

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:35 p.m., Tuesday, October 22, 2019, by Mayor Tammy de Weerd.

Members Present: Tammy de Weerd, Joe Borton, Luke Cavener, Genesis Milam, Ty Palmer, Anne Little Roberts and Treg Bernt.

Also Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Clint Dolsby, Kyle Radek, Cameron Arial, Mark Ford, Joe Bongiorno, Todd Lakey, Ashley Squyres, and Dean Willis.

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

Roll Call.

**A. Meridian City Council**

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

**B. Meridian Development Corporation Board of Commissioners**

<u>  X  </u> Dave Winder - Chairman	<u>  X  </u> Dan Basalone
<u>  X  </u> Nathan Mueller - Vice Chairman	<u>      </u> Tammy de Weerd
<u>  X  </u> Steve Vlassek - Secretary/Treasurer	<u>  X  </u> Rob McCarvel
	<u>  X  </u> Diane Bevan
	<u>      </u> Treg Bernt
	<u>  X  </u> Kit Fitzgerald

De Weerd: Okay. I'm going to call this meeting to order. It's a joint meeting between the Meridian City Council and the Meridian Development Corporation. Thank you all for joining us, those out in the audience. For the record it is Tuesday, October 22nd. It's 4:35. We will start first with roll call attendance for City Council and, then, I will ask Ashley if she will do -- call role for the MDC board.

**Item 2: Adoption of Agenda**

De Weerd: Thank you. Item No. 2 is adoption of the Agenda. Council, do I have a motion to approve the agenda as printed?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Move to adopt the agenda as published.

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**Item 3: Joint Meeting with Meridian Development Corporation**

- A. Civic Block RFP Review Committee Recommendation and Discussion [Action Item]**
- B. Selection of Civic Block RFP Development Partnership [Action Item]**

De Weerd: Item 3 is the joint meeting between the Meridian Development Corporation and the Meridian City Council. Item 3-A is a presentation and discussion about the Civic Block RFP. I will ask for Mr. Nary and, then, Mr. -- so, all I can think of is Lavoie at this time. I think that Todd should feel very appreciated on that. But we will start with our attorneys and Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, Members of the Commission. What you have before you is an RFP that was submitted pursuant to a public offering. There is only one single proposer that's in front of you. They will have about 15, 20 minutes to present their proposal to you. What you are looking for today is we are looking to understand both the proposer and what they are willing to do and have offered to do as part of this RFP and what it's going to take to accomplish that and because there is a lot to do, if this -- if this proposal is acceptable to both the Council and the Commission, today we are really looking to get direction to move forward with some continuing steps to make it happen. There is a lot of public process that's necessary to do it as being proposed. There is a lot of public hearings that need to happen and the proposers understand that, really, a final decision isn't really -- really possible to do at this time. It is more of a direction to move forward and continue to do the public processes that's necessary in noticing and hearings there needs to make some of this happen. But getting the direction that that's what you would like to do is kind of what we are seeking today from the Council and, again, I will turn it over to Mr. Lakey for the Commission, so --

De Weerd: Thank you. Mr. Lakey.

Lakey: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Just to echo a couple of additional things that Mr. Nary mentioned. As he noted, this isn't a comparison, since we only received one proposal. So, the decision tonight is, essentially, to accept or reject or accept with conditions, but it is very preliminary in the sense that -- and you will hear more about what

the specifics are, but the proposal is contingent on a public process and there can be no commitment on that public process. If the public process happens, then, the project may move forward. If it doesn't happen, then, it doesn't. So, it's essentially -- part of it is just to potentially initiate a public process and see where that goes and, then, if that goes forward, then, there can be more detail put into that. The public process for MDC board's benefit is the city's process, not MDC's process as far as adopting the necessary ordinances that might be required and I think that's all I have, Madam Mayor.

De Weerd: Thank you, Mr. Lakey. I understand that Matt Stoll will be presenting from the committee. Thank you for being here. If you will state your name, please.

Stoll: Matt Stoll. COMPASS Executive Director, member of the committee. So, good afternoon -- good afternoon, Mayor, City Council and Members of the MDC Board of Commissioners, I am Matt Stoll, executive director of COMPASS, a member of the Civic Block RFP review committee, a property owner impacted by the proposed project and a Meridian city resident. I'm here today to describe the community's work and present our recommendation to you. The review committee is made up of a broad cross-section of ten interested stakeholders representing downtown business residents, business owners, the chamber, library district, COMPASS, Council and the MDC board. We are -- we are -- we are also supported by the excellent staff from both the city and the MDC. This has been a very involved six month process. Staff and interested stakeholders started their work back in May doing months of research and drafting the requests for proposal. They did site visits and researched various community center like projects. Ultimately they sent out the RFP in August to broad distribution and conducted due diligence meetings, which culminated in receiving the excellent response before you. Following the response on the 4th of this month the review committee met -- has met three times and had respondents present their proposal in person. Members of the committee also did a site visit of the respondents' current project in Garden City. Based on the committee's extensive deliberations and research, the proposal's adherence to the guiding principles of the RFP, adherence to the destination downtown plan, the city's strategic plan and other plans and documents, the committee recommends approval of the proposal with the following contingencies. It is important to note the proposal -- it is important to note the development agreement with the respondent will place all the risk on the developer, which -- whether the tax increment generated will be sufficient to cover reimbursement of the cost of the project and corresponding improvements. If the required contingencies are not met, the project will not move forward and the city and MDC will not have expended any funds. The contingencies are as follows: Developer shall provide an updated pro forma subject to -- pro forma subject to audit by an independent third party retained by the city MDC. Developer shall have secured bridge funding, as well as performance based surety bond prior to construction and transfer of any property to ensure final delivery of the civic block site. Of note some level of surety is advised and the committee feels this adheres to a performance based partnership model. The project -- the project should include office and other revenue generating and/or job creating commercial uses -- use or uses above the community center in lieu of the charter school. Again, a note. Given there is no direct taxable value, revenue production, or private job creation in the proposal, the committee would -- would have like to see more of this. That

said, if the respondents can articulate a plan model that supports the economy of downtown, this may be something you take into consideration. The site visit that a few committee members went on shows great promise in creating a true live-work-play family environment that is nonexistent in Meridian today. It also shows promise in creating a business workforce pipeline with children being educated at the school, taking ideas into incubation that -- that, then, leads to startup business and/or trained workforce to support downtown Meridian's economy. Questions of access to the school and parking still remain. Next contingency. The final project must include funded adequate parking. Any offsite parking must be a specified approved alternate location. Developer shall cover all project design costs up to and including construction documents for all buildings, site improvements, parking, and required public infrastructure improvements. Public project funding will be based on a tax increment financing, TIF, performance based reimbursement model. Reimbursement is made upon successful completion of the improvements and only from a portion of the tax increment dollars received by MDC. Again, a side note. The committee felt a performance based model protected both the city and MDC's interests, while allowing a true partnership to move forward. Next contingency. Any new urban renewal district, URD, must be approved independent of any action related to the civic block project and prior to final negotiations of a detailed civic -- civic block development agreement. The creation of a new district is a public process and there is no commitment that it will be approved. If a new district is not approved, then, the community center project does not move forward. Of note -- another note -- side note. This is -- this was important to the committee as it allows the partnership to begin while ensuring a deliberate and necessary public processes is followed. Next contingency. Developer shall cover any costs associated with de-annexation and creation of a new URD. The final project must address the guiding principles and basis for selection criteria outlined in the RFP. Another side note. This allows for the continual monitoring and check in that the project is hearing to the goals of the city and MDC as the project is designed and delivered. Next contingency. Developer agrees that its proposal will remain valid for sufficient time to allow for the decision of whether to de-annex the property from the current URD and create a new URD to be made and, if applicable, the execution of a development agreement. In conclusion, the committee feels this is an incredible proposal that will deliver an iconic and catalytic project for -- for downtown Meridian. We feel the respondents are an excellent team that can deliver on their proposal and who are committed to the success of Meridian. With the discussed contingencies in place, the committee feels it is appropriate to approve the proposal and start the process. We and the respondents are well aware there are many checks and balances along the way that will need to be met, but are prepared and excited to put in the -- the work necessary to move this proposal forward. On behalf of the committee I thank you for the opportunity to be part of this process and chapter in Meridian's future. With that I and the committee stand for any questions.

De Weerd: Thank you, Matt. Council, any -- and Council and MDC board, any questions at this time?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Matt, appreciate very thorough update going through each of these pieces. We haven't seen the RFP, we haven't seen the proposal, so if some of these questions are included in the proposal we are going to see at one point, my questions might be somewhat unnecessary, but did the proposal talk at any length about the proposed school and how large that would make up the proposed project site and -- you kind of alluded to the parking piece. I don't know if that's included in there. And for the Council and Committee's benefit, I'm sorry if I'm asking some of these questions, but us not having that in front of us it's hard to get a good grasp for those that weren't on the selection committee to kind of understand the totality of the project.

De Weerd: Mr. Nary, you sent that -- the proposal out to the City Council?

Nary: Mr. Arial did.

Arial: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, you should have received that, essentially, at the time it was sent. So, if you have not seen it, I apologize, but that was sent to you.

Cavener: Madam Mayor -- and I guess --

Arial: I can double check that.

Cavener: It also wasn't added to the record for today's meeting and that's typically where I go to seek out this information. So, I haven't seen it. If you sent it out, Mr. Arial, my apologies for missing it, but I'm hearing some -- some comments that maybe some other people hadn't received it as well.

De Weerd: Okay. Well, the applicant -- it's hard for Matt to answer that question.

Cavener: Sorry, Madam Mayor.

De Weerd: Any other questions for Matt at this point? Okay. Thank you, Matt.

Stoll: Thank you.

De Weerd: We do have the applicant or the proposer here that is here to present what they are bringing to the discussion and so I will turn this over to the team.

Elton: Madam Mayor, Members of the Committee, we are honored to be here today. Myself -- or if it's all right with you we are going to co-present -- or both stand here. I think that's okay; right? My name is Aaron Elton. I am the director and VP of finance with Galena Opportunity Fund. With me is Bill Turax, the president of Galena Opportunity Fund, and we are the respondent for the RFP and we are really excited for the downtown core of Meridian. I hope that's what comes across and what came across in our proposal. We are bullish and if I let bull -- if I let Bill -- bull. If I let Bill loose he will get super bullish.

So, the point is we love downtown Meridian and I think anyone serving on this committee probably does as well. So, that's number one. We do not have any technology with us and we don't have the proposal. So, if you haven't seen it we would love to show it to you, but we don't have the technology and the pretty pictures. I have some printed out, but I don't think that will do you much good. But we are excited for this proposal and are presuming -- and maybe that's not a wise presumption -- that those who we are speaking to have read it and are familiar with what we are proposing. So, I think we will just back up and talk a little bit about what the proposal is, what we think should be on the civic block and how that relates to what we plan to do across the street, because that's -- all of this ties together with -- with what Galena is doing across the street and it's across the street from City Hall, too. So, that corner of Main and Broadway back basically to across the street from the current COMPASS building and the civic block, so --

De Weerd: Council -- Council, before you get into the details, it was sent out on October 9th to -- that I can see.

Truax: Mayor and Council, Bill Truax. Members of the MDC Board. Appreciate you all entertaining this -- this meeting. We are here because we care about the downtown of Meridian. We submitted a response under the RFP because we think that it is viable. The RFP was structured independent of what we are doing to the south on the Union Pacific station grounds and so that -- that is why it's a little bit -- probably was a challenge for other folks to reply to, but it was very important for us we thought in the development of this downtown core to help inform the -- the overall vision of the area and what we did when we were putting it together was really look at it as a way to begin the discussion and the framework for consideration jointly as a partnership for the stakeholders in the area and that -- that was the overriding theme that we were hoping came across in the -- in the RFP response.

Elton: So, I don't know if we are asking questions or if we can ask questions now, but would you -- would it be helpful for us to go through the actual nuts and bolts of what we are proposing?

De Weerd: Yes, please.

Elton: Okay. I would enjoy that. So, first off we control the ground across the street, that, like I said, is on the corner of Main and Broadway. We plan on making our building a mixed use project there that includes all your typical mixed use pieces. There is going to be a fair amount of residential units, primarily rentable apartments. There will be some retail -- significant amount of retail and we want to put a lot of office in downtown Meridian. So, that's the beginning of this. But we also know that we got to park that thing and we only have -- call it six acres that's there and we need a lot of parking. So, we are going to build this on a podium is our plan and since we are going to build the podium, which originally was a number of floors above -- possibly three, but probably two layers -- stories of parking, we thought, well, with this RFP going across the street, why don't we combine our efforts -- public and private partnership and we will just add parking to what we are going to do across the street to be able to park not only the community center that's

proposed in there and the use elements that are in there, but we also want to see events coming to this and, of course, any community center would lend itself to the events that would happen in 17,000 square feet that's proposed in there. We propose a larger square footage community center in there. We added an auditorium, because we have been talking -- I have been hearing a lot about having an auditorium in downtown Meridian and if you saw the proposal you will see that it looks like the auditorium is -- is listed as a charter school -- like it would be part of the charter school, but that's -- that was a typo. It would be a community auditorium owned by whoever owns this piece, which we assume is the city and/or MDC. So, the public entity owning what we are proposing and so instead of the 17,000 -- and it really is up to the committee. We want to do this how the city and -- and the owners see this vision, but we want to see --

Johnson: Sorry.

Elton: Oh, good.

Johnson: You can control it from there as well.

Elton: Okay. Great. Thanks. So -- can you see my mouse here?

De Weerd: Uh-huh.

Elton: So, this auditorium shows -- we said 500 seats, but that's a starting point. If you want comparison, the Nampa Civic Center has approximately 600 seats. So, if you have been in that auditorium it's about 600 seats. My favorite in the area is the Brandt Center NNU and that's almost 1,500 square feet -- or seats. So, you know -- and I say that's iconic. I mean if you want to do something amazing in downtown Meridian, you would possibly do an auditorium that's -- that's somewhere in between 500 and 1,500 seats. And there are users -- we have been approached by users that are currently doing productions in Meridian and also in Boise that would like to have a presence here. So, there are folks who want to put on events that would bring people to Meridian during -- during what we call off business hours for events. That's exciting to have those uses for the auditorium and, of course, other things that would come up that the owner would -- would determine how you want to use that. But we added an auditorium. It doesn't have to be there, but we did add it in our plan. Any questions while we are looking at this, because this is one of the only -- this might be the only slide that has the actual floor plan. It has the large community center and I'm hoping I can get to -- if you haven't seen this here is a rendering of what it would look like from the -- you are looking to the northwest. So, that's the southeast corner of -- and you have got Broadway here going east-west on the left. So -- I think that's 3rd Street; right? Yes, 3rd. So, the community room was a key element and it was part of the proposal -- RFP. Sorry. And you can see that part of our vision is to have some greenery on the roof of there. It's -- it's actually a really cool element we think. If there was something above the community center -- and I want to point out something that's really important here. These floors above what we are calling the community center, this -- it looks like office. What we are calling it as a charter school and we are proposing that we want to bring a charter school to downtown Meridian. It's

hard to underwrite. We looked at this at other -- for other uses and I suspect other potential respondents were looking at office, residential, other uses that might be above this. It's really hard for us to take a risk to put office there, particularly with the parking situation, because it wouldn't be onsite parking. If they had to park -- if they had to go across the street to their parking it's challenging. For residential if you had to go across the street to carry their groceries in or whatever. It's -- it's just a higher risk than Galena is ready to put people -- their parking across the street for either office or residential. A charter school, which we have done in our -- in another development in Garden City, we love the -- the way that the charter school brings all elements of life into that one place without cars and we hope that a lot of people that are in the residential would use the charter school, because it does have that financial element that people can use it even if they are not high income. A few people in this group may have toured our project down in Garden City. We are really proud of that, because -- and, really, Bill made that charter school come there. It's a partnership with -- with a subsidiary of the Albertson Foundation and they have just done an amazing job and the key to that partnership is the -- the -- sorry. The -- the project is the partnership with the Boys and Girls Club across -- next door and they use the Boys and Girls Club for the gym. The playground is -- is the city park next door. It all fits. And the charter school is -- I mean there is a lot of activity there during school days and it's a lot of fun. Of course, in downtown Meridian the Boys and Girls Club is a few blocks away and we have to figure that out, but there is a Boys and Girls Club right there that we can potentially partnership -- partner with. They are open to it. We have had those discussions. So, we are excited about the element of attracting a charter school, which would be revenue generating, which is one of the requirements on the contingencies, but we are not positive right now that the charter -- that -- we don't have a charter school in the bag is what I'm trying to say. So, we propose this without one on top, but the pictures that you see here have that use on top of it. So, if you look at the pictures it may be a little confusing, but what we are proposing is without that charter school on top, but we would like the opportunity and the contingency as we work through design over the next few months, we potentially could attract and -- and nail down a charter user that could have a school on top and, then, potentially lessen the cost burden on the public entity for this development.

Truax: I would clarify we are meeting with a charter school group that will be in town tomorrow. They are also touring a site that we are doing a similar sort of development in Twin Falls where you're doing an urban renewal district site that's got housing -- affordable and market rate housing together with a charter school. They have done about a hundred charter schools across the country. They usually own them for three to five years and, then, they sell them back to the charter school operator, so -- and they are very excited. They have already got a charter here in northwest Meridian. So, they said it would be fairly simple for them to move and add another charter to this downtown area. If it -- if it seemed like the right use. Again, to -- to take a step back, the purpose of our RFP -- response to the RFP was to create a -- a working relationship with the city and MDC to try to find what is the optimal use for programming and space in that downtown core and understanding that as you go through that and we go through that we are going to arrive at what I think is better ultimate programming than what was originally sought in -- in the RFP.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Can I sneak one question? Is -- is the design an idea that it's a K-8 elementary or secondary charter?

Truax: No, it's not specified right now. I mean we -- they need to look at the market and the demand -- demand specifically in the area to understand where they see the kids coming from. If it's a Boys and Girls Club integration, then, it's probably K-6 or K-8.

Borton: Madam Mayor. What begs the question is the parking. K-8 parks much differently than the -- than the secondary.

Truax: Oh, right. Yeah. And K-8 is like the one we did in Garden City. It's very -- there is about 40 stalls and half of them are parked outside at the Boys and Girls Club. K -- I would say high school is going to be a lot different if you got destination drivers for sure.

Elton: Yeah. The question is will high school be there and we don't expect that. We don't expect high school. Right. I think that's the -- I wanted to just show this, because the community room was a key aspect of the -- of the response and we like the design. This can change, of course, but we love the design of a glassed in community room and the -- what we are calling the back end of the -- the south end of this and there is a lawn that spills out -- if you look at these renderings here you can see that part of the -- if you had an event that -- where people are seated and it's a nice day, you can open up these -- what we would call the large glass garage doors, if that's what we -- what we put in there, to spill out onto the lawn and have an indoor-outdoor event and we think that might be something that's pretty popular in the area. Other places that these architects -- Aiello is who is designing this and that's become a very popular element is the indoor-outdoor event space. We -- the elephant in the room when we talked about this with the committee were the finances. So, why don't we just dig into that, unless there is further questions.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I do have a quick question going back to the charter school. So, you have already made it clear that office wouldn't work and how --

Elton: We would love to do that. Yeah.

Milam: But if for some reason a charter school doesn't work, whether it's not approved or you can't find a charter that's willing to work with you, then, it's just a community center?

Elton: Yes. In our proposal these numbers that are proposed are just the community center. This is with no revenue generating element at all.

Truax: It's hard to imagine if -- if we approach it as a collaborative proactive effort jointly that we are not going to find some use that is compatible I think and a lot of that is based on our assumption that we are going to be able to move forward on the Union Pacific Railroad tied to the south. We have met with the city, we have met with ACHD, and all the stakeholders and, you know, we are as confident as you can be, given the type of project that it is, but the worst case scenario in our minds, outside of, you know, -- yeah, worst case is really you end up with just the community center, because I think that's underutilizing the site and really the -- the block itself.

Elton: We have two working mics. We can both stand here. Any other questions? I wanted to simplify the financial piece and if you want to get into the -- the -- the details it's available in the -- in the proposal. We would be happy to talk through it. But I thought we would use the sources and uses to just tell you where we landed and this, as proposed with the -- what I'm calling the smaller version of the auditorium, it could even be smaller than this, if there is any auditorium at all, it lands at 12,823,000. That's with the city contribution of 3,850,000 that's already in the proposal for the community center and -- and, then, all the -- all the soft and hard costs that you can see on the right side to -- to bring you to that number. In essence, without revenue generation this -- you know, it costs what we need to put this up and our -- our understanding is the city wanted something like this and I think we all would wish that there could be some revenue generation above it or as part of it and I know part of the presentation that I saw before the RFP went out is that it could -- you don't have to be on the first floor, you could put the community center above whatever the revenue generation could be there. Our problem was parking. You got to park this thing somewhere and putting the community center two or three stories up causes an issue, too. So, it's all about this compact site and density and do you really want a community center on this. This is our vision of what we think is fantastic in this location, based on what we know we are going to build across the street and we see this as -- yeah, it's -- it's a benefit to our -- our development across the street, but we hope that the public entity also sees that what we are basically doing by proposing this new URD is we are raising our hands and saying tax us, if you want to put something really cool over there, let our development pay for this and the city has thrown its -- it's significantly -- and MDC with the land. I mean this is a significant input from all entities and we are saying, hey, we will make up the balance based on what we know is going to be spectacular across the street. So, that's where this comes from as we create a new TIF funding element that -- that gets you a new URA, we de-annex a few blocks, the civic block and, then, our acreage across the street out of the current MDC -- the current URD downtown -- the downtown URD and re-apply and create a new URD that's just a few blocks size and that's how you pay for this is you tax entirely our project, essentially. Any questions on that? I think we are to the questions portion, unless you want to --

De Weerd: Council, any questions? Commission?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

Cavener: How long in terms of timing to, then, repay that amount of money? Is this a URD that exists for the 30 years, for --

Elton: Twenty.

Cavener: Twenty?

Elton: And -- yeah. And -- and if you see the calculations -- I don't like throwing out the full calculation, but the gentleman -- some of you may be familiar with Phil Kushlan, who wishes he could be here today. He was part of our original presentation and he knows this inside and out and we are glad to have him on our team. He is confident that based on what we are putting across the street over those 20 years -- it's about a million a year. It becomes 19 million something over 20 years. So, I just don't -- it's in the proposal. I don't like to say we are going to use 19 million dollars to do this. If you wanted to do something bigger we think that there is a buffer between the 12 eight and take out the 3,850, of course. So, we are talking about a TIF in the nine million range that there is some buffer to expand it, make it smaller, whatever it makes most sense from the public entity.

De Weerd: Other questions? Okay.

Elton: Thank you.

De Weerd: Thank you. So, I guess at this point it's discussion for the MDC and the City Council. MDC would be asked the -- to take action first, since they initiated the RFP, and followed by discussion and action by Council. The committee had a lot of questions, so at this --

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: I want to point out by the lack of questions the committee must have done a phenomenal job of weeding through all the -- all the humps.

De Weerd: Okay. Counsel Lakey again, will you kind of give an overview to the MDC board on what they have to consider this evening.

Lakey: Thank you, Madam Mayor and MDC Board Members. Again, your decision tonight is, essentially, either to accept the proposal or reject the proposal or accept the proposal with certain contingencies. The committee has made some recommendations on potential contingencies. You have heard some discussion from the respondents themselves as far as their proposal. Again, this would be an acceptance, but one of those contingencies has to be -- if there is an -- there is an acceptance has to be that public process, which the city is engaged in, to create -- excuse me. First to de-annex this small portion of the current urban renewal district and, then, create and make -- make the

necessary findings to create another small -- a new small district which would reset the the -- the base for that small district and -- and take the other part out first and then -- and, then, set that new district. But that is a public process where the city receives public input and comment, has to pass ordinances and there is -- there can be no commitment in that process going forward, other than to initiate it and see what happens. So, that's your -- that's your sideboards. Those are your sideboards, Commissioners, to accept or reject or accept with contingencies and -- and an acceptance is really just an agreement to see how the process goes -- initiate the process, but see how it goes and, then, there is a more detailed development agreement that would be executed if that public process to create a new district happens. There may be some type of preliminary contingent letter of agreement or MOU -- Bill and I talked about potentially that beforehand. But, again, any -- any approval has to be completely contingent on that public process without any commitment there. I would be happy to answer any questions from my board if you -- if you also have any.

De Weerd: Okay. I'm going to turn this over to the MDC chair and he can run this portion.

Winder: Thank you, Mayor. So, I guess what we would be looking at from MDC's perspective is a member willing to make a motion to accept the proposal with the committee's recommendation, the contingencies, and also the -- do they -- do they need to spell out the de-annexation and new urban renewal district, the city's approval of that as well?

Lakey: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, that is one of the listed --

Winder: That's good enough that it's in there? Okay.

Lakey: The one that may generate some more discussion perhaps from the board is the whole office charter school concept, since the proposer has a potentially different idea there and, again, it's your comfort level on that particular contingency, if you want to move forward, if you want to create some more flexibility there or -- or describe it more generically as revenue generating something, but that's -- that's something that I think can be flushed out. It's -- it's proposed as optional in the RFP at this point in response.

Winder: So, I guess we would be looking for a motion from an MDC board member if anybody would like to make one. Commissioner Basalone.

Basalone: I move that we accept the proposal as presented with contingencies included and move forward.

Fitzgerald: I will second.

Basalone: I don't know what else you need.

Winder: So, a motion by Commissioner Basalone and a second by Commissioner Fitzgerald. Is there any discussion from MDC board members?

Basalone: One quick --

Winder: Mr. Basalone.

Basalone: On that -- I think we have kind of been through this before with another project, but a project like this is kind of a journey of a thousand miles and you have to start with a single step. That's what came to my mind in listening to this. Nothing is ever as simple as it appears, but if we never start we will never know where it will finish and this is an outstanding proposal. We have talked for over ten years that I'm aware of about the need for a community center, for having an auditorium downtown, for bringing families downtown and this certainly would do that. So, I appreciate the work that was done by the committee, made up of a broad spectrum of downtown interested people and community members, and I say we go forward with this motion.

Winder: Thank you. Yeah. I agree with what you said, that, you know, we have to start somewhere. This isn't committing ourselves to this yet, it's just committing ourselves to starting down that path to do this and it's an important step that we have to take if we are going to do this. So, any further discussion from MDC board members?

Palmer: Madam Mayor, Mr. Chairman, I guess a question to clarify.

Winder: Go ahead. Yeah.

Palmer: Or not. I just wanted to, for clarification, make sure that you wanted to maintain the consistency that a charter option -- charter school option as a potential revenue generating method is not something that you are interested in.

Winder: Yeah. I think the way it's written on -- it includes office or other revenue generating and/or job creating commercial uses above the community center. So, whether that's offer or -- you know, if it's -- if it is a charter school that's a -- that's established -- or that's achieving those objectives, then, that's -- that's okay.

Palmer: Thanks.

Winder: But -- but not just the community center. Commissioner Mueller.

Mueller: So, I just have a quick comment on this. So, this -- this is a pretty creative proposal for a pretty hard puzzle I think and, then, not only that, I think that they stepped up and they tried to solve things that we didn't even ask them to solve, like the auditorium and things like that. So, on one level I applaud you guys for what you are signing up for, because I think you went kind of above and beyond on actually meeting what the city needs, which was even more than we asked for. On the flip side, I think that that means if we do go down this journey we are going to come back to these clauses at some point and we are going to have to work through them again and again and -- and like -- like I think you so accurately stated, you said if it is a charter school or if it ends up being something else, in the spirit of partnership I mean, yeah, we can move forward I think

right now with these contingencies locked in how they are. I think that's good, because I think it's still putting a challenge on it to make it a higher and better use for downtown, but at the same time over the course of this process I think it's going to require a little bit of creativity from all of us, because it's a really expensive project that largely is not revenue generating, you know what I mean? So, I think it's -- I think it's a pretty awesome place to start. It will be interesting working through these over time and seeing how -- how it plays out.

Milam: Madam Mayor? Sorry. Also -- oh, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair. Sorry. In the middle of your motion -- I guess before -- yeah, before your motion is made I think that this is an important aspect that we discussed -- or you discussed, but our contingency is saying no charter school, it says revenue generating business and the revenue needed in the URD is not -- for TIF is not included in that building, so the funds -- the revenue is not necessary for this project to work. I just would hate to close the door on that option right here at the beginning. So, I would maybe take that contingency out and -- and leave that as still an open option. Thank you.

Winder: Would any of the committee members wish to address that maybe?

De Weerd: I guess, Mr. Chair, it was a question I -- I raised in the initial discussion and I was not able to attend the meetings because I was out of town and so it was a question certainly we raised early and I don't know -- Mr. Arial, maybe you can help walk us through the discussion and where we are at right now.

Arial: Sure. Appreciate that, Madam Mayor and Mr. Chairman. So, the committee's deliberation did focus in on this and I would be, you know, happy to acquiesce to anyone that was in -- participating in that discussion, but I think it's important that the committee felt that, yes, revenue generation, job creation added value was an important part of this and that was part of the RFP itself. If you -- if you -- if you go back to the RFP there was a scoring matrix that centered on that. Focusing back to Matt's comments, that was a consideration. As proposed that was limited. Therefore, that was a consideration of the committee. Now, with the consideration of a charter school and the overall scope of what's being proposed, the committee felt like, yes, that is of interest, we do want to see office, but it was incumbent upon -- potentially the respondent to make their case for some -- some alternative and so if the committee -- if the Council feels that that alternative, as -- as proposed, the charter school and/or not, I think that's also a third option is to do none of that, just the community center portion, that -- that could be an option as well. So, again, from the committee perspective I think there was an element of flexibility there. Yes, we do want office. Yes, we do want added value and job creation. But there is some flexibility there.

Lakey: Mr. Chairman and Madam Mayor, if I might augment that a little bit as well. The contingency is -- at least presented by the committee wasn't a mandatory one. Some of those are mandatory in regards to -- we have to be adequately parked and things have to be approved. This was more of a should -- should include office or other generating -- revenue generating, job creating type uses. But I don't think it was a mandatory. So,

there is some flexibility built into this. If -- the respondents in their presentation mentioned there were different types of charter schools, as far as their ability to generate revenue, but I think it gives you the flexibility with the nonmandatory nature of that contingency to decide down the road if you do think a charter school is a good idea or something else.

Cavener: Mr. Chairman? Be the third City Council to interject on the MDC meeting. I guess my question is either for -- is for Mr. Lakey or Mr. Nary. So, in terms of process here, I don't want to get in the way of MDC's ability to make their motions. I know Council Member Milam asked some questions about clarifying on the motion. So, can you help me understand how if MDC passes the motion that's on the table, is that, then, that comes before the Council for adoption. I just want to make sure that I'm kind of following the process appropriately.

Lakey: Mr. Chairman, Madam Mayor -- and I will let Bill chime in as well, but MDC issued the RFP, but it's always been a joint RFP and both entities own property and, therefore, it has to be approved by both entities. It just made sense to separate the motions and have each entity make their decision. But if one entity tonight doesn't agree and doesn't want to move forward, then, it doesn't move forward.

Cavener: Mr. Chairman. But clarification then. Mr. Lakey. Again should MDC pass the motion that's before them, that's the same motion that would need to be adopted by the City Council or if the Council were to change, then, would that, then, go back to the MDC for concurrence or -- or adoption? I'm just trying to understand the process.

Lakey: Sure. And, again, I will let Bill chime in as well, but optimally the -- if there is some kind of desire on both sides to approve it, your motions should be the same or -- I wouldn't even try to avoid something similar and if you have to talk back and forth to get some kind of similar motion, that would -- I think that's okay. That's why you have a joint meeting. But I think to move forward we have to have maybe -- have to have the same motion. Whether they are more basic or whatever, but there has to be consensus from both bodies. And, Bill, I -- again, I would defer to you, but --

Nary: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, I would echo what -- what Counsel -- or what Counsel Lakey said. This is the dialogue that you need to have to have that cooperation and -- and the partnering of that and I think Council Member Bernt came to talk about one of them, the one that you're having probably the most bullet point discussion is the one that includes the term in lieu of the charter school and I don't want to steal Council Member Borton's thunder, but his suggestion was to eliminate just that phrase, because, then, it really clearly is a desire of both the MDC and the City Council, if that's your desire, that -- that you can consider some type of revenue generating use on that site, but you're not precluded from considering something else and that sounds like the flavor of where some of you are is you don't want to foreclose either option, because we are way early in the process and if that's your -- that's your direction that would make sense to me for us moving forward.

Cavener: Mr. Chairman, one additional question if I can.

Winder: Go ahead.

Cavener: Mr. Lakey or Mr. Nary, ultimately if this is all approved who leads the project? I recognize it's kind of a joint effort, but at the end the day who -- who is in charge of this?

Lakey: Madam Mayor and Mr. Chairman -- and, again, I will let Bill chime in as well, but there is -- it's kind of like a relay race. I see it initially as the city is in charge of the process of de-annexation and creation of a new district. That is totally the city's realm and public process and I think once that happens, then, it's MDC's RFP, but, again, it's a team effort and both have to be involved, but once that's created and it's within the district, then, I think MDC takes more of a leadership role in putting things together. But, again, it has to be a consensus on both sides. We can't -- MDC can't get out in front and then -- and contrary to what the city wants to do.

Bevan: Mr. Chair?

Winder: Commissioner Bevan.

Bevan: So, I -- my thoughts on this is I think we need to remember that the -- the idea of a charter school isn't a random decision on this developer's part. I'm familiar with their other project in Garden City. One of my employees, she's a single mom, she drives 20 minutes to put her child in that school, because she just loves it so much and they -- and, in fact, they go to the Boys and Girls Club immediately after. So, I think it is a very proven model that works and I think it's something that we need to look at that contingency, because I think it is a good job creation, it is a -- it is a revenue driver. I -- you know, I think the fact that they address the parking issue in respect to office space I think is important for us to remember, but having -- actually know of their other project I -- I think that is something that should absolutely stay in the conversation.

Winder: So, do we want to -- yeah. Commissioner Basalone, could you restate your motion, please. Sorry.

Basalone: My motion was to accept the proposal as presented with contingencies that are included.

Winder: And the second from Commissioner Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Winder: Do you want to amend -- to remove -- to strike the in lieu of charter school? Was that the recommendation from legal counsel? Yeah.

Basalone: You're going to put that burden on me, uh.

Winder: You made the motion.

Basalone: Yes. I see no problem with excluding that. I think the proposer -- the proposers could come back at some future date and give a rationale for re-including it. So, I would see no problem with that.

Winder: Okay. Does the second agree?

Fitzgerald: Second.

Winder: Okay. Any further discussion, MDC board members? No? If not, Ashley, would you call the roll vote, please.

Roll call: Winder, yea; Mueller, yea; Vlassek, yea; Basalone, yea; McCarvel, yea; Bevan, yea; Fitzgerald, yea.

Winder: All ayes. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

De Weerd: Okay. Council, this is your -- your part for discussion and possible action. I will start with Mr. Nary, again, reiterating the -- what your options this evening are.

Nary: So, Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, as we have discussed, really, what we are seeking is direction based on these contingencies as proposed by MDC. Maybe to help flush out a little bit of Councilor Cavener's question, the process, as Counsel Lakey has stated to form a district -- an urban renewal district is -- is totally on the city to do and if that's the direction, we would have to begin that. Part of that will be some level of agreement with the proposer to continue with the process, that this proposal will remain on the table, that they are going to be committed to this district if it were to form. They recognize that there are contingencies and public processes necessary to occur and that there is always that risk that it could not happen, but that we don't want to form a district and, then, they are not a part of it anymore. So, some level of commitment from them as we move forward and, then, we would begin that. At a certain point in time, as Mr. Lakey said, MDC is agreeing that once that happens they will, then, become the managing entity of that district, but until that happens they really are simply waiting to see what occurs or wanting to make sure any other projects that have any relationship can move forward on their own merit without being dependent upon this process. So, there is a length of time that's going to occur for that to happen. But to begin the process of moving forward we do need that direction to go -- go ahead.

De Weerd: Okay. Discussion? Mr. Bernt? Pull your mic down. You never do that.

Bernt: I could talk. I guess I could start with discussion. I really enjoy the creativity of this of this proposal. I like the dynamics of it. I like what it can offer to our community for generations to come. Excited to see how this pans out. I know there is a lot of hurdles that we need to overcome in order for this to take place, but I'm excited and positive that working together and being transparent in the process will equate to a fantastic project.

So, with that I move that we accept the proposal by Galena Opportunity Fund with the following contingencies that were spoke -- spoke before. With exception of the third contingency, striking in lieu of the charter school, leaving a period after community center.

Milam: Second.

De Weerd: Okay. I have a motion and a second. Discussion?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Question for the attorneys in the room. Mr. Lakey, I appreciate your comments about motions trying to be the same, but not similar. I just want to make sure there is no concern from any legal staff about our motion and if there is -- if it's approved if there is any conflict between what was approved by MDC.

Nary: I don't believe so.

De Weerd: It's the same thing.

Cavener: It sounded a little different.

De Weerd: But thank you. It should be clarified then -- any other discussion?

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Madam Mayor, to that point, which I think is a great question, is it fair -- we are all looking at a document with the bullet lists. It's a list of conditions that were reported to us by the committee that if the motion that MDC had approved and if the city is to proceed that we can reference this document as an exhibit to, rather than read each bullet point. Just so we are clear that we are all referencing, quote, the same conditions. Is that fair?

Nary: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, yeah, I -- I have been following the same document. It's titled Civic Block and Community Center RFP. Mr. Stoll pretty much read from this document, so I do think we can make it part of the record to make sure it's clear to the public that's what we based off.

Basalone: That was the document I was using as well.

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Just curious to know who from MDC and the City Council was on the RFP selection committee. Okay. Okay. Great. Madam Mayor, I just -- I want to thank the committee for their great work on this. For the applicant or the RFP responders, this is pretty visionary. Somebody who grew up in this community I never thought something like this would exist here in a million years. Commissioner Basalone talked about it's the first step. There is some things I have got to wrap my head around on this whole process, but I'm -- I'm generally supportive. I think this is the right step in the right direction for our community. I think this process played out spectacular and I want to thank MDC and RFP committee for that. Cameron, my apologies, you did send it to me, it just missed me. I wish it had been added to the public record, but I also wish that I would have seen your e-mail and read it. So, no big deal. Appreciate the good work. I'm excited to take this step forward. I'm supportive of the motion.

De Weerd: Any other discussion? Mr. Clerk, will you call roll.

Roll call: Borton, yea; Milam, yea; Cavener, yea; Palmer, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Bernt, yea.

De Weerd: The ayes have it. Thank you so much.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

De Weerd: Okay. We do have a little bit more to our meeting and so I would like to thank our MDC board for joining us and -- and for this continued partnership. I think maybe, Ashley, do you need a motion to adjourn this section -- segment of the MDC meeting?

Squyres: Yes, ma'am. That would be great. Could I have a motion, please.

De Weerd: Well, Mr. Chair, you can --

Winder: So, can we get a motion from an MDC board member to adjourn our portion of the meeting, please. Commissioner Basalone.

Basalone: Move we adjourn.

McCarvel: Second.

Winder: So, motion by Commissioner Basalone and second by Commissioner McCarvel. Is there any discussion? If not all in favor say aye. Sounded unanimous on the MDC portion. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**Item 4: Department/Commission Reports**

## **A. Public Works: Solid Waste Survey Results**

De Weerd: Okay. We do have our Public Works Department here. Tom and Dave are here to talk solid waste.

Miles: Good evening, Madam Mayor and Council Members. Just for clarification, do you want us to run through as much of it we can until we get to 6:00 or do you want to look for a relative good break point in between? How would you like to move forward?

De Weerd: I think you need to run through the presentation.

Miles: We will do. So, based on the last topic that was up on the agenda I think there is a lot of exciting things happening in Meridian and in -- from our world in Public Works and solid waste. This is another topic that we have been anxiously awaiting and I think is valuable to us. So, tonight we are going to present the solid waste survey that we have rolled out to the community and we have got a lot to cover, so we will move quickly. Hopefully you have had a chance to review this survey that was in the packets. We are not seeking any action tonight, but we do have some recommendations to at least consider and discuss at the end of this. So, as part of our strategic initiatives at the city and the department goals, we wanted to reach out to the community for interest on solid waste topics and a range of topics, whether they are happy about the recycling and their -- their trash services, all the way through to how they feel about some community environmental benefits that -- environmental initiatives and topics in the city as well. It's been at least 18 years since we reached out to the community, so we felt it was a good time. What we did was we worked with SWAC to develop a draft survey. We passed that back and forth several times and, then, we contracted with ETC and Jason Morado is here with us tonight, so he will run through the majority of the survey, the administration of the survey and, then, I will come back and we will go through some recommendations and any discussion or questions that you might have. So, again, quickly on the agenda, Jason will run through it and we felt it was important to have their firm go through and help us with the administration. We were looking for statistical nature and statistical soundness of the survey and so an independent administration of that is one way to help us with that. So, with that I will let Jason take it over and, then, we will come back and talk about any questions you might have.

Morado: My name is Jason Morado. I'm with ETC Institute. It's great to be back here in the City of Meridian. I have been here a couple times to present the results of a citizen satisfaction survey and today we are going to go through the high level findings from the environmental and solid waste survey that was conducted this past summer. So, this is just a quick rundown of what I will go through. I will go briefly over the purpose and the methodology of the survey. Then I will go through the major findings and you can see here how we broke the results into kind of seven main categories. Then I will give a quick summary of the results and, then, Dave will come back with some step recommendations and, of course, I will be happy to answer any questions as well. If you want to wait until the end you can, but if you want to jump in as I'm going through feel free to do that. So, just one real quick slide about ETC Institute. We are based in Olathe, Kansas, which is

in the Kansas City area and we are a national leader in providing market research for local governments. We have been doing this type of work for over 35 years and in the last ten years alone we have conducted surveys in more than 900 communities in 49 states, so this is really the type of work that we specialize in. So, there is several reasons to do a survey like this. One is to gather input from residents about current recycling and trash services provided by the city. Also to evaluate resident recycling and environmental perceptions and behaviors and, then, also with this survey we were able to determine resident priorities for possible expanded services. So, this survey was five pages long. It's a pretty typical length. One of our community surveys. The survey was administered by a combination of mail and online to randomly selected residents throughout the city and that's our standard methodology for these community surveys. Our goal was to get at least 500 completed surveys. That's the same sample size we had for the two citizen satisfaction surveys that we have conducted for the city and, once again, we had a good response. We ended up with 532 completed surveys and one thing we always do when we conduct these surveys is as we are collecting the data we check the demographics to make sure it reflects the actual population of the city. So, we had a really good representation by those key demographic areas, such as age, gender, geographic location and the results of the 532 completed surveys -- at the 95 percent level of confidence has a margin of error of plus or minus 4.3 percent. So, essentially, that means that if we conducted this survey the same way a hundred times, 95 times the results should be plus or minus 4.3 percent from what we are reporting. So, the results aren't perfect, but, really, it's a very small margin of error. So, here we have a map of the city. The red dots are households that completed a survey, so we did get a good distribution throughout the city. This is very similar to the distribution we had to the couple of other surveys that we conducted for Meridian. So, first, we will take a look at satisfaction with current trash and recycling services. This was the very first question on the survey. Here we are asking residents how satisfied they are with current trash services and if you look at the two blue pieces of the pie, a total of 84 percent of respondents were either very satisfied or satisfied with current trash services and that's compared to only four percent who are dissatisfied. So, really, really positive, high satisfaction ratings for current trash services. We, then, asked what do you like about the current trash service and you can see the most frequently mentioned thing was the day of their trash collection. That was mentioned by almost 70 percent of respondents. Then we asked what do you dislike about your trash service. By far the top one was the accepted recyclable items. That was mentioned by 45 percent of respondents. We also asked how satisfied residents are with their current recycling services. Here 53 percent of respondents were either very satisfied or satisfied. That's compared to 19 percent dissatisfied. So, the satisfaction with recycling is not nearly as high as trash, but still you have got almost a three to one ratio to those who were satisfied versus dissatisfied with recycling. So, these are still pretty good numbers. We asked what do you like about the current recycling service. Again, the most frequently mentioned thing was the day of recycling collection. Then we asked what do you dislike about your current recycling service. By far the top one was the accepted recycle items. You know, there was nothing else that was mentioned by even more than 20 percent of respondents. So, now we will take a look at the importance of various recycling and environmental topics. We asked how much emphasis does your household placed on recycling. So, 53 percent of respondents said they always recycle

and, then, on top of that number -- another 33 percent said they recycle most of the time. So, in other words, 86 percent of survey respondents recycle either always or most of the time. Another six percent recycle some of the time. Two percent said they don't recycle, but they claim they are planning to begin. And, then, we have only seven percent who don't recycle and just say they are not interested. And, then, we asked why do you recycle. Eighty-five percent of respondents said to conserve landfill space. And, then, there is four other reasons that at least 70 percent of respondents selected as to why they recycle. It's to leave a better place for future generations, to conserve natural resources and to prevent pollution. We asked how important it is for the city to address various issues related to trash and recycling. So, you can see here the dark blue are those residents who feel like it's essential that the city address that item. The light blue is very important. Yellow is somewhat important. And, then, the pink means residents don't think that's an important issue to address. So, if you start at the top of this chart, 70 percent of respondents feel like it's either essential or very important for the city to reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill. Another 20 percent beyond that say it's somewhat important. And, then, if you look at the row beneath that, almost 60 percent feel it's either essential or very important to reduce the amount of gas -- greenhouse gas emissions produced by waste. If you look at the bottom of this chart, there is not a lot of concern with the decrease -- decrease in the noise caused by trucks or decrease in the number of trucks driving on residential streets. For each of those well over 60 percent feel like that's not something that's important. We asked how concerned are you about environmental topics. Eighty percent of respondents are either very concerned or somewhat concerned and that's compared to only four percent who are not concerned. And, then, here we ask should Meridian practice sustainable efforts in energy conservation methods daily as part of its operations. If you look at the two blue pieces of the pie, a total of 89 percent say, yes, the city should practice sustainable efforts and energy conservation. If you break that down, a little more, 26 percent say the city should expand investment and infrastructure that reduces environmental impacts and, then, the other 63 percent say, yes, it's important, but also they should keep any increased costs as minimal as possible. We asked which environmental topics do residents think are the most serious topic facing Meridian. There is four items that between 40 and 50 percent of response selected includes air pollution, pollution in waterways, long-term regional water supply and, then, inadequate recycling services. So, now we will take a look at some various recycling activities and behaviors. We asked on average how full is your recycling container on your designated recycling collection day. Thirty-six percent say their recycling containers are typically overflowing. Another 55 percent states usually over half full. Only nine percent say less than half full. So, definitely clearly the residents are -- think recycling is very important and are very actively participating. We asked if households are currently doing any of these various activities. About two-thirds say they recycle electronic items, such as computers, televisions, or cell phones and, then, just over 60 percent say they are taking household hazardous waste to a collection event. We asked if households are currently making any effort to reduce the amount of trash they throw away and you can see almost eight out of ten households say that they are doing that. Then we asked what prevents you from recycling more than you currently do. By far the top choice, which was selected by over 50 percent of respondents, is that they say nothing. They are recycling everything they possibly can already. There is really

nothing else that's a major barrier -- barrier to preventing recycling. The other most frequently mentioned item was I don't know what I can recycle. But even that was only selected by 21 percent of respondents. We asked how many times in the past year did you or someone from your household take materials to the recycling area at the transfer -- transfer station. You can see what that pink bar -- that 34 percent said zero. So, in other words, 66 percent of respondents have taken materials at least once in the past year to the transfer station and you can see the breakout of how often they have done that. And, then, we asked are you currently participating in any of these sustainable behaviors and respondents could pick as many choices as they want. Ninety-three percent of respondents say they -- they are recycling. Eighty-five percent are changing light bulbs to energy efficient bulbs. And, then, you also had just over 60 percent who are planting shade trees in the yard and just over 50 percent who are making energy efficient upgrades to their home. Then we asked what would motivate you the most to practice sustainable behaviors. The top choice was financial savings on the utility bill, selected by just over 70 percent of respondents and, then, about 60 percent said they would be motivated by the impact on future generations and, then, improved air quality. Almost 50 percent said they are motivated by the impact of long-term global climate. So, we will take a look at now just some various recycling issues in the community. We asked if the city were able to increase the frequency and materials collected in curbside recycling what's the maximum additional amount you would be willing to pay per month. So, if you look at the pink part of the pie, 37 percent say they are not willing to pay any more per month, which means that the other 63 percent are willing to pay at least something and, then, you can see the -- the pie chart just breaks out how much they would be willing to pay. We asked what's the maximum additional amount you would be willing to pay per month to continue curbside recycling as it is now. Again, if you look at the pink part, 29 percent say they are not willing to pay any more. So, the other 71 percent are willing to pay some additional amount to continue the curbside recycling at its current level. We asked how willing respondents would be to participate in a voluntary curbside recycling program, even if that means the cost of curbside recycling exceeds 20 dollars per month per user. Not a lot of support for this. Sixty percent say not willing. Another 24 percent not sure. For those who said not willing or not sure, we asked them what's the reason for that response. Almost half say they don't support any increase in fees for a pay to recycle program. But, then, another 41 percent say 20 dollars or more per month is too expensive, but they would consider participating for a lesser amount. We had a couple of questions about the familiarity with recycling. We asked do you know what materials are recyclable. Just over two-thirds say they do. Five percent say they don't know. And, then, the other 27 percent are not sure. We asked if responders know how to find out which materials are recyclable. Again, about two-thirds say yes, 11 percent say they don't know how to find out, and, then, 22 percent are not sure. We also asked the question about communication. Here we asked residents which sources they most preferred to receive information about solid waste services and respondents could pick up to three choices. The blue bar is their first choice. That's a source they think is the most important to learn about solid waste. The orange is their second choice and the grays are third. By far the top two sources are the utility bill and, then, a internet source that's easy to find. In the survey we gave an example of the city's website. Then we asked what role of government in recycling and environmental issues. So, we asked how active of a role

should local government take in each of these various recycling and waste reduction issues and you can see for each of these over 90 percent feel like local government should take either a leadership role or at the very least a supportive role in each of these things. In fact, for all four more than 50 percent said an actual leadership role. So, this includes informing residents and businesses about existing programs and services, supporting the development of waste reduction in recycling programs. Developing programs to expand waste reduction and recycling in the community. And, then, educating residents about the importance of waste reduction and recycling. So, that's everything that I had. Just a quick recap. We saw that residents are certainly very concerned about the environment -- environmental topics. Eighty percent are very or somewhat concerned. Only four percent were not. Almost nine out of ten residents feel the city should practice sustainable efforts and energy conservation. Residents are extremely satisfied with trash services. Eighty-four percent are either very or somewhat satisfied, compared to only four percent who are dissatisfied. There is a lot of examples in the survey that show that residents feel it's important to recycle. Fifty-three percent always recycle. Another 33 percent on top of that recycle most of the time. We also found that 70 percent of residents feel it is essential or very important to reduce the amount of waste sent to the landfill. And, then, in that last slide we saw that residents certainly feel that local government should have an active role in recycling and yard waste reduction issues. So, that is everything that I had. I will turn it back over to Dave with some takeaways and recommendations.

Miles: Thank you, Jason. So, Mayor and Council, I know that's a lot of information and we are trying to do this quick. So, again, we are happy to answer any questions. But I think when -- we have looked at the survey results and kind of capturing the high level takeaways and sort of where do we go next, we can clearly see that residents are concerned and focused on what's going on in the environment. That's something that was a good justification or a good information for us to understand and, then, looking at this sort of from a top down or high level approach drilling down a little bit. Following up on that environmental support there is support for what we have seen and what we shared with you with our environmental programs plan about a triple bottom line approach. We saw that affordability is a central component of what the survey respondents said, as well as sort of the social or the responsiveness and ability of government to respond and programs to respond, as well as the environmental impact. So, we feel like we are moving in the right direction to not just look at a program and say, hey, we should do something, but look at what are the impacts financially, socially, environmentally, all those things in consideration with a more holistic approach and getting all the feedback that we can get. It was interesting for us to ask and receive the feedback about the government's role in solid waste programs. That's a pretty resounding result of over 90 percent did say we should have lead support, inform and educate on those types of programs. I think that's good insurance for us and good reminder for us that we are moving in -- again in the right direction. And a shout out to Tom and our communications folks. Emma. They presented to MYAC just recently on an education front earlier this week with some really good feedback -- or, excuse me, last week was really good feedback from all those people. So, I think that education role is something that's improving and planning to get better. And, then, on the solid waste services specifically, generally people are happy with their trash

service. Generally people are happy with the recycling service. We see that they are not willing to pay for a -- sort of pay performance -- pay to play recycling program. We have talked to Republic and the 20 dollar threshold that we used in the question was based on what Republic had told us they thought the bare minimum costs would be for that. So, I think that -- that cost is at least 20, if not more dollars and people pretty much say they are not willing to do that -- at least the respondents in the survey say that. Again, interestingly and supportive for us is the transfer station. The transfer station is a valuable resource for the citizens of Meridian. It's something that they can utilize. It's something that provides benefit not only for air quality and road congestion and things of that nature. So, those are sort of the high level things that we see out of the survey. And, again, there is education opportunities, there is sort of opportunities to look at programs with SWAC involved and SWAC was invited tonight to -- to attend, sit in. They have the survey. They have been presented the high level takeaways of the survey and we are planning on doing this again for them tomorrow as a run through of the survey, which is why you will see the recommendation at the bottom is that what we really would like to do is take all this information, work with SWAC on the recycling front, on the trash front, and help guide our program where we can go forward next with the intent of developing specific recommendations that the city can take, bring that through to SWAC and, then, follow up with you all in Council as those recommendations come forward. So, that's kind of what we see going forward and happy to stand for any questions.

De Weerd: Thank you, Dave. Thank you, Jason. Questions?

Cavener: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: Just to -- what -- Dave, will we also share the full report with our waste hauler -- with Republic? Did they get a copy of that as well?

Miles: Thank you, Madam Mayor, Council Member Cavener. They have a copy.

Cavener: Madam Mayor, one additional. Do we know how our public is satisfied with Republic versus other jurisdictions that Republic serves and how do we compare versus the trend?

Miles: Madam Mayor and Councilman Cavener, so with SWAC one of the things that we are doing -- and Tom's done a great job, Tom Otte, our solid waste coordinate, has begun collecting and compiling all of that data for customer satisfaction related to Meridian. We have not yet compared it to satisfaction results to other cities. For instance, Boise, Nampa, the others. We could certainly do that and work with SWAC to compile that effort and certainly work with Republic to get some of that information.

De Weerd: I think in the past -- and maybe what Mr. Cavener is asking is usually as we have been able to utilize Jason and a broader survey approach, what have seen when it -- when you go out and you survey on these topics.

Morado: So, this survey is a lot more customized for Meridian than the citizen satisfaction survey, which has a lot more standard questions. So, for that report we had a lot of benchmarking information. Here it's much more limited -- limited. I mean definitely the results are very positive. I would say more positive than most of the communities we survey, but -- but this is definitely much more customized than the other survey that we do.

Cavener: Thanks you.

De Weerd: Any other questions from Council?

Little Roberts: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Madam Mayor, just a comment. First of all, thank you. Thank you very much. I think this is really a timely issue with all that we have seen regarding the orange bag program that I will make the assumption that that will be a topic of discussion when you bring the information back.

Miles: Madam Mayor and Council Woman Roberts, that's correct. We will be actually talking next week with -- with Dow to get an update and that will be one of the ongoing conversation components.

Little Roberts: Thanks.

Milam: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mrs. Milam.

Milam: Thanks, Dave. I can't wait to see this again tomorrow. No. Just kidding. But, actually, to bring up the orange bag, I didn't do the math on it, but I think the orange bag participation was about 18 percent. I think. But that -- I think that was really pretty high considering that we started with, what, 1,500 bags and, then, just kind of -- just kind of on your own and we were slowly getting the word out to people about that.

Miles: Madam Mayor, Council Woman Milam, yes, 18 percent was the number in the survey and what we are looking to do is validate that against sales data from the stores that are selling it for an up-to-date participation rate and the program is moving forward and continuing. I know a lot of you have read articles in the papers recently. So, the program is continuing to move forward. They do have some hiccups in terms of processing equipment, but we have been told that they have found fixes for those and intend those to be in place by the new year. Hopefully January, possibly early spring is what we were told. So, meanwhile, the program is still continuing, still functioning for all the residents as it was designed for them to operate and for them to put the materials in the bag.

Milam: Thank you.

De Weerd: Okay. Anything further? Thank you. Very interesting. We appreciate -- I know a lot of thought and effort went behind this survey and getting the questions reflective of what we wanted to learn from our community and our residents. So, congratulations, Dave, to you and Tom and -- and thank you, Jason, for your role.

Miles: Thank you.

**Item 5: Action Items**

- A. Public Hearing Continued from October 15, 2019 for City of Meridian Business Hours**
- B. Public Hearing for Ordinance 19-1855: An Ordinance Prohibiting Use of Compression Brakes Within the City of Meridian**

De Weerd: Before I ask to -- a motion to adjourn our work -- work session, we did have two items left and I wanted to find out if there was anyone that was here to provide public comment on either 5-A or B on our work session agenda.

Johnson: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Anyone signed up?

Johnson: There is someone signed up for the public forum portion of the 6:00 o'clock listing compression brakes as a topic.

De Weerd: Okay.

Johnson: I was going to put that when we got to that, but you can certainly do it now if you prefer.

De Weerd: I think we should adjourn and we can move these into -- onto the next agenda. Okay. So, Council, with that said I would entertain a motion to adjourn our work session.

Borton: Madam Mayor?

De Weerd: Mr. Borton.

Borton: Move we adjourn the work session.

Cavener: Second.

De Weerd: I have a motion and a second to adjourn the work session. All those in favor say aye. All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:01 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

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

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK