

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 16, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Liz Strader.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen, Nick Napoli, Kurt Starman, Tracy Basterrechea and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record is June 16th, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next item is the Pledge of Allegiance. Please rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Next up will be our community invocation, which tonight will be delivered by Kerry Laframboise. Kerry, good to see you again. Thanks for being here. If you would all, please, join us in the invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection.

Laframboise: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Members of the Council. It is a privilege and an honor to -- it's a privilege and an honor to be able to open these proceedings with prayer and I don't take that lightly. So, tonight I would like to read briefly from Proverbs 2, 1 through 9. It says: My son if you receive my words and treasure my commands within you so that you incline your ear to wisdom and apply your heart to understanding, yes, if you cry out for discernment and lift up your voice for understanding, if you seek her as silver and search for her as hidden treasures, then, you will understand the fear of the Lord and find the knowledge of God. For the Lord gives wisdom. From his mouth comes knowledge and understanding. He stores up sound wisdom for the upright. He is a shield to those who walk uprightly. He guards the path of justice and preserves the

way of his saints, then, you will understand righteousness and justice, equity and every good path. Thank you, Lord, that you have given us access to your wisdom, to your understanding and your discernment and to your knowledge. Through these gifts you guide us to understanding justice and equity. Please grant to these men and women the guidance they need as they deal with the issues facing them this evening and throughout the coming months. Give them integrity and discernment to guide this great city. We ask these things in your name, Jesus, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you. Next up is adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to tonight's agenda. I move that we approve the agenda as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Simison: Next up is announcements and recognition.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: If I can take just a couple of minutes to have an announcement. Coming up this next week is the 97th annual Dairy Days Week, culminating with the parade on Saturday, June 27th at 11:00 a.m. I don't take it lightly that I'm sitting in the chair that was once held by Councilman Keith Bird and he was a longtime member of the Dairy Board and I get to sit on that dairy board now as well, but the first thing we do is Monday is the Keith Bird Annual golf tournament named after him. The Dairy princess is Wednesday night. One of the highlights is Thursday evening in the park is the ice cream social and if you have never had an ice cream social from Reed's Dairy it's some of the best in the valley. Friday we will start the morning off with a pancake feed and they will have dairy shows all day long. There is music throughout the park with bands playing all three days, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. You can come back to see

where the roots of this city came from as we were one of the largest dairy consortiums in the United States in its heyday. It's hard to find a dairy around here now, but the history is still here and Old MacDonald's Farm will still be going next to the Speedway. There is a demolition derby. Trust me, there is something for everybody at this event. There are some flyers, some big ones on the back table and it is all over Instagram and Facebook, too, if you just search for it. But I would love to see everybody show up. The parade will usually have 75 to 100 floats. Usually by the time the first one finishes the last one hasn't even got out on the street and we will all be out there. The weather is supposed to be really good. I would love to see if everyone would get out and join us. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Thank you. Council, anything else under announcements and recognition?

PUBLIC FORUM

Simison: Okay. Then with that, Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [Action Item]

1. Public Hearing (Continued from April 14, 2026) for VanTrust (ZOA-2025-0002) by VanTrust Real Estate, generally located at the southwest corner of Black Cat Rd. and Franklin Rd.

- A. Request: UDC Text Amendment to adjust the flex space standards to lower the office requirement from 30% to 10% in the I-L zoning district.

Simison: Okay. Then we will move right into our -- you have to sign up in advance. Yeah. Next up will be our public hearing, which is continued from April 14th, 2026, for VanTrust, ZOA-2025-0002. We will continue this public hearing with staff comments.

Napoli: Good evening, Mayor, Members of the Council. So, yes, this application was continued on April 14th and the City Council continued the subject applications and directed staff to prepare development agreement provisions, coordinate with ACHD and the developer to the adjacent property to the south regarding improvements to Black Cat Road and provide updated language for the proposed flex space standards. So, on May 15th, 2026, city staff provided the draft development agreement provisions and flex space code amendment to the applicant for their review. In addition, staff met with ACHD on April 23rd, 2026, to discuss potential improvements to Black Cat Road. Following that meeting ACHD indicated that it would not pursue a cooperative development agreement for Black Cat Road improvements, citing higher priority projects, including improvements at the Venable intersection regarding the new community center and the extension of West Corporate Drive to West Waltman Lane and those are highlighted right here. So, additionally, staff also met or talked with the

developer of the Black Cat industrial project, which is directly to the south across the canal and he indicated -- his intent was to pursue a development agreement modification to their existing development agreement in the future and this amendment would propose revising the square footage thresholds that would trigger required improvements to Black Cat Road. Additionally, staff is preparing an application to amend the future land use designations within the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan. This proposed amendment is limited to the future land use map. Concurrently -- concurrently staff is evaluating potential additional amendments to the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan and related modifications to the Comprehensive Plan to better align with the direction provided by City Council. The initial FLUM amendment application is anticipated to be presented to City Council later this year and this is just a little highlight of the area that you guys will see some changes to later this year. And I will stand for any questions you guys -- here is the proposed flex space code change. It's also in your packet and the development agreement provisions are on the next slide, which I can change to in a little bit. And I will stand for questions.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Nick, thank you. Just a quick question. With some of the changes that are actually shown on the screen here, did you pull these together based on feedback from Council, your own kind of research? Just kind of want to know how you ended up with what we see in front of us tonight exactly.

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, it's a great question. So, yes, some of us from your guys' feedback wanting to provide some more flexibility for the development community. It was also taking some feedback from the development community on really what percentages -- for one, it was to clean up the percentages, which we actually just went to more of a standard ratio across all zones that flex space is permitted in, which is that ten to 30 percent of office and retail showroom. So, any zone -- any zoning district that allows where flex space is permitted will allow for ten to 30 percent retail showroom across all districts. So, it could be 90 percent warehousing and ten percent office and that's allowed in the C-G zone, as it would be in the I-L zone and that was based off of a lot of feedback we did get. Obviously, it's still a work in progress. I wouldn't say this is -- solves all of the issues that flex space has and we actually are evaluating that and having a workshop with you guys next week and meeting with more of the focus group to have a -- maybe a more comprehensive change, but I think this is a -- in the near term solution to some of the challenges that we were facing, as well as to what the applicant was asking for in their code change.

Taylor: I appreciate it. Just a follow up, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. Thanks, Nick. Some of the feedback you got from the development community was this some feedback that you had had previously kind of on file? Did you go out and sort of have some more informal discussions? I know we didn't have any kind of formal outreach, at least I'm not aware of, but how did you collect some of this additional information from the time we had this last meeting until today to kind of inform that?

Napoli: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, it's a great question. Yes, we -- so, we did definitely pass feedback. This has been an ongoing thing. I wouldn't say this is new. Flex space has been a -- I wouldn't say a challenge, but it's been trying to find the balance between where the office retail showroom should land in regards to the warehousing and what zones. So, it was definitely based off of previous feedback. I also did -- I talked with a couple people that I deal with on a regular basis, including the VanTrust team on what their thoughts were on it and all of them were supportive of it generally. I did let them know that, you know, we are going to have a larger change probably coming in the future that will maybe address more of their concerns, because a lot of feedback we got was actually wanting less retail showroom and office, because most people aren't going to have 30 percent office, especially in the I-L zoning, but today we actually got a request from another developer that wants maybe more flexibility to have 50 percent office, which was the first time I had heard that. So, it is a little bit of a -- a moving target that we are trying to find where that happy medium is and we hope to accomplish that really in that workshop, but I think that this is a -- a code change that satisfies kind of what the applicant was looking for while also cleaning up the code in the near term, which knowing that there will be a bigger change in the future. Correct.

Simison: Any further questions for staff on this item? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward?

McCluskey: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Council. Chris McCluskey. Address is 205 North 400 West, Suite 100, Salt Lake City. 84117. I want to start by saying thank you for the time this evening and echoing Nick's comments a little bit on the UDC. That was one of the conversations we had quite a bit of discussion on last time when we were here for a council meeting. As Nick said, VanTrust is supportive of the code changes in that order and so that alleviates that problem from our -- our concern. So, I wanted to spend a few minutes to actually discuss a little more I think what was the bigger concern, which was Black Cat, specifically from an access and traffic standpoint. So, I think in my humble opinion or the interpretation I got the -- the project from a -- a aesthetics and location and type of use was -- was not the question as much -- as much as the traffic impact and being the smaller development within a larger development area -- we are obviously 20 acres out of a much larger area that has industrial zoning. Still generating traffic, obviously, but at an impact rate that's lower than a lot of our development partners who are in the area, specifically south and east and west, some of the other development areas that Nick and Bill highlighted last time. So, working through that, obviously, our impact isn't the one that's going to necessarily change the level of service from say a C to D, but we do understand that there is an obvious impact

once we do complete the development. So, we have tried at both Council and staff's recommendation to try to discuss with the adjacent developers opportunities for us to help in some way to alleviate the problem. Obviously, ACHD coming forward with no development cooperative agreements was kind of a little bit of a hiccup, not giving us an opportunity to provide additional infrastructure improvements, which was tough, as we were trying to find solutions to move forward. So, in that vein, though, we did reach out. Obviously had some great conversations with our development partners to the south, Black Cat and Sawtooth. There are opportunities for us to partner with them in the long run. If the improvements that they are required versus their development agreement come forward we are willing to offer some contributions of capital to be able to facilitate that. Obviously being a smaller development that's not a large amount, but we are willing to contribute up to 200,000 dollars to help for infrastructure improvements. Kind of a back of the napkin analysis that we did, but kind of somewhat prices out to -- for example, a turn lane or a suicide turn lane. It's a bad term for a center turn lane. I shouldn't use that. But the center turn lane is to help facilitate some of those turning movements at -- at Franklin Road off of Black Cat to help alleviate some of the traffic. So, that was one of the things that we were trying to do to help alleviate some of those concerns. Obviously, the right timing is kind of the question on this and, you know, from a land seller's perspective, obviously, the families -- you probably are going to hear from later. I believe they are going to speak on the open forum. But this is an opportunity from exit generational assets that they have held for a long time in the families. Franklin is forcing, obviously, the Troys to make the decision a little sooner. So, we are trying to help facilitate, A, some families to exit the area, plus put a development and at the same time already contributing quite a bit of infrastructure improvements with the collector street that you see kind of between the northern buildings and the southern buildings, which, again, for a small site building a road on site is -- is obviously a capital cost that we are willing to contribute there, but, then, also trying to contribute to the Black Cat improvements as well. So, we just hope that, you know, if there was any questions maybe we could help. Obviously, this is -- is a much larger concern that was voiced last time that we -- we only have a small portion that we can help with, but we would love to either field any questions or if we needed to go over for -- I believe all the council members were here last time, so they heard the project, saw the -- saw the level of quality and what VanTrust's vision is and, hopefully, that's a win-win for the city as well. At least we feel it is. So, maybe I will stop there and see if there is anything that we could answer questions or specifically with the transportation, we have tried and -- and I don't know if that's adequate, but we would love to answer questions.

Simison: Thank you. And, Mr. Nary, I'm going to turn to -- technically I only called up the very first item. Both of these items being considered simultaneously in this conversation or are we doing them separately just from the conversation?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I mean you can -- you can certainly hear them together. We need to vote on them separately, but you could hear them together if you wish.

Simison: Okay. All right.

McCluskey: And I don't know if it's appropriate. I should ask Council. But the UDC text amendment we are not pursuing at this time as the code changes alleviate those concerns, so I would say the -- and Item One I believe of that is -- if I'm correct is the -- is the UDC amendment changes that we requested. VanTrust is -- I don't know if we can withdraw now on that or if you just vote to deny. The UDC changes or the code changes would facilitate that. Those are adequate for us. It might be best to withdraw -- withdraw that. Council can accept the withdrawal if that's your desire.

Napoli: Mr. -- Mr. Mayor, if I can chime in real quick. So, just so I'm understanding correctly, Chris. We -- the code change that we presented tonight would be essentially in lieu of what you guys proposed. So, you don't want to withdraw it, because you -- Council would be acting on this language tonight, so it would be essentially piggybacking off of the UDC text amendment that you guys did propose. So, I -- before we withdraw the application -- I don't know how -- we might be a little bit further down the line with our code -- further code change, so I think we do want to keep this open if you guys would like it. Correct.

McCluskey: Thank you. Yes. Sorry.

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Deborah Nelson. 601 West Bannock Street. Just to clarify, with that understanding that's great. Yes. Thank you. We will keep the application active. If the Council is amenable to accept the staff's proposed language to what the code change would be, then, yes, we are in agreement with that remaining.

Simison: Okay.

McCluskey: Sorry. Mayor, Council, any other questions or --

Simison: Council, any additional questions? And I guess, Nick, did you have plans to do further on the application overall or not necessarily? Item two. Are you going to do any more of a staff update on item two?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, no, I was not planning on it. It was just the annexation of the property with I-L zoning. If you guys would like I can -- I can go into some more detail.

Simison: Okay. Council, do you feel like you need anymore on the overall project? Okay. Just want to make sure everyone's on the same page that we are -- items one and two are open before us for consideration, conversation, questions to the staff and the applicant at this time. Is there any additional questions for the applicant at this time? Okay. Thank you.

McCluskey: Thank you, Mayor. Thank you, Council.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody marked they wanted to speak.

Simison: I'm sorry?

Johnson: Nobody marked that they wanted to speak.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present that would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room -- if you -- go ahead and come on up. If you would like to provide testimony and if you are online and you would like to provide any comments or questions, testimony, please use the raise your hand feature. If you would state your name and address for the record. You will be recognized for three minutes.

Thruston: Hello. My name is Gina Thruston and my address is 496 East Amalie Court in Meridian and we own the property at issue in this application at 5201 West Franklin Road and we are here to speak again in support of this project. Since the April meeting we believe VTRE has actively worked to address your concerns. We kindly request your approval, so they can move forward with this project without further delay. I will mention again that the growth in this area over the past number of years has made farming more difficult. Meanwhile, road widening to accommodate that growth has taken more and more of our land. They took some in 2017 from my father-in-law and they just now are taking some in 2026. The proposed light industrial project by VTRE is the right choice for this site. It creates a true win-win for our community. By bringing jobs closer to residents this project helps fulfill the city's goal of allowing people to live where they work. Although coordinated -- coordination among competitors with adjoining properties is atypical, I believe VTRE and Sawtooth have initiated discussions concerning the Black Cat Road widening, which is a very positive sign. Furthermore, VTRE's proposed acquisition of both properties creates a clear path for the development of the collector road. Without VTRE's site consolidation acquiring both parcels is highly unlikely for another developer. This would severely delay the road project and it would, then, ultimately limit future access to our property. We respectfully request your approval this evening, which will allow our families to successfully move forward -- move forward to our next chapter. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Appreciate it.

Thruston: Thank you.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item? Good evening.

Neddo: Good evening. I'm Trina Neddo. My address is 2434 West King Road in Kuna. I have a power of attorney for Mark Choi, the other property that's involved in this property. I won't take much of your time. I just wanted to say that we definitely support this project due to that road -- actually that's what made me think about getting up -- is with the road expansion happening with -- ACHD will be taking Mark Choi's home. It will be removed from the property in the next 90 days. So, not only is he without a home or rental property, he is also now struggling with the farming, the same as the Thruston family. So, we definitely want to support this project, because he is going to be without

a property that is of any use to anybody at this point without development coming in the future. So, you know, thank you for that.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Okay. Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item -- these items? Okay. Would the applicant like to make any final comments or does the applicant waive? Okay. Council, applicant waives any final comments.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: If there is no more comments, I move that we close the public hearing on ZOA-2025-0002.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on Item 1, ZOA-2025-0002. Is there any discussion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I will kick off the discussion.

Simison: Wait. We are going to -- if there is -- oh, sorry. Go ahead. Yes, you want -- you want discussion on the motion or do you want me to close it? For discussion on the motion to close. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: Do you also want to close the other public hearing as well?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: We are hearing these both together. Move we close the public hearing on H-2025-0052.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on Item 2, which is H-2025-0052. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: Councilman Overton for discussion.

Overton: Open up discussion on these two. On the first one I was in support of the changes to flex space just because I think we need to be more reactive to what is needed out there and when we set any type of parameters up there and it's not what people are looking for, I don't know that we are doing our due diligence sitting up here. So, I -- I'm fully supportive of the text amendment change on the office requirement down to -- down to 30 percent. That's the first time you have done that to me.

Simison: It's a new program. You will get used to it.

Overton: There you go. When it comes to the approval of the application I initially was pretty concerned about the traffic concerns that we were going to have in that area and I'm still concerned about them. But I think we get into a position where there is so much other property that's already been approved and this will provide one of those roadway segments within it that will help with traffic getting in and out of this project, as well as other projects. You know normally we hear from the public that can't believe that we are developing all this farmland -- that used to be farms when I was a kid, but to hear the testimony in this case we are hearing from landowners who can no longer farm that land, that know that the best move forward with that land is to sell it and have it developed into what its next stage of life is and it's important -- I don't think that message gets out enough to any media people that are sitting in the room. I don't think that message gets out enough to folks about exactly how some of these decisions come about to develop some of the land that we all grew up watching as farms when we were kids. So, I appreciate your comments. It means a lot to hear you say that. I don't think that this one project is going to be that big of an impact on traffic in this area. It's going to have an impact. Absolutely. But I don't think this one is the one that's the straw that broke the camel's back. I think we are going to have to work with ACHD in the future, as we always do, and continue to push for improvements in this area, so we can move traffic as quickly as we can. The city is full of roadway projects that have really high priorities and we continually try to work in this area, especially on the north side of the intersection of Franklin and Black Cat. But I will be in support of both of these projects -- or both of these items tonight.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I always appreciate good feedback and insight from our Council President. I think this is one where I look at it a little bit differently. I'm certainly in full support of the UDC text amendment, but the comment about this one not being the -- the fly that breaks -- that breaks the camel's back is well heard. I actually think that we are headed down to kind of a death by a thousand cuts. We have -- we have got development in this area that we have said no more growth because of the roads and I'm -- I'm disappointed and, quite frankly, very frustrated that our roadway authority, who looks at a road that was rated better than E two years ago, isn't worthy of investment for best

case ten years from now. I think Black Cat is an important part of our community. There are planned changes, but we are incentivizing a lot of growth with a lot of industrial traffic on a road that I just don't think can simply handle it right now. We didn't think it could handle it when we limited the growth of the other large scale industrial project and while I -- I recognize that this has less than an impact than that large scale project, it is impact on a road that we have said -- past council has said we want to really limit growth in this area until the roads are improved. I'm disappointed and very frustrated. I will be voting no towards this annexation tonight and -- and wish that -- I wish that our agency partner understood the -- the value and the impact of not acting on Black Cat means for Meridian moving forward.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Initially I was -- the thing that bothered me the most was making changes to our code on flex space kind of in light of an application, but really like where we have ended up. We have, obviously, had a few discussions about flex space since then on some other applications and I like where we are going and I think -- appreciate the fact that we are very soon going to be having a broader discussion about how to handle this, but the ten to 30 percent that sort of -- I think that's the right -- the right spot. So, that all -- my -- my concerns with that have been satisfied. I like where we are going with that and it seems like that's the direction we are going to go -- probably broadly speaking as we try to put a finer point on things. When it comes to the annexation request and some of the traffic concerns, I never viewed this project as dumping a lot of traffic on Black Cat, just kind of where it was situated with Highway 16 and the access point from Franklin Road it -- I didn't feel it was fair to hold this application sort of subject to some of those requirements that were put onto some of the -- or the properties on Black Cat from previous council decisions in years past. So, I think this is a really good project. I think the way we kind of pulled together some -- a few different parcels for kind of a nice coordinated development I think works well. So, I think -- I see it as a nice transition from the properties to the east and, then, to what will likely be more of an industrial park to the west. I think this is a -- kind of a nice transition into that and I think it's a good area. This is kind of where we want this stuff right along a freeway. You know, we are not going to put a bunch of single family homes right next to the freeway. These are the types of things that we want and I think this is attractive from some of the -- the -- the drawings that we have had. So, I'm going to support both of these tonight. I think where we started to where we have ended up I -- I'm happy. The last thing I will say is I do really appreciate the applicant's willingness to enter into discussions with people in the area and being willing to put up money to fix the problem. It goes a long way towards helping us out. I -- I don't like it when applicants just view their little universe and their application as sort of a -- an island in and of itself. I like how there is an understanding that it's all interconnected and not being required, but being willing to put up some -- some capital to kind of fix those problems I think helps us when we have conversations with ACHD and with others to say, look, we are -- you know, bring some

money to the table, we are going to try to fix this and we need to fix this. So, I will be supporting both of these tonight.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, if there is no more comments --

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I would move ahead with a motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to approve File No. H-2025-0052 and ZOA-2025-0002, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 16th, 2026.

Simison: Okay. Could --

Taylor: I will second that, but is that how you wanted it?

Simison: No.

Little Roberts: Question?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, it's perfectly fine to either -- do either way. You can -- you need to vote on them separately. You can -- you can move to approve them both if you want, but you do need to vote separately.

Simison: It probably would be quicker if we just voted separately on the two -- the two separate motions. So, the second withdraw?

Taylor: I will withdraw.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Had it drawn up in front of me with both of them for one vote. We will separate them. One more time. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2025-0052 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 16th, 2026.

Taylor: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Clarification. Does it matter what order we do them in, Mr. Nary. Okay. So, withdraw?

Overton: Withdraw.

Simison: The third time is the charm.

Overton: Chris, if you would like to buzz me that would be -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Third time. It's going to be a charm. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to -- I really do -- I move to approve File No. ZOA-2025-0002 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 16th, 2026.

Taylor: Second.

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

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, absent; 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.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2025-0052 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 16th, 2026.

Taylor: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 2, H-2025-0052. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: Four ayes. One nay and the item is agreed to. Thank you. Good luck and thank you. Look forward to working with your partners to make sure we get just as many improvements there as we can for that road network, so --

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

- 3. Public Hearing (Continued from May 19, 2026) for Syringa Crossing Mixed Use Development (H-2025-0007) by Hawkins Companies, generally located at the northwest and southwest corners of S. Meridian Rd./US69 and Amity Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 62.43 acres of land with R-15 (9.76 acres), R-40 (18.01 acres), C-N (2.07 acres), C-C (9.12 acres), and C-G (23.47 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 8 building lots on 24.46 acres of land in the proposed R-40 and C-C zoning districts.

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 3, which is a public hearing continued from May 19th for Syringa Crossing Mixed Use Development, H-2025-0007. We will continue this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next application before you is Syringa Crossing. They have a request in for an annexation and zoning, preliminary plat and a conditional use permit. The annexation portion of this site consists of approximately 62 acres of land, including right of way to the section line of adjacent roadways. It's currently zoned RUT and L-O in Ada county and it's generally located at the northwest corner and southwest corners of West Amity Road and South Meridian Road, State Highway 69. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designation is mixed use community. The applicant submitted revised plans after the Commission hearing as outlined in the memo from staff to the Mayor and Council dated June 9th to address items discussed during the Commission hearing that contributed to the Commission's recommendation -- recommendation of denial. Staff's presentation will include the amended application information and the presentation slides will show the original versus revised development plans. The applicant will cover the proposed changes in more detail in their presentation. The applicant is requesting annexation of 62.44 acres of land with R-15 zoning, which is 9.73 acres, R-40, zoning which is 16.58 acres and L-O zoning, which is 5.33 acres, C-N zoning, which is 2.07 acres and C-C zoning, which is 28.73 acres. A conceptual development plan was submitted with the annexation application as shown that depicts how the site is proposed to develop. The northwest corner is shown there on the left and the southwest corner shown there on the right. At the northwest corner of the annexation area a multi-family development is proposed consisting of 98 garden style apartment units, three units fewer than before, at a gross density of approximately ten units per acre, 37,000 square feet of office uses, which is 16,000 square feet more than before. A 63,000 square foot grocery store, which is 2,000 smaller than originally proposed, with retail shops, restaurants and a bank, totaling 117,600 square feet of commercial space overall. And that is 10,000 square feet more than the previous plan. Public, quasi-public and plaza areas are also proposed in the commercial portion of the development. The open space has been reconfigured with the revised plans and has increased overall between the residential and commercial areas. All commercial development is proposed to be a single story in height, while the residential is proposed to be three and four story apartment buildings. A mix of at least three different land use types is proposed as desired. The applicant is proposing changes to provide better functional integration of uses as discussed during the Commission hearing in accord with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed density conforms to that desired in the plan. Community serving facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, churches, schools, civic buildings or public safety facilities are not provided,

which does increase service and transportation network impacts. Supportive and proportional outdoor public and/or quasi-public spaces and places connected by pathways are proposed consisting of plazas, outdoor gathering areas and linear open space areas that the applicant states consists of 23 percent of the northwest development area, which exceeds the five percent required in the comp plan. The original plan there that was reviewed and acted on by the Commission is on the left, the revised plan is on the right. At the southwest corner of the annexation area -- area 30,000 square feet of commercial space is proposed, which is 5,000 less than before, anticipated to include restaurants, retail shops, a coffee shop and gas station convenience store and 78,000 square feet office space has been added. Across the street on the southern portion of the development a 302 unit multi-family residential development is proposed, which is 20 fewer than before, with a gross density of 18.2 units per acre. Commercial structures are anticipated to be a single story in height. Residential structures are anticipated to be three to four stories in height. With the proposed changes the development plan is now consistent with the following mixed use provisions in the Comprehensive Plan. A mix of three different land use types are now provided as required, whereas only two were provided before and outdoor public and/or quasi-public spaces and places consisting of plazas, outdoor gathering areas and linear open space appear to meet the minimum standards. The development -- again this is just for the southwest corner that I'm speaking about now. The development is still inconsistent with the following policies in the Comprehensive Plan. The residential area is 68 percent of the site, which is down from 72 percent, which is 18 percent more than the maximum allowed of 50 percent in the MUC designation and 3.2 units per acre -- per acre over the maximum density allowed of 15 units per acre. Commensurate levels of employment and other nonresidential elements supporting residents and reducing local vehicle trips are not provided due to the excess of residential area and density provided. Community serving facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, churches, schools, civic buildings or public safety facilities are not provided, which increases service and transportation network impacts as I noted. The applicant has requested the overall project be considered for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, rather than two individual projects. The Comprehensive Plan specifically states contiguous mixed use identified areas that are bisected by an arterial or highway are considered separate and independent areas for use in design integration and will be evaluated independently of each other. Some of the reasons for such include safety and efficiency of the transportation network, pedestrians and motorists alike. An overall pedestrian plan was submitted for the annexation area as shown that shows ten foot wide pedestrian walkways in blue. So, the original plan, again, is on the left. The revised plan is on the right. And five foot to seven foot wide sidewalk shown in pink providing connectivity along streets, through parking areas, public, quasi-public, commercial and residential areas. Conceptual building elevations and perspectives were also submitted showing what future commercial, retail buildings and plaza areas will look like, as well as the residential buildings at the northwest corner of the annexation area. The primary transportation considerations for this development involve the timing and coordination of required off-site improvements, access management along Amity Road and State Highway 69 and completion of internal street and pathway connections needed to support a functional mixed use neighborhood pattern. The project would add

measurable traffic to a network that already experiences operational strain during peak hours, underscoring the need to align development phasing with programmed intersection and signal improvements. Because of its proximity to two major transportation corridors, the design must emphasize efficient site access, safe circulation and continuous pedestrian and bicycle connections consistent with the city's adopted street and pathway standards. ACHD's recommended conditions and findings addressing intersection mitigation, access spacing and collector completion reflect these shared objectives and are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code standards for coordinated land use and transportation planning. A preliminary plat is proposed to subdivide the southwest corner of the annexation area, but not the northwest corner. The northwest corner is only conceptual at this point and is just part of the annexation. The plat consists of ten building lots, six commercial, two office and two residential on 24.46 acres of land in the proposed R-40, L-O and C-C zoning districts. One access drive is proposed via West Amity Road and one is proposed via South Meridian Road and State Highway 69. A portion of a future collector Street, Hematite via West Amity Road is depicted along the southern portion of the west boundary of the site and stubs to the property to the south. The portion that connects to Amity Road is off site on the adjacent property to the west and is not proposed to be constructed with this development. We do have a application that will be coming before you soon, Story Rock Subdivision, that is the property directly to the west, which would complete this road section if both projects are approved. A waiver from City Council is requested to UDC-11-3H-4B-2A, which prohibits new approaches directly accessing a state highway. ITD has approved this access. A backage road generally paralleling Amity Road and Meridian Road. State Highway 69, is proposed for access to the properties fronting these roads in accord with the UDC. There is a 40 foot wide gravity irrigation easement. Let me find my slide on that here. There you go. On the southwest corner in the commercial area as shown. It's that kind of brown area. Trees and large shrubs are not allowed in that easement area. A conditional use permit is also requested for a multi-family development on the southwest corner of the annexation area -- in the plat area, consisting of 302 apartment units on 15.23 acres of land in the R-40 zoning district, at a gross density of 19.8 units per acre, which has slightly increased from before with the decrease of the residential area after addition of the office area. Three and four story multi-family buildings are proposed with parking on the ground floor on some units. Let me find those elevations for you real quick here. Those were the original elevations and, then, these are the proposed changes. Building materials consist of fiber cement siding, variegated board and batten in a variety of colors and styles, stucco and brick. The final design, if approved, is required to comply with the design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual. The collector street access along the west boundary, Hematite, is needed for emergency access and should be extended from West Amity Road to the site prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy within the multi-family development if approved. Based on 302 units, a minimum of 3.24 acres of common open space is required. Go back to that slide. Too many slides here. Just a moment. A total of 3.8 acres is provided exceeding the minimum standard. Proposed amenities consist of a clubhouse, swimming pool and spa, a community garden, shade structure, walking trails, children's play structure and three sports courts. Additional amenities are recommended by staff if approved based

on the area inside the development. The applicant is requesting the following waivers from City Council. To UDC 11-4-3-27-C8, which states common open space areas in multi-family developments shall not be adjacent to collector or arterial street buffers unless separated from the street by a berm or constructed barrier at least four feet in height with breaks on the berm or barrier to allow for pedestrian access. The applicant is requesting approval through the conditional use permit for common open space areas in the multi-family development to be located adjacent to a collector street buffer without a berm or barrier separating it from the street. The reason for such is an enhanced interaction is desired between the street and the ten foot wide multi-use pathway along the collector street, with a narrower street section and wider pathway adjacent to common areas. The second waiver is to UDC-11-3H-4B-2A, which prohibits new approaches directly accessing a state highway. City Council may consider and approve a modification to the standard upon specific recommendation of the Idaho Transportation Department or if strict adherence is not feasible as determined by City Council. The applicant is requesting Council approval of the proposed access south of Amity Road. A recommendation has been received from ITD on the access. They will allow a right-in, right-out access. No written testimony has been received on this application. The Commission recommended denial of the annexation application and, consequently, the preliminary plat and conditional use permit applications. Therefore, conditions of approval are not included in the staff report. If the Council determines the proposed annexation is in the best interest of the city with the proposed development plan, the project should be continued to a later hearing date in order for staff to prepare recommended conditions of approval. The possible motions on your hearing outline are incorrect. Please be aware of that. There are two motions before you tonight that you should consider. The first is for denial. The second is for continuance to a later hearing date to allow staff to prepare conditions and, again, Council is the decision making body on that. Possible motions do not reflect that. Thank you. Staff -- the applicant is here to present.

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

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Sonya -- or maybe Bill. Is one of our options to send it back to P&Z, because it seems like there are so many changes. Is that within our purview?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, yes, you can always remand it.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Sonya, kind of along Council Woman Little Roberts question. Could the applicant have, after the Planning and Zoning denial, after they provided updates and changes, request to be sent back to Planning and Zoning?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, they could request that tonight --

Cavener: Okay.

Allen: -- but they would have to go before you to request that. They can't just automatically go back to Commission after they have made a recommendation. Thank you.

Cavener: Thank you.

Simison: Council, additional questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant -- applicant like to come forward.

Mansfield: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council Members. My name is Ethan Mansfield with Hawkins Companies. 855 West Broad Street, Boise, Idaho. 83702. Sonya, would you mind firing up my PowerPoint presentation, please? Thanks. I would love to present our new project this evening for your consideration. Obviously, I would love a recommendation of approval. If you feel that -- after you ask questions of me you still need more information I think that's appropriate to send it back to the Planning and Zoning Commission. However, I'm -- I would love an opportunity to answer any of your questions about this proposal prior to that time, because I think -- I think I have the answers. Thanks, Sonya. Is there any way we could pull up the PowerPoint presentation or -- I'm just -- I don't really love working in the PDF. It makes a little difficult, but -- if that's the -- if that's all we got -- okay. No worries. While she's pulling that up, just a brief outline of kind of what I will be talking about this evening. I had quite a few project overview slides. I think Sonya did a really nice job of kind of summarizing the project, so I will blow through those -- through those pretty quickly. It will be on the record if you want to review or if you have specific questions about different uses. I do want to make it clear kind of while I'm giving the overview there is nothing that is precluding any sort of civic use from occupying an office space. If there is a library needed by the city we could absolutely entertain something like that. I just know that there is one down the street. We are happy to, you know, offer this space to churches. There is one adjacent to the property and, then, we are actually extending sewer in partnership with another about a half a mile to the west. So, all that said is we are absolutely not precluding any sort of civic use within this development. I know Sonya mentioned that there were no kind of community-oriented uses provided and I just wanted to kind of put that on the record tonight before we got the PowerPoint fired up. This is fine, Sonya. We can use it. That's okay. No worries. And with that -- yeah. As Sonya mentioned, it's an annexation zoning and development agreement on the northwest and southwest corners. The CUP and preliminary plat is on the southwest corner only. The genesis of that is a pre-app with the City of Meridian. We went in with only the northwest corner. We went in with 284 residential units, 130,000 square feet of

commercial. We were asked by the city to come back with both the northwest and the southwest corners as a single kind of more cohesive development under a development agreement and this is from the Comprehensive Plan in the orange here. Mixed use projects are to be developed with an overall master or conceptual plan for the larger mixed use area. This is, you know, a 56 acre area. This is the larger mixed use area and a development agreement will typically be required for the area with the future land use designation of community. So, with that, you know, I will kind of skip the overview for the -- the big -- both sides and I just want to kind of talk a little bit -- here is kind of the overview in one slide. So, we have got 400 -- up to 400 multi-family units. That's 23 fewer than the last plan. We have more than doubled -- well, nearly doubled -- almost a hundred percent more office space -- dedicated office space. That's 450,000 square feet of office, almost 150,000 square feet of food retail, personal services, other commercial services, shops, bank, gas station. That's an increase of 10,000 square feet. Overall we have 9.9 acres. That's 18 percent of the site is quasi-public open space. That's a civic use per the Comprehensive Plan this excludes multi-family common open space. So, just as you are thinking about that, right, none of that 18 percent includes anything within our CUP. Staff explicitly asked us and Planning and Zoning specifically asked us to separate those out, so they weren't getting double counted or confused. So, that 18 percent covers the whole site, including the multi-family area. But none of the -- none of the multi-family amenity space, common open space, is included in that 18 percent calculation. So, in sum I will go over kind of what that looks like in sum. So, here is the northwest corner quickly. About 31 acres. We added 10,000 square feet of shop space. No extra drive-throughs proposed. You know, additional office space. So, 37,000 total on this corner. You can see the new layout kind of opens it up more between the multi-family and the commercial areas. We have about nine -- we have 98 multi-family units. We created kind of additional open space and linkages between the commercial and the residential. At our neighborhood meeting -- one of our early neighborhood meetings we actually had a household from Grace -- the subdivision to the northwest Graystone, Gray Lock, I cannot recall, and they said -- they are brand new to the neighborhood, as most residents were, because they are just new -- new homes. We talked to them about our commercial development and they say we are excited to walk and ride our bikes down the pathway to this development. So, in my mind that's exactly what this sort of development should be doing and I think, you know, given those comments that's a win. The plan for the southwest corner calls for 25 acres -- is 25 acres. Calls for 30,000 square feet of commercial space. We have added 8,000 square feet of office uses, notably your net density over the residential area doesn't change when you reduce the size of the residential area; right? It's like -- with math like you can reduce the units of the residential area, but if you reduce the size of the residential area, too, your net density stays the same. So, we could keep chipping away at the size of this residential area and never change the net density. So, that's just something to consider when you are thinking through the math equations in your head. We made room for more office at the expense of residential units and that's kind of the thing that should be remembered here. On this side, 2.8 acres of quasi-public open space is provided. That's 11.4 of total acreage and that's only the area that is not included in the CUP -- CUP space. So, in other words, an additional 3.3 acres of common open space is provided. That's 21 percent of the acreage in orange. So,

within this orange area 21 percent is common open space per the CUP. So, overall -- well, I guess I didn't add that in. Overall 6.1 acres of open space -- quasi open space, clubhouse area, park area, 6.1 acres, that's one in every four square feet is a common open space amenity. So, I think it's safe to say it has adequate open space. That's, you know, a quarter of all the space is open space. Here is how we propose to integrate the uses. I think it's a relatively robust network of pathways. Something I will talk about in a moment is the connection of that future roadway. That is planned to be constructed with a STARS agreement that we are working through with ITD right now and I will talk about the STARS agreement in a second. I think it's very unique and it's important to understand why the site is laid out the way it is in relation to the STARS agreement. I will say a little bit more about connectivity. There is a central, you know, spine on the southwest corner that connects every use from the central location. It connects the residential areas to the residential park area. It connects the residential areas to the commercial uses and office uses. We have talked about the northwest corner already. It connects houses from adjacent neighborhoods to our center. I think that's a huge thing that cannot be overstated is the connectivity, not just within this neighborhood, between other neighborhoods and this neighborhood. That's the reason for a waiver between the multi-family area and a collector roadway, because we want it to feel more open to the street, open to the -- the -- the ten foot pathway, so there is not a giant berm between the house and the pathway; right? We want this to integrate. That's the whole point. Here is some renderings. I will go through these really quickly. A couple on the northwest corner. A couple more on the northwest -- just a small office plaza to kind of give office workers a space to kind of relax, eat, drink, you know, bring your lunch, run across the street to the grocery store, grab lunch, come back, eat. You could go to any of these plazas as an office worker or as a resident. Here is some from the southwest corner. We worked really hard to tie the multi-family area to the corner that's wrapped in commercial uses. It needs to be wrapped in commercial uses, that's the only place that commercial uses will truly thrive. It's -- this area is car dependent, so most of the traffic will be arriving via vehicle. So, we are facing that reality and trying to blend that with the reality of bringing residents from adjacent areas able to walk and bike to the site. It's a real challenge in places that develop as an auto dominant -- you know, auto oriented site. And I think we have solved it here. Here is a few additional amenity renderings. Now, let's talk about transportation improvements. So, this project is proposing to use a STARS agreement. That is sales tax -- a portion of sales tax generated from the commercial uses on the site will pay for the improvements to the transportation network, not only adjacent to the site, but around the site as well. So, we are proposing to complete the entire cross-section of State Highway 69 from our south end to the north end of the site. We are working through details with ITD, but we will likely be including additional area farther south of the site to complete the cross-section essentially from where the Costco development stops, pick that up and run it past our development. That is economic activity on the site paying for the transportation improvements that were planned by ITD. I think that's a huge win. The reason we need to put a grocery store user on the northwest corner -- the reason we can't have, you know, equal parts residential, commercial and office is because to generate that sort of sales tax revenue requires an anchored shopping center. An anchored shopping center is required to do the STARS agreement. So, we -- and to do an anchored center you need a certain

amount of land. That land is only made possible by a big chunk of that northwestern corner. So, what we are doing is we are trying to use that center and we are synergizing with some of the commercial on the southwest corner, but we can't do two grocery anchored shopping centers, that's too much, but we can do a bunch of pads out front of -- or a bunch of pads on the corner of that Amity and State Highway 69 corner that kind of feed off of the energy from that grocery anchored center. So, that I hope kind of gives you a little bit of context for why it's planned the way it is. We are not trying to ignore any of the Comprehensive Plan mandates or requests or guidance. What we are trying to do is we are trying to use those to put guardrails on it so we can, then, start there and, then, see how we can make this project economically feasible. That's what we are trying to do. ITD is really supportive of this project. I have had multiple phone calls with Kendra over at ITD. We really appreciate their support and we are really working together well to make this STARS agreement a reality. But it doesn't happen without this site layout. It just doesn't. I should also mention that ITD did approve the access to the site on State Highway 69. There is a deeded access on Lyra -- or, sorry, excuse me, a deeded right-in, right-out where it's shown on the northwest corner and we are requesting a right-in, right-out on the southwest corner. It's circled there in orange. That's approved by ITD. We only have two entrances to the site. One on State Highway 69. One on Amity. That's how you get to the southwest corner. So, without that access to State Highway 69 we are -- it's really tough. It's going to be confusing for residents. It's going to be confusing for everyone who visits the site. So, we respectfully request that approval. ITD thinks it's a good idea. We are going to build it out. We are going to, you know, build the whole cross section. So, we are excited about that. And here is -- here is kind of the summary. You know, you can see in orange that's Comprehensive Plan language. Any mixed use project must work towards the purpose and intent statements, including availability of goods and services to the community. Offset impacts. By providing quality of life opportunities not typically achievable through other single use areas. We are building out the whole roadway network in front of the site and a little bit south. The baseline coverages are a starting point. The health and well-being of the community and the market potential build out over time for the service area of each mixed use designation. We have done commercial development in the valley for 50 years. We think we understand pretty well kind of the potential build out, you know, what's going to happen over time in this area and this particular corner can use a grocery-anchored shopping center. It reduces travel times for those around it and it reduces travel times and potentially keeps people out of their car from the residents adjacent to the site. The higher the residential density the greater the share of non-motorized trips to and from development. So, just keep that in mind. Like -- like as you increase the number of people who are within walking distance, the greater the share of people who walk and bike to the development. It's kind of math -- it's just math. And in sum, our STARS agreement, we need this layout to be successful to do a STARS, to build this transportation networks. So, really appreciate your consideration this evening. Respectfully request approval -- or I guess defer on continuance to define conditions. Thanks so much.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions? Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor. Ethan, can you find the slide -- or at least the picture where it shows that collector street on the far west side? I have a couple questions. That will probably work. So, describe to me at Amity Road -- what does that intersection look like? Is it -- is it going to be kind of built out? It's sort of five lanes on Amity Road and -- I'm trying to get a sense of what that intersection is going to be like and how it's going to function.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, that is a great question. I'm assuming you are talking about the plan north --

Taylor: Correct.

Mansfield: -- intersection.

Taylor: Yes.

Mansfield: Okay. That is proposed to be -- at full build out a lighted intersection. It will have two lanes, one in either direction on Hematite south two lanes. One on either direction on Hematite north. It may -- I believe their truly may be some turn lanes in there, like maybe single turn lane -- left turn lanes. But it's a two lane kind of cross-section and, then, yes, Amity will be two lanes in either direction and a center turn lane.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Is it your -- as you sort of lay out the property with that collector is -- are you hoping that you will drive some of the -- kind of interconnectivity of that -- of this proposal on that road instead of being on Highway 69? And, if so, when is that road actually built in the process?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, another good question. So, this road that -- on the south side that road would be completed with phase one of the improvement and Sonya mentioned one of the conditions was to actually complete that road prior to occupancy of the first multi-family buildings. So, the intent of that south side done with the south side and, again, this is all part of the STARS as well. It gets kind of paid for with that -- those dollars. And, then, we are proposing a second phase. This is actually phased out so you can see it. Green would be the second phase. That would be what's included with phase two of the STARS agreement as proposed. We have got some stuff to work through with ITD still, but, you know, that's the idea is that when that -- when that north phase comes in, the grocery anchored center, then, that gets constructed -- that -- a backage road gets constructed with that. So, they kind of come in with the development.

Taylor: One final question, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: On the STARS agreement and sort of that anchor grocery store, how much other retail is kind of in this development? Because -- because it seems like what I am recalling real quick a lot of office space, not a lot of retail. So, it seems like your sales tax revenue is primarily generated by one entity, the grocery anchor, but not a lot of other sales tax generating kind of properties there. But I want to make sure I'm understanding that correctly.

Mansfield: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, another good question. So, we have got 150,000 square feet of retail, of which 63,000 -- again, these are kind of rough -- you know, it's not -- it may not be exactly this, but generally 63,000 out of 153,000 will be the grocery anchor.

Taylor: Okay.

Mansfield: We didn't want to program too much retail into this, because we -- we wanted it to be the right amount and the right amount meaning it meets market demand or market demand when the surrounding area is built out. You know, our project including some of the subdivisions -- quarries to the west, that kind of stuff. So, that's why we chose that amount.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Ethan, always appreciate your enthusiasm for your projects. I got a lot of questions about this project, but I -- I'm not quite sure if tonight's the right time for that. I just -- I don't think this application is ready for prime time. But you -- you wanted to take some questions and so I -- there is at least one that I -- I would like your insight on and, you know, a denial from staff, denial from Planning and Zoning, we take those serious and I think you took it serious, too, because what appears to be is some attempt to address the concerns that you heard from Planning and Zoning. How do we know that those concerns from the Planning and Zoning Commission were resolved without giving them the opportunity to weigh in?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, a great question. I think it's a -- it's a very fair question. I don't know that the Planning and Zoning Commission could say right now like, oh, yeah, this is great. I -- what we are hoping for is for City Council, who is the body who actually makes the decision to look at this standing on its own two feet and saying does this comply with the Comprehensive Plan? Does this comply with the goals of the city? Does it comply with the development ordinance? And I think between staff and City Council and me answering questions about the development, I -- we can provide the tools for you to do that this evening.

Cavener: Okay. Mr. Mayor, I don't have any additional questions tonight.

Simison: Okay. I will have some questions, comments for consideration. My first is saying on the -- the road. Since the road is planned to be done with a STARS agreement, but it's on property which you don't own, how much of that road is contingent upon this Council taking action on an application or irregardless of whether or not Council approves that, do you have the rights to build that road?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, we -- that road is within our development application as something that is, you know, at some point required of us. We have worked pretty closely with Corey Barton, the landowner and Trilogy Development, the development group to the west, to coordinate the construction of that road. That is essentially planned exactly where their proposed collector is planned. I mean it is their proposed collector in their plan. Your question is what if either that or this don't get approved? I believe that's your question.

Simison: I think it's -- what if it doesn't get approved? What if he says, yeah, I don't want to develop. I don't want to annex. I don't want to bring this forward. Can you still build the road? Do you have the rights to build the road or --

Mansfield: It's a great question, Mr. Mayor. We have spoken with him and we have gotten to a point where there is kind of a mutual agreement that this road will happen. We don't have a formal agreement, but if that is something that is requested by this Council I am sure we could get that next time if there -- if this doesn't get approved tonight and that's what's stopping it, we can absolutely get that agreement, because we do have a good relationship working together and we have had, you know, handfuls of meetings about this, so -- about this very road. So, I think we could absolutely provide that surety for you.

Simison: Yeah. Because I will at least give you my two cents on some of this. It was interesting to hear that staff basically said bring these all back together as one, which I think is great, but, then, we also have the component that says an arterial bifurcates them to not be considered as one in some regards. I have said this to staff. They know where I am on this issue. I prefer the look of the picture -- the full picture and not be tied to one individual parcel. So, for me personally I can look at this holistically and say do I -- do I think this meets the intent on both -- as one unit despite the fact that there is an arterial separating it. But without that connector road being in, to me it doesn't, because I think that that's what provides the safest connectivity between the two parcels. So, without it, then, I -- it almost does -- how does each one stand alone or not in relation to the comp plan from my perspective, you know, and so I think that's -- to me that -- that road connection is important without putting that affirmative obligation that Council has to approve that project in the future for that road to be built, because I don't think that's fair to you and I don't think that's fair to Council, I don't think that's fair to the expectations of the project that thou shalt annex and approve so said road can be built to allow this to occur. So, that's just on the macro level from -- from my standpoint. I do love the fact that once again we are seeing someone talk about a STARS project to get long-term transportation solutions along this corridor and the service that it provides to this area, which is growing and the relationships that you have with others to the south

that are trying to build their buildings and get access to utilities, which I don't know how much of this project is contingent upon that, that's not relevant in this context, but to me those are all I think an important part of it and I'm not asking for a response to any of these questions, I'm just -- they are just -- they are just out there -- well, one more and, then, I will let you go. The one question I did -- I kind of threw in there. You talked about, you know, reducing the land mass and the residential just equates to not being able to -- I know you reduced some, but you can continue to reduce to meet the thresholds -- what I have heard you say is you are not going to do that. That's how I interpreted your statement that we can -- we can put in more other uses down here, because I actually like -- personally I like the layout that you had of the previous version better from a holistic layout. Here I feel like we are shoehorning in a couple of office buildings just to meet -- again meet the intent of the three compared to anything else, but I'm not sure I agree with your statement that says, no, you tell us less space and we are just going to leave our density at the same level no matter how small you get us to, because that's the density that we think we are going to do, even though we are over the number. So, I will let you unpack everything I said as you see if there is a question or comment or otherwise, but just unpacking my comments, the positives, the challenges and the perceptions. I will leave it at that.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, thank you for those comments. They are actually very helpful in helping us understand your position. It's like really instructive, frankly. So, thank you for -- thank you for that. Just to touch very quickly on -- on each. First was about the importance of the collector roadway to the project. I understand those concerns. I also want to mention, you know, we are proposing a utility connection underneath that collector roadway. We have spoken again with the developer to the west and it's all been kind of discussed, right, and like we feel comfortable enough with those connections, both the roadway and the utilities, to put this before you this evening as something that we can do. We can do with STARS. We can, you know, provide those connections and an understanding that if we can't do that that's on us and this project doesn't happen. We are fully aware of that possibility. The next thing I wanted to talk about a little bit was the utility connection with neighbors to the west. The neighbor to our south has been in the past unwilling to extend sewer through their property. We worked with ITD to extend sewer around their property. Again, that's already been done, so, you know, take it -- it's happened. There is no going back. I mean that's one of the reasons we would like your approval here, there is a public sewer main that runs -- you know, there is an easement that runs through the southern end of our property to serve the property to the west and Stone Hill Church. So, you know, for what it's worth that's -- that's happened. That's there. So, there is no more kind of blockage of the development of that area by a single landowner. Just, you know, wanted to just outline that so everyone's clear. It also allows us to service our development with sewer. So, kind of multiple benefits there. Finally, wanted to address the multi-family component on the southwest corner. You mentioned that, you know, as the multi-family area gets smaller, you know, it -- it -- it sounds like we are not going to do anything different than what we are doing. You know, we would have to take another look to see if the project would go -- would work if we lost residential units. What I'm -- I guess the point that I'm trying to make with this statement about the math, though, is that if we reduce the size

of the residential area, even if we kind of correspondingly lose units, the density remains the same. So, we would have to not only lose units in proportion to the amount of land we are losing, but also above and beyond the amount of land we are using kind of double loss -- double lose units to, then, make the density on the southwest corner under 15. If -- I was kind of merely trying to explain a math equation, not really kind of trying to, you know, say we are unwilling to do that. Although if we were conditioned to do that we are unsure if the project would actually work. We would need to go back and look at the pro forma and see what we could absorb.

Simison: Okay.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: This might be a question for staff. Am I correct -- and just -- just kind of repeating myself to make sure I'm correct. If we didn't have Amity Road and the project is laid out as it is, it would qualify holistically as a mixed use area. It would -- it would meet all the standards? I guess I'm -- because we -- the problem is Amity Road cuts it; right? So, they are trying to be -- trying to find a way to satisfy the demands of a mixed use development. But we are kind of being cute here and trying to -- they are asking us to look at both areas collectively and ignore that, you know, Amity Road -- say if Amity Road wasn't there, it -- it works with our comp plan or does it?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, Council, yes, if the arterial road wasn't there it would qualify as an overall joined mixed development. However, the Comprehensive Plan specifically states that they have to be considered two separate projects because of that arterial street. So, it's a very big detail.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, just to give you a little bit more context behind Ethan's statement of come in together. At the time that we started discussions with the applicant the mixed use standards were different. They were -- they weren't the current ones that we have. So, it was really just a timing of when the application was submitted. So, the applicant got caught up submitting after the comp plan -- the mixed use changes had -- had changed and so the application was submitted, so we had to evaluate it under the new mixed use standards, not the previous ones that didn't really have that specific requirement. So, that's why when -- when you see a slide saying staff said bring it in, because you are right, at the time the comp plan we want to see that. The other piece of the Comprehensive Plan, though, even though you have the arterial, the Comprehensive Plan says still look at the larger mixed use -- use area. So, again, it's -- it's a guide -- the Comprehensive Plan is a guide, but the intent is -- to Mayor's point is without the collector it's -- we don't want people crossing arterial roadways to get to the services. They need to be stand alone, so that way -- mixed use is to be integrated, so everyone can stay there and have services provided in that general area and not force people onto arterial roadways or state highways to -- when they are in close proximity to those services. So, that's really the -- the premise behind why we put

that -- that requirement in the Comprehensive Plan or that guide -- guideline in the Comprehensive Plan, because we wanted to make sure that they could function separately. So, again, it's really a situation where there was a lot of moving parts with this development, the applicant has been working with the property owner to the west, to the south, everyone around them trying to get utilities figured out, annexation path, all of these things. The church I think you are aware of, Stonehill Church, and it's even farther to the west waiting on utilities. So, again, a lot of moving parts, which took a lot of time and it just -- unfortunately, the applicant did get caught up in doing all of that extra work trying to make sure that they could address a lot of our concerns and still work with the adjacent property owners.

Simison: Okay. Well, we will see if anybody -- I assume we want to take testimony, if anyone else out there has some, so -- okay. Thank you, Ethan. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. Cooper Sharp.

Simison: Okay. Good evening. State your name and address for the record.

Sharp: Cooper Sharp. 3578 South Falconers Place, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. Good evening, Mayor and Council Members. I'm in support of this project and voicing my opinion as such. I live approximately two miles to the east on Eagle Road and off of Amity. We had a very similar project that developed there on the corner with Albertsons with some retail pads and some -- some townhouse -- multi-family behind it. Since that has gone in that's very much impacted me and my family's life in that area. Living on the south side of the freeway there is not a lot of restaurants, shopping, anything. We got to go to the north side and crossing the freeway is horrendous, especially on Eagle Road. So, bringing this type of development to the south side of the freeway within proximity for us -- we see it as a very beneficial add to our community and the offering of our lifestyle and -- and well-being in that area. A lot of times having kind of the -- the experience of seeing some developments in the area, a lot of times it's a chicken and an egg thing; right? Of, you know, which one goes first. From what we have heard and seen the applicant has done a tremendous job of working with all parties involved, including, you know, future projects and we see it as a well-being or a movement from the applicant to try and make it work for everybody's well-being. We feel like it's -- you know, my family feel like it's a great add and asset and as such should be approved. So, I just want to voice my -- my support of the project and recommendation of approval. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Cooper. Thank you so much. I appreciate you coming to share your experience with us. Would you mind sharing what other amenities or businesses that have grown up around that Albertson's that you and your family take advantage of?

Sharp: I would be remiss to say that we don't go to Jersey Mike's about every week. Don't want to admit that, but Jersey Mike's -- the restaurant that just went in on the corner, the steakhouse. My wife occasionally goes to the Pilates studio that's right there. There is a bank right there that we frequently attend to withdraw cash. So, very -- very impactful for our family of, you know, minimizing -- again, we live, you know, not very far -- less than half a mile from Albertson's, but we drive, right? Very rarely do we walk. But we drive there and those amenities have greatly changed our time that we spend in a car from having to go to the other side of the freeway or up anywhere on Eagle Road.

Little Roberts: All right. Thank you so much.

Sharp: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item? If you are online you can use the raise your hand feature. Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward for any final comments?

Mansfield: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council Members. I would just like to say if the collector road is a sticking point and that is something you would like to see built, obviously, with the first phase, first, you know, commercial -- whatever condition you feel is appropriate, we are willing to agree to that sort of condition. We have a great relationship with the adjacent landowner and I just wanted to put that on the record to just say, you know, we -- we can agree to that sort of condition, if that makes the -- makes it happen.

Simison: Okay. Council, any additional questions, comments? Okay. Thank you.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: It's my understanding that our choices are denial, continuance or send it back to Planning and Zoning and I know we have gotten a lot of questions answered tonight, but I think I would feel better if we sent it back to Planning and Zoning. I don't know that we did get all of their questions answered and I just think there has been enough changes that it needs to go through the process again and I'm throwing that out there for discussion, not making a motion until I can hear from some of my colleagues.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Question for -- for Bill or Sonya. When a -- when a remand occurs and we send -- if the Council were to send this back to Planning and Zoning, what level of staff analysis, either continues or begins again in light of that remand? Is a new staff report generated? Is it a continuation of the existing staff report? Maybe give Council a little flavor about what that process is from a staff standpoint.

Allen: Yeah. Mayor and Council, Councilman Cavener, I would update the staff report fully for -- so, that the Commission and Council could see where they are consistent and where they are not with the UDC and the comp plan.

Cavener: Okay.

Allen: The reason it wasn't updated this time was because the Commission didn't see those revised plans, so I didn't mess with that document.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: So, I -- I completely understood kind of the reason why. I just -- I wanted to make sure from my standpoint that if that occurs that they get kind of a fresh document that outlines kind of here is where -- here is what's changed. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, just for commentary. I agree with Council Member Little Roberts. I -- to me I think short -- short of a denial I think a remand is the only other option that I would feel comfortable with supporting this evening. I do -- I appreciate where the applicant's coming from, but the fact of the matter is we have -- we have a process and I have too much respect for the Planning and Zoning Commission to say, sorry, we are going to handle it here. You know, if -- it's staff have approval, Planning and Zoning Commission denial, maybe there is an opportunity -- it's only a couple of issues that we are working through I think there is a narrow path. But there is a lot that's changed and I think there is a lot of questions out there that still need to be answered.

Simison: Okay. Maybe a question for staff from their perspective. I'm going to ask you to go into the head of the Planning and Zoning Commission. From the changes that were done do you feel like they were getting to the heart of the Planning and Zoning Commissioners' issues? And I say that in the context of like when you -- when you look at this project and you have an arterial road separating it, is Planning and Zoning Commission ever going to say, yes, we have an arterial road separating the project area, even if they like it are they going to still recommend denial? We are going to be back here with another reconsideration conversation. I'm just intellectually curious.

Allen: Yeah. I can offer my two cents and Bill can follow up. You know, the Commission and Council has adopted our Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifically states it can't be considered one project for that reason. So, I -- I personally don't know if they would or should change their recommendation on that. They had recommended denial for inadequate integration between residential and non-residential uses. It's changed some. I'm not sure it's enough. Lack of prioritization of pedestrian mobility within the project. They have submitted an updated plan that does show additional pedestrian mobility and existing open space as proposed fails to serve residential and non-residential users adequately under the Comprehensive Plan. So, those are the main things just to refresh you on why they recommend denial. Again some of those things have changed from staff's perspective. I'm not sure it's enough to meet the policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Thank you.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, happy to kind of give you piggyback, too. I think you guys are aware that Commission -- the waiver to State Highway 69 or Meridian Road is your purview. So, again, on -- on occasion Planning and Zoning Commissions have supported that or recommended that you support that request, so that's -- that's one thing that -- it's your body -- your purview to -- to review that and approve that. I think Sonya did a great job of kind of capturing what the Commission stated. But, again, to your point, Mayor, they -- they could say we think you should look at this. They can't say do it. They could just say our recommendation is it is a single project if the applicant does X, Y and Z. Extend the collector road. Like Sonya was mentioning is the -- has the pedestrian network increased enough to get them to say that it is better integrated? Keep in mind mixed use is not just about vehicular traffic, it's about getting peds and bicyclists through the site, too, and so when we see a large -- large asphalt -- sea of asphalt through a parking lot we have to make sure that pedestrians can walk through that as well and bike through that and not get hit. So, there is a lot of policies in the comp plan under the mixed use standards that speaks to minimizing conflicts when these things integrate and I think to the applicant's point I think they have done better, but I don't know if they have done better to satisfy the Commission and whether or not that would sway the Commission's decision. I don't -- I don't believe the Commission spent a lot of time discussing the segregation between the arterial, it was really those things that Sonya was mentioning, is making sure that it does function and integrate better, so it is more cohesive, understanding that not each site is going to have more than the other. I think -- I think one thing that I brought up during the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing was the fact that we are lessening density on one side in order to pick it up on the other and to me that's -- that didn't seem right to do that. It didn't say we are going to do 20 units to the acre on one half and, then, do ten on the other and say we are 15 across the board, because, again, that has different impacts. One -- one side of the street has to deal with a higher density than the other side, which -- which, again, I understand the applicant's perspective knowing -- knowing that they were pursuing that STARS agreement, we don't know those things. We don't know what all goes into drafting a STARS agreement, we just get that information. So, at least hearing that information and maybe even sharing that with the Planning and Zoning Commission, I think that's some benefit to that, because, again, we have to weigh that, the common good for the community and if that's something that's

necessary to get these things moving forward and I think to the -- the Mayor's and the Council's point I think it's -- it's worthy of getting input from our Commissioners.

Simison: And just for the record I didn't say we should get input for the Commissioners, but some of the Council did, so -- yeah.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, I first looked at this and saw the changes and the first thing that came to me is that the changes to me looked to be significant enough that this was worthy of being remanded to Planning and Zoning. But I think another important thing has to happen when it goes back to Planning and Zoning is whether -- what the applicant takes is exactly what we have seen tonight or whether it's another iteration when it goes back in front of Planning and Zoning is in this application I don't know how I would be able to say I'm okay with anything if we don't have ITD at the table to bring forth the roadway issues that have been discussed here tonight. We always have and usually have ACHD on the phone ready to help us as we work through a project, but in this case, considering we are talking Meridian Road and the level of service that that road attempts to provide today, I think it's important, both at the P&Z and at a future Council meeting that ITD is in the house and able to answer questions specifically addressed to them on how this process would work.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: If we are ready for a motion I will make a motion that we remand it back to Planning and Zoning.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Okay. I'm sorry, do we close the public hearing? Did we already do that? Okay. Sorry. Okay. So, I have a motion and a second to remand this back to Planning and Zoning. Is there discussion on the motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: To share some thoughts, maybe as much for the benefit of the applicants, I think that what Councilman Overton said about looking at it, there is a -- I think there is a lot of issues that still need to be worked out with this. For me that connector road is important in being there early in this process. We don't want to be pushing people out on Highway 69 and down and across and so I think that interconnectivity is pretty

important to -- to looking at this. I -- I understand what the comp plan says and I think that's important that we follow that, because that's what provides some consistency here, but -- so, I don't know what P&Z may come down even yet with a revised plan or some updates, but I think that connectivity on that -- was it Hermite? I'm not sure what the road was. I think that's really important that that's earlier in the process, so I will be supporting the motions tonight, but I just wanted to share that, so that the applicant has some additional feedback.

Simison: Any additional comments? Staff need anything else? Okay. If not Clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item will be remanded back to Planning and Zoning and I imagine we will see you back here at some point in time one way or the other. So, hopefully it's with a positive from everyone involved.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing to Consider Adoption of the Ada County Jail Development Impact Fees Ordinance and the Ada County Emergency Medical Services District Development Impact Fees Ordinance Authorizing the Imposition of New County-Related Development Impact Fees

Simison: Okay. Council, do we need a break before we take on the next thing or are we good to go? Okay. Well, with that, then, we will move forward with Item 4, which is public hearing to consider adoption of the Ada County Jail Development Impact Fees Ordinance and the Ada County Emergency Medical Service District Development Impact Fees ordinance authorizing the imposition of new county related development impact fees and we will open this public hearing with staff comments from Mr. Starman.

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. I will pause just a moment. Chris, are you able to bring up the PowerPoint? Thank you, sir. I will go ahead and start without the PowerPoint. We will catch up later. So, you -- just as a refresher, Council Members, Mr. Mayor, we did a fairly in-depth update for you about two months ago on April 14th and spent a pretty good chunk of time talking about this topic. I'm going to try to keep my remarks a little more brief. Since you just had a recent presentation on this I will keep my -- try to keep my comments relatively brief. When we concluded our discussion in April I think I can -- just in a very brief way -- summarize the Council was supportive. We want to partner with the county. We do view the county as our partner and we do -- I think the Council has articulated that a philosophy of growth should pay for growth. Your direction to staff at that time was to proceed with drafting ordinances, as well as drafting the agreements -- interagency agreements necessary. But you also said at that time that you probably were not yet ready to schedule a public

hearing for this purpose and I think the main concern -- perhaps the only concern at that time was the issue of timing vis-a-vis other cities in terms of adopting ordinances and some potential risks there. We have had discussions in the past about, you know, uneven playing fields, but I think in particular the concern in our April discussion was there is a hypothetical where, you know, maybe four of the cities, five of the cities participate, one or two do not and what does that -- what might that mean? And we had a conversation about that likely means that at some point the county would need to update its capital improvements plan, its -- their plans plural. Would also need to update its fee studies and the fee may change. So, we don't know if that's a linear relationship. If you reduce the service area and reduce development that's happening, it's not clear whether the fee would be the same. Would it be more? Would it be less? And there was concern, rightfully so, on the part of the Council is do we get into this, start collecting fees and, then, have a -- an issue like that. So, I think we have a resolution to that issue tonight and that's why we did schedule the public hearing to give you an opportunity to advance this topic and so I think it's a solution that works for everybody. You know, we work collaboratively with the -- with our county partners. Their legal counsel has reviewed the language. The county's chief operating officer has done the same and is here tonight to speak -- to answer questions you might have relative to the county. So, I'm going to go through the PowerPoint very quickly. It is a public hearing. So, it's important, it's an opportunity to hear from the public as well and to get input from your constituents as well. As a reminder the original proposal that was -- the original studies and fee proposal included three different county wide impact fees, coroner, EMS and jail. You know from previous discussions that the coroner topic has been placed to the side. The county I think still would like to pursue that idea at some point, but after it makes more progress with the legislature to provide some clarity around that topic. So, tonight we are talking, as we have in the past, last couple discussions, we are talking about EMS and the jail. You also recall from -- we have been discussing this topic for some time now and actually took some concrete steps in 2025 to help advance the topic and in particular sort of outlined an implementation plan and have essentially completed the first three. One was to approve some initial limited intergovernmental agreements that would kind of get us to the point where we are now and that's been successful, that's why we are here chatting this evening. We also at that time -- or in that time frame of 2025 approved the capital improvements plans for EMS and the jail and you also amended the city's Comprehensive Plan to include those CIPs as well and that was accomplished last year and, then, we paused until other cities were able to make more progress and I'm happy to report tonight that I think that has happened. We are not a hundred percent to the finish line, but others have made more progress and I will give you a fresh update on that in just a moment or two. So, really our last step in this process and the purpose of the public hearing tonight is to -- really if we want to continue to help our partner with that -- you know, with these fees -- impact fees and the philosophy of growth should pay for growth is to conduct a public hearing and decide whether you all, after hearing from your constituents, whether you wish to proceed with the necessary ordinances and agreements that would enable that to happen and authorize that to happen. A quick update from last time. I will just recap for the public as well. But at this point in time Star and Eagle and Kuna have finished their processes. I believe Eagle and Star in particular have been collecting the fees for a few

months now, perhaps a bit longer. Kuna just recently adopted this ordinance. There is a 30 day wait and so either they are right at -- at that point or maybe they have just started to collect fees. I didn't get the exact date. But Kuna, if they haven't collected fees yet, they are about ready to do so and they may have been doing it for a week or so. Garden City has introduced ordinances for first reading, but I believe -- I don't believe they -- they paused their process as well and -- but I have been chatting with their attorney -- the city attorney for Garden City and I believe they do intend to move forward particularly if Meridian does the same. So, I think Garden City has started the process. They paused and will likely proceed soon. With respect to Boise City, perhaps Mr. Rutherford can give us an update on what he knows. I will say I spoke with one of the lead attorneys from Boise City last Friday and indicated that they are still an interest in working with the county, that there is a desire to do so. Not a lot of tangible results quite yet, so I didn't -- I didn't get the sense it's going to happen tomorrow or next week, but I also didn't get the sense that it's -- it's not going to move forward either and perhaps Mr. Rutherford has some -- some intelligence -- some insights on that that might be helpful to us if that's of interest to the City Council tonight. But we are -- I guess to go back. I think we are close to probably having five of six cities and they are getting very close to the finish line and Boise City at least still indicating a desire to work with the county on this topic. In order to address that concern, however, from our last discussion about the potential risk that surrounds the topic of if all cities do not participate is there a possibility of fees being too high or too low, refunds, et cetera, collaborated with the county on some language that would I think address that topic for the City Council to your satisfaction and really something kind of consistent with what we have talked about previously is to be as helpful as we can to advance the ball, but also wait until all the cities are ready to implement and so we can all kind of do it together in a sort of a cohesive way near in time and that makes I think sense for the development community and for all of the cities as well. So, the solution -- or a potential solution is you have the ordinances you have before you today have -- this is an excerpt from the Jail Impact Fee ordinance. There is similar language for the EMS ordinance as well, but, essentially, by ordinance ties the timing to -- we would adopt the ordinances, they would go into effect -- the two ordinances would go into effect 30 days after adoption and publication, but, then, the actual fee implementation would be contingent upon all the other incorporated cities in Ada county adopting the necessary ordinances and agreements to implement and collect those impact fees as well. So, essentially, we would do all we need to do and the ordinances would be approved and to use that expression on the books, but the last step would pause until we have everybody on the same page. That's also helpful, just parenthetically. We haven't talked about this previously, but I know for -- for your staff that's helpful as well, because, you know, we collect impact fees now for ACHD and we collect impact fees for the City of Meridian and so we have, you know, a basic framework in place to do that, but this type of stuff the devil's in the detail and so the programming that's required for different computer applications, changes to processes, discussions with our counterparts at the county of how this is going to work on a day to day and logistical basis, a little bit of time to work through those issues would also be helpful, quite frankly. So, this is primarily to deal with the issue we talked about back in April, but there is a side benefit that it provides some additional time for -- to kind of do the logistical type work behind the scenes that

make that all work. As the Mayor indicated we open the public hearing tonight. This is a public hearing. It's been advertised as such. There are basically three topics that are subjects of the public hearing. The proposed Ada County Jail Development Impact Fee Ordinance, the proposed Ada County Emergency Medical Services District Development Impact Fee Ordinance and, then, related to both is the actual fees themselves, which are covered by a different section of state law and so all three of those topics are covered by this public hearing. We would love to hear from -- from the public and from our constituents on, you know, their thoughts about this concept. As a refresher, this is -- we talked about this previously. I will just -- maybe just use the first number for both, but the cost in terms of the proposed fees that are before you and the subject of this public hearing depends on -- just as we -- for the City of Meridian for our impact fees, we have different categories of residential or multi -- you know, single family, multi-family, retail and so forth. The county when it did its analysis and fee study did something similar. They have some different categories, some categories we don't use today, but a similar methodology. The proposed fee -- I will just talk about sort of the equivalent residential unit or single family unit is proposed at 516 dollars per single family home. There are other figures as you see on the screen for other categories of use, including non-residential uses as well and, then, for EMS the comparable fee is 175 dollars per single family home and, again, other fees for different categories that kind of stem from that base calculation. To the extent -- so, I'm just going to sort of lay out the framework here. This is the public hearing piece. We are not ready to act on any of these things quite yet, but I just wanted to tell the complete story while I had the opportunity to do so and, then, I will step away, we will have our public hearing. I can come back and talk about these more if you would like, but to the extent after hearing testimony tonight and having your questions answered and deliberation if you choose to move forward next steps would look like what's on the screen before you now, would be to introduce the -- I'm just going to truncate this description for -- to save a few words. We will do -- we will introduce the Jail Impact Fee Ordinance by first reading by title only, dispense with the full reading and approve the summary for publication. Do the same for the EMS ordinance. Our recommendation, just to -- out of an abundance of caution we recommend that we do all three readings. So, first reading this evening if that's your desire. Second reading next week and, then, third reading your first meeting in July. So, quite frankly, the state statute that deals with this aspect within the Development Impact Fee Act is not as clearly written as it should be. So, just to make it out of an abundance of caution our recommendation is to do all three readings just to make sure that it's, you know, there is no questions. Next we have two interagency agreements for -- these, essentially, would be successor agreements to the -- the ones you approved in 2025. These are the agreements that between the county, agreement one and the EMS district, agreement number two, that basically lay out the contractual relationship that the city will collect fees on behalf of the county and/or EMS district. This is how that's going to work and so forth. I will say parenthetically -- this might be a question or a topic of discussion for you -- after working with the city's Finance Department and talking with our CFO, the agreements do not contemplate charging a fee to the county for collections, although I think the county would be willing to entertain that and they have an agreement that sort of allows for that. The rationale for that was twofold I think -- or at least twofold. One is that with respect to ACHD we collect fees on

ACHD's behalf and we do not charge a fee. That's part of a larger arrangement, however, where both agencies work together, so the concept was, you know, we don't charge ACHD fees and they don't charge us fees. So we are trying to be consistent. Secondly, you know, our chief financial officer thought particularly for ongoing costs that are -- once it's -- once the program is in place and the process -- processes are in place that really the ongoing cost is not a great substance and so for those reasons the recommendation was not to include a fee, but you may have some different thoughts about that. I do want to say, however, just for full -- full information to make good decisions, there are some upfront costs to the city that -- and we don't have a good grasp of what those look like yet, but there is going to -- as I mentioned there will be programming costs to amend -- or to modify our existing programs. Some of that will be done in-house with city staff, so it may not be a hard expense, but there is certainly a soft cost there for city staff to do that. We don't have great numbers there. Just to give you maybe a sense of order of magnitude in a discussion as recently as this morning, maybe your thought was we are talking about maybe tens of hours, like maybe up to 50 hours of staff time to -- programming time to do that and, then, with one particular application, which I -- that's not my field of expertise and I couldn't -- I don't even recall which it was now, but for one program in particular it may require some assistance from that particular vendor, but the thought from our IT director was that would not be a substantial cost, but less than 10,000 dollars, maybe substantially less, but probably no more than that. But I do want you to be aware there are some implementation expenses that to step into this and make some changes to our systems, particularly on the IT side, there is going to be some upfront expenses. Right now that's not contemplated in the agreement. Again, the county may be amenable to that if that's important to the Council, but I just want to kind of flag that for you as well. To the extent you did those things tonight or in the near future, the idea on the intergovernmental agreements in particular is that we would be first to say, yes, we, then, transmit the -- after the Mayor's signature would transmit those to the county and to the EMS district for their approval and signature and, then, the implementation date for those agreements is inter-tied to the implementation date of the ordinance, so the agreements don't become effective until the ordinances become effective. They go into effect at the same time. As I mentioned, we recommend doing all -- all three readings by title only, to waive the full reading, and just the way the calendar falls this month, we have a fifth Tuesday that you all likely will not be meeting, so we will do the second -- if you proceed the second reading next week and, then, a third reading on July 7th, would be the likely time frame. We, then, publish as we do -- we would recommend a summary, because ordinances are quite lengthy. I think 23 to 24 pages per ordinance, so summaries would be helpful in this instance. That's something you can do by majority vote. The ordinances, then, under state law, once the ordinances have been adopted by this body and been -- and they have been published they would go into effect 30 days thereafter and as I mentioned we have that timing issue at that point where we would not -- the ordinances would be adopted and on the books, but we would not be collecting the fee until that timing issue is resolved I spoke about earlier. So, that's a quick run through. I mentioned that Steve Rutherford, the chief operating officer for Ada county is here, I'm sure he would be happy to come to the podium and answer questions you have and I would invite Steve to come up. If I missed anything important he can come supplement

anything I missed as well. But at that point I will pause. This is a public hearing, so I'm happy to answer questions you have now, but you may want to hear from the public first. I'm at your pleasure. Whatever you would like to do.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Thank you, Kurt. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, no.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to come forward and provide testimony on this item? A fine resident and county employee, we would love to hear from them.

Rutherford: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Steve Rutherford, chief operating officer for Ada county. That's 200 West Front in Boise. 83702. Although I'm a Meridian resident. So, thank you very much for having us back to continue this discussion. We are very appreciative. In terms of an update Eagle and Star are collecting at this point. Kuna is -- is finished with the process and we are currently in the process of adopting the intergovernmental agreement. We have -- we got in a little kerfuffle and so they sent the wrong one over, so we have to get our board to approve that and, then, they will be collecting. Garden City let me know tonight that he is trying to get this on -- this subject on. They have got a second and third reading to finish of the ordinances for next week. We will see. But he -- he was pretty interested in following Meridian as soon as possible and, then, some good news on Boise, the remaining city. I got an e-mail from mayor's chief of staff -- one of the mayor's chiefs of staff last week and we have a meeting next Thursday with their planning staff, a couple of their lawyers, their finance people, similar to the conversation we had with Kurt and Lavoie not too long ago -- actually it was a while ago now. So, I think it's progress. I have talked to the development services director and -- and she said, you know, it shouldn't be too painful. I do think they are going to want some concessions. They have -- as I have mentioned before they have been interested in an exemption for affordable housing and so we have contemplated that for some time and there seems to be some interest in ADUs as well and an exemption and the commission's willing to work through that with them, because, you know, ultimately I think the goal is just to get this adopted county wide and we are encouraged by the recent communication from the city. So, I'm happy to answer any questions you have about these impact fees. But we are, again, really appreciative for the invitation to come out.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Steve, are you okay with the language in our agreement that we will hold ours until all the cities are ready to go?

Rutherford: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, I guess a couple of things. Yes. To start out, yes, that's absolutely fine. You know, ultimately we are interested in all getting to the finish line together and everybody's at a different pace. The idea that we are all going to cross the finish line at the same time -- it became really impractical and unworkable dealing with, you know, mayors and city councils all over the valley. So, that is absolutely fine. Like the Mayor told me about a year ago, maybe 18 months ago when I was standing at this, why are we -- why are we still talking about this. Development's happening and we are losing funds and so there is some sense of urgency. I think if the chair was here tonight you would hear that. But we completely understand, because it gets weird if one of the cities either delays or -- or decides not to do it. So, just -- just, again, grateful for the action at least that's proposed tonight.

Simison: Yeah. And I will just weigh in on that topic just from a practical standpoint. I would be in favor of doing this without it to move it forward and start collecting immediately, because, frankly, if five of the other six cities -- we are a majority of the development in the county under that scenario with our partners at Kuna and Star and ourselves far outpacing our neighbor to the west of us. So, while there may be some concerns over what happens if someone doesn't, all of us put together to me alleviates those concerns at a higher rate than waiting for the other to maybe happen or maybe not happen. My personal opinion. Any additional questions for Steve? Okay. Thank you.

Rutherford: Thank you.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or online? Kurt, any final comments from staff on this item?

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council Members. No additional comments. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have. If not I will let you take care of the public hearing and I'm happy to stay at the podium to talk about your next items on your agenda, the ordinances and agreements, but I will -- we will take care of the public hearing first.

Simison: Okay. Appreciate that. I will just say this. I did hear today for the first time from Director Miles about the potential costs for implementation. Right. I am under the impression that these are soft costs and I frankly think that even if they weren't they are a small price to pay for our residents and taxpayers compared to the hard costs of paying for these out of other property tax if we didn't have impact fees overall generally. So -- you know. So, I -- we are prepared to move forward as we see fit to achieve this. I said even if we got to just take a check -- we can figure out a way to take a check from somebody to pay these if we -- it takes so long to get our -- our system moving forward cost effectively. Okay. With that do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Before a motion, I -- I recognize that the public hearing can be closed, but where we have multiple readings on this and I recognize that our friends in the media just left, but a change in a shift like this I would be more supportive of keeping the public hearing open through the various readings in case someone in our community wanted to weigh in and provide a perspective. So, just for consideration I guess.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I'm in -- I'm in agreement with that line of thought that we leave the public hearing open through the third reading.

Simison: So, do I have a different motion?

Cavener: I think that was a motion. At least I heard it as a motion.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Make a motion that we keep the public hearing open --

Simison: Continue the public hearing.

Overton: Continue the public hearing.

Simison: To next week.

Overton: Next week.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Okay. I have a motion and second to continue the public hearing to next week. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: And, Kurt, we know you won't be here, so we don't expect you to come back and be present for the next two --

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Yes, this will be my -- my last -- likely my last City Council meeting. Actually my last day with the city is next Tuesday, but I told Bill I have a hard stop at 5:00 p.m., so I won't be here at 6:00 p.m. But it's been a pleasure to work with you all for the past several years. So, thank you. I was going to mention two

things and, then, I will -- or at least one thing and, then, we will -- if you would like we can transition to first reading of the ordinances. My recollection -- I will take a -- I'm very comfortable with continuing the public hearing. My recollection is the -- the state statute specifically allows you to do your first two readings before you complete your public hearing process, so I think perfectly fine to continue the hearing until next week and keep it open. That's fine, too. That does not -- does not preclude you from offering the ordinances for first reading this evening if that is your desire to do, so -- so, Chris, I don't -- I don't think we need to pull it back up. I -- part of the PowerPoint was some action items, but if that's your desire your next item on the agenda would be the potential offering the two ordinances listed consecutive. I think the jail is listed first and I believe the EMS ordinance was listed second. I would recommend two different -- you know, two different actions on that. But if you are so inclined you can offer those ordinances by first reading and we can proceed accordingly.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 5. Ordinance No. 26-2126: An Ordinance Adding a New Title 12 Called "Countywide Development Impact Fees" to the Meridian City Code and Adding Thereto a New Chapter 1 Called "Ada County Jail Development Impact Fees" That Provides for Short Chapter Title; Authority, Findings, Applicability, and Purpose; Definitions; Capital Improvements Plan; Periodic Review of the Capital Improvements Plan; Intergovernmental Agreement with Ada County; Imposition of County Impact Fees and Payment; Enforcement and Collection; County Impact Fee Administrator and City Powers to Require Payment of County Impact Fees; County Impact Fee(s) Exemptions; Process for Individual Assessment; Extraordinary Impacts; Developer Credits and Reimbursements; County Impact Fee Payment Mistake or Misrepresentation; Fee Payer Refunds; County Impact Fee Capital Projects Trust Fund, Expenditures, Budget, Audit, and Surcharge; Appeals and Mediation; Miscellaneous Provisions; Punishment for Violations; Construction of Ordinance Intent; and Providing an Effective**

Simison: Okay. And with that we will move on to Item 5. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance. First reading.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance adding a new Title 12 called "Countywide Development Impact Fees" to the Meridian City Code and adding thereto a new Chapter 1 called "Ada County Jail Development Impact Fees" that provides for short chapter title; authority, findings, applicability, and purpose; definitions; capital improvements plan; periodic review of the capital improvements plan; intergovernmental agreement with Ada county; imposition of county impact fees and payment; enforcement and collection; county impact fee administrator and city powers to require payment of county impact fees; county impact fee(s) exemptions; process for individual assessment; extraordinary impacts; developer credits and reimbursements; county

impact fee payment mistake or misrepresentation; fee payer refunds; county impact fee capital projects trust fund, expenditures, budget, audit, and surcharge; appeals and mediation; miscellaneous provisions; punishment for violations; construction of ordinance intent; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? Okay. Seeing none.

6. Ordinance No. 26-2127: An Ordinance Amending the Meridian City Code by the Addition Thereto of a New Chapter 2 to Title 12 Called "Ada County Emergency Medical Services District Development Impact Fees" Providing for Short Chapter Title; Authority, Findings, Applicability, and Purpose; Definitions; Capital Improvements Plan; Periodic Review of the Capital Improvements Plan; Intergovernmental Agreement with EMS District; Imposition of EMS Impact Fees and Payment; Enforcement and Collection; EMS District Impact Fee Administrator and City Powers to Require Payment of EMS Impact Fees; EMS Impact Fee(s) Exemptions; Process for Individual Assessment; Extraordinary Impacts; Developer Credits and Reimbursements; EMS Impact Fee Payment Mistake or Misrepresentation; Fee Payer Refunds; EMS Impact Fee Capital Projects Trust Fund, Expenditures, Budget, Audit, and Surcharge; Appeals and Mediation; Miscellaneous Provisions; Punishment for Violations; Construction of Ordinance Intent; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: We will move on to Item 6, which is Ordinance No. 26-2127. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance amending the Meridian City Code by the addition thereto of a new Chapter 2 to Title 12 called "Ada County Emergency Medical Services District Development Impact Fees" providing for short chapter title; authority, findings, applicability, and purpose; definitions; capital improvements plan; periodic review of the capital improvements plan; intergovernmental agreement with EMS district; imposition of EMS impact fees and payment; enforcement and collection; EMS district impact fee administrator and city powers to require payment of EMS impact fees; EMS impact fee(s) exemptions; process for individual assessment; extraordinary impacts; developer credits and reimbursements; EMS impact fee payment mistake or misrepresentation; fee payer refunds; EMS impact fee capital projects trust fund, expenditures, budget, audit, and surcharge; appeals and mediation; miscellaneous provisions; punishment for violations; construction of ordinance intent; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? Okay. Seeing none.

7. Ada County and City of Meridian Intergovernmental Agreement for the Collection and Expenditure of Development Impact Fees for Ada County Sheriff's Jail on Development Within the Municipal Boundaries of the City of Meridian

Simison: We will move on to Item 7, which is the Ada County-City Meridian Intergovernment agreement for collection and expenditure of development impact fees for County Sheriff's Jail and development within the municipal boundaries of the City of Meridian. Do I have a motion on this item?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Move that we approve the Ada County and City Meridian Intergovernmental Agreement for the collection and expenditure of developmental impact fees for Ada County Sheriff's Jail on development within the municipality municipal boundaries of the City of Meridian.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 7. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

8. Ada County Emergency Medical Services District and City of Meridian Intergovernmental Agreement for the Collection and Expenditure of Development Impact Fees for the Ada County Emergency Medical Services District on Development Within the Municipal Boundaries of the City of Meridian

Simison: Next up is Item 8, which is Ada County Emergency Medical Service District. The City of Meridian Intergovernment agreement for the collection expenditure of development impact fees for Ada County Emergency Medical Services District on development within the municipal boundaries of the City of Meridian. Do I have a motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton. See if you can say it that fast.

Overton: I move that we approve the Ada County Emergency Medical Services District and City of Meridian Intergovernmental Agreement for the collection and expenditure of

development impact fees for Ada County Emergency Medical Services District on development within the municipal boundaries of the City of Meridian.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion that was faster and seconded. Is there any discussion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I wish he had made a mistake so he would have to withdraw it and do it again, but -- well done, Mr. President.

Simison: If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Not a future meeting topic, but just a quick moment of privilege. Kurt, thank you for your service to the City of Meridian. I know we have got this to the -- to the two yard line on this big project that you and Steve have been working on. Thank you. I -- as one who goes back and watches and reads the minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission I just appreciate the guidance and support you have given our Planning and Zoning Commission over the years. They are better because of your involvement and you will certainly be missed here at the city. So, best of luck in your retirement.

Starman: Thank you.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, I don't get this opportunity very often, so I do want to echo what Councilman Cavener said. I want to thank Kurt for his time with our office. I have had a long career and a privilege to work with lots of attorneys over the years, two of them in this room and Kurt is one of the few and Mr. Rutherford is another one, that I have had the privilege of working with and having worked for me that I treasure and value all the

advice and work and the value they brought to me and to our team and to our city and I just want to thank him and I don't get a chance, because he doesn't come usually when I'm here, so I appreciate it and I want to make sure to note that and thank Mr. Rutherford for being here for the county, too.

Simison: Yeah. And I think -- what you don't see is everything Kurt does is not in this room and in other facets and he has been a great -- in this -- bringing his former profession to light as well for our city as a city manager. They will bring that into the conversation is combined with his newer legal expertise has been a great benefit and value in some of the other areas where he served with the city. So, we really appreciate it and -- and I will just say this, Steve, if you are looking for a different opportunity the City of Meridian will be hiring.

Cavener: Shots fired.

Simison: Well, you got to take an opportunity when you see it. So, with that do I have a motion?

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: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:12 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK