

Meridian City Council Work Session

June 23, 2026.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m. Tuesday, June 23, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Luke Cavener.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Dave Miles, Caleb Hood, Bill Parsons, Garrett White and Tracy Basterrechea.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next up is adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: On tonight's agenda we will be removing Item 20, the Prosecution Services Budget Amendment, and with that one change I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda with the removal of Item 20. 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 with that modification.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the June 9, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting**

- 2. Dr. Astin (Northpointe Commercial Subdivision) Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2026-0109)**
- 3. Stonehill Crossing Subdivision Water Main Easement (ESMT-2026-0018)**
- 4. Windrow No. 1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2026-0118)**
- 5. Reveille Ridge Subdivision No. 1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 6. Centrepoint Apartments Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2026-0120)**
- 7. Centrepoint Apartments Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2026-0122)**
- 8. Centrepoint Apartments Water Main Easement No. 4 (ESMT-2026-0123)**
- 9. Centrepoint Apartments Water Main Easement No. 5 (ESMT-2026-0124)**
- 10. Centrepoint Apartments Water Main Easement No. 6 (ESMT-2026-0125)**
- 11. Ten Mile Storage Sanitary Sewer And Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2026-0126)**
- 12. El Pollo Loco Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2026-0129)**
- 13. Zenith Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 3 (ESMT-2026-0134)**
- 14. Final Plat for Dayspring Subdivision No.3 (FP-2026-0007) by Toll Brothers, generally located 1/4 mile south of W. Ustick Rd., midway between N. Black Cat Rd. and N. McDermott Rd.**
- 15. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for VanTrust (ZOA-2025-0002) and VanTrust (H-2025-0052) by VanTrust Real Estate, generally located at the southwest corner of Black Cat Rd. and Franklin Rd.**
- 16. Agreement between Meridian Youth Baseball/Softball and the City of Meridian for Priority Use of Sports Facilities - 2026 Season**

17. Utility Agreement between the City of Meridian and Idaho Auto Mall, LLC for Access near the Northwest Portion of the Property

18. City of Meridian Financial Report - May 2026

Simison: Next up is the Consent Agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton

Overton: There are no changes to tonight's Consent Agenda. I move that we approve the Consent Agenda, for the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

DEPARTMENT REPORTS [Action Item]

19. Owyhee High School Baseball State Champions Day Proclamation

Simison: So, we will move on to our first item this evening Under Department Reports will be the Owyhee High School Baseball State Champions Day proclamation. So, if I could invite the coach and the team to join me at the podium we would appreciate that. So, Council, we are here once again for this opportunity to recognize another Owyhee Storm state championship opportunity. We -- you guys may not know this, we get the softball team winner this evening at the 6:00 o'clock meeting, so I tried to dress appropriately. Not wearing my -- my family's colors tonight, but I'm here in strong support of what you all are accomplishing. By raise of hands how many of you -- this is your first state championship of Owyhee. Okay. Leave them up if you are in number two. Three? There might not be any of who had four, because otherwise we have a problem. Oh, yeah. Coach. Coaches can count. Not the -- not the students from that. But we are excited to have you here tonight. We are going to read a proclamation, then, ask your coaches to say any words and ask each of you to just say your name, your year and your position. For some of you that's old hat, but we love getting all your names on the record for the community. So, with that whereas being an Owyhee High School baseball player is more than making pitching, fielding, hitting and achieving state

titles, it is training to build leadership, character, confidence, teamwork and resilience, all traits needed to succeed on the field, in the classroom and in the real world and whereas the hard work and dedication to the Owyhee Storm baseball team and coaches resulted in the school's fourth championship since the school opened five years ago and whereas the Storm closed the regular season winning 23 of 24 games and whereas the championship marked the first time the Storm have swept the conference, district and state titles in the same year and whereas the leadership, training, discipline of their coaches helped all team members to focus their talents, passion and determination to becoming a winning team, with each player making valuable contributions to their victory. Therefore, I, Mayor Robert E. Simison, hereby proclaim June 23rd, 2026, as Owyhee High School Baseball State Champions Day in the City of Meridian and call upon the community to join me in congratulating the Owyhee High Storm on their remarkable athletic achievement and for representing Meridian so proudly in the state tournament, dated this 23rd day of June 2026. So, on behalf of myself, City Council and our community, congratulations and we are happy to have you -- recognize you this evening and invite one or two other coaches who want to come up and say any words, so coach.

Rasmussen: Thank you. I was not prepared for this, so I will do my best. My name is Matt Rasmussen and I had the honor of being the head coach of the 2026 Owyhee Storm baseball team and I just want to thank the Mayor and the City Council for having us today and recognizing the accomplishments of these guys and what they were able to do this season to win the conference, to win the districts, to win at regional and, then, go into the state tournament and win three straight. It was -- it was pretty amazing. Great ride. Nobody thought we could do it this year, which was kind of like, I don't know, kind of the chip we played with on our shoulder I believe. We graduated 13 guys a year ago in '25 and everyone had written us off. That's why this group's pretty special, because they worked and grinded and didn't like being told they weren't good enough to win it and that's exactly what we did, played better than anybody else. So, thank you to the parents, the Owyhee administration, the coaches on the staff and all these guys right here. We only -- only graduated five, so, you know, no guarantees, but we hope to be standing here a year from now, too. So, thank you.

Conklin: My name is CJ Conklin. I'm a junior. Pitcher.

Zannitto: My name is Christian Zannitto. I'm a junior. Pitcher.

Keith: My name is Nathan Keith and I am a senior. Catcher and pitcher

Robertson: My name is Matt Robertson. I am a junior. Third baseman.

Menke: My name is Max Menke and I was a junior. Outfielder.

Hollenbeck: My name is -- my name is Jack Hollenbeck and I was a junior. Shortstop.

Booth: My name is Jack Booth and I'm a junior. Outfielder.

Peterson: My name is Aiden Peterson and I'm a junior. Pitcher

McGee: My name is TeGhan McGee and I'm a junior. Outfielder.

Thomas: My name is Knox Thomas. I was a sophomore. Pitcher.

Leak: My name is Kelly Leak and I was a senior. Pitcher.

Jakovac: My name is Zander Jakovac and I was a sophomore. Infielder.

Medina: My name is Landon Medina and I was a first baseman. Junior.

Gallegos: My name is Jaden Gallegos and I'm a junior. Catcher.

Sullivan: My name is Carter Sullivan and I was a sophomore. Pitcher and outfielder.

Ruffing: My name is Jacob Ruffing and I was a junior. Third baseman.

Plue: My name is Owen Plue and I was a sophomore. Pitcher.

Zahm: My name is Paul Zahm. I was a junior. Pitcher.

Balian: My name is Jaden Balian and I was a junior. Pitcher.

Patterson: My name is Ian Patterson. I was a junior. Pitcher.

Juhasz: First off, senior players missing: Brooks Romer, senior. Outfielder. Shelby Pease, senior. First baseman. And Paxx Henry-Lang. Senior. Pitcher. My name is Brooks Juhasz and I'm a pitching coach.

Hollenbeck: Assistant coach Justin Hollenbeck.

Omar: Steven Omar. Four rings. Assistant coach.

21. Fiscal Year 2026 Budget Amendment in the amount of \$31,597 for Meridian Pool Building Maintenance

Simison: Okay. Council, with that, with Item 20 being removed, we will move on to Item 21, which is a fiscal 2026 budget amendment in the amount of 31,597 for Meridian pool building maintenance. Turn this over to Mr. White.

White: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, thanks for having me tonight. Like Mayor said, in front of you is a budget amendment for 31,597 dollars. In short, as we started de-wintering the pool back in April, all the way through May, one thing after another started adding up on kind of unexpected maintenance items, everything from a roof leak to pump -- circulation pump going out that you just can't really know until they go out and

as those things kept tallying we started thinking, okay, we need to either do a budget amendment and come and talk to you guys about it, so the big one that's on here, as explained in the memo that we had, is the lights in the -- in the pool -- in the big pool. They were all working last year. Everything was great. Fired everything up this year and we found that they -- seven of the ten are out. That was a big expense. So, at this point we are here in front of you to ask for the budget amendment to cover these project costs. So, with that I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Appreciate you guys coming for this. We sent the information to the Council and a couple Council Members wanted the -- kind of good hygiene of doing it as a budget amendment. It's something we need to do, so like that's pretty straightforward, so with that I move that we approve the fiscal year 2026 budget amendment in the amount of 31,597 dollars for the Meridian pool maintenance.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and second to approve Item 21. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

22. Fiscal Year 2026 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$173,700 for Ustick & Venable Signalized Intersection Design

Simison: Next item up is Item No. 22, which is the fiscal year 2026 budget amendment in the amount of 173,700 for Ustick and Venable signalized intersection design. Mr. White, you can take this one, too.

White: All right. Mr. Mayor and Council, thanks again for having me. This budget amendment is something we have been talking about for a little bit now or for a while. This is the signalization of the Venable and Ustick intersection like we had discussed before and like the memo says. In short the CDA, the cooperative development agreement that we are getting into with Brighton and ACHD is super close to being done. You guys should actually see that for approval on signature in the next few weeks. Got that feedback this morning right before this. So, look forward to that. And

before we sign that we need to have a budget for it and so we are here in front of you guys to get that approved. This is our proportionate share of the CDA, which is basically the design of the project and, then, the CDA kind of divvies out who pays for those things after that. So, with that I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you, Garrett. And just -- this is impact fees -- or this -- is part of that project correct portion as well.

White: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions for Garrett?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Nice to see a project come together in a critical area. Definitely important for us to approve this. I move that we approve the fiscal year 2026 budget amendment in the amount of 173,700 dollars for the Ustick and Venable signalized intersection design.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and second to approve Item 22. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

White: Thank you.

23. Flex Space and other UDC Standards Update

Simison: Thank you, Garrett. Thank you, Steve. Up next is Item 23, which is Flex Space and other UDC standards update. Mr. Hood. Mr. Parsons. I don't know if you are tag teaming or who is leading out, but -- looks like Mr. Hood.

Hood: Mr. Mayor, Council, I do have Mr. Parsons and Mr. -- was here just a minute ago, but -- so, they are here for support should I need it. So, this afternoon we would like to talk to you about some potential UDC changes. There is a very brief cover memo that was in your packet. The clerk is handing out some more detailed information. They are collated, Chris, so, hopefully, you can just give up -- sorry. I tried to make it more simple, but there is basically three things in the UDC regarding legislative changes. So,

Emily Kane spoke to a few weeks ago and so this is a follow-up to a few of those items and, then, we are going to further discussion on flex space. So, I will have some code implications, but we are going to kind of take these in order of what I think is easiest to hardest. I'm going to go ahead and get started, because I think the first one is fairly straightforward. So, this last legislative session House Bill 800 amended two sections of Idaho Code. The first one really doesn't pertain to planning, but the -- the second section 6765 is the Local Land Use Planning Act, so it doesn't affect what we do in our office. Essentially the second bullet summarizes it. Again changed two sections of state law. So, this is certainly paraphrasing the intent of that, but basically manufactured units. So, units that are prefabricated and brought on site are to be treated as traditional stick built or wood framed type homes in basically all aspects and this also includes the same for multi-family. So, you can take those same -- say 400 square foot things that are manufactured on site and put three of them together to have a 1,200 square foot dwelling and we have to treat them the same as we would again a traditional stick build home. The UDC does already address single family homes that way, so we already in our definitions and in the way we treat manufactured homes as if it were a single family dwelling, but we don't currently address that for multi-family dwelling units. So, again, if someone took 400 square foot manufactured units and put them on top of three different units and made a multi-family dwelling we don't call that out as being something that will be currently permitted. So, we are proposing one change you can see on this slide and it's highlighted and I believe I even put it in yellow on -- on that first handout sheet titled Manufactured Home. So, that's the only change this one for us to be code compliant. I have vetted this through legal and others on the team, but here to wordsmith -- well, there will be public hearings on this, but if there is a better way -- I should have started with that. If there is something else or a better way that you want us to approach this certainly open to that. But this one I think is pretty straightforward, but I will pause in case there are any -- any comments on this one.

Simison: Council, any questions? Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Caleb, is the definition from the legislative text or is that our definition that we have created to conform?

Hood: So, the last portion of this slide, the UDC change is a change to UDC and the only thing that is changing is the underlying part. So, we already have a multi-family dwelling definition. What we are doing is -- and what's underlined is -- it's not verbatim, but it's essentially the way that the state law reads. So, it -- yeah, there is some slight wordsmithing that went on there, so it doesn't exactly mirror it, but I believe it does in intent to the bill.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Just more like curious. I have a good sense of what a traditional manufactured home is. I'm just kind of curious, what type of project would we be likely to see that would be a multi-unit manufactured building? I'm just kind of curious what that would look like, if we have seen examples of that, does that mean it's something

that's just prefabricated and, then, kind of set -- because I have seen that, but just help us understand a little more what we are talking about.

Hood: Yeah. I might -- actually, I don't think we have seen any here in -- Mayor and Council, I don't think we have seen any in Meridian, but I have seen in other places where, again, you pre-manufacture the units and basically -- almost like what we have over with the project across the street where it's podium style and you just build them up and bring those units and, then, you finish them out individually, but they are largely manufactured off site. That was going to be -- basically a pre-manufactured podium style multi-family project, so -- I don't know technically it was. I can't remember how we actually permitted that, but it's something like that essentially where you are bringing them mostly built and on site and siting them. Can you think of any, Bill, that we have seen that would -- that would do something like that, instead of a more steel or wood frame concrete even tilt up type of a building? I'm not aware of any.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of Council, I'm with Caleb, I haven't seen that, but I think this also addresses where someone could have one parcel to develop, but bring in multiple units. So, although it may not -- may not be just one -- there might be one building, but multiple buildings situated on the site or developed on the property. So, although it's all just one building, it still may be ten units on one property and, therefore, we would still define it as multi-family and we would still have to allow that under -- under this provision as well. So, I have seen that example in Meridian where they -- they have done a single family development, but because they didn't condo the building or subdivide the property was defined and approved as a multi-family development.

Hood: Yeah. And just to build on that -- that's a good point and I have seen, again, same thing I think where there is multiple manufactured single family dwellings that aren't attached to each other, right, on one property and by our definition that would be multi-family, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: But just -- just so I understand, I don't think at least before there was anything in our code that would have prevented like modular construction techniques or the use of those. This is just sort of explicitly conforming to the legislation --

Hood: That's right.

Strader: -- then. Got it. Thank you.

Simison: Any other comments, questions?

Hood: All right. We are going to go to the second handout then, which has to do with accessory dwelling units. So, this one -- I think there is the citation of the Senate Bill

3054 and, then, the two sections of Idaho Code that again were modified by this. Title 55 has to do with homeowners association, so I'm not going to really talk about that, but essentially prevents HOAs, as well as the city, which, again, back to 6765, from banning ADUs in residential zoning areas and, then, this is the part that I want to highlight. It preempts certain standards that we currently have in process. We are going to have to -- excuse me -- even though we just modified this about six months ago we are going to have to come back in and slightly tweak that. The good news is you all didn't want to have a homeowner occupied requirement there, so you had that dialog. Good thing we didn't adopt that, because the state would have preempted it should you have done that, so -- but there are a couple of things that I do want to call to your attention and do need a little bit of direction on this one. Again, it's all on the table, but there is some more I think we would like to have your input in which direction to go and their options. So, again, we are in pretty good shape here in that the UDC currently allows ADUs in all residential zoning districts, but those standards that need to be revised and I thought what I would do just real quick is I will read this section that talks about what we can and can't do basically as a city. So, we have to allow for either one internal accessory dwelling unit or one detached accessory dwelling unit per lot in the rear yard or subject to setback requirements for the primary dwelling in all residential zoning districts. We -- we have to -- we can't require any off-street parking or guest parking for an accessory dwelling unit unless the principal dwelling unit does not have off-street parking or the street is not paved and designed or constructed for on-street parking or unless the principal dwelling unit is within one quarter mile of transit and employment area or commercial services. I'm going to just pause there. So, I made it through two. Staff is proposing to not have or remove the current requirement for parking for ADUs. This is a very convoluted section of the code in my opinion and it is going to be a nightmare if we are going to try to regulate that and keep up with if this is -- I don't even know what an employment area is. We don't designate those necessarily or commercial services and what does that mean with -- if there is a C-store within the quarter mile? So -- and it even seems backwards to me in that you should require parking if you are further away than that. So, this is very -- I don't think it's the best section of the code again in my opinion. So, in the conversations with staff we decided it's best just to not require parking for ADUs and I know historically, not even this council, but previous councils, too, that has been a big concern for neighborhood character and things like that. But, again, we are sort of preempted in a lot of this. There is a way to do it, but it's darn near impossible. All of our streets are paved, so really it's -- it would be difficult to -- to have that parking requirement. So, that's what staff is proposing is to get rid of the parking standard. I should just point out that is -- the underlying strike through on the handout is there, too. So, that's Subsection G on page two or the -- or the back side of -- of the first page I guess. Page two. So, you can see that's a simple strike through in our current standards. I'm going to go on then. We can't -- we can't impose impact fees or utility connection fees on accessory dwellings that are greater than those imposed on single family dwellings. So, staff's proposals is to charge them just the same, because a dwelling unit is a dwelling unit. We do have differences in some of those impact fees for multi-family versus single family, but these are single family dwelling units by definition. The state law does allow us to be less restrictive if we wanted to. So, there are a couple of these things that their standards say, you know what, when I get to size

even we don't have to interpret it to be more restrictive. If we wanted to be less restrictive we can. Staff is not proposing that though. This one is another one that I'm going to pause after reading. It says prohibit limiting the size of an accessory dwelling unit to less than one thousand square feet or 75 percent of the size of the primary dwelling. That does not say whichever is greater or whichever is less. So, we have taken sort of the conservative approach to say whichever is greater. At least that's our proposal now. It does mean that you can have some very large accessory dwelling units. A 4,000 square foot home could have a 3,000 square foot ADU, but it's not clear in how this is written and we would rather not be the first challenge in the state if we interpret it the wrong way. We have seen from other folks that were part of the committee and in the legislature that have sort of interpreted it the other way and we certainly could. If Council is pretty confident in that -- and I think it is probably whichever is least, but that's -- it's not -- certainly not clear here and so we are playing sort of the least risk in the courts anyways and maybe more risky in neighborhoods if someone were to build a 3,000 square foot ADU in that example. But that staff's proposal is the greater of the two is your option, so -- I don't know if there is any thoughts on that.

Simison: Mr. Nary, can you give me your two cents on what would be the -- if we were challenged is it a financial or is it a code change?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, we think it would probably be an action where they would like to get a permit and they aren't allowed to, because it doesn't meet our standard and so it would likely not be a damage claim it would be more like an injunctive action that requires you to do something, but, again, it's hard to know with the way the statute's written, but I don't see it as a financial impact potentially. It's more likely a court forcing us to really allow something to get built.

Simison: So, the risk to go the opposite direction from what staff is recommending at this point in time that would be a little to the city likely?

Nary: It's probably -- I mean -- I think where the staff -- where we have landed from up -- from both legal and planning is the safest route to not get challenged would be to do what we are proposing. If we want to run the risk of getting challenged is there a financial impact as -- I don't think so. Could there be some other impact? Possibly. Again defending ourselves, spending the time on that and try to do that. But other than that I don't know.

Simison: Yeah. And yet getting challenged, but going to the legislature to try to get clarification seems like an appropriate way to go compared to the opposite of allowing a 3,000 square foot -- is that an ADU?

Nary: Well -- and I think, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I mean one of the things we struggle with and what I don't think the legislature thought about is that may seem very out of place in a traditional normal neighborhood. It may not be out of place on a personal property that's two acres large and so it really is so relative and the legislature

didn't really take into that consideration. They just gave us a square footage amount and set a percentage in relation to the original building -- the property itself.

Simison: Just like for -- I mean my house is 3,000 square feet, so I could do a 2,200 square feet ADU adjacent to mine. Am I limited in height? Kind of the four stories or it is limited by all the other codes we have?

Hood: Mr. Mayor, you are getting ahead of me a little bit. It is on the slide, but, yes, we have amended -- proposing to amend in our -- in the changes, so maybe just to put a bow around the last point, the maximum size is subsection E, so -- on the bottom of the first page. So, if you want to change that or take direction on that, I'm happy with that and, then, to the height is -- it's just a small adding -- middle of page two under I addresses height. So, it's under design. So, that is one of the things that the legislature is allowing cities to regulate. So, your ADU can't be taller than the primary structure. So, we are adding that to our code. We had some other things that made it kind of fit into your neighborhood type of a thing, but height was particular -- specifically called out in the legislation, so we are going to add it to our code. We thought that was a good thing to, again, try to keep within -- with neighborhood character not to allow it to be taller than the primary dwelling.

Nary: And Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I don't recall, Caleb, but it doesn't require that we have to adjust anything regarding setbacks or anything else either so -- and if it's a fairly small lot it would be awfully hard to put a building of that size on it. But I think that's the only restriction we would have. And that's why I was talking about the height, because --

Nary: Yeah.

Simison: -- you can go up and go up.

Nary: Right.

Simison: If you can't, then, yes. Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, I -- I think just my recollection of some of the discussion about this, keeping in mind, you know, we think of ADUs in the context of Meridian, it's very different than, you know, Kootenai county or Butte county or Bingham county or Blackfoot, Idaho. So, these rules all apply, so I think they are probably -- I think the goal was maximum flexibility and the minimal amount of requirements from the legislature, so I don't -- don't think I would disagree at all with counsel and with Bill's and Caleb's recommendations about where they are at in terms of -- it seems awkward and strange, but that's because we are thinking of, you know, a quarter acre lot, you know, and try to put an ADU that's the same size as your house on it, so -- I think it's probably the safe space to be at this point without any additional clarification from the legislature on that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just a couple -- a couple. I think our setback requirements can still apply thankfully or you would just like have a complete nightmare. I -- personally I don't love the -- I guess interpretive approach of whichever is greater. I don't feel like that's a great fit for a city. Like personally it's my opinion. I -- I would prefer the interpretation of whichever is less and, then, see how that sorts itself out and try to get clarification from the legislature. I just -- and I do appreciate the thought around building height. I think that's probably where we would get the biggest pushback. I have experienced that personally in my district with a lot of frustration from people and, you know, I'm just imagining if somehow like the setback requirements were met and, then, you had a situation where you ended up with, you know, a 3,000 square foot home next to a 4,000 square foot home and how would people feel about that and I just -- again, like any situation where they are trying to uphold people's property rights, we are trying to balance that with the character of the city. I personally would prefer -- I guess a tailored approach that's whichever is less, but that's just my -- my input.

Hood: Mr. Mayor. Just sort of on the fly -- and I'm -- it may be a horrible idea. We can mirror the language in the statute and just sort of punt it. I -- that puts it on staff though. The first one that comes in it's 1,001 square feet, it's on us to make that call. I -- like I said, I'm not saying it's a great option, but we could just use their language and go we don't know and, then, we -- either at that time we say, yep, we are going to give you the permit for that 1,001 square foot ADU or we are going to deny it because it's more than a thousand square feet. I don't know. Again, as I said it might be a bad option, but we could get a 50-50 chance if we take whichever is less or whichever is greater, but it's got to be one or other. I can't -- I can't do it both ways, so -- we can move on and double back and, again, there will be public hearings on this, too. So, yeah, we don't all have to agree right now. But I appreciate the feedback and we kind of had this similar conversation, so -- and, then, I'm just going to keep going down. I already mentioned no owner occupancy requirements, so we can't do that, so we don't have it, so that doesn't apply at this point. And, then, here is the section, Mr. Mayor, prohibit imposing a limit on building height that is less than the height of an existing single-family primary dwelling on the lot. So again -- and, then, prohibit restricting for accessory dwelling units that are more restrictive than restrictions for single family dwellings within the same zoning district with regard to setbacks, lot size or coverage on building -- on our building frontage. So, again, we treat them like the other dwelling on the site and not preferential treatments or less setbacks or -- or more, so -- that would be approved administratively. Luckily we already do that, but you don't see ADUs, they just are staff level approval. And, then, here is something I probably could have put on the slide, coulda, shoulda, woulda. This does only apply to cities of over 10,000 people. So, the counties are exempt. It is only an item -- 10,000 is not a large city necessarily, but that is -- this only applies to cities of 10,000 population or more. So, the smaller cities are exempt. And, again, you have underlying strike through of the draft. I'm not trying to put you on the spot. You can e-mail me, call me, whatever and we can -- we can talk through it some more if you have any other questions or concerns on this. I will take them now, but I'm going to move on to the -- the last one here, unless there is anything

right now. Okay. Starter home subdivision. So, this is a new one. This is brand new legislation. This section actually already does exist though, but it's new, so I don't know which one is going to be 6541 and 6542. They had two -- two bills that had the same section of code. This is Senate Bill 1352. Again only applies to cities over 10,000. We have to amend both our comp plan and our zoning code to allow what are called starter home subdivisions. I think most all of you are tracking this and kind of know, but it applies to properties that are four acres or more -- and this is optional, doesn't mean you have to. If you are a five acre project it doesn't mean you have to do this, but the city has to allow 1,500 square foot -- maximum square 1,500 square foot lots in all residential zones and there are -- there are preemptive requirements to our setbacks. So, it doesn't matter if you are an R-2 zone, you have to allow a 15 foot front setback for a starter home subdivision. So, all of our zoning code basically gets preempted by -- by this to allow 1,500 square foot lots in all residential zones throughout the city. High density, low density, medium density, everywhere could be a starter home subdivision if you are four acres or more and you apply for it. So, again, this isn't mandated that private property owners have to do starter home subdivisions, but we have to allow it. So, there will be some pretty substantial amendments in multiple sections of the UDC. We don't define starter homes as of yet. So, first page there is a definition and, again, this one pretty much does mirror the legislative language of what a starter home subdivision is. I'm not going to run through all them. I sort of just did. There is all kinds of footnotes and things within our schedule of use and our tables that talk about starter home subdivisions and basically give them an exemption and say this is what applies to them in all zoning codes. So, that's the approach we took. It seems like it's the most straightforward approach and there is a companion application that was submitted here last week -- two weeks ago now -- to amend the comp plan to just -- it's basically an ode to starter home subdivisions in our Comprehensive Plan that addresses it and says in residential districts throughout the City of Meridian you may do starter home subdivisions. So, it's nothing super fancy or elaborate, but it -- it is code compliant in our opinion, so -- I can run through it some more if you would like, but, essentially, that's it and I -- I want to kind of give you some context, too, in this handout. So, there is more than what's changing, but it gives you kind of a full picture of how the code kind of flows. Oh, I guess there was one other thing I wanted to point out. Staff is also proposing a new finding and so if you -- sorry, there is no page numbers, but it's the second to last sheet of paper and it's the backside of that -- of that page, second -- the second page of paper, the backside, and this -- I'm proposing that they -- the findings be added to all subdivisions. So, these are the subdivisions. May look familiar to you, A through F for all subdivisions. I would propose we add G. It allows you some discretion in subdivision that -- to make a finding that the plat is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and that's straight out of the legislation. So, it does give you an opportunity if you -- to make a finding or not potentially to say this, starter home subdivision in this location, even though we have to allow them, does not meet this finding. So, there is language again in the statute that allows -- I don't want to say that out, but a finding you have to make that it is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods. That's straight out of the bill, so -- but that wouldn't be just for starter homes subdivision, that would be for all subdivisions, so -- I think with that I will take comments, feedback.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Caleb, I think I might have teased this question a few weeks ago when we kind of were bringing this up. My -- my question would be when it comes with the limitations that we would have on setbacks and things like that with these starter home subdivisions, is that only with these subdivision designations or would it apply to all of our residential designations?

Hood: So, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, if I'm understanding your question -- well, let me answer how I understood your question. So, again, in all residential zoning districts we have to allow starter home subdivisions, but we aren't changing the standards for all lots in all zoning districts to allow starter home subdivisions. If that makes sense. So, unless you come through our process as a starter home subdivision you aren't entitled as a starter home subdivision and not eligible for this.

Taylor: Yeah. And, Mr. Mayor, just to follow up on that while Caleb's coughing. Yes, that's what I meant. Like you have to come through our process and you -- at the beginning of the process saying we want -- this is what we are seeking and, then, that would sort of trigger these new UDC -- or these new rules that would come along with the starter home subdivisions. It wouldn't be applicable to any other residential -- which is kind of what I was wondering. I think I was -- a month or two ago whenever it was I kind of brought it up and it was -- we got to look at it, but we don't think so, but I think you answered my question

Hood: I will share a little bit. You know, we have had some conversations of 90 some percent of our projects if -- you know, close to a hundred anyways. We do a development agreement; right? And there is a concept plan. What happens if they go from that concept plan with an R-4 zone and now want to do a starter home subdivision? We don't know how that would necessarily play out, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: That's kind of one of my questions. Like I guess I'm curious. It feels like we still have discretion when it comes to the annexation decision, but my concern is once we annex in property at that point like -- let's just give an example. Let's say if someone comes through and we annex in a subdivision with a plan for large lots. The neighbors are happy, it seems like it's a good fit, and, then, two weeks later they come back and they say, you know what, we would like a DA modification, we are going to build a starter home subdivision. Maybe this is a legal question, but like what -- what ability do we have at that point to say no? Do we have a leg to stand on? Do we just have to approve it administratively? I just want to understand our legal interpretation at that point of what we would need to do.

Hood: And -- Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I will certainly let Bill -- Bill chime in. I do think we have some discretion and that is some of why this new finding I would propose we add, but even in the bill there are still some things -- like here is public utilities; right? If our sewer capacity is not there we can say no as a city. If we can't service that as that dense of a subdivision and we can't provide -- there is a life safety issue, we can deny starter home subdivisions, but to clear that bar is -- is a pretty -- it's a pretty high bar. So, you still do have some ability, but the intent certainly is to allow these more than deny them. But there are circumstances where we can say no.

Nary: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor, Member of the Council, Council Member Strader, I mean I think, yeah, that's a great question and we talked about that in our internal group and I -- at least today I would tell you I don't see a court saying that this statute somehow circumvents a contractual relationship we have created with a property owner. They have agreed to come into the city under these conditions. We contractually agreed to them to do it that way and we are not obligated to change it just because they want to change it to something else and this doesn't really require us to do anything. It requires us to allow it in code. It allows it in our ordinances or comp plan. But it doesn't say contractually we have to agree to it whenever somebody wants it. So, I think we still have the absolute right to say no thanks, we like what we agreed to, we like the development agreement we already have and we are not willing to change it and I don't think -- we don't have any case law that says we are obligated to change that, so I don't see that today.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just maybe a broader scoping question. I might want Dave to chime in. We have to amend our comp plan. Our comp plan is coming up on nine, ten years old. I know we were -- we contemplated whether or not we wanted to pursue maybe some funding to look at the comp plan -- comp plan and kind of do that. Would it make sense to just amend the comp plan how we thought made sense or would it make more sense strategically to take this moment and have the holistic view and that way we are having a very involved process where we say maybe these are some of the areas where it would make some sense with sewer capacity, utility, et cetera, to have these subdivisions, because that would help guide developers instead of them coming in and saying -- kind of scattershot where they want to see, we are going to kind of guide it where it makes the most sense. So, I'm kind of curious sort of a big picture question about timing on amending our comp plan for that and sort of a comp plan redo.

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor and Council, that's a great question. I think in our minds when it comes to -- the back away from the legislative -- the comp plan discussions that we have heard Council make comments about and looking at the comp plan and, then, the length of time it's been in place and what are the changes we have seen, we have been targeting FY-28 as kind of the next step into that to be able to have conversations with you or with the community about what is it about the comp plan that

we think we even want to touch? Is it just a light touch and redo some sections? Is it a full blown effort and aligns with the strategic plan, as well for our tactics and timing, along with the things that we are currently working on that touch or impact the comp plan. I think that's why we were thinking '28 and not necessarily diving right in now. Now you go to the legislative aspects where we have to touch the comp plan because of these bills. There is certainly a conversation that we could have about doing that. I do get a little hesitant about timing of doing it a more robust effort in the content just because of these legislative issues, because of the rush of time that would take to get into effect by February of '27, which the legislature has in their bills, and potentially us missing the other things we want to touch in that larger discussion, if that makes sense. We can certainly have the conversation. We are open to feedback on accelerating that or not. It does have an impact on staff and the things they are currently working on. So, I think my opinion is approaching the legislative needs now with the comp plan amendments that we need to make under the legislative aspects is a good approach. And, then, discuss with you all what is it about the comp plan that we as a community want to undertake, how much of that, what elements and handling that separately. That's my current thought.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm really glad you suggested this, Council Member Taylor, because it's a really interesting question. Like could we satisfy the legislation by saying we have done an analysis and based on our utilities these are the areas that we support starter home subdivisions. Like could we take that opposite approach of being proactive? Like these are the areas where we can support it. Would that meet the intent? Like would that meet the legislation's requirements or would that still get us into issues?

Hood: So, Mr. Mayor, I can -- I can -- we can brainstorm that idea, too, in designating areas on the -- on the comp plan. What that wouldn't satisfy, though, is a portion of this that talks about in residential zoning districts. Comp plan doesn't have zoning. So, back to the -- we have already annexed it and you are in the city already. Comp plan doesn't -- it doesn't apply. It doesn't matter anymore essentially. So, we talked about that. Let's designate some spots on our comp plan that we couldn't -- can allow these. Also maybe just to piggyback, if it's okay, a little bit of data. So, I think we can do a lot of this work in house, right, with Public Works staff; right? We need to know what -- what the water and master plan is and the sewer master plan and the roads and all that infrastructure that would be needed to support this and where it's lacking we can say, hey, if we -- if we made this a five lane roadway and we bought -- made this line bigger for sewer or whatever we could accommodate this or, no, what we have in our current plans can only accommodate this density, so I don't want to go to the public necessarily right away without having a good understanding of where maybe we can allow some more starter home subdivisions and target them in our Comprehensive Plan and say, hey, this is a higher density area than others and if I can just one more thing just to -- not to be repetitive, but I didn't mention it here. I was going to say it as we transition to

flex space. We do need to make these changes by February 1st. Going to the public and getting that feedback and -- and I'm -- I'm really kind of dreading this, because I -- I can sense some of the feedback we are getting, I'm going to have to say, sorry, but we are going to do this anyways, you know, so that -- that public feedback at least with initial code compliance -- I think this is the best -- best path and, then, we look at a bigger picture. Let's look at our infrastructure with some of our other partners, like ACHD and ITD and other -- schools and say where should we be doing some more of these things? Where is the opportunity? And, then take that out to the public and go these are the areas we can accommodate these. Do they all make sense? Do some of them make sense? That's where I would like some feedback I guess from my --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: At least as a decision maker, whether it's in the comp plan process or just outside of that, I do think having Public Works start some kind of an analysis of what this change could mean if it was fully implemented in different areas of the city would be really important, because as we start to see requests come through -- like we need to have a grounded and like consistent analytical approach to approving or denying them and I think there is a lot of work, unfortunately, that -- modeling, honestly, they need to do a lot of modeling of like what this would mean, how much we could support seeing this. I guess I would just encourage as much of that work to start as possible so we can get ahead of it.

Hood: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes.

Hood: I was just going to say we actually did work with Public Works and they mapped all the parcels that are four acres or more in Meridian just to kind of get an understanding how many parcels are even out there. Not that all of them would run to do a starter home subdivision, but where -- where are these? I don't think they have gone to the -- the extent of, okay, it's on this trunk and how much capacity on this trunk versus that one, but some of that's already started and I will reiterate that with them. So thank you.

Simison: Yeah. I think that's the challenge is like it's good for a moment until it's not good, you know. But that's -- that's the underlying issue and even if we -- even if we designate places in the future someone else might eat that up and it shouldn't be designated, so it's -- it's Houdini.

Miles: Yes. Mr. Mayor. And just to clarify, you know, some of that early work land within the city at least, don't call me, I'm happy to share a map with you, because we did look at that, but it's roughly 40'ish parcels, roughly 700 acres that are inside of annexed city land today that would meet this four acres or more designations. So, that gives you --

it's spread around the city as well. Happy to share a map with you, but it gives you an initial stab into the Mayor's point. That could change tomorrow depending on which development comes in first and, again, on the comp plan conversation happy to talk more about that and timing wise I think there is all of these competing interests in the comp plan and the timing of the legislative activity that needs to occur. I think giving it its rightful place and getting it established and, then, giving the comp plan conversations its due respect and efforts and how we want to roll that out to the community and what you all would like to see us touching in that -- in that effort as well, it feels like a -- coming -- planning in '27 and executing, asking for funding if needed in '28, somewhere in that time range.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. Dave, I think that's probably good feedback to take away here in some ways. I think it's probably a conversation we ought to have, you know, maybe as -- after we get out of the budget discussions just to kind of let you present some information, let us kind of chew on it, because it is a -- you know, it's -- there is a lot of planning that goes into it and I think not rushing it, but having a thoughtful approach makes sense. I think I would encourage us to have that discussion sometime maybe late summer or fall.

Simison: Is that part of --

Taylor: Comp plan. Like sort of a bigger picture Comp Plan discussion, like what makes sense, a big big massive relook, tweaks -- I mean --

Simison: So, the level of the comp plan, not necessarily whether or not we should do it before February?

Taylor: Yes. Correct. Yeah. Clarification. I understand we are going to have to do some things prior to the deadline, but this is more of a bigger picture holistic look at timing of when we may want to do that.

Hood: Okay. Those are the easy ones. I'm now on to -- I have no idea what we want to do. No. Flex space. So, you guys actually -- you did take an action a couple weeks ago. Maybe it was just last week, the 16th, last week and so that will -- that ordinance is working its way through and we will adopt that as you all approved. Wanted to maybe just step back a little bit, though, and we have talked about this several times now over the last handful of years. Excuse me. And give you a little bit of the history on flex space, not all of it, but I think back when we included this in our Unified Development Code there was an intent to protect industrial, but also allow some non-industrial type functions within those buildings for that tenant. So, calling out specifically you can have some retail, you can have a showroom, you can have some office within there. You don't have to be a hundred percent distribution or warehouse; right? So, another

intended effect of allowing some quasi-industrial users in commercial zones. So, even promoting some industrial uses outside of the industrial zone, so in the C-G zone maybe having some -- some buildings that -- that -- that allow different uses there. Over the last couple of years, again, we have tweaked the specific use standards -- those percentages quite a bit a couple of times even and had conversations at three different hearings. Recent history, again, the -- was approved on the 16th. That ordinance is -- is forthcoming, but the section of code that that addressed didn't address all of the aspects of flex space. So, really kind of three -- three sections of flex that go together and that's the specific use standards, which, again, you are familiar with. It talks about ten to 30 percent of these types of uses in -- in -- for flex use. The schedule of use. So, the tables, which zones can I do flex space in? So, commercial zones, industrial zones, office zones, that's the schedule of use control or the tables and, then, again, the definition and that's where I kind of wanted to start even right now is just to read to you the definition real quick of what flex space is and I think there is some room for improvement there. Sorry, I just lost them to pull it up real quick here. So, flex space. The use of a building or portion thereof for small scale warehousing and/or light industry with associated office and/or retail showroom space. Period. Flexibility and use of the interior space and low scale attractive exterior appearances characterize flex buildings. I think this is where we get off on the wrong foot is everyone has their own definition of what flex space is and staff can't even agree what this means, what low scale is, what attractive is, what -- you know. So -- so, that's I think one thing that we need to work on is what is -- what is flex space and we have heard from you some feedback already. So, I think some flexibility you guys have talked about is a good thing. The market influence and those types of things. We get that. I think we are going to have to, again, kind of tighten this definition down a little bit, though, as we also look at the schedule of use and -- in the specific use standards. So, again, staff can't even agree is this a multi-tenant building, is it total flexibility for any user that wants to go in there? If we have a roll-up door does that make a flex building? So, everyone sort of has their own vision of what a flex building is and we need to really get on the same page with this. So, we miss each other on what flex is and, again, we understand that you want to be more flexible and I think we are making some strides there. Schedule of use. So, that's, again, the zones that are allowed and just in the interest of time I'm going to go through that pretty quickly, but, again, the twofold concern that we have is allowing more industrial type of buildings in commercial zones and this just isn't the potential look or the unattractiveness of an industrial building, but the uses themselves and the conflicting uses potentially even within the same building; right? So, while these industrial buildings have forklifts or triple trailers or things and now if we allow a daycare to go in there or something else, there is an inherent conflict in some of these uses. So, a line should be drawn somewhere, at least in staff's opinion, that there is a separation of use. That's what our -- that's what our zoning code is based on. I will touch on this in a minute. There is other cities throughout the nation, even in Idaho, there is a form-based code. It's performance standards, not about the use. It doesn't matter what you call yourself, as long as you build the building to this line and this tall and put these windows on it we don't care what you do inside, but industrial when there is roll-up doors and docks and those types of things and also just say it can be more of a nuisance even. Like the parking requirements in industrial are less. We require a

quarter of the parking in industrial areas. So, then, when you get those taken over by churches and Pilates studios and these other uses that do have a higher frequency of customers, they are under parked and so it is this balance of at least if we are going to keep with our current model of having Euclidean zoning some of that separation of -- you know, we have mixed use areas, but we don't allow industrial in those; right? So, mixed use more with the commercial and residential. So, again, I think this just goes to show some of the definition and the schedule of use and where we want to allow these uses protecting industrial, also allowing it in some commercial zones, but with some caveats, so --

Simison: So, Caleb, while you take a drink of water and give you a basic question, just -- since you brought up other communities. What other communities in our area have flex space though -- have a similar or a different definition and/or have a percentage based in their flex space? That to me -- you know, we don't have to do what the Joneses do. I think it's important to understand what the Joneses are doing, so that we know if we are an island in the what we are doing here or -- and sometimes when you are on an island you are leading, but where are we?

Hood: Good question, Mayor. I -- and I was going to, again, kind of talk about this when we get to solutions and options and what others are doing. So, typically, right, wrong, indifferent, but it's three that I can kind of compare ourselves to. Excuse me. We get these types of things: Boise, Nampa and Eagle. I mean these are kind of my litmus tests for these types of things. What are they doing? At least at a starting point to see what they are doing. Boise does not have flex. They don't just flex. In residential actually they do, but they don't have it for commercial or industrial use. So, they don't have -- any flex space doesn't exist in their ordinance. Nampa's it does, but only in definition. They have a definition of a flex space building, but, again, we use form-based code, so that doesn't really mean anything. It just defines that it's a flexible building for space. Form-based code. It says it's performance standard. So, it has to be at least two or three stories tall, depending on what zone you are in and there are some other requirements, parking and those types of things, but it doesn't actually have a schedule of use control like the City of Meridian does. Eagle does and they are the closest that we have, where they have parking requirements for flex buildings, but their parking requirements, just as an example, are one per 500, which is more like our commercial standard than our industrial standard that's at one per 2,000. We just approved last week -- well, it's on the books now -- one per thousand is our current flex space standard. But Eagle has flex and, again, they are most similar to our code and we are somewhere in the middle with how we treat them in their schedule of use. They do allow it as principally permitted in their C-1, their C-2 -- sorry. Their C-3, their C, B, D, their M-1 and their B-P zoning districts. Don't ask me what all those mean, but they do have principally permitted flex space as a use in the city of Eagle. So, it's kind of all over the place and those three that we most typically use -- three flavors of ice cream.

Simison: And do they have a percentage of the building? Is that any -- is that in any of the components? Just wanted to --

Hood: Maybe I will double back after kind of get -- get through some other things and I will see if --

Simison: I thought I heard they had that they had a percentage from a listed -- in that context. But I didn't know if that was fact or fiction.

Hood: And, again, that's something I think that we would want another crack at, even though you just approved ten to 30 percent, depending on the zoning district. I think we -- we had another one, you know, where it talks about a maximum. What happens if we have 51 percent commercial in this, can we still be a flex building? So, everyone wants flex.

Simison: Everyone wants flexibility.

Hood: Yes. And we -- and we want to as well, but there needs to be some sideboards at some point. Just, again, professional office in a flex building, something like that is not -- not flex by current definitions or anything like that, so -- so, yeah, I will speed this along. I think here is just a -- so, some -- some quick summaries of what we see as options. We can require CUPs for these and you know it when you see it; right? We could say Planning and Zoning Commission or City Council, they want to call themselves a flex user, flex building, what do you think? I mean you are going to punt it rather than messing with, you know, a lot of the definition. You say you want to do a flex building, get a CUP. Don't love it. But just an option. We could kill flex all together; right? We can just -- it's not a -- it's not an industry standard that you have a flex use in your schedule of use control or allow flex buildings necessarily. To get rid of it. Again, not in favor of that, just saying it's an option, it will create other issues. I'm not proposing that. The third one is really what we are more proposing is to work with our UDC focus group to fix the definitions, schedule use and those specific standards some more. But I want some more feedback. We have gotten some notes, again, from the past few years where we have had these conversations, but if there is any other flexible, but what are those, how can we better define that so we aren't getting daycares next to fertilizer plants, next to FedEx, you know. We can't have all that flexibility, because we can't realistically -- and, again, this is something that tracking those tenants over time and managing that building is flex and saying, well, you can be the office component and someone over here is warehousing, what happens when the warehousing moves out and now they don't need the 30 percent. They are at 90 percent because it's vacant over there. We kick them out, too, because now it's not a flex space? It just adds some challenges when we don't sort of look at how we -- you know, the expectation of staff to manage this, too, and -- and what tenants are going in there. So, anyways, I will stop, pause, look and see what Eagle has for percentages and take other feedback.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, this is an intriguing discussion to me, which is strange in some regards. I actually asked myself the question by trying to define what flex space is are we killing flex space? Like how do you define it? And as I -- as I view it -- and we have had examples come before us I think in some of these applications -- there is -- there is types of uses and configurations and layouts and needs that we can't anticipate and when we try to define it we inadvertently create problems that we didn't anticipate. I think as a city a higher level philosophy should be how do we allow the greatest amount of ability for people to start a business, run a business, have some kind of enterprise that works really well here. We don't want to drive them to other municipalities. We don't want to become an obstacle to them doing something that is economically advantageous for them, provides benefit to the city. So, what I don't want to do is create barriers to entry, barriers to growth, things that are not intended to be harmful to someone starting a business, but which may -- we may inadvertently be doing that by trying to define what it is by the -- by coming up with a schedule of uses. I kind of wonder if you are just -- we don't even have flex space in the code, then, how do you -- does that allow people to have different types of uses in these buildings, kind of this form based zoning that you talked about. Don't know if that's the right answer, but to me I -- this particular type of a topic I feel like less is more when trying to get what I think we want as a city, which is we want diversity in our economic baseline. We don't want just, you know, some retail, hospital, a few office space, we want a variety of economic activity. The way to do that is to stop trying to control it by creating some rules. That's -- that's -- again, I'm just sort of speaking what I feel like philosophically makes a lot of sense to me. I understand, though, if I was a certain user type there is other neighbors I would not want to have or that wouldn't make sense to be safe. Like I wouldn't want to run a daycare next door to a FedEx, lots of big heavy truck, I get that. So, I understand there is some need for that, but I think philosophically I'm going to -- I'm going to push back on any desire to really try to define it closely or put a lot of controls around it, because I just think that's actually the opposite of what we want in terms of that. We are entering a new sort of a -- new economy where we can't even anticipate the types of uses. Three years from now what's it going to look like? I don't know. I think we need to try to be forward thinking to encourage people that come here and say Meridian is a great place to go, because there is a lot of flexibility. That's just kind of my -- my initial gut reaction as I have contemplated. I think what we have -- we have seen is we do need to get all kind of things figured out. We have had some confusion. We didn't mean to do that, but people have come and said, hey, we have got these great ideas, there is things we want to do, here is what the market is telling us, but we can't do it in your city because of this. So, I think we do need to address it, but I mean -- I'm just kind of wondering if we don't even address the issue at all if that gives us the flexibility we want. I don't know

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So to kind of tag along on what Councilman Taylor just said, I mean we have -- again, we have discussed this several times and I think the problem is we are trying to

hit a moving target. We get these requests from businesses and when we wrote our ordinances, our rules, the UDC on flex space, that's how business was being done at that time, but it keeps changing and the customers that they are seeing out there keep changing in what their needs and wants and desires are and I keep -- when I look at it I think if we keep trying to move the percentages of what we want to see flex space, we are going to constantly be doing this dance again and again and again as those demands change and I'm not sure that getting rid of that flex space requirement is not the right decision and, then, regulating the uses in a different manner than flex space altogether. So, we can keep the daycares away from the FedEx and forklifts, but allow a lot more flexibility in those uses, because I think we are going to always be trying to play catch up what the business needs are as the economies change, processes change, technologies advance beyond what we know today, so my thought.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think -- I think for your solutions of feedback, like CUPs -- I don't even want to go that route, because we are picking winners and losers and I think we don't want that. I don't want to kill flex space, because I feel like it's an innovative property type. It gives people an ability to build things they wouldn't otherwise be able to do. I think maybe where we need to go with it, instead of trying to regulate like this percentage of office or this percentage of that, maybe where we need to go with it is just to really sit down and have a really good understanding of what truly incompatible uses are and to prohibit those. So, like top of mind the daycare one is a great example. Heavy -- heavy industrial is very different than light industrial. Completely different ball game environmentally in terms of health impacts to the neighbors. I think if we put ourselves in that mindset of like I don't want to dictate anymore. You need this percentage, that percentage. Whether something is a little bit commercial or a little bit industrial I'm not sure I care that much. I think I care more about like truly incompatible uses being next to each other. Maybe -- you know, I think your third option is kind of where it needs to go, but maybe with more of a focus. Instead of being prescriptive, giving as much flexibility between light industrial and commercial as we can, but just identifying these are the uses that just don't work that we don't want to see. Maybe something like that would work better for us. I don't know. It's a really tough -- it's a tough one. We keep trying to build a mouse trap and it is really hard. But I don't want to kill the innovation. I think people like -- really appreciate having the flexibility of that -- of that approach, just like there are just some uses, though, that just don't work and that -- that would be hard, though. We are putting ourselves in a position where if unbeknownst to us a new tenant moves in and it's one of those truly incompatible uses and we catch wind of it, like how do we deal with it? But maybe that's an easier cleaner way. I don't know

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, having been multiple business owner and it just seems like our businesses have changed so many times and Amazon created so many home-based businesses that have outgrown their garage and look for flex space and I have talked to several people and we even had one at one point that all we were doing was repackaging, but we needed something that was five times the size of our garage to do it in, but we didn't need any like retail, nobody was going to come by and pick one up, we didn't need a showroom and so I think the more flexible that we can be the more opportunity we have to meet the needs of our citizens as small home businesses are growing and growing these days.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: And kind of along those lines, I just -- I don't know how you shoehorn all of this in to find the right package and whether it's roll-up doors, ten percent, 30 percent or is creation of jobs a factor that we can -- can that be a barometer of what we approve and what we don't approve or are we fine with just storing a bunch of stuff next to a daycare? As I have listened to some of the comments of people who have come before us, you know, they -- they have focused on here are the number of jobs that we are creating. Here is the -- here is the space that we need in order to help the economy of Meridian move forward. So, I'm not sure how we weave that in and -- but if we are shoehorning roll-up doors and percentages, I would like jobs to be part of that consideration.

Simison: And just my two cents. I'm all about no percentages. Yeah. Uses, conversations, plus, minus, good, bad, but nobody wins on percentages in this conversation.

Hood: So, Mr. Mayor, that's a great segue back to your question and Mr. Parsons was very helpful and looked up Eagle's definition, so they don't have a percentage requirement in their flex space. They do limit those to 30,000 square foot buildings though. So, again, ours says small scale. We don't put a size on that. Hundred thousand square foot buildings have been flex in the past. We don't have any way to say that's too big or too small, but that's what Eagle does is they say 30,000 and within their definition there is a laundry list. I won't read them all, but there is like 25 sample uses of what can go in there. Based on this discussion I'm kind of thinking going the other way, well, not define what it is, but we will define what it isn't, you know. And so maybe there is a few uses where we say you can't be this and you can't be that, but everything else sure. I don't know if that's going to work or not, but I hear -- I hear what you all are saying and instead of defining it, let's define what it isn't and maybe we can -- maybe that -- maybe we can get there. But that's what Eagle does, is they have -- again, they cap the -- going to be a flex building you can only be this big and here is the uses that can go in it.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Kind of a comment. I think this is the right direction to be going and I think Council Woman Strader's comment about defining incompatible uses is probably a better, easier way to go about it, so, then, that we are not inadvertently creating barriers that we don't anticipate. You know, within a building, you know, two or three uses that are compatible, like you can do that, but I think it's easier to say these are the things from a health and safety point of view are incompatible. We are not -- we are not going to do that. But it's hard to anticipate, well, what's compatible to some users. That's a hard thing to define. But it's easy for us to say like these things should not be together. Like that -- anybody knows that that doesn't make sense. I think that's a good direction to go and if it is the UDC focus group that helps us have that conversation I think that makes a lot of sense. It's going to be a lot easier for us to do that and it's going to have lasting impact that to Councilman Overton's comment, we are not going to be back here in 18 months, because someone brought an application that we are like, oh, geez, now what do we do? This is going to have something I think would be lasting and provide some certainty.

Hood: We will be back. Thank you.

Simison: Perfect. Thank you. Good luck with all that stuff and, yes, we will be seeing that all back here one way or the other over the next seven months.

Hood: Yeah.

EXECUTIVE SESSION [Action Item]

24. Executive session per Idaho Code 74-206A(1)(a): To deliberate on a labor contract offer or to formulate a counteroffer.

Simison: Thanks, Caleb. Okay. With that Item 24.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I move that we go into Executive Session per Idaho Code 74-206(a)(1)(a).

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and second to go into Executive Session. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor -- or if not clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and we will go into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (5:45 p.m. to 6:09 p.m.)

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we come out of Executive Session.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton. I move that we adjourn the workshop.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:09 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK