Meridian City Council Work Session October 6, 2026.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, October 6, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Laurelei Bakken, Dave Miles, Berle Stokes and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

__X__ Liz Strader __X__ Brian Whitlock
__X__ Anne Little Roberts __X__ John Overton
__X__ Doug Taylor __X__Luke Cavener
___X___ Mayor Robert E. Simison

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, October 6th, 2026, at 4:30 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item is adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There will be one change to tonight's agenda. On the Consent Agenda we will be moving Item 28 off the Consent Agenda for discussion and with that change I move that we adopt the agenda.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item] Approved

1. **Approve Minutes of the September 15, 2026 City Council Work Session**

2. **Approve Minutes of the September 15, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting**

3. **Approve Minutes of the September 22, 2026 City Council Work Session**

4. **Approve Minutes of the September 22, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting**

5. **Apex Northwest Subdivision No. 7 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 3 (ESMT-2026-0215)**

6. **Apex Zenith Sanitary Sewer Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2026-0218)**

7. **Apex Zenith Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2026-0219)**

8. **Meridian Medical Partners Phase 2 Water Main Easement No. 4 (ESMT-2026-0214)**

9. **Meridian Medical Partners Phase 2 Water Main Easement No. 3 (ESMT-2026-0216)**

10. **Shop Isla Enterprise, LLC., Full Release of Sanitary Sewer Easement (ESMT-2026-0213)**

11. **Victory Commons Lot "A" Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2026-0212)**

12. **Final Plat for Centerville Subdivision No. 4 (FP-2026-0021) by Kent Brown Planning Services, located at 5200 S. Hilldale Ave.**

13. **Final Plat for Springday Subdivision No. 2 (FP-2026-0026) by Engineering Solutions, located at the North side of W. Ustick Rd., 1/4 mile west of N. Black Cat Rd.**

14. **Final Order for Adero Park No. 2 (MFP-2026-0007) by Conger Group, located west of N. Ten Mile Rd. and north of W. McMillan Rd.**

15. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Cherry Blossom East Subdivision (H-2025-0030) by Breckon Land Design, located at 523 W. Cedarburg Dr. and the 0.67-acre property to the east, located in the NE 1/4 of Section 12, T.3N., R.1W.**

16. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Pollard Commercial Split (SHP-2026-0007) by Brighton Corporation, located at 6489 N. Levi Ave.**

17. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for 2730 E. Franklin (H-2026-0034) by Jason Nienhouse, located at 2730 E. Franklin Rd.**

18. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Storm Crest (H-2026-0024) by Bailey Engineering, generally located at the southeast corner of W. Ustick Rd. and N. McDermott Bypass**

19. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision, and Order for Denial for Horse Meadows No. 3 (VAR-2026-0002) by KB Homes for Property Located at 4534 W. Meadowpine Ct.**

20. **Development Agreement (Rolling Hill H-2025-0040) Between City of Meridian and Blue Skyline Ventures LLC for Property Located at 1560 Rolling Hill Dr., 1520 Rolling Hill Dr., 1480 Rolling Hill Dr., 4270 E. Overland Rd., and 4240 E. Overland Rd.**

21. **Interagency Agreement between City of Meridian and ACHD for Ustick Road, McDermitt to Black Cat.**

22. **Agreement Between the Nampa and Meridian Irrigation District and the City of Meridian for Pathway along the Sky Pilot Drain in Dayspring Subdivision No.1**

23. **Temporary License Agreement for use of City Property for Renaissance Faire**

24. **Professional Services Agreement for Design and Installation of Community Center West Entrance Mural Between Jordynn Eld and the City of Meridian**

25. **Professional Services Agreement for Design and Installation of Community Center East Wall Mural Between The Banksy Protocol (dba Chalk & Cloud) and the City of Meridian**

26. **Professional Services Agreement for Design, Fabrication, and Installation of Community Center Lobby Artwork Between The Sculpture Idaho and the City of Meridian**

27. **Professional Services Agreement for Design, Fabrication, and Installation of Community Center History Wall Artwork and Wall Diorama Installations Between Stephanie Inman and the City of Meridian**

29. **Professional Services Agreement Amendment to 5.28.24 Contract between the City of Meridian and Emergency Responders Health Center**

30. Approval of Fiscal Year 2027 Purchase Order to Big T Recreation for the New Community Center Playground for the Not-to-Exceed amount of $349,521.00

31. Approval of Fiscal Year 2027 Purchase Order to Mountain Home Auto Ranch for five (5) Police Patrol Vehicles for the Not-to-Exceed amount of $293,971.02

32. Approval of Agreement with Billing Document Specialties for Fiscal Year 2027 Postage and Mailing Utility Bills and Authorize the Procurement Manager to Sign

33. Fiscal Year 2027 Cooperative Agreement between the City of Meridian and Valley Regional Transit

34. Approve Fiscal Year 2027 Amendment No.1 and Purchase Order to Polydyne INC. for Wastewater Polymer Chemical for the Not-to-Exceed amount of $315,302.40

35. Approve Fiscal Year 2027 Amendment No.2 and Purchase Order to Dubois Chemicals for Water Department Sodium Hypochlorite 12.5% Chemical for the Not-to-Exceed amount of $719,000

36. Net-Zero Budget Amendment in the amount of $40,000 for City Hall Tenant Improvements

37. City of Meridian Financial Report - August 2026

Simison: First up is the Consent Agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: For Consent Agenda we have one change, which is moving Item 28 off of the Consent Agenda for discussion. Other than that I move we approve the Consent Agenda, for the Mayor to sign and Clerk to attest.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda on all items, except Item 28. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the Consent Agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

28. SRO (School Resource Officer) Services Agreement between the City of Meridian, Police Department, and West Ada School District for 2026-2027

Simison: Item 28 we are going to remove from the Consent Agenda. So, turn this over to Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council I think I can start, but I'm probably going to have Captain Stokes probably pick up some of the more operational questions that have been posed, but I did send him a -- and not have a chance to see it. I sent it late this afternoon. Trying to answer some of the specific questions that have been raised about the contract. Just to give some background, the contract has been negotiated between the city, both the police department and the deputy attorney from our police attorney from our team with the school district and the intent was to -- with the school district was to try to create a template contract that they could, then, use with their other schools outside of Meridian. So, with Eagle or Star or with Boise, so that they would have a standardized contract. So, they worked through a lot of the contractual things on duties, responsibilities, payment, how duties are designed and assigned and Captain Stokes could probably talk more specifically about some of that stuff. But we did try to answer some of the questions. Council Member Cavener did a great job of picking the one typo out of there, the error, so it was -- that was a good way for us to show you did read it and we were checking. So, good job. You passed. So, thank you for catching that. So, we will correct it. But other ones were pretty straightforward questions on some of it. Again most of it I think is probably more towards the captain on the specifics on the -- how they -- school resource officers interact with the different schools. Question was about elementary SROs and we have a system where all SROs are assigned to high schools and middle schools and, then, they have a variety of elementary schools that they work with. So, we don't have ones for every single school, they are -- have multiple schools that they have to provide support to over time. Again, we did get some feedback today from Finance on what that was. Some of that is reimbursed by West Ada, some of it is part of their normal workload process that they -- they get overtime for. One of the concerns was raised about information -- how information gets transferred or how we have it -- there is some outline in the contract on that. But most of the time, again, the school is the repository of all of their information. We only have access to it -- no different than anyone else can have access to things. We have to ask for that through the normal public records process. Everything comes through us as a public record that we may have gotten from the school we don't provide to the public, we refer them back to the school, because it's not our record. So, there really isn't a -- an issue or concern in my part that we are going to unintentionally release information from somebody that's not ours. We don't do that. We scrutinize all of those, so that's not been a real concern. The liability -- again Captain -- Captain Stokes can talk about the specifics, but officers, as long as they are accurate in the course and scope of their job and their responsibilities and their training, are covered as part of our normal liability coverage. So, that's not a real concern. That

has not been an issue in the past. Certainly if there is an issue we will address it. If there is a personnel action of some sort, an officer's conduct, we will address that. That's different from what they are really concerned with here and one of the ones that was interesting was just a question about, you know, certifications and how that is handled and done and there really isn't specific certifications for some of the things, but some of that is and there is a link, actually, that we can provide, it showed we have actually been recognized as one of a few cities in the country for an outstanding SRO program. So, we really have had some national recognition on how we do perform this and how this is done with the -- with the school district. But, again, I think Captain Stokes could talk more about the specifics of operational things. One of the things I guess from a legal standpoint from my end -- and I will let Captain Stokes take it from there -- as long as police officers are staying within -- within the course and scope of their training, which is dealing with criminal activity, not school -- not school responsibilities. They are not there to be the school's security guard. Schools have security guards and that's what their job is. Our police officers are there to deal with crimes or deal with situations before they can become crimes and addressing some of those types of issues in the schools, but not necessarily there for school enforcement of rules and policies and things like that. So, that is how they are trained, that is how they are directed and that has consistently been how it's been done over the years and, again, I'm not going to say we haven't had hiccups occasionally, but we have addressed those. But, I don't know, Captain, if you have got other perspectives on that or other ways that --

Stokes: No. I think that was well put and happy to answer any questions I can. Or try to.

Simison: Council, any questions for Captain Stokes or Mr. Nary?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: A question either for Mr. Nary or Captain Stokes and it really pertains to parental notification when an SRO is involved in an interview with a minor. I know that language was included I think in the previous contract. Obviously there is a letter from the state superintendent says that's supposed to occur. I know the language is pulled out of the contract. So, where is that information captured? Is that in procedure? In policy? Is that something that's been shared with the council? I just don't recall seeing it if it was and I'm just trying to track where -- where that information is housed.

Stokes: Absolutely. So, I think Bill touched on it that the school district this year tried to come up with kind of a boilerplate agreement for all the schools and so our -- our contract this year is -- it's quite different than it has been in years past, because we had our own and Boise had their own and so on and so forth. The specific on parent notifications -- so, there is Idaho statute that requires the school district to make those notifications to the parents; right? And that's a -- that's a legal requirement for the

school and the school officials to do. It's not a law enforcement legal responsibility. However, with that said, we always talk to the parents. Now, whether it's before we -- we stop a student or interview them or anything, but I talked to our SRO team today and they -- you know, they are building those relationships. The parents are part of the -- the solution or solving the problem or whatever's going on with the kid. So, those notifications happen. But as far as like a legal requirement, unless Bill can -- can advise me otherwise -- that requirement is on the school and the -- the school employees, it's not on law enforcement.

Cavener: That's very helpful. That explains why it was pulled out of our contract, because it's not something that's our responsibility now based on the change in the state. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, I don't have any other additional questions.

Simison: Council, any additional questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Not a question, just a comment. I dig out some of the history every once in a while. But I remember working under the first -- I spent three years as an SRO working for the city and had the first of the SRO contracts back in 1991 to '94 and they were a lot thinner, a lot more brief, less legalese, but the intent of them has always been the same, which is to develop a level playing field between the school district and the police department so we understand whose policy and procedures we are working under at each time, what responsibilities are, how things play out. Specifically the overtime issue was always a very careful one on how we did it for what they needed and who paid what and how that was done and I'm pleased to see that we are still doing a majority of that. I think we have always had a model contract compared to the lack of contracts and the lack of information on other parts of the state and I'm glad to see that it looks like the rest of the state's catching up to us. Some by state law, some by others, but it can't -- it can never be stated too much that this -- what this contract represents is probably the greatest community policing tool in our city, which is an opportunity to have those kids and those officers working side by side in the schools, instead of having that interdiction with the youth being the first time they see those bright lights in their rearview mirror when they are driving, to have positive interactions with our youth in our secondary schools, our junior high and high schools and our elementary schools when we need it, but it's been a phenomenal program and I'm always glad to see it continuing and getting bigger and stronger as we go and -- and it's -- I think it's one of the pillars when we talk about the city and being a great place to live, work and raise a family is to have such a strong program built into our schools with a partnership that we do that continues to make this such a great place to be. So, if there is no other questions, I would like to move that we, then, approve the school resource officer agreement between the City of Meridian Police Department and the West Ada School District for 2026 and 2027.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve the SRO contract previously identified as Item 28 on the agenda. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS [Action Item]

38. Sewer/Water Service Request Outside of Area of City Impact

Simison: With that we will move on to Department Reports. First item up is Item 38, the sewer-water service request outside of area of city impact. Laurelei, good to see you.

Bakken: Thank you. All right. Thanks, Mayor and Council. So, we have a request before you tonight from a neighboring city that's kind of out of what we normally do. So, we have done a little bit of upfront work, but before we got too far down the road we wanted to make sure that this is something that the city was interested in. If you are we have some more follow-up work to do, but wanted to go through this request. So, we received a request from the city of Nampa to consider providing water and sewer service to a development that's located within the city of Nampa. So, just to orient ourselves on the map here. So, this is along McDermott Road. To the north is Ustick. To the south is Cherry. This request is for part of a larger planned development in the city of Nampa that's highlighted in the whole yellow area that's called District 16. So, this full development is already annexed into the city of Nampa. It's also located in Canyon county. So the Canyon county, Ada county line -- the red-ish area is Meridian and Ada county and the non-red area is Canyon county. And so, like I mentioned, the request we received was to have Meridian provide water and sewer service to a portion of this development while the development still remains annexed into Nampa. So, I think something that's important a little bit is to talk about the why, because there is a pretty significant why on this request and since this is not something we normally do. So, the primary driver is the construction of State Highway 16 that kind of bifurcated this development. So, essentially, what that's doing is making it much harder to provide water and sewer service to the eastern side. So, for Nampa to serve water and sewer to the eastern side of this parcel significant infrastructure would be required to overcome both grading concerns and to get under Highway 16 and so the request is not coming simply because it's costly to build this infrastructure, but it also adds ongoing operational complexity for the city of Nampa. It adds ongoing cost and long-term maintenance challenges. So, a couple of questions that you might be thinking that certainly came to my mind when we first started talking about this was why can't the development just de-annex from Nampa and annex into Meridian? So, one of the challenges is it sits on the Canyon county-Ada county line and thus far we have not annexed any Cannon county land. We also as practice, in an effort to be a good neighbor, really try to respect our area of city impact boundaries with our neighboring municipalities. So, the next question that I asked was, you know, are we going to have

to build anything extra to serve this that we weren't already planning on building and so the answer here very specifically, because of where it's located, is no. So, we are already planning to construct the McDermott trunk line right down McDermott directly adjacent to this development in 2029. So, we aren't making commitments to extend lines out or add additional infrastructure that we weren't already planning to do. So, my next question was do we have the extra capacity to serve this with our McDermott trunk line or are we going to have to upsize it or by doing this would it take away future development from Meridian either upstream or downstream? And so we ran our sewer model to confirm that we do have enough capacity in the planned line to serve this development. It will not require up-sizing and it will not take away capacity from planned development and you might ask how that's possible. Well, when we build these big large diameter deep sewer lines they have a significant margin of safety built into them and the reason being is that development does not occur how it's master planned out; right? Densities change, planned uses change all the time and so we have to build these big permanent lines big enough that they can handle differences in density changing. These lines are also built to not run at full capacity. So, by design they are estimated to be around 50 percent. So, that leaves a lot of the lines still open and that's really to build in that margin of safety, knowing that things change down the line, because going back in and up-sizing because another development came in or a density increased would be a huge not cost-effective way to do it. So, adding this parcel of land does not impact our current flow or future flow projections and we also as a margin of safety discussed with the developer of including a maximum ERU on this to say, you know, we have modeled it at this. This is the maximum that we would allow and they were agreeable to that. So, just, if you are curious, the development is planned to be a mixed-use development with warehouse, flex and manufacturing towards the north and tapering to multi-family and single-family to the south. As a reminder this development would go through the city of Nampa's development approval process not Meridian's as it would be in the city of -- it would be in the city of Nampa, not the city of Meridian. So, the next question I asked is what's in it for Meridian? Why would we consider this? So, there is a few reasons to discuss and the first being a significant cost savings to the citizens of Meridian. So, the developers agreed to contribute between 25 and 50 percent of the cost of this next segment of the McDermott trunk, which would save the city somewhere between 2.7 and 5.5 million dollars, which is a pretty significant amount. The difference in the value here is dependent on whether we want to wait -- or whether the developer would want to wait until -- to connect until we were finished with the segment in the probably early 2030 timeframe or if they wanted to accelerate that it would look like the framework under our public-private partnership agreement. So, the segment just to the north that we are working on with the Toll Brothers where they design, construct -- or design, bid, construct, manage the project and, then, we reimburse them 50 percent of the costs when we were planning to spend those costs and so the developer hasn't decided which one of those options, but they have committed either way to either 25 percent or 50 percent, which is a significant amount of money for this project. A couple of other benefits. The developer has also offered that if the public-private partnership path is taken to construct the trunk line, that they would be able to construct the trunk line on their property, which has significant impact for us in two ways. One, it allows us to not have to close down McDermott Road

for construction. That's huge. And, then, the other thing is it greatly reduces the cost of the project, because you are not having to do a bunch of roadway restoration, so that's a huge plus. The developer would also be required to install significant portions of water mainlines to get water from its current location over to serve this development. So, that would be a requirement that they would have to bring looped water to this site and most importantly this request is not coming from the developer, it's coming from the city -- the city of Nampa and so really Nampa is looking at their long-term operational concerns and complexities. It's not just looking to appease a developer. So, of course, there is a couple challenges and we will talk a little bit about those, too. So, the first is that our city code currently does not allow this. So, if this is something we wanted to consider we would have to talk about code changes and I will talk about that in more detail. It would also require coordination and cooperation as we work through design, construction and ultimately operations, since this would be in the city of Nampa, but served by Meridian. So, we would need to be involved in the design process. There would have to be coordination in how fees were collected in development and just as a note the developer would also have to pay our regular water and sewer hookup fees and, then, also The Oaks lift station reimbursement fees, in addition to the McDermott trunk contribution and, then, we would need to coordinate with Nampa to make sure the infrastructure is designed and installed to Meridian standards That we got appropriate easements for operation and maintenance and, then, some future communication with residents who would be getting most of their bills from Nampa, but would get their water and sewer bill from Meridian. So, logistical challenges, but I don't think insurmountable if the two cities are willing to work through that coordination together. So, let's talk about the bigger issue is the required change in city code. So, our current city code only allows water and sewer connections outside of city -- city limits if the requester can demonstrate a public health or safety reason. So, you guys see these when we have failed wells or failed septic systems come through and, then, we have them sign an agreement that says they agree to annex to the city once things are contiguous and the reason we do that is to prevent a bunch of small county enclaves from developing permanently in the county and so, really, this helps promote orderly and contiguous development. So, it was really important to Public Works and Community Development as we started thinking about what could a code change look like that would still be restrictive enough to protect our long-term interests and we have a proposal and so I'm going to go through this with you, because I think there is some important parts. So, it would be in addition to this code and it would say annexation may be waived with approval by city council if the city receives a written request from a neighboring municipality or public utility provider. So, it has to come from a neighboring city, not just at the request of a developer, in which the requesting parcel is annexed to provide permanent water service. We would want it to be permanent, so that there is not the complexity of trying to switch back and forth later on due to serviceability constraints in which the constraints will not be improved with the passage of time. We felt like this was very important, because we don't want requests just because development doesn't want to wait for the infrastructure to get there. There has to be a legitimate reason that the original planned city infrastructure is not going to work and that includes, but not limited to, major transportation infrastructure or geological or geographical features. Ideally these would only be when there was a significant roadway. So, Highway 16 or

some type of geographical issue like major slope or grading or major waterways that aren't going to be changed with the passage of time. So, we would -- on the sewer side we have the same language, the same addition would have to go there, too. So, you know, with these changes we feel like it significantly impacts the -- or significantly limits the possibility of a future number of these -- a huge number of these requests coming in. We have looked kind of around the city boundaries and really we don't think that there is -- this -- there would be a large number of these. Really mostly -- since most cities want to and plan to serve the areas in their city impact and the key is that there has to be some kind of physical constraint that won't be improved with time, so -- and ultimately, too, council would retain the authority to say, nope, this doesn't work for Meridian or also in this case, you know, hey, there is nothing significant enough to benefit Meridian in doing this. I think in this case specifically there is potential significant benefit to the Meridian ratepayers by offsetting a significant cost in sewer infrastructure and in this case specifically, too, we aren't extending anything new or adding anything that we weren't already planning on doing. So, I think those are some really important elements to that. So, with that really looking for your guys' direction. Do you want us to spend more time on this? If yes it would be -- the next thing you would see would be that code change and, then, a finalized agreement that would be a three-party agreement, the City of Meridian, the City of Nampa and the developer. So, really, looking for some direction. We also have a representative from the City of Nampa here tonight if you have any specific Nampa questions and my phone a friend Dave for the technical questions. But happy to answer any questions.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Thank you, Laurelei. Councilman Overton.

Overton: Laurelei, great presentation. I have read through everything. I'm very supportive of what this looks to do. I think it's a great way to show off our partnership with the city of Nampa. Is there any approvals needed from Canyon county or Ada county? I know we are trying to do this from Nampa city to Meridian city, but is there any county approvals needed or state approvals needed to go cross county lines?

Bakken: Told you I was going to use my phone a friend.

Miles: Mayor and Council, appreciate the question. I'm -- step out on a ledge. I don't believe so, but we can confirm that, through the monkey wrench of the state. I don't believe so, other than our standard DEQ process for our sewer lines and maybe our representative from Nampa can answer the Canyon county side, because they are probably more familiar with that than I am.

Badger: All right. Daniel Badger, city in Nampa city engineer. From the Canyon county side and Nampa side, no, there would be no approvals that would be needed through the -- the county for -- for anything of this nature.

Simison: And, Laurelei, if I could just add a few points. You know, we have had other even similar conversations about maybe some parcels on our side that may want to be served by Nampa because of this feature and I think that -- that's a different conversation for a different day. But the -- from my perspective -- and I -- I say this looking at our good friends in Star and Eagle, I really don't want to annex across the state -- across the county line. You know, dealing with the secondary government process for budgeting, dealing with secondary transportation entities for those elements, so -- Star is going through those issues as they try to figure out how to have roads serve their city by another entity when they primarily have ACHD. So, for -- for me that this was about collaboration with the neighboring city to help provide service and we often know -- Mayor Tammy said it all the time, you know, sewer drives your boundaries. That sometimes sewers are good neighbors and I think the only other thing that maybe -- to go back to a little bit of what Councilman Overton mentioned -- is if this is outside of our service area, then, we just want to -- we would have to make sure that we would want that to be cleaned up, so that we didn't have a similar charge from another entity of serving outside of our planning area boundary.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Laurelei, I just -- one question on the -- on the proposed language for the ordinance change. Generally I'm supportive of what we are -- the direction we are moving. I think it makes some sense. But when you have a public utility provider, how is that defined in our code? Who would that entail potentially?

Bakken: Good question. We were thinking Veolia as the water service provider for city of Boise and so maybe we need to be just a little more explicit on that. But it would have to be -- you know. And we don't really anticipate anything on that, because that border is pretty well developed, but it would be a request from city of Boise and Veolia. So, maybe we could just be more explicit.

Taylor: Yeah. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. I'm -- yeah, I'm not -- I don't love the idea of changing code to -- for very very specific things, but I understand why we would maybe want to do it in this case. So, my -- my desire would be to avoid maybe someone reading it differently a few years down the road and opening a doorway that we didn't have. So, I -- I agree with the idea of it needs to be a request from another municipality, not from any other entity outside of that. So, unless there was some compelling reason why we wanted to keep the language of public utility provider, I would prefer to keep it out so that it's a city-to-city request.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Laurelei, I tend to agree with other council members on this. What action, if any, is going to be required by the Nampa city council to facilitate this potential change? Do -- have they -- have they discussed this? Do they have to take action to approve that? Have -- have they had a chance to discuss this? And if -- if it -- if it has been discussed what has kind of been the general synopsis of the -- the discussion?

Badger: Mayor, Councilman Cavener?

Cavener: Yeah.

Badger: Okay. So, we have had some internal staff discussions with our -- our mayor and chief of staff on this. It has not gone to the full council. Ultimately the -- the three party agreement is what would end up going to our city council for approval and that -- that's what we would be looking at for the only thing that we would need on the Nampa side for approval.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, a quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Laurelei or Mr. Nary, would we be, then, the last one to sign? So, the developer, then, the city Nampa, then, it comes back to us? Is that how it works?

Nary: It can. Yes. That would be fine

Simison: Well -- well, maybe to -- maybe the point would be we would want there to be a city of Nampa conversation and general agreement before we go take any further action.

Cavener: I think that's where we are at. Yeah.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Have we done a pretty good analysis of the tenants and the types of users that are coming in that we -- because I know we had to put it through our model. It's all gravity fed. Like I just get concerned about at some point the limits of modeling and the unknown of adding in -- like, for example, a super user. So, I just -- help me understand how robust the modeling was and exactly how we went about that.

Laurelei: Great question. So, it's -- it's very robust and we built it off of the -- the -- I guess numbers that the developer gave us for their proposed layout, which is why we put the ERU cap on to say, you know, you said this warehouse space would be this --

you know, this number of ERUs. We are capping you at that. So, however you decide to, you know, make that work and model, but we cannot -- or we will not go over that initial --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And I -- and I think that's a really interesting way to handle that contractually that I think works well, but in practice how would that work I guess would be a question. Like how would we enforce that?

Bakken: That's a good question. I think we may need to put something in the agreement that would put some onus on Nampa to I guess monitor as users came in or changed. You know, I think because of how the infrastructure is -- is developed there I'm not sure you could have, you know, the -- because the constraint would be the -- the sewer lines going to the buildings and the infrastructure going to the buildings could really only handle a maximum capacity, so they would really be limited there, but -- do you have any thoughts on --

Badger: Mayor, Council Woman, I would -- we -- with our building permit process we do those analysis for the ERUs. We -- we call them EDUs on our side of the county line I guess. But we -- we do that and we could easily have a track down sheet that shows where we are at within that contractual responsibility. There will be some strong coordination. Obviously we will be collecting fees and returning those fees to you guys based on your fee schedules for those building permits and so we would just have within our system that hard cap that if they were to approach that we would be in some conversations and if they were requesting to go over that that would, obviously, be something -- that would be a conversation to amend the agreement if that were to come. Though with our -- the Highway 16 specific area plan it envision -- it does not envision those heavy water users within that area and so I wouldn't anticipate seeing that. But if -- if someone came with that type of a request we would flag that and -- and come and have the conversation with your staff to -- to determine how to handle that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. That's really helpful. It sounds like a good plan, like a practical approach for it. I guess it's -- I guess my -- my only concern is just -- as you know like -- it's really important that we model it correctly and it's a -- it's permanent infrastructure and so I guess a question I would have is like globally when you look at the entirety of the capacity that needs to go through the McDermott trunk line and the way the development has been getting approved so far, do you feel that -- where do you feel like the risk is larger to the city of Meridian holistically for that entire sewer trunk? Do you feel like the risk is higher that we will not have enough capacity, because I know we

have some discussions with Star about their boundaries and so forth or do you feel like the -- the risk is more the other direction? Like help me understand how you see development unfolding along the entirety of the trunk line and where you think the risk lies.

Bakken: So, Council Woman Strader, I feel like -- so, our sewer model -- they -- they actually design for only 50 percent capacity and so in these really large diameter sewer trunk lines it leaves a really big margin of safety and so I feel certain -- we have even modeled different scenarios of, you know, if and when Highway 16 extends to the south and that maybe changes development plans and brings in different densities and -- and we have the capacity to serve that in this line I think because it's being built big enough to -- really it's one of our -- our big main collectors and so it's -- it's really oversized to provide that margin of safety.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: To put a more fine point on it, if that sewer trunk line needed to extend under the interstate -- and I know geologically there are challenges there -- would -- theoretically would our entire area of impact in the southwest -- oh, sorry, south -- yeah -- west part of our city be able to be served by that trunk line still I guess would be my guess?

Bakken: Okay. Yep. So, all of our master plan takes into consideration full build out of the entire city -- area of city impact and so that trunk is built today to be able to serve that entire area.

Strader: One more -- can I get one more?

Simison: Just if I can put a point at least from my perspective. I think the risk becomes to the last properties in may be limited on their ability to change their zoning or -- whether that's the very last one on the line or the very last one because we don't develop to a certain direction, so you may be limiting a future landowner from changing their zoning request at some point in time. From my perspective. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: What percentage of the total sewer capacity would this one development represent roughly?

Bakken: I don't have that number specifically, but I do remember it didn't actually change the percent capacity full in the line, because it was such a small number.

Strader: Like less than five percent then?

Bakken: Oh, yeah. Less. It didn't even change it --

Strader: Less than one percent. Okay.

Bakken: Yeah.

Strader: Thank you. That makes me feel much more comfortable.

Bakken: Yeah.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Laurelei, can you just go back to the map as well?

Bakken: Uh-huh.

Whitlock: I mean we have this -- what do you call it? Trapezoid or -- did I get that right? Is it a trapezoid?

Bakken: I think so.

Whitlock: A small sliver to the north above -- north of Ustick, south of Cherry, those are all I think five acre lots on septic and wells that are within Canyon county.

Bakken: Yep.

Whitlock: And, then, we have been talking about future development moving the McDermott trunk line even -- even farther to the south. Is there -- this is a one-off. Is there any chance that there will be a second one-off because of any of those other properties that are east of 16?

Bakken: So, great question. We actually asked that to City of Nampa. Do they anticipate any, you know, future requests and they told us that they did not. I think they don't anticipate that county subdivision to change or go away for, you know, considerable amount of time and I think they have plans to serve the remainder.

Simison: Council, any additional questions?

Strader: Mr. --

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor? Oh, go ahead.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, just --

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe one more question. I understand it's difficult to change area of city impact and I do think it would be cleaner if everything, you know, sort of to the east of Highway 16 was in the city of Meridian and everything to the west of it was just in the city of Nampa. Like just logically to me would make more sense. Is that something that you all discussed with them? Like the potential to sort of bifurcate the property in some way and annex in at least that east part of the property? Just because it does seem like if that county enclave ever does develop it would need -- I assume logically would need to connect to this sewer trunk line, too. That's a Nampa question I think.

Badger: Mayor, Council Woman, so the -- the city does have sewer that comes under Highway 16 at Cherry, it just doesn't have enough depth to make it all the way up to this area and so that -- that area there to the south of Cherry would be able to be serviced by the line in Cherry, we just can't make it all the way up there.

Strader: Okay.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I did speak with the counsel for the developer in this case, too, and this kind of goes back to the earlier question about do we need county's approval -- either Ada county or Canyon county. For service I'm not aware that we do. I think we are fine on that for services. But if we are going to move the line of the county from one side to the other, unlike here, because when I spoke with the counsel for the developer in this case I said, you know, we have done this along the Meridian-Boise border for 25 years and it's not been very difficult to deal with. We have addressed it and we have dealt with Kuna, we have dealt with Eagle, but they are all within the county and that's -- that really is the deal breaker here is that county line is now a little more problematic in trying to move that, so, then, you end up with a situation like the Mayor spoke about where you have a city that has a portion in one county and another and, you know, is that -- that is a different solution here. That's not a solution that anybody was in favor of. So, this is the best solution to this particular problem and I think what we were trying to do and what Laurelei has done a great job with her team and what we got some feedback from the developer as well is trying to narrow this so this isn't becoming a constant question to the council, can we do this, can we keep doing this and -- and we tried to stay away from -- when I talked with their attorney on simply just making it a financial reason, but more of these unique circumstances between municipalities or counties and the uniqueness of the geography, that that's the key and -- here that would make more sense from a long-range perspective than just helping -- it's great to help pay for the trunk line, but we didn't want that to be the only driver.

Strader: Okay.

Simison: Okay. So, to summarize, see what the City of Nampa, city council, if they are favorable and, then, if so continue the work?

Nary: Yeah. We will work in an agreement and some ordinance change.

Bakken: Okay. Thank you.

39. Discussion of Transfer of Property Located at 226 E. Broadway Ave.

Simison: Thank you. Appreciate it. Okay. With that move on to Item 39, discussion of transfer property located 226 East Broadway Avenue. Mr. Nary.

Nary: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, so this is a transfer agreement. This is the property that is currently the parking lot of the VRT Compass Building. This -- this parking lot currently is under the ownership of MDC. It was part of a downtown redevelopment project a number of years ago. We have been in discussion with them for a while on transferring that as that MDC urban renewal district is sunsetting. They are trying to deal with their assets, deal with some of their other properties and this is one of them. There is some long-range plans on -- on potential redevelopment there, but this is really just step one of that, simply moving that particular item of their inventory over to the city, so that we can put it on our -- basically on our balance sheet and move it onto ours and, then, we can address future needs as we see fit. Pretty simple agreement and you are -- there to move it forward and the next thing we just will simply, then, sign a deed and we can get the deed recorded and it becomes the city's.

Simison: Thank you. And the only thing to add the MDC board did already take action on this item --

Nary: Yes.

Simison: -- and agree to this process for those that may be hearing it for the first time. Council, any questions for Mr. Nary on this item?

40. Memorandum of Agreement Between City of Meridian and Meridian Development Corporation for Property Transfer of 226 E. Broadway Ave.

Simison: Okay. With that move on to Item 40, Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Meridian and the Meridian Development Corporation for property transfer of 2026 East Broadway Avenue. Do I have discussion or is there a motion?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Mr. Taylor make the motion.

Simison: Mr. Taylor. Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I have not sought recognition yet, but I will take the recognition. Yeah, I'm happy to make a motion that we approve the Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Meridian and the Meridian Development Corporation for the property transfer of 226 East Broadway Avenue.

Whitlock: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 40. Is there discussion on the motion? I will just say I appreciate Bill working alongside their counsel and MDC's board's action on this item and with that ask the clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Okay. We have reached the end of our agenda. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we adjourn.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:13 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ _____/_____/_____
MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

_____
CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK