

A meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 3:01 p.m., Tuesday, October 11, 2016, by Mayor Tammy de Weerd.

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

Members Absent: Luke Cavener.

Others Present: Bill Nary, C.Jay Coles, Jaycee Holman, Caleb Hood, Warren Stewart, Mike de St. Germain, Perry Palmer Steve Siddoway, Sean Kelly 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> O </u> Lucas Cavener
<u> X </u> Mayor Tammy de Weerd	

De Weerd: Okay. I would like to start tonight's meeting first by thanking everyone for joining us this evening -- or this afternoon. For the record it is Tuesday, October 11th. It's a minute after 3:00. We will start with roll call attendance, Mr. Clerk.

Item 2: Pledge of Allegiance

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda A

De Weerd: Okay. Item No. 3 is adoption of the agenda.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: We need to -- Item 4 needs to be adopted to the agenda. It's a proclamation for National School Lunch Week. Item 5-I, the resolution number is 16-1173. Item 9 we need to adopt ordinance number 16-1708 to the agenda. And also Item No. 11, an Executive Session per Idaho State Code 74-206 needs

to be adopted to the agenda. And with that I move we approve the amended agenda.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve the agenda as amended. All those in favor say aye. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Item 4: Amended onto agenda: Proclamation for National School Lunch Week

De Weerd: Item 4 is a proclamation and tonight we will be joined by Jean Dean, who is the school nutrition supervisor with the West Ada School District, and Sue Clark. If you will join me at the podium. Okay. If you would like to come up here and I will read this proclamation and afterwards if you'd like to share a few words we would love to hear them.

Dean: Okay.

De Weerd: Okay. Whereas the National School Lunch Program has served our nation admirably for over 60 years through the advanced practices and nutrition education and whereas through this program schools are required to provide meals that meet federal nutrition standards and includes offering fruits and vegetables every day, serving whole grain rich foods, and limiting fat calories and sodium and whereas the West Ada School District serves over 18,763 healthy meals a day and over 3.3 million meals per school year at 53 school sites and whereas in addition to the above, the West Ada School District also provided over 50,000 free lunches to local children between the ages of one to 18 years through the summer feeding program that was held in various city parks; whereas there is continued need for nutrition education for our children and awareness about the value of the National School Lunch Program. Therefore, I, Mayor Tammy de Weerd, do hereby proclaim October 10th through the 14th as National School Lunch Week in the City of Meridian and I encourage all of our residents to become more aware and concerned about our children and their own nutritional habits in hope of achieving a more healthy citizenry for today and the future. So, thank you for joining us, Jean, and thank you, Sue, for being here and I will turn this over to you.

Dean: I wasn't expecting to talk. My husband says I can do it anywhere. Right now, actually, we did set a record. We fed 19,024 children about five days ago and that was a record for us. Participation is up at all our schools, especially our high schools, and it is such a privilege for us to be able to do this every day and I tell someone -- I tell people all the time that without food service and custodial

service the schools just don't run and without us they just can't get the nourishment that they need to do well on their tests and be healthy students and it is such an honor and we truly appreciate this proclamation and, by the way, tomorrow is National Join Your -- Invite Your Parents To School for school lunch day and it's a great time all week. You're always welcome to join us for lunch. We have great food and for adults it's only 3.65. It's a good buy. Thank you.

Item 5: Consent Agenda

- A. Approve Minutes of September 20, 2016 City Council Special PreCouncil Meeting**
- B. Approve Minutes of September 20, 2016 City Council Regular Meeting**
- C. Approve Minutes of September 27, 2016 City Council Regular Meeting**
- D. Final Order for Avebury Subdivision (H-2016-0108) by Avebury Development, LLC Located North Side of E. Pine Avenue and West of N. Locust Grove Grove Road**
- E. Final Order for Bancroft Square (H-2016-0110) by Schultz Development Located at 2750 S Eagle Road**
- F. Final Order for Swindell Subdivision (H-2016-0109) by Volante Investments, LLLP Located at Northwest Corner of East Overland Road and South Locust Grove Road**
- G. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Maddyn Village (H-2016-0075) by A Team Land Consultants Located West Side of N. Meridian Road, South of E. Ustick Road, North of W. Sedgewick Drive**
- H. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Laurels Townhouses (H-2016- 0065) by Northside Management Located at 2116 S. Accolade Avenue**
- I. Resolution No. 16-1173 : A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Meridian, Amending the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan to Update the Text of the Plan (H-2016-0098) to Modify the Goals, Objectives and Action Items Contained in the Plan; and to Amend the Future Land Use Map of 2002 Comprehensive Plan**

- to Better Reflect to Existing and Built Environment, and to More Consistently Represent Existing Land Uses; and Providing an Effective Date**
- J. Addendum to Development Agreement for Settlers Square (MDA-H-2016- 0074) with Seagle, Three, LLC located at 870 W. Ustick Road in the southwest ¼ of Section 36, Township 4 North, Range 1 West**
 - K. Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement between the City of Meridian and 4345 Linder Road LLC within Decatur Estates Subdivision No. 2**
 - L. Approval of a Sole Source Purchase for Hidrostal Influent Submersible Pumps for the WRRF Capacity Expansion Project**
 - M. Approval of Task Order 10640.a to Civil Survey Consultants for the “Water Main Extension: Locust Grove Rd (Mary Lane to Lake Hazel Rd) and Lake Hazel Road (Locust Grove Rd to Eagle Rd)” project for a Not-To-Exceed amount of \$55,706.00**
 - N. Approval of Task Order 6009.a to CTA Architects for the “Rail with Trail Pathway Design” for a Not-To-Exceed amount of \$77,600.00**
 - O. In Accordance With The Interagency Agreement Previously Approved By City Council, Approve The Not-To-Exceed Amount Of \$420,400.04 To Pay Ada County Highway District (ACHD) For City Water And Sewer Improvements Constructed By Knife River Corporation At The Intersection Of Ustick And Meridian Road, And Ustick Road Between Linder And Locust Grove Road.**

De Weerd: Thank you much. Okay. Item No. 5 is the Consent Agenda.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: As stated earlier, 5-I, the resolution number is 16-1173. With that I move we approve the Consent Agenda as published and for the Mayor to sign and the Clerk attest.

Borton: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. Are there any questions? Mr. Clerk, will you call roll.

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

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Item 6: Items Moved From the Consent Agenda

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

Item 7: Community Items/Presentations

A. Check presentation from The Light My Fire Organization

De Weerd: So, we will move to Item 7, which is a check presentation from the Light My Fire organization. I will say I personally contributed to this check amount and we are still paying off our credit card. No. I'm kidding. So, who do I turn this over to? Pam, do you want to recognize Mr. Ricketts? Or Perry. I saw you both jumping up to --

Orr: Madam Mayor, City Council, this is Mr. Bob Ricketts and he is representing the Light My Fire organization. It is a group of amazing volunteers that is generally from the insurance agencies and the cleanup agencies and there is a few more that partner with us in the most amazing way and so I'm going to turn it over to him so he can tell you.

De Weerd: Thank you. Thank you, Pam. And I will tell you, Pam, you're also on the planning committee I believe and Pam goes above and beyond in a number of different ways that I won't mention, but you are appreciated. Thank you for joining us.

Ricketts: Thank you, Pam. Thank you, Madam Mayor, City Council. It's a pleasure to be here today. It's been a lot of years that we have been doing this. We were counting back and -- and we have been doing this for 23 years now and we have accumulated over 365,000 dollars that we have raised for the Fire Prevention Education and the burn out funds in Boise and Meridian and that's something that this organization is very proud of and with that --

De Weerd: And how many years have you been involved in it?

Ricketts: I started it, my wife and I did.

De Weerd: And you're still going and thank you for what you do.

Ricketts: And the driving force is here tonight, so -- or this afternoon. I will introduce her in a moment.

De Weerd: The fuel. Yes.

Ricketts: The fuel and -- that's exactly right. But I do want to make a couple of comments that -- that I think is important. Of course, many of you don't know this, this week is National Fire Prevention Week, October 9th through the 14th, and that's proclaimed by the -- by the governor and, of course, the history behind that is -- it's because of Mrs. O'Leary's cow that kicked over the lantern in Chicago in 1871 and started a little fire there that kind of destroyed a few things, but it was kind of interesting, I actually had the opportunity to go to Chicago in September and we learned a little bit about Mrs. O'Leary and her cow and the fire and so forth and actually saw where the -- where the barn was that the fire started and it was very unique back then, but the Chicago River is actually between where this fire started and the downtown that burned and it was -- it was very interesting in how the fire actually got across the river and caused so much damage, because it burned over 2,000 acres, killed over 250 people, and displaced over 100,000 people and burned 17,400 structures. But back then there were no environmental concerns about the industries dumping things into the rivers and the waterways and so forth in that area and come to find out that the fire -- it actually started on the -- on one side of the river and, actually, when it got to the river there was so much pollution in there, some oils and greases and so forth from the factories, that the water actually caught on fire and that's how the fire got across the Chicago River and burned the entire city down, basically, on the other side. So, just a bit of history on that and so we are in the fire prevention business here and so what we want to help make sure that I do recognize Fire Prevention Week. We have a very dedicated group of individuals who -- who actually, you know, do the work behind the scenes in putting two events together each year. One is a dinner auction, which is in February, and we have a flyer to give to you that will mark this year's event coming up on February 24th, 2017, and, of course, an annual golf tournament that we hold in June. And so I would like to introduce those who are here, because these are the other driving forces behind the work that gets done and how all this stuff gets put together and the money gets raised. But we have here today, of course, my beautiful bride who started this with me, Judy Ricketts, and, Judy, if you would --

De Weerd: Stand up.

Ricketts: Please. And, then, we have -- from various --

De Weerd: I think Judy still hasn't forgiven me for outbidding her. Oh, twice. Two years in a row.

Ricketts: Yeah.

De Weerd: And I just know I have the strategy down.

Ricketts: Yeah.

Bird: Just running it up on them.

Ricketts: You're winning. All right. We have -- from Disaster Kleenup, who is Mary Cahoon, who is normally here, who is now our chairman of our board, is not here. She had a death in her family and so I'm going back to filling in for her again. But we have representing Disaster Kleenup Kerry Ogden. Kerry, if you would stand. We have from Belfore Andrea Bradshaw. At Paul Davis Restoration we have Blaine Toole. We have -- from CTR Chrissy Kane. And, of course, our two incredible members of the Meridian Fire Department that do a ton of work for us, Pam Orr and Perry Palmer, and these people are incredible. So, I would like to give them a -- and as Mary always says, now the fun part comes and that's presenting the money. The money this year -- we had a total of 34,150 dollars raised, which gets divided between Boise and Meridian, and we have -- we have put aside 13,660 dollars specifically for the City of Meridian this year and we are going to present -- 8,196 dollars goes to the Fire Prevention and we are so grateful that the City of Meridian has adopted the matching funds program, which kicks that up to 16,392 dollars. And, then, of course, to the burnout fund of 5,464 dollars to the burnout fund. And we actually -- we have a commemorative check somewhere, where ever that is, but, then, we actually have some money, so if the representatives from the fire department and the burnout fund -- I believe Joe Bongiorno and -- I don't know who is here for the -- for the -- Pam is fire prevention. If you will come up we will -- our pleasure. There is your check. Pam or Perry. There you go.

(Picture taken.)

De Weerd: So, I will tell you that the governor gives it a week. We gave it a whole month. So, just always trying to outdo the governor. Okay. Well, thank you for being here and you don't have to stay for the rest of meeting.

B. Idaho Transportation Department: Changes to Eagle Road at Village Drive and River Valley Street

De Weerd: Okay. Item 7-B is under the -- a discussion about proposed change with Eagle Road and, Caleb, are you going to do this presentation?

Hood: No, Madam Mayor. Erika Bowen with ITD is here to --

De Weerd: Okay.

Hood: -- give you the update.

De Weerd: Okay.

Bowen: Good afternoon, Madam Mayor and City Council Members.

De Weerd: Good afternoon.

Bowen: Thanks for the opportunity to speak to you. Over the last year --

De Weerd: State your name.

Bowen: Oh, sorry. I'm Erika Bowen. I work for the Idaho Transportation Department. I'm the District 3 traffic engineer --

De Weerd: Thank you.

Bowen: -- for our region. Over the last year ITD has received multiple requests from concerned citizens, from the Meridian Police Department, from the ACHD, to review the safety of the intersection at Eagle Road and Village Drive. Particularly in the last few months those request e-mails, phone calls from concerned citizens have certainly increased in frequency and with how they are looking at safety on this road. We have been monitoring crashes at this intersection since 2012 when their access opened. The access was conditioned upon it being safe, with the understanding that it would be closed if crashes were being experienced there and we have multiple accesses along Eagle Road in the median and so there are crashes experienced at all of those accesses, but when looking at and comparing those to this one, this one certainly has a higher frequency of crashes that we are seeing. Over the last two years in particular the crash rate has increased from about two accidents per month in 2015 to right now we are seeing about three crashes per month. So, that's something of concern to the department. What I would like to do today is to walk you through our crashed data. What the existing conditions are. What a median access closure looks like and, then, what are the next steps in this process.

De Weerd: That was good timing, Ralph.

Bowen: When you look at the intersection of Eagle Road and Village Drive, what's unique about this as compared to all the other median accesses that allow for the U-turn, plus the left turning movement, is that there are three through

lanes and so you can see this on the diagram. You have got three through lanes headed northbound, in addition to the one right-turn lane, the dedicated right onto Village Drive. When we look at the crash data since 2012, about 75 percent of the crashes that are being experienced here is head-on turning and angle turning. So, someone making that left is -- is getting into a crash with someone headed northbound. Another 15 percent of those are rear ends and so when you're looking at that and seeing, well, what's the rear end, with those, those are folks who are slamming on their brakes, not -- trying not to hit the person making that left turn -- left turn and they are stopping and the vehicle behind them -- is rear ending into them. This is just like I said, a different condition than we see everywhere else. Along the other median accesses it's all two lanes either on the north or the southbound direction that folks are making the left-hand turn movement. So, I pulled some of the information on crashes, just a high level overview. In 2012 the access opened in about October, so we only saw three crashes that year. 2013 it increased to about 12 crashes. 2014 we saw 16. 2015 we were up to 19. And, then, in 2016 about right now we are at 24 crashes and the year isn't over. Double asterisks on there that is a noncomplete data set for two reasons. One being the year is not over yet. The second being all of our crash data is recorded and collected from the police department and put into a database and that database they try to keep up with all the crash data from around the state. We were able to confirm the number of crashes that have been experienced there to date, but not have all the data associated with that. They are still processing and doing quality control at the Idaho Transportation Department. What I think is significant to look at is the severity of crashes and so when you look at these numbers the -- these numbers are related to the crashes involving injuries, not necessarily the number of individuals injured in each crash. So, in 2015 we had three crashes with the -- with motorists who had visible injuries, five crashes with motorists with possible injuries. Eleven crashes involving property damage only. With a total economic cost of crashes around 1.1 million. So, the Idaho Transportation Department looks at and puts a cost to each of these crashes and so the cost is due to medical expenses, due to property damage, due to time that it would take you away from your livelihood, from your jobs and they put numbers to these and so we were able to come up with what that economic cost of crashes was for 2015. To me what's significant is in 2016 we have got four crashes with visible injuries, three with possible injuries. I have got 17 nonreportable crashes right now and so what that means is I wasn't able to grab the data out of our database, it wasn't cleansed yet for me to see what that looked like, for what type of injuries were occurring in those and we are already over that 1.1 million. We are at 1.4. We have got 17 crashes not accounted for and a couple more months left this year. So, that is certainly costing Idaho taxpayers money for the crashes that are related to this intersection that we want to be aware of. We have been looking at this access since I was traffic engineer on access about a year ago. Met with CenterCal a few times and talked about, well, what can we do here. CenterCal certainly wants their customers to be safe in turning into their facilities. ITD wants

motorists to be safe traveling along the state highway system. One of the things we thought of is when we are looking at the types of crashes that are occurring, what is happening in a lot of these instances, if you travel along Eagle Road you can see is that the two left lanes -- let me back up to a picture real quick. So, the two left lanes closest to the median are getting backed up from River Valley and folks are stopping. Those individuals are being nice and those two lanes are stopping and waving the left turner through, to say go ahead, we will stop for you to make that turn. You know, go into Village -- The Village center. What is occurring, however, is there is free flow traffic at 50 to 55 miles per hour in that third outside lane. It is very difficult with sight distance, with obstructions of those vehicles, to safely make that maneuver when vehicles are stopped and telling them it's safe. A lot of those crashes are occurring in that kind of time frame, that kind of situation where it is the unintended crash between the outside lane and the left turning traffic. So, one of our ideas that we had -- actually, let me back up. One of our ideas that we had and that we actually implemented was let's put up a big sign that says watch, caution, three oncoming lanes of traffic. Maybe they just don't realize that they -- that this is a different intersection condition that they are experiencing everywhere else on Eagle Road. So, when you travel on Eagle Road in a southbound direction you can see our sign. The sign worked for about a month I would say, when we were talking with law enforcement. It's something new. It was very large, very visible, people were paying attention to it. What often happens with passive safety improvements, passive traffic control measures, is people start becoming numb to that and that is probably what happened here. They saw it initially and people started gauging their own personal risk of how to go about their -- you know, their traffic maneuvers. You probably see that all the time, folks crossing double yellows, you cringe when someone crosses in front of you a little bit too close to your preference when they are making left turns. That's potentially what's happening here. The other thing that we looked at -- and I met with CenterCal and their engineering representative last month is we said, okay, let's make the site conditions similar to all the other intersections that allows for this turning maneuver and so we talked about reducing the lanes here from three to two, to allow that dedicated right turn lane, but to actually cross out that third outside lane. This way traffic patterns are closer to what that expectation of -- of the motorist is everywhere else on Eagle Road. Plus we were seeing the backup on two lanes. So, if two lanes are being stopped, both lanes are leaving them to pass through, there is not that third outside lane for folks to consider. We actually drew up striping plans, traffic control plans, that was something that we were considering implementing as we discussed with CenterCal until about a couple weeks ago when we were looking at how this coordinates with the larger Stars project that CenterCal and ITD is working on and so that Stars project is from Franklin to Fairview. It's adding three through lanes and right turn bays all throughout that corridor, so that from the interstate to River Valley when you're headed northbound we have three full lanes of traffic. When we looked at that and it says, well, the improvement that we are trying to do for Village Drive is to neck it

down to two lanes, the goals didn't mesh. You know, the goals of the Stars project is to increase mobility, increase flow. How are we going to do that and, then, all of a sudden pinch down, narrow down this intersection, so we have got two lanes of traffic. With that -- go back to the right slide that we are on. Oh. And the other thing that was important is the Stars project is anticipated for completion in November 2016. So, it's not that it was two years away or three years away, it's happening in a couple weeks and so that's something we were wanting to -- that we wanted to consider is the goals of the Stars project wasn't aligning up with our goals of trying out the safety improvement of reduction in lanes. So, in talking with ITD management, we came to the conclusion that we really need to address the safety concerns here of the traveling public of the motorist and so our immediate response right now is without a different alternative to look at we need to close the median access -- the left-in median access for Village Drive. And on here is a striping plan and so headed south from River Valley on your left what you will see is some striping as you continue down that will X out the left turn lane and, then, the image to the left is a type of safety product called Sure Curve and so it's a bolt down, semi-permanent installation of a traffic barrier, something that can be removed in the future if it's not needed in the future, if we come up with a different safety improvement to address safety and mobility or if we want to in the future install something more permanent, such as adjusting the concrete curbing. We are looking at putting signage up there warning traffic of different conditions. We are also looking at putting dynamic message signs north of River Valley warning folks that the left-in access at Village Drive will no longer be available to them. That way they can make that decision early on whether to make the left at the signal at River Valley to get into the complex or to go down to Fairview and be able to make it there as well. ITD has press releases that we are ready to put out as well and we will continue to notify the public and observe, see what's going on. We have been working with the ACHD and so with the elimination of those left-ins they will be monitoring the signals and making any tweaks that are needed to help with congestion that we might be seeing at their signals due to increased left-in movements in the left turn. Any -- any questions on striping?

De Weerd: I guess I have a question for Caleb. When we approved the -- the development wasn't there going to be a light there and is that the -- was that considered as an option to mitigate the traffic accidents? I mean when you go up to River Valley the left turn movements that want to go into this development stack way far back and you almost need both of those in order to accommodate the traffic that's wanting to go into The Village.

Bowen: Madam Mayor, Kittelson & Associates and I met yesterday and we have been talking as well prior to that about various options to look at and that's one of the things that we are going to continue to do moving forward is -- is a signal at this location the right option, to look at safety, mobility. Are there other potential solutions out there. ITD's concern right now is installation of a signal can't

happen immediately. There is design. There is material acquisition that needs to occur. So, it could be a month out. It could be two months. It could be whatever that time frame is. What happens if someone gets into a crash tomorrow or, you know, heaven forbid someone has it -- we have a fatality there tomorrow, if the department knows there is a safety issue today we want to be able to address that while still being partners with CenterCal to move forward and see what could be done to allow for that left-in movement again in the future. But the number of citizen concerns that we are getting, the volume of e-mails, phone calls, just looking at this, the department feels very strongly that we need to act now and address the safety issue and continue to look at options for the future.

De Weerd: I guess Caleb --

Hood: Madam Mayor, I haven't looked at the development agreement for several years, but just going off of memory when this came in, I'm going to just speculate that there is nothing in the development agreement that the city jumped in and said, you know, a signal here. I do know that when CenterCal -- if I remember anyways, when CenterCal was coming in they proposed a signal even back then, but I think through part of the negotiations for the Star improvements and those types of things, it's been pretty much what Erika said, that that this was the approved initial turning movements at this intersection. So, it was talked about back when they originally came through for annexation, but -- and I can double-check here just to look in our database, but I am highly doubtful there is anything in there that says you're granted a signal. City Council doesn't typically do that.

De Weerd: We don't get into detail, but we did have the conversation that having the lights would help mitigate that. And certainly once the property across the street develops.

Hood: Yeah. And, Madam Mayor, I do remember some of those conversations, I just don't think anything is going to be -- you know, maybe in the minutes there is that discussion, but I don't think there is going to be anything in the development agreement or the conditions of approval that really go to -- to that point.

De Weerd: Uh-huh.

Hood: But I will double-check that.

De Weerd: Council, any questions?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I -- you know, there is no entrances on -- from River Valley to -- to Fairview from the west. So, the traffic that wants to turn into The Village can do so at the light at River Valley, in my opinion, and I know it stacks up back there, but we can take off some of that deal and make it a longer turn lane. My biggest fear -- you put a -- you put a light there, which is a quarter mile, you're going to be stacked up halfway to Pine Street at times and I know we can coordinate it and stuff until an Opticom is hit and, then, that fouls up the light deal for three or four or five rotations. I -- when this come forward I thought this was going to be a right-in, right-out, but I was wrong.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Just a question. I drive up and down -- I drive up and down Eagle Road all day long for work and now avoid it and take Cloverdale as much as I can, but I have noticed several times at 2:00 o'clock going southbound at River Valley the -- at least one of the turn lanes has been backed onto the main travel lane of Eagle Road. I'm assuming that that's timed to make it efficient for the traffic coming out of Eagle and Fairview going northbound, so that they don't get tied up all the way to Fairview; right?

Bowen: Yes.

Palmer: So, if -- if a light were to be placed here, say two lanes like River Valley is, would it be timed similarly so that it's not affecting northbound traffic, but still easing traffic off of the other intersection there just north of it?

Bowen: Yeah. And, so, Madam Mayor, Council Member Palmer, that's -- one of the things when Kittelson & Associates was showing me -- they showed me a visual model of what would it look like to put a signal there. How would it affect northbound traffic, how would it affect right turning traffic from Fairview onto Eagle, what could we do to minimize things like delay. We see a lot of yellow flashing lights around town, which is really helpful with moving traffic and giving that fair warning. So, I guess I would say that the department is working to schedule a meeting with CenterCal with their traffic engineer, law enforcement, to review a number of different options, one being a signal here to see if that is something that is viable. It doesn't -- as Council Member Bird said meet our IDAPA spacing. It would address safety, but there is other ways to do that as well. But we want to be open minded and look at how it affects the entire transportation system here. I have got a couple other slides if you don't mind if I keep moving forward. Okay. So, I wanted to -- I'm an engineer, so I like numbers. I wanted to show you who exactly is affected by this median access closure. So, on the left-hand side of the screen is a diagram with the various movements at the intersection. So, for instance, you see headed northbound

20,067 vehicles making a U-turn from northbound and southbound was nine vehicles. We went out and collected data Saturday, December 5th -- oh, it says 2016. But 2015 from 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. and so in that spreadsheet is -- what you see is all the various movements through that intersection for the day. Who gets affected by that is really we are affecting the 1,793 left turns and the 34 U-turns that were being experienced in that single day on Saturday by closing the median access. We are not closing the right-in, right-out access that Village Drive has, so none of that gets affected. The other thing that I circled and highlighted in blue is what we are doing is we are affecting the 20,000 travelers who are headed northbound. We are making sure this is a safe passage for them, so that they are not potentially being involved in a crash. That is a heavy volume of traffic headed northbound. To give you a little bit more granular detail -- so, we look at peak hours, peak traveling hours, whether it is on Saturday or throughout the weekday seems to be right around the lunchtime hour and so when they looked at the a.m. peak most vehicles traveling through that intersection it was 11:00 to noon and 194 left turning movements were experienced there. From noon to 1:00 on that day 165. So, those are the real numbers that on an hourly basis that the other signals at River Valley or at Eagle and Fairview would have to take on. So, it's truly that 1,700, 1,800 vehicles who would need to find an alternate path to get into The Village. So, moving forward, we actually already in stage two to implement this work tonight. We have got all the materials, we have got all the crews ready, they are kind of standing at the wings waiting for that final head nod to make sure that we can go forward with those safety improvements and so they will be out there with traffic control tonight, setting up the dynamic message signs, we will be putting out our public announcements as well and looking to get this implemented. Like I said, our big concern is we know is a safety issue out there. There are so many calls, pleas for help for ITD to look at and do something. I always hear on the phone how many more people do you have to kill? Basically none, because we haven't killed any -- you know, no one's died here, but how many more crashes, you know, will occur here before we do something. Hopefully none, because the anticipation is to address the median access issue tonight.

De Weerd: Well, I certainly hope that works, because maybe we will see widening on Chinden and I think we probably -- what is the -- the safety concerns here, percentagewise, versus the accidents we have on Chinden and we are not getting any solutions up there.

Bowen: And the department is looking at all sorts of -- I guess projects, so -- you're probably specifically talking about Chinden and Eagle or just Chinden in general?

De Weerd: I'm talking Chinden from -- anywhere between Eagle and Linder to begin with. Certainly the intersection of Chinden and Locust Grove, but I mean

those accidents occur frequently as well and we are not getting anywhere with that until 2021.

Bowen: Well -- and the department is looking at those, trying to address those. One of the things that makes this easier to implement is -- is certainly cost. Now, we are not looking to acquire right of way, we are not looking to expand. This is a low cost, high benefit, high value improvement to address safety. Certainly the department knows and acknowledges that there are corridors everywhere that are either congested or have safety concerns. Money is limited throughout the state. We have a strategic initiatives budget that is competitive throughout the state for every district to propose projects and so there is need everywhere, not just in -- in Ada and Canyon counties, that District Three is trying to compete with to show where the greatest need is.

De Weerd: With the same traffic volume?

Bowen: There is -- there is I would say different ways to look at safety, but it's an accidents per million vehicles. So, I would have to go back and look at the data to see where traffic volumes and accident per million vehicles are along the Chinden corridor compared to other corridors around the state and if that's something you're interested in we can certainly get that information to -- rather quickly, too. I know I have seen maps generated that shows a comparison of similar corridors across the state and how they rank, either better, worse, or the same, similar to other corridors statewide. So, that's something we can get for you.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Erika, I might have misunderstood or not heard, but if -- if you have to go to lights out there at this location when and how much are they -- how much are -- do lights cost? When could we expect them? I know they are probably not in the budget for this year or next year or --

Bowen: I'm not sure that is the solution that ITD will move forward with. It's something that we are willing to look at closer with Kittelson & Associates to evaluate. Signals typically cost us about 300,000 for a full intersection. This is a little bit smaller than a full intersection, so something less than that. But it's something to consider. But, like I said, we -- we are still in the evaluation phase of putting a signal there.

Bird: Thank you very much.

Little Roberts: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Yes, Mrs. Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Probably one of my concerns, Erika, would be suddenly closing something off is the economic impact on -- I mean we watched businesses close on Chinden because of access suddenly being denied and I'm sure -- you know, The Village isn't in any danger of closing, but you still want those patrons and also what the value of the property across the street suddenly is to deny access. So, I'm just a little concerned that we get this information on the day that the work is supposed to happen without time to really evaluate it.

Bowen: Madam Mayor, Council Member Little Roberts, the Idaho Transportation Department did give a presentation to the Meridian Transportation Commission last week. Amy Schroeder spoke to that committee and let them know of our intent and, then, on the recommendation of Caleb Hood he recommended that we come and give a similar presentation to your committee. With respect to your question -- or comment with regarding to business, as you alluded to the Center At Meridian is a destination. I have got a graphic in this slide as that there are multiple access points that -- that a consumer can go to get that. We heard similar outcries and comments when ITD put in medians all up and down Eagle Road. I was not involved in that one and would have to go back and get statistics for you to see if any businesses closed as a result of that. I know personally -- and it's just personally, it's not, you know, engineering, but if I want to go to The Village it's because I want to go there. I never drive on Eagle Road and say, oh, I want to take a right and, you know, go eat at the Matador or something like that. To me it's -- it's always a destination. You know, as a gas station is something that, depending on access and ease of crossing the street and what that price is, whether it's two cents cheaper or not, will I go out of my way to make a U-turn and hit the other side of the road. But there are a lot of opportunities at River Valley. Folks can make a U-turn from south to northbound on Eagle and Fairview. You're able to do that and, then, the right-in on Village Drive. There is Records Road off of Fairview and, then, the Records Road extension, which is going up to Ustick, which I do believe will be completed in the next month or two as well. So, there are certainly a lot of options available to the public and to consumers. But we can certainly look into your question about businesses and see if we have any statistics of what occurred after the median closures or after the median was installed on Eagle Road.

Little Roberts: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Erika, I know of at least four that closed because of those medians and so that's my concern is access to our businesses and our economic drivers and I'm certainly concerned about safety as well, but I would just like to

really see a time frame for the potential light to really be examined and not just have this stop with this solution, because it seems like there are other options.

Bowen: Absolutely. And as I mentioned, you know, that's something that we are going to set up a meeting with Kittelson & Associates, CenterCal, law enforcement, ITD staff as well, to look and see if this is a viable solution that meets all of the needs. That's something that, hopefully, we can do early next week to keep this moving forward. It's not something that we want to sit on either, because if we look at that and it is not deemed a viable solution for allowing left-ins to be reopened here, then, we need to look at a couple other, you know, ideas that we were throwing out yesterday between the Kittelson & Associates and myself is an automatic gating system, similar to what you see in HOV lanes over in Seattle or DC where you pick time of days that typical crashes are occurring and we just close the access. Whereas I know I have used that access. There are certainly times of the -- you know, times of the day, days of the week where it was perfectly safe, because you're able to find appropriate gaps there. You know, throw out big ideas and maybe a fly over and I don't know if there is enough area and the cost would certainly be expensive for that one, but maybe a dedicated fly over from the left lane to get into the center. You know, tunneling under. Signalization is something that we are going to look at. As mentioned earlier, River Valley. So, it might be taking a step back and saying what do we really need to do to River Valley to be able to get enough traffic through those left turns. You know, I stated earlier I have seen it where the left turn lanes are blocked by the southbound lanes and even though the signal is saying turn left, there is nobody, you know, in those lanes available to make that maneuver. So, there is certainly some reconfiguration there that might improve our overall coordination and mobility of the corridor. And the other thing that ITD is really interested in looking at closer is the Records Road extension. What does this do for traffic. Do traffic patterns change at all with folks having another option of being able to enter in that complex. So, these are all things that we certainly want to sit down with Kittelson & Associates and CenterCal to explore and figure out what works best for the corridor here.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Madam Mayor, Erika, you mentioned that they are waiting for the final nod. Is there -- are they waiting to see how this meeting goes before -- I mean are we -- have any influence on whether this moves forward tonight or not?

Bowen: Madam Mayor. So, it is intended that this is information only and so they are ready to go. I was given instruction by the district engineer that if there was an extreme circumstance that required -- or that the City Council requested ITD to reconsider, that's something that we might be able to -- to look at. The

concern that the department has is that with the striping in particular we are at the mercy of temperatures and weather right now and so you cannot stripe when it's raining. Striping does not -- the paint in striping does not adhere to the pavement very well in colder temperatures. We absolutely have to do this work at night due to the traffic volumes and so with all of that combined, you know, it's supposed to start raining on Thursday this week. So, it's -- we are a little bit at the mercy of the timing of all of this and so ideally -- like I said, they are ready, they have got their equipment, they are wanting to move forward tonight, but I was given a very slim -- you know, if there was something extreme where there was a reason to delay this, then, we could call up the district engineer and see if there was a chance to delay. But in speaking with her this morning she wanted to go forward with it. She thought this was the right solution to put in place right now, that we are more than willing to partner with CenterCal to look at and evaluate other options, but she, too, had concerns that if there be a crash tonight or a crash tomorrow and that citizen would call up and say, well, you spoke about this, you were ready to act tonight and now, look, you know, something happened to my loved one and what are you going to do about that. So, we are not saying this is a permanent installation, we just need to figure out what's the right option and what's the right improvement to reopen it.

De Weerd: I guess my concern is we are learning about it the day before you already have a solution that you're moving forward with and last week you talked to the Transportation Commission. The notice to the city seems next to impossible for us to have any input.

Bowen: And, Madam Mayor, the department certainly appreciates and wants to gather input from your city, from any city, on safety, but it is the state highway system and so we manage that and we are looking out for the best interest in terms of safety and mobility for the travelling public and I can appreciate that the City Council would have liked some additional time to consider to be able to have a discussion -- a better discussion with the transportation department on this, but barring there not being another solution at this time to help -- to prevent and eliminate these crashes that are occurring, this would still be the direction that the department would go in. Kind of looking at these potential ideas here and with us being in discussion with CenterCal over the last several months, nothing else has really come and risen to the top, besides signalization. But signalization takes time to implement, to gather material and put down on the pavement.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: Erika, I appreciate that it is not a permanent solution. My question is why wouldn't you start with something like automatic gating and that still allows some

traffic to go through there and, then, monitor any potential accidents during not so busy times?

Bowen: Madam Mayor, Council Member Milam, that is certainly something that we want to look for. So, really, where the concern is is in timing. So, even with gating that's a solution that we would need to reach out to the vendor, potentially with DOT on how it works. You know, even I have concern. I know Kittelson has concerns where -- you often see this on HOV lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, and there is mechanisms in place to make sure those gates come down and they are not crashing on top of a vehicle or a motorcyclist or a bicyclist, you know, anyone using this. And so there is things that we would have to consider to make sure it works succinctly so that these gates aren't opening and closing and causing a different type of crashed and so I think that is certainly an option to look out, it's just not a quick option to address the safety concern and so we were looking at how to address that safety concern. ITD gets lots of comments and questions about safety concerns, not just at this intersection, but all over and we try to mitigate for them, to address them as quickly as possible, and often it's in terms of signing and striping. There is other bigger issues where we need to acquire right of way, do expansion projects, but this is -- this is the typical procedure I would say that ITD goes through is we have been monitoring the situation, crashes are escalating and outcry from the citizens, conversations with law enforcement is escalating as well, that something needs to be done here and so we are trying to act accordingly to do something, but still leaving the opportunity open for us to figure out what's -- what is another option out there to make sure that economics is not, you know, being hurt for all those businesses, but we are still being able to maintain safety and mobility.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Madam Mayor, I'm curious if CenterCal representative has any comment and I'd also like to hear from our law enforcement as to what their opinions might be as to the -- the various options, especially signaling it, so that we can ensure the economic prosperity of the -- the tenants around the intersection while being able to efficiently and safety get traffic through.

Hood: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Who is saying -- oh, it's like where did that come from.

Hood: Before you --

De Weerd: I know it wasn't God.

Hood: Before I -- well, pretty close, but no. No. Before you transition to what Mr. Palmer just recommended, I just want a couple of points of clarification. This was on the Transportation Commission's agenda for last Monday, but they did not hear it. Amy Schroeder did attend, but it was vacated from the agenda. We thought it more appropriate to be a discussion at the Council level than at the transportation commission. I do appreciate Erika coming on short notice to give this presentation to you, because she was scheduled to be last Monday at the Transportation Commission, but they didn't hear it. So, I don't have anything to carry forward, any recommendation or words of wisdom from them. They haven't -- although we have talked about -- and Sergeant Arnold may come up as part of -- as part of the request to hear from the police department, but this corridor had been discussed by the transportation commission, but they haven't been briefed on the potential striping and median changes, but that's forthcoming. So, just a -- just a point of clarification. And the other thing -- and I didn't make it all the way through the development agreement, but I did, to your question, Madam Mayor, earlier, in Section 5.5 of the development agreement with Meridian Town Center -- I will just read you a portion of this. It says: No details related to access to the property are approved with the subject annexation and zoning approval. The proposed access locations on the major arterials will be approved by ACHD and ITD. So, that's what's in the development agreement and it really punted to say whatever -- so, just those couple of things before you move into the next phase of -- of this meeting, so --

De Weerd: Thank you.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Before we do that, can I ask a couple of questions while you're up here? The first one is do you utilize any objective measurements to determine at what threshold level there is now an unacceptable level of crashes and, if so, what is that measurement is?

Bowen: So, we look at and compare the actions per million vehicle mile of this intersection with the rest of Eagle Road. I didn't bring that data with me, but we can certainly get it and be able to present to you how it is substantially higher than the rest of the corridor and so that's what we look at is what is a typical condition and, then, how this one might be exasperated. Is there a threshold? It's more of a comparison of -- is it greater than, you know, less than the other one. ITD doesn't have specific standards to say at this threshold we do something.

Borton: So, Madam Mayor, a similar question would be -- it doesn't sound like you track the number of crashes in proportion to daily trips. So, for example, if

crashes might increase, but increased at a slower rate than the number of trips increase, you don't track that data either?

Bowen: I don't particularly track it myself. We do have analysts at ITD who could do that, could grab that information.

Borton: And the reason I ask, Madam Mayor, is it sounds like some of the -- for this example I'm not seeing objective measurements that we have this defined policy and it's crossed to define threshold of percentage of crashes to daily trips and that warrants us to investigate a change, it sounds more subjective, whether it's in relation to the proportion of crashes at other areas on Eagle Road.

Bowen: And I would agree with that statement.

Borton: The challenge that I have with that, amongst the other challenges -- and Council Woman Little Roberts hit it on the head with the timing of this -- if you could go to your -- I think your earlier slide showed the number of crashes -- maybe slide two. Yeah. And I -- did I hear you correctly, one of the remarks was crashes have gone -- increased from two to three per month at this left turn?

Bowen: Yes.

Borton: So, the reason I asked about the objective measurements -- I don't have a lot of reference for whether it's gotten worse or not, but the numbers that are utilized, at least today, show you have got three crashes out of 53,000 left-hand turns monthly and you have got an equivalent of 60 per million crashes, you know, five one-thousands of a percent of these left turns, the vast majority are all safe, efficient left turns. You have got an infinitesimal teeny fraction where there is an increase and it's gone from two to three. Any one crash is unacceptable and the only solution is you close Eagle Road if you don't want crashes. But it seems so teeny in light of what I think can be the drastic consequence that -- that we don't have an answer for today. If there is a reason to delay and maybe we will get more information that changes that, but among these concerns is that fraction is so small and the decision isn't -- isn't made to close this based on some objective threshold being crossed -- and I have no information to say that the businesses that are impacted, either their revenue is cut in half or they are closed entirely; right? And if revenue is cut we will never -- we don't know, but a lot of the landlords and property owners will tell you -- and Council Woman Little Roberts probably can cite the data -- I bet it might be more than 1.4 million dollars of economic loss caused by this closure. So, if you're causing a greater economic loss by the closure to solve a problem that is infinitesimally small statistically speaking, that doesn't cross any objective threshold and, realistically, once closed it's not going to reopen. I think it sounds backwards, the -- the willingness that you have described, which is great to do analysis and see if Records Avenue will change or if there is an economic data to support it, I would

hope this decision it would be at least delayed until all of those questions are answered and there is a comfort level to answer all those, because I think it is a huge drastic impact that might not be solving that great of a problem. That's just the gist of what I got from the numbers that you provided and if there is not objective measurements that -- that warrant the closure, could cause irreparable damage.

Bowen: Madam Mayor, Council Member Borton, the Idaho Transportation Department, like many DOTs across the nation, are all going towards zero deaths. That -- that is our safety moto, our safety slogan. There are no fatalities at this intersection, but we feel very strongly to maintain safety for every motorist. Now, one is too many, two is too many, you know, I completely understand where you're coming from, where it's -- it's a small number of -- you know, 1,800 folks are making that left-hand turn every day, you know, out of that, you know, two a month, three a month are getting into those crashes, which affects, you know, two or more vehicles. You know, if it was your significant other or your child who got into that crash -- not as a left turner, but as the bystander who happened. I -- we have commercials -- department messages that have been broadcast as public service announcements where it's how many is too many and folks come up with a number. Well, ten is okay or 20 is okay and, then, when we say how many in your family is it okay and they say none and so I can understand there is a balance between economics and safety and mobility. I certainly understand that. Our three goals for ITD are safety, mobility and economic opportunity. We look at these crashes, we look at crashes everywhere within our district and take input from law enforcement, just from what we perceive safety as and your constituents are saying this is not safe. We are getting a lot of e-mails and a lot of phone calls saying this isn't a safe intersection. I avoid it completely, you know. Or this isn't safe. I just had to slam on my brakes, because someone made a riskier judgment call in making that left turn and those are the kinds of --

De Weerd: And I guess the greater concern is going to be what are you going to drive behaviors to do. So, you're going to go do a U-turn and do something -- a U-turn on Fairview and Eagle, which is the busiest intersection in the state. So, where you're going to see some erratic behavior and maybe running of red lights on the green turn on River Valley, what is the possible ramification that you may reduce crashes there, but are you going to cause them other places, because now you're going to stack so far back on River Valley or you're going to throw more in the intersection of Eagle and Fairview that will cause people to do some pretty stupid things and, you know, I -- I appreciate Councilman Borton being able to better articulate what my question was on percentage of accidents, but by doing this are you going to make another turn movement either at River Valley or at Fairview or maybe even at Records off of Fairview even more dangerous, now you have that many more turn movements that have to figure out how to get into The Village. So, that's -- those are our real concerns that I don't know what the

answer is and I don't know -- and the data, if that -- those -- now what are those 18,000 left-hand turns going to do instead.

Bowen: And they will find alternate access as you suggested. They will make a U-turn, that's protected when they are at those intersections, Eagle and River Valley. They will make the left-hand turns.

De Weerd: Well, I don't know that our U-turns on Eagle Road has been all that safe. I have heard some pretty interesting statistics on that, so I'm not sure if that's really the answer.

Bowen: And I would have to go back and grab that. I don't have those statistics in front of me.

De Weerd: Okay. Well, we don't want to beat you up, but it -- it is a little bit frustrating to us that we are -- we are getting this and the next day the change is coming in and -- usually we do have an opportunity to weigh in, especially in one of the largest developments in our community, with the greatest economic impact potentially.

Bowen: And I can appreciate that. I'm, you know, part the messenger, part --

De Weerd: I won't kill the messenger. I promise.

Bowen: Yeah.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: I agree with that and I appreciate you are just the messenger, but I think there is an opportunity -- at least from my perspective, to say, you know what, the City of Meridian has raised a lot of good questions and a lot of them are unanswered and it might warrant taking some time and tabling this and getting these things answered and this is a great discussion, even though it's extremely late, this might lead to additional information or an alternative solution. That opportunity exists it sounds like.

Bowen: It certainly exists. That's not something within my power to make that judgment call on, but after the meeting I can certainly make a phone call to our district engineer and bring up your concern and let her make that decision of whether to move ahead tonight or need it to be delayed. But, as I said, we are constrained by weather and other conditions as well. So, if we don't act rather quickly, this isn't something that we will be able to effectively address until next

spring then and so, then, there is three crashes a month that will occur at this location potentially.

De Weerd: Okay. Any other questions for Erika at this point? I will ask The Village to comment and, then, we would love to hear from our law enforcement. Thank you, Erika. If you will, please, state your name and address for the record.

Chou: Certainly, Madam Mayor. My name is Jeremy Chou, I'm an attorney for Givens Pursley. Represent CenterCal. The law firm is located 601 West Bannock, Boise, Idaho.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Chou: Thank you, Ma'am, and thank you Members of the Commission -- oh, I'm sorry, for the Council -- for the opportunity to discuss and address these issues. I have, as I said -- as I said, I represent CenterCal, also known as The Village at Meridian. With me today Hugh Crawford, who is the general manager at The Village and also John Ringert with Kittelson & Associates, that specializes in transportation planning, design, and engineering. We were notified on September 28th, 2016, that ITD intended to temporarily close this left turn at the end of this month. As a result of that, on October 7th, 2016, we sent them an appeal more as a formality of their decision, in the hopes that to further have this discussion about alternatives. We didn't -- I mean it wasn't our experts are in agreement with ITD that there is an issue on that turn lane, but for us it's -- it's not about complete closure or an opening, there are other options out there that -- that have been considered and, frankly, have been approved in the past. In a moment I'm going to ask, with your permission, Mr. Ringert to come and explain kind of the history with respect to this access, along with some of the questions that you had addressed to -- I'm sorry, is it Mr. Ringert earlier -- with your permission. But I think, just from listening to some of the questions and some of the comments, it's -- Council Person Little Roberts really kind of hit it on the head. The concerns with respect to economics aren't unwarranted here. In fact, it's important to note that when you're talking about access, safety is certainly a consideration, but I'm quoting here: The standard for an access, quote: May also include overriding economic opportunity considerations and that's under their standard -- that's under the ITD and IDAPA standards. You know, you heard -- there were several options out there. One that we really kind of have been talking about since 2009, have been signalization of that -- of that -- of that access. In fact, we heard Ms. Bowen say that, yeah, it would address the safety issues. Well, it would also address the economic issues. And to address some of the questions that Council Person Bird had asked, a signal would probably typically cost about 250, 300 thousand dollars and that would be something that CenterCal would pay for. CenterCal actually has the ability to pay for that now under the Stars budget, under their I-Stars program. As far as timing goes, Mr. Ringert will be able to address that more accurately, I believe, when we have that

discussion. He was talking about really -- if we did -- if we went through this process now maybe in the springtime. Now, with all that said, one of the issues here have been ITD's decision to temporarily close this -- this access. We are concerned, just as Council Person Borton has said, that if you close this thing you will never get it reopened and that's -- you know, I understand ITD is willing to work with us and, frankly, I very much appreciate that and -- but there have been other things that -- that you can consider, other than temporarily closing this access. Some might include signage and some, of course, might temporarily include restriping until you -- you have a permanent -- permanent solution and we are, frankly, very, very appreciative of ITD for -- for stating that they are willing to meet with us and discuss these options. But for now, because we are in this Council, I wanted to at least introduce Mr. Ringert and -- and have him give you kind of a history and some of his analysis of some of the other options that are on the table.

De Weerd: Thank you, Jeremy.

Chou. Thank you.

De Weerd: Good afternoon.

Ringert: All right. Good afternoon. Madam Mayor, Council Members. John Ringert. I'm a principal engineer Kittelson & Associates, 101 South Capitol Suite, 301, Boise, Idaho. 83702. As Jeremy mentioned I thought I'd just give a little history, because I -- every time we have started talking about The Village, you know, things -- everybody remembers pieces, so I thought I would just go through a little bit of that -- that history, so that, you know, we are not forgetting the past. Sometimes we can learn from the past. So, I have put together this presentation and it's not necessarily for this group, it was actually internal for our group, because so many people forgot, you know, or just, you know, things have changed over the years -- over the past eight or more years. So, the first thing I'd also like to do is really say how much we appreciate Erika and ITD going through the process to monitor this intersection and -- and as well as the police department watching out. I mean that's -- you know, the -- while these things can be tough to go through, at least we are talking about -- you know, talking about the situation. The worst thing is is nobody even knows a problem occurs until something really bad happens. So, I think, as Jeremy said, you know, we are -- you know, we have been -- we have, you know, worked with ITD in the past couple months looking at this. We looked -- they met with us even a year ago to say there is an issue and I think we have gone through that and I think we all agree something -- something is definitely worth doing. Let's see. I got to make sure I remember.

Hood: Blue arrow there.

Ringert: Blue arrow. Okay. So, looking at this as we went back, I thought it would be -- I thought it would be good just to kind of go through and remember what his whole -- what this whole area was originally planned and to look like that. Now, stuff changes over time, but I think some good questions came -- have come up regarding the economics, handling the traffic, and this was a challenging site from the start. A lot of acreage, a lot of grand plans, a lot of density for -- you know, for -- compared to a lot of other developments along Eagle Road. It kind of looks the same sometimes from -- from an aerial view. If you get down on the street it's different and, you know, because of that we were looking at an equivalent of over two million square feet. This is like, you know, the Boise Towne Center if you add up all this stuff together. So, you know, it was a lot of traffic to accommodate and it's only had about 30 to 40 percent built out and occupied. Now, that doesn't mean there won't be a lot of long-term future development of some of these other parcels on the west, but this whole plan was made -- it was set up for all of these. We will have chances to change things and to modify and to do -- and to work on solutions, but, generally, you know, traffic is going to increase along that -- in that area and I know it can be hard to believe how -- can you have more traffic and you can have more businesses on the Eagle Road and Fairview corridor, but it will happen. Make sure I don't hit the wrong one. Obviously, as was mentioned by Erika, we -- we have what's called an improvement package that's under the state Star program. This was a -- you know, right off the bat back in, you know, 2008 this was a -- this was identified as probably the -- an Achilles heel of this area is how do you -- how do you fund improvements with the state -- with the state really not having money, ACHD having money, but very limited funds, and the need for a lot of infrastructure, really, to even -- to even keep things at a -- at a similar level. So, you know, this is kind of a unique development in this case that by having all this property together come in and be studied together and kind of go through the process to come up with a vision, we could develop this and do, you know, 25, 30 million dollars worth of improvements over a matter of years and we are currently in the second phase of those improvements, which are under construction. Let's see. So, with regard to our -- our left-in, the left-in was originally planned for a signal. In fact, not just a signal, a fairly large signal. This was a -- this was a challenge of the site is, you know, while today there -- a lot of the eastern half of the -- of the -- of all that property out there is developed with The Village, there still a reasonable amount of square footage to be built at The Village. Most of the outbuildings toward Eagle Road are still to happen. There is the whole west side, which is -- which somebody at some point will -- will find -- will develop and, then, there is some other -- there is some other property under development right along Fairview and so, you know, this -- this was -- this was a challenge getting the traffic in and out and the left turns coming from the north were a concern. So, originally -- the original proposal was, essentially, a traffic signal with double lefts and these would just be to -- it would essentially serve the left turn and go straight back. So, essentially, while the other signals at both ends -- and I will go through that -- are -- are cycling through, this one -- it wasn't intended to stop

traffic or be a -- or be a signal that allows people to go through. Let's see here. Why did we -- why was this proposed -- and some of these slides may have been ones we presented clear back when they presented to the City Council at that time back in -- in 2008-2009. Safety it was -- it was a concern -- or was an issue. As Erika mentioned, you know, it's not just here, it's across the country. There is a certain point at which people get a bit overloaded trying to judge traffic conditions. So, even if -- even if there weren't this congestion occurring and people waving other people through, there is always a concern when you get -- when you're having to make a left turn across more than about two lanes. It's -- it's not that you're necessarily going to have any crash problems, but -- but it does occur and it is something we keep in mind when we design things. We also had more congestion at the other intersections. When you have traffic congestion you have crashes that follow. It doesn't necessarily mean you -- that, you know, you don't make these decisions, but, you know, once people -- once people are stop and go and moving like that, you have -- you do have an increase in crashes, so you want to keep the traffic moving, keep it moving at a safe speed in order to -- to really keep things working. Capacity. And, again, you know, capacity was -- is kind of where we start with traffic a lot of times. There were significant increases in delay at Fairview and River Valley if you didn't have a signal, because we are really pushing those left turns to go signal -- to those intersections and if you think about a car going -- making a left turn, I have to give them two seconds of green time to make a left turn. So, for every car during cycle that makes a left turn, I imagine about two -- I'm taking two seconds off the through traffic during that cycle. So, it's -- it does have an effect on -- on through traffic. And, again, you know, the original -- the original study said, geez, we really need to have double lefts signalized. We understood the issues, definitely, with that. So, essentially, what this shows is a little model -- this was actually, I think, developed originally when we were -- when we were talking with the City of Meridian during the -- prior to even the development agreement. What it shows is, essentially, all that's really happening is our left turns are going to go at the same time as the left turns at Fairview and, then, the rest of the time it's green and that assumes a protected signal phase. We are only having two phases, so, really, there is no way -- there is no -- there is no way you would ever have a reason to stop your northbound through vehicles. But as Erika mentioned, there is delayed other -- you know there is delay created by any signal. If you're turning right turn off of Fairview, if you're going westbound, you take a right, you can get caught by this signal. If you're trying out of The Village at -- you know, at a right-in -- at the right-in, right-out at the eighth mile, you can get caught at the signal and experience extra delay. But, essentially, that was the idea of it and how it would work. If I can figure out why I -- how to hit this thing. If you have gone down and driven Highway 44, State Street, right around Highway 55, between Horseshoe Bend Road, there has been one there for years. Same situation. Stuck in for pretty much the same reason. We had -- there was turns across the way three through lanes. The outside lane is a free right onto Highway 55, you go towards McCall, at much

higher speeds and, you know, it was anticipated to be the same -- have the same concerns. It's a little closer, it's a little tighter spacing, so, you know, we are looking at -- we are looking at the quarter mile. It's about 800, 850 feet there. But it's -- it's very similar. So, they are in existence. If you have driven outside in places like Florida and stuff, they are pretty -- it's a pretty common thing, because they have six lane arterials. It's mostly common when you start getting into those three -- three lanes where people are having to cross it and it gets busy. So, as we go forward I think we will -- what we want to make sure happens -- and it sounds like there is a few questions here that came up where I'm hearing some similar -- similar thoughts is as we go forward really what -- what we are working with ITD on is how do we -- how do we kind of solve -- how do we kind solve these multiple -- these multiple issues. We have got -- we have got to improve safety. But we have got to look at the fact that we still have a lot of growth in that area, even though traffic's pretty busy, there is still a lot going on and we need to -- we need to get -- we need to somehow accommodate that. This shows -- this shows a slide going back to when this went -- went through ITD and ACHD for approval and it shows kind of -- if we would have had a signal where our delays might be northbound on Eagle -- on Eagle Road at like Fairview and Eagle, once we gave up the signalized alternative it -- it jumps up a little bit. What was never studied was no left turn access and that's the concern, you know. So, looking at the long-term, I think that's -- that's where we are concerned and I -- and I know that ITD is -- is thinking the same thing, that, you know, we do need to address that. Let's see. Where is -- River Valley, much more extreme. I think some of you have driven -- you have mentioned you have driven that. I have driven it numerous times. You know, already without those -- that signal we have moved a lot -- we have moved a lot of left turns coming from the north at -- onto River Valley. There is also a lot of other little things going on with respect to the lane utilization of those two left turn lanes and, you know, there is apartments and the park is just gorgeous and I think it gets -- during certain times it gets a lot of use. I know I have gone to a number of events for my daughter there and it's not -- it's not a quiet park all the time. So, I think all that put together has put a little stress on River Valley already and, really, we haven't looked at the -- this situation with no left turn access. As Erika mentioned, you know, the -- the initial -- the initial -- an initial closure -- it's probably with ACHD monitoring that intersection it's probably going to -- it's probably -- it probably can be mitigated with a few -- with a few tweaks maybe. But, really, we do need a long-term solution, you know, this -- it might be expanding River Valley, but right now, you know, River Valley -- just adding more traffic to that is -- is probably -- probably going to be saying that it's going to be difficult to deal with in the future. I'm sorry, I'm not always that good with it. So, we talked about the past approval history. In 2009 we had a -- we had -- we had a chief engineer decision on our permit. It had a condition to install it as an unsignalized intersection and, then, signalize it when it was warranted to be signalized. So, it basically -- it was basically -- you know, ITD was going to monitor it, we were going to monitor it, and when either the traffic volumes or something cropped up that caused a need to signalize it, it would be

signalized. And I think we generally agreed with that -- with that decision. They had good -- good reason to not want a signal out there at that point would -- could be serving fields, you know, even though CenterCal was ready to go it wouldn't be the first time a development got delayed and you would have a signal out there and -- and, then, you have the other issue of -- you don't give anybody else a signal and now you have a signal serving nothing and I -- and so there was a -- you know, I think that was -- that was understood. ACHD, they were -- they were a bit hesitant. They really wanted to have Records Avenue extended, which, by the way, is being extended this -- under the same project in the next couple months, because, you know, we want to really -- we want to make sure not only -- they wanted to make sure, really, it was needed and we -- we didn't jump to -- you know, jump into it before -- before there was that much traffic and -- and not really push the local system -- the local collector system. Well, the recession kind of hit and everything got a little delayed with -- with the -- with The Village and ITD during that time designed their medium project down Eagle Road. As a part of the median project it was determined at ITD that a signal here wasn't matching into what they were doing on the rest of the corridor and they just simply said we want to remove Condition 12, which is the -- to signalize it. We were -- and under Condition 12 we were required to signalize it. It wasn't our option. We were conditioned to signalize it when it was determined it was needed. So, they removed that. We -- you know, we asked them about it and they -- and they confirmed that they wanted to -- they wanted -- they didn't want to reconsider that and they wanted to keep it -- they wanted to make sure it was unsignalized. So, really, it has gone back and forth. We have looked at it in the past and I think that's our goal right now is to work with ITD, look at this option, look at any other options. You know, I think we are willing -- you know, we are perfectly open to consider all the options out there and, you know, the challenge with this particular situation -- it would have been really nice to be doing this a year ago, so that by now we all had a solution. Instead, we are -- it's kind of a -- it's -- the timing is kind of difficult to all of a sudden, you know, react, because you can't react in these situations. We got -- we got to methodically think through the right solution and, realistically, a solution is not going to be implemented probably until, you know, spring at best for almost any of these complex solutions. We did end up getting a permit issued for the unsignalized configuration. It happened to have a mention of -- of a potential future request for a signal, although one was never approved. So, you have already heard the other recent history, so I don't need to go through that. You guys have -- you know, you guys have already heard from Jeremy on that and you have already seen some mitigations that have been discussed already that ITD has come with, that we have come with. You know, I think -- I think the bucket is full of options. On our end I think the signal still is the one that pops out as the best option, just because we have kind of been there and done this already before we even got -- went through the development approval process or during that process and that was the solution that ended up, you know, being the most palatable and being supported by the state safety engineer and, you know, you have seen some of

the restriping plans. Obviously, they were less impactful than the -- than the closure of the median. So -- so, I thought I would just kind of look -- give you some things to think about. You know, I'm focused on the long-term, as I said -- I think we all agreed, at least with CenterCal and our team and ITD that something -- something should be done, it's -- the timing is a challenge, but going on -- going in the future we really need to make sure we understand what we are -- what the challenges are. Full closure -- it has an advantage. It definitely should solve this -- this crash issue. I mean it is -- it is distinct and that's what we looked for. Joe, you mentioned -- you had a question -- you had that question -- or Councilman Joe Borton, you had that question about at what point do you make these judgments. Generally it is by crashes per million -- million entering vehicles in an intersection or a million vehicle miles. If we did a screening it probably wouldn't pop up as a problem in that case, but the -- but what -- but what you look for if you're wanting to do a deeper analysis is you look at a particular crash that's occurring between two particular movements and in this case it is very obvious that maybe on a -- on a statistics for all the traffic on Eagle Road, you know, it probably wouldn't pop up, but if -- but if you really did a safety -- you know, like ITD did, they did a detailed safety review, we have a particularly correctable crash and, you know, there are -- there are actually traffic signal warrants for particular -- for correctable crashes, for instance, that we use. So, it's -- there are reasons -- there are certain patterns -- when you see a certain pattern there is certain things you can do. So, we did see those patterns. The disadvantages are that it might not be able to accommodate future development. I'm not sure how much we can expand other intersections. We are really kind of -- we really -- really built out these intersections pretty large and I'm not sure we can -- we can add storage for left turns, so we can back up further, but that's a challenge and, you know, that could create other -- other crashes not -- not this kind of severity, but maybe -- you know, you could end up with, you know, a lot of rear-end crashes occurring in other places and other types just due to the traffic congestion, people having to stop a lot. Signalized left-in, this is why it was -- it went through and was approved at headquarters at ITD by their -- by headquarters and really pushed by their safety engineer. You know, it solves -- it's kind of solved that question of crashes or it should, unless people are going to run a red light. You know, you would definitely want to monitor it and put in the little blue lights and whatnot at the signal, so the police can look at that. It provides the capacity we need and improves River Valley and Fairview signals and by improving those you should get less congestion in general in the area. But it doesn't meet ITD's half mile signal spacing. You know, that is something we -- we don't disagree with -- in an optimal world we would keep signals at a half mile, but in this case, you know, it's -- it's -- you know, you got to look at a particular situation and say is there -- is there a benefit and also is it a full signal. There is a lot of intersections now the engineering industry is looking at, such as -- I don't know if you have ever heard of a continuous flow intersection that uses this exact same principle. They turn left before the intersection in a gap, so it doesn't affect through traffic. It's basically the same thing. You know, we

understand there is a precedent it could set. There could be a request by other developments on down Eagle Road. I doubt any development on Eagle Road is similar to this one, but, you know, if they -- if they have a reason, why not look at it if it -- if it can improve safety. And you're going to stop some right turns coming from Fairview, you know, that might -- you know, that's going to occur and it could slow down speeds. Once you get a lot of signals people will slow down. It's just the environment changes for them. If I put signals at a mile, they are going to go 60 miles an hour. If I put signals at, you know, a quarter mile all the way down a road, the environment feels different, they will probably go 40 or 45. So, that's all I had. Sorry if I took a little long, but it gives you kind of the full history of what we were doing back -- clear back to 2008. So, if there is any questions.

De Weerd: Council, any questions?

Bird: I have none.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Ringert: Thanks.

De Weerd: Was there anything further? Hugh?

Crawford: Hugh Crawford. General manager. CenterCal Properties. 3597 East Monarch Sky Lane, Suite 225, Meridian. Jeremy and John raised all the good points. I appreciate ITD's fair representation of what their role is. We all have the same goal. We want safety, but the key is the shopping center -- CenterCal invested close to 400 plus million dollars based off a plan that allowed left-hand turns into the -- into the site or we wouldn't be developing that site. It would be something completely different. The tenants that have signed long-term leases, the investment that CenterCal has made in construction and access and building something as beautiful as it is, could be harmed irreparably if -- if we lose this. We want safety, but there are alternatives that can be done and we are willing to work with ITD and we are willing to put our money where our mouth is. We did that in 2008 in the agreement. The Stars agreement allows for it. We are ready to do it. We have the money to spend to -- to make that -- that intersection safe and I appreciate the -- the time, you know, Council and Mayor's time in listening and considering, so that you're input to the state can -- you know, is heard and valued in bringing something so that your commitment to the city and to the state's economy is -- is thought through fully, because the west side of the road is also ready to be developed and if that access going left onto The Village is taken away, going into the west side property could be considered not -- be taken away as well, it's going to sit as farmland. No developer is going to touch it or it will be something completely different than what the plans call for today. So, thanks for your time.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Crawford: Unless there is questions for me as representing CenterCal.

De Weerd: Council, any questions?

Bird: I have none.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: This is reflecting from -- it was from a slide that we were just shown, but it looks like you had some -- this conversation a year ago.

Crawford: It was --

Milam: Close to a year ago and -- to put up the sign.

Crawford: And that was the sign that Erika showed, the yellow sign that went in front of the left-hand turn lane that says, caution, watch for three oncoming traffic lanes.

Milam: And did you have a serious conversation about an intersection -- a light at that point?

Crawford: Well, a light on our radar -- has always been on the radar as part of our development agreement back in 2008 that said when traffic and safety warrants
it --

Milam: Right.

Crawford: -- CenterCal will be obligated to do that. And so we have been ready to do that -- but we were looking at other steps before we got there, because we know we -- we still have several hundred thousand square feet until we are fully built out, both at retail and office, bringing, you know, lots of people to work and, then, more people visiting. So, you know, as the development, if you look at a development it -- the traffic is now saying -- not just looking at square footage is requiring the light to be put in, but the traffic that's coming to the project that's now saying -- it's raised this issue.

Milam: So, based on your agreement they should have come to you and said, okay, traffic is bad, now let's put that light in that you agreed to; is that fair to say? As opposed to say, hey, we are going to close down your access?

De Weerd: Okay. We can't have testimony from the --

Crawford: Oh. Sorry. Yes. In the original agreement in 2009 and it was changed in 2011 after we were already well under construction. That would have been the -- we would have expected that. You get to a point, let's sit down and talk about the light that was part of the development agreement.

De Weerd: Any other questions? Thank you, Hugh.

Crawford: All right. Thanks a lot.

De Weerd: Okay. And from our PD. Sergeant Arnold.

Arnold: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you for your time. My name is Stacy Arnold, the traffic sergeant, for the Meridian Police Department. The traffic team has been to -- we will call it ballpark 27 crashes so far this year -- 26 crashes so far this year at this intersection. Most all of them were caused by left turning traffic in a T-bone collision by the car in the third lane who is traveling along at 55 miles an hour and the cars that are stopping in the number lane and number two lane, waived somebody through not looking to see if there is something coming and we have these crashes. The crashes have resulted in -- another one just kind of ballpark, because I don't have the exact numbers in front of me. There were about nine people transported to the hospital for various injuries. We for a long time were very pro closing the intersection. That was the -- the best solution that we had at the time. If we close the intersection we stop all of this. This won't be a problem anymore. Up until last week I met with Hugh and some of his people over at CenterCal and we talked about a light and what they proposed for the light really made sense when we started looking at it. It's a light that's timed with the left turning traffic from eastbound Fairview to go north on -- on Eagle Road and it's timed with the northbound traffic just leaving from Eagle and Fairview going north, so that it doesn't interfere with that traffic. Really, the only traffic that we are talking about this light would interfere with would be the right-hand turning traffic from westbound Fairview, which when you think about having a quarter mile of distance you're not going to back a lot of cars up. We are not talking about a light that's going to be red for a long period of time, it's not going to be like sitting through Eagle and Fairview or Eagle and River Valley. So, since that meeting I have done a -- my own little informal traffic study and most of that has been me sitting along the side of the road watching what cars are doing at intersections and one of the things --

De Weerd: I was wondering what you were doing. I drove by and thought what is he doing?

Arnold: Yeah. My eyes were open I hope.

De Weerd: Thank you for your -- I think.

Arnold: So, one of the things I looked at was -- was the River Valley intersection for the southbound traffic and there is two turning lanes there, but currently only one lane gets utilized. The inside lane doesn't get used very much, because most people aren't going to the apartment buildings or to the park, they are wanting to go to The Village. So, they stack up in the number two turning lane and they back up almost to the end of that intersection. So, I don't know if it's human nature or what drives people to do that, but they are going to take the next easiest entrance in there, so we start talking about this 1,793 cars a day that use that -- that left turn and, then, we are plugging those into that -- that intersection. It's not going to take long before we start backing cars up in that turn lane back onto the -- the number one through lane for southbound traffic and that's just going to create more problems for us, especially when we are talking about speed limits that are 55 miles an hour and people are expecting traffic -- because they see that green light and they are expecting traffic to be moving and not at a dead stop and, then, we are going to have the skid marks and the oil stains and things like that just down the road. So, I talked with the members of the traffic team. Initially they were very -- I don't get it, I don't think a light is a good idea, and when I talked to them about the timing of the light and how the light would function, the minimal impact that it would have on traffic, we kind of came to the same conclusion, it really does make sense. The other thing is if it -- if it's -- if it solves our problem and the taxpayers aren't on the hook for it, then, why not try it, why not give it a shot and see if it works. And if it doesn't work, then, we pull it out of the ground and we closed the intersection off and -- and we solve the problem that way. But I really do think -- in looking at the plan for this light that the light will work.

De Weerd: Thank you, Sergeant Arnold. Any questions for Sergeant Arnold?

Arnold: Great. Thank you.

De Weerd: Appreciate your approach in working with our business. Well, I guess, Council, any change of opinion since we had Erika up? Do we still have the same concerns and would ask her to go back to ITD and share what those concerns are and ask for a delay in moving forward with the closure?

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Definitely not a change. If anything more solid in the thought process that -- understanding that may, you know, reduce nine possible wrecks between now and the end of the year and would make your stats look better, be better for sure, but if it means an additional six months to get to a point where we can have a light there, that the engineering, plus common sense shows that it wouldn't cause any significant or actual delays to traffic just passing through the area going north-south to be able to have, you know, two left turn lanes in there and, then, the future on -- on the empty property, likewise there, especially where it's not a full light system where there is left turns, you know, from The Village turning left onto Eagle Road, just Eagle Road being able to -- to enter those properties, makes apparently engineering sense, it makes common sense, and I would plead with you to -- to pass onto whoever is the decision-maker to partner with us and hang on and, hopefully, we can work it out to where CenterCal is paying for it anyway, to get it to where we have, you know, the efficiency that we are looking for, the safety that we are looking for and the economic sustainability that we are looking for.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Little Roberts: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: I would just like to agree with Councilman Palmer. Can we make a formal request that it be delayed? How do we do that? Could I make a motion?

Bird: Sure.

Little Roberts: Then I would like to make a motion that we send our recommendation that the -- the project be delayed officially to give it six months to -- to strongly consider and, hopefully, even install a light.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second. Any discussion? On this one I will ask for roll call.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

De Weerd: That give you something better to -- to bring back to ITD. So, Erika, thank you for being here. Thank you, CenterCal for also being present and sharing the history of the project and some of the work you have been doing in working with ITD for really a long-term solution that will also be a solution for the short-term safety issues and to our police department, thank you for a kind of circling around with The Village and looking at possible solutions that, again, that solve the safety of our public. So, thank you all.

C. Republic Services Report: Proposed Change to Early AM Commercial Collection Start Time

De Weerd: Nothing further I will move to Item 7-C, which is a Republic Services report and -- Rachele and Steve, tag teaming it.

Klein: Yes. Madam Mayor, Council, Rachele Klein, Republic Services, 2130 West Franklin Road, Meridian, Idaho.

De Weerd: I saw you back there wanting to comment on --

Klein: Yeah. I had so many comments that -- good thing I wasn't on here.

Cory: Steve Cory, chairman of the Solid Waste Advisory Commission. I live at 2630 South Loftus Way in Meridian.

De Weerd: Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Rachele.

Klein: And thank you for having us here today. For probably purposes of clarity, there is a lot of data on this slide. I don't know if you had a chance to read it, but I thought I'd just take a minute and read it with you. It's pretty short, if that's all right, and, then, maybe we can -- it will prompt some discussion. So, this is a memo that was presented to the Solid Waste Advisory Commission earlier this month -- or, actually, on September 28th and they recommended that we bring it forward to City Council for consideration. So, in January of 2000 Sanitary Services Company, which is known here as SSC, signed an agreement with the City of Meridian to provide trash collection services. Two commercial trash trucks serve the businesses in town. For safety reasons the contract required SSC to collect trash from the ten public schools within Meridian city limits between the hours of 5:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m., as memorialized in Meridian City Code and, then, you can find the -- the actual part of the code documented there and -- yeah. Let's see. In the past 16 years the population of Meridian has grown from 37,235 residents based on the 2000 census, to over 90,000. It is now the second largest city in Idaho and according to recent articles in the Idaho Statesman multiple high-density housing projects are proposed for construction in the near future. To accommodate the growing population, 20 new public schools were built within the city limits between January 2000 and today,

including the list that you have before you. With business growth came the demand for commercial recycling, which added to -- was added to the franchise agreement in 2001. This additional line of business required more trucks and containers and more service. Further accelerating growth Meridian has gone through multiple annexations over the past 16 years. The city is almost 27 square miles, if you kind of bundled it all up, but it's actually bigger in a lot of ways and the public schools are strategically spread from edge to edge and throughout the municipal footprint and, then, you should have a school map attached in your packet to show you where all the schools are found. Current conditions. We now have 1,136 businesses in Meridian with commercial trash service and 449 of those have signed up for additional recycling service. Traffic has increased disproportionately to an increase in business and residential accounts due to infrastructure constraints, but I think we just went through a lot of those. We have a left-hand turn barrier that runs all of Eagle Road now, which we didn't have back in 2000 and we also have compressive two lane roads, particularly Chinden, lack of right-hand turn lanes and the decreased ability to make left-hand turns along major thoroughfares throughout the city and an increase of inbound employee traffic and an increase in vehicles delivering goods and services to all these city businesses. Services are offered six times a week, so multiple trucks are touching many sites multiple times per week. Additional trucks and drivers have been added to the fleet to accommodate the commercial growth in Meridian. So, under current conditions we are unable to service all 30 schools within the city limits before 7:00 a.m. The last schools are currently being serviced close to 10:30. It would take two more trucks and drivers for the 5:00 to 7:00 window to stay compliant with the current contract. Each truck is 325,000 dollars, with an hourly rate of 125 dollars, which includes the truck and driver. Together the additional trucks would be an extra 500 dollars a day for two trucks and drivers for two hours each. The annual commercial rate impacts of running those trucks two hours per day, five days a week, and 40 weeks per year, which syncs up with the school year, would be 100,000 dollars. In an effort to contain costs we have optimized truck routing and currently have all trucks moving from high or low areas of traffic congestion. We have considered the option of bringing trucks into Meridian from other service areas, but all trucks are deployed between 5:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. removing school trash and recycling throughout the valley before pedestrians, bicycles, cars and buses arrive on the campuses. Proposed contract and code change. In an effort to be proactive in addressing future growth and community safety, Republic Services is proposing a 4:00 a.m. commercial and industrial start time. This would allow us to utilize the drivers and assets currently in our -- on site and in our system. Allowing an early start time would bring Meridian into line with the 20 plus communities we reviewed in Idaho which have commercial and industrial start times of 4:00 a.m. or earlier. As density increases in the part of Idaho the trend is to trash start -- the trend is to start trash services earlier in the day. Boise recently moved to 24/7 commercial and industrial trash collection, which will be effective January 1st, 2017. Starting by 4:00 a.m. in Meridian would allow us to maintain high

safety standards and excellent customer service without seeking a rate increase for two additional trucks and drivers for the 5:00 to 7:00 a.m. window. Early morning noise concerns and mitigation effort. We realize Meridian is a high-quality community and we want to protect that culture. In an effort to address potential resident concerns about early morning noise we pulled customer complaint data for the past 18 months, ranging from March of 2015 to August of 2016 from our info pro data system. Fifteen Meridian residents called in with noise concerns during this time and I attached a log. Three of these complaints were from one person, a renter who is no longer residing at the same address. The majority of the residents who lived along commercial residential seams and had purchased houses before the nearby commercial properties had been developed. They tended to be frustrated in general with early-morning commotion, multiple delivery and service trucks frequenting the businesses close to their homes. These trucks, which include cleaning services, food and beverage delivery trucks, et cetera, operate 24/7. Residential residents -- or several residents who called in live close to schools and could hear our trucks, particularly during spring and fall when their windows are open. Most residents were fine once we shared school safety concerns and the handful that needed for attention came before SWAC. In all cases SWAC and Republic Services worked together to resolve the early morning noise issues by making small operating changes, including moving trash or recycle dumpsters, installing plastic lids, using tire strips on the front of the dumpsters and not cycling the blade until off site or using white noise back-up beepers. Republic Services -- our request is that we would like to present this data today for Council review and consideration to moving to an earlier start time. And with that -- did you want to add anything, Steve?

Cory: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, I think it's important to go ahead and report SWAC's consideration of this issue. It was brought before us in August and we did recognize the fact that because of the growth there was an issue with code compliance that trucks were on school grounds after 8:00, maybe up to 10:00, creating a major safety issue. We did continue it from August to September to allow Republic Services to talk to code enforcement and the police department and there is a difference of views on this subject, but that was clearly defined and so when we picked it up in September we were still stuck with the issues that we have discussed and came to a view that there was one option of increasing the equipment and the manpower and as a result of that increasing the rate to our customers in the city or to go ahead and start down the path of having a broader window for collection at a little earlier time. With the discussion of some of these mitigation effects that have been used in the past and Republic's interest in using those, the commission concluded that the recommendation to you would be to open the window to start a little earlier and get all this work done, so that the trucks were not present on school grounds. When we get to that I'm certainly available for questions about SWAC's activities.

De Weerd: Thank you, Steve. Council, any questions for Steve or Rachele?

Bird: I have none.

De Weerd: Mr. Nary, what is the process on this?

Nary: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, if the direction is to amend the ordinance to change the times to 4:00, that that would be the direction we would be looking for. If your direction is not to do that, I guess they would be looking for what your other alternatives would be.

De Weerd: So, if it was to change the ordinance that would come back in the form of a public hearing and --

Nary: Yes.

De Weerd: Okay.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I have been very involved in these conversations and kind of gone back and forth in discussions with the police department and at SWAC. I really look at this as a safety issue for our children. They cannot get in and out before school starts, so I would like to change the ordinance to allow them to start at 4:00 a.m., kind of catch up with the rest of the valley a little bit and, hopefully, they can -- that will make a difference that will get them in and out of the schools on time.

Bird: I will second it.

De Weerd: So, we can instruct staff to move forward in drafting an ordinance and getting it set for public hearing. Is that the will of Council? I see all nods. Well, thank you for sticking with us through the previous issue that took a little bit longer than we thought, but greatly appreciate the partnership with Republic and certainly, Steve, we appreciate our citizens that serve on SWAC and the thoughtful consideration you give to these -- sometimes sticking issues. So, thank you for that and we will let you know when it's set for consideration.

Klein: Thank you.

De Weerd: Bill, how long do you think -- when do you think that might come back?

Nary: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, timing is sort of up to you. We could bring the ordinance next week. We don't always do three public hearings, but we can do it next week or we can put some information out to the public first and, then, bring it the second week, whichever your preference, or we could start it next week, do a public hearing on the second week, whichever you would like.

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I'd like to see the first reading next week. Open the public hearing. That gives people -- and, then, the second week hold a public hearing and read the ordinance, hold your public hearing, and, then, the third week read the ordinance and close the public hearing and make your decision one way or the other. That would be my preference.

Nary: Okay. We can do that.

De Weerd: Bill, can you get with Kaycee to make sure we get this information out to our citizens?

Nary: Absolutely.

De Weerd: Okay. Anything further from Council? Okay. Thank you.

Item 8: Department Reports

**A. Emergency Medical Services Joint Powers Agreement
Renewal**

De Weerd: Okay. Item 8-A under Department Reports.

Bird: Emergency medical.

De Weerd: I -- Perry, we are under Item 8-A under Emergency Services Joint Powers Agreement renewal.

Palmer: My apologies, Mayor.

De Weerd: That's all right. I kind of wondered -- I was like, okay --

Palmer: Broken fire trucks, so -- yes. The JPA is an annual renewal and time is up. We are actually, I believe, the last agency to sign the renewal. All the other partners have signed that. The chief wanted me to convey that the agreement is

working very well and as designed and they just recently brought on the joint quality assurance person into the system.

De Weerd: Thank you. Council, any questions on this item?

Nary: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Yes, Mr. Nary.

Nary: From a processor standpoint there is a letter that's to be signed by you just continuing Meridian's participation as part of the packet, so a vote to do that would be best for the record.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: I would move that we approve the letter and authorize the Mayor to sign the letter set forth in the packet that continues and renews the Emergency Medical Services Joint Powers Agreement.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second. Mr. Clerk, will you, please, call roll.

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

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

De Weerd: Perry, would it be possible that the department brings back just in memo form to Council how mutual aid has worked, both calls that we have gone out on and where we have received that mutual aid?

Palmer: Madam Mayor, absolutely.

De Weerd: Okay. Thank you very much.

Palmer: Okay.

B. CDBG Reprogramming of Funds for Substantial Amendment

De Weerd: Item 8-B is under our CDBG and I see Sean and I will turn this over to you.

Kelly: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council. While I have about ten seconds of the microphone here I just want to recognize Jennifer Yost from the city of Nampa, who happens to be one of our most notable valley-wide HUD representatives -- not representatives, but an expert, if you will. So, what she does at the city of Nampa we get the benefit from, so since she's here to work with me on something completely different, I just want to go ahead and embarrass her just a little bit.

De Weerd: Thank you.

Kelly: One second.

De Weerd: For great things.

Kelly: Not quite ready. I apologize. Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, thank you for the opportunity this afternoon to come before you to talk about potential projects and reallocation of funds for a future substantial amendment. As you know I came before you about last month. We talked about one for the Meridian Food Bank as well. This one is more for capital projects. As we discussed in the last meeting that we came to we talked about how -- why we do the substantial amendments, so just a quick refresher. These are the three reasons why we would do them. In this case it's new activity to the action plan. We are going to look at the '15 action plan. We have a couple of projects, as I explained before some just don't move forward. Some don't move forward fast enough. One of the things to remind Council is when we start a fiscal year or a calendar year or -- sorry, a fiscal year or a program year it's October 1, but we don't get our funding for that year until December, January, February and so when you're doing a capital project that pushes the calendar from when you can go to design, when you can do construction, and oftentimes and as you have noticed, we do a lot of our construction projects right now, which means we are out of the year that we should be really doing them in. What I'd like to do is try to -- we have an opportunity to do that now -- is pull that back maybe half a year, maybe almost a year, and get started on things early that we might have planned for in the action plan for the next year. Let's talk about why and how that works. So, the ones that didn't move forward -- we had the pathway segment from parks, that's the Five Mile Creek pathway. We have done this several years ago. We did the first half of that. This was, then, continued -- continue this up to Cherry and, unfortunately, we have been sitting on -- three easements have been holding this particular project up. Parks has not been able to get them. We do have some movement as I was talking to Steve Siddoway now, that we do have

some -- some movement on those easements, but we are still not going to be able to do it in the time frame that we wanted to. So, that's some money that we need to reallocate. We also have the Idaho Avenue sidewalks project that came in under budget and when I talked to you about that that sometimes projects will -- will bid for something and they will say 150,000 dollars, like the case -- like this is the case here and it only took 90,000 to actually complete. And, then, the Boys & Girls Club brush up. That was one of the things that -- we had it built in there, it was about 13,000 dollars, and they had ESI on-site building that gym and because of our fiscal year problem -- or our program year problem where we won't get funding until about the first of the calendar year, they just went ahead and contracted with ESI to get that done. So, it just made more sense for them. So, that puts that money back to us. And, then, every year we usually have residual admin and so this is actually from '13 and '14, there is some residual admin and we are always going to have some of that and so because of that we have this opportunity to do some projects a little early than we were actually planning for in the next year for the action plan. And so this is my recommendation to Council is 150,000 dollars would go to Public Works for street lights. We had already planned on street lights in the -- the low -- the LMI area. Austin Peterson is going to be leaving at some point here. I'm sure we all know that now. But before he leaves we have an opportunity to start that project early with funds from last year. We don't have to wait until the calendar year starts before we get that funding. So, that would actually push that calendar back and we would be operating and doing that on Todd and Chateau potentially there. I would also recommend keeping it in the action plan for next year, because Austin is already programming other street lights in the LMI that we have already -- and Council has already seen in the street light program, so we would be able to do that also next year. And, then, reallocate 30,000 to Neighborworks Boise. That's for home buyer assistance. They expended their money last year pretty timely. We have an opportunity to use some last year money to actually do that now. They wouldn't have to wait until January or February to sign a subrecipient agreement to actually work on home buyer assistance. And, then, I would make that H2 project -- I'd keep it. I don't think we need to get rid of that. I think that that needs to stay as an alternate project, because eventually we are going to get those easements or something is going to happen there. I think Steve feels pretty confident about that. I know Caleb and I have talked about just -- talked about that just a little bit about it still might take some time, but if we get additional unallocated funds and they have those easements, why take it out of the action plan, let's leave it in there. We can go back and trigger it. It doesn't require a substantial amendment if we keep it in there. So, we substantially amend to put it as an alternate project. We unfund it. We fund the other projects. And now we have got an alternative that probably will go forward. And, so again, what does this do for us? It just allows us to start the year a little earlier than what we would have and it brings us -- brings that cycle back to not starting half of a year after the action plan year actually starts, which is what we are usually fighting. We have a timeliness thing we need to hit

that we are not supposed to have more than 1.5 -- 1.5 of our allocation in any given year by the end of the summer and that gets very hard to meet when you are forced to get your funding somewhere close to the calendar year change and, then, start projects, especially when they are capital projects based on the design and one the length of time it takes to design and construction. And, then, we will have late phaseability. We have projects that are already programmed, that Council has already approved for next year in the action plan, we keep them there. We might need to modify them, we might need to alter them, we are not going to be doing Todd and Chateau next year. We will do them this year. And, then, we might be able to do another portion of the LMI and, again, Austin is working on those now. The key part with that one is that Austin is willing to put forth the effort to get the design started now if we can before he ends up leaving and, then, whoever follows him -- whoever backfills him will take those -- take the torch from there. My plan for this, if Council wants to do it this way, I can either come back next week with a more detailed breakdown. I can ask Council right now if you'd like me to go ahead and notice this next week on Monday. If we do that I will come back on November 15th, public hearing, because it is a substantial amendment we need to do that and I would ask Council to go ahead and vote on that.

De Weerd: So, Sean, I guess this next slide opens the door for maybe other ideas. Right now the urban renewal district has gotten a handful of requests for facade improvement and I know one of those also is a request to cover cost of moving our sewer out of the alley and putting it into the street. Certainly since that is a desire by the city to remove sewer in the alleyways where we can, I think that should be a cost that the city considers and probably because this is a blight project would be -- have possible qualifying project. If you could meet with Ashley with MDC and see what some of those requests that have come in. That one is on Broadway. I know another blighted corner is on 2nd and a half and Carlton and they are looking to do some work on an historic structure and -- and so those are perhaps other projects that might be interesting for qualifying for Council to consider as well.

Kelly: Madam Mayor, absolutely. And, again, this next slide was exactly that. I mean I like to try to bring you guys something that's packaged, so that you can -- the work is kind of done there, I have done some research, I have got some things for you guys to approve and that way we can go forward. But I also wanted the feedback and you guys know I have been asking for feedback. So, with this I do want those ideas. I have a package that you guys can approve on November 15th if that's what you would like to do. We also have projects that we need to get, you know, reprogrammed and so I do want those. So, I'm kind of offering two things. One is the amendment as I have offered it. If we would like to change that in any possible way. It's Council's program. The city's program. Mayor, to your point, we do have slum and blight -- one small problem, we are just now starting our slum and blight -- or slum and blight plan and so that once

that completes we will be able to do anything MDC would like to do within the program. As far as the sewers are concerned, that's a Public Works thing and that's something that we can do in the LMI without being slum and blight. That's a benefit to LMI. So, we are able to do that. And I have had brief conversations with Public Works about those and I know that there is some 70 year old sewer lines behind people's houses just over here across the street. So, we do have that and it's something that we have looked at. If you would like me to research that further with Public Works I can certainly do that.

De Weerd: Please.

Kelly: Absolutely. One of the things I did want to bring up -- and this is just to bring it up. We are one of the only cities locally here that doesn't have an emergency home rehab program and one of the -- one of the benefits of having one is I had -- I have had four calls this year. One of them was yesterday from citizens of Meridian asking, hey, I'm LMI, my roof's caving in. Hey, I have got -- my water heater went out, I don't have a -- yesterday was -- I'm indigent, I was sick, I was out of my house and someone broke into my house and I have 15,000 dollars worth of damage and I have no program to assist that person or those people with. Now, we may have or we may not have a very large population of folks that need that, but I think if you look in the few blocks that are really close here, we may have that. What some of the folks do in other -- in other municipalities is they have, you know, 40 or 50 thousand dollars set aside to do home rehab and they do a grant for the low income family up to a certain amount, five or ten thousand dollars, and the difference is with the facade improvement program, this is not Davis Bacon and so I think that that is a -- that's kind of a win when you start doing construction stuff and you put a lot on the homeowner, you make sure that if they are going to do construction, if they are going to do something, they go get the three bids, they bring it to us, they pick the lowest bidder, they get the roof repaired. No Davis Bacon. So, I wanted to offer that to Council as something to think about. Do I have any other questions from Council or any other ideas for things that I should run away and scurry away and try to go seek out?

De Weerd: Council, any feedback?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Maybe not a discussion for today. Is there -- is there ever a consideration or a component of these programs where just the funds are simply returned?

Kelly: Madam Mayor, Council Member Borton, that is -- that is a concern. That is something that people actually talk about and -- go ahead. Sorry.

Borton: Well, the two comments that you had made is -- is one of the projects being under budget, another where there is residual admin, meaning there is savings, which is great, but if -- in the simplest sense we planned to do X and it cost less, should we not just simply return the funds, the unused funds, rather than search for another way to spend it?

Kelly: Madam Mayor, Council Member Borton, that is -- that is Council's decision, that is something the city can do. It's something that I don't think happens very often, but when it does happen that money goes back into the pool and gets redistributed to other municipalities to use for the same things that we would use it for. Unless I'm mistaken there, I'm pretty sure that's exactly how that's carried out. So, the option is there. That is something that we could do.

De Weerd: Without penalty? It seems like there is some kind of penalty by doing that.

Kelly: Oh, Madam Mayor, I'm sure that there is lots of penalties when you start turning things back over to HUD. I don't know what they are and I'll research them if we'd like, but that is certainly something we would have to deal with. And one of the reasons that I saw a penalty -- it may not be a monetary penalty, but it will certainly be -- we can give the entire program back for all we are concerned, but we are still tied to everything we have done to it and the monitoring of everything we have done to it for the next five, seven, ten years. So, there is some type of a hit there, just so -- just to recognize that. Do I have any further questions, Madam Mayor, or --

De Weerd: Not at this point. We can reschedule this for follow-up discussion next week and if you can bring back more information. Certainly if you can meet with MDC and find out some of the projects they have in front of them for their consideration. Follow up with Public Works on moving the sewer from the alley to the street on Broadway and -- anything else?

Kelly: Roger, Madam Mayor. I would like to, if I could, notice on Monday for the substantial amendment as we have written. I could do it as a draft with some additional projects that might be in there, but that way we have got the notice of the projects that we have here. That way on November 15th, whichever direction Council decides to go with that substantial amendment, we can have our public hearing and we have notice.

De Weerd: Okay. I think that's fair.

Kelly: Thank you, Madam Mayor.

C. Community Development: Residential Structure Design Criteria

De Weerd: Thank you. Okay. 8-C is under Community Development.

Hood: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council. I wanted to spend a few minutes with you -- hopefully that's all it is, but just to circle back and touch base. Back in -- just a little bit of history here quickly. Back in 2007 when Planning at that time, we weren't Community Development back then -- was talking with Council and establishing a work group to come up with design review process and protocol and standards, it was pretty clear from the Council that was here at that time that doing design review for single-family homes -- there wasn't any interest in doing that and that's still the same sentiment. We share that same sentiment in planning today. However, we have morphed to some degree kind of towards that and so I just want to take a few minutes, explain residential building permit review process and what we are currently doing and kind of get some better guidance and understanding from you all where that line is, how much time, what's the level of effort we should be spending on looking at some of these homes and, really, what -- what's changed or, again, just sort of trial and error and I'm going to guesstimate, because I don't know exactly how long it was ago, but three, four years ago, somewhere in there, a comment was made about homes that are along arterials and other major roadways and the backside of them being more attractive if you will and so there was -- the Council, basically, said, hey, if you -- if 99 percent of the population can see that, we want staff to make sure that that looks nice and I just want to kind of explain to you kind of how that's playing out, that that -- you know, it's subjective, similar to -- to crash rates. You know, there is not a -- this is a nice -- everyone agrees this is the nice side of -- the backside of a home it looks nice. I might think it does. You may not. The architect is proud of it. But I just kind of want to, again, touch base with you. So, typically, what happens is the annexation of a project and we are conditioned at this point -- we have a pretty standard condition of approval that require articulation through changes in material, colors, modulation and architectural elements, horizontal and vertical, to break up monotonous wall plains and roof lines for homes that face arterial and collector roadways. So, we are not looking at every home. It is -- you know, five percent let's say of single-family homes out there. But it does take time and effort to review these, to comment on them, to make sure that what I just read is being complied with. Planning staff, to make sure -- someone's got to check to make sure that a lot and block -- this applies or not. So, Planning goes in and touches every single single-family permit that comes in and says, yeah, we need to do the review on that or, no, it's okay, we don't need to review it for any compliance stuff, it's just internal to a subdivision. But at least we are looking at it to make sure that whatever pretty pictures the developer came and showed you at that hearing, they are in the same family; right? So, it takes some -- some time for us to do

these things and just sort of as an aside, we are also working with our contractors on the building side of things to make sure that what's actually getting constructed out there is what they show us on the plans that we review and approve. We don't have the manpower to go out there and review every single home in Planning. We aren't going on site to make sure that what's being constructed are the plans that come in. We just don't have that resource. You know, doing three or four homes a day, that would be a full-time position for somebody to go out there and just verify the elevation. So, we don't collect an additional fee, we just sort of do this as part of the building permit review fee and we sign off through the building permit fee -- or building permit process that the home complies or not and if it doesn't, then, again, we are talking about time to go back and forth with whoever the builder is, their architect, to say, hey, listen, I'm just seeing a massive wall here with a couple of windows. We need some changes in materials or colors or those other things that I listed. So, I just want to quickly kind of show you some success stories on some of these and just kind of -- again, with the overarching touch base what should we be doing in this realm when we are -- and the name isn't being protected of the innocent here at all, so -- but these are things that are on record, these are homes that we have reviewed and approved. So, here you have got the -- what was originally submitted and here is an after. And I can go back and forth and what you -- and some of them it's easier to see than others, the changes, but the -- the level of effort -- again, to coordinate with them and go back and forth. So, if you look at the -- the rear elevation, which is in the bottom left side here, the shutters and some changes in the roof to make that modulate a little bit more and the pop outs on that, again, just talking with them. And a lot of times we have builders that are willing to do these things, but it's that back and forth. Here is another before -- here is the rear elevation before and here is an after. So, again, it changes -- the roof plains, you're not just looking at a massive roof line there and in this case it's just a single level, but it does help to have, you know, some changes in lines there. This one -- let's see. So, again, some pop outs -- and I realize the scale is kind of small here. It's kind of hard to see. But you can see the changes that flash. Some of the -- the pop outs around the windows provide some of that articulation. So, you can see that both from the side and the rear. If you look at the top one you can definitely see, you know, some of the eaves over the -- the roofs and some of the pop outs on either side of the -- the windows. And this is the last one, which -- which we did catch some flak for, but actually does comply with our -- the condition we read or at least that was our interpretation that it complied. What also comes into play here is the elevation of these homes. Sometimes you will get the grade change; right? Someone -- sometimes they will berm up a nice berm and put a fence and you can't see any of the home, because it's almost in a hole now with the berm and fence and it's set back from the road. Sometimes it's the other way and they build up the buildable lot and the road is down here and so you can see -- in this case it's the rear elevations, which there is a change of -- of color and materials that would -- would allow it to comply, but it's just so high and above and stands out, you can still just see it and

so it is massive still. But, again, it complies with those standards. So, you know, I just want to just quickly say, you know, most of them aren't a problem, but, again, it's -- it's a level of effort to review these and I just want to touch base and ideally what we are trying to get to is -- is that certainty that the development community wants, that we want. You know, where is -- just tell me where the line is and I will -- I can design it for you. But it's this -- this subjective stuff that we kind of want to get out of. We don't want every home to look the same. We don't want to say build this one and you will be approved every time, but we want them to have a level of understanding of what we are actually going to be looking for when we are looking for these. So, again, I just want to read the condition one more time. The way our standard condition reads right now is the rear or side of structures that face arterial or collector streets shall incorporate articulation through changes in materials, colors, modulation and articular -- architectural elements -- excuse me -- horizontal and vertical to break up monotonous wall plains and roof lines in accord with UDC 11-3-19 of the Meridian design manual. Even that has been -- in the architectural standards manual, the -- what was previously the design manual, most of the time what we require is a -- a change in either materials or color or other architectural elements in combination. We don't say you need to do color changes and material changes and modulation and require all of that on any one façade, but we say you got to provide us something that provides that -- that breaks up that façade. So, again, either -- any combination of those things. One of the issues we struggle with -- again, I'm going back to the current process -- is our building department doesn't care what color anything is, so we don't -- the building department doesn't require them to submit color samples of what's going to be out there. Further, a lot of homeowners paint their home in ten or 15 years. I know it says lifetime warranty or 30 year warranty, they don't do that. So, we aren't really looking for color changes and that's been some of the push back, these builders are saying, well, building doesn't require us to give you colors of this stuff. We don't -- maybe we don't even know what color it's going to be. That's the homeowner's preference. So, I guess my first -- what I would propose is that we not be in the business of regulating color and determining if color does what we are trying to make it do. But, again, I want to touch base, because for the past years color has been an option. You can maybe have the same HardiePlank siding, but if you provide two colors that at least appears to break up the massing of that. Now, that's not typically what we get, not just a color change, there is something else with materials or other things, but -- but I would propose if Council is agreeable that at least take color out of that list of things that you could provide that makes -- again, long-term compliance. No one's going to be checking into that. The other -- the other potential change that I would at least want to talk about a little bit is in the past these have also come up -- these homes that back up to or front on parks have also been talked about as being -- hey, those -- those are visible to a lot of people that either patronize, you know, city parks or maybe even private parks. So, that's something that is a standard condition that for any lot and block that backs up to a city park we apply this same condition and say if you -- if a

façade is visible from a park, it also needs to do these things or, again, should we be in the business of regulating what the back side of someone's home is, even if you can see it from a park. So, you don't need to answer right now, but that's a question is arterial -- right now it's arterials and collectors. Do we also want to include parks and if you say, yeah, parks sounds good, public and private both or just public. The other -- the other change I would propose is -- and I already mentioned this -- I would change that condition to read: Shall incorporate articulation through changes in one or more of the following and it isn't a laundry list you have to do all of these things, but you need to provide us an elevation that proves that the building articulates, that there is lines on it and you choose -- you're the design professional, you choose what that method is. But there needs be at least one and it could be more of the following. Now, we could change that, it can be two or more of the following if you wanted to do that, but just to clarify, you don't have to have pop outs and changes in material and colors -- it's not everything, it's just some of those things. And, then, finally -- no, not finally. I got two more changes. I would take out the reference to our -- to city code and the architectural standards manual. The architectural standards manual is primarily meant for multi-family and attached single-family product. It's not intended for single-family homes for the most part. Now, it does address it, so if in the future councils they say, yep, every single family home goes through design review, we are set up to do that. But it really kind of is overkill in my opinion. We don't want to be doing that and I'd probably be here in six months saying we need three more staff, because we are reviewing every single family home that comes through. But we -- there are some solid things in the architectural standards manual, but I think we would get push back from the development community. And I don't know that the -- there is a return on that investment, quite frankly. I just don't know that it's that beneficial to the community at large to require all homes to go through design review. The final thing that I want to talk to you about is I -- what I would propose is to potentially exempt single level homes from this. And, you know, this one was, again, a success story. What you have to remember with most of these where there is a collector arterial or to say all of these, you have a landscape buffer. Our city code requires a 20 foot landscape buffer and 25 foot wide landscape buffer on arterial, 20 foot on collector, 25 -- and most of the time the developer puts up a six foot fence. So, you put up a six foot fence, you put in trees, you put in landscaping, you're really not seeing -- you're seeing the peak of the roof and a little bit of the roof line, but most of these it's screened to some degree. An alternative could be to say any structure less than or greater than a certain height, say 25 feet, which is a single level. So, again, you have got the first six or eight feet of this thing is generally screened anyways. It's single level. Now, could you have a really long -- could you have this version be 60 feet -- yeah, you could. We may get burned with that. But it's not that massive thing that, you know, hovers over a roadway, right? So, I guess just some direction on that. Again, all these are -- where is that line, Council. What -- how much do you want us to look at these? You know how -- how concerned are you about this and can we -- is there any leeway in that.

And, if not, we can continue to do this and work with the builders to get improvements like this and you're going to have a fence that screens most of this and is it worth it I guess is the question. So --

De Weerd: Caleb, I think it was mainly on the -- the two stories and the -- the walls, not the roof lines.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I don't know. I think that that makes a huge difference in the way that it looks and that improvement is well above fence level.

Hood: I'd like to get a subjective -- and I'm just trying to -- you know, I just want to be clear with everybody here are the rules and we can -- we can -- because right now it does -- we do require it for single level, so that's what we are doing now.

De Weerd: Your -- your memo doesn't really detail any of -- of the things that you pointed out.

Milam: Yeah.

De Weerd: And I think it would be helpful to -- to kind of see that in front of us. Maybe the -- the questions you have and some of the recommendations --

Hood: Okay.

De Weerd: -- from a staff perspective and how difficult it is to -- to oversee some of the components of that and it might be easier to have that conversation. I don't know. Don't want to speak on behalf of Council. What -- what would you like?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: Same old story with me. I -- if we want to be in the design business, get your checkbook out, buy the lot and build the house you want. Everybody has different tastes. I mean I don't think we have had a problem that I know of with the deal and I just -- and when these developers come in they have got plans to what they want -- you know, what kind of houses and they get their CC&Rs set up to it. They have got a design and review committee there I think on most CC&R -- homeowner associations. I think with -- Caleb, you brought up some

good points to drop out, but I just have a hard time of telling somebody what -- what color and what kind of material they need to have on their house. You know, if I was -- I would have all brick houses, so --

De Weerd: No, you would have all glass houses.

Bird: No, brick. It lasts longer than glass. I would have glass in there. But, anyway, that's -- that's my thought. I thought you brought -- you brought some good points up. I think that -- we haven't had any problems -- and to be truthful with you, we have got some awful good subdivisions out there. I haven't seen any that's real bad.

Hood: Well, Mr. Bird, if I can, just pat my staff on the back a little bit, because we are doing this. I mean you -- where -- we miss some every once in a while, so don't get me wrong, but we get -- we get quite a few plans that are pretty boxy and I think you would be getting more complaints from folks if we weren't working with the builders to kind of dress them up a little bit. I don't -- you know, I'm just saying some of that is because we are being involved in this process today. So, if you like -- but you're getting nice developments. I'm not going to take all the credit for it, don't get me wrong, but there is some examples where they are coming in pretty cheap, if you will, and we are asking them to dress it up because it is fronting a Locust Grove or an Amity or some of these other roadways and so --

Bird: Follow up, Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: And I agree on that to a point, but I can tell you in 2008 some of these people that we thought were cheap developers, you drove through their -- their development and there wasn't any houses for sale -- or foreclosures. You drove through the other ones and every other one was foreclosed. So, there is a purpose there for it.

Palmer: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Palmer.

Palmer: Madam Mayor, Caleb, I -- I'm on board with I think all of your recommendations. And, then, to the points where you asked the question, yeah, I wouldn't worry about color, given that we have Corey Barton in front of us. I just purchased a Corey Barton. It's about eight years old and a lot of -- a lot of the homes in there are getting repainted and it's in the CC&Rs in their -- like a lot of HOAs they are pretty on top of making sure that they are adhered to and that there are multiple colors as they were when they were built as requirements were

there. I -- I certainly wouldn't worry about the ones that back up to -- or adjacent to city parks and certainly not ones that are -- back up to private parks in subdivisions and -- yeah, I agree with you, I wouldn't worry too much about the first level -- or single level homes either. While the success story you presented was -- you know, shows a big contrast, I would be curious where that one in particular was built, especially with the landscaping at there -- most all the subdivisions have berms that -- then with a fence on top of that, I mean, yeah, you would certainly see the peak and it would certainly look better, but I don't know that it's consequential enough to make a requirement on a single level.

Hood: Thank you for that. Madam Mayor, if I can, just -- with one of the builders we are currently working with, we actually asked them for that. We said, you know what, what you have provided -- go take pictures, stay on the sidewalk and show us -- you know, here is where the home is, look at how -- because even landscaping can break that up; right? I mean even that roof line and some of these other ones, I mean with the trees that are out there -- you know, you put a couple deciduous trees up there and it breaks it up, too. So, it provides that perspective and we can maybe make the finding that, you know, this doesn't apply to those things. So, that's kind of where we are going is some other ways that they can comply with this requirement. If through a berm and wall-fence combination it screens and the only people that know you only got one material on your back are the people that you invite for a barbecue, why do we care? You know, there is no public benefit to that. So, we are trying to work with builders on compliance and finding, you know, where that -- we are trying to be reasonable in this; right? You know, trying to -- but that's why we are here is to make sure that what we think is reasonable you all concur with and we can relay that to the development community and say, yeah, step that up a little bit or, no, that's okay, we -- you can do this with those trees there. That sounds good. Madam Mayor, to your request, I have no problem next week -- and I'm sorry I didn't do it, but I can do red line, underline, strike through with the changes to that standard condition. I got some feedback just now that I appreciate. But I will -- I will just add that to the end of the memo and say here is -- and there is probably going to be a couple of notes below it to say, hey, should we also do this, but I will just propose something with underline and strike through and come back next week. Unless there is more direction you want to give me now and I'm good with that, too.

De Weerd: I -- I think that sounds reasonable. Any other comments for Caleb as he brings that back?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton. Will you pull that closer to you.

Borton: The examples are -- examples are great, scenarios where there might have been a request to deviate from our existing rules and maybe could have been or should have been warranted, but we weren't allowed to -- that might illustrate why one of the amendments is necessary. That's always helpful.

Hood: Can I just share that one that I can think of most recently. So, again, we had a home that didn't do all of these and we had somebody saying, no, that you don't have -- your roof line doesn't do this, you don't have that mix of material, you aren't doing all of the things I listed there and we have somebody else in the office that says, no, that can be just one or two or these things that break that up and so there is some inconsistencies just with staff in application here where if you look at it on the face of it, yeah, you know, the elevation here, this -- this does not comply. But when you consider that you can't see this, what's the public benefit, you know, so -- or, you know, someone who is painting, you know, another color on there and one planner is calling it good and the other one says, no, you need to add another type of material there. So, that -- that's -- again, that's -- that's kind of the real life examples without -- I can probably come up with a couple more for next week, but that's, essentially, the issue is for consistency I need to provide that direction to staff to say this is how we are going to apply this and a director's determination memo that I can share with everybody that says this is the expectation on these. If they provide you -- you know, either do what it says in the condition or provide us another exhibit that shows that it's superior to or equal than, you know, this requirement. How -- how is your berm and your fence and your landscaping providing that illusion of modulation in this building, so -- I will be back next week, so thank you.

Item 9: Amended onto agenda: Ordinances

A. Ordinance No. 16-1708: AN ORDINANCE ADDING MERIDIAN CITY CODE SECTION 1-8-5, REGARDING AUTHORIZATION OF FBI NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS CHECKS FOR APPLICANTS FOR EMPLOYMENT; ADOPTING A SAVINGS CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

De Weerd: That sounds great. Thank you, Caleb. Okay. Item 9-A is Ordinance 16-1708. Mr. Clerk, will you, please, read this by title.

Coles: Thank you, Madam Mayor. City of Meridian Ordinance No. 16-1708, an ordinance adding Meridian City Code Section 1-8-5 regarding authorization of FBI National Criminal History Records Checks for applicants for employment. Adopting a savings clause and providing an effective date.

De Weerd: Thank you. Council, seeing no one in the audience, do I have a motion? Except Steve. I'm sorry. Public not staff.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 16-1708.

Bird: Second.

Milam: With suspension of rules.

Bird: With suspension of rules.

Milam: Yeah. Yes. I said it very quietly. Sorry.

Bird: Second.

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

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

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Item 10: Future Meeting Topics

De Weerd: Council, under Item 10, any items for future agendas? Just wanted to give you a reminder that tonight is the Meridian Stars Award. It starts at 6:30. And we have Walktober and Mayor's Walking Challenge going on for this entire month and Steve came out and joined Kaycee and I today. You are always invited. If you would like to get the schedule, please, let Peggy know and she will get that information to you. Keys to Safe Driving is Saturday, the 15th. It's at our public safety building from 9:00 to 11:00. And the Meridian symphony is playing also on Saturday and meet over at the Centennial High School and begin the concert at 7:30.

Item 11: Amended onto agenda: Executive Session per Idaho State Code 74-206(1)(f): To communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation and 74-206A (1)(a): a governing body or its designated representatives may hold an executive

session for the specific purpose of: (a) Considering a labor contract offer or to formulate a counteroffer

De Weerd: So, Item 11 is under Executive Session. Do I have a motion?

Coles: Madam Mayor?

Bird: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Bird.

Bird: I move we go into Executive Session as per Idaho State Code 74-206(1)(a), (a), and (1)(f).

Milam: Second.

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

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

De Weerd: All ayes. Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (5:42 p.m. to 6:08 p.m.)

Bird: I move we -- are we ready? I move we --

Milam: Second.

Bird: -- come out of Executive Session.

Borton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Bird: I move we adjourn.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: All those in favor. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:08 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)



MAYOR TAMMY DE WEERD

10 / 25 / 2016
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:



C. JAY COLES, CITY CLERK

