

A meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:14 p.m., Tuesday, February 16, 2016, by Mayor Tammy de Weerd.

Members Present: Keith Bird, Charlie Rountree, David Zaremba Joe Borton and Genesis Milam, Luke Cavener and Ty Palmer.

Others Present: Ted Baird, Jaycee Holman, Caleb Hood, Tom Barry, Mike Pepin, John Gonzales, Mark Niemeyer, Clint Dolsby, David Miles, Laurelei McVey, 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> X </u> Genesis Milam	<u> X </u> Lucas Cavener
<u> X </u> Mayor Tammy de Weerd	

De Weerd: Thank you for your patience with us. We apologize for this late start, but thank you for joining us tonight. For the record it is Tuesday, February 16th. It's 6:14. 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 Troy Drake with Calvary Chapel

De Weerd: Okay. Item No. 3 is our community invocation. Tonight we will be led by Pastor Troy Drake. He is with Calvary Chapel. If you will all join us in the community invocation or take this as an opportunity for a moment of reflection. Welcome.

Drake: Let us pray. Lord God in Heaven, I just humbly come before you here tonight on behalf of our city to thank you for this country where we get to pursue the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and, God, we just thank you for the freedom that we have in this great country and we also pray, Lord, here tonight that you would protect all the servants of our community, the police officers, the firefighters, Lord, that you would protect the citizens in this fine city that we get to live, work and play and, Lord, we are also praying for our governor, the -- our congress, Lord, that you would just help them to choose wisely and the decisions that they make, not only today, but in their whole term and, Lord, lastly, but not least, we just pray for these servants here on the City Council, the Mayor, Lord, that you would give them just godly wisdom on conducting city business,

Lord. This is no small matter. And so we just appreciate them, Lord. I pray that you would give them lots of grace and they would know how much we appreciate what they do for us. And so, God, thank you for this time and we just honor you with all that's done here tonight, In Jesus' name, amen.

De Weerd: Thank you, Pastor Troy.

Drake: Thanks for the opportunity.

Item 4: Adoption of the Agenda

De Weerd: Item No. 4 is adoption of the agenda.

Bird: On the agenda we have -- on 5-J, the resolution number is 16-1120. Under Item 6-A we will have the transportation commission annual report. Under 8-A, that applicant has requested that that be continued to March 1st, 2016. Under 10-A the ordinance number is 16-1672. And under 10-B the ordinance number is 16-1673. And with that I move we approve the amended agenda.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as amended. All those in favor say aye. Oh. Forgot that part.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

De Weerd: Just for clarification for the audience for those that might be here for 8-A, this was improperly posted and so we couldn't hear it if we wanted to anyway; is that correct? Okay. So, I just wanted any of you that might be here for that item to know that it will be continued because it was improperly posted and we apologize if you're here for this.

Item 5: Consent Agenda

- A. Approve Minutes of January 26, 2016 City Council PreCouncil Meeting**
- B. Approve Minutes of January 26, 2016 City Council Meeting**
- C. Approve Minutes of February 2, 2016 City Council PreCouncil Meeting**
- D. Approve Minutes of February 2, 2016 City Council Meeting**
- E. Approval of Award of Bid and Agreement to POST DRILLING, INC for the "WELL 30 PRODUCTION WELL - CONSTRUCTION" project for a Not-To-Exceed amount of \$272,420.00.**

- F. Support Letter For US 20/26 Roadway Widening**
- G. Sanitary sewer and water main easement between the City of Meridian and Lynx Investments, LP for West Director Street**
- H. Sanitary sewer and water main easement between the City of Meridian and Lynx Investments, LP for Arliss Avenue**
- I. Sanitary sewer and water main easement between the City of Meridian and Lynx Investments, LP for N. Bergman Avenue**
- J. Resolution No. 16-1120: Resolution Approving the Reformat of the Meridian Design Manual Including Reducing Duplicate Guidelines; Removing Site Design and Transportation Related Guidelines; Emphasize Architectural Elements and Change the Name of the Design Manual to the City of Meridian Architectural Standards Manual.**
- K. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Birkdale Estates Subdivision (H-2015-0021) by EGC Development, LLC Located Northeast Corner of N. Meridian Road and E. Chinden Boulevard Request: Annexation and Zoning of 10.06 Acres of Land with an R-2 Zoning District AND Preliminary Plat Approval Consisting of Nineteen (19) Building Lots and Four (4) Common Lots on 10.06 Acres of Land in a Proposed R-2 Zoning District**
- L. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Citadel Storage at Amity (H-2015-0031) by Citadel Storage, LLC Located Southeast Corner of E. Amity and N. Meridian Roads Request: Annexation and Zoning of 15.84 Acres of Land with an I-L Zoning District**
- M. Final Order for Paramount Veranda (H-2015-0033) by Brighton Investments, LLC Located 6280 N. Fox Run Way Request: Final Plat Approval Consisting of One (1) Building Lot, Two (2) Common Area Lots and One (1) Other Lot for Future Right-of-Way Dedication**
- N. Final Plat for Sundial Circle Subdivision (H-2016-0003) by Red Oak Development, LLC Located 2250 W. Whitelaw Drive Request: Final Plat Approval Consisting of Eleven (11) Single Family Residential Lots and One (1) Common Lot on Approximately 2.54 Acres in the R-4 Zoning District**

De Weerd: Okay. Item 5 is the Consent Agenda.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we approve the Consent Agenda as noted earlier 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, yea; Cavener, yea; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea.

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 6: Community Items/Presentations

A. Amended onto the agenda: Transportation Commission Annual Report

De Weerd: Item 6-A is what was amended onto the agenda, our Transportation Commission Annual Report. So, Tracy, thank you for being here with us and certainly we appreciate your volunteerism and your commitment to the community.

Hopkins: Thank you, Mayor and Council Members. My name is Tracy Hopkins. I'm the chairman -- current chairman for the transportation -- Meridian Transportation Commission and thank you for the opportunity to come here and present our 2015 annual report. The Transportation Commission was formed in February 2013 with Ordinance No. 13-152. The Commission consists of nine appointed commissioners and meets on the first Monday of each month in the Council chambers. Councilman David Zaremba and representatives from ITD District Three, ACHD, COMPASS, Valley Regional Transit, and the West Ada School District serve as ex-officio members. Planning division manager Caleb Hood provides staff support and Ted Baird, the deputy city attorney, provides legal guidance. Additional city staff and staff from ex-officio agencies have interacted with the commission from time to time. Commissioner Hopkins, which is me, and David Ballard were elected chair and vice-chair of the commission for 2015. In 2015 the commission was involved in both short and long-term roadway project planning and prioritization. Transit planning. Evaluation of city policies. Corridor management. And school zone requests. A more comprehensive summary of the business conducted in 2015 is as follows: Monthly updates were provided to the commission regarding progress of projects that were in construction or soon to be constructed. Notable projects were -- in 2015 include completion of Ten Mile, Cherry Lane to Ustick, and the Meridian Road interchange. The commission provided direction on prioritization of proposed roadway,

intersection, and community projects for inclusion in ACHD's five year work plan and the capital improvement plan. Documents impacted by these discussions included ACHD's five year work plan and the CIP. The regional transportation improvement plan, better known as TIP, and the Communities In Motion 2040 long range transportation plan. In January the commission discussed roadway lighting along arterials with Austin Peterson and the Pine Avenue design elements with Brian McClure. At that time the chair and the vice-chair were elected. In February bus service was discussed at length. Commissioners Ballard and Lewis were continuously involved in regular meetings with the Valley Regional Transit Committee in 2015. In March the commission began to prioritize roadways, intersections and community program -- program projects. Project priority lists were sent to the Council for ratification. April's meeting focused on intelligent transportation systems. Shawn Martin gave a presentation to the commission on ITS and the upcoming projects. During the May meeting a homeowner in Bear Creek addressed the commission seeking support for improvements to Stoddard Road. The commission made the recommendation and sent it to Council. No meeting was held in July due to Independence Day. And in August truck traffic and routes in the northwest Meridian were discussed. A potential school zone designation at Rocky Mountain High School was discussed during the September commission meeting. Sergeant Stacy Arnold attended and introduced himself as Sergeant Gonzales' successor as the police department's liaison to the commission. In October Cynthia Gibson gave a presentation about her organization the Idaho Walk Bike Alliance. Potential truck routes in northwest Meridian and the need to extend State Highway 16 was also discussed. In November TAP projects and safe routes to schools, as well as Idaho Avenue place making projects were discussed. On December 7th the commission discussed the school zone flashers and pedestrian hybrid beacons at Compass Charter School. In addition, a report from the police department was given and school district hot topics regarding transportation was shared. Now currently we get a -- we get a report from the police department on a monthly basis updating any needs and things they may see during the following month. The commission is grateful and I, myself, for the opportunity provide this service to the citizens of Meridian and to actively shape the transportation system of our city. With that is there any questions?

De Weerd: Thank you, Tracy. And I think that the time that you have invested on our 20-26 committee has been appreciated and I will tell you Mr. Ballard is at so many different meetings as it pertains to transportation to represent the commission, as well as a citizen voice -- that is all acknowledged and certainly we are grateful for your time and commitment.

Hopkins: Thank you.

De Weerd: Council, any questions?

Bird: Just thank you.

De Weerd: Very thorough report. We appreciate all that you are doing and we look forward to your work ahead.

Hopkins: Thank you.

B. Idaho Avenue Rightsizing Project - Downtown Business Owners Association Proposal

De Weerd: Thank you. Okay. Item 6-B is a -- a report following up on last week regarding Idaho Avenue. I wasn't quite sure who was presenting. Thank you for being here, Marty. If you will, please, state your name and address.

Schindler: Marty Schindler. 6835 North Topaz Jewell Place, Meridian, Idaho.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Schindler: Good evening, Madam Mayor and Council Members. Thank you for allowing us time again to return. On last Friday on the 9th, the property owners on the north side of Idaho Avenue met at Rick's Press Room at 3:00 o'clock and Caleb Hood joined that meeting and we addressed the concerns of the Sessions and, then, came back with these -- the following findings. On your monitor is those findings. It's been suggested that -- across the top you will see now three decks in the brown area. Those decks were originally priced out -- came in at a dollar amount of 40 dollars a square foot. Through a sponsorship we have been able to reduce those prices. Along with that, we have added metal planters. They are a two tone planter. They are in the bottom right-hand corner and they will be manufactured locally, is our -- is our preference. We have come up with a total dollar figure for the plan that lays before you of 2,890 dollars and with that we would ask that -- that the budget remain at the 24,000 dollar figure for any kind of contingencies or anything we may have missed and at that time I would like to kind of ask for -- Caleb had a recommendation that came about just a few hours ago and it was things like this that I just want to say in the hour of essence of time I wanted to stand before you tonight and bring this back to you, but I feel comfortable in the dollars that have been proposed. I personally have invested my time to put together the packaging. Today I met with Caleb Hood and went through the line item by line item of what those consist of for the elements and amenities and I think we have addressed both needs. I think that we have also addressed that in a fact that we have reduced the overall budget with our goal to start. We also have come back with a solution that I think, basically, helps the local economy, along with community activity in there. So, with that I will take any questions that may be asked.

De Weerd: Thank you, Marty. And thank you to the entire team. Good job. What an awesome report. Council, any questions? No? Caleb, did you have something that needed to be added?

Hood: Mayor, yeah, maybe just a couple of things. So, the thing that Marty refers to is in looking at the revisions there are some -- the south side of the street -- and I didn't -- I don't have them side by side, but if you -- the proposal that I had for you last week there was some additional planters on the south side of -- of Idaho Avenue. My concern with this layout is without any physical barrier in here someone that's been going to the bank or

anywhere else in here may turn this corner and still pull up to the curb. There is nothing physically to stop you from doing that. So, I would recommend another planter. That's what you see here. This symbol -- this green symbol is one of the planters Marty called out there. But putting another planter somewhere in this location to, again, makes it feel like it's not just a wide open street that someone can pull up to the curb, so that really -- not that it wouldn't stop somebody that really wanted to -- you could still pull up to the curb, but it at least calls out a little bit more, like, hey, okay, this is a curb line for now. Don't park there. So, that would be one comment or one add I would add to their -- to their list or the budget, if you will, for this. Maybe just a couple of other things just to call out what you see here and what's in that budget and what isn't. These tables and benches and these and in front of Rick's, those aren't part of that budget, that would be brought to the party by others and that's not part of this budget up here. So, what you see part then -- or what that 21,891 dollar budget includes are the paint, the temporary curbing on both sides, the planter -- so, there are 13 or 14 of them now if you add another one -- planters. And some of them are rectangular and some of them are square, like Marty called out. One ADA ramp to go along with the relocated ADA parking stall. One bike rack and, then, 314 lineal feet of boardwalk in three different sections as Marty called out there. And that's -- that's what that subtotal gets you. So, I just wanted to kind of -- there is some other things shown on here and I just wanted to clarify that those are the elements that are -- that are proposed at this time and maybe just to clarify a little bit more, in talking with Marty, I think there is -- one at least to leave the option open and after this project or this phase, if you will, is closed out, somewhere around the 20 to 24 thousand dollar range, still leaves some additional monies, potentially, that the DBA or businesses may come and ask you all to expand and say, you know what, we forgot about this or that or do something else. So, I just wanted to let you know we will close out this phase, but in this budget year they may come back and ask for some more of that money to back fill some of the other things in here. So, at least that's what I understood from our conversation. If they don't want to do that I'm fine just closing that with phase one, too, but I just wanted to kind of put that out there as a potential that over the next three or four months there may be a phase two. I guess just the last thing I would call out are some of these things may need to be tweaked or, again, just verified as we get closer to actual construction. As an example, if tables are put out here and this decking is put here, we need to make sure people can walk. So, it's really tight right now to get through here -- kind of hard to see, just as an example, so we will just need to verify that there are five feet of clear for people to -- ADA clearance so people can still get by, because, again, with the railing here and the tree and this deck, we will just verify things like that. So, this -- this schematic isn't necessarily to scale and what -- exactly what you will see. I mean things are scaled, but it won't probably lay in the street exactly as shown in this diagram. So, I think with that I don't necessarily have anything else and I appreciate the businesses putting the time and effort into this proposal, so -- sorry, I do have one more thing. I talked with Finance a little bit today and so what we -- what we envisioned was if the -- if we get the blessing -- and we get the blessing from MDC Board -- again, remember, they are 50-50 partners in this -- doing an RFP for the decking, the planters, and the ramp and giving folks three or four days to respond to that RFP and, then, moving forward with this, so -- with the intentions of still getting this constructed in the spring. So, sorry I forgot to mention that, but wanted to let you know that this really -- the timeline I think we can still

make it, but to have it April installed and, then, a May big push, whatever that is -- advertisement for it, so --

De Weerd: Okay. Any questions from Council?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Caleb -- and maybe this --

De Weerd: Do you want to pull your mike --

Cavener: Sure. And maybe this will be addressed in the RFP. My question is about the planter boxes. I assume they are going to be consistent in terms of style and quality that's been consistent with what we have seen downtown?

Schindler: Yes.

Cavener: I don't know if it's a question for Caleb or Marty.

Schindler: They are. Actually, we will have in place an ideology of a -- what the concept is and given that to Caleb. There is -- there is a specification that we have actually written and at this time we haven't held back from putting that forward, but they are a two tone steel planter. They are powder coated. They are 21 gage steel. So, yes, they are -- we have a -- we have a plan of attack for that --

Cavener: Great.

Schindler: -- and -- and there was one thing that I may correct Caleb, that it was 313 square feet, not linear feet of decking. A little different.

Cavener: Great. Thank you. Thanks, Marty.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Cavener: Good job on getting the sponsorship. Hopefully at a later time we can recognize whoever that is.

Schindler: Yeah. We would like to bring more forward.

Hood: Madam Mayor? If I can and the sponsorship -- I asked Marty to point this out, but that dollar amount you see there does anticipate some sponsorship. We have got -- if you recall from last week it was 40 to 55 dollars a foot. But the bid here is less than that and that is based on some expectation that maybe there is some advertisement by someone that donates or substantially reduces their price in the RFP process in exchange for some

placard or some type of business identification that says planters donated by so and so or such -- so and such for deck and things like that. So, there is a caveat there, too, that if they don't propose that, the price may go up a little bit, but that's kind of what you see tonight is anticipating that -- that partnership from a business to donate to some degree.

De Weerd: We would love to recognize businesses that step up and sponsor planters and such.

Schindler: Great. And it is a local business. They are within ten miles of our -- of our city, so --

De Weerd: That's awesome. And, again, our thanks and congratulations. We appreciate -- we appreciate everything. I think we will take action when there is something more concrete or --

Hood: Madam Mayor. Yeah. What I will do is I will work with Ashley Squires and get this on the MDC board agenda, too, because we need them to also concur with this. After that happens -- or maybe even as that's happening I will work with our legal team on an MOA, a memorandum of agreement with MDC to, basically, take their matching funds and roll it into the city's funds as a budget amendment and that way the funds are all in one place, that way we can expend them as this project moves forward. So, probably I would imagine two, maybe three weeks be on a Council agenda with an MOA and a budget amendment that takes MDC's half and puts it in the city's budget as a line item, so we can expend it out, so --

De Weerd: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Caleb. Again, thank you to the Downtown Business Association, to Marty and Joe -- good job.

Item 7: Items Moved From the Consent Agenda

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

Item 8: Action Items

- A. Public Hearing for Knighthill Center Apartments (H-2016-0002)** by James Wylie Located Southwest Corner of Chinden Boulevard and N. Linder Road
 - 1. Request: Amend the Recorded Development Agreement (MDA)** (Instrument #114014784) for the Purpose of Incorporating a New Concept Plan, Building Elevations and Certain Provision of the Development Agreement

De Weerd: So, we will move to Item 8-A. I need to have a motion after opening this public hearing on H-2016-0002. I will request a motion to continue this to March 1st.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we move the public hearing on H-2016-0002 to March 1st, 2016.

Milam: Second.

Cavener: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to continue Item 8-A to March 1st. All those in favor say aye. All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

B. Public Works: Public Hearing for Water and Sewer Assessment Fees

De Weerd: Item 8-B is under our Public Works Department and I will turn this over to Mr. Barry.

Barry: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Good evening, Members of the Council. We are here to discuss a water and sewer assessment and last time this item was before the Council was prior to the new Council members joining. So, I thought it might be appropriate to spend just a few minutes providing a little background on water and sewer assessments. First I will begin by informing you that there are two general revenue income streams that come into the Enterprise Fund. The first is utility rates, which pays for -- this is the monthly utility charges that our residents and businesses pay to -- pay to the city for upgrades, repair, replacement, operations, maintenance, those sorts of things. The assessments or what we also call hook-up charges or hook-up fees are fees that are paid one time at the start of new construction, usually when a permit is drawn. Utility rates, as I mentioned, pay for ongoing operations and maintenance, whereas assessments pay for the initial impact that that new development has on the overall system. Assessments pay for development-related impacts totally related to growth. So, any growth impact on the system are to be paid for by those who impact the system, which is new development. As I mentioned, it's collected -- the fee is collected one time at the beginning of the permitting process and, then, these revenues contribute to the current infrastructure and to finance future growth associated with the capacity that's taken by the new development that's coming in. Only growth-related expenses are allowed to be considered in the development and in the application of the assessment fee. Like rates, however, assessment fees have to be periodically modeled and modified. The last major review in the department for the sewer rate -- or, excuse me, the sewer assessments was done in about September or -- September, October of 2014. They were modified during that time as well. Those went into effect last January. We have updated that model for the sewer assessments and have presented that information in December of last year for your consideration and we will be talking about that again this evening. The water

assessments had not been updated since 2007 and there is a modest update that we have talked with you about in December, which is still on the books for discussion this evening. So, you will hear about that here in just a few minutes as well. Since the last time we brought this issue before the Council in December of last year we have had several activities occur throughout the month of January and February, most notably reaching out to our development partners and impacted stakeholders to talk about this particular impact and the plans that the department had for increasing the -- the assessment fees. So, it's the intention for us in the department to modify these assessment fees as we have presented in December of last year. Mike Pepin is our deputy director for the Public Works Department. I have asked him to quickly go through the presentation just to make sure that the community and in particular our two new Council members are completely familiar with the background associated with the drivers in regards to this issue. It shouldn't take very long. I will also say that Mike and his team are the ones that have lead the modeling efforts and have really done the heavy lift with regard to the socialization and communication on these issues as well. So, I appreciate his leadership and his efforts on that front. So, without further adieu I will turn it over to Mr. Pepin.

De Weerd: Thank you, Tom. Good evening.

Pepin: Good evening. Madam Mayor, Members of Council, thank you for your time. Thanks to Tom for setting that up. He took about five or six items from my slide show, so I will condense mine down a little bit and get right through it, hoping to be done in about ten minutes. But we felt it was important for us the bring to you -- and, then, also as Tom has mentioned, the community -- some of the information we shared with professional organizations and developers in the community since December to discuss this topic. I'd like to go over some pressures on our utilities -- utilities meaning water and wastewater utilities. Some financing guidelines and challenges that we have had. Assessment fee background and findings. Process steps we have taken. Some education and out reach and, then, of course, the recommendation at the end for you all to consider. So, pressure on our utilities. For the last couple of years you have heard permit, permit, permit and regulations of the treatment plant, but we found recently that growth is a major concern that we have, as you're well aware, in the City of Meridian. We recently completed a near year long -- year and a half long capacity assessment and it showed us that we did not much as much capacity at our wastewater treatment plant as previously determined. So, with that -- and the fact that we have a very good idea of what our draft permit will be at the plant, we have identified that we have needed to make some adjustments to the capacity situation a little bit sooner than we originally thought. Previously they were thought to be back in the five to seven year time frame in our capital improvement plan, but we needed to pull them forward and I will explain some of the why in that in just a moment. Also, underneath water quality improvements that's in and around our NPDES permit and what we discharge out of the waste treatment plant, which is an increase to service levels, obviously. Quickly growth pressures. This is a fairly busy slide, so I will summarize it rather quickly. The top left is a migration study that we found that United Van Lines just put out and Idaho is number four of 50 in terms of migration where people are moving to in the United States. The yellow are where people are leaving from and the

gray -- they call it bounced. So, you can see that people are moving to Idaho, according to this graphic right here. The top right shows Idaho population growth, which you're very aware of year over year. The bottom right is the Meridian population growth year over year. We all know the 12th fastest growing state, ninth fastest growing city in the nation. Number one in Idaho. And here is a good illustration on the impact of growth in Meridian specifically since its conception. So, you will see around 1903 the city became incorporated and there was about 250 residents at that time.

De Weerd: Is that right, Mr. Bird?

Bird: I'm not quite that old.

De Weerd: I was just seeing if you were awake.

Pepin: Well, between 1903 --

De Weerd: Sorry, Mike.

Pepin: -- and 1920 the city doubled. So, there were up to 500 by then. Moving forward, fast tracking to 1990, there was roughly 12,000 individuals living in the City of Meridian. A decade later that doubled again. There was 72,000. So, you can kind of see the theme as we progress. 2010 we saw another 25 percent increase and here is something that we haven't shown very much yet, but maybe some of you have seen it. If not, here is what 2015 looks like. So, now according to COMPASS census, whoever you want to follow, there are a little over 91,000 residents in the City of Meridian. So, growth decade over decade since 1990 has grown in Meridian nearly 105 percent -- 1445 percent on average decade over decade. Switching gears a little bit into financial guidelines. So, these are some things that we worked under the premise that you have charged us with that we try to operate under as we can and come to you if we need some help. Growth pays for growth, as Tom mentioned. Rate payers pay for system operation, which is personnel, operating and maintenance and I will explain some of that here briefly. We utilize a pay go. Pay as you go system to avoid debt. We are not debt financed at all. Application of these guidelines -- assessment fees. The little small coin there with the A and the F, those are your sewer connections and your water connections. The other piece of our rates, they are the bulk of revenue into the Enterprise Fund in terms of your water usage and your sewer usage. Replacement and repair comes from rates. Growth does not pay for replacement or repair for our system. So, if we look at a ten year utility cost and previously we were modeling on five years, now our capital improvement plan is -- is ten years. So, we thought it was important for us to show you ten years of impact to the Enterprise Fund. So, we are estimating between our capital improvement plan over ten years and the cost to operate our utility, about a 374 million dollar ticket over ten years. But I will break this down even further for you, so you can see some specifics. So, if we look at just capital, everything that's in our capital improvement plan we go through and identify what proportionate share of that project is associated with growth, is associated with replacement and is associated with upgrade, because different customer classes have to pay for different proportions of that project. As you can see here, nearly a 200

million dollar capital improvement plan -- and that's across all utilities in Public Works, water and wastewater. We have identified nearly 50 percent of that needs to be borne by the developers. So, nearly 100 million dollars. The rest of it, 275 million, so the projects in the capital plan that are related to replacement and upgrade and, then, the personnel, operating and maintenance over ten years you can see a large burden falls on the rate payers and we bring rate updates to you -- it used to be on a six month basis -- annual basis as well. So, you will see when we are needing to talk about rate adjustments. We are not here today to talk about that, this is specifically the assessments. So, to get even more specific, we broke it down by utility and as I mentioned and Tom mentioned, we have need in our wastewater utility and you can see that by the majority -- two-thirds of our capital improvement plan is in wastewater, 77 million of it. We are good. So, what are the assessment fees? We brought to you in December the analysis that we had done, we had taken it back out and discussed it with some prominent developers, the BCA, and I want to reiterate, the information hasn't changed. I want to give it to you and, then, also to our citizens. So, the current fee that Tom mentioned on water has been in place since 2007. We have not touched it. A lot has changed since 2007. That fee currently is 1,794 dollars. When we take that 22 million dollars that you saw on the last slide and we break it up proportionately, this is what the water assessment fee tells us, that we need to increase the water assessment fee by 179 dollars, roughly ten percent. You might ask how does that compare to our neighboring municipalities? I will get to that in a minute. First, if you were to take -- which we have never -- at least -- never is a strong word. Since I have been here and since Tom has -- for the last eight years we have not taken inflationary index against any of our assessment fees. If you were to take a simple ENR index, which is the engineering news record, a very prominent construction index and you were to do it year over year, as that index to that 1,794, we would be at nearly a 26 percent increase to that fee year over year. We are asking for ten percent, 179 dollars. So, how do we compare? We are number three in the region -- Treasure Valley region, as the third lowest to connect to our water system. Boise is zero, because they are -- their water needs are supported by United Water, which is a private firm. They don't have an assessment fee. So, one could argue we are number two. Switching gears into the wastewater assessment fee. This is the fee that we have looked at recently and right now it's 3,426 -- excuse me -- 25 dollars. We did increase it as Tom mentioned in October by 676 dollars. At that time we were very focused on permit and regulations. Regulatory requirements. What we found in the analysis that I mentioned earlier that capacity is really driving our capital improvement plan right now as well. So, when we look at those things it required us to re-run the model, because we pushed some things around, moved some things around in the capital improvement plan and added some other things. One thing that's on there is the south Meridian. That was not -- and that annexation plan was not part of the previous capital improvement plan when we ran the assessment fee that landed at 3,425. That's a fairly substantial impact to the Enterprise Fund. So, when we added that in there and made some other modifications we are still identifying, as I mentioned earlier, that growth is going to continue to happen rapidly. We have to work under -- in industry standards that when you're treatment plant reaches roughly 80 percent capacity you need to start building new capacity, because it takes two to three years to design, construct, test and implement new capacity. We initially thought we had a few years to do that. We don't. We need to start that right now. As many of you are aware,

we have design going on right now for the capacity expansion. So, we are going to -- we are going to be constructing in the next two to three years to allow for continued growth. So, the wastewater assessment fee with all of the updates to include the other project I just mentioned and some other things, is now a proposed fee of 3,884, which is a 12 percent increase. So, 459 dollars on top of the 3,425. And this does increase our standing from a regional comparison standpoint. Previously we were the number two lowest in the Treasure Valley. This will put us higher than Nampa, Star and Boise. So, if we look at it as a combined assessment fee -- so, if you're going to build typically nearly every client customer that we have isn't going to just hook up to water and isn't just going to hook up to sewer, they are going to impact both of our systems. So, if you take into account what an applicant will come in and ask for, the new 17 -- or, excuse me, 1,973 for water and 3,884 for sewer, would put us nearly smack dab in the middle of the assessment fee total combined in the Treasure Valley.

De Weerd: So, Mike, it's hard to put Boise in there when they don't do water, so it's a little bit misleading.

Pepin: It is, Mayor. We can leave them off if we --

De Weerd: Just saying.

Pepin: So, really, then, we are number three.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: Am I just reading this wrong or is it -- is Nampa 2,900 dollars?

Bird: Nampa is 30 dollars cheaper.

Pepin: Their water assessment fee is 2,939. Their sewer 2,884.

Milam: That's the total. That's what I was looking at.

Pepin: The totals are --

Milam: That's not in order.

Pepin: No. We wanted to show, Council Women, the total combined impact.

Milam: Thanks.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Mike, do you have any idea what SUEZ charges for their hook-up fees?

Pepin: United Water?

Bird: SUEZ. Do you know what they -- have any idea what they charge?

Pepin: Councilman Bird, for their --

Bird: Water hook-up.

Pepin: -- water hook-up? I have been told that they do not have a water hook-up fee, because it's built into their rates. Their capital plan is borne by the ratepayers.

Bird: Privately.

Pepin: Privately. Yes, sir. So, that's a glimpse of what the combined fees look like from a regional benchmark perspective. So, the process, as Tom mentioned, we have been -- we brought to you in the beginning of December the figures that I just showed you. Those haven't changed. What we have done is quite a bit of work between then and today getting back to you now. We have had a presentation and a meeting with the BCA membership and their leadership. We have also had a developer focus group, which included prominent builders and developers in the Treasure Valley, specifically Meridian. We have advertised through the Clerk's Office and the ValleyTimes for the public hearing and we are here today to provide a motion that we can bring back to you next week for you to consider. Education and outreach. Here are some of those things -- and one thing I wanted to point out before I move into the recommendation is, you know, these -- we understand that any fee increase from a professional association standpoint is not going to be widely celebrated. So, we wanted to take a very collaborative and communicative approach with the -- not only BCA, but some other developers that we know support Meridian and our residents. So, we went to their meeting, got some feedback, exchanged a few phone calls, e-mails, had a developer focus group, invited them over here to City Hall, met with them, answered questions. I have been in contact with BCA leaders here for the last couple of weeks talking about concerns that they have and things that we could potentially modify or accommodate, just so that the business impact is not March 1st these go into effect. So, what you're going to see is kind of a collaboration of what we feel supports their request, but, then, also our needs to get these fees implemented in a timely fashion. We feel -- and the BCA does not oppose that the water assessment fee is fair straight forward. It hasn't been touched since 2007. So, we would present to Council a water assessment fee of a one time 179 dollar increase effective on June 1st of 2016, to give them a little bit a lead time to prepare between now and March 1st if they have anything in the works. The other side of things is the sewer assessment fee. That's a little bit bigger jump. We would suggest through consult with the BCA a two phased approach to this. The first phase would take nearly half of the fee, 229 dollars, and implement it on June 1st, 2016, along with the water, which would take it to 3,654 and one year from that date we would implement the remaining 230 dollars on June 1st, 2017,

which would bring the total fee on the sewer side to 3,884 dollars. So, we are asking you to consider -- and we can bring back to you in resolution -- is this approach right here. Adopt this on March 1st and this would be your implementation strategy, identified in resolution.

De Weerd: Council, any questions?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Mike, in light of how fluid the growth is, would it be appropriate if there was going to be an increase in the sewer assessment fee, to do a 229 now and not do anything further, understanding we will probably revisit this at this time next year anyway?

Pepin: Madam Mayor, Councilman Borton, good question. We have thought about that. Just like taking -- let me talk about this approach right here. Just by taking this approach right here there is -- we are potentially not taking about 240,000 dollars over the next year in assessment fees if you average out the permits year over year. So, we are very cognizant of that. Our -- through our analysis our goal is not to review the assessment fees every year. Now rates we understand that -- we are very confident that the work we have done from a regulation -- regulatory capacity, the CIP, all the work that's gone into that, all the firms that have been included, all the consultants that have weighed in and the associations that -- we are very confident that our capital improvement plan assessments are going to be stable for a little while. So, we would have to look at that suggestion, Councilman Borton, to see if -- what the impact of that would be. I don't have it in front of me in terms of a financial impact. If we want to provide stability to the developers and the builders, our suggestion would be to leave the assessment fees alone for a period of time and only evaluate them if there is an inflationary need or an indexing need, because costs go up and project costs are to go up. So, I would be hesitant to -- to suggest that approach, Councilman Borton.

Borton: Okay.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Mike, you know, on your ten year assessment from -- wasn't it 215 to 225?

Pipen: Yes, Councilman Borton. Or, excuse me, Bird.

Bird: I'd like -- I would like to see you go back, now that we got the numbers and stuff in and re -- see what our actual cost and stuff was per growth. You go -- you can go get your numbers from -- I guess if we are going to do it we will go from COMPASS -- of our population and see what -- from 2005 to 2015 what our capital improvement and our cost

was to compare to see what -- and, then, you can all -- we can always get your inflation numbers that you can add in and stuff. But I would be really interested to see what we paid the last ten years and what we are planning for in the next ten years and this setup right here is -- I think is something we have to do. I know our assessments don't need to be looked at every year, where our rate fees do need to be looked at every year. But our assessments need to be looked at least every five years I think, if not more, but I don't see anything wrong with this -- phasing in like this, as long as we get the letter out to everybody by April 1st that it goes in effect June 1st, so we don't -- and let everybody know what's coming for and I don't -- I don't see any problem with this. I think that -- I think they are very minor increases for -- especially in the sewer, which we haven't touched since 2007. But I would be real interested to see what the last ten years per population -- bigger and it shouldn't be too hard to take a calculator to.

De Weerd: Thank you, Mr. Bird. I know Public Works and this Council has been very sensitive to these kind of assessments, but also have a serious commitment to our ratepayers that the cost of growth will not be on their shoulders and so we want to -- it's a fine balance and appreciate the data that you have shown us and the work that has gone into it. Anything further from Council? Okay.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I do like Councilman Bird's idea, though, of maybe putting this on a five year -- or whatever the rate number is, as opposed to just whenever it's needed. It seems that when that situation -- sometimes things can get forgotten or unnoticed until it's too late and, then, we are like, well, we haven't looked at it in ten years, we probably should have done this a couple years ago, so if it was on a regular basis, whatever that year is, I think that would be a good idea to look at.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: It's -- Mike or Tom, when it went up in October of '14 was the 676 -- I don't recall if that was an adjusted amount, the recommendation was a higher figure, but we scaled it back or was that the full recommendation?

Pepin: No. Madam Mayor, Councilman Borton, that was the fee at that time, given what was in the capital improvement plan. Yes.

Borton: Okay.

Pepin: That was not a staggered approach, that was what the model told us.

Borton: Okay.

Pepin: Yeah.

De Weerd: Okay. We still have a public hearing, so thank you, Mike.

Pepin: Thank you.

De Weerd: I did have one person on our sign-up sheet. Dave Yorgason. Good evening.

Yorgason: Good evening. For the record, Dave Yorgason, representing the Building Contractors Association of Southwest Idaho. My address is 14254 West Battenburg Drive in Boise.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Yorgason: You're welcome. Thank you. Just a few comments for you tonight and, then, I will be glad to answer any questions you have as well. First of all, I want to thank the staff for meeting with us and with other members of our association. I do know the history of the first increase of the sewer fee that took place just a little over a year ago, as I was involved in those discussions as well. I can tell you about all of the cities on that list, except for one, Kuna. I have not done business there, but I have called them on numerous occasions. So, I think I got a pretty good handle on sewer and water fees across the entire Treasure Valley. I do -- one note is that they, I think, identified the most expensive water company within the city of Eagle. There are actually three water companies in Eagle. The one they chose was the most expensive. It has a trunk line fee of over 2,000 dollars in addition to the other fees that they charge and so United Water and the Eagle Ranch water are substantially cheaper than what was posted up there for Eagle city water. Nonetheless, we do know that -- and appreciate Meridian's approach of no debt. I think also when there is no debt to pay for your services you probably ought to be in the lesser half of the fees, because you don't have any debt to pay for those fees, just a point of note. By my calculation when you include last year's increase in the sewer fee and this year's proposed full increase, it's 1,135 dollars. When you compare that to the prior number, which I think was 2,749 dollars, that's a 41 percent increase in your sewer assessment fee in just over a year's period of time. That's pretty substantial. Which is probably why we are as not opposed to the -- or even surprised by the water request, but the sewer is really where the great concern is. We did have some discussion with staff. We appreciate their listening to our request for a staggered approach. Their offering of half now and half a year from now is appreciated, so we are not going to say we are opposed to that. Our hope was a little longer than that, maybe three or five years from now, recognizing that nobody has a crystal ball of how many permits the city is going to pull over the next ten years. I just know that this year -- and certainly last year were substantially higher than the 1,002 residential unit average that the city has seen over the last nine or ten years. I don't know if we are going to continue at this pace. I don't think you will. But I do think you will have commercial permits taking a greater percentage than what you may have seen in the prior ten years as well if residential does slow down. So, with that our ask is to see some kind of a request of three or five years was what we

considered. I heard five years discussed here now. I don't know if that means take half of the sewer now and, then, wait three to five years to see if you need it or if three to five years from now just know that you're going to review it. I appreciate staff's comment that they are not intending to over collect. I also know that once a fee is increased it really never goes down. Not in my career have I seen fees go down. So, with that we don't stand here opposed. We are not excited and doing back flips either. And stand for any questions you might have.

De Weerd: Well, I will say that Keith and I have been here long enough we have seen them go down and, then, have to pay for it later. So, it certainly is -- it's complicated and certainly we would love to plead the same request to the EPA and not requiring us to adhere to new standards and new regulations and delay the implementation, but we weren't given that opportunity, so -- and one thing that we did find in the review of operations and where we are today, is we didn't have quite the capacity that we thought we had. So, that does get passed to growth. Growth pays for that and it pays for the new regulatory requirements that we are, oh, so excited about.

Yorgason: Madam Mayor, we understand all that. We are not -- we haven't hired an engineer to question the CIP. We were -- again, I was very much involved with the discussions a year ago -- or 18 months ago in which the discussion was very clearly both capacity and EPA requirements. Since that time more burden has been taken upon by the city from the EPA. We understand that. We also understand the recalculation or realization of greater capacity restrain that the city has. We are not questioning any of that. We also know that we have more permits today on average than what you have had over the last ten years. And so we are not challenging, we are not opposed, though we are not excited about it, we recognize the need for -- to meet your needs to expand the capacity.

De Weerd: We are not excited either. Like to be number one.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: David, I think by putting this in in June the developers have had time to adjust their costs, which they do. You know, if they know that it's going in in June, I will guarantee you their lot prices and are going up right now. While I hate to raise fees and I have battled every one we have ever had, I -- it's got -- growth has got to pay for itself, because once you start having to go in debt you never get out and you do nothing but put a burden on the future taxpayers and as long as I'm on here we are not going in debt. So, that -- take that -- I think -- I realize that after what we got in October -- we brought this up in October that -- that we were getting 49 increase -- you were going to get 49 percent one way or the other. We just delayed it six to eight months for you. So, I think -- I think that this -- I think this is fair. I think if Mike can go back and get what the actual cost was for the last ten years per -- per citizen, that helps us project for the next -- with throwing in your inflationary construction costs and stuff and, then, we have really got them to work off

from, some basis -- you know, just a little calculation. So, right now while I hate to see us have to raise a thing -- and like Tammy said, we have lowered rates in Meridian, Idaho. But I am also not going to go in debt to make growth go.

Yorgason: Madam Mayor and Councilman Bird, I agree. We are not asking you to.

Bird: I know you're not.

Yorgason: And I don't think you should.

De Weerd: Council, any questions from Mr. Yorgason? Thank you.

Yorgason: You're welcome. Thank you again.

De Weerd: And thank you for working on this. We know you invest a lot of time to -- working with our staff and representing your industry and we appreciate that.

Yorgason: You're welcome. Thank you. Please know I'm just the messenger and thank you for your time.

De Weerd: Well, go back and tell them you did a good job. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone who would like to offer testimony on this item? Okay.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Can I ask one more question of Mike or Tom? With regards to the slide that shows the assessment -- sewer assessment fee for each of the neighboring communities -- I don't know what slide that was. Yeah. That one. So, the -- the hook-up fee seems to be intended largely to correlate with growth, but the -- the various fees here don't seem to correspond with the growth rates in each community. Some communities without growth have really high hook-up fees and vice-versa. So, just educate me real briefly on why there might be such a discrepancy on that.

Barry: Madam Mayor, Councilman Borton, the discrepancy has a lot to do with size of community, the service that's offered, the infrastructure that the community owns and operates, whether they have debt serviced. There is so many factors in each of those communities that make their numbers different, which is why when we throw a slide like this before the Council, it's very difficult to defend in any way. We do it simply as a matter of reference. But one could argue that the service in Boise is the same as it is in Meridian, which is the same as it is in Nampa, and so and so forth. And to the -- to the average resident that's probably true. But it's not when you look at the systems and the infrastructure, the complexities, the types of permits. For example, we operate under a different permit today than the city of Boise operates under at the wastewater treatment plant. Which is different than the city of Kuna's permit that they operate under. So,

regulations and all these other things that I have mentioned, really make it difficult to get a true apples-to-apples comparison of what the benchmarks are. This is simply just for reference, what each community has to do is it has to look at its overall cost structure and make sure that the allocation of those costs is appropriately apportioned between each of the customer classes and that's generally what every community does and that's exactly what we have done here. But you would -- I would never expect to see in any community across the country the ability for us to do a true apples-to-apples comparison and get to maybe what you're -- what you desire.

Borton: Okay.

Barry: I hope that helps.

Borton: Sure. It does.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I have always believed that our fees and stuff -- we -- I don't -- I don't compare to anybody else. What do we need. Get our costs down. What do we need. And, you know, hopefully -- and I don't know for sure, but I'd almost make you a bet that all those that are higher than us have got some debt service that they are having to pay for, too.

De Weerd: Okay. Any further questions from Council? The idea, then, is to bring this back and -- no?

Barry: Madam Mayor? If I may, the -- because this is a hearing, we have asked that -- if you have received the testimony you needed from the community, that you close the hearing and make a recommendation -- or make a decision on the recommendation the department has before you. It is our intent that with that decision by the City Council that this evening we can, then, bring back a resolution next week that you can adopt and we can implement the fees according to the schedule that's on your screen in front of you.

De Weerd: Which is where I was going.

Barry: Okay.

De Weerd: But thank you for so eloquently putting that together.

Barry: My apologies, Madam Mayor.

De Weerd: So, Council, you would need to make a motion to first close the public hearing, but, then, to consider a resolution that can be brought back next week.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Hearing no more public testimony, I move we close the public hearing on the water and sewer assessment fees.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on Item 8-B. All those in favor say aye. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we approve the proposed utility -- the assessments with water fee being in effect June 1st, 2016, for an amount of 1,973 dollars. The sewer assessment fee June 6th -- June 1st, 2016, raising 229 dollars. And on June 1st, 2017, it raises another 230 dollars, for a total assessment fee over two years of 3,884 dollars. And to bring back the resolution and effective date of getting letters to the people by April 1st.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second. Maybe you want to make that April 2nd. Sorry. Any discussion? Madam Clerk.

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

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried. I'm sorry. Majority has it. Five ayes carries. Sorry about that.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY.

**C. Staff Letter of Recommendation for Approval of Floodplain
Variance Request of Tenant Improvement at 240 W. Taylor Ave.**

De Weerd: Item 8-C is discussion about -- I don't know. David.

Miles: Flood plain variance request from the applicant across the street at 240 West Taylor. Good evening, Madam Mayor and Members of the Council. We have a request from the applicant and the applicant's agent for a flood variance request across the street at 240 West Taylor. The applicant is proposing to perform a tenant improvement application of over 45,000 square feet in an existing building. This is the old Plumb Creek

Lumber Yard across the street. The new applicant and new tenant is another lumber company and they are proposing to install a rather large piece of lumber process equipment known as a planer and sorter. It takes up approximately the entirety of one 45,000 square foot building and an additional 10,000 square feet or thereabouts for the second building. Under the FEMA flood plain regulations and the Meridian City Code, the applicant would be required to raise the existing floor by about four feet in order to comply with the FEMA regulations in the city code. As a solution under the code the applicant is proposing to elevate the existing floor about two feet, which would put it above the minimum FEMA base flood elevation, which is a federal requirement and, then, install the planer an additional two feet above that elevation, which would meet the minimum local code requirement and, additionally, they will flood proof -- dry flood proof, which is, essentially, keep any potential for water away from the equipment in areas that you can't meet that four foot elevation, but they can meet the two foot elevation. So, any in between areas will be protected and there is approximately six areas of that nature. Additionally, they will dry flood proof all of the electrical equipment that's proposed to power the piece of equipment, which is required under code -- it meets the ordinance requirements. So, we are working with the applicant and the engineer we feel that this is a viable solution. There is no additional threat to flood hazards and flood impacts, other than this one piece of equipment, which is self-insured and does have a flood insurance policy on it as well. The applicant is aware of any additional risks that they may face if there was a disaster that impacted their piece of equipment. We reviewed the flood insurance studies and found that the velocities in this area are very low and so we are not concerned with the risk of a rather large piece of equipment getting up in a water event and floating downstream. We don't see that as practical or likely to happen. So, with that the applicant is here if you have any questions for them or they have anything additional that they would like to introduce, but we feel this is a valid recommendation to support a variance request for this purpose.

De Weerd: David, I did have a question that -- when we ran the facility under the new Meridian Road, they upsized the pipe. Was there a flood plain revision because of the improved capacity there?

Miles: I appreciate the question. It's a great question. There was not a formal map revision done by the applicant at the time, because the water elevations -- I will try and state -- not too scientific, but the water elevations were impacted to the point where the requirement for the letter of map revision was required, so it was more voluntary at that point and we will discuss later on in another agenda item in that area of town and those culverts -- there is not just one culvert that was under Meridian Road, there is a series of four or five additional culverts, which under the hazard mitigation planning for the city there are opportunities to seek solutions with multi-partner agencies and federal funding to try and resolve instances like that. But in short, no, a federal letter of map revision wasn't performed for that one specific culvert.

De Weerd: Thank you. Is the applicant here this evening? Would you like to add anything? Okay. The application for the record is here if Council should have any questions. Any questions for the applicant or for staff?

Bird: I have none.

De Weerd: Thank you, David.

Miles: Thank you.

De Weerd: And thank you to our new business in town. Okay. Council?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move that we approve the letter of recommendation for approval of plain variance request at 240 West Taylor as per Meridian Code N-6-4B.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve the letter of recommendation for approval on Item 8-C. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 9: Department Reports

A. Community Development: Letter Requesting Joint Meeting With the Ada County Board of Commissioners

De Weerd: Item 9-A is under our Community Development Department. I will turn this over to Caleb.

Hood: Thank you, Madam Mayor. This is building on a letter that was shared with you last week during your workshop. The same letter, essentially, is before you tonight. No changes were made. However, we did have legal look at the letter, sign off on it. The only real new information that I have for you is that the Council did cancel our tentatively set date of March 16th and right now tentatively set for April 6th. So, we don't want to date this again. Just to refresh your memory, whenever we send this they have 30 days to meet with us. So, if you want to force their hand and make them meet with us sooner than later, you could sign this tonight. But I'm not recommending that. I'm recommending you really look at the substance of the letter here and, then, maybe in another month or so send this letter out. But right now, again, we tentatively have it scheduled for April 6th. In

my opinion there is nothing pressing that another month delay -- you know, we can wait, basically. So, unless you all want to and want to meet with them sooner, but once we send this they are forced to meet with us within 30 days. So, again, we can post date this, essentially, you know, March 6th or sign it -- the meeting just after March 6th, but, really, tonight what I want to insure is that the letter reads the way you want it to read and we will figure out the date here in the coming weeks.

De Weerd: Caleb, why don't we put it on the Council workshop on March 8th and for a final Council approval and signature and we can send it the next day.

Hood: Madam Mayor -- and I would just ask if there are any other changes between now and then, please, let me know. That way it goes smoothly, then, on the 8th and we can -- we can sign and get it off to them, so -- thank you.

B. Police Department: Budget Amendment for Peer to Peer Engagement for the Office of Highway Safety in the Not-to-Exceed Amount \$10,000.00

De Weerd: Thank you. Okay. Item 9-B is under out Police Department. Good evening.

Gonzales: Good evening, Madam Mayor and Council. Those of you that don't know me, I'm Sergeant Gonzales with Meridian Police Department. Here to ask for a budget amendment of 10,000 dollars. This is in regard to a grant that we received from the Office of Highway Safety to continue some of our work with our -- moving more to a peer model, within with MYAC and the youth in our community, something that we feel is very important and I believe this Council and Mayor has also felt it has been important in the past as well. So, we have a grant of -- grant money of 30,000 dollars. The 10,000 dollars is our match for that, with a total project of 40,000 dollars. So, what I need is a budget amendment of 10,000. This will help with some training with -- primarily it will be Stephanie in our crime prevention office to be able to look at our programs that we have and make sure that we can move them more to a peer-to-peer model to where our young people are doing our advocating for us and when it comes to safety we know that the two things that work most with safety with young people -- one is parents taking control of the keys of a day and knowing where their kids are. The other one is the peers in a car or with their teen making good choices together and that's what's going to make our community safe as far as young people. So, with this we want to make sure that we evaluate our programs that we have, that our teens are involved and are the ones speaking for us, rather than us preaching to them. And part of that will be training for our young people as well, to bring professionals to train them on how to advocate on a peer-to-peer level as well. So -- and, then, we have some community events that we also work on year to year and we will be evaluating that to bring them into a peer-to-peer model as well. So, don't know if you have any questions for me. I believe I need a budget amendment of 10,000 dollars and, then, probably spending authority for the entire project as well for 40,000. I will stand for questions.

De Weerd: Thank you, Sergeant. I will just tell you -- especial to our two newer members that Sergeant Gonzales is known throughout the state and the nation for his passion for driver's safety, in particular for our youth and I appreciate your advocacy for these programs and I know -- not just one person does it -- you have an awesome team that you inspire and you inspire our youth as well to stand up and be part of the solution. So, on behalf of myself and this Council I want to thank you for your leadership in this.

Gonzales: Thank you, Mayor.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: So, I move that we approve a budget amendment for a peer-to-peer engagement for the Highway -- Office of Highway Safety in the not to exceed amount of 10,000 dollars. That is the amount on the budget amendment that we have that's been signed. Would that need to change if I add spending authority --

De Weerd: No. You approved the grant -- I think last week or the week previously.

Milam: So, I don't need to add that in there?

De Weerd: I think just to note the spending authority.

Milam: The spending authority of the total project not to exceed 40,000 dollars.

Bird: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Madam Clerk.

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

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Gonzales: Thank you.

C. Police Department: Budget Amendment for Police Vehicle Replacement for the Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$16,556.00

De Weerd: Thank you, John. Item 9-C is also yours.

Gonzales: Yes. This is also a budget amendment asking for 16,556 dollars and this to purchase a patrol vehicle. This patrol vehicle is a Ford -- 2016 Ford Interceptor and the

way this came about is we need a new vehicle to replace two vehicles that were crashed and were -- were totaled and ICRMP has given us 24,952 dollars, but to be able to purchase a vehicle we are going to need another 16 -- correction. Yes. 16,556 dollars. And I stand for questions.

De Weerd: Council, any questions?

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: Seeing none, I move that we approve the budget amendment for the police vehicle replacement for the not to exceed amount of 16,556 dollars.

Bird: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 9-C. Any discussion from Council? Madam Clark.

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

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

D. Public Works: Budget Amendment for the Purchase of a Sewer Cleaning Truck for the Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$500,000.00

De Weerd: Thank you. Okay. Item 9-D is under our Public Works Department. You know, Laurelei, before you start I just want to congratulate you and your team for the clean inspection that you had. That was a big deal and just on behalf of Council and myself, we just really want to thank you for the work that you do out at the wastewater resource recovery center -- whatever.

McVey: Almost.

De Weerd: WWTP --

McVey: Thank you so much. And, really, I couldn't do it without the group out there, so it's congratulations to that whole group of staff, but thank you. So, thank you for your time today, Madam Mayor and Members of the Council. For those of you that might not know me, my name is Laurelei McVey and I am the superintendent of the wastewater division. So, I'd like to take this time today to give you a status update for the wastewater collection cleaning system program and ask for your support for additional resources to keep that program on track. So, I'm going to just start off with a little bit of history and background

for you guys. So, the purpose of our collection system program is to clean, maintain, and evaluate the collection system, but it's an underground asset that's out of sight, so -- however, it's also one of the most expensive assets that the city owns, so it's critical that we take care of the system through routine cleaning and cameraing of the sewer system. So, that's what our group does out in the city. So, prior to 2009 we contracted all of that work out and, really, we were on an eight to ten year cleaning schedule and I will talk a little bit more about why that was too long and the -- so, there is -- we were spending a bunch of money each year and we were really at the mercy of the contractor, both their timeliness and their quality. So, in 2009 the City Council approved to bring the program in house to increase the quality, timeliness and we have been doing a great job at that over the last few years. So, we have really -- like I said, we have really accomplished a lot in the last six years. So, in 2009 when we brought the program in house the city had 258 miles of pipe. At that time the City Council approved the purchase of one hydro cleaner and one CCTV van and we also established cleaning and TV cycles that were based on EPA established standards. In 2013 we came back to the Council to give you an update. A couple of exciting things happened in that time. We had cleaned the entire system for the first time in a four year period and, most importantly, we reduced over a million gallons of infiltration and if you're not aware of what infiltration is, it's groundwater that gets into the collection system through cracks or leaks of the pipes and that's a million gallons of water that goes to the treatment plant that doesn't need to be treated at the treatment plant. So, that's really an astonishing achievement that that group has accomplished and, then, in 2015 we came to you again and asked for a second CCTV van and at that point we were able to CCTV the entire system for the first time in a period of six years, which brings us to 2016. The city has grown to 439 miles. Just to give you a little bit of perspective, if you drove from Meridian to Portland that's 422 miles. So, we have experienced -- the presentation before me was a really good introduction into the amount of growth that we have received in the city. So, in the last seven years we have seen over 70 percent growth in our infrastructure. So, that brings me here to talk about why we are falling behind in this schedule and why we need additional resources. So, in case you haven't seen the news lately, the city is growing and the growth only continues to look like it's going to keep going. So, I think the presentation before me did a good job at telling that story. So, where we are at today. So, you will see on this graph is what our current -- so, we have one hydro cleaner truck. Its capability is the blue line that you see there. The red line is our cleaning goal to stay on track for cleaning the lines once every three years and you can see that that gap is only continuing to grow as the city continues to grow. So, let me talk to you for a little bit why a three year cleaning cycle is important. So, really, it comes down to preventative verses reactive maintenance. So, the -- like I said before, the collection system is one of the most expensive assets that the city owns. So, it's our job to take care of it in advance before big breakdowns happen. So, it's kind of like changing the oil in your car. It's much cheaper and easier to change the oil in your car than it is to replace the engine. So, our cleaner program does just that, it's preventative maintenance before big costly breakdowns occur in the collect system. Additionally, it's also required under our NPDEs permit to properly operate and maintain our system, which also includes the collection system. So, these are some pictures from Meridian and these are pictures of the lines before they were cleaned. So, you will notice there is debris. That picture on the top right is grease coming out of a service and all the three pictures along the bottom

are roots that grow in to the sewer. So, you can see that one little piece of debris or one root start causing a blockage, which, again, catch debris, catch the wastewater and result in sewer overflows, which is an NPDEs violation and so it's easier for us to take care of these problems and that's why you can imagine if we only clean our lines -- every line gets cleaned once every three years you can see why that three year cycle is really important and as we fall behind it just increases the liability that the sewer may back up and also by cleaning the sewer increases the life of the sewer, because if the sewer is sitting in there it's very corrosive and so it can eat the pipe more quickly than if we clear those blockages and the sewer is flowing.

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener --

Cavener: Maybe a quick question while --

De Weerd: -- you're going to ask about the frog; right?

Cavener: I'm not going to ask about the fog.

De Weerd: Okay.

Cavener: I want to, but -- just for clarification, the six images that we are seeing here, all of those pipes were cleaned three years previous and this is what has occurred in the three years since?

McVey: No. No.

Cavener: Okay.

McVey: No.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

McVey: No. So, these are various pipes that we found throughout. We have -- we have identified areas of high root problems. Generally it happens more in the downtown area and so as we replace those older sewers with PVC pipe we tend to not see the roots as bad, but we -- the root -- the areas with the root problems -- we actually have to go to more than once every three years. We also have high grease areas, which we also go to more than once every three years.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

De Weerd: So, if Mr. Cavener isn't going to ask about the frog, I have to.

McVey: Madam Mayor, we do get -- so, we code our sewer based on a national standard and the code that you use for frogs and mice and any sort of thing is vermin. So, there is all sorts that get in there and usually they may or may not get out and can cause that backup, but -- if he was in our system. We see mice, too.

De Weerd: I'm glad you only showed the frog. Thank you.

McVey: Yeah. It could be worse. Okay. So, we -- we also looked at what other cities were doing around the valley to kind of -- to check ourselves and make sure that we were on track. So, what's important to look at on these columns is the number of cleaning trucks and, then, the cleaning schedule in years. So, you will see that most cities have more than one truck. That's for two reasons. So, as the city grows one truck just simply can't keep up and, additionally, one truck put you at a liability for -- if your truck is down, it's in the shop, it's somewhere else in the city and we have a problem, we only have one truck to respond to that sewer emergency and you can see that our cleaning schedule, even -- so, our three standard is pretty -- pretty much on track with the other cities in the valley, but we are currently at 4.4 years and that gap is only continuing to grow as you saw on that chart that had the red and blue lines. So, in summary the challenges that my group is facing is it's really related to the extensive growth that we have seen. One truck just simply can't keep up any longer. Additionally, our original truck has been aging, so it -- it can't -- its output has decreased and it is also important to note that the hydro cleaners -- so, the red truck there has to clean before the camera can go down the line. So, right now our entire collection system is -- program is hinging on one vehicle, whether that vehicle is up and running or not. So, our asset management data is slowed down by only having that one truck. So, essentially, we are just working the plan just a little bit ahead of schedule. So, we had a second hydro cleaner truck planned for FY-17. It's in CIP and included in the rate model. Something that we learned as we were looking into these trucks is they have a really long lead time. So, it's about six months from when you order the truck to when you receive it. So, because these are so specialized they are not, you know, just sitting on the lot, so they are really custom made to order. So, what we are asking to do is a budget amendment in FY-16 that would, essentially, move this purchase up six months to allow us to cut down on that lead time and get the truck here sooner, just to catch up on that three year cleaning cycle. So, again, just in summary, we would be asking for a budget amendment in FY-16 for the hydro cleaner. It will insure that we can recover our deficit to get back to the three year cleaning cycle. It will insure we can respond to emergencies -- sewer emergencies. It will keep us on track with our asset management life cycle collection data and it also will meet our regulatory requirements and, additionally, we are not asking for any more staff to man this vehicle. So, with that I will stand for any questions that you have.

De Weerd: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Appreciate it. Just one question. Appreciate the presentation. I think you have made a compelling case as to what these vehicles accomplish and now I can explain it to my son, because he asked me and I didn't have a full understanding, now I do. My question really relates to -- and you touched on this I think one slide back and I'm just trying to wrap my head around what -- what's the rationale between now, as opposed to going to the regular budget cycle on this particular item?

McVey: So, it really just comes down to that lead time. If we wait until the regular budget cycle -- so, if -- if the amendment goes through now we would be able to place the order and the truck would get here sometime in the summer. If we wait until the budget cycle, then, we wouldn't get the truck until probably next springtime, because of the six month lead. So, it just allows us to catch up on the three year cycle faster and really reduce the liability to the city.

Cavener: Thank you.

De Weerd: And I'd also invite your son out to Public Works Week and he can check it out. Any other questions?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Did I hear you correct that -- that we can't utilize the camera trucks until the cleaning goes first?

McVey: Councilman Borton, that's correct. So, because -- so, at about three days the sewer grows enough what we call slime growth that you're not able to see any of the cracks or any of the defects in the line, so we don't let any more than three days go between cleaning and cameraing, because, otherwise, the camera, one, can't get up the line and it can't see the defects as well.

De Weerd: Aren't you glad you asked?

Borton: Well, Madam Mayor, I am, because I was trying to recall the approval process for the second camera truck and kind of the chicken or the egg, which came first and I must presume we don't have a scenario where a second camera truck sits idly by, since we only have one cleaning truck. I presume. I just don't recall that part of the conversation on the purchase --

McVey: Councilman Borton, that's a great question. The camera trucks move a lot slower than the hydro cleaner, because of the detailed type work that they do, so the amount of footage that they can complete in a day is significantly less than the one hydro cleaner.

De Weerd: Okay. Any other questions? Okay. Thank you, Laurelei.

McVey: Thank you.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I would move that we approve the budget amendment for purchasing of the sewer cleaning truck not to exceed amount of 500,000 dollars.

De Weerd: Okay. I have a motion.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: And a second. Any discussion?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Just a comment. The vehicles are needed. Five hundred thousand dollars, that's a fire truck and I just think that like a fire truck it should go through the budget process.

De Weerd: Okay. Any further discussion? Madam Clerk.

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

MOTION FAILED: TWO AYES. FOUR NAYS.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: I agree with Councilman Cavener that the budget process is the appropriate place I think for this budget amendment and request to be run through.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: While I don't -- I don't disagree with you guys, but, I will tell you what, I could name you three trucks -- fire trucks that was bought on budget amendments, including big trucks that are emergency vehicles.

De Weerd: And it's really hard for me not to say anything, but you are the ones approving this growth --

Bird: That's right.

De Weerd: -- and with the growth comes new lines and as was demonstrated through this presentation, one truck not keeping up and that one truck has done a stellar job, but it's not enough and there are certain things you find that the crystal ball just doesn't work during that budget and annual process, which is why we do have an amendment process. So, that's just my two cents worth and I -- I am sorry to see that it failed.

Barry: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Barry. Sorry, I knew that wasn't God.

Barry: No. No. I would strongly -- if I'm -- I hope I'm not out of line here, but I would strongly encourage the Council to reconsider. The -- the collection system program is an insurance program for the city. The growth that's occurred over the past couple of years has been more accelerated than we had predicted. This particular vehicle is in our five year capital improvement program and it's scheduled for replacement next year. I feel that it's a mistake to prevent this vehicle from being purchased at this time, increasing the city's liability as it relates to our permit and also potential sanitary sewer overflows and other health impacts associated with the community. I will respect whatever decision you decide, but I'd ask you to strongly reconsider your motion on this particular amendment. Thank you.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: This is sideways to the question. And now David isn't here I got to be sideways. Tom and I have discussed and he's going to start a program on this larger equipment, like the fire department does, putting so much each year in a truck or a replacement program, but that don't solve the problem for this -- this one problem and while I hate budget amendments as much as anybody, we also got to be practical and understand that being proactive is so much better than being pro reactive. I -- I don't think I -- I know that getting this on board sooner is very desirable and I just -- I think that if this was the only time we had ever done a budget amendment for something of this kind of deal, I would really be doubtful of it, but we voted and the majority won, we will live with it.

De Weerd: Just to add my two cents. I had no clue it was going to fail, so I didn't weigh in, but when this one fails, unlike the fire trucks, we have no other truck and, you know, when every business looked at redundancy and backup plans and we don't have that here, which is another logical step in making sure that we have the two vehicles. So, if --

if someone who voted in the negative wants to bring this back at some point, we can consider it then. But we will move -- we will move on.

E. Public Works: Ada County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Participation

De Weerd: Item 9-E is also under Public Works and I will turn this over to David.

Miles: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council. Public Works -- the city and the Public Works Department had been asked to participate in the 2016 Ada County hazard mitigation plan update. This is similar to an effort that occurred in 2010. This is the county's natural hazard mitigation plan and it relates to mitigation efforts or construction project efforts or actions that local communities can take as part of the county's plan to prevent future disasters from natural hazards. Every year -- or every cycle the county goes through and updates and asks for planning partners to be included in that development of that update and this is time for that cycle visit in 2016. The hazard plan is put together by the county to try and resolve the mitigation of natural hazard disasters occurring. Participating in the plan allows the city's interest to be protected and represented in the document itself as it's developed and, additionally, allows the city to access both pre and post-disaster mitigation funding. So, for example, the example we talked about earlier, the Nine Mile culvert that's underneath Meridian Road, projects like that can be eligible for grant funding inside of this type of plan if it is identified. So, the participation by the city allows us to identify certain types of projects like that and place them inside the plan to, then, be allowed to go get grant funding. With that said I'm happy to answer additional questions. We do have Paul Marusich here from the county, he's the county's representative for the project and he can provide further detail on the plan, as much as you want, or if you have questions for him as well, but with that we do recommend allowing the staff to participate. This is a no cost action, other than the staff time to participate.

De Weerd: I'm really asking someone named crash is okay, you know. It is a hazard in and of itself. Council, any questions?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we allow staff to proceed with a letter, for the Mayor to sign approving their participation in the Ada County natural hazard mitigation plan update.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 9-E. Any discussion by Council? Madam Clerk.

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

De Weerd: All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 10: Ordinances

- A. Ordinance No. 16-1672: An Ordinance of the City of Meridian Amending Meridian City Code as Codified at Title 11, Entitled Unified Development Code Pertaining to Definitions; Residential Dimensional Standards; Fencing; Structure and Site and Multi-Family Design Standards; Common Open Space and Site Amenity Requirements; Specific Use Standards for Drinking Establishments, Flex Space and Home Occupations; Timelines for Signatures on Development Agreements; Subdivision Design and Improvement Standards and Other Miscellaneous Sections; and to Carry out the Policies of Meridian's Comprehensive Plan in Part by Reformatting the Meridian Design Manual Including Reducing Duplicate Guidelines; Removing Site Design and Transportation Related Guidelines; Emphasize Architectural Elements and Change the Name of the Design Manual to the City of Meridian Architectural Standards Manual**

De Weerd: Item 10-A is ordinance 16-1672. Madam Clerk, will you, please, read this by title.

Holman: City of Ordinance No. 16-1672: An Ordinance Amending Meridian City Code as codified at Title 11, entitled the Unified Development Code of the Meridian City Code pertaining to definitions; residential dimensional standards; fencing; structure and site and multi-family design standards; common open space and site amenity requirements; specific use standards for drinking establishments, flex space and home occupations; timelines for signatures on development agreements; subdivision design and improvement standards and other miscellaneous sections; and other miscellaneous clean-up items and reformat of the Meridian Design Manual, including reducing duplicate guidelines; removing site design and transportation related guidelines; emphasize architectural elements and change the name of the design manual to the City of Meridian Architectural Standards Manual and providing for a waiver of the reading rules and providing an effective date.

De Weerd: Thank you. You have heard this ordinance read by title. Would anyone like to hear it read in its entirety?

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: Seeing nobody wants to hear this read in its entirety, I move that we approve Ordinance No. 16-1672 with suspension of rules.

Bird: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 10-A. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

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

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

B. Ordinance No. 16-1673: An Ordinance (Southridge Estates RZ 14-007) For the Rezone of Three Tracts of Land Situated in the North One Half and the Northwest One Quarter of the Southeast One Quarter of Section 23, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County. These Parcels Contains approximately 5.55 Acres

De Weerd: Item 10-B is Ordinance 16-1673. Will you, please, read this by title.

Holman: Thank you, Madam Mayor. City of Meridian Ordinance No. 16-1673: an Ordinance RZ 14-007, Southridge Estates, for the rezone of a tract of land situated in the north one half and the northwest one quarter of the southeast one quarter of Section 23, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho. Establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of R-16, Medium High Density Residential to TN-R, Traditional Neighborhood Residential, 3.05 acres, R-4, Medium Low Residential District to R-8, Medium Low Density Residential District, 083 acres and R-8, Medium Low Density Residential District to R-4, Medium Low Density Residential District 1.67 acres zoning in the Meridian City Code, providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County assessor, the Ada County recorder and the Idaho State Tax Commission as required by law and providing for a summary of the ordinance and providing for a waiver of the reading rules and providing an effective date.

De Weerd: You have heard this read by title only. Would anyone like to hear it read in its entirety? Seeing no takers --

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 16-1673 with suspension of rules.

Bird: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 10-B. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

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

De Weerd: All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 11: Other Items

De Weerd: We have a new item on our agenda. Other items? Any other items?

Item 12: Future Meeting Topics

De Weerd: Okay. Any future meeting topics? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Bird: So moved.

Milam: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:57 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR TAMMY De WEERD

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

JAYCEE HOLMAN, CITY CLERK

Bird: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 10-B. Madam Clerk, will you call roll.

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

De Weerd: All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Item 11: Other Items

De Weerd: We have a new item on our agenda. Other items? Any other items?

Item 12: Future Meeting Topics

De Weerd: Okay. Any future meeting topics? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Bird: So moved.

Milam: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:57 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

Keith Bird

~~MAYOR TAMMY De WEERD~~
Council President, *Keith Bird*
ATTEST:

3 1 8 1 1 6
DATE APPROVED

Jayne Holman
JAYCEE HOLMAN, CITY CLERK

