

A meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:05 p.m., Tuesday, March 22, 2016, by Mayor Tammy de Weerd.

Members Present: Mayor Tammy de Weerd, Keith Bird, Joe Borton, Ty Palmer and Anne Little Roberts.

Members Absent: Genesis Milam and Luke Cavener.

Others Present: Bill Nary, Jaycee Holman, Bruce Chatterton, Caleb Hood, Sonya Watters, Steve Siddoway, Warren Stewart, Jamie Leslie, Perry Palmer, Keith Watts and Dean Willis.

**Item 1: Roll-call Attendance:**

Roll call.

<u>  X  </u> Anne Little Roberts	<u>  X  </u> Joe Borton
<u>  X  </u> Ty Palmer	<u>  X  </u> Keith Bird
<u>      </u> Genesis Milam	<u>      </u> Lucas Cavener
<u>  X  </u> Mayor Tammy de Weerd	

De Weerd: Okay. Thank you for joining us. For the record it is March 22nd. It's five minutes after 6:00. We will start with roll call attendance. Madam Clerk.

**Item 2: Pledge of Allegiance**

De Weerd: Item No. 2 is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you will all rise and join us in the pledge to our flag.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

**Item 3: Community Invocation by Larry Woodard with Ten Mile Christian Church**

De Weerd: Item No. 3 is our community invocation. Tonight we will be led by Larry Woodard. He is with the Ten Mile Christian Church. Thank you for joining us, Larry. If you will all join us in the community invocation or take this as an opportunity for a moment of reflection.

Woodard: This has been an unusual day, has it not? And my prayer reflects that. Our Dear Heavenly Father, we come to you tonight with anxious hearts after learning of the Islamic terrorist attack in Brussels. We pray tonight for those who were wounded and for the families of those who were killed. We ask that all the hurting people in Brussels be comforted as a search for the terrorists begins. We pray tonight for our nation, that we be safe from this kind of attack, but we

are reminded that even in our city, a city that has been blessed with good police, good leadership by this Council and neighborhoods that are clean and friendly, that we not forget you. Before the Council takes up business of this city we just ask for your forgiveness when we have strayed in our moral values. Nude Facebook pictures, drugs, pornography, language are just a few of the dangers our young people face and we ask for wisdom in how to deal with these issues. Our city continues to grow rapidly and with growth comes critical infrastructure issues that this Council must address. Give each of them wisdom tonight as issues come before them. Tonight I pray for the city clerk, who quietly goes about her duties each day. The city worker in his pickup truck that makes sure the water is available to each home, that the sewers work, and as I often mention, our emergency personnel, the police, fire, ambulance services that keep us protected and safe. I thank you tonight for the Mayor, each City Councilman and Woman and each city official who is attending tonight, that they have good health and wisdom as this Council meeting begins, in Jesus' name, amen.

**Item 4: Adoption of the Agenda**

De Weerd: Thank you, Larry. Item No. 4 is adoption of the agenda.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Under 6-G, the resolution number is 16-1126 and Item No. 9-B has been asked to continue until April 5th, 2016, and Item C has been asked to withdraw this application. And with that I move we approve the amended agenda.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda as read. All those in favor -- I'm sorry. The adoption of the agenda. All those in favor say aye. All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**Item 5: Proclamation**

**A. Proclamation for March for Meals Month**

De Weerd: Council, excuse me while I go to the podium. I will ask Mr. Grant Jones to join me up here. I have a proclamation to read and, then, I will ask Mr. Jones if he would like to make some comments. This proclamation is regarding Meals on Wheels and if you haven't helped to deliver them I would suggest that you volunteer and take that opportunity. You will get a greater understanding of

the importance of this activity and the service. It's not just feeding the hungry, it is -- for many of our shut-ins that outlet to have social and human contact. So, I appreciate all you do in our community and across the Treasure Valley. Whereas on March 22nd, 1972, President Richard Nixon signed into law a measure that amended the Older Americans Act of 1965 and established a national nutrition program for seniors 60 years and older and whereas Meals on Wheels America established the March for Meals campaign in March 2002 to recognize the historic month, the importance of Older Americans Act nutrition program and to raise awareness about the escalating problem of senior hunger in America and whereas Metro Wheels -- Meals on Wheels -- say that fast -- in Treasure Valley has served the seniors of Meridian and surrounding communities admirably by providing nutritious meals and whereas volunteers are the backbone of the program and not only do they deliver nutritious meals to seniors who are at risk of hunger, but also delivery genuine, caring concern and attention to their welfare and whereas Meals on Wheels program helps maintain senior health and independence and offer a powerful socialization opportunity to combat loneliness and isolation, therefore, I, Mayor Tammy de Weerd, do hereby proclaim March for Meals Month here in the City of Meridian and I urge every citizen to take time this month to honor our local Meals on Wheels and the seniors they service and the volunteers who are an integral part of this program. It's signed today and I will turn this over to Mr. Grant Jones and ask him to make some comments on behalf of the Meals on Wheels program.

Jones: Thank you so much.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Jones: Thank you so much, Mayor Tammy. It is a real privilege to be here tonight. We deliver and serve over 400 meals just in the Meridian area alone every weekday. That's a lot of meals if you think about it. Nine hundred in our whole program and senior hunger and food insecurity is real. It really is. We think we live in a, you know, pretty affluent community where we don't have to worry. Over 29,000 Idaho seniors face food insecurity. I want to share a face with that statistic, just to give you a quick little story. We were just recently notified about a lady named Wanda -- and I get kind of emotional about this, because you just think about there are lots of Wandas out there in Ada County. One of -- a lady had come to our office and I gave her a brochure. She took it, she said I didn't really know why I took it, I just took it. Well, now she knows why. She went to her neighbor, they just moved there. She went to her neighbor and she took her a cinnamon roll and Wanda started crying and she said it's just a cinnamon roll. Well, I used to make cinnamon rolls. I can't make them anymore and I'm going to have this for dinner. Nicki looked at her and said that's your dinner? She said I went to the refrigerator this afternoon, I had two hotdogs and they were green. That's all I had. That's all I have. So, Nicki said, well, enjoy the cinnamon roll, but I'm going to bring you a dinner. So, she did and, then, she put her on Meals on Wheels, so now we deliver to her every day. Lots of

Wandas out there. So, thank you so much for what you're doing. Thank you for your proclamation. We really appreciate it. And we have for you -- I know you're going to love these -- Meals on Wheels hot pads. So, a pair of hot pads for you and may I say one thing -- just one more thing? We had a march on Saturday, 891 people came out. Frank, who is back here, front page of the ValleyTimes, plus inside the paper. FSA right here in Meridian donated five dollars, which is the cost of a meal for every walker. That's pretty generous. And they have committed to next year, too. We doubled what we had last year in Meridian at Kleiner Park and we hope we have the largest one in the country and Meridian may be able to take that distinction. So, thank you so much. It means a lot and this means a lot to our seniors and we really appreciate the fact that you're recognizing that senior hunger and food insecurity is real, even right here in Meridian. So, thank so very much. Thank you.

**Item 6: Consent Agenda**

- A. Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement between the City of Meridian and James D. Patterson on S. Barletta Way in Normandy Subdivision No. 1**
- B. Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement between the City of Meridian and James D. Patterson for S. Sarteano Ave. in Normandy Subdivision No 1**
- C. Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement between the City of Meridian and James D Patterson on S Leaning Tower Ave in Normandy Subdivision No. 1**
- D. Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement between the City of Meridian and James D. Patterson for South Murlo Avenue in Normandy Subdivision No. 1**
- E. Cost Share Permit with the Ada County Highway District for: Street Lighting Improvements to be Included with the Franklin Road, Black Cat Road to Ten Mile Road Widening Project. The \$29,000.00 Local Match is to be Paid up Front Per Idaho Transportation Department Requirements.**
- F. Fifth Amendment to Lease Agreement with Department of Correction for Space at Meridian Police Department**
- G. Resolution No. 16-1126: Approving Fifth Lease Amendment Extending Term of June 24, 2002 Lease Agreement for Space at Meridian Police Station Between State of Idaho and City of Meridian**

- H. **Approval of Task Order 10628.a to MURRAY SMITH & ASSOCIATES for the “WATER MASTER PLAN 2017 UPDATE – PHASE 1” project for a Not-To-Exceed amount of \$68,748.00.**
- I. **Final Plat for Creason Creek Subdivision (H-2016-0022) by CS2, LLC Located Southeast Corner of N. Linder Road and W. Ustick Road. Request: Final Plat Consisting of Thirty-Four (34) Single Family Residential Lots and Six (6) Common Lots on 15.75 Acres of Land in the R-8 Zoning District**
- J. **Final Plat for Oaks South No. 4 (H-2016-0020) by Coleman Homes, LLC Located South Side of W. McMillan Road, Between N. McDermott and Black Cat Roads Request: Final Plat Approval Consisting of Forty-Six (46) Single Family Residential Lots and Seven (7) Common Lots on 17.99 Acres in the R-4 Zoning District**

De Weerd: Thank you for the hot pads. For some reason my hot pads never look nice very long. So, that's great. Okay. Item No. 6 is our Consent Agenda.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: On Item G, as stated earlier, the resolution number is 16-1126. With that I move we approve the Consent Agenda and for the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. Madam Clerk, will you, please, call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, absent; Cavener, absent; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**Item 8: Items Moved From the Consent Agenda**

De Weerd: There were no items moved from the Consent Agenda.

**Item 7: Community Items/Presentations**

**A. Recognition of Parks and Recreation Commissioner  
Treg Bernt**

De Weerd: So, we will move to Item 7-A and as our parks director makes his way forward, along with Treg, I did want to add my own remarks before our director has a chance to acknowledge the volunteerism and leadership shown by Treg. Treg, I want to personally thank you. I have seen the passion that you have had in your last six years in serving on our parks and recreation commission and the leadership you have shown, both as the vice-president and president. But your passion is infectious. There is no doubt where your love for our city parks and recreation program lies. You -- as I mentioned the -- that infectious piece, it surrounds you and you draw people in. You have been a real passionate voice and have served on our impact fee committee and also an advisory committee that there is little doubt in anyone's mind what you think, because you're pretty frank at sharing your thoughts. We do appreciate your service. You are a loss to our parks commission, but we know where you live and we will hunt you down when we need you.

Siddoway: How about tomorrow? Thank you, Mayor. I don't know that I could say it any better. His passion, like you mentioned, is really truly second to none and Treg is already missed dearly. As you mentioned, he served for nearly six years on the Commission, five years and nine months to be exact, and was our president in 2013. One of the things that I wanted to highlight -- he went out himself and secured a sponsor a few years ago with Meridian Cycles to be our sponsor for our first pathway Z card map a few years ago and that was something that I really appreciated about him. While he's served on the commission I just wanted to take a minute and share some of the highlights of those six years.

Bernt: Not the low lights?

Siddoway: Not the low lights. We will skip those tonight.

De Weerd: I could probably tell a story or two. Shall I?

Siddoway: But to be fair, I want to mention that our two other commissioners here, Creg Steele and Phil Liddell, have also served on the commission through these same achievements, but in -- in 2010, soon after he joined, we opened new amenities at Centennial Park. In 2011 we opened the Diane and Winston Moore Pathway. In 2012 we opened Julius M. Kleiner Memorial Park. In 2013 the parks and recreation maintenance facility. In 2014 new park amenities at 8th Street Park. And in 2015 the Settlers Park tennis complex and the Story Bark Park. And, then, for his crowning kind of final hurrah with -- he stayed with us through December of 2015 when we wrapped up our parks and rec master plan

and thank him and all of our Commissioners for the leadership on that, but, Treg, you have been with us through a lot of significant accomplishments and we thank you for your role in them.

Bernt: My pleasure. Thank you.

Siddoway: I have an actual certificate to give him, which says to Treg Bernt in recognition of your service, dedication and participation on the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission for the City of Meridian from April 2010 to January 2016. On behalf of your fellow citizens we thank you for your years of service and commitment to improving the quality of life in our community. Presented this 22nd day of March 2016 and signed by the Mayor and the Clerk and along with that a very small token of our appreciation, your official City of Meridian mug.

Bernt: All right.

Siddoway: Shall we have him say a word?

Bernt: I don't -- I -- I will be real short. I -- during these type of talks or, you know, when I express my gratification I always get real emotional, but I just wanted to thank Steve and his staff. I have an enormous amount of respect for Steve and those in his department. They are fantastic people and it's truly been an honor to be able to have worked with you, Steve, and your staff. Grateful for the Godfather himself Creg Steele and my partner in crime Phil Liddell and my other friends that I have made on the commission, they have been fantastic to work with and they have taught me a lot and I have learned a lot over the years. So, I promise you this won't be the end of Treg Bernt in the City of Meridian, I can promise you that. I appreciate, you, Madam Mayor, for your friendship and, hopefully, and in the near future our paths can cross again. Thank you, Council Members and Jaycee and for all that you do for me and for the opportunity to serve. Thank you so much.

De Weerd: Thank you, Treg. And I will say that the gray hair probably is from the Godfather and his -- his partner in crime next door.

Bernt: From the lashing I have taken in the past month from these guys.

De Weerd: Thank you, Treg.

Bernt: Thank you.

**Item 9: Action Items**

- A. Request by Penelope Riley, representative of Jerry Trana, to discuss annexation and connection to**

**municipal water and sewer services for the property  
located 175 N. Black Cat Road**

De Weerd: Under Action Item 9-A is a request in front of you -- you do have in your packet a letter for request for municipal water and sewer services. Warren, did you want to present this? Was someone going to offer any comments on this or -- okay. Would Penelope like to come forward?

Riley: Good evening. Thank you, Mayor and Members of the Council. Penelope Riley. Post Office Box 405, Boise, Idaho. 83701. On behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Trana I want to thank you for giving me a few minutes of your time this evening. I'm going to cover my material really quickly to leave time for any questions that you might have. You're getting a couple of handouts. There is a letter regarding the sewer and water line in Black Cat Road and also a handout from the City of Meridian's website on the low density employment land use. So, Mr. and Mrs. Trana of 175 Black Cat Road would like to rezone their property to C-2 through Ada County Development Services. Once the new zone is granted they intend to use the one time split option to create two parcels. The northern parcel will remain single family residential and the southern parcel would become the new home of Trana's Garage. Ada County requires certain documentation in order to grant the rezone application -- excuse me -- to even accept it. This documentation includes a verification from the City of Meridian that the parcel cannot be annexed and authorization to connect to the City of Meridian sewer and water services. Ada County also requires that the proposed zone be consistent with Meridian's future land use designation on the site. So, there is a map that you see now and this is where the subject site is relative to the rest of the City of Meridian. Customary procedure for annexation is to go through the entitlement process. In this instance, as you can see on the map, the parcel is not contiguous to the City of Meridian. Given this property cannot be annexed at this time and that the process of requesting annexation through a development application will yield no return on cost, we respectfully request the City of Meridian provide the Tranas with a letter establishing that the site is not annexable at this time. The next map is going to be the Ten Mile area and the future land use. Oh, it's coming up. Thank you. So, the site is where the little asterisk is there. The future land use map shows that the Trana site is included in the Ten Mile specific plan as a low density employment future land use with zoning designations as C-G, L-O and I-L. The Ada County C-2 zone is comparable with the city of Meridian's C-Z -- excuse me -- C-G zone. Boy, don't try and say that very fast. In the C-G zone auto repair is a permitted use. We believe that the proposed Ada County zoning designation is consistent with Meridian's future plans for the area. That the proposed use is able to comply with the C-G zone. One of the allowed zones for this land use and meets the intent of the zoning ordinance. It's also included in the information letter from Civil Survey Consultants. So, at this time city sewer and water is available in Black Cat Road. The Meridian Public Works Department has an application for requesting these services for properties not within the city. It is understood that

agreeing to annexation in the future is a part of any agreement between the Tranas and the City of Meridian, authorizing connection to these services. To summarize, I'm asking for the City of Meridian to provide the Tranas with a letter establishing that their property is not eligible for annexation at this time. I'm hopeful that the presentation will provide you with some assurances that the proposed entitlements through Ada County are consistent with your long range plans and zoning ordinance. And, finally, my discussion of the desired and required connection to city services was intended to provide the Council with a full understanding of the Trana's planned development activities. Thank you for your time. I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

De Weerd: Council, any questions? Does staff have any comments? Typically in the past we have not extended services to those that are not annexing into the city, but I hear we have facilities in the road and so we are able to deliver services?

Stewart: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, there is a sewer and water main running in Black Cat Road in front of this particular parcel. They would -- you know, I think there is some real -- I think Caleb had some things that he would like to talk about perhaps with regards to annexation and land use and so forth, but from a Public Works perspective the sewer and water mains do exist. They would have to go out into Black Cat Road and establish residential sewer connections to those mains, but they do exist out there in the roadway. Whether it's advantageous for the city from other perspectives to go out -- you know, to approve this, I think maybe Caleb would have some information on that.

De Weerd: Okay. Thank you.

Hood: So, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council. First time I'm hearing about kind of some of the details. I knew that this request was on the agenda and I read the letter that was in the packet. I have a little bit of a problem with jumping to too many conclusions based on what our comp plan map and the request to write a letter saying -- you know, I have no problems saying it's not eligible for annexation, because that is true. If you -- if you read more into the Ten Mile specific area plan though -- and I don't know exactly what land uses are proposed here. C-G is not the ideal zone in this designation on the comp plan. The low density employment is more an office district. So, if they are proposing office, maybe we can write a letter that says this land use may be appropriate in the county, but our vision -- the plan is really looking for office along Black Cat. So, kind of working backwards a little bit here and I do have some hesitancy on that request to write a letter, because I'm not sure that this is consistent with the city's vision for this corridor and this designation in the Ten Mile specific area plan. Regarding advancement of -- even though sewer and water appear to be very close and available, I mean it has historically been the policy of the city -- it's a three legged stool. Sewer, water and annexation. They all go together. And you don't really want to advance one without the other. If services are advanced,

but yet you don't advance the city limit, it really -- and we will talk about this a little bit later -- it could hamper the future development of parcels down the stream if you will, because you aren't extending those services to and through, let alone extending the city's limits so that the next parcel is contiguous and, therefore, adjacent for development in the city. So, there can be some real problems that get created land use wise. If you provide services and allow them to develop in the county, yet you don't make it annex into the city and, therefore, allow again adjacent properties to be annexed. It is true, I mean C-G and I-L both are -- can be appropriate zoned in here, but it really comes down to what is the land use and I will just -- Sonya, can you pull up Google Earth, please, and go -- just looked on the existing condition out there and one of the other concerns I have with this -- and I don't know the proposal, I don't know the rezone to C-2 in the county, what they would proposed for access, but there are three driveways to Black Cat Road, an arterial roadway, within 180 feet of each other. That's not something that meets typical city policy. So, with the extension of services and that consent form that -- for the handful of cases that we do that for, I don't know -- I can't even envision a scenario where we ever actually -- the city initiates the annexation. I don't know why we would want to annex this. This seems like you probably just wait until the city limits get there and you're eligible for annexation. We review the entire project for the merits as development in this city, not development in the county with city services. So, just kind of a summary of my initial thoughts -- thank you, Sonya. Right there where the blue outbuildings are. So, that's the subject property. Again, city policy -- we are going to look at restricting driveways -- can you zoom in just a little bit, please. And, again, I don't know what's proposed at the county or what will be proposed, but it's definitely going to be substandard. We are looking at property that doesn't have -- their driveways aren't even paved into the site. The parking there, obviously, isn't going to meet our -- our standards. There isn't any households out there. So, again, they are kind of in between both worlds with living on a property that's C-2. In a commercial district or an industrial district in the city you can't have residential. So, you can't live on a property and have -- run a business out of the back in the city and I understand they are looking at a lot split and that creates another problem, which we don't allow lot splits in the city either. So, again, this seems to not -- be against a lot of our Comprehensive Plan policy that we have -- we have in the city if this were proposed in the city. And I realize they are trying to go through the county process. I can comment on those applications in the county and it would probably raise a red flag when this comes across my desk.

Nary: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you. Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, to provide some additional historical perspective, it has not been common for past councils to extend services without annexation. We have done that on occasion and we have done that by agreement. The agreement requires they annex when they

are annexable. It has not been for commercial properties. It's been for agricultural properties, individual residences on an agricultural property or an individual residence with a family septic system and so that's in the normal course of when city services have been extended. You know, Caleb brought up a really valid point is under our city ordinances you're required as a development to extend services to and through. That wouldn't apply to this, so they would just hook this house up to services and they wouldn't be required to extend it and if you look how large that parcel is -- I don't know, again, what the future development of that site is, but, again, they are not going to be required to extend it any further beyond that and how in the future we are going to get access to get services through the other way or this easement or something else. I don't know. But -- but that's been the historical way we have handled these types of requests. We just haven't had one for an existing business. We had one issue with an existing business on McMillan that didn't want to annex and had city services available and they were not willing to annex that property and it's still in the county and they could not rebuild their septic system, because they were not willing to annex. But that's the only commercial one I could think of that we have had in about the last dozen years.

De Weerd: Thank you. And, Caleb, does this not come through your office? You haven't seen this?

Hood: Madam Mayor, I saw the letter that was in the packet. It didn't have a whole lot of details in it. It had the property address and the request to hook up to services, but this is the first time I'm hearing about the C-2 zone and going through the county and lot splits and things like that. I have not -- I didn't know any of those details.

De Weerd: Okay. Thank you. Council, any questions for staff?

Bird: I have none.

De Weerd: Does the representative have any comment on the conversation?

Riley: First of all, I --

De Weerd: If you will just restate your name for the record.

Riley: Penelope Riley. Do you need my address also?

De Weerd: No. We are good.

Riley: I was directed by staff at Development Services to come directly to you, so that's what we did. I was told that they -- there was nothing Development Services could do to help us with our inquiries and that we had to come straight to the Council. So, anyhow, it's currently zoned RUT and half of this site would

remain RUT. It's true that the southern parcel would become C-2 if we were successful with Ada County. With regard to parking, paving, driveways, I'm assuming that ACHD would see this application and we would be more than happy to go to ACHD and discuss consolidating driveways, getting everything paved back 30 feet, all the standard development requirements for accesses to arterial roadways. I guess I'm feeling a little bit blindsided here, because I was not trying to make trouble or bypass Development Services. I was told to come here directly. If you have any questions for me that would be great.

De Weerd: Well, I don't think anyone was saying that you -- you avoided the process, it's just the details in your letter didn't state the intent of the use for the property. So, it was not anticipated.

Riley: This is not something I have done before and so I was reliant on guidance from other parties on how to do this. So, I apologize if it's not done correctly.

Hood: Madam Mayor, if I can. I did talk to Bruce Freckleton, who directed Penelope to come before you, because that is our policy. Again, we can't write a letter saying you can hook up to city services when you're not annexed. That is -- the only body that can do that is you all. I guess the point I wasn't aware of is the request to also write a letter saying we are in support of commercial development out here in the county. That's -- that's kind of -- that's another step, guess, that -- that adds on to not just the policy of hooking up, but, then, preapproving development in the county and that's where, again, I haven't seen the site plan. First time, again, I'm hearing about commercial zones. I don't even know what -- what uses are out there and, again, I -- so, I'm not trying to overreact, but I don't really know, so I kind of play maybe Devil's advocate or the sky is falling a little bit with these and I don't know what type of project may go in here. But it's not just paving the property back 30 feet, it would be, you know, city required parking lots to be paved, not just your entrance to a roadway and it's not ACHD policy about accesses, it's the city's policy about accesses. So, things like that that -- that concern me a little bit. So, sorry if you feel blindsided, but that makes two of us.

Riley: We are not asking for the City of Meridian to give us a letter that supports the proposed use. I did state in my presentation that that would be the future home of the Trana Garage. So, it would be an auto repair shop. It's already in existence. So, we are just asking for a letter that says we can't annex right now. That's really all we are asking for. Thank you

De Weerd: Thank you.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Maybe for clarification. The last remark made kind of pivoted this process -- is the request simply to have the city provide a letter saying that this property is not eligible for annexation period? Your last remark sounded like that was the extent of the new request.

Riley: That is correct. I provided additional information, because I thought it might be appropriate and respectful to do so. But that is all we are asking for is a letter. The Public Works Department has an application for hooking up to sewer and water outside of the city limits and I have advised the team members that that is the route we need to proceed with, because that's the -- based on your code that's what you're supposed to do and it was actually a code section about hooking up to sewer and water when you're not in the city limits. But the letter is really all I'm asking for. That's correct.

De Weerd: So, procedurally I guess -- while you still stand up here, just in case we need to ask you a question. The city's policy is not to extend services unless there is an annexation. Outside of that, I don't think that Public Works can approve extending services without the direction from City Council. So, you need a couple of things here. You need City Council to act on the request to extend services to a parcel that will not be annexed into the city and, then, you need a letter from the city saying we will not annex you and what I heard from your original comments is you would like us to include a statement that the proposed use is consistent with our Comprehensive Plan.

Riley: I was just trying to provide that assurance, because it's important to Ada County to ask you. I'm assuming when they route any application they are going to ask you if what's being proposed is consistent with the future land use that's proposed for the site based on Meridian's Comprehensive Plan. So, I was trying to be -- I was trying to provide you with a lot of information quickly in all the elements that related to what the future held. And if you would excuse me for just a moment. According to Meridian City Code 9-1-16, connection to city water system outside of the city limits. It actually says there is an application you need to fill out. You file it with Public Works and pay a fee. So, this is what I was basing my comments on about doing an application. It does say later on the City Council is the ultimate decision maker.

De Weerd: Okay. Thank you.

Nary: Madam Mayor, maybe to help clarify. So, the basis of the letter, why it's here tonight, was the request for both the annexation letter, that it's not annexable at this time, as well as the connection to city services, but from what I heard from Warren is that application hasn't been completed or processed yet, so they really can't really act on that yet anyway and I think what Caleb is saying is there has been no application from the county asking for comment on whether this is -- meets our Comprehensive Plan. So, at this point it's premature for planning to give you anything. They haven't analyzed that. I recognize that there

may be some misunderstandings here on process, but what Ms. Riley is really only in front of you tonight could have been handled at the staff level if it was only about annexation. I think the two -- maybe the miscommunication occurred and needed both and both requiring Council approval, but I think one is premature. I think the -- premature in regards to whether it meets the comp plan and maybe premature as to whether or not the analysis from Public Works would tell you yes or no we shouldn't do it. I think you have got enough information. Whether or not you feel comfortable making a decision is up to you, but I think we would be asking the same questions at a future date on is services available and why we should or should not provide it for a parcel that's not annexable. I don't know if that helped or made it less clear.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: We can't make a decision with regards to extension of services tonight.

De Weerd: Without the application.

Borton: So, there is no point in even commenting on it until the application is completed and presented. Correct?

Riley: Madam Mayor? If I may, please. Those are -- those are requirements of the application to Ada County. In order to make an application to rezone the site with Ada County I must provide them with a letter that says the site cannot be annexed into the city. If I proposed to zone in a commercial zone, then, I must give Ada County verification that the site can be connected to sewer and water and I apologize for making things muddy, when I was just trying to be informative. The primary reason for being here is the annexation letter. The rest of it is something that's placed on us by Ada County. They are going to contact Development Services and say is the proposed zone consistent with your future land use map. So, these things are going to show up. Some of it's premature, Again, I was directed to come here for the letter. So, I didn't -- I just did what I was directed to do.

De Weerd: Well, thank you. We will all learn with you.

Riley: Okay.

De Weerd: We are not familiar with Ada County's processes either, so we -- we apologize if we are clumsy in figuring all of this out.

Riley: This is not ordinary and it a clumsy thing to do, so --

De Weerd: Yes.

Riley: Thank you.

Hood: And, Madam Mayor, if I can, just my -- and I'm going to -- you know, just go back up more to the -- to the latter part of that. I mean like she said, I mean that's part of their application just to get in the door with the county. I just didn't want there to be any surprises. Send one letter that said we will serve and, then, I turn around and write a letter saying we recommend denial of the project. I mean that just doesn't seem right to send a letter saying we will extend our -- if that's what you all want to do. We will extend your services and, then, it comes in and I have to say, no, our comp plan says this should be office and research. This is an auto garage. I don't know how -- again, I'm not -- I haven't seen the site plan. I don't -- maybe -- maybe I can make the finding that it's consistent, but I don't want to send one letter one day and another letter saying we recommend denial of the next potentially. So, that's my concern is -- it may be premature, but it's all sort of wrapped up together and to really make a recommendation that's appropriate to provide them services, I think you sort of need to know what we are going to get, don't you? I mean not just me, but -- that's kind of where I'm coming from.

De Weerd: And typically we would ask for a staff report to kind of give an overview of all of these details. So, we at least act like we know what we are doing up here. Yes, Mr. Bird.

Bird: Well, I will stumble through as I understand it. What the applicant is asking for is a letter stating that that property at this time is not annexable. Is that right? Is that the way -- and she wants us to write that, but, then, she also wants us to say that it can be serviced. Well, there is no way we can say it can be serviced, because we don't even have an application for it. I, as a Council have no problem -- it don't meet our zoning or anything else -- to say that it is not -- it can't be annexed at this time, but there is no way I'm going to say that it is serviceable. That's my personal opinion.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: I believe she would just be satisfied with a letter saying it's not annexable currently and that's it. And that's the truth, so I think that's -- we can do that. And just that. Lots of head nods.

De Weerd: We can. But it does go back to Caleb's point and what was discussed tonight in terms of the proposed use and it not being consistent with our Comprehensive Plan, as well as extending services without annexation is -- provides a conflict. You're saying one thing to proceed further to, then, have the

city come back and say, yeah, but we won't serve. If you won't serve. So, that's the conundrum that has our head spinning right now.

Hood: And, Madam Mayor, I have no problem and I don't know if Warren and I co-signed it, the letter to the county, but if it just says that, this subject property is not currently eligible for annexation in the City of Meridian period. We sign it. I don't see a conflict with that. It's the second part of that that I do worry about misleading the applicant, potentially the county. So, if that's all that's being asked for and with your direction I think we can send that letter and that will be fine. I don't know that that gets the applicant in the door, though, with the county. I don't know that that goes as far as it needs to, but I don't have a problem with that letter.

Stewart: Mayor, I would agree with Caleb. We certainly can provide water and sewer services, because they are in the road, but I don't know that it makes any sense for us to do so. I don't know that I would even -- that that's advisable based on what they want to do, which we don't know much about, so --

De Weerd: Well, it sounds like if the -- the Council is so inclined to instruct staff to write the letter saying this property is not annexable and so, then, the process can begin, I think, then, staff will have more details to make a determination and recommendation to come back to Council with.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton. I can't make the motion.

Borton: Yeah. If it -- if it needs a motion. I would move that we direct staff to provide the applicant the letter requested, specifically stating this property located at 175 North Black Cat Road is not presently eligible for annexation.

Bird: Second.

Palmer: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to instruct staff to provide a letter. Madam Clerk, will you, please, call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, absent; Cavener, absent; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried. Thank you.

**MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.**

**B. Final Plat for Paramount Subdivision No. 31 (H-2016-0021) by SCS Brighton, LLC Located North of W. McMillan Road and East of N. Linder Road Request: Final Plat Approval Consisting of Forty-Two (42) Single Family Residential Lots and Three (3) Common Lots on 10.54 Acres in the R-8 Zoning District**

De Weerd: Item 9-B was requested to continue to April 5th. Council, do I have motion?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we continue H-2016-0021 to April 5th, 2016.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to continue Item 9-B to April 5th. All those in favor say aye. All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**C. Continued from March 1, 2016 Final Plat for Kentucky Ridge Estates Subdivision No. 4 (H-2015-0035) by T & M Holdings Located 1100 Riodosa Drive Request: Final Plat Approval Consisting of Twenty (20) Building Lots and Three (3) Common Lots on 5.49 Acres of Land in the R-4 Zoning District**

De Weerd: Item 9-C is also an item that has been requested to continue to -- oh, no. It's been requested to withdraw and we would need a motion to approve that request.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move that we allow the withdrawal of the application on H-2015-0035.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve the request to withdraw the application on Item 9-C. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, absent; Cavener, absent; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**D. Public Hearing for Olivetree at Spurwing Subdivision (TEC H-2016-0023) by Spurwing Limited Partnership Located North of W. Chinden Boulevard and West of Spurwing Way Request: Two (2) Year Time Extension on the Final Plat for Olivetree at Spurwing Subdivision in Order to Obtain the City Engineer's Signature on the Final Plat**

De Weerd: Item 9-D is a public hearing for TEC H-2016-0023. I will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Watters: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council. This application before you tonight is a request for a time extension. This site consists of 20.51 acres of land. It's zoned R-4 and R-8 and it's located north of West Chinden Boulevard and west of North Spurwing Way. This site consists of 20.51 acres of land. Excuse me. This property was annexed and platted in 2006 -- I'm asleep tonight. A final plat was approved in 2008 and four previous time extensions have been granted to extend the time period in which to obtain the city engineer's signature on the final plat. The applicant is requesting a two year time extension to obtain the city engineer's signature on the final plat for this subdivision. The final plat consists of 65 single family residential building lots and six common lots. Eighteen percent of the site is proposed to develop as open space. The applicant states that the Idaho Transportation Department has completed improvements for the State Highway 20-26 Chinden Boulevard-Ten Mile Road intersection, which requires significant modifications to the overall Spurwing development. With construction of the corridor complete they feel current market conditions are favorable to complete processing of the plat and construction of the subdivision. Construction plans are complete and should be submitted within the next month. Staff is recommending approval with no new conditions of approval. Written testimony was received from Shari Stiles, the applicant's representative, in agreement with the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

De Weerd: Thank you. Council, any questions? Okay. Would the applicant like to make any comment?

McKay: Becky McKay. Engineering Solutions. Business address 1029 North Rosario. I just want to let the Council know that we have updated their construction plans. Those were submitted on the 3rd of March back to the

highway district and to the city. So, my client will be proceeding with this development, because this is our fifth time extension and I had indicated to him that the Council -- this is as far as they have gone on other projects and that constructions on previous projects have been -- this is it, build it or start over. So, I did inform my client of the Council's past comments and he will start construction -- he's thinking the fall -- summer or fall. But we will have our new plan approval in about a month. Thank you.

De Weerd: Okay. Any questions for Becky?

Bird: I have none.

De Weerd: Okay. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone who like to provide testimony on this item? Okay. Council?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we close the public hearing on TEC H-2016-0023.

Little-Roberts: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on Item 9-D. All those in favor say aye. Did I hear all ayes? Okay. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we approve the time extension on TEC H-2016-0023, including staff and applicant comments.

Little-Roberts: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 9-D. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, absent; Cavener, absent; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: Thank you for that articulation. All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**Item 10: Department Reports**

**A. Mayor's Office and Economic Development: Discussion Regarding the Proposed Medical School in Meridian**

De Weerd: Okay. Under Item 10-A we have a discussion regarding the proposed medical school in Meridian and I will invite Brenda Sherwood, our -- and our Community Development Director Bruce Chatterton.

Chatterton: Madam Mayor, Council Members, Brenda is really going to do the heavy lifting for this presentation. I just wanted to cue things up. We are very excited to be here tonight to ask you to confirm Meridian's partnership with the Idaho Department of Commerce in making ICOM, the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine a reality. Specifically we need your approval to prepare a resolution that you would act upon in about two weeks. The resolution will confirm Council's commitment to provide 200,000 dollars, plus 100,000 dollars in wage permit fees as the city's local match under the state's tax reimbursement incentive program. Also I would be remiss in not recognizing our economic development administrator's role in making this happen. Partnering with the Department of Commerce, really doing the leg work, and I wasn't -- I didn't have the privilege to be there, but I also understand that at a very important and emotional meeting the Mayor really closed the deal. So, that combination, that tag team, is -- is very effective. Appreciate that a lot and that's really how we got here today in large part. So, Brenda.

Sherwood: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, of course I would just like to start, as I always say, congratulations. This is the proposed College of Osteopathic Medicine and I'm going to start calling it ICOM from here on out. So, ICOM. It's Meridian's very first recipient of the Idaho Department of Commerce's tax reimbursement incentive. But you know what's even more exciting about this is that this is the first recipient to reinvest the approximate 3.9 million dollars that they will be receiving as a tax credit from that incentive back into the community in the form of student scholarships. This is going to create a lot of opportunity for Idaho students. Just a little bit about the project. This was a project that went throughout five states in the northwest. It was a project led by Senator Mark Hagadorn and the Idaho Department of Commerce and I want you to know that this -- this really picked up the pace. All of us learned that it was about doing business or, you know, doing these incentives and working through this at the speed of business and I think that we all prevailed. Where they are going to be located -- they are going to be partnering with Idaho State University and they are going to be locating on that land that's actually been held by Idaho State University and has been exempt to taxes. However, this is a private college, so what's really exciting about this is that you will see that land will be back on the tax roles for the City of Meridian. I'd like to really talk to you about what the benefits are -- the economic impact to the community and I'm going to read through this, so that I don't get any of these numbers wrong, because they are all

pretty big. First of all, 79.5 million dollars impact during the construction period, with approximately 350 jobs created as the result of just the construction and planning. The facility capital investment is approximately 32.6 million dollars. It will be up in the hundred thousand -- or hundred million primarily just because of the equipment that will go into the school as well. The number of new jobs is equal to -- equals 90, with the average wage of 88,300 and the total project wages per year are 79.5 million. So, we are very excited about this project. It's going to bring a lot to the community. But also as a state that's been rated 49th in healthcare, this I think will impact the state of Idaho more than the investments and give our children the opportunity to be part of a medical school to become physicians. So, we are excited about this project. Once again, Mayor, thank you for all the support. It was fast. And so I really appreciate everything that was put into this and thank you to all of you and congratulations. So, now we would like to move forward with that resolution. We will come back with the commitment -- actually, we better go do this again. What we are asking today is for that commitment to our partnership, the 200,000 and up to 100,000 dollars in the fee waiver and we come back to you with that resolution in about two weeks time. There we go.

De Weerd: Okay. So, Council, I think the request in front of you is to approve the commitment and instruct the city attorney to provide -- or to prepare a resolution to be voted on at our next regular meeting on April 5th. So, any questions from Council or commits to Brenda or Bruce?

Little Roberts: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Yes, Mrs. Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: I would like to move that we approve the commitment and for legal to provide a resolution for us to vote on April 5th.

Bird: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to direct staff to provide a resolution to come back for Council for a final approval on April 5th. Any discussion? Madam Clerk.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, absent; Cavener, absent; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes.

**MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.**

De Weerd: I appreciate the -- the shepherding this through the process, Brenda, and for your work with the Department of Commerce. Our thanks to Megan

Ronk, the director. To Governor Otter for his leadership on this and to Senator Hagadorn. I think that as we look back we have been hoping for medical education in this state for some time. This medical education will be provided not on the backs of our taxpayers, but with a private investor and a private college that in addition to the WWAMI program, will continue to provide medical education, but expand that opportunity to these students that we have in this valley and across the state of Idaho. It's exciting -- very exciting to have this opportunity and to see that it's located in our health science and technology corridor, to continue to build on the development and the focus on health sciences and technology in that area. It's going to create a lot of opportunity. This is an applicant status, so they still have some regulatory and accreditation hoops to jump through. I think the city has demonstrated a support through the commitment by City Council to show that we stand beside them and will be a partner in their success and meeting those initial accreditation steps, but also as they go out into our medical community and develop the opportunities that have been a concern of the medical community in terms of those residencies and -- and the clinicals. I think they have established key relationships. They are willing to be a financial partner in those residencies, which is -- is something very new and very welcomed by our medical community and I know that in the six years they have to develop the needed residencies they will continue to make progress and have opportunities for our students as they graduate and start looking for the next part of their medical education through the residency. So, we are excited. We appreciate the -- the public-private partnership of this. Part of their partnership with ISU is going to be leasing or paying for the facility use that they have with ISU and I know in talking to the students that we have through the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, that our focus on medical education in some form or another -- this is an opportunity that is extremely exciting to them that's being offered right here at home and in our own state of Idaho. So, it's a win-win for everyone and excited to see it move forward.

Sherwood: I am, too. Thank you so much, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council. Thank you.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Chatterton: Madam Mayor, I think Brenda and I both neglected to mention -- Council is aware of this -- that ICOM's intent is to use our local match to fund scholarships. So, this would be the first instance of a local match actually being given back effectively to the community in the form of the scholarships. So, it's really -- really remarkable I think we can feel even better about -- about reserving these funds for this use because of, you know, that good impact.

De Weerd: Well -- and with the focus of the city and -- on our youth and their future, I think it's very appropriate. So, thank you.

**B. Community Development: Discuss Potential Topics And Prepare For Joint Meeting With The Ada County Board Of County Commissioners**

De Weerd: Okay. Now that we have had all this feel good good news, I will turn this over the Caleb. I'm just kidding. Item 10-B is through community development and to have a discussion about our upcoming meeting with the Ada County Commissioners and the letter that was approved last week that has been sent out and it's been confirmed the meeting date and time. So, Caleb.

Hood: No, thank you, Madam Mayor. Your opening comment was spot on. If this topic weren't bland enough I made the PowerPoint black and white tonight, so please bear with me as we go through this. But we are -- we do just want to make sure the talking points are in order, that you at least know where everybody is at as you go and engage with the Board of County Commissioners on April 6th at 2:00 p.m. at the courthouse. I think I verified with everybody last time you had that on your calendars, but that's kind of the idea with this is to prep and make sure that -- that the agenda is set accordingly and, then, to go through any -- any items that we need to talk about internally before we air that with the board on the 6th. So, I just wanted to take a second, though, to just kind of orient you just to the bigger picture of -- of how we can do this with -- or together with the board. We talked last time about, you know, once we sent that letter they had 30 days to respond and as the Mayor just mentioned, they have confirmed that meeting with us. But in Title 67-6526 of Idaho Code it talks about negotiation of areas of city impact and so, really, a city within a county and the county can -- toward the bottom of the slide, go through and by ordinance create the way that you want to plan and what's effective within a city's area of impact and I highlighted the third on there, because mutually agree upon plans and ordinances adopted under this chapter. So, it's whatever you all agree to with the county we can implement within our area of impact. We can say county rules apply, we can say city rules apply or whatever we mutually agree with to implement. So, that's kind of the summary of that section of Idaho Code. Just one more section and this really applies to a subsection of one of the topics we will talk about, but annexation by cities and I'm not going to read this entire slide against a black and white and it's state code, it's not that exciting. But the point here is orderly development, cost effective availability of municipal services and equitably allocate the cost. So, those are some of the key points in here why annexation makes sense and, again, that's really only going to apply to a small portion that we are going to talk about today. I don't have a long PowerPoint presentation, but this is the meaty slide, if you will. So, again, Title 9, Chapter 4 of Ada County code contains our section of the area of city impact agreement. So, what we would request -- what I'm asking you to request of them -- what our letter states is that all proposals, not just subdivisions and rezones, on property that's eligible for annexation -- so, contiguous to city limits -- apply for annexation and not be processed through Ada County. So, I have got a couple of slides here that show some of those

examples over the past year of where some of those projects are and just kind of bring me to home of what this is talking about. But again -- and this is sort of in a hierarchy of my request for you all. This one is one that I think makes a lot of sense that we talked about a little bit a couple weeks ago, but if it's eligible for annexation, let the city process it. That's kind of the long and short of it. Have them come to the city and request annexation if it's within our area of impact and eligible. That one's kind of low hanging fruit I think from my perspective in the feedback I have gotten from the county thus far. I will just clarify that most -- most property owners that are eligible for annexation do want to come into the city and develop, because we do have sewer and water and they can develop to a high level. They can get more of a return on their property. They can do more density, they can build those bigger buildings, so there is an incentive for most property owners -- for most types of development to annex in the city and not go through the county processes, because they are pretty limited. However, there are a few and I will just list a few. Contractor's yard, cell towers, and outdoor storage yards are ones that it's the exact opposite. It's easier for them to get approval in the county than it is the city and so they are doing that through the county and not the city. So -- and those are the ones that cause us the biggest headache as time goes on. So, one of the exceptions to that request -- and this isn't fully vetted, but if somebody wants to do a single family addition, a home occupation to run a daycare or a home business or other -- and I guess that's kind of -- you know, wouldn't make all of those properties request annexation. So, if you just -- if you just want to do an addition to your home or run a daycare, I could see you running an exception through the code and I will probably also just point out -- I didn't want to be too presumptuous with you all, with the board, with Ada County staff. We haven't gone to the extent of doing underline and strike through of what the code would look like. We want to make sure at a high level that broadly we are on the same page, then, we will go and write the code and run that back through and say, okay, here are these proposed exemptions, daycare, single family additions or whatever. So, this is just a sampling. But, again, I didn't want to spend the time and the effort to actually draft all of this code and you say, no, we don't want to do that. So -- so, that's one -- that's one of the three bullets here. Are there any questions about that? Does everyone kind of understand what -- what that request is? Again, you're eligible for annexation. The county doesn't process it. The county sends them. They don't take in an application, they require an application to send to the city. Okay. The second request would be for those properties that aren't eligible for annexation. So, bullet one does not apply here. What we would request is that the county amend Title 8 to include some of our or similar urban level improvements for county subdivisions and commercial developments. So, again, this -- the sub bullet here is not fully vetted, I'm not endorsing all of these, these are just things that have been thrown out there as potential to include in the code and if you have the feedback now and you want me to take it off the list now, because you're like that seems a bit much to require a county subdivision to put in -- I'm just going to pick one. Public streets. I will take it off the list. The list. So, if there is any of these. But this is our -- our -- it's a growing list, but the short list of

things that we think potentially could go in Ada County code and so they would require through their review and approval on our behalf for when the city limits do get there retrofitting of these county subdivisions and commercial projects isn't so much. They are set up for being and looking and feeling like the city when the city limits get there. So, I will just read it real quick. Landscape buffers along arterials, pathways or easements, so that we can put the pathway in, so at least the land. Open space. Requirements for tree mitigation. So, right now any trees that are removed from the site we require you to reconstruct or replant a similar caliper inch on this site or in a public park. Sewer or water infrastructure. Dry line sewer or water infrastructure or easement, so that those can be put in in the future. Streetlight infrastructure. Not saying hang the poles, but maybe the conduit, maybe even the bases for them, so you don't have to rip up the street to run conduit and things like that. Public streets and not private streets with stubs to adjacent properties as appropriate. And, then, here are the prohibitions. So, prohibiting billboard signs, barbed wire and electric fencing. And, again, to me I could see that even still in cases being okay. You got a five or ten acre lot, you're on the outskirts, maybe you're running horses or whatever you want, have barbed wire. So, again, I'm not -- I'm not advocating necessarily for that list, that's just a list of things that I have heard from folks. I think most of those make some sense to a certain degree. So, I will pause there with just kind of that -- that's what we would look for the county to implement, essentially, on our behalf and you could add to that list, too, I guess, too, if you had something else, but that's kind of the intent behind this bullet.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Madam Mayor, a question. So, if -- in that last one where you mentioned the billboards, if that was something that they implemented would that, then, only affect people that are applying for a billboard within an annexable property -- an existing -- it wouldn't affect anybody that's existing as they are?

Hood: Correct. Madam Mayor, Councilman Palmer, it would be for new proposed billboard signs. It would make any non -- it would make them nonconforming today, but -- any existing ones, but it wouldn't require them to tear them down or anything, you just -- any new ones in our area of impact would be prohibited.

Palmer: Okay. Thanks.

Hood: And that would go for everything on the list, quite frankly.

De Weerd: Any other comments? And I think Caleb has really reached out to the other departments to kind of tap into historical problems and those things that we have had issues with to anticipate. As well, a lot of this is in agreement with

the city of Boise that they help enforce many of their city standards in their agreement and we just don't have that yet in ours.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Does tiling waterways fit as -- into the conversation at least? One of the items that might be worth discussing?

Hood: It's -- it's -- Madam Mayor, Councilman Borton, I mean it's certainly something we could add to the list. I don't know what the county's policy is on that right now, so I could see if they -- I don't know if they require that now or not. But certainly if it's something you think that they should require, I mean we could add it to the list and talk about it with them.

Borton: Well, it seems -- Madam Mayor? It seems to fit to capture the same theme of insuring certain components of city-type development or apply to these county applications to preserve things such as that.

Hood: Is everyone comfortable with the other things on the list? At least having the dialogue with them about those items on the list -- and as the Mayor -- I didn't pause long enough to get everyone's head nod, but as the Mayor pointed out, just things like the pathway system -- I mean that's critical. If you get a county project in the middle of a section and we don't get the easement or the pathway in, we are proposing to have that -- now the city has got dead ends on both sides and the likelihood of us ever getting through there is -- is pretty slim. So, that's just one example on pathways of why it makes sense to -- to at least get an easement, if that has them -- because that's going to be a pathway to nowhere initially, but you're going to have a pathway to nowhere on both sides if we don't get it through there, too. So, I don't know exactly what that looks like with code. But if everyone's at least good -- some comfort level with having these, plus tiling waterways on the 6th we will move forward.

De Weerd: We have pathways to nowhere all over the place.

Hood: And we want to try and avoid them. And, quite frankly, Madam Mayor, some of those are because there is county blocks.

De Weerd: Uh-huh.

Hood: There is county projects that have been not yet developed that don't allow us to connect the pathway network. So, were trying to avoid that in the future. And, then, the second sub bullet on this slide here, as -- again, as the Mayor pointed out, we have talked with Fire, at least at a director's meeting -- a couple of them I think it's been discussed at and this even goes to the earlier action item

we had tonight with the request for hooking up to services, there is a policy on commercial development in our area of city impact, but not contiguous. That way you aren't getting these types of requests. Let's come up with a policy with the county saying, listen, if they are not eligible, they are not eligible and we -- you know, we aren't going to hook them up. If you want. I'm not saying we have to, but develop some policy on that topic. Same with fire protection. I know this is something -- Mr. Palmer's here, which is good. I mean he worked with Ada County through -- sorry. And Fire is here. It's not that it's not good that you're here as well. Yeah.

De Weerd: Chief Palmer.

Hood: Right. Perry Palmer is here, yes. Chief Palmer is here and he works with Ada County reviewing development applications in the county to make sure there is some level or review, because it's us responding -- us, fire, responding to enclave properties or to commercial projects that don't have fire flow and there is not hydrants yet, but there is a commercial project that was approved in the county with -- I will use my term -- marginal fire flow availability. So, having a phasing of those projects -- the first phase they could just meet fire flows, but they have a master plan where they are going to add, you know, thousands of more square footage when city services are available. Well, that's kind of cart before the horse. The city should be approving those master site plans, not the county, and then we implement their plan, it should be reviewed by you all, because we are the ones that are going to inherit that project and that land over time. And, then, paving a parking lot, again, things like we have talked about tonight or et cetera. Again, those types of things for county -- for things that don't have commercial allowances in our area of city but similar to the point up above, there should be some investment in the property that doesn't make it stick out like a sore thumb as the city limits approach. I guess that's my editorial on that topic. But potentially developing a policy with them on what level of commercial development is appropriate in our area of city impact, but not yet -- doesn't yet have those urban level services. So, a sub bullet, but under the same main heading.

Stewart: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Yes, Warren.

Stewart: I want to just kind of take an opportunity to chime in a little bit from the Public Works perspective. Tom isn't here to talk about this and asked that I kind of mention this to you. The water and sewer issue has been an issue for us in the past. We have had a couple of instances in the county where we have had county developments, which have come in which actually those particular properties were on the alignment for major trunk sewers that would serve properties down the road and we went in and asked for -- the one or two particular cases that I can think of we asked for easements. We didn't even ask

them to put the infrastructure in, we just simply asked for the easements, so that that corridor could be preserved, so that we could eventually extend sewer through there and onto properties beyond and we were denied that through the county and that creates problems for us. I mean, obviously, not only does it make it difficult for us to eventually serve that particular property, but it could actually put a roadblock in place for properties that are beyond them. You know, Meridian Heights is a great example, sort of a county development that did its thing years ago, came back and cost the city a lot of time, effort, money, investment and whatnot in order to help resolve that in the long run and we actually have another situation here where we have done the south Meridian annexation project, which is primarily the city has led that to basically overcome impediments that had been caused by county development. So, this is from an infrastructure standpoint a really important issue for us and Public Works, because we believe that it certainly has impacted us in the past. It certainly has caused the city to invest significant time and money and we are still trying to resolve some of those issues today and we need to make sure that we work better in the future, so that we can avoid that.

De Weerd: And, Warren, I think it's fair to say it wastes time and money on both sides, because when the county sub comes in they are required to put in dry infrastructure that is our best guess and what if the best guess is not the best guess? That is -- is not able to utilize it and they have to -- to put in different infrastructure. That's a waste of money. On the private side you're requiring extra expense that is not a for certain. So, I think that building from the inside out has proven numerous times to be the -- the right approach. Any questions from Council?

Hood: Madam Mayor, I just have a couple more slides and, then, we can -- you're probably prepped enough, but I just kind of -- I'm going to jump back to impact fees here in just a second. I do want to do a little bit follow up on what Warren said and going back to the director's meeting and from the police department, their main concern with development in the county is consistency and code enforcement and that's kind of what Warren is saying with consistency in code, enforce your code. Don't allow variances. If we are asking for an easement, we need the easement. If your code requires that in our area of impact we get either dry line or the easement to put in future sewer lines, please don't allow that variance, because now we may not even be able to design around that. You may just have to shut off a whole shed or we have to go -- or a lift station and costs us hundreds of thousands of dollars, potentially, to -- to serve people downstream from that. So, from the police department standpoint, again, code enforcement and consistency was their biggest issue. I don't know how we really wrap that into this dialogue, but maybe there is a follow-up meeting with the county on that -- on that topic. I just want to kind of bring you in on that as well. So -- and Warren kind of stole a little bit of my thunder. I want to run through a couple of sites and if you look at that third bullet, maybe we will start there, because that's where he went. Overland, Ten Mile, Victory, Meridian and

Linder-Victory, this is something at those director's meetings -- at least the one that I went to, was talked about. It's some examples. Gives some real life examples of what the issues are and so Warren mentioned Meridian Heights and Kentucky Ridge. These were county subdivisions and the city limits have been growing this way and not to rehash, you know, recent history, but, you know, we are currently working to bring that sewer line by this subdivision, because there wasn't a to and through policy and this developer didn't have to bring the sewer line down, so we are working on extending sewer so we can get orderly growth and development in this portion of south Meridian. I know this may hit close to home for a certain -- some certain people on the Council, but I -- I just want to call out, you know, a couple of county subdivisions in this area. It's a similar situation where city limits are here and you have older county subdivisions, but there is no infrastructure here and the likelihood of these developing and extending that infrastructure to the larger lot subdivisions that want to extend is not very feasible. I mean it's cost prohibitive for a lot of developers. So, the city has to step up, essentially, and -- well, has worked to deal with the property owners to step up and extend that sewer if someone doesn't step up and extend that. But you also look -- and, again, I know there has been conversations on this, but if you look at the infrastructure on these county subdivisions, there is no sidewalk along the arterials, there is no sidewalks internally, you don't have connectivity. You have got a middle school that's going in right across the street and yet there aren't -- there isn't that -- those urban level services. And, again, I know this is an older subdivision, but we see this same type of development occurring now and so we are going to see this in five and ten years just a mile or section down the road, because you do get these county subdivisions with five acre lots that are developing and don't have some or all of that infrastructure we just talked about the county requiring in Title 9. I just want to bring a couple of other -- zoom into a couple of other locations. I want to show you a couple of commercial -- and you're all probably aware of these, but I think it helps to -- to see them again, especially with an aerial view. So, you have a county approved project here and --

De Weerd: A very old one.

Hood: -- city one -- it's old -- it's older. But just to show that the level of development in the county versus the city and the landscape buffers that are required and the sidewalks that are required and the lack thereof. So, if you look at all four corners, the three corners that are developed in the city pretty consistent. You have commercial development -- yes, it didn't just get approved yesterday, it's been there. But there is new commercial development approved. All of -- so, just go to the residential side -- and, again, an older subdivision, I don't know, '70s, '80s, maybe even older than that, but they all have direct lot access to Locust Grove Roadway. You know, there are 30,000 cars a day and the county doesn't have the access restrictions to arterial roadways. They are approving driveways right now at Eagle Road south of town. They don't have the same policies we do and it's not a problem now, but it's going to be a problem

into the future. So, just working with them on access, having an access policy on allowing a private driveway. So, again, you know, you look at nice landscape buffers and sidewalks, you get a battery company that went through the county and they don't have landscape buffers, they don't have a sidewalk, they have an advertisement vehicle out front. Just the difference between development in the county and development in the city. We just have different standards. So, I plan on just showing a few of those during the joint meeting. Again, that was something that was brought up at the director's meeting. I don't know what your all thoughts are on that, but just to kind of -- I have got a little bit more recent one if you want, because that's -- I think they are fair still and valid, but -- but those projects are a little bit older -- just real quick. Another one. Victory Road. So, this is not too far from where we were just at, but Mesa -- this subdivision here kind of paints a pretty good picture I think. Five acre lots in the county. Long cul-de-sac that dead ends. If you look at the city approved subdivision, there is a stub to this property, but there is no connectivity to any of the adjacent subdivisions in -- that are developed in the city and we are left with a gap in the sidewalk that would make the -- basically, you know, three quarters of a mile on the north side have complete sidewalk and no landscape buffer. So, again, this one really paints a good picture of, you know, the development between the county and the city and I'm not saying all development in the county should have urban level streets and streetlights and sidewalks and all that, but -- but to retrofit a lot of these subdivisions it's very, very difficult, especially when these are private lanes. Those are so difficult to convert to a public street in the future and, then, you're left with this big -- a long run, there is no way to get across that thing and you really are forcing folks on the arterials and it makes -- forget safety, but congestion and all of those different reasons to have some of those requirements for --

De Weerd: Caleb, I think another example is -- and it's King something. It's down in south Meridian on -- off of Eagle Road across from Tuscany.

Hood: Kingsbridge.

De Weerd: Yeah. Kingsbridge. When it wrapped around that county sub --

Hood: Yeah.

De Weerd: -- and the -- the neighbors were concerned that, you know, they -- they had no sidewalks, they knew kids would be walking through their subdivision, they had the narrow roads, they had borrow pits for drainage, and safety was a huge concern of the neighbors in that county sub and having school age kids walking through it. It's just different standards that if you anticipate the city growing around it, you want some compatibility in at least looking to the public safety piece to that.

Hood: Yeah. That's a good point. I can bring that one up. And it's really the private lanes -- at least in this case, if memory serves, I think that -- that developer was required to construct off-site sidewalk on --

De Weerd: He did.

Hood: -- a portion of Dartmore to get out to Eagle Road to address that concern.

De Weerd: Uh-huh.

Hood: But you are retrofitting it. At least it's a public roadway with the right of way. That's a private lane. You have to go to a hundred percent of those folks that have an interest in a private lane and get them all to consent? It doesn't happen.

De Weerd: Well -- and that would be a perfect example, though, to the county in you had a developer that had to do off-site improvements because of the concerns of the neighbors and that was at extra expense and certainly wasn't something that had to happen, but he knew to be a good neighbor it had to happen.

Hood: So, I'm not going to beat this dead horse. I think I talked about all these things here in retrofitting safe routes and connectivity. I just want to take just a minute and run through the applications that we saw in 2015. I do have a handout if the clerk -- and I'm not going to go through all of these, but there were -- and this doesn't include property boundary adjustments, records of survey, most variances, staff level approvals, but these are, quote, unquote, true development applications. Somebody's proposing to build something or change a land use on a property. So, I just wanted to -- we had 13 -- 14 of them last year. So, a little over one a month. It doesn't seem that much, but this is just 12 months worth of applications. So, you know, it's -- and not all of them are egregious, some of them are -- are really no issues. In fact, the first one I have on the screen was a contractor's yard. They did have a variance request for their setbacks, their shop to be located closer to a hundred -- closer than a hundred feet and, quite honestly, a contractor's yard in this situation where it's next to county properties, it will probably redevelop with a higher and better use. I mean it is sort of an interim use as a contractor's yard. Some day when there is an interchange here this will redevelop and it will be something different. So, I don't really have a concern with a contractor's yard in that -- in that situation. There was a digital billboard sign proposed on -- at 1035 East Fairview as you can see it's an enclave property. It's just out of our downtown. Why is the county approving digital billboard signs on Fairview just outside of our downtown. So, again, that just highlights one of the -- the earlier points of why we want to renegotiate. Five Mile and Victory, outdoor storage -- self storage and gravel pit. You all probably got phone calls from some of the neighbors out here when it was proposed on this property. It was appealed to the Board of County

Commissioners. They ended up denying it. But, again, having an outdoor storage facility -- it was mostly the gravel pit I think that the neighbors were concerned with, but they also had some commercial development. So, the level of commercial development and the neighborhood concerns were our concerns. Amity and McDermott -- or near McDermott, this was a three lot residential subdivision. It, in an of itself, it's pretty far out there. I mean, geez, this is way out, so, you know, not a whole lot of concern with it, other than it had a private lane and, again, this isn't going to be my problem, but -- and for future generations, private lanes out there, you aren't going to be able to get through this section, you're going to have to go around. So, you're not going to have neighborhoods on this side of McDermott and this side of Black Cat being able to get there, you're going to have to go out to Amity or Lake Hazel to get there. So, that's the main concern there is a private road at that project. 5151 South Meridian Road. This was a 66,000 -- again, self storage facility. At that point in time it was an enclave like it shows now, the city limits reflect the south Meridian annexation. But, again, there wasn't -- 66,000 square feet of outdoor storage proposed not too terribly far from existing city limits that cause -- and I know Perry -- Mr. Palmer -- Chief Palmer, excuse me, was a part of that review at the county and fire flows, you know, they were working through those things, but, again, why have these interim conditions, just wait for our services. We have planned services for water infrastructure there in this fiscal year. The next one, number five on your list, Nickel Creek Place, a graphics arts product business out of a home, no real issues. Home occupation. Home business. That seems -- that's no issues from my standpoint anyway with those. The next one off of McDermott Road, outdoor self storage facility. Again, self storage, self storage, self storage. Outdoor. No pavement. You know, barbed wire fencing. City limits aren't that far. We have projects here and another one that -- that will probably be before you before too long that backs right up to these -- these properties. It is a contractor's yard, though. So, again, I see those as redeveloping. It's when they are adjacent to city limits like this one is, a contractor's yard next to city limits and their variance is to our constituents, basically, you know, residents in Meridian, with a county contractor's yard, they should be applying to the City of Meridian if they are eligible for annexation. Next one was a -- the Fairview cemetery. Again, no -- no issues with the expansion of the cemetery from my perspective. Accessory structure. No real issues with that one either, again, with its location and an accessory structure. Group daycare off of Tasa. Again, the group daycare, home occupation type of a thing, that seems to be in line with our future vision. Again, landscape contractor's yard. Again, we -- so, it's kind of the same types of things, but the variance to the setback closer to residential. Thirty-eight thousand six hundred five square foot research and development facility. Again, we have got proposed commercial projects, not too far from city limits. In fact, we heard from several of these neighbors here asking the city to oppose this project in the county. The county was looking at approving a master site plan on a ten acre research park. I will just leave it at that. And, then, the last one to highlight was a cell tower and we are seeing more and more of these as well. Again, this is an enclave. Totally surrounded by city limits next

to a high school. Not that we wouldn't approve a cell tower. A cell tower may work there. But it's the level of improvement of the site associated with developing that cell tower. Are they paving -- are they paving their access in and making sure that dust isn't being brought in. Are they putting in their landscape buffers. Is the sidewalk being connected? Those types of things that urban level developers are required to do versus county level development. So, those are just -- that's just a sampling of this past year and the applications that we saw. Not all -- not all development applications in the county are bad or cause me pause, but 50 percent, something like that, roughly, do or are of some level of concern, so just to, again, kind of bring the point home. So, finally, impact fees. I didn't hear anything back from fire or police about potential for the county to protect -- collect impact fees on our behalf. Steve Siddoway did provide some comments on this and other things, but, again, we talked about this last time, Boise City and Ada County have an agreement, it's in that Boise city's area of city impact agreement with -- with Ada County to collect parks impact fees. The main justification for that is the residents that are being approved in the county are parks patrons and create that demand, so why shouldn't they be paying a proportionate share of park impact fees. So, that's one where I'm not the subject matter expert on impact fees. Again, it's something we asked for in our letter. Again, as far as the hierarchy goes, the thing that -- that I would request you -- you discuss with them it's the first two bullets and not that we can't talk about impact fees, but I don't know how would be we start to go to implement something like that. But I just bring it up, because it is -- it is possible. And I don't know if anyone else wants to speak on that -- on that topic about impact fees, but with that I hope everyone is comfortable for the 6th. I don't know how long -- I haven't timed myself, but I won't do that long of a presentation on the 6th. I will definitely make it shorter, but -- but it will be in the same vein, so --

De Weerd: Caleb, I think it was very helpful and I appreciate the examples and kind of walking through it and giving specific instances where it's caused challenges.

Hood: I will work on some more examples as well.

De Weerd: Okay.

Hood: Maybe instead of the ones I had here. Everyone's good, then? Thank you.

De Weerd: Uh-huh. Thank you. Oh. There is -- there is another private lane that if -- if you can use that as an example -- was it Wingsgate? What --

Hood: Wingsgate. Yeah.

De Weerd: Wingsgate. Oh, my gosh. I'm so glad that that area is -- is built out.

Hood: Not quite. But we are getting there. And that may be a -- I can look at using that one.

Bird: Wingate is off of Ustick.

Hood: Yes. Yes.

Bird: Between --

De Weerd: It was over by --

Hood: Do you know where that's at, Keith?

Watts: Yeah.

Hood: Yeah. We can -- that is a good example, Madam Mayor. So, I can -- here is Wingate. And it actually used to go through here and, yes, we got through the -- the Sharps. If you remember Dale and Helen Sharp's property that --

De Weerd: Absolutely.

Hood: -- you know, used to have --

De Weerd: I have scars.

Hood: -- the five acres here. But that is -- there are still some scars, actually, from the remnant of what was Wingate and, you know, these would be double fronted lots. So, that's maybe a good example, too, to bring up to that to say --

De Weerd: Well -- and I think there is one over by Redfeather as well that is now a major connection to a large subdivision through a county sub. Has no sidewalk. It's a very narrow street. There is no lighting. It's -- it's not a safe connection, but a lot of people use it and they drive very quickly through there. So, we have, unfortunately --

Hood: There are examples that --

**C. Community Development: Review List Of Priority Roadway, Intersection And Community Programs Projects For 2016**

De Weerd: Uh-huh. But thank you. Okay. So, if there is nothing further, Council, on that one, we will move to Item 10-C. You received a road priority list last week and I will tell you I only got halfway through it myself. That was a lot of great detail and appreciate that.

Hood: Madam Mayor, if I can, just the -- I sent you all an e-mail, but this is the exhibit I didn't show you last time. I have talked to two Council members, so I will just share with you that feedback that I have gotten from them. Mr. Cavener was not able to be here. He wanted to talk a little bit about the community programs projects and Rail with trail. I don't know if it's appropriate now, but there was a discussion at the transportation commission about the purpose of these lists and this list is primarily used again for ACHD, so they can know what our priority projects are. There was some discussion about, well, why is Rail with Trail so high on our list to ACHD. They are not going to really do anything. That's -- that's outside their right of way, aside from crossings, and I told the commission -- I said it's not just an ACHD list, this is a comprehensive list that I share with whoever asks to say what are your -- what are your priority projects for pathway, sidewalks, roadways, intersections. So, this isn't just an ACHD list. Yes, that's primarily what we use it for, but you will see projects on Chinden, you know, that are listed there and that's a partnership with ITD. But they are still on our list, even though ITD is going to be the lead agency in making those intersections happen. So, that was the feedback I got from -- at least a question or future dialogue is should we add an asterisk next to projects like that that may be -- the File Mile Creek pathway extension that goes back Badley to Fairview, ACHD is probably not going to play a role in that, why -- you know, should it be so high on the list.

De Weerd: Well -- and, Caleb, I would maintain that the Rail with Trail -- ACHD has told us that they are on board, they see it as a priority, and they also see it as a potential alternative to widening Fairview where the small business owners up and down that corridor express concern. They see the Rail with Trail as a potential alternative. Improving that would eliminate the need to expand Fairview. So, I guess I would say the Rail with Trail becomes even more important.

Hood: And I don't want to put words in anyone's mouth, that wasn't Mr. Cavener. I don't think that was his point. Just to have the dialogue about should there be some footnote or something there about this project maybe not being so much for them to program, because our expectation isn't for them to necessarily fund it a hundred percent.

De Weerd: Is it my expectation.

Hood: Okay. Well, maybe it is. Okay. And, then, the other -- I just had a brief e-mail back and forth with Councilman Borton -- again, not to put words in his mouth, but he's actually here. I think he's generally okay with the priorities as shown on this exhibit here, but some of the dialogue, as you may recall from two weeks ago, was about -- and, Madam Mayor, you weren't here -- was about Fairview at seven lanes and ACHD has Fairview in their CIP through Meridian Road planned for widening to seven lanes and one of our higher priority projects

is the Locust Grove-Fairview intersection. It's number six. So, it's a top ten project and they would blow out to a nine by seven. So, nine lanes -- nine lanes on east and the west leg and seven lanes on the Locust Grove leg to accommodate a future seven lane wide Fairview. And I just brought it up that in the past it's been a topic of discussion, I said I don't recall there ever being -- I know there is not a resolution. I don't remember there ever being a vote or even consensus from the previous councils on, yeah, we think Fairview should be seven or, you know, it's okay being seven to Locust Grove or to Meridian, but, boy, west of Meridian Road does it really need to be seven, maybe five is appropriate. So, I think maybe -- against that's what we are -- maybe there is some of that dialogue tonight for potentially including in the letter that you all have in your packet. But, other than that, I think the priorities are what they are and if you're okay with the list and the letter, I will -- if you will authorize, I will get the Mayor's signature and get it off by -- April 1st is the deadline to ACHD, so that's the update I have.

De Weerd: Appropriate.

Hood: Yeah.

De Weerd: Any comments from Council?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: It doesn't necessarily need to be addressed in the letter, but to follow up on Caleb's comments, the question that I had with regards to Cherry Lane. It didn't make initial sense that the -- the ultimate build out of Cherry Lane heading west from that Locust Grove interchange would be seven lanes, as opposed to five. Understanding it's seven from Eagle to Locust Grove and, then, at least my initial thought was five heading west from there and so the question is whether that's really been addressed by the Council before taking a position or have we even discussed it at some point, presuming we need to, and give some consistent direction -- not necessarily in this letter, but whether it's a unified message to have that be seven to and through or if five is more appropriate as you enter our downtown Main Street, Meridian Road.

De Weerd: I think that the city has expressed concern of the seven lanes and asked them to look at other opportunities. Again, I would point out the -- the rail corridor is -- is one of those. Hasn't been -- I mean certainly in the initial discussion, but the Fairview corridor has been a point of discussion and potential contention of what was being proposed.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Fairview has been discussed quite a bit and I'm quite shocked that they come -- that they come out with the seven lanes at all, because it is -- it is the greatest way to shut down business -- existing businesses that are already there. And we have -- we have had -- we had a committee that we have met -- oh, I would say five, six years ago, two from Boise, two from Meridian, and -- and had, basically, said that five lanes and all of a sudden you have got seven and it's something that I think -- I think if they look at going over five lanes on Fairview from Orchard to the county line at McDermott, I think they are going to kill one heck of a lot of establish businesses that have been there a heck of a lot longer than Fairview has been paved. So, I -- I just -- I think they are -- I'd sooner see them worry more about getting Ustick five lanes all the way through, because Ustick is -- is the one road -- east and west that goes from the river to Boise. From the Snake River to Boise.

Hood: And, Madam Mayor, Mr. Bird, just on that point, I will just point out that Ustick is a priority corridor and they are working on it. So, it's not an either/or. They are doing Ustick, but they are also planning to do Fairview. So, for them it's both. It's not an either/or, so -- but if you look on the spreadsheets, I mean Ustick -- the next few miles of Ustick will actually be under construction later this year.

Bird: I know that.

De Weerd: I guess -- in response to your earlier comment, I do think it's something that this Council needs a joint meeting with Ada County Highway District to discuss the Fairview corridor and what some of the alternatives that are being considered in lieu of a seven lane facility.

Hood: So, Madam Mayor, can I ask you -- can we go another step first before that joint meeting? What I would -- I'm working on the capital improvement citizen advisory group at ACHD and they are working on their next round similar to our impact ordinance, they do it every four or five years they have their group of projects. Gary Inselman -- I'd like him to come to just address you and kind of explain from the staff perspective more technical perspective on why they are at seven and, then, we can -- similar to our discussion with the board, I want you to be comfortable before we just pound our fist and say, you know, not seven. To get their perspective at least from a staff level about why they are planning on seven lanes now, if you're okay with that, before we go into the joint meeting. Is it okay if I invite Gary in the next month or so to come and -- or do you want to jump to the joint meeting, that's fine.

De Weerd: I'd rather pound my fist if I have to.

Hood: I didn't mean to assume that you would, but just before you have your mind made up, maybe listen to why the transportation authority thinks that seven

lanes is warranted. If you have already heard it and you don't want to do that, that's fine, too. I just thought I would offer that.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Okay. Mr. Bird.

Bird: Caleb, you know, we had a meeting -- a joint meeting down there discussing it a couple three years ago and we had enough of those businesses along there that -- that got up and testified. I understand the staff really don't have to answer to the public, but I will guarantee you the elected officials do.

Hood: And that's fine, we don't have to -- I just wanted to make sure you're comfortable --

De Weerd: But our staff does. I mean you guys do really well.

Bird: I was talking about ACHD.

De Weerd: I think if Gary if the first appropriate step I can save my fist pounding for later.

Hood: You could practice on him.

De Weerd: I can. And he's fun to practice on.

Hood: All right. I will work on that. Thank you. Good with the priorities on the list then? I will put it on letterhead and get the Mayor to sign it then.

De Weerd: Yes.

Hood: Thank you.

#### **D. Finance Department: Update to Purchasing Policy Discussion**

De Weerd: Okay. Item 10-D. Keith, before you get started I just want to thank you. This was really comprehensive and all the various forms that you presented the information was helpful. I know that the departments have expressed sincere appreciation for the clean up, making the process easier to understand and easier to use and I will turn it over with my praise.

Watts: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Council Members. I have e-mailed the draft policy to each of you and provided another hard copy just in case you didn't have it up in front of you and, really, I'm just here tonight to ask for feedback, comments, and answer any questions that you may have and to look for

direction. If you wish I can go through the -- the major changes that I pointed in my cover letter that I sent to you folks earlier last week I believe, if that's where you would like to start. I will state that I have -- I had -- Councilman Borton has given me feedback with no recommended changes and I was able to meet with Councilman Cavener last night and to answer any questions he had and review it as well and he is comfortable with it as it sits. I would like to go through and tell you the process of -- that we went through to draft this. I made all the changes that I thought were appropriate, reorganized it, sent it through the Finance Department and had the key players in the Finance Department review it and provide feedback. Then I provided it to the Mayor and my liaison Councilman Borton for their review and comment. After that passed that out to the department directors and I have had either e-mail or conversations with each of the department directors and had no significant comments or changes. Aside from just the department directors I also had the entire Legal Department review it as well and, then, sent to you, the Council members, for their review as well, so --

De Weerd: Council, any questions, comments for Keith at this time?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Yes, Mr. Borton.

Borton: Just to tag with your comments, I appreciate Keith's efforts to get all of this input on the front end from so many different interested stakeholders. It's led to what I think is a great product, great end result.

Watts: Thank you. I guess I would point out -- one more item I'd like to point out, too, is I had one add from the McGladrey Report. There was one small section where I had that conflicting three words with one of the HR policies and we have completely removed that section from the purchasing policy. Now we just refer to the HR policy to avoid any conflicts and that was my one take away from the McGladrey as far as the policy was concerned.

De Weerd: Thank you, Keith. Anything further from Council? So --

Watts: And direct that would be -- bring it back on the -- would you like it on the 5th or next -- or would you wait until the -- the second week, the 12th? The workshop?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: My preference would be on the workshop, the 12th. Let's bring it back. That will give everybody time to look it over really, really good.

Watts: Yeah. And, then, we will --

Bird: I think -- I think you did a great job on it, Keith.

Watts: Thank you, sir.

Bird: You addressed some of my concerns.

Watts: Thank you.

### **E. Public Works: Design Standards Update**

De Weerd: Thank you, Keith. Okay. And 10-E is under Public Works to have an update on our design standards. Design standards? This is all underground. Who cares what it looks like.

Stewart: Well, some people do. Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, some of you heard me give some updates on the design standards a couple different times, but I think we are -- at least two of our Council Members this might be the first time that they have really heard a lot about it. I just wanted to give you an update on the process as to where we are at and I forgot something. I just wanted to hand you each a copy -- a draft copy of the design standards. I'm going to take you through briefly the process that we underwent to put this -- the standards together and where we are going to go from here. So, essentially, to just kind of recap a little bit for those who may not be familiar with it, the City of Meridian and the Public Works Department has a couple of -- one -- primarily one document right now that we utilize to help the development community and our contractors who are putting in infrastructure for the city and the specifications and there is two pieces to that. There is the ISPWC, which is the Idaho Standards for Public Works Construction that's produced by the state and, then, there is the city of Meridian supplemental specifications that go along with that. Those are primarily instructions or directions to contractors who are out building things in the field. It tells them how to build it. But the city has not had a central repository or location for all of the information that we require designers to have when they are designing plans and putting together specifications that they need to submit to the City of Meridian. So, a few years ago we realized that we sort of had this deficiency. What really kind of brought it to light was the fact that we put together our street lighting standards, which was the standard that was adopted in 2010 and we realized the value in that standard and thought, you know, we should probably create something similar with regards to sewer, water, reclaimed water and other things that the city has to deal with and put that in a document, so that we had a resource that was available to all of the -- essentially consulting community, consulting engineers who are putting these plans and specifications together, so they had one location where they could really get a hold of most of the information that they would need to put together a set of plans and specs that

they could submit to the city and hopefully by doing that it would help them so that they wouldn't have to go through as many iterations in the review and approval process. So, the design standards and specifications are slightly different. Specifications are instructions to the contractors. Design standards are instructions to the consulting engineers primarily or the development community. Again, just a reminder, we did have a street lighting standard that was adopted in 2010 and we are reviewing and updating that as a part of this process. They are complimentary documents. Okay. So, just to review some of the drivers behind this, we wanted to be able to document current practices. Much of what's in this document that you see before you is actually things that we have been doing and requiring for many years. They are not new, we just didn't have a place where somebody could look them all up and -- and review them all. So, a lot of what you have there is just actually putting all of the current practices in a document that makes it easier for people to use. There are some new things in there, especially when it comes to, for instance, reclaimed water. We didn't have a lot of information with regards to reclaimed water and so we took this as an opportunity to really sort of identify what we want and what we would expect with regards to reclaimed water when somebody is putting in reclaimed water facilities within the city. As I had mentioned, we also hope that this would streamline the review and approval process for plans. We wanted to improve our ability to communicate with the design community or with the development community. We feel that this does this. It helps put together all of the information in one location that they can use as a reference that should help them out and it also should help us when we have to update something, it gives us one location that we can update, similar to what we do with the specifications. Every year or two we gather together all of the things that have come to our attention over the past few months and we make an update, we do a public outreach and we bring that back to you guys for your approval. So, it's sort of formalizes the update process and makes sure that we are getting out and reaching out to the stakeholders to make sure that everything that we are doing is -- is communicated well to them. It also helps us to facilitate this opportunity for public outreach. It really drives us through a process that helps us to get out -- and I will talk a little bit about what we did with this and you will see that. It helps to drive a process that helps us to reach out in order to get with our stakeholders and get information from them. So, to sort of give you a little bit of a timeline just real quickly about what we have done so far. In the 2015 time frame -- or 2013 time frame, excuse me, is when we really started putting this information together. We went out, looked at other communities, not only -- not only here in the Treasure Valley, but elsewhere in the -- kind of Pacific northwest and we went and found what they had for design standards and we started looking and saying, well, what about what they have done should we bring to the City of Meridian. How should we organize it? It was kind of a benchmarking effort. In 2014 we developed our sort of first draft document and we started some internal review. We created some committees. We had a major committee that had members from each one -- or from various different departments and divisions within the city. They had subcommittees. Each one

of those subcommittees was responsible for two or three chapters within the document and we broke it up and really allowed them to dive into the meat of the -- of the document and get those particular chapters the way they needed to be. We developed in 2015 an outreach strategy working with our -- the Mayor's office and our -- our specialist up there and we also conducted a peer review. We went out and had a consulting firm review the documents for us and provide us with their comments. We did -- after we got the peer review back we did another internal review and made modifications and changes based on that review. We met with other folks in the City of Meridian to discuss outreach opportunity. We developed a presentation and, then, we started our presentation -- I'm not going to go through all of these bullets, I'm just going to kind of hit some of the highlights. So, in 9/8/15 where you start to see the dates, is kind of what I want to go through. So, early last fall we did a presentation to the BCA where we actually presented design standards to them and opened the comment period where we solicited and said we are going to have a comment period now for the next -- I think we had a little over two months that we left the comment period open and said could you, please, provide comment regarding the design standards. We also conducted an open house here at City Hall and we sent out an e-mail blast, as well as we put it on our -- on the internet -- the design standards were on the internet and we -- and we noticed everybody. It was on one of the little front page flags that -- basically so that when you opened up the website you saw it right there on the main page, if you wanted to comment on the new design standards you could click on that and it would take you into a spot where you could review the design standards and it would solicit comments. So, we did that on our website. We conducted an open house and after we conducted an open house we put together a series of focus groups. The focus groups consisted of two different -- two different groups. We, essentially, had a development group where we had -- and you will see their names and organizations listed here. We had representatives from the some of the more significant or major developers that do work here in the City of Meridian, as well as some of the engineering firms that are more prominent and do a lot of work here in the City of Meridian and we went through chapter by chapter. We met several different times, because it took us a while to get through the document, but we went through chapter by chapter with the -- with the development group and with the engineering group and got their comments and feedback on the document. Then we took all of that information, we made the modifications and changes to the document that we felt like we could and should and we created a question and response document to go along with it. So, we -- we listed every single comment that we received and how we responded to every single comment. After we put that together we sent it out for one more review to our peer group and we are doing an internal review again right now. We have, again, posted that document on our website, along with the question and response, so if somebody wants to know, you know, I commented on this, they can go down and find their comment and they can find what the response was from the city, how we addressed their comment. So, we went through a fairly extensive process to try and get feedback on the document. In total we received

105 comments. Primarily the vast majority of those comments came in through the focus groups. We did receive a few comments through the open house. We had about 20 attendees at the open house and we did receive a few comments there. We actually did not receive one comment through the internet, although I think a lot of people pulled their document from there and, then, came to the open house or other places to talk to us about it. Ninety-three of the comments that we received we favorably addressed and what I mean by that is we were actually able to address that comment in a way that actually was in their favor or we moved in their direction to make those corrections or make those changes. There were some -- some as you can see that we were not able to address or we weren't able to do exactly what they asked for and I wanted to list some of the reasons why we were not always able to respond positively. Some of those actually increased the risk or the liability to the city. It was shifting, essentially, from the development community to the city for the risk and we thought that's probably not fair to do. So, we didn't -- you know, essentially, accept or -- or make those changes if that was the case. Some of them actually increased risk to public health, which we weren't willing to do. Some of them actually were because there were conflicting views. In other words, we had certain entities that expressed that they wanted it this way and some that expressed, no, we like it that way and so we didn't have universal agreement on what they wanted. So, in those cases we tended to leave it as it was. Some of them were because they were, essentially, requirements that were from another document or another agency. They -- in most cases what we did is we actually removed those requirements from the design standards and just listed a reference to the other document. But we didn't actually -- it didn't actually appear that the -- the design standards were making that requirement. We were simply referencing the document. Some of the things that were -- were concerned were actually things that were to the UDC and so we were like, well, if you want to change the UDC that's a different process. We will remove it out of the design standards. It's not removing it as a requirement, but we won't have it here, we will just reference the UDC. And there were a few cases, although not many, where it actually would undermine the objective or the purpose of these -- of the standards. So, all in all we were able to address 88 percent of the questions or comments favorably, which I think was pretty good, actually, when you think about all the things that they commented on. We did our best to listen and to make the modifications and changes that they asked for whenever we could. Moving forward, we have -- as I mentioned, we have taken this document that you have, as well as the response document, we have put it on the internet and we have sent notifications back out to all of the subcommittees and asked them for review. We sent it out for a second peer review, available online for anybody to comment on. We have contacted all the focus group participants, the BCA, and all the open house participants and asked -- and told them that it was available and we would like final comment on the document and what our -- what we were hoping to do is be able to take this document and bring it back to you on the workshop in April and seek adoption of the document at that time. We have asked for the comments -- for everybody's comments to, essentially, be in by April 5th. It gives them two

weeks. That seems like a short time frame, but the reality is we have already had a very long comment period and I hope that we have received the vast majority of the comments that we are going to receive. So, I don't anticipate a significant amount of comments at this point. So, we are giving an additional two weeks worth of comment period for anybody to make final comments. We can make final modifications and, then, bring it back to you in that week before the 12th and, then, come back on the 12th and seek adoption of the -- the design standards. So, that's it in a nutshell. Sorry it took a little long, but I wanted to make sure everybody knew where -- where we had been with this.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Thank you, Warren. Yes, Mr. Bird.

Bird: Very nice, Warren. I appreciate this. I do have one question. In your focus group I see you got a lot of professionals and stuff like that, which is great, but why -- why don't we have a couple of utility contractors, the guys that actually put this stuff in the ground? You know, a lot of times we can design something and it looks good on paper or on our computer and we can draw it up nice, but it don't work out in the field and you and I both know that happens more than we would like it to. I would like to see -- when you -- and I like the way you -- the process you went through couldn't be beat. We should go through all these processes when we design something -- get a design review standard, but I would -- I would like your team to sit down and think about getting a couple of -- of the actual contractors or construction guys that do the actual physical putting it in the ground and making sure that they are on board, too.

Stewart: Madam Mayor, Councilman Bird, I totally agree. When we went to the BCA we actually announced at the BCA -- but we contacted the association that we would welcome -- if you wanted to be on one of the focus groups, let us know. And we also sent out a lot of the notifications for the open house were sent out to contractors and the message that we got back, honestly, was that the contractors were primarily more interested in changes made to the specifications, because that affects them more directly in the real world and that the design standards were really intended to help consultants prepare plans and although they were interested, they were more than willing to let others be a part of that focus group, as opposed to being on it. We do intend, as soon as we complete this process, to start the process to update the specifications and I expect we will get a lot more interest during that process from the contractor's community.

Bird: Great answer. No problem.

De Weerd: Any other questions, comments?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: One quick question. Warren, can you go to slide six? I think it's --

Stewart: You might have to remind me -- I can't read that one.

Borton: Yeah.

Stewart: Is that it?

Borton: Yeah. And I agree with Councilman Bird, this is a through process you went through to gather all this input. It's fantastic. It leads to a great result and a great product. On the -- the items -- the very few items that were not favorably addressed gave five good explanations as to why they wouldn't be. Of the 12, it looks like 12 comments, on providing that feedback of one of these five explanations as to why those 12 wouldn't be addressed, were any of those 12 resolved or is there still lingering disagreement from whoever made those comments that these five explanations that seemed reasonable don't address it, at least in their eyes?

Stewart: We haven't -- you know, we had some discussion as we were going through the focus group discussions themselves and in some cases, you know, we -- we, essentially, talked to them then and said, well, we will have to -- we will have to ponder that and look at it. We haven't gone back to them at this point and -- although we have, but it's just gone out -- and told them how we revised it. That document that I talked about, which is the response document, basically says here is the comment, here is how we addressed it or maybe why we couldn't address it. They will be getting that at the same time frame I think as some of that went out yesterday, some of it went out today, some of the e-mails went out today, so people -- I expect we will get some of those comments and feedback in the next two weeks. There are some things. For instance, I will just give you a heads up. I'm confident that when we come back -- or pretty confident that when we come back on the 12th seeking adoption, that there will probably be folks in the audience who will come up and want to talk to you about street lights again. We hear that over and over, even though that's been adopted since 2010, we made significant changes to the street light standard and I think the vast majority of those changes were -- will make life better and easier for the development community. However, one of the comments that we made and have made consistently is that we have adapted a standard, which is a -- you know, essentially, a standard that's by -- by the transportation industry on street light spacing and it's based on photometrics, you know, and safety and they don't like the spacing. They want it to be further. And I have no basis for allowing it to go further and I have offered several times, said you show me another standard that I can use and I would be happy to consider it and I have not receive one yet. So, I'm sure that that's still a bone of contention with some folks. They would like greater spacing. As an engineer I simply -- street lighting is not my area of

expertise and so I go to the resources that we have from the professionals, who that is their expertise, and we have adopted what their recommendations are.

De Weerd: Warren, have they come back and offered you an alternative and cited the resource of where they found the standard?

Stewart: I have not had any of them come up with an alternative standard. I mean we have a standard. We are happy to share that with them where ours comes from, but I have not had -- I have offered that same statement that I just made here in every meeting. You give me an option, I would be happy to consider it and I have not gotten one, so -- I'm sticking with the one we have until there is a -- a bona fide alternative. I get a lot of -- well, Boise doesn't do it that way or Nampa doesn't do it that way and I'm like, well, you tell me what their -- what they base their lighting standard on and I will be happy to entertain that. But you asked Boise and you ask Nampa and they are like, well, it's just been that way for -- for years. But they have no basis for it. And I'm like, well, I can't get there. I'm not going to --

De Weerd: Isn't that good enough? Just because you do it that way.

Stewart: Well, that doesn't make me feel --

Bird: Very good, Warren.

De Weerd: Any other questions? Thank you. Very thorough. We appreciate that.

**Item 11: Future Meeting Topics**

De Weerd: Okay. Council, anything further for upcoming agendas? Any topics?

Bird: I have none.

**Item 12: Executive Session Per Idaho State Code 74-206 (a)(c): (a) To consider hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, wherein the respective qualities of individuals are to be evaluated in order to fill a particular vacancy or need. This paragraph does not apply to filling a vacancy in an elective office or deliberations about staffing needs in general; AND (c) To Conduct Deliberations Concerning Labor Negotiations or to Acquire an Interest in Real Property, Which is Not Owned by a Public Agency**

De Weerd: Okay. We will make sure to get the design standards on there and, Council, we are at Item No. 12, Executive Session. Do I have a motion?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we go into Executive Session as per Idaho State Code 74-206, (a) and (c).

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to adjourn into Executive Session. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

Roll Call: Bird, yea; Borton, yea; Milam, absent; Cavener, absent; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (8:24 p.m. to 10:35 p.m.)

De Weerd: -- motion to come out of Executive Session.

Bird: So moved.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: All those in favor say aye. All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

De Weerd: Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Bird: So moved.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: All those in favor? All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:24 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR TAMMY DE WEERD

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
JAYCEE HOLMAN, CITY CLERK