

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:10 p.m., Tuesday, August 18, 2020, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Joe Borton, Luke Cavener, Treg Bernt, and Brad Hoaglund.

Members Absent: Jessica Perreault and Liz Strader.

Also present: Adrienne Weatherly, Bill Nary, Cameron Arial, Caleb Hood, Brian McClure, Todd Lavoie, Jenny Field, Brad Purser, Jeff Lavey, Scott Colaianni, Mark Niemeyer, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

Roll-call Attendance:

<input type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Borton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brad Hoaglund	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Treg Bernt
<input type="checkbox"/> Jessica Perreault	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Okay. Take two. We are going to call this meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, August 18th, 2020. It's 6:10 p.m. We will begin this meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next item on the agenda is the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Thank you. Next item on the agenda is our community invocation, which will be given this evening by Rabbi Fink from The congregation of Ahavath Beth Israel and we -- if you would like to take this as a moment of silence or join us in this community invocation we would appreciate that. Rabbi Fink, you are recognized.

Fink: Thank you. Source of life, we thank you for this opportunity to gather and for the responsibility accorded to those who come together to deliberate and to set policy for our community this evening. Grant them we pray the courage to lead and the empathy to listen, that they may govern with wisdom and compassion. May they guide us through these trying times with an eye for steadfastness and safety and inspire us toward a shared sense of the common good. Bless the work of their hands and of their hearts that they might guide us with wisdom and with strength and let us say amen.

Simison: Thank you, Rabbi Fink. Appreciate it.

Fink: Thank you.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Simison: The next item is -- which is not on our agenda, but is the adoption of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: One thing we need to do is add to the Executive Session, which is Item 10, we need to add Idaho Code 74-206-A-(1)(a), as well as -- oh, excuse me. It's (f).

Nary: Excuse me. 74-206(1)(f).

Bernt: (1)(f). Perfect. Did we get that? Okay. And then -- what's the other thing? The second thing is that we need to switch Item 3 before Item 2. So, we will just switch those two items for -- for our presentations this evening. Other than that, Mayor, I move that we adopt the agenda as amended.

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up under public forum?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we have one sign up, Jonathan Walker, to speak about sound abatement barrier on Chinden.

Simison: Okay. Is Mr. Walker here? All right. If you would come forward and you can -- you are recognized for three minutes.

Walker: Okay. My name is Jonathan Walker and I live in northern Meridian near Tree Farm and Chinden, with the expanding highway.

Simison: And if you could state your full -- your address for the record.

Walker: 4102 West Silver River Street.

Simison: Perfect.

Walker: And so she's going to pull up some pictures. I just -- my concern is, basically, about a sound abatement wall that was supposed to be installed behind our row of homes and I don't think it was installed according to what they were supposed to build for sound abatement purposes. I have got a lot of help from Mr. Hood and as well as Ms. Sonya Allen. They have kind of helped me with -- to gather a lot of information. They have been very helpful with this, but I just kind of wanted to kind of bring this forward. I'm trying to get done whatever we can get done as soon as possible because of the traffic noise. So, is there a way I can put a pointer on any of this or anything? So, up near the top what you see is -- that's Chinden Road and these houses -- these -- these plots right here that are right next to the road, that's where our row of houses are and so our backyards back up to -- directly to the road there and from what I understand is -- is Brighton Corp built this neighborhood and as part of their plat agreement they were supposed to build a sound barrier that meets City Code 11-3H-4D, which is typically supposed to be a ten foot barrier, but there can also be alternative means and they -- that's what they submitted to the city. Could you go to the next slide? You just click on that next one. I mean it's free. So, this was what was presented -- what they submitted to City Council and it had the sound professional approved, said it would have -- it would work as an alternative and what we see is this six foot wall and, then, this large four foot tall graded berm which is graded to three feet of length for every foot of height. There is trees on both sides and there is a 40 foot dedicated common lot between the lot line and the end of the sidewalk -- the far side of the sidewalk and this is what residents were under the impression was going to be built there and it looks very good and even said in the request that it was going to be similar to the Rambo Subdivision, which looks almost exactly like this, which is right next door. So, that's kind of what everybody was under the impression of. And could we go to the next slide? So, that's what was actually built. As you see there is no -- there is no berm, there is -- I guess in the future they could put some trees there, but, essentially, it's online with the road. There is no berm that breaks line of sight or anything like that and I think someone that looks at this picture is like, well, maybe that berm is on the other side of the fence, because that doesn't look anything like what they submitted. So, important to look at here is that fence right there, just --

Weatherly: Hold on just a second.

Walker: Sorry.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, my apologies, but the slides -- we saw the first slide, but nothing was changing after that, so --

Walker: Oh.

Hoaglund: Definitely -- definitely want to see it, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Walker. Mr. Mayor and Adrienne, yes, now -- now we can -- now it changed to the second one, so --

Walker: Okay. But you can see on there it basically said there was going to be a 40 foot dedicated common lot, which the sound person said that was important, the distance. Also the height of the berm there and that the fence would be at the top of this berm, which would be above the retaining wall you see there on the lot line on the right. And, then, so if you go to the next one. I said there -- you see there is no berm that goes higher than the level of the road. There is none of that landscaping. The -- the distance I think they said in the form was going to be 56 feet from the edge of the roadway to the lot line. It's -- it's about 30 feet. So, it's almost half of what they said it was going to be and, then, if you go to the next slide, just so you can see, this is from inside the yard. So, you can see that there is no berm there that they were supposed to build on top of that and just to be clear, where that fence line is on top, that's where the vehicles are. So, it's like they drive by at eye level. It's not like they are on the other side of that wall right there, because this is kind of recessed into the ground. So, the vehicles are right up against that -- will be driving right up against that wood fence there and there is -- there is nothing blocking them at all, but that berm was supposed to be there. And, then, I have a video next. I don't know if you can play that or not. And that's -- that's the berm right there that was -- I mean that's all that they put there when it was supposed to be this 12 foot wide, four foot high rolling berm with landscaping on both sides of it for sound abatement and I think that everyone just -- we were kind of under the impression that -- that something was going to be built similar to what's next door in Rambo and all the other -- and every other -- on the southern side of that road every other residential area has a hardshell wall for sound abatement and we are the only one -- it's a thousand foot stretch and we don't and we would really like them to build it -- build a hardshell wall, because they, obviously, didn't build what was approved by the sound engineer.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Walker, and appreciate your help and understanding as we walk through the technical difficulties. I think the Council understands. Unfortunately, the public forum there is no comment or back and forth at this point in time, but, hopefully, that was explained to you, but it's been shared and we have received it and I know staff is aware of the issue --

Walker: Yeah.

Simison: -- and the community development.

Walker: All right. Thank you.

Simison: All right. Thank you.

Walker: Thank you for your time, everybody.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I guess a question about process. I don't know if this is something that is a potential future meeting or something that's happened -- going to be addressed more administratively.

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I can tell you I -- I have been involved in some of the conversations with Planning and this project hasn't been final approved yet either. So, it's still an active construction area because of the roadway. I don't know if the roadway impacted some of those changes or not, so we will work with Planning and probably have to come back with you to update you on what the progress is.

Simison: And that likely would -- Mr. Nary, could be accomplished through an e-mail or other measure.

Nary: Absolutely.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Public Hearing for City of Meridian Fiscal Year 2020 Amended Budget

Simison: If there is no Council action, which is required or available. All right. Moving on to Action Items. We will turn to our first action item, which is a public hearing for City of Meridian Fiscal Year 2020 amended budget and I will turn this over to Mrs. Fields if she is with us.

Fields: Right here. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. Thank you for having me on Zoom tonight. I'm going to share my screen. Let me know if you see it. Okay. So, I'm here to present to you our fiscal year 2020 amended budget. This is our public hearing. Tonight I am going to go over our three major funds with you. General Fund, Capitol Improvement Fund and Enterprise Fund. We are going to stop and take any questions and answer any questions. Our public hearing is tonight. And with the closer of that we will ask Council to approve our fiscal year 2020 amended budget. So, that --

Borton: Jenny?

Fields: Yes.

Borton: Could I jump in with one quick question?

Fields: Of course.

Borton: Maybe a comment, but the image over your left shoulder is just outstanding.

Fields: What image? Oh, my God. Thank you.

Borton: I love it.

Fields: Thank you. So, with that we are going start -- during this time last year, Council, we had adopted our original 2020 budget. Total city budget last year at this time for 2020 was 120.5 million dollars. So, throughout the fiscal year departments have come before you to seek the budget amendment approval. So, our final budget for 2020 came in at 121.6 million dollars. That is up .91 percent from where we had it originally. What I'm going to go through tonight with you is the changes that happened throughout the fiscal year. So, this will be more of a review for you, because these budget amendments -- these changes have been presented to you over the last ten months. So, with that said we have a total of 36 budget amendments. General Fund, Capital Improvement Fund, and Enterprise Fund is -- the amounts are displayed on the screen for you. This is just more of a formal process that we notify our citizens of the state of our fiscal year 2020 budget. With that we are going to jump right into our General Fund budget. General Fund last year -- the original budget was set at 67 million dollars. We ended General Fund 71.3. Total budget for General Fund is up 6.5 percent and personnel, capital, and carry forward is displayed on the screen in front of you. Within the General Fund we have a total of 24 total budget amendments that was approved. The major three that were approved for employee benefit plan trusts, contracted building services, streetlights for a couple of Chinden projects, and our carry forward adjustment. In our Capital Improvement Fund we started the year off of 5.39 million dollars. Our final capital improvement fund ended up four -- a little over four million. And the reason is with no budget amendment and Capital Improvement Funds, our carry forward adjustment made it go down 24.6 -- or 24.46 percent and all of that is attributed to our parks. Discovery Park project carry forward adjustment. In the Enterprise -- Enterprise Fund our original budget was at 48.1 million dollars. We finalized Enterprise Fund budget at 46.1 million. That is down four -- about four percent. And within our Enterprise Fund we have a total of 12 budget amendments that were approved. The major ones that were approved throughout the fiscal year were our wastewater -- our wastewater land acquisition, the water main extension projects and our meter budget amendments. They also have a carry forward adjustment that was down 7.3 million and majority of that was attributed to our wastewater capacity expansion project. I know I went through those really fast, but those were just some high level overviews of what has taken place in -- during our fiscal year 2020 budget and I will sit for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Jenny. Council, any questions? Okay. This is a public hearing. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on this item?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. And someone took control of my computer, so I can't get to -- if there is anyone in the -- on the Zoom app who would like to -- sorry. Apologize. I did not realize my video was not live. Is there anybody in the Zoom app who would like to testify on this application or do we have anybody who is on the phone? If so, if you can raise your hand and the Clerk can bring you on to testify. We see two attendees and neither one is raising their hand. So, hearing no further -- seeing no one wishing to testify or no further questions from Council, do I have a motion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I move we close the public hearing on City of Meridian's fiscal year 2020 amended budget.

Cavener: Second.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Is the approval of the amended budget needed tonight or does it follow next week with the ordinance?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, so we just need direction to bring the ordinance back. So, you do need to make a motion for that.

Borton: Mr. Mayor? Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I move that we do provide that direction to legal to bring back an ordinance for approval of the 2020 -- fiscal year 2020 amended budget for our consideration and vote next week.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to have an ordinance brought back by Council next week. Is there any discussion on that motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for City of Meridian Fiscal Year 2021 Proposed Budget

Simison: With that we will move on to the next item on the agenda, which is public hearing for City of Meridian fiscal year 2021 proposed budget and I will turn this over to Brad. I will open this public hearing with staff comments and turn this over to Brad.

Purser: Let me know when you can see me. Let me know when you can see me. I'm sharing my screen here.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: One thing -- I was looking -- I forgot to look at the -- the timeline for the budget. Actually, Finance had scheduled that for September 1st. So -- so, that was the intention was to bring that back. So, if you wouldn't mind correcting that, so we can line up with Finance, because they prepare the final numbers that get attached, so --

Simison: Would the motion maker -- let me backtrack and approve one officially. You need to reopen something, Mr. Nary?

Nary: The motion would be to rescind your prior motion and correct it to September 1st.

Borton: So moved, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Okay.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to rescind the previous motion as it relates to the date and move it to September 1st. Is there any discussion on that new motion? If not, I will call the question. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Okay. And, Brad, we can see you now and we heard you before.

Purser: Great. I'm sharing my screen. Can you guys see that?

Simison: You see -- yes.

Borton: Yes.

Simison: A blank -- a blank screen if that's what you are hoping for.

Purser: No.

Simison: There you go. Now we got it.

Purser: Okay. Great. That's good. Here. Appreciate having me out. I'm here to talk to you about the 2021 proposed budget. As part of that I'm going to talk about the overall budget process and how we got here today. I'm going to talk about the 2021 proposed budget and its different pieces. The General Fund, Enterprise Fund. We will end with questions. And, then, next steps. So, with that how did we get here today? This all began in February, March time frame when Mayor and some of the Council Members and everybody in the -- in the budget, we all met together with all the departments and we went over the line item budget line by line, make sure that we were good with what was in there. We took that budget that we had created and we presented that to people -- or to Council in June. So, the overall process was about a nine month process. In June we met twice where we presented a balanced budget and got that approved, after which we, then, went forward and published that final budget and now we are seeking public support and input as part of the public hearing process. Once that public hearing is concluded and we will, then, seek approval from Council to approve the budget. Once approved we can, then, begin to appropriate the funds as they have been presented and, finally, after the funds have been appropriated we can, then, begin to execute that budget as we have presented it. The overall process, as I said, is about a nine month process. There is a lot of people involved, which we are grateful for -- to have their involvement and support. So, Let's look at the overall budget. The FY-2021 total budget is 129.3 million dollars. As you can see the personnel side of that, if you look at the pie chart on your left, you can see about 44 percent of the overall budget is related to personnel. When you add up the capital you can see that you have about 38 percent of the budget is related to capital expenses. This is citywide. All funds included. When you look at the pie chart on the right you can see that about half of the budget that we are presenting is related to either public safety, parks, that type of thing. The other half is related to wastewater, our Public Works group. So, when we dive into the General Fund side of things, going a layer deeper, we can see that the total 2021 proposed budget for the General Fund is 71.4 million dollars. Of that you can see 59 percent of that total number is related to personnel and we have operating and capital making up the balance. If you look at the chart on your right, the pie chart, you can see that public safety makes up about 67 percent over -- overall -- overall General Fund budget and the rest made up of parks and admin and Community Development group. So, looking at revenue, our total anticipated revenue for 2021 is 65.1 million dollars. The majority of that is made up of property tax, about 60 percent of that. The rest of that is made up of inter -- intergovernmental and other sources of revenue. Total we are anticipating at 65.1 million dollars. Moving on towards our Enterprise Fund, FY-2020 budget for Enterprise Fund is 57.9 million. Again, looking at the chart on your left you can see that, you know, personnel makes up about 39 percent of that, while capital makes up the vast majority of that. It looks like about 54 percent of the overall total. Of that you can see 57 percent looking at the chart on your right -- the pie chart on the right is related to our -- our wastewater. Overall budget for 2021 is 57.9 million dollars. Moving on to our revenue for Enterprise Fund, our anticipated revenue for 2021 is 44.5 million dollars. This is made up of -- 61 percent of that is utility sales and the balance is really in two other budgets here, our utilities connections and our other utility revenue, you know, combined totaling the 44.5 million. With that that basically

makes up our overall budget in the different funds and I will pause for a minute and if there is any questions I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Brad. Council, any questions for staff at this time? Seeing nothing from Council for Brad at this time, we will see if we had anybody signed up to testify on this public hearing from the public.

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. If you are on the Zoom call and you would like to testify on this item, please, indicate so by hitting the raise your hand feature. We do have one person potentially in there that could testify at this point in time.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Seeing no one who is raising their hand to testify at this time, Mr. Borton.

Borton: We just can't hear you. The audio's cut out again.

Simison: Can you hear me now?

Borton: There we go.

Simison: Okay. We have -- we have no one who has signed up to -- no one who is raising their hand to testify or signed up to testify and no questions for Brad at this point in time. So, I will turn this over to Council for any -- any other questions from any other staff that they would like to address.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I wanted to start off by thanking the fire chief for clarifying some -- some questions on the design process of the fire stations that are proposed in the budget this last week. Before we go I would like to throw it out -- are there any more questions or concerns Council would like to discuss before we move on in regard to the fire stations, the design aspect, or anything else?

Simison: Councilman Bernt, just for the record -- is my mic working now? Oh. Okay. Perfect. Thank you. I know one of the -- in conversations with other members of the Council who maybe aren't here tonight, just want to make sure something is very clear from my perspective as the Mayor. Approving the design for two stations in this budget does not mean the cat is out of the bag and does not mean that you will for certain see two stations in next year's budget. There is a lot of question marks that need to occur between now and, then, including what happens with the legislature. So, just so it's clear from my perspective as the Mayor, there is no guarantee that there will be two stations

presented in next year's budget. There is a lot of questions and there will be a lot more conversation with Council. This is just about the design and moving two -- two forward so that they would be ready when the time is right and the funds are there. So, just want to put that out there so everyone hears it very clearly.

Bernt: Perfect. Thank you. Is the -- is the chief on the line? Is he --

Simison: The chief is on the line, as well as the architect, if there is anything specifically you would like to address towards them. I think the only -- the main question that I had -- and we have been discussing this a little bit -- is in regard to the savings. The proposed -- the proposed savings in regard to Station 8 if we were to continue with the current line item in the budget to -- to appropriate spending authority for impact fees for Station 8 and -- and what that looks like if we were to hold off and it's -- for some time in the future and -- and maybe have a budget amendment or something along those lines and what those numbers look like and what the savings might be.

Niemeyer: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Is that Chief Niemeyer? I couldn't hear or --

Niemeyer: Sorry. Yes, sir. This is Chief Niemeyer. Mr. Mayor, Council, first let me just kick off -- great conversations that have occurred around this. I really appreciate the questions that have been asked. A lot of great questions. I know Council Woman Strader is not here tonight. She and I connected on some of the questions, so -- Council President Bernt, to answer your question, I mean there is certainly unknowns as far as cost increases; right? I think we all buy a gallon of milk. We all buy supplies and we see increases in goods that we buy and the architectural design firms are no different. Typically architectural design is based on the cost of construction of a facility and so as those construction costs go up so do at times the cost of design. Certainly I faced that with my house when Cheryl and I built our house. So, doing this now -- and just a reminder, I know, Council, you are aware of this, these are impact fee eligible items. We went through a process with impact fees where we identify growth and what would be needed to meet that growth and certainly design was a part of that and so we have been collecting those impact fees from the development going on. I know we have talked a lot about savings. What does that savings look like? How much does that look like? As somebody who manages overall our impact fee fund, for me personally if I can save 30,000, 40,000 or 175,000 dollars that can be applied in the future to the construction of a project, certainly I am -- I am desiring to do that and I think we have been able to demonstrate and I appreciate the feedback from the presentation I sent out on -- on Friday, the narrated PowerPoint, that was the first one I have done. So, hopefully, it worked well. But really showing the snapshot of what those different aspects of design are and what those different costs are that make up the overall cost of design. I do have Gunnar Gladics on tonight. Gunnar is with Rice Fergus Miller. That was the firm that we used for Station 6 and I think I articulated in the presentation our design for Station 6 was about 620,000 dollars. The design for Station 7 starts off at about 580. These are conservative numbers and I -- if we need to I can let Gunnar speak to that. They anticipate

further savings, but certainly not willing to put numbers to that at this time as we move forward. But I want to just echo what the Mayor said. This is step one and it's an isolated step, even though I understand the conversations that occurred last week. This allows us to be somewhat shovel ready if and when that discussion around the construction of these stations occur. We don't want to face delays like we faced with Station 6. We are trying to stay ahead of this ballgame. I think we have a very good timeline laid out and a very good plan laid out. So, Council President Bernt, I hope that answered your questions. Certainly happy to elaborate that or have our architect chime in on that as well.

Bernt: Sure. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: So -- so you answered one of my questions, the cost for the design of Station 7 would be 580k. Conservatively speaking it could be a little bit more, it could be less, whatever. But what is the exact cost for the design of a proposed -- Station 8 included in the budget and -- and not in the budget if it were done at a later date?

Niemeyer: Council -- Council President Bernt, great question, and that was in that slide that I articulated out. With delays in design, wait a year, wait two years, we know there is going to be cost increase. I think that's based on inflation, whether it's two percent, three percent, four percent, one percent. It's no different than any other business. Architects are no different in the cost of the goods that they provide. So, we anticipate that there would be a cost increase. Within the slide for Station 7 and 8 -- and, again, I think Councilman Borton asked me a great question, so I want to -- I want to kind of hit on that a little bit. The original FY-21 design would get us to construction docks. If you look at the overall cost, for example, the cost of Station 7 that was included in the slide that I sent out at 580,000, also, then, goes into the bidding and it goes into the construction management. The architect always plays a role in the management of the construction, not to be confused with the CMGC and for Station 6 that -- that CMGC was ESI. So, this gets us to construction documents. We don't move further in the full expense of that cost until we get into the construction. So, I think I have alluded to in a previous presentation and this is no different than any other city project in which construction is being done and design is being done, it's not just a one year cost, it's cost over a two to three years throughout the life of that construction and throughout the life of that project. So, I hope that answered your question. Certainly if it didn't happy to have Gunnar chime in and get more specific to your question.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: So, I mean I get that and that -- that all makes complete sense. But I would just like to know what that number is. I know that -- I know that there is potential that that number could increase, if not -- if not -- if not approved. I understand the philosophy

behind that. I just want to know -- I want to know what -- what the cost savings is going to be.

Niemeyer: Mr. Mayor, I think at this point, Mr. Mayor, I would like to have Gunnar chime in. I think we have sent that cost savings out, but certainly, Gunnar, the architect, Gunnar Gladics, can chime in and talk about the savings in designing two stations at one time.

Gladics: Yes. Thank you, Mark. Thank you, Mayor and Council.

Simison: Gunnar, if you could say your name address for the record.

Gladics: Oh, yes. Sorry. My name is Gunnar Gladics and I'm at 14222 56th Avenue Northwest, Gig Harbor. So, just to clarify, Council Member -- I think it was Treg, the -- you were asking the cost if design on Station 8 is delayed after completing design on Station 7 for a year or two years or what have you?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, Gunnar, just to be clear, I -- pretty simple. I just want two numbers. I want to know how much it's going to cost to -- for design if the -- if this design is appropriated through the 2021 budget versus if it's not. I just want to know what the number is? It's that simple.

Simison: And, Councilman Bernt, maybe if Station 8 -- or 7 was to be 580,000 and Station 8 would be 580,000, both separately, and you do them the same, is the number still going to be 1,160,000 or is it going to be different to do them both at the same time? Is that part of the -- the -- what you are looking at?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I just have heard multiple numbers and I just would like to know what the number is going to be.

Gladics: Council Member, we have -- what we -- what we did was provide number to Mark in the Fire Department for that initial number of 580k for Station 7 and, then, the Station 8, if conducted at the same time, designed, as -- our current estimate would be 406,000 for the -- the all in, including bidding and construction throughout the entire process.

Bernt: I couldn't quite hear what he -- Mr. Mayor, did you --

Simison: Four hundred --

Bernt: Four oh six. Is that what you said?

Simison: Yeah.

Bernt: And that's included; right?

Gladics: Correct.

Bernt: Okay. I got you. So, if -- if we decided to do a budget amendment, you know, three to six months or a year down the line, what would that number end up being if it's -- if it's not approved in this -- in this budget that's what -- that we are talking about right now?

Gladics: Well, I think we probably would -- would want to work with the city. I think there would be some definite benefits to having done the -- the plan -- I believe that both stations would -- would more or less be the same, so I think the -- the building itself would remain mostly the same. Some of the civil engineering and landscape components may change a little bit, but really probably what we would just adjust is the construction administration and bidding components. Of those two I think we had 27,865 and 133,347 respectively and those may need to be addressed if the contract is not continued into construction. Did that makes sense?

Bernt: Sure. So, what's -- what would be the total number?

Gladics: Well, for the -- I would -- I would assume probably about a three percent per year increase in cost for the -- let's say 150,000 for bidding and construction administration, but not being able to do the math right off the top of my head.

Simison: Mr. Bernt, maybe if I could help even understand yourself. Are you saying what would the number be if this was done separately? That's essentially what you are saying. If this was done six -- so, if we did Station 7 and it was done and we, then, did a budget amendment for Station 8, what would be the cost for Station 8. Is that your question?

Bernt: I know -- I know that -- yeah. I mean essentially. Or what happens if we -- we approach this after the legislative session when we will be know more what that looks like.

Simison: So, again, I guess my question for you is Station 7, what would be the cost to do Station 7 this year and assuming no inflationary cost in one more year what would be the cost of Station 8 to do that project? Is it the 580? Is it the 580 for both or is it different?

Gladics: Oh. Now I -- so, Station 8 I think that base price 406 -- and what I was saying is only a small amount of the fee would actually increase, which I'm thinking if it's -- if it's designed to the final construction documents, the only thing that we would need to look at after pausing is the total value for construction administration is about 150,000.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: Can we have the Clerk add Mark back in. He got kicked out of Zoom. Thank you, Adrienne.

Weatherly: You're welcome, chief.

Niemeyer: Thanks, Adrienne. Sorry about that. It just -- Zoom kicked me out all of a sudden. Yeah. I think to the Mayor's point, the question, if I understand it correctly, is what is the current cost of Station 7 and 8. What are those potential savings. The cost of Station 7 is 580. That's down from 624 for Station 6 and if we do Station 8 design that cost is 406. Now, that includes the bidding phase and it also includes the construction management phase, which I know we are not at. That is a separate conversation post-legislative session. So, within that slide, Council President Bernt, that I sent out on Friday, you have got the cost breakdowns where you could see where we are at through construction documents. That's -- that's getting into the HVAC system. That's the shovel ready aspect of the project. So, I think I have been following the conversation and the question I hope. I am certainly happy to follow up.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I think it makes sense what's being presented and correct me, chief, if I say this wrong, but in this current budget with the 600,000 dollars is the total allocation for, quote, design of fire stations. That -- that would allow the schematic design, design development and construction documents to be completed for seven -- a seventh station at approximately 375,000 dollars and four an eighth station at approximately 227,000 dollars. The difference between those two I think is the savings that's being discussed with a second. The additional design cost of bidding and construction admin is the same in both. It may go up three or four percent a year, that portion of it, but the big -- what I understand Gunnar talking about and from what the chief has said, that within the 600,000 dollars in the current impact fee allocation in this budget you could design them both. If you wanted to only design Station 7 by itself that would only cost about 375,000 dollars to do the -- to do the design work, excluding bidding and construction admin.

Niemeyer: Councilman Borton, you have got it spot on and I think we got there through a series of texts and e-mails through this process. But, yes, you have got that exactly. I think the cost was 632 and some change to get to that point that you were talking about with Station 7 and Station 8 and, then, from there as we go through and see what the legislature is going to do in that further conversation, we would talk about construction and timing of construction and that's when the other fees would apply. And I apologize, Council, I don't have a cool cutout behind me like Brad and Jenny. I have to work on that.

Simison: Council, any further questions on this topic for the chief or Gunnar? Okay. Thank you, gentlemen. Don't go too far, but I think you are relieved for a few minutes.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: That -- that helps answer the questions I had and following up from the last budget meeting with regards to both stations. I really appreciate your comments. We

have been overly sensitive to make sure -- I guess cautious in a good way to make sure we are not creating any unintended inertia to do two stations at one time and you have been very clear that that's not the case and we are going to have a discussion perhaps this fall or early winter specifically on one versus two, pros, cons and where that one may be. So, that -- that's a big part of getting comfort and going forward with this part of the budget. Understanding that you are not expecting the Council to have making -- be making that commitment and we are not thinking that you are making that commitment either. So, I appreciate that.

Simison: And just to be clear, unless there is something specifically the Fire Department needs, this is probably not a conversation until next April when it really -- until we have enough data or information to make educated information to Council so a decision can be likely made.

Borton: Or whenever the CFP is presented. I guess it's part of that.

Simison: Well, the CFP -- the CFP will -- is one thing, but what the legislature does will impact the CFP later in a way that does -- you know, we -- again, I can tell you the CFP can accommodate both of these and the staffing with the assumptions that our CFO normally puts into it. However, all those assumptions can go out the window very quickly in April. So, we won't want to have a real conversation about it until then. Council, any other questions on this budget at this time for Brad, Todd, or any of the other directors who are present in person online? Okay. We did have someone else join.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: I will just do another -- this is a public hearing. Is there anyone who is on the call who would like to testify on this item? If so, if you can indicate by raising your hand and the Clerk will bring you in. Seeing no one wishing to raise your hand. So, Mr. Borton, I will turn this back over to you as you were seeking recognition.

Borton: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I just -- for clarity, we opened the public hearing for the 2021 budget, as well as the proposed foregone revenue decision?

Simison: We have not done the foregone revenue yet. No.

Borton: Okay. Got it. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: If there is no other discussion from Council or the public, I move that we close the public hearing on the City of Meridian's fiscal year 2021 proposed budget.

Hoaglun: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I really appreciate, again, the clarifying answers from the chief and from Gunnar being close and -- and available and for -- for shedding light on -- on this topic and I don't mean to be annoying, I don't mean to, you know, pound a dead horse by any means, but I -- I do pause for concern about this. I feel -- I don't -- I don't see -- I don't see -- if we were to have this discussion in April and in -- and if at that time we felt like we needed to appropriate some funds through a -- through a budget amendment for a design of Station 8 versus doing that right now, I don't -- I don't see a huge difference in that and -- and in my role -- and I feel like I -- in my opinion I -- the prudent thing in my opinion would be to approve this budget, only approving the design of Station 7 until we know more about what Station 8 is going to look like and if that means we have to pay a couple of bucks along the way I think that's prudent. I don't see that -- I don't -- I don't see that -- that number significant enough at this time to -- to include Station 8 in the budget currently. So, those are my thoughts.

Simison: Is there any further comments on the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. Those opposed nay.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Now we are into the --

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: -- the public hearing is closed, but -- Mr. Borton, yes.

Bernt: I spoke too soon. I apologize.

Borton: I apologize -- I apologize, too. I -- we moved to close the public hearing and, then, there was discussion and Councilman Bernt made comment, but I don't know what motion was just put before us.

Simison: Well, the --

Borton: If there was one.

Simison: Your motion -- all we did was close the public hearing. Councilman Bernt jumped the gun. Spoke on -- during the closing of the public hearing. So, now -- now when the public hearing is closed, so we are into discussion element.

Borton: Thank you, Mayor.

Bernt: Super honest.

Hoaglun: Well, Mr. Mayor, it's been talked to -- if I might address the issue. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Yeah. Yeah. I appreciate Councilman Bernt trying to look at it in a different light and seeing if there is ways with concerns that we have about future -- about the future and what might happen. We don't know what it is. But I'm confident about locking in some savings now, even if that changes a little bit, it's money not -- we don't have to spend that -- that is impact fees, but certainly we can -- we can move that to construction. So, that's always -- always a good thing and I appreciate his taking the time to look at it, but with your assurances, Mr. Mayor, and I think from the Council side we are going to proceed cautiously. We are not committing to anything beyond just the design phase and getting things ready and, then, at that point in April, as you point out, we could have a more informed discussion about what we are going to do in the future. So, I'm comfortable with the amount that we have budgeted for FY-2021 and would like to move forward with that. So, Mr. Mayor, if there is no further comment from Council, I would move that we have a -- legal bring forth an ordinance for approval on -- I believe on September 1 for the FY-2021 budget amount of 129 thousand 364,101 dollars.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, I will have the Clerk call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, absent; Perreault, absent.

Simison: All ayes. Motion is agreed to and a resolution will be brought forward on September 1st.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

2. Public Hearing to Reserve All Foregone Revenue Associated to Fiscal Year 2021 Budget

Simison: Thank you very much to the Finance Department to get us this far.

Purser: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: We will see you again -- well, maybe not you all, but we will see your work here in a few weeks. Moving on to the next item on the agenda.

Purser: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yeah. I'm not getting rid of you. So, don't worry. Next item on the agenda is a public hearing to reserve all foregone revenue associated with fiscal year 2021 budget and open this with staff comments and turn this over to Brad.

Purser: Yeah. This next piece is really just to elect to reserve all foregone revenue associated with 2021 budget. The amount of that would be a little over a million dollars. With that I can stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for Brad at this time? Okay. This is a public hearing. I don't know if we have anyone signed up. If there is anyone online who would like to testify on this item if you could do so by raising your hand down below in the -- on the Zoom app. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. And seeing no one who is raising their hand to testify, Council, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move that we close the public hearing on reserving all foregone revenue for the fiscal year 2021 budget.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing regarding the foregone associate -- revenue associated for fiscal year FY-21. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Mr. Nary, I assume we have seen these as similar?

Nary: Yes, sir. A motion to bring back an ordinance on September 1st.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: For -- at least for conversation, I'm not sure where -- where Council is. I have put considerable amount of thought on this and this is a new process for us that was thrust upon us by the legislature to communicate to the public our intention of what we are or are not going to do with a foregone. I have said I think in a number of City Council meetings not taking a property tax increase in my opinion is a -- is a commitment to the

taxpayers. We don't have an ability to control or impact future Council actions, we can only stay focused on what's before us and to me I think it's a prudent decision that if we are -- if we are not taking a property tax increase that we should not take the foregone or not allow the foregone to be taken in future years. So, I'm not sure what the process would look like and I'm not sure where the rest of the Council sits. This is the first time that we have had the chance to discuss this, but I am supportive of not reserving the foregone for future use.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: To continue that discussion, I think that's a weighty consideration for sure and I -- I understand where you are coming from with it. I think our Council and -- current and past has done a really good job in utilizing proceeds and revenue sources, excuse me, right when -- when necessary and taking what's necessary, utilizing no more than necessary. There have been years where this Council has taken zero, has taken one, one and a half, two. It has exercised sound discretion in -- in not collecting the maximum amount in many years, which I applaud that practice and this year in particular in taking zero percent. So, with that track record I -- I trust the judgment of Council to utilize foregone only and if that extreme necessary circumstance were to occur in the future, I would be very reluctant to hamstring a future Council's ability to exercise that sound discretion, getting input from the public and -- and I think it would be appropriate to continue the same process with -- as has happened in previous years where it has been available for this Council to have taken foregone and we have elected every year not to do so, because it wasn't the right decision. So, I -- I trust that same sound judgment would occur in the future and I would like to afford future Council that ability to exercise it and such. So, I would be supportive of retaining the forgone for future years for Meridian based on our track record.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: You know, I appreciate Councilman Cavener's, you know, concern and his viewpoint and outlook to it. Yes, we don't want to tell taxpayers, oh, no tax increase this year, but we are going to take it next year. I agree with Councilman Borton that we do have to be cautious as we approach each year and making sure we only fund what is necessary and I think past Councils have done that and at the same time I want to make sure that we do have adequate resources to fund the fundamental elements of good government and we don't know what the future holds and to have that option or -- whether it's this Council or another Council, I think we have to preserve that option. I think the track record, as Councilman Borton has pointed out, has been good and I hope that continues, but I also would support reserving the foregone revenue associated with this upcoming fiscal year.

Simison: Is there any further discussion on this item or is there a motion?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, I would move to -- have we closed the public hearing on this?

Simison: Yes, we have.

Hoaglun: Okay. Thank you. I thought we had. All of a sudden it occurred to me we had not. Mr. Mayor, I would move that we reserve all foregone revenue associated to fiscal year 2021 budget and that legal present an ordinance on September 1 for Council consideration.

Bernt: Second.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I appreciate the discussion from my good colleagues who are testifying or communicating remotely and I hope that should the city be in a position where they have to look at foregone they continue to have these collaborative, although sometimes disagreeable conversations in the future. So, I appreciate the comments from both of you and you sharing your perspective tonight.

Simison: All right. With that Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, nay; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, absent; Perreault, absent.

Simison: Three ayes. One no. Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE NAY. TWO ABSENT.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, just wanted to clarify from earlier when the Council Member Hoaglun read off the motion for the FY-21 budget he actually read it as 129 thousand 364,000 and

I know it was 129 million and that was what was discussed and that's in the document. Just want to clarify that's the ordinance we will bring back is 129 million, so -- just wanted to be clear --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, thanks to Mr. Nary for --

Simison: My ears heard millions, but maybe I was thinking that.

Nary: Yeah. And I -- Brad thought he heard it as thousands. So, just wanted to make sure. If we are going to bring back what was presented.

Simison: Okay. Perfect.

4. Public Hearing for 2020 UDC Text Amendment (H-2020-0072) by City of Meridian Planning Division

A. Request: Text amendments to update certain sections of the City's Unified Development Code (UDC) pertaining to Code Enforcement and Penalties in Chapter 1; Specific Use Standards in Chapter 4; the Public Hearing Process in Chapter 5; and the Subdivision Design and Improvement Standards in Chapter 6.

Simison: Okay. Next item is No. 4, public hearing for -- for 2020 UDC Text Amendment. We are going to open this public hearing with staff comments. I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Hood.

Hood: Thank you, Mayor, Members of the Council. Can you all hear me okay? Thumbs up? Okay. Thank you. So, I'm going to be presenting to you tonight the Planning Division's application to amend the text of the city's Unified Development Code or the UDC as we often refer to it. For the purposes of this application the Planning Division worked with our code enforcement division to propose the changes that you have before you tonight. I'm going to talk a little bit more about code's version of that here in just a second. You will probably recall -- and probably can't -- want to forget, but you can't -- that we went through a series of workshops this spring and so this is really that culmination of those conversations we had about process improvements for planning this spring and this is the first round of those. So, these are the less controversial changes, the process improvements that planning is proposing. There is another process that Bill Parsons is leading with our UDC focus group, which includes members from the development community, citizens at large, and others that are kind of working through those more sticky, again, more controversial, more development related improvements. So, you will see that probably around the end of the year. So, they are working through that. They have had one meeting. They have got another meeting scheduled for -- I believe later this month. But this is kind of round one. So, again, we didn't -- I didn't share what your -- what's before you this evening with the UDC focus group, but we did share directly and indirectly with our development community. So, the BCA, we transmitted to

them. Our development stakeholder group, we have shared this information with them. So, we haven't been trying to keep this a secret, it just hasn't gone through kind of our normal protocol for UDC changes. But, again, I feel like it's been vetted pretty well with you all through, again, those workshops this spring. So, at a very high level -- and I'm going to -- I'm going to walk you through these here in just a minute. We have got kind of three sections. The code enforcement and penalties section in Chapter 1 of the UDC. We got the public hearing process changes in Chapter 5. And, then, you have got some what I will call cleanup changes in Chapter 4 and 6. So, those are kind of the three overarching themes, if you will. So, with that let me see if I can share my screen and just walk you through, then, the -- the text and it shouldn't take too much. This has really kind of been pared back from that master list of potential changes to, again, having two different rounds -- kind of the round that -- and I'm not going to put words in anybody's mouth, but, you know, the 300 foot to 500 foot notice that I will talk about here in just a second, I don't know that everybody's a fan, but nobody is just, you know, pounding their fists in anger that we are talking about changing it to -- to 500 feet. So, I think this is a good first step to improve our process. I guess the other thing I would point out real quick that the changes that are in that second tier that I mentioned -- so, the planning process improvement changes, what you don't see and what we are working on right now is kind of a companion FAQ website that we are going to put up on our website, so that the public, once they get a -- you know, neighborhood meeting invite notice, hey, what can you expect? You can expect, you know, to have the developer hold this at a location within five miles and that they should bring a site plan and be available for questions. Next step is likely an application submittal with a public hearing and just kind of walk people through that process -- our process from their standpoint. So, you are a layperson, never been through this, but you got an invite to a neighborhood meeting or a public notice and you are like what does this mean, we are going to put that information on our website, that, again, helps people just understand what to expect in our process. So, just kind of keep that in mind as we go through this, because, quite frankly, there is not a whole lot of meat to these changes. They are pretty straightforward. But when you look at these changes and, then, how we are going to actually share that information with the public, I think is going to be pretty powerful. So, jumping to -- can everybody see the screen okay? Okay. So, let's -- let me just start by saying I received a note this morning from Lacey in code enforcement. As you -- you are aware, she is the interim supervisor over there. We were actually working with Richard Everett on this and when he was still here we submitted the application. There has been some last minute concerns about what code enforcement is actually requesting this evening and they have asked to actually withdraw that from this application. So, everything you see with the title under 11-111 that has to do with code enforcement, they need to -- they need to talk with our prosecutor a little bit more, with our IT Department a little bit more and just make sure that the things are actually proposing -- all the T's are crossed, I's are dotted, everybody's on the same page. So, that's the request tonight and the motion would be to remove everything that has that Title 11, Chapter 1, Section 11. So, I'm not going to run through that, just because, again, our proposal at this point in time is to not adopt those changes. So, before I move to the next tier, though, I just want to see if you have any questions or -- or concerns even with that. And I will mention Lieutenant Colaiani I believe is on the line and -- and I will defer to him if you have any questions, but before I move on just wanted to touch base on that.

Simison: Council, any questions on that item for Mr. Hood?

Hood: All right. So, Mr. Mayor, I'm going to continue on. I didn't see anything there. So, I'm sorry -- and 11-112, too. So, that penalty section will also need to be deferred. So, 11-111 and 11-112, everything to do with code enforcement this evening. So, the third tier -- it's not -- it's in order of how it appears in the -- in the UDC, not in the order of how I kind of group them together. It's a minor change here, just so it matches up our definition section with our specific use standard section, we are adding the vehicle sales and rental, we are adding the word and service, so it just matches those up. So, again, I'm not going to spend any time on that, that's just sort of a scrivener's error type of a cleanup thing there. Then we get into the -- the second tier that I mentioned, the planning process improvements that we are proposing. And, again, most all of this should look very familiar to you. We didn't have a hundred percent consent on all this going through those workshops in the spring, but, again, none of this information should surprise you. Some of it, again, is just kind of -- I think it was Councilman Hoaglund that brought it up, you know, 11 by 17 isn't -- isn't as standard, maybe 18 by 24 inch signs is a little more your political types of signs that you could maybe get a little bit more readily laminated or are affixed a little bit easier to a property. So, again, kind of clean up things that way where we change it from 11 by 17 to 18 by 24. Neighborhood meetings. And I'm going to kind of group 11-5A-6C and 11-5 -- 11-5A-6C. So, one is your neighborhood meetings and one is your mailing and publishing of the public hearing notices. So, you will see both of them. There is a lot of similarities. The main one, again, being our current standard is that developers are supposed to send neighborhood meeting invites to everybody within 300 feet of the subject property and the proposal here is to change that to 500 feet of the subject property. The second subsection there, subsection three, we are proposing that they, then, have to -- excuse me -- have to consider those comments by not submitting an application to planning any sooner than ten days after that neighborhood meeting. So, at least their intent to consider some of the comments they may have heard from the public, not just turn right back around and submit the same thing at their neighborhood meeting, but really consider those comments that were received at the neighborhood meeting and potentially make changes to their plan is the second part of that. And, then, having those neighborhood meetings on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and at a reasonable time and we listed that at 6:00 -- starting between 6:00 and 8:00 p.m. with - - with -- within five miles or closer of the proposed project site or at City Hall. So, again, that should all sound pretty familiar, but I will just pause and see if you have any comments on that section as I scroll to the next sort of related section.

Hoaglund: Caleb -- Mr. Mayor, this is Brad.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. Mr. Mayor and Caleb, I just -- I'm assuming people would understand that Five Mile location for some of our activities that might occur on the city border, we -- our preference is that they hold it within the city, not in another city. Well -- or within five miles, because, you know, if they are on the border they could conceivably do it from

another location that's not in city limits, but we are anticipating city limits. Is that -- is that correct? Or does it matter?

Hood: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, it doesn't matter. I mean certainly that's the intent, but reading, you know, the letter of the code as written and you certainly could have it, you know, in Ada county, unincorporated Ada county. There are some schools that are not incorporated within city limits yet they are still considered Meridian. There may be an entrance -- an instance where there is a church or something just on the other side of the county line or city line that is a nice, you know, kind of gathering, you know, place to have a neighborhood meeting. So, it wouldn't be prohibited. Certainly it's what you said, it is the intent that it be in Meridian city limits, not go as -- you know, hopefully it's even closer -- a lot closer than five miles to the project site, but it wouldn't explicitly have to be held within city limits, so --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. I -- I can see your point, Caleb, on that. It might be something just right there in unincorporated Ada county or across -- just across the road and there might be a perfectly fine facility that they could use and hold the hearing. So, yeah, I -- it's probably better not to muck it up by adding any requirement like that, so -- but definitely we want the intent to be as close as possible and preferably within city limits. But, yeah, we will just leave it as is.

Hood: Good question. Thank you. Okay. So, again, sort of related -- at least part of this similar to the last section, we will send -- the Clerk, then, will send postcards to everybody within 500 feet of the property being considered, instead of the current standard, which is 300 feet. So, that's pretty much the change there. I will briefly pause, but, again, I feel like we have talked about that quite extensively over the last several months. Written testimony. So, this -- this one is actually the one that we got written testimony on is -- is written testimony. So, this is a new section. It's one, again, where -- where I don't know that there was a hundred percent consent from Council and as you will see in the four written -- three out of the four anyways written testimony received on this topic were regarding this subsection. The proposed standard is -- is written testimony submitted for consideration. So, you can consider that. You and the Planning and Zoning can consider it to be submitted to the Clerk by noon the day prior to the public hearing. A lot of this has to do with intent; right? We were getting a lot and you still continue to get a lot of last minute information. People are submitting letters and oftentimes they are long and they submitted it at 4:30 the day of the hearing and that -- you don't have an opportunity to review that. You have got a workshop and so how can you reasonably read and review all of the written testimony, especially if you get flooded with it the day of a hearing. So, this is more about intent and trying to disclose, boy, we would really like for you to submit your written testimony and, in fact, we are putting it in code if you want it to be considered it needs to be to the City Clerk by noon, so that, again, it gives you a reasonable opportunity at least to -- to review that. Again, you have three folks that commented,

though, on that. Some wanting that to be even less amount of time, so 48 or 72 hours before. So, I don't -- I don't know what the right answer is here, but -- but this is kind of what we -- I heard the direction from Council when we talked about it last -- a few months ago, so -- and, then, I will pause, because we are almost done, and I just have one more section and this is back to tier three, if you will. So, those kind of other UDC developments and I will classify this as kind of cleanup related. Just clarifying kind of our terms. Cul-de-sac, dead end streets, we use those terms simultaneously, so a lot of this is just making it clear that they are kind of one and the same and, then, talking about emergency access and how that can also be a consideration when having a cul-de-sac or a dead end street that extends more than 750 feet, but, really, we are trying to keep those at 500 feet or less. So, with that, Mr. Mayor, that is the extent -- let me just give you a summary, I guess, of what -- the Planning and Zoning Commission did hear this on July 16th. At the public hearing the Commission voted to recommend approval of the subject requests. Bill Parsons presented on behalf of Planning. Written testimony was provided by Laren Bailey, Sally Reynolds, and Dave Yorgason. I mentioned their comments already. There was no key issues of public testimony. The Commission did have some questions about agency comments and staff reporting agency comment deadlines and, again, we have cleaned some of that -- those things up with publishing our packets earlier in the week and working with staff to meet those deadlines. Placement of public hearing signs. So, that's something, again, we talked about this spring, but went to round two should the city hire out contractors to put up the public hearing signs, should we continue to allow developers. So, you will hear more about that in round two. I don't know where it's going to land with that UDC focus group, but a good discussion there thus far on -- if the city should hire companies to put up public hearing signs or not. Review of common driveway standards and so including that in round two and, again, we are reviewing parking standards with round two, so Bill's on that. They also had some questions about communicating this information. I mentioned that already with the website we are going to develop and share the information and provide hyperlinks on how to -- how to participate in the planning and hearing processes and, then, had some questions on the -- on written testimony one day instead of two days as proposed. So, at the end of the day they didn't make any changes to the staff recommendation. Since that hearing we have received one more, again, public comment from Mike and Malissa Bernard, again, regarding the cutoff times for accepting public testimony and, then, the code enforcement requests to continue their -- their changes to coincide with -- with phase two as well. So, in summary, staff believes the changes proposed with this application will make the implementation and use of the UDC more understandable, usable, and enforceable, while greatly improving the transparency and efficiency of the planning and development process and with that I will stand for any questions, comments you may have.

Simison: Thank you, Caleb. Council, any questions or comments for Caleb at this time?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just a quick comment. Caleb, hats off to you. Making a perfect UDC might not be possible. We understand you are trying to make it more perfect and improve upon it. It's a continual process and doing it one bite at a time is still helpful. So, we just definitely appreciate the efforts in trying to shepherd this through. Step one.

Simison: And while we have a second, this is a public hearing. If there is anyone online who would like to testify, if you could raise your hand so you can be queued in, but I will still leave this open for additional comments from Council or questions for Mr. Hood.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Question for either Caleb or maybe Bill. The -- the written testimony received from the Bernards suggested, you know, a mechanism that would allow for all public testimony, regardless of the time, to be collected and included as part of the public record, but maybe designated -- if it exceeded whatever the deadline is that there be some delineation that it may not be reviewed by Council. Is there any -- it seems like a good compromise, something that I'm open to, but I'm just curious if that creates any risk for us along our -- in our records or anything like that.

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, Council Member Cavener, I mean that's -- that's a great question. I think the intent of this ordinance, the way they are crafting it, is to put the public on notice that if you want to be sure it's read -- we do have to take everything that comes in regardless. So, it still becomes part of the record, but it's not unreasonable to have a cutoff and -- and so -- but no different -- you may occasionally call -- you will have somebody testify and, then, hand their written testimony in. You have heard it, but now you have it in writing, so there is nothing -- so, I don't see that as a problematic issue for the court.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: And I think that what -- what I'm trying to avoid and what I think is what the citizen is trying to avoid is a scenario where a citizen delivers testimony to the clerk and they say, sorry, it's past the cutoff time, we can't take it.

Nary: Yeah. And I think, again, we could work a little bit on the language I guess with -- with Planning, but I think that -- the way I understood what they were going for was if you want it included as part of review, this is the time period it must be submitted. I don't -- we would not direct people not to -- not to put it in the record. We may have to work with the clerk's office to separate it out, so it's clear what was not reviewed. The concern I have is there could be one, there could be ten pieces of information and you may have read some of them, because you have the time to review it. I don't really want to prevent the Council from reviewing anything. I think what we are trying to get to on this ordinance

is to tell the public if you submit it by this date it will -- it will most likely be reviewed. If you submit it after this date it may not be reviewed and so I don't -- if the Council has the time and they read it all and they read everything up to one minute before the meeting, that's fine.

Cavener: Sure.

Nary: But we may have to look at that and figure out a way to separate and clarify, so a court would know we didn't look at that.

Cavener: Right.

Nary: You know, I can recall once where we had a letter that was submitted during the rebuttal that no one had seen and -- and it actually caused a remand. So, it's an issue that can be problematic, but we will work on that with the Planning and the Clerk's office and how to identify that.

Cavener: Good. Appreciate that. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions or comments for staff at this time? Okay. Well, this is a public hearing. I know we have at least one person ready to testify. If you could, please, state your name and address for the record and you will be recognized for three minutes.

LaFever: Denise LaFever at 6706 North Salvia Way and one of my concerns is -- is that Susan was nicely put on the UDC focus group, that was something that was brought up, and when she -- Susan wasn't replaced. Liz Strader and your Council has worked with the Planning and Zoning to make that appropriate for her to have a replacement. My concern stands with 11 -- 11-5A-6 and 11-5-A-6E, 11-5A-6H. I really think those need to have further public comment. I'm not opposed, per se, to 11-5A-6C and 11-5A-6E, I just don't think they go far enough. The 500 feet, that's give or take. I would like to see a sign posted stating the date, the time, and the location of the meeting, along with a sign-in sheet with people to allow comments that get submitted with the application. My real issue stands with 11-5-A-6H and although they have -- there is nice comments on here that say the reason for the change, that doesn't actually go into the change and I view this change as an erosion of the public due process. It's not clear on here within the language -- it says any, but does any mean staff? Does any mean applicant? Does any mean agency? And I am just deeply concerned and I -- about the erosion of the due process for the citizens. I wholeheartedly agree with all the comments that Malissa Bernard made in her letter where she stated further that the citizens are at a disadvantage as some Council Members know and -- and staff know I have spent a lot of time to understand the process, to understand the public hearing, to understand UDC and really work to understand all this, so I could speak on behalf of different items. For the normal person to go back through and come up to that speed and have a fair process that they can be heard, I just don't want to see further violations of the due process, nor do I want to see where we go back through and it's typical in court where applicants or staff may

drop something at the very last moment where the applicant -- not the applicant, but the public can't respond to it and I don't think that's what we want as a city. I -- I have found with the city and working with the city and City Council that it's always been nice that our Council folks are willing to listen, willing to go to coffee, willing to talk and I would just like to see UDC language that supports that and, furthermore, when we had talked about this with Susan and Sally and some others and what we would have liked to see is that all of the documents necessary to make a decision, including staff reports, P&Z comment, all agencies were submitted and, then, the public was allowed, you know, over a week and five days to literally comment on it before it went to Council. I see this as a backwards move. That's all I have.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? And maybe a comment before I open up for questions is that I do think that the efforts we have made to require things to be published on Wednesday help give at least that week time frame for review, for the comments to be received, and at least on -- you know, on the 6-H issue I think that we have taken reasonable steps to try to improve that process, even through our noticing of agendas to make that possible. But any other questions for -- okay. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone else raise their hand to testify?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. This is a public hearing --

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Yeah. The only question that jumped out in review of this in preparation that I wanted to ask legal counsel was on that 6-H, I think it's written that it applies to everybody and anybody, which could include the applicant, so is there -- the applicant I think has different rights than a member of the public. So, comment on that if we have any concern as written in this application.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, Council Member Borton, you know, I mean I am a little concerned about shall and I think that's what's prompting the conversation, because you are right, I mean ultimately -- and this is an internal debate on due process that we always have. Ultimately the application is between the property owner and the city and everybody else is a commenter, whether they are an adjacent property owner, just an interested citizen, an HOA or whatever, they are all just commenters. Ultimately the last word goes to the applicant for a reason and that's where I think Mr. Borton is talking about is, you know, you have a situation that on the Tuesday before -- the Monday before noon a very well thought out public statement is made that has -- is refutable by the applicant and if we were to hold this strict line where the applicant couldn't provide written testimony about it, he can only come and testify about it, but, then, when he finishes and hands you the written document of what you just read -- said to you, are we going to take it. My view is we would take it. I think -- I know we are trying to make sure the public has plenty of

opportunity to participate and I think that's the right thing to do, but we also have to remember that ultimately the property owner-applicant is the person whose rights -- the court is going to be extremely concerned if we infringe on that due process. The opportunity to be heard is what the rest of the public has and I think we are providing that. So, I wouldn't say that the applicant couldn't submit something in writing less than 36 hours before the hearing, because, again, I don't know when it came in. If it comes in at five minutes to 12:00 they are not foreclosed from responding to it and they can't only be required to do it in a public testimony, because there may be pictures, examples, or something else that needs to be included. So, I do think we will have to figure out how to word that to address that concern, because, again, we do want the public to be able to participate, but the applicant always has a right to respond to it and should be able to provide it to you in writing to do that.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I really appreciate that direction and if the word shall becomes should, that might be more accurate with what we actually would be able to do in practice. I think one of the remedies also for Council -- if it's an applicant who provides things very late, the Monday afternoon, Tuesday morning type of submittal from an applicant, which might cause understandable concern from the public, the Council always has the opportunity to just continue it and that could be one way we can help control 11th hour submittals, at least from -- from an applicant is we need time to review everything. We can continue matters.

Hood: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hood.

Hood: If I can just comment on that last point. So, Council Borton, that is on the table to discuss with the UDC focus group. I know you received some comments on some projects in the recent past about, you know, 2:00 p.m. I -- you know, I stayed up all night preparing my testimony and, then, the applicant revises their site plan, now my comments aren't valid anymore. You know, how is a person supposed to keep up when a new -- new application, essentially, is submitted the day of the hearing. So, that's on the table. What's reasonable. Is it ten days before, so that gives staff and the public and elected officials time to review that, but that is something we are kicking around, again, with phase two is -- now this isn't so much written testimony, but -- but changes to a plan and submitting that. So, in the same vein, though. So, I just wanted to let you know that that is also being considered. Just -- Mr. Mayor, if I may, just one of the points that Ms. LaFever brought up -- we did at Mrs. Susan Karnes' request appoint Annette Alonso to the UDC focus group. That's who Susan requested be her replacement and she did participate in the first meeting of that UDC focus group. So, I just wanted to circle back on that -- on that comment.

Simison: Council, any further questions or comments or do I have a motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Question I guess for Caleb or Bill. What -- what's the direction, then, that we need from Council to -- are we -- are we looking to adopt what's being presented as a whole, less the code enforcement piece that's been requested to be held back? Is it prepare a resolution for it? What's -- what is the next step that staff is seeking from Council?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Cavener, so the next step is to prepare the actual ordinance that will come before you for approval. This is the opportunity, if you either need more time, want to make some changes that you would like to see in the written ordinance, like in 11-5A-6H, Council Member Borton, is suggesting that the language should say should be submitted for inclusion, not shall be submitted for inclusion. So, that way there is some discretion to that. If there is another section regarding either the footage or the days or whatever, this is the time we will still bring back a final form for you.

Cavener: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Caleb, have you had any discussion with our two absent Council Members about any of this?

Hood: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, certainly Councilman Perreault is my Council liaison and we have had several conversations through the whole process. She's also on that UDC focus group round two, so she's been kind of my main point of contact, along with the Mayor's office, on -- on some of these things, so -- Council Woman Strader, I -- off the top of my head I don't remember having -- certainly no one-on-one conversations. It seems like maybe -- maybe she sent an e-mail as we were going through that workshop process, but nothing of late.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Caleb, in terms of timing for you, part of my preference is to -- I know we have got two Council Members and I recognize, you know, if you are not here for the meeting you sometimes miss the opportunity to speak up, but if there is no -- no rush to maybe continue this for a week, take in the conversation that we have had here tonight, maybe allow us as a body to make any proposed changes, to bring that back next week and give our two absent members an opportunity to provide any of their insight as well.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: The sentiment makes sense. It doesn't sound like there is urgency that one week causes a problem. The public hearing very well may close and we can delay discussion until that -- until next week.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, your hearing next week on both work session and your regular session are pretty lengthy, but your 9/1 hearings are not. So, you might want to wait two weeks just to make sure you don't get overwhelmed with hearings.

Simison: I guess to Mr. Borton's point, if it's not a public hearing -- if they close the public hearing what is the -- just discussion on a potential motion at that point in time by Council? And, then, would they have to reopen the public hearing to make modifications or not really?

Nary: So, yeah, if they are going to make modifications to what's there in two weeks they will have to reopen the public hearing to do that -- to make those directions. But, again, if -- just trying to figure out how to make sure you are not having a room full of people while you want to have a deliberative discussion about it. So, certainly your choice.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, question for Mr. Nary then. If under 11-5A-6H we make that change to should as opposed to shall, does that require this to remain open for public comment?

Nary: So -- I apologize. So, if you are only talking about all of you and not getting additional feedback from the public about those changes, you don't need a public hearing. Again, I -- all I know is that it's a fairly lengthy agenda. I don't know how long that means and how long this discussion with the other two Council Members might be. So, yeah, you wouldn't need to open a public hearing just to make some changes, if it's only your -- your group doing that.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Borton: Thank you.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Nary or Mr. Mayor, any issues with having this on our 9/1 workshop or does it need to be on our main meeting? Or do you have a preference?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, it doesn't matter, because you're only basically giving direction to bring an ordinance back, so your workshop's fine, too.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: So, I got a thumbs up from the Council President, so I move that we continue Item 4, the UDC text amendment H-2020-0072 to our 9/1 workshop.

Simison: And, sorry, were we going to close the public hearing and move the item?

Bernt: No, it's already been closed, hasn't it?

Cavener: Boy, Mr. Mayor, we are -- we are sloppy tonight. My apologies.

Simison: Okay. Just wanted to make sure we were closing it first and, then, moving it to that point, so --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, if I may?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move we close the public hearing on H-2020-0072.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed nay. The ayes have it.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move that we continue Item H-2022-0072 to the 9/1 workshop.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to continue Item H-2020-0072 to the September 1st workshop. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed nay. The ayes have it. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Council, how are we doing? Do we need a break before we go into these next couple items? Okay. Let's -- let's go ahead and take a five minute break and we will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. Five minutes. 8:00 p.m.

(Recess: 7:54 p.m. to 8:04 p.m.)

5. Public Hearing for 2020 Comprehensive Plan Policy Prioritization (H-2020-0073) by City of Meridian Planning Division

A. Request: To amend the text of the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan by adding priority levels and assigning responsible department leads to the existing policies of the Plan. This amendment makes no revisions to the text of the Plan, except to add priorities and responsible leads for the policies adopted in December of 2019.

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting back from recess. Just for the record it's 8:04 and we will turn to Item 5 on the agenda, public hearing for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan prioritization, H-2020-0073. I will open this public hearing with staff comments and turn this over to Mr. McClure.

McClure: Mayor, Council, thank you for having me here tonight. Can you hear me all right? Good evening. I'm here tonight to discuss a Comprehensive Plan text amendment with you. First, though, and very briefly, the current Comprehensive Plan was adopted in December of last year. There are 492 policies and 380 action items. The new Comprehensive Plan is organized by themes, which came directly out of the public outreach of that effort. The plan is really two documents, the regular text policies and map, which is the Comprehensive Plan. It's forward thinking. And, then, the existing conditions report is really focused on who we are today and where we have been as to the amendments of the Comprehensive Plan. I won't linger here, mostly for anyone in the public, but this slide here describes why we have a Comprehensive Plan. In summary, we plan because we are told to for the community good and to incorporate the community's vision. You can see there are 17 required components of the state enabling legislation in the -- on the right side of the screen. Again, this is why we are here tonight. This amendment doesn't change the future land use map and it doesn't revise any of the text. The purpose of the update is to add priorities and responsibilities to the policies. This is needed for transparency to the public to understand our priorities and to be efficient. We also said we would do it, which is incorporated right into the text of the new plan. The text on the right side of the presentation you can see here is straight out of chapter one under next steps and I have highlighted the relevant sections in red text. I can't go through all the policies. We did a number of them. But you have the complete information in your packets. On a high level and as a method of process, though, these policies are responsibility for and proposed by consensus. I think that's pretty significant. We have shared them with city leadership and discussed what was best for everyone. A few areas they received some proposed tweaks when we do the first real update, maybe next year. As an example some of the action items are too big for just one department to lead, more than likely we will want to split some of those up. On the right you can see a breakdown of the policies by topic and on the next slide you will be able to see them by a few other ways. Here are the policies by lead and priority and, then, ongoing by department. These are rolling packets, both in the application letter and the staff report.

The one -- the ones with a time frame are sort of like projects, things that need to be done more comprehensively and the ones with ongoing or more day to day are specific to development review. Lastly, on this and for next steps, priorities will help you inform other planning and budgeting efforts. We have a few highlights for you. Before I show you how these can look in the final document, the golden objectives provide context for many of the 380 action items below them. These action items often vary wildly in scope, complexity, and frequency and so the goals and objectives are not prioritized they are context. Additionally, responsible lead and support departments shown our simple summaries of those below them for the goals and objectives. Really -- and, for example, the goals and objectives are populated with responsible leads so that when you sort by departments you don't lose that context and only see the actions, you retain and keep and see the goals and objectives with the action. Next the party periods shown or proposed and are general, much like the comp plan. This is our historical practice. These are really intended to be from the point of adoption or if there are changes since the adoption within -- some other sort of addendum -- or amendment. At the July meeting before the Planning and Zoning Commission part of the recommendation was to include priorities for the ongoing items. In staff's perspective this doesn't work very well and I did not likely do a good enough job going into the detail as to why. Ongoing items are at every opportunity. If it's development related, then, we view them with every application. If there is an action described with a yearly project, then, it's with that yearly effort. If it's coordination with ACHD, then, we do that at every chance we get. These are for now and not for big blocks of sort of abstract time. We want to do something else with those and apply some sort of time period to them, so we will have to look at some other revisions to the text to consider that. If we were to move forward with this amendment as proposed this is what you would likely see in the findings. This is formatted for the new Comprehensive Plan. You can see on the right there there is two new columns. One would lead, one would support, and, then, down at the bottom there is some notations that describe some of the acronyms and various time periods. I do have one slide after this which is related, but not strictly related to the action. So, with that I will stand for any questions or discussion.

Simison: Thank you, Brian. Council, any questions or comments for Mr. McClure? Okay. This is a public hearing. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on this item?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

Simison: Okay. And the last time I checked we didn't have -- we do have a hand raised? Okay. If there is a hand raised, we can go ahead and bring them into the room and ask them to state their name and address for the record.

Weatherly: Denise, go ahead with your name and address, please.

LaFever: Denise LaFever at 6706 North Salvia Way and I just want to say I think Brian did a really good job with the presentation. I really appreciate the way he laid out his report and his presentation. So, I'm for making some priorities that are based on the staff meeting. That's all I have to say.

Simison: Thank you, Denise. Council, any questions for Denise? Okay. Thank you very much. Do I have a motion to close the public hearing or is there any further discussion?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I move that we close the public hearing for the Comprehensive Plan policy prioritization, H-2020-0073.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the item? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Any opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, question for Brian. This -- this is just to bring back to Council an ordinance or what format will this be in to -- for us -- for us to adopt? Is there something that we take further action on and what format does that look like?

Simison: Ask Mr. Nary to respond to that.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Hoaglund, so we would bring back a resolution with those changes and, then, that would be attached to the resolution.

Hoaglund: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we adopt the 2020 Comprehensive Plan policy prioritization, H-2020-0073 by the Planning Division -- Division and that a resolution be prepared for Council consideration at our next meeting.

Cavener: Second the motion.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: I have a motion and a second and a comment.

Nary: Yes. The next meeting deadline was today, so it would have to be at least September 1st. Mr. Mayor, if I might amend my motion to -- that it be adopted as I laid out in the motion, except the date be September 1st.

Cavener: Second agrees.

Simison: And the second agrees. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I just -- I wanted to reiterate and thank Denise for sharing some comments towards Brian. Brian, appreciate your good work on this. We don't get to see you very often and now I guess we only see you what's on the computer screen, but we appreciate your due diligence on this project.

Bernt: Ditto. Thank you, Luke.

Simison: Okay. Hearing no further discussion, we do have a motion. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed nay. The ayes have it. The motion is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Thank you, Brian. And now I think we will turn it back over to Mr. Hood, if he is going to swap places with Mr. McClure. I can't tell if they are --

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

6. Community Development: Presentation of Ada County Highway District's Draft 2021-2025 Integrated Five-Year Work Plan

Simison: Okay. Item 8 is -- or Item 6 is Department Report, Community Presentation, on the Ada County Highway District's 2021-2025 integrated five year work plan. I will turn this over to Mr. Hood.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. I'm going to talk to you about the draft -- initial draft of the ACHD 2021 to 2025 integrated five year work plan. Given that an acronym, so IFYWP. That was -- you had a pretty lengthy packet item for this topic and we are certainly not going to go through it page by page. I probably should have put it in my memo, but that wasn't the expectation of you either, but you had the information should you choose to -- to go into it at that detail. Earlier this year the city did send to ACHD our roadway intersection and community program priority requests and asked them to consider that as they drafted this is IFYWP. ACHD recently released that initial draft and is now seeking our feedback, not just the City of Meridian, but there are other stakeholders in the county as well and I will just draw your attention -- ACHD has actually responded to the spreadsheet that we send them with our priority requests and responded to each of our priority rankings by providing us an update to where they stand in their process. So, if you have your packet open and want to go to page 151, I would encourage you to do that. I'm going to actually go there here in a minute with you and -- and draw your attention to a project or two, but that's our -- that's our list that we sent to ACHD earlier this spring and they provided comments and updated that to just let us know where

all those projects stand in their process, so -- so, staff has reviewed the draft integrated five year work plan and discussed with the Transportation Commission on August 3rd. Essentially, besides an interim signal, that they are -- they have added to the program at McMillan and Black Cat -- so, near the new Owyhee High School being accelerated into 2022, there is really not a whole lot of change. So, they are adding another year to the program, but none of our projects were substantially delayed or substantially advanced, everything just kind of going through that process. So, there is really no change that staff is really wanting to bring to your attention as it relates to Meridian anyways. There are certainly some other changes in the program, but as it relates to Meridian it's kind of what I would have expected I guess. Staff did ask for feedback from the Transportation Commission, again, at that August 3rd meeting on the overall integrated five year work plan, but in particular we asked them to look at a concept to potentially move two of our projects down on our priority list that we sent to ACHD earlier in the year. In particular there are two projects on South Ten Mile Road that staff brought to the Transportation Commission's attention. The section of Ten Mile between Victory and Overland, which is currently the city's number six highest priority project and is planned for construction in 2022 and into 2023 and, then, the second project, but it's related, because they are designing them concurrently -- would be that intersection at Ten Mile and Victory and that's the city's number 17 highest priority on the list that we have submitted and, again, planned for construction concurrently with the roadway widening project. The Transportation Commission did review it, but had no comments or recommendations that they asked me to carry forward to you all tonight on those -- on Ten Mile or the initial drafts of the integrated five year work plan. There is one other thing I just want to draw to your attention also on the August 3rd meeting. We had a member of the public attend with some concerns about the Eagle project between Amity -- yeah, Eagle project between Amity and Victory and so wanted to bring -- if you can -- if you did go there to page 151 in your packet, that's priority number five. So, fairly high up is the roadway widening of Eagle Road there between Amity and Victory and the intersection is number 26 on our priority list. That individual had some concerns with some of the design elements, a roundabout, the way they are crossing pedestrians, but Brian McClure actually talked to you about this last fall a little bit about how they -- Locust Grove and Eagle Road, they are trying some kinds of newer design concepts and, obviously, Brian's here, so if you have any questions on that Eagle Road project I will probably defer to him. But I wanted to call that out and just let you know that we have been back in contact as well with Albertsons, who was kind of off of our radar for the past almost two years. They are back on scene just as ACHD is about ready to wrap up design, they are at 99 percent, getting ready to go out to bid and construct this project this next year -- this next fiscal year. So, again, if you look at that it's -- it's very late in that whole design process, but I just want to bring that to your attention, since there are some concerns with what -- how that -- that project or two -- the intersection at -- at Amity and the roadway widening project towards Victory and the current status of that. But I just wanted to kind of draw it your attention a little bit. Again, the Transportation Commission, though, didn't really have anything that they wanted me to say. Yeah, we should send a letter to ACHD, but if you direct me to do so I need to do that by August 21st, so that's, you know, coming up really quick, so I need that direction tonight. We can't continue this out to September 1st. So, any -- any direction -- if you want to send a letter, please -- please let me know what that is and,

again, I need to send it out this week. With that, Mr. Mayor -- if you have any questions on any of it -- but, again, if you go to page 151 and just kind of go through -- and if you would like me to run through that spreadsheet with you we can, but if you look at the -- kind of the middle -- middle to the right two-thirds of the -- of the pages there, you have got the -- you know, design year, right of way acquisition year, and construction year. That's what everyone cares about what year does it actually get built. We also have ACHD's response. So, that ACHD response column is the one -- if you are curious about any of our projects and where they sit at -- in ACHD process, page 151 through 150 -- it's just a couple of pages there -- you have that information. And with that I will stand for any questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you, Caleb. And, Council, I'm just going to do -- add on to what Caleb talked about, because I did have the opportunity to sit down with Director Wong from ACHD on Friday and a couple of things to point out. A, I think you are going to hear next week, if I'm not mistaken, Caleb, that we will hear from someone from the Tuscany area regarding the Eagle-Amity issues. I think that's going to be presented to you all next week. However, that will not be in time for any consideration for a letter to ACHD at this point in time on the five year work plan specifically. I did alert the director to potential some thoughts may come from us regarding the Ten Mile projects. And I think the point here is the city is the one -- those projects, honestly, if we -- if you look at them there is not a lot of Meridian residents that benefit from those projects on the south side of Ten Mile, as we don't have development down in that area. They really are for others, but they do count against Meridian in our allocation of projects for the city. So, if that's something that we -- may not be on our priority list as much as other projects and maybe something we want to consider sending in the letter for further comments on this. But part of our conversation with the director was the need to probably have a joint meeting, because despite Linder Road overpass being number two on our list, I have heard that ACHD doesn't see it as a high priority from the city, because they haven't heard it directly from Council in a face-to-face format, so --

Bernt: Tomorrow morning? I'm available.

Simison: Yeah. So -- so, we will -- we will need to have a joint meeting with ACHD to talk maybe specifically about that topic with them. In addition, the Eagle and Amity was something that I did bring up with the director and he is going to be getting back to me as far as where they are in that process and this does go to issues that were raised regarding Eagle, Amity, with Albertsons, as well as others, but otherwise that are going to now be likely be proposed at the Hill, which, again, is within a half a mile. So, there is -- there is some other issues, but I don't know that it impacts the five year work plan discussion at this point in time, because I still think that we believe that that's an important project to have done. It's just important to have it done correctly. I think that's the more important conversation. But if there are comments regarding the Ten Mile corridor specifically, if we want to send a letter on that I think that's right, at least want to make sure Council weighs in on that topic tonight or anything else that you think is relevant for a letter to ACHD.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Maybe help me with a little bit of clarification. We talked about Ten Mile. I assume you are talking Ten Mile south of Victory.

Simison: I -- I would put it south of the Overland-Ten Mile connection at this point in time, because that's -- that's where that project really hits is the Victory one.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, a couple of comments.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm always happy to meet with our friends from the highway district, but I can recount I think at least the last two or three times that we have gotten together the subject of the Linder Road overpass was discussed at length and enthusiasm from our body shared with them, but if we need to meet with them again so they can hear from us that's fine, but perhaps we include -- instead of doing a letter just from you, Mr. Mayor, maybe it's something that's signed by all of us and we include within that what I believe -- I think is pretty strong enthusiasm for the Linder Road overpass. That way they get it in an official letter with a request to discuss what that may look like from their perspective when we meet. So, we got some framework around what we are going to be talking about. On the Ten Mile piece, I think I'm in agreement with you, Mr. Mayor, for the most part. I do know that on our -- our 2020 rankings that both the Transportation Commission I think that we have -- we have approved has Victory and Overland as number six. I'm not quite sure if I wrap my head fully around removing that particular piece, but clearly Amity to Lake Hazel and so on and so forth does seem to make sense. I'm not so beholden that we need to hold on to the priority ranking for Victory and Overland -- or Victory -- Ten Mile, excuse me, between Victory and Overland, but I think it is more of a priority than -- than the other intersections that run south.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I would agree with Mr. -- Mr. Cavener. Also just to clarify, are we -- did you say that we weren't going to discuss this evening at least at the minimum a letter in regard to that pedestrian crossing that the citizen had concerns with, along with roundabouts, or are we going to reserve that for next week?

Simison: I believe that would be the intention, since we are -- I would encourage us to stay focused on the five year work plan, unless we want to move that project --

Bernt: No, that's fine.

Simison: Yeah. And we did discuss that with ACHD about that potentially being another joint meeting topic, depending on where it is in their process and their willingness to

engage further if Council's desire is to do so. Is there any other comments or direction for Mr. Hood at this time from any other members of Council? If not, then, what I would suggest, if it's okay, is that we draft up a letter that I can sign specifically related to Ten Mile and focus on areas south of the intersection corridor of Victory and Overland as to not being priority -- as -- as important priorities for the City of Meridian at this time.

Cavener: Okay. I'm good with that.

Simison: Okay. Mr. Hood, I think that means tomorrow morning, just so you know, since I'm out --

Hood: I will get Mr. Miles on that. Thank you.

Simison: All right.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: We, then, send a follow-up piece about Linder or you will communicate -- staff will communicate that with ACHD staff and -- I heard Council President Bernt under his breath say can they meet you tomorrow morning and I thought it was somewhat tongue in cheek, but I do think we -- if that's what they need to hear from us we should be meeting with them sooner rather than later.

Simison: Yes. It is the intention. I -- my -- my guess is that we list the next Tuesday and see if there is a second agenda item that we want to have for that, but we can start the process. It was on my list to talk with the Council President tomorrow about, about getting that moving forward.

Cavener: Great. Thank you both.

Simison: Mr. Hood, are you? All right. Awesome.

7. Community Development: Presentation of Results of Open Space Study Survey

Simison: Moving on to our last item from Community Development this evening. This is Item 7, Community Development presentation, results of the open space survey and I'm going to turn this over to Cameron.

Arial: Good morning. Or good morning. Good evening, everyone. Good to be back with you. Everybody hear me okay? All right. I'm going to go ahead and share my screen and get the presentation up for you. Let me know if that's -- can you see that okay? All right. Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, it's good to be with you. As we have previously -- previously discussed and in conversation with -- continued conversation around the

Comprehensive Plan, one of the items that came out of the Comprehensive Plan that was a -- you know, a priority point to explore further was the open space issue that we continue to hear throughout the process from the public and so as staff we have been working on that and wanted to report to you this evening the results of that survey. As you know, you know, this has been a topic in land use applications, you know, in many of our public hearings and not to confuse what's going on with Caleb's open space UDC group, but certainly related is kind of this survey pertaining to what our citizens think of open space. This also pertains to our current strategic plan, Item 1-C-3, which talks about open space and the preservation of it and so based on that we wanted to really kind of assess citizens' understanding of open space, what they -- what they -- what they think it means and what their preferences are around it. Also gauge kind of their willingness to pay for it and -- and, then, also kind of as a third wheel is to educate them on what the possible open space types exist. So, kind of a multifaceted purpose behind the survey. So, as such, you know, it wasn't -- specifically it wasn't intended to be a -- you know, a random sampling, scientifically derived survey, it was meant to be broad and sent out to as many Meridian citizens as possible to gather as much information, as well as to educate. So, it's important to just caveat this data that it's not generalizable to all of Meridian and Meridian citizenry, it's not, you know, scientific in that regard, but we do -- we certainly can say definitively that of those surveyed. These are the results. I am pleased -- very pleased with the number of responses. We had over at the end of the day over 1,500 responses. So, you know, again, that's -- that's a good response and that certainly the -- the data is useful. So, again, we are trying to understand what open space means, because, again, through the -- the public hearing process and through, you know, the Comprehensive Plan outreach it meant a lot of different things to a lot of different people and so we really wanted to kind of hone in on that. It is important to note, too, that we did partner with Boise State and Idaho Policy Institute. Many of you know Dr. Greg Kildare and his team and so they have helped us assess this, run the cross-tabulation and present the results. So, I'm going to go ahead and just dive in real quick. This is kind of just that -- some factoids, if you will, around the survey itself. So, we ran it for just over a month. Tried to leave it out there to make sure folks could -- you know, gave people adequate time to respond. Some noteworthy things. As they ranked their responses you can see here kind of what was folks' number one choice. You can see there a nature reserve type concept got the most, number one. Both public parks, multi-space, outdoor urban spaces, pathways, working farms and, then, preservation of historical or cultural significant property. This is an important slide. Really what we found when you kind of boiled it down and ranked it, you know, so the first place, second place, third place, fourth place rankings and so forth, that 81 percent supported purchasing property for open space and when you boil that down even further, you can see there there is this kind of a, you know, dividing line, if you will. All of them received over 50 percent or a simple majority, but you see that, you know, our public parks in particular, folks at the 82 percentile really were willing to support purchasing parks, nature preserves, and pathways at a high rank and I would just focus you on when they talked about what funding source to purchase open space, 48 percent of the survey folks identified development impact fees as their number one preference. So, just real quick I found these interesting that I thought we would share. Sixty-six percent of respondents were female, 67 were between the ages of 25 and 54. Seventy-one percent had a bachelor's degree or higher and 90 percent owned a single

family home. So, again, as we kind of ran into -- ran the cross-tabs on property purchase, you know, you see, again, 81 percent of those surveyed supported purchasing property of some type of open space. So, again, the high -- high -- high level finding. We found it interesting and wanted to report based on length of time, meaning how long they have lived in the city. This was -- this was interesting that those that -- that lived longer in Meridian were less likely to support. Now, got to kind of caveat that, again, the support was very high regardless, but there was a difference. So, for example, if -- if folks had lived here three to four years they were at 84 percent and that dropped down if you lived ten years or longer. So, something there to consider. Age, again, on purchasing property, you know, this -- the -- this 25 to 34 year block was our peak at 87 percent support for purchase, but still strong support across all age demographics. And, then, just another note -- noteworthy one, folks that had a bachelor's degree supported 87 percent and, then, you know, less likely to support if they had a high school degree. As far as parks are concerned, kind of drill down into that. I found that interesting that three to four year -- people that lived in Meridian three to four years strong support at 88 percent. Again, kind of across the board folks supported parks, but saw that uptick there with that demographic. Age. Again, that 25 to 34 year old folks, that peaked at 91 percent support. I think -- I think that's all I want to do for there on parks. So, on nature preserve. So, again, length of time in Meridian, this one was a little different. We found that if they, you know, had lived less than one year they were more likely to support that at 84 percent and, again, longer than ten years at 78 percent. So, not a huge difference, but, you know, something, you know, interesting there that new comers may support just, you know, raw ground, you know, preserved -- preservation of that type of open space. In this -- in this tab, again, the -- even this younger crowd -- although there weren't a ton of respondents in this demographic, the 18 to 25, I better -- you know, need to mention that. But 94 percent of them did support purchasing property for nature preserve open space. Pathways. Again, so this was that -- that the -- kind of the tail end of that -- that -- the top tier, if you will, for supporting open space -- the purchase of open space. Kind of followed along the same lines as parks to a large degree and -- but you do see kind of housing playing a -- playing a role. You know, we are at peaks here with those folks that -- that rent. That connectivity -- you know, and that -- that kind of seemed logical where maybe they live in more dense areas of town, they want to be connected and not so auto -- auto centric. So, on the funding question, again, number one ranking went to the development impact fee for using that as a funding mechanism. Let's see. This was an interesting one. I think you found a higher support with folks that had -- are newer to the city, as opposed to those that have been longer to the city, less inclined to support there. Also that -- that held true with the age demographic as well. The -- the older crew tend to support there. And so, again, in conclusion, you know, of those surveyed -- again, this can't be, you know, extrapolated across the entire citizenry, but of those surveyed it was very clear that citizens value open space to the extent that they are, you know, largely willing to pay for it and, then, we see peaks with parks, nature reserves, and pathways as those that received the highest percentages, but with all of them -- you know, nearly all of them receiving, you know, majority. And, then, just finally that development impact fees were the -- the funding mechanism of choice. So, with that certainly we can dive into any aspect of the survey that you would like. Hopefully that was a quick summary, but

certainly interested in your thoughts on this and how you would like staff to move forward, if at all, with this information. Mr. Mayor, thank you for the time and open to discussion.

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

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. Quick question, Cameron. Right on that very last one on the conclusion I was trying to parse out, you know, that -- that figure of 48 percent, you know, of respondents ranked the use of impact fees as their -- as their most favored use of -- of paying for open space and, then, it says over bonding and using the city's reserves. So, how was that question worded or what were their options of -- of impact fees? I mean sometimes people think bonding someone else is still paying the bill, but, you know, city reserves is only adding the money, just spend -- spend from the savings account, it's still all taxpayer dollars, but I was just curious as to how that was worded.

Cameron: Yeah. Let me pull up the exact question, Councilman Hoaglund. Great question. One moment here. Take me just a second. Yeah. This was a ranking question, if I'm not mistaken.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Cameron, if it's helpful I have got it in front of me. I could -- I could read it if that's helpful.

Arial: Oh, sure. Yeah. Yeah. I'm just pulling it up, but go ahead and I'm -- I will just share that now, so you guys can see that.

Cavener: The question was, yeah, in order for the city to acquire any of your preferred open space choices, how would you, or those in your household, want that decision to be made. First option is City Council approval of development impact fees. New development pays a fee for open space purchases. Second option is public vote. Property tax levy. Tax imposed on Meridian properties to purchase open space. Option three. City Council authorizes use of General Fund balance. City uses its surplus revenues to purchase open space. Or other is -- is the fourth option.

Arial: So, that may be -- let me just elaborate -- and thank you, Councilman Cavener, for reading that off. Just to elaborate on that, so this was a ranking question, so you could select between one of these four and so as such the number one ranking was the impact fee one at 48 percent. That -- that number does not include your average -- you know, maybe that ranked second with a lot of people as well. But we figured we would just report the highest number one ranking one.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Cameron, maybe -- maybe following on up that, do you have the numerical amount? So, I know we are talking percentages, but I think we -- the survey started I think with a little over 1,500. Do you have -- I mean typically with surveys the more questions you ask the more people drop off and so I don't know -- is it 40 percent of that 1,500 or is it a lower number?

Arial: Yeah. Let me -- let me see if I can pull up the -- the exact number of responses on that question in particular.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Arial: I definitely know we have the --

Cavener: Cameron, it might be easier maybe just to send some of that stuff, too, later on. I don't want to -- I don't want you to feel like you have got to kind of go fishing for -- for me on that question. I just was curious if it's something you had offhand.

Arial: Sure. No, I'm happy to follow up with you, Councilman Cavener, on that -- on that point. What was -- what was the number of respondents on it. I do -- I will say that, you know, we -- we did take all of the data, but, you know, there is -- there is, obviously, you know, you are -- you are speaking to, you know, survey attrition. So, we can -- I can get you that to make sure that, you know, at least that -- each of the numbers. I want to say that it was high, but we will -- we will get that definitively.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, a couple other questions if I may.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Cameron, I appreciate you bringing this. I know you and I had some spirited conversations about surveys and straw polls and statistically validated, so this -- this information is fascinating. My assumption is -- because I appreciate you sending me the questions. We didn't boil down survey respondents based on where they lived in Meridian. Do we have anything that's one level deeper are you aware of?

Arial: We -- we actually do and just for the sake of time I didn't -- I didn't put that slide in. We do -- Brian McClure did provide a heat map. I can send that to you as well.

Cavener: Awesome.

Arial: Not surprisingly, most of the respondents were in the north and south, but we did get a northwest, southeast where a lot of our growth is and a lot of our residences are. But I can certainly share that with you as well. It's -- it's safe to say that we got a broad -- a very broad response geographically.

Cavener: Great. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Cameron, a question that you asked has really piqued my interest and it wasn't captured in the slide, so I'm hoping maybe you can give us some insight. I think it was Q2 where you were asking the -- the respondents about if they would support purchasing property for open -- for open space and you have yes, no, or don't know. I would be curious to know what the response is from that. But, moreover, if they say no, we ask them what city services those in the household would prefer that the city be focused on and I would love -- again, I don't know how many answers you got, because when you invite kind of a narrative I'm sure you got a whole slate of different things. But I would love to see what our public is saying that they would want us spending our dollars on as opposed to open space.

Arial: Yeah. Happy to -- happy to get you that -- that data as well. And it's -- it's -- if there is -- that is some of the follow up. If you want me to come back and present that type of, you know, drill down specifically, happy to do that as well.

Simison: And to dovetail with this, we do have the draft city survey results back, which I think you will be seeing those in the next three weeks here, Council. So, I don't know the open space was listed as an item, but at least it will tell you where the residents think as a general viewpoint --

Cavener: Sure.

Simison: -- compared to what you may have heard in this survey. Different people. Different questions. Not necessarily can't -- hard to cross tab the two. So, you are getting the results of both of them within a three week period likely.

Cavener: Wonderful. That's great news.

Simison: Council, anything further for Cameron on the item at this time? Thanks, Camera. I think it's more digestion at this point in time and perhaps one off conversations for anything else as we move forward.

Arial: Yeah. Understood. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, and Members of Council. Appreciate the time and happy to discuss as you need and provide anymore data, but, yeah, look forward to the follow up.

Simison: All right. Thank you very much.

Arial: Thank you.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 8. Ordinance No. 20-1888: An Ordinance (H-2020-0009 – Lavender Heights Subdivision) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Located in the SW ¼ of Section 32, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 55.14 Acres of Land From RUT To R-4 (Low Density Residential) Zoning Designation (16.37 Acres); R-8 (Medium Density Residential) Zoning District (28.07 Acres); R-15 (Medium High Density Residential) Zoning District (3.25 Acres); and R-40 (High Density Residential) Zoning District (7.44 Acres) in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: So, Council, that brings -- brings us to Item No. 8, Ordinance No. 20-1888. I will ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Weatherly: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is Ordinance No. 20-1888, an Ordinance H-2020-0009, Lavender Heights Subdivision, for annexation of a parcel of land located in the SW ¼ of Section 32, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 55.14 acres of land from RUT to R-4 (Low Density Residential) zoning designation (16.37 acres); R-8 (Medium Density Residential) zoning district (28.07 acres); R-15 (Medium High Density Residential) zoning district (3.25 acres); and R-40 (High Density Residential) zoning district (7.44 acres) in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Council, you have heard this read by title. Is there anybody who would like it read in its entirety?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we approve Ordinance No. 20-1888, with suspension of rules.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the ordinance under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed nay. The ayes have it and the motion is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

9. Ordinance No. 20-1889: An Ordinance Amending Meridian City Code Section 8-1-4(B)(1), Regarding Requirements for City of Meridian Use Zone Encroachment Permits; Adopting a Savings Clause; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Item 9 is Ordinance No. 20-1889. I will ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Weatherly: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is Ordinance No. 20-1889. An ordinance amending Meridian City Code, Section 8-1-f(b)(1) regarding requirements for City of Meridian use zone encroachment permits, adopting a savings clause and providing an effective date.

Simison: Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anyone that would like it read in its entirety? Seeing no one raise their hand.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we approve Ordinance No. 20-1889 with suspension of rules.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 9, Ordinance No. 20-1889 under suspension of rules. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, we are on -- on to Item No. 10.

Bernt: Future Meeting Topics.

Simison: Oh, sorry. I skipped over that. Council, is there any item under future meeting topics?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

10. Per Idaho Code 74-206A(1)(a) To deliberate on a labor contract offer or to formulate a counteroffer. Amended agenda to add Idaho Code 74-206(1)(f)

Simison: Then I would love a motion on number -- Item No. 10.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

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

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adjourn into Executive Session. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, absent; Perreault, absent.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries. We adjourn into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (8:54 pm. to 10:03 p.m.)

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move we come out of Executive Session.

Hoaglun: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to come out of Executive Session. All those in favor say aye. Opposed nay.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I move we adjourn.

Hoaglund: Second.

Simison: Motion and a second to adjourn. All those in favor?

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:03 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK