- and that -- that is a requirement of a PUD, to be honest with you. So, on this next slide that I have in front of you it kind of -- it doesn't highlight all the specifics, but I wanted to at least just put it in layman's terms on -- on what it is and so really in the code of planning and development can be developed in any district. So, regardless, it can be for a commercial sub, it can be mixed-use, it can be a residential. The last couple ones that this body has approved they have been residential in nature and they have been for relief to setbacks and to allow for multiple types and as part of those approvals there was a mix of residential types like you see in bullet number three. There were deviations to setbacks, which is pretty typical for what we see, but also if -- if you note here along the periphery are where it's adjacent to other developments, it needs to meet the setbacks of the underlying zoning district. So, that's something to -- to point out here. It's -- it's really more internal to the site, not along the adjacent -- when it's adjacent to a subdivision or along a street. Again, there is certain uses to Caleb's point under the old -- some of the old PUDs out there, there were use exceptions that were allowed. That's still allowed under the current standards. Don't see that a lot. And, then, again, as part of the projects we get that vehicular and pedestrian circulation plan for you and we include that as part of the packet. So, you can see that the development is being interconnected with both of those multimodal connections with the surrounding developments as well, because that is an important -- to your point that goes back to those traditional neighborhood concepts where you have buildings fronting the street, you don't see garage dominated, you don't see cars in driveways, it's meant to be internal to the site and away from the street, because you want it to be inviting and

friendly and, then, of course, it encourages clustering of buildings and the benefit of that is because you don't have the big yards, but you get the bigger open space, so it becomes more usable. Or you save that important natural feature and integrate it -- integrate that into the development. Now, the recent changes that we have had to this section is the -- the old code used to require a minimum of ten percent for PUDs and now that we have updated our open space and amenity standards that number has increased as well. So, we took that requirement out, because we needed it to align with the current changes that we have had. So, that was the other benefit back in -- under the previous ordinance or before we updated our open space that you had to provide a minimum of ten percent open space. But now we get that with every development. So, that's kind of -- going back to Caleb's opening remarks, that's why people weren't doing PEDs, because we have changed so many other sections of code and they had plenty of land to do it. They are like, well, we can just do a typical R-8 subdivision and get all the open space and amenities and still meet the codes and not have to worry about meeting all of these other more stringent requirements just to -- and jump through more hoops and pay more money to get something that we can already get that's predictable and easy to get through the process. And, then, also as like anything, with a -- a subdivision or annexation, there is -- there is important -- there is findings you have to make. So, that's the other key. So, Caleb touched on the discretion, but there is also findings that you have to make that go along with that discretionary action that you take and so that's just as important. Again, last we discussed on the previous project, you know, the purpose that's -- that's something when we meet with applicants early on in the process we are like go to this section and see how you are meeting this. Again to Caleb's point, there is not a lot of historic features, but I have touched on a couple projects that did have some historical significance and, essentially, they take a photo and remove the building and they might just put a plaque in the open space to reference it in the future, so they know -- so, that the -- the neighborhood knows there is -- there was an historic barn on the site and -- and what it meant to the community. So, we don't really have a lot of specific standards in code to preserve historic features either, so that's something that we may want to discuss with the UDC focus group as well as we -- we move on to that second round of UDC changes. And, then, Caleb touched on a lot of it. But, again, integrate it -- you know, innovation is -- innovative design, again, trying to hit that density, if you will, is -- is very critical and, then, the other important part is the mix of residential types. We want to make sure that the neighborhoods are inclusive and integrated. I know this body has always -- you see when we have multi-family adjacent to single family it doesn't always go well for us and we tend to have a lot of public uprising of that and they are -- they are at the hearings testifying that they don't want that type of development next to them. But in -- in my -- as a professional planner that's something that you want. If you get something on -- on the books and you are opening -- having an open dialogue as part of the public hearing process and people seeing that it is integrated and part of the overall development, I think they will embrace it more, because we are using a tool that allows everyone to have an inclusive neighborhood and, then, still have those traditional neighborhood designs and still share that amenity and open space and create those sense of neighborhoods. Whereas if it is disjointed -- if you have a multi-family coming in afterwards, then, it does seem like

nimbyism and people are being more adversarial than trying to welcome neighbors to the community.

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. So, I guess my expectation of this was more along the lines of if an applicant is not capable of meeting the future land use map designation because of limitations that are created outside of their control and that that's the baseline for which a PUD is considered, is that -- that's not the case? And I was always under the assumption that that's kind of where we start from and then -- and, then, the other elements that are in -- under the purpose section here would -- would be additional considerations, so -- so -- so, that is not a factor or that is a factor in whether the applicant initially considers a PUD?

Parsons: Council Woman Perreault, it's -- it's not the only factor. I mean it's -- certainly when they come and talk to us at the beginning of the process, if that's their justification of why they think they can go down that road, we are like -- we are open to it, but still tell us how you are doing this or meeting the intent here. A lot of -- some of the PUDs that were approved under the old ordinance -- and even the current ordinance, they were still square pieces of property, flat ground. There were no underlying constraints that would prevent them from complying with code. They just -- again, they had a vision for their property, they thought it was innovative design, and so they looked at this, they saw that it worked and they moved forward and ultimately the Council agreed and approved the project. So, that's not the only factor that goes into it. But as we continue to grow, as land becomes less and less available, we will start -- our -- our code -- you will see this on some upcoming projects that will be coming before you. Without going through that PUD process we may have to do three or four alternative compliance requests to get them to -- to do an in-fill project and that's not what alternative compliance is for in my opinion. If we have to do all of these different staff level variances to get you the same result, we probably should have pointed them to a PUD to -- to do the in-fill. So, that's why it's critical for us to really try to define this a little bit better, really explain when it's -- when it's applicable, build on that and, then, remove things that may be obstacles, so that this can be a more flexible tool for you to understand, for staff to understand, for an applicant to understand, for residents that come to a hearing and see it on the agenda to understand that it -- it's meant as a -- a tool for innovation, flexibility, not to get out of the code requirement. But you hear that all the time. Whenever you hear -- the -- the public hears alternative compliance or a PUD, the first thing they go and first thing they say to you is they are trying to get out of code requirements. That is not the case. They are doing something different than -- and the code allows them to do it within reason and, then, again, it's a case-by-case basis. It's not you setting a precedent, it's you looking at that specific project and you are saying, yes, it meets this particular finding and we find that in the affirmative and you support it. And, then, we move on and we go on to the next project.

Hoaglund: Councilman Overton.

Overton: That was my first PUD that we approved a few weeks ago and thank you so much for -- for doing what you have done to try to clear this up. I think the charts will help. But when I look at part of the code and I see the amount of discretion written into a PUD and I see innovative design that creates a visually pleasing and cohesive pattern of development, I think about six individuals sitting up here interpreting that, we are always going to be a little bit off and different, because that's pretty broad and I think we are so used to having standards that say exactly what we mean and don't leave as much leeway as this PUD does, but I understand the need and I think we are going to -- as you say, I think we are going to see more of them, because we are going to have so many more in-fill projects as we continue to fill up this city coming forward. But thank you very much for what you have done. I think going with it is right.

Hood: Mr. President. And as we try to wrap up here I do want to -- we had some next steps and -- and I don't -- I don't want to drop this bomb and, then, drop the mic and we are out type of a thing. But I did want to at least make you aware that we are in conversations right now about having something -- I will kind of try to paint a picture this way. So, our -- our PUD ordinance as amended and we will do some of these things we talked about even today and whatever else the focus group can help us kind of further define this while defining innovation and -- and some of those things, so you are not all six having a little bit more of sideboards on that and -- but I -- I see our current PUD ordinance being used mostly for in-fill kind of as we all have said and more and more of that over time. We are also kind of simultaneously working with a developer on coming up with a new ordinance that really would be for those last remaining 40, 80, 120 acre projects and this would be where they write their own zoning code. I mean that's kind of the way that -- that this goes as it is a true planned unit development where it's -- yeah, we see that you have code, city. Here is our codes. And -- and some of that is -- you know, again, they are standalone. I won't say it's Hidden Springs, but it's a standalone community where really they are addressing everything that that community needs and they are saying here is the rules that it's going to -- that -- that we are playing by, here is the zoning, here is all that. Still consistent with the future land use map; right? Still consistent with the overall vision, but the way they are doing that is some of the administrative oversight they are taking on themselves to some degree. We don't have it totally crafted yet, but I wanted to just let you know there is sort of a -- and I don't even want to call it companion, but it's -- it's -- it's very similar in the innovation kind of category, but, again, meant for something that is of multiple uses and over the years and decades usually for these projects they are going to have a commercial component. They are going have a multi-family component, they are going to have these other components that you are going to approve them year one, you may not see those until year ten, but they are on the books, transparent still; right? It's happened. There is still a record. There is a record of it happening, but they aren't coming back to you and now the nimbyism, if you will, exists because they have got that approval on the books and there is these standards. So, we can talk about that a little bit if you want. It's still in its infancy stages. Again, I don't have a draft or anything. We have seen some drafts. We aren't quite there. But I just wanted to let you know there is another one where it's not -- doesn't fit nicely in a box. Harris Ranch, just to give you kind of an idea, that they -- they have a similar thing. If you look at the city of Boise's code they allow this PDD I

think is what they call it or -- or something along those lines. But they set up specific districts. Yeah. So, these districts, again, have their own kind of code, you reference it on -- in the city zoning and it's consistent with the future land use map and all that, but it is a separate handbook, basically, of -- of that project and that's -- that's the ordinance basically. So, again, I wasn't trying to drop a bomb, but letting you know that's likely -- you will likely see that here -- maybe even this calendar year sometime with -- with some additional PUD changes, so -- thank you and feel free to reach out to us at any time, you know, with -- with anymore questions or feedback. Suggestions are always appreciated.

Hoaglund: Thank you, Caleb and Bill. Yeah. And I think one of the things you have heard is, you know, the charts and comparisons to make it easier when we have those tables, because ultimately the decision is up to the Council whether or not is it innovative, do we want to accept that or -- or not. So, that's -- that's where the buck will stop. So, thank you for that.

15. Comprehensive Plan Policy Updates

Hoaglund: Up next we have the Comprehensive Plan policy updates and this time we have the brain and the brawn with Caleb and Brian. And, Brian, are you kicking this one off or is that going to be Caleb?

McClure: Council -- sorry. Council -- I ate it. Council President, I will kick it off.

Hoaglund: Go ahead.

McClure: So, Caleb and I are here tonight to talk to you about Comprehensive Plan policy updates. These are the goals, objectives, and action items in the adopted Comprehensive Plan. Briefly this is an overview of the presentation. We will cover some background, Comprehensive Plan policies with updates from staff. Comprehensive Plan policies with recommended minor revisions. Comprehensive Plan policy staff would like to discuss with Council. Related staff projects and next steps. Most of these slides were covered in the memo and the information is for Council. Staff would like to spend some time discussing some specific policies with Council towards the end of the presentation. The City adopted the Comprehensive Plan in 2019 and which included all the goals, objectives, and action items and otherwise known as the policies. Adoption did not include priorities for these policies. In September of 2020 the city adopted an update to the plan. This included Council supported policies, either with a time frame to complete or assigned as ongoing. Departments were also identified for leader support. It's now been several years since we assigned those priorities and it seemed appropriate to update Council on progress for the ones identified as high or very high. In total there are 53 policies that are high or very high. Those were included in the memo as attachment one. There is no request for you unless Council has questions or would like additional follow up on these. That can also be provided offline if you still need some time to process or after considering some of the discussion we would like to have with you later. We will move on to policies, proposed revisions,

unless there is a question here. Forty-two policies have proposed minor revisions. Some of these are just text changes to reflect department structures, priority level or very minor text corrections. Those are included as attachment two in the memo. The changes are very minor for transparency. Staff would like to move forward with a formal adoption to incorporate these into the Comprehensive Plan. Again, we can revisit this later if you have any questions or additional direction. The next slide, if there are no other discussion, is regarding some very specific policies for high and very high and Caleb will cover those.

Hood: Thank you, Brian. Members of Council, Council President, Mayor. So, first, before I jump into the -- the five kind of policies that -- that I would like to touch base with you on, I -- I do want to extend our gratitude to the various departments of the city. Brian put all the policies that were applicable to each department to the department heads and either director or a downline staff did respond and -- and put responses on some accountability on how they are doing on those ones that are assigned to each department. So, I do appreciate them working this exercise into their workflow over the past few months and, again, the -- I think you said 53 were at the -- the higher, very high category. We have five of those. I have five of those that I kind of wanted to just touch base with you on and -- and at the time -- and -- and it was -- it was a little bit awkward; right? Councilman Overton wasn't here as -- in his current role as a Council Member and two of you were just coming on to Council, right, as we were adopting this two year process of the new comp plan. So, I don't even know how much, you know, buy-in there was from most of you at the dais this evening on those -- those policies. But here are the five and I will just say the first three even are very, very similar and it's been some time now, but they have to do with growth areas and priority growth areas and strategic growth areas. So, I won't -- I -- I didn't -- I attempted, but I didn't pull up the growth map, but a lot of it had to do with -- you -- you will probably recall, right, fire response times and sewer sheds and availability and there were some other things in that map of, hey, this is where we are going to grow, because we have services planned or generally in this area and we can get there. We have two new fire stations since then that are under construction and they are going to come online here shortly. But, again, these three policies in particular are all sort of related. The first one was to identify those growth areas. And, again, I think we have kind of done that with the growth map. It's not adopted. It's not an official -- there isn't an official growth map, but we do call on it from time to time and -- and show developers and -- and property owners, hey, you are kind of on the wrong side of this line, you are out there, can we grow back towards the city limits a little bit and, then, implement those strategic growth areas and, then, incentivize those and even -- so, even, that is the next level of, you know, we have been pretty blessed with having relatively flat, square ground that doesn't have a whole lot of challenges to it, so the incentives we have to offer are next to nothing. People want to be here. They want to develop here. It's a nice place to be and to do business and we are pretty business friendly. So, some of this is even just to call out that. We haven't developed too many incentives, because we already are pretty just naturally pro development, if you will, and that's maybe not even the right term, but we have -- we have a lot of -- our processes are pretty good and efficient and we have good response times for emergency service providers and good parks and those types of things. So,

we haven't had to dig into enticing development to come our way; right? As, again, we are just sort of -- it's not just dumb luck either, there has been a lot of, you know, past work that's gone on that has really set us up for that success. It may not always be that way though. So, these -- these three kind of in tandem. And they are different policies, but all really related around this concept of a priority growth area or growing from the inside out and not sprawling way out first. So, I guess I wanted to talk to you a little bit more about that. These are all very high priorities and, again, just to call myself out, we haven't made a whole lot of progress on that. I don't have a map, right, that I can point to and go here is a bright line, don't grow on this side until X, Y and Z happen on the other side of the line. We are not ready to extend there. So, we are not going to get there tonight, but I did want some confirmation -- or if you guys are -- you know, the way -- the kind of business as usual we have been experiencing it -- I will just say over the last year or so. I'm okay with that. But I really do want either, nope, these are right, go do it or -- or -- or not. So, I'm sure you have read them by this -- you know, at this point in the presentation, those three that are at the top anyways, and I will -- I will stand for any, again, feedback, direction you -- you may have.

Hoaglun: Council? Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Council President. So, Caleb, just to clarify the exact feedback you are looking for, are you asking if you -- if -- if these be removed from -- from the priorities -- if we change the priority type from very high to high or -- can you give some clarification? Is it all of the above?

Hood: Good -- good question. Council President. Council Woman Perreault. So, the exercise was really just about the priority and a -- again accountability, how well have we done in this one. I'm calling myself out and saying we -- we haven't really made a whole lot of progress on these three. But some of that is is I didn't really get the sense that we should. If -- and we will get into this in a minute, because there is some next steps with comp plans -- we want to change the language in the policy, that is an option, but this is what we heard from the community in 2019. So, that's not necessarily my question right now. It is really is this a very high priority or high even? Is this something that -- or is it more medium or low and, yeah, we maybe should, but right now it's not the time to do that. But for the long range 20 year plan that is your comp plan, don't remove it, but maybe this isn't the highest thing right now to say we are going to approve growth here, but not there or that type of thing, so --

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglun: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. So, I think we have done a great job of focusing the growth in areas that are consistent with our -- the services that we are capable of providing at any given time and so if you want to call that a priority growth area I suppose you can. I know I have had feedback from members of the development community that feel like that language is a little confusing, because it isn't an official decision that was made.

But, really, the intention was for us to grow in a way that is not encouraging development that is not conducive with -- with the water and sewer services that we supply, which is a very fair and logical way to approach growth and so if you want to change the wording on this, you know, to -- to, essentially, affect that and not use the words priority growth, I suppose that's something to consider, but -- but, honestly, I -- I think that us continuing -- if we don't continue to grow in a -- in a -- in a -- a way that is conducive with the other services we are providing, then, we -- I just don't know how that looks from a long-term planning perspective and maybe Brian can speak to that. I just -- I don't see how we plan without knowing what we intend to do in the future and whether you want to -- or whether we want to call that priority growth or not. I guess that's more of the question for me than it is prioritizing that we intend to keep growing in a pattern that is conducive with Public Works.

Hoaglun: Council Woman -- Brian, did you want to respond or -- any comments?

McClure: No, I don't have -- I will let Caleb respond. Thank you.

Hoaglun: Okay. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Sure. Yeah. I -- so, just to dovetail on that. So, I -- I have leaned very hard into priority growth areas and view that as my framework, whether we formally adopt it or not I view that as my framework for decision making. So, any encouragement that we can move in that direction more formally I'm very supportive of. I will state very frankly -- like I'm not supportive of building a -- a new -- putting the investment in a new sewer shed -- a new sewer trunk, for example, in an area that geographically it doesn't make financial sense. That's just one example. So, I -- I think we need to lean harder into the first two items on priority growth. I think that's critical for maintaining the trust of the public in Meridian. So, I'm really glad that you brought this up, because I do feel like we have kind of dropped the ball as a collective group on moving that forward. On the third item, I agree, I don't think that it's appropriate for us to, you know, change the playing field here in terms of a bunch of incentives. I haven't seen that that's necessary to get the outcome that we want to see for the city, you know, so I don't think we need to move that forward personally, the incentives. Like I -- I think the market is, you know, answering the call currently. Preserving industrial land has always been really important. I think we need to -- I think we need to continue to do that. I -- I would like to see how much we have lost in the last couple of years and see where we are at. And, then, the last item is really tough; right? So, you know, I had had informal conversations with a couple of people about, you know, whether it's, you know, kind of deed restrictions to reserve farmland or, you know, different -- there are all kinds of methods. It doesn't even have to be public funded. But the challenge I think for us is like all of these properties that are undeveloped -- the vast, vast majority of them have been optioned out to development already and that -- that's just a -- a real struggle. So, unless I'm wrong about that -- I mean unless we could identify, you know, areas where we think that's possible, I would be all for discussing it, but I -- I think that's a real challenge for us in terms of -- of where we could -- where we could feasibly do that, just speaking frankly. That's my feedback on those items. Thanks.

Hoaglund: And just my input, that -- that industrial base, you know, it's like farmland, if you lose that -- industrial areas, it's -- it's gone forever. So, that's something that we need to make sure we keep -- keep track of. Yeah. The public support for funding, preserve open space, you know, that's -- that's a tricky one, because a lot of people think, oh, we -- we want it to be into a park. Well, you know, we geographically locate parks and there is reasons for that and -- and to serve the entire community, but there is other places -- like I know they want to -- on Meridian Road and Victory on the southwest corner, you know, it's -- it's a difficult place to develop. Neighbors don't want it, because that means they come through their neighborhood. They would love to do open space. But what do you do with that? What does that mean? So, if we go down that path for that, what does open space mean? What does that look like? Is it just going to be what it is now? Kind of a -- a weed patch and it's open space. So, yeah, those are some things that we kind of want to have discussions with parks as well on -- on something like that.

Hood: Mr. President, I can just build on that last one, then, that's on the screen now and -- and that's some of what I had. I -- we had a -- a previous director and don't -- this doesn't mean I don't have -- don't care about open spaces necessarily, but the last director had more of a passion for that or was at least told to look at this a little bit more and there was some survey responses even that said, hey, look at a foothills like levy or some other way to preserve farmland for this trust. We will do it if told, but this was assigned to Community Development I think because that's the last director -- and, again, I haven't -- I haven't made any progress on this and so it may be more appropriate for Parks, Mayor's Office, to maybe see what kind of momentum there is for something like this. So, I'm not necessarily trying to -- well, yeah, I am. I'm trying to get rid of this policy from -- from Planning or Community Development, because I -- I don't know what to do with it. It seems like there is a political kind of bent to this and, then, if -- it could be something that the Parks ends up running with, if -- if there is momentum. So, I will leave that there. You don't have to answer that. I think the Mayor is still on -- in the meeting, so I will hear from him later I'm sure if I said something wrong and Dave's giving me the evil eye, but -- anyway. So, that was something -- that was one where I'm -- I'm trying to -- yeah. Next time we report will say again that I haven't made any progress on this one.

Hoaglund: Okay. Sounds good.

Borton: Caleb? Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just real quick on the -- on those last two. I -- I think the -- the focus would be on the fourth one is really -- you know, because we see these CUP applications that are attractive and it's -- and we slowly bleed industrial property with some nice conditioned property and I would be curious if -- not today, but you -- if -- if the fourth one were to remain on, if you would make a recommendation -- or your department that says here is conditioned CUP eligible uses in these industrial zones that we think you should switch

to prohibited, because on a one off basis it's just really difficult to say -- to really provide conditions -- I mean if we are -- if it's -- if it's initially approved, then, we are fine with it not being preserved for industrial and if we want to do the opposite, then, let's put our money where our mouth is and change the CUP designation to -- to prohibit it, which is a -- that's a big commitment if we are willing to do it, but pick a lane; right? We got to prohibit some of this stuff, because you can't just condition it away, so -- and I think the fifth one is just never going to happen. I -- it's not really who we are and it's not the foothills. It's -- it's not -- it's apples to oranges. So, those are my thoughts in reviewing this for today.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you, Councilman. Of course on the industrial base -- unless it's innovative, Caleb, then, we can -- no.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I apologize I didn't speak to those last two. I was under the impression you had more to present on those maybe before we gave you some thoughts on that. I agree with Councilman Borton. I think that was well spoken about the fourth item. The fifth item -- I was on Planning and Zoning when all of this was going on, so I sat, you know, through all of these same hearings and it -- it came out of concerns about how we were categorizing density and on the -- on the future land use map, you know, how we were managing that and a desire of some of the residents to not perhaps -- preserve farm ground, but there really was sort of a push for us to have a future land use category that was less dense than low density and that's really where that came from and -- and I agree with staff's assessment that some of the momentum on that has been lost. We haven't been hearing that on a regular basis that I know of in the last three or four years. So, if it's not a priority, you know, if we are intending on reclassifying items that were originally prioritized through a process of communications with our residents and our stakeholders and we are not hearing back from those saying that that is a priority, I don't -- I don't see an issue, either down grading the priority level or removing it from the list.

Hood: Thank you again for that feedback. I think we will move on. I -- I do want to make one more comment, though, before I -- I give it back to Brian. Just on that fourth one I hear you. We will come in -- and, in fact, we have had interns in the past do some of that analysis and look at existing industrial parks and how many yoga studios and karate shops and churches and some of those conditionally allowed uses are actually taking up residence in what would otherwise be an industrial complex. So, we can -- we can show you some of those numbers as we propose to maybe remove some of those land uses from being conditional to being prohibited. The other thing we are doing is -- we are just starting, but in -- in mixed-use areas and in other areas to help -- let me back up. So, we still need those uses; right? We need churches. We need karate studios. They need a place to go and they are going there because there isn't anywhere else. They can't afford the frontage on the Eagle-Overland, so they go into

the industrial park that's just off, because they don't maybe need the visibility, but they still need the -- the square footage. So, what we are really trying to do is -- is address a place for them -- kind of the second tier commercial places to go. Not in our industrial park second tier, but in a commercial project. So, you don't have to be the fast food places that want easy in and out, you can be that second level -- just second drive aisle through as you transition and your residential is behind that. So, really looking at those site plans to say, again, the kind of second tier access gives them places to go, so they aren't eating into the industrial land. But it's -- a lot of our stuff -- either the frontage on an arterial or residential behind and there is nowhere for those daycares and the other uses to go without going into these some or lesser -- lesser industrial park. So, anyways, just a -- a precursor to some of the other text you will be seeing likely in our comp plan, too, and our zoning ordinance.

McClure: Thank you, Caleb. Staff has several other Comprehensive Plan revisions in the works. The first is the mixed-use area of the -- of the text as Caleb mentioned. The city continues to miss opportunities for design, necessary services, and spaces for public gathering and mixed-use area. Frankly, they are just operating as holding zones for big box and multi-family, which is bad, except in the absence of all the other things the community needs it creates a problem. Staff has a hard time defending broad language of the text and applicants struggle to understand the baseline elements that serve as a justification for the additional intensities. Staff is planning to reorganize some areas, provide some more examples, and add additional design principles. The purpose is not to modify the intent of the mixed-use areas, it's just to better align expectations with implementation. This will require some broader outreach with public and -- with public and development stakeholders and, then, go through another text amendment. Staff has also identified some potential future land use map changes for cleanup and there are some other land use projects that could be included as part of a related or separate map amendment in the future as well. With that would Council be supportive of a simple text amendment -- I'm sorry. Eating the mic again. A simple text amendment to clean up some of the policies we discussed and, then, are there any other questions or comments on future projects or anything else we discussed earlier?

Hoaglund: Comment, Council? Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Council President. So, yes, I'm supportive of it. I -- I appreciate the thoroughness with which you have gone through this. If you wouldn't mind going back to just the previous slide there. In regard to the mixed-use changes, the things that I have most noticed is we get a concept plan that a developer is hoping will -- will pan out based on the research they have done before they come in with the application. And, then, a few years later economy changes, the way people do business changes, and now all of a sudden we have a concept plan that's no longer really valid for how people function and so I don't know if there is really anything we can do about that element of it, but maybe that's something to consider in terms of -- is there a way for us to be more flexible when they ask for a concept plan for what that might look like to sort of foresee some possible adjustments that they might make? Obviously, we are still going to need to have them go through the process of doing a DA modification if they

need to make major changes. But maybe thinking that through. And, then, I -- I see the struggle to understand concepts. I see a lot of those coming around -- the mixed-use employment seems to really struggle with that and, then, also when there is a requirement for a similar use, but multiple -- multiple of similar uses and -- and I -- this is -- couldn't come at a better time. I mean look how much has changed and how we are doing business from when this was written pre-COVID. It's just -- it's so different. And so I think really maybe assessing -- even if there is an opportunity to assess what you are seeing in other areas how things are being designed differently and concept plans are being designed differently due to, you know, how we are operating -- not just with office, but, you know, deliveries -- you can get anything delivered now, right? Just all those elements, so --

Hood: That's good feedback. Council President, just one -- one last comment that I have at least. A lot of those changes you just mentioned I think you will see in the code, not so much in -- in the comp plan. So, we are working again with the UDC focus group on drive-throughs; right? I mean we are seeing a ton of drive-throughs -- I mean delivery and pickups are huge versus what they were three years ago, so not so much in the comp plan, but your point is still well taken. We will look at this document as well to see what the pandemic has done and what -- how that may affect sort of the vision for our community moving forward. But we will see some more immediate changes to the standards in the UDC.

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. I would say, you know, for the more minor textural changes that you had outlined I would say, you know, keep working on it and moving it forward. I think on these items we just discussed it's worth following up. On the mixed-use changes, you know, when we had that grad student intern that did all that work for us, like that really opened my eyes, like, wow, we have a big opportunity here on mixed-use. I definitely think doing a text amendment makes sense, but I think maybe like replaying the tape on -- on some of the conclusions we drew from that work would be smart and, then, kind of using that to drive some of the changes that are necessary to get better mixed-use projects. That's the biggest example I can think of, something that sticks out of my mind where we really heard really good feedback from somebody that deeply researched our mixed-use projects. So, I -- I would pull from that work and -- and come back on that one.

Hood: Mr. President? Council Woman Strader, can I ask -- and this isn't just for you, but for -- for anybody. And I don't know if this is why Brian had it highlighted or not or bolded. Something like that, though, the outreach and involvement, the public involvement in that, right -- it is sort of a technical --

Strader: Yeah.

Hood: -- play; right? So, I think that's some of what I struggle with sometimes with this. It's the community's vision, but at the same time I don't need just Joe off the street

telling us what mixed use should look like and how that should develop. So, I guess just to daylight that a little bit -- we are not trying to hide the ball and we are not going to develop this, you know, in a dark room smoking cigars and no one can see what we are doing, but at the same time our public outreach -- at least to develop the draft standards -- is going to be done by a small group of professionals, then, it will get vetted for review by the public and everybody else and -- and we will certainly -- but I just wanted to make sure -- and if you have any thoughts on a better process to involve the public -- again we are not trying to not involve them up until a certain point; right? It just gets too -- it's too much if -- if you have too many lay people that are part of that, so -- but if you have thoughts on that, well, I will take them.

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Sure. Yeah. I -- I -- so I think it is too technical -- like you are -- you are just -- you are not going to -- you -- you could involve -- I think there are community members that are well versed enough on our code and understand it enough that they could. I mean I don't think that totally -- that blanket statement is totally true. Like I -- I definitely think you have people that are really involved that could help. I would suggest, in addition to those stakeholders, I would suggest even circling back to the person that did that work originally and asking, you know, to -- to refresh on any kind of conclusions and -- and get some input. I mean I would think that, you know, there is quite a bit of goodwill there and to the extent that you can involve, you know, technical folks like that that have studied it, that are independent, right, in addition to our stakeholder community that we normally have, like I think that's important, because I -- I really felt like what was such a breath of fresh air coming out of that work was truly like a third party removed from our city that had like a completely different perspective and a fresh eye; right? I mean you guys and all of us look at this all the time, but somebody that really had like that kind of independent perspective. So, even -- you know, I -- you know, even, you know, ULI -- I would -- I would think, obviously, you have a lot of resources with ULI, the Urban Land Institute, for all those in the audience and -- and organizations like that that you could leverage to, so --

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, I -- I just want to clarify -- or ask is -- is this like an official midway Council -- so, I -- I don't want to -- because I -- we are going to -- we do have a budget for like a -- a midway point review of the Comprehensive Plan; correct? Or no?

Hood: So -- Council Woman Perreault, Council President. So, no, what we typically have done -- and, again, COVID kind of put a wrench in things a little bit. But annually we will -- Brian will send out to all the various departments saying here is your policies, proposed changes, and any status updates. We don't have it structured -- and -- and I said -- I think I said 20 years before. There isn't a real lifespan to our Comprehensive Plan. So, it's not ten years is a midpoint check in and with the way we have grown as a

community we aren't going to get 20 years out of our plan, because things -- our society changes and our land uses change. So, I'm -- but I'm not ready to start a new comp plan. I wouldn't call this the midpoint just yet. I think we work the plan at least for another few years. So, again, this effort was really just to say those -- those things in the first few years -- in 2019 -- it's been a first few years, so how did we do? Everyone reports those out. The next step, then, is to tweak some, add some, remove some, update some, whatever that looks like and that will be -- that's one of the next changes. So, this mixed use is a separate process that may come along with some text changes, but we will also do that and say, okay, this policy is really kind of outdated four years later. Let's change it. Here is what it should say. But, again, there is not like a midpoint check in. We will -- we generally check in with Council annually and say, high and very high projects, here is how we are doing on those things. Or if there is something that was low and you want to move it to high, that may come out, too. So, hopefully, that answers your question. This isn't like a mid plan check-in though.

Perreault: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Yes. To clarify what I was really getting out -- and I should have asked the question clear -- is do you have a consultant take a look at it and is there -- I think that's -- I was trying to sort of see if that's where Council Woman Strader was going is do we take everything we looked at, have our consultant go back and review how we are doing and kind of give a report as -- so, that's -- that's what I was asking, if that's something that was anticipated. I was under the impression that the intention of our comp plan was to go at least ten years. That's what I understood to be the case. And I don't know why or how, but in my head I had an idea that we would be sort of reviewing that in some sort of official way on year five. Not proposing that we do. That's entirely -- you know, not -- that's not my decision, but if -- if -- if this is going to get that involved, then, do we have that conversation. I didn't get the impression it needs to be that involved, but just want to put that out there.

McClure: Council President, Council Woman Perreault, the intention of the -- this is not to use a consultant. It -- it's not an overhaul. This section of the Comprehensive Plan is very small compared to the rest of it. It's -- it's important, but it's small. That's not to say we couldn't utilize other resources -- or -- or help to, you know, support that a little bit, but I don't think we need a consultant. I think just being honest -- one thing that will help will be having staff give you their opinion, rather than have designed by committee with outside influences.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I promise this is my last one. The first time I heard the term -- going back to the -- the prior question -- priority growth area, the Mayor actually presented that term

and if his voice is up for it, I would actually really like to hear his thoughts on the three -- the first three priority sections. Yes. There. That -- that was -- the priority growth area was something that kind of came about in conversations that we had and on the dais and I would like to hear his thoughts on that.

Simison: Yeah. I mean I thought the priority growth areas, personally, have been defined enough through work with staff. Both in conversations with Council and work with staff that they can articulate it. To me it's never a go or no go. It's just to help give basic guidance and feedback to development as they consider where to move projects forward or not. I think every project stands on its own and if someone comes in and they want to provide all the services that are necessary in order to grow in an area, I think that's a conversation that Council should hear as part of the development application. So, having a defined area as priority to me does not -- to me what I would want to say at this meeting, but I think it does provide guidance in its current position. Yeah. The incentive stuff -- I have always really viewed that more for in-fill. You know, I have never really viewed incentives or, you know, generally where we are going to grow, but maybe in areas where we want to see more growth occurring or the challenges that we have with internal development. So, that's how I view item three more than in any other area. Yes, we have URD's that are part of that. We just heard the PUD conversation. We could talk about CIDs and LIDs and I think that those are still two things that are part of that conversation, but does that mean that's everything we want to do? In -- in years past we have at least -- I don't want to say Council or previous mayors have talked about it, but, you know, do we want to talk about impact fees, you know, in zones. You pay a different impact fee because you are into the core and you pay more on the outside that. Those could be incentives or disincentives, however you want to look at it in that regards. But for the most part it's -- it's been more the in-fill when it comes to the incentive conversation. But, you know, if Council feels like we have enough incentives and we don't need to do anymore, then, that's great. But there is always more that can be considered if it's high enough of a priority to us. Does that answer your -- the three or two enough?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 16. Per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(c): To acquire an interest in real property not owned by a public agency, 74-206(1)(d): To consider records that are exempt from disclosure as provided in chapter 1, title 74, Idaho Code, and 74-206(j): To consider labor contract matters authorized under section 74-206A (1)(a) and (b), Idaho Code.**

Hoaglund: Any further questions? Comments by staff? Follow up? Last word? Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Mr. President, I move that we go into Executive Session per Idaho Code 72-206(1)(c), 74 -- sorry. 74-206(1)(c), 74-206(1)(d), 74-206(j).

Perreault: Second.

Hoaglund: And we have a motion and a second. Mr. Nary, did we need also 74-206(a)(1) A and B?

Nary: No.

Hoaglund: Okay. Just wanted to double check. Thank you. We have a motion and a second for -- to go into Executive Session. Madam Clerk, could you, please, call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, absent; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

Hoaglund: All ayes. We are adjourned into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (6:56 p.m. to 7:52 p.m.)

(Motion to adjourn Executive Session made by Council Woman Strader, Seconded by Councilman Overton. Voting Yea: Councilman Borton, Councilwoman Strader, Councilman Hoaglund, Councilman Overton, Council Woman Perreault.)

(Motion to adjourn.)

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:52 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK