

PERRY CITY COUNCIL
MEETING PERRY CITY OFFICES
August, 25 2022

7:00 PM

OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mayor Kevin Jeppsen presided and conducted the meeting. Council Member Nathan Tueller, Council Member Toby Wright, Council Member Blake Ostler, Council Member Dave Walker and Council Member Ashley Young.

OFFICIALS ABSENT: None

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Robert Barnhill, City Administrator
Shanna Johnson, City Recorder
Scott Hancey, Chief of Police
William Morris, City Attorney
Tyler Wagstaff, Public Works Director

OTHERS PRESENT: Roger Kelly

ON-LINE: Doyle, Lewis

ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Jeppsen called the City Council meeting to order.

ITEM 2: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Conflict of Interest Declaration

None.

ITEM 3: Action Items (Roll Call Vote)

A. Resolution 2022-15 Adopting a Final Tax Rate and Budget for Fiscal Year 2023

Mayor Jeppsen said at this time he thinks the Truth in Taxation had been a good process for them to go through with the things that have come to light. He mentioned they had good participation this year. There were two main issues that stick out to him: management of resources and communication with the public and he is glad that they had discussed how to remedy them. He said he calculated the number of responses received from the public hearing and at city offices. His statistics showed there were 1,771 property owners in the city and of those about 2% gave comments. Of the 2% participation there were 7.7% positive and 1.4% negative in support of the proposed property tax rate. He said this is crucial in the decision making process; however, the council members have probably already made their decision for the direction they want to go with the tax rate. And an interesting thing he noticed was going on-line with the public hearing he thought would increase the participation but that wasn't the case. And he was surprised the big difference of the positive and negative of the 2% of the total population. He mentioned he spoke to Mr. Barnhill, Ms. Johnson, and Mr. Wagstaff and they are working on plans to improve the management of resources and the communication the city will have with the public.

Ms. Johnson said she emailed to the council another tax rate option. This option would show the projects that were carried over from last FY2022 which equals the \$93k of projects that didn't get completed and were moved over to the current year. She said this option will cover these projects,

our proposed FY2023 expenses and not really add anything to capital projects or contribute to fund balance. She pointed out that the additional option emailed was the second option down on the property tax option chart. This rate shows a 2.7% increase and uses the \$93k fund balance to cover new expenses and the two carried over projects, but nothing else. Ms. Johnson explained the property tax option chart in the packet, which has all requested tax options including the Certified Tax Rate (CTR) at the top and maintaining our current rate at the bottom. Previous to this meeting she talked to three council members to get their feel for their top three tax option choices and of the top choices, 12.2% was at least one of the options considered by all three council members. She noted that this was the rate that was put in the tentative budget and a mid-level compared to maintaining the rate.

Ms. Johnson said that another thing the council will pass tonight will be the budget. Prior to this meeting she emailed the recent changes in the tentative budget. She explained the newest change was in the Enterprise Fund. The revenue was \$1,205,000 and now it is \$1,207,000 because she added \$1,772 in revenue to the sewer budget. This increase equals the revenue due from Willard City as a result of an adjustment to reflect actual pay increases awarded. She also updated personnel services and material, which reflected moving the side by side and adding the increased wages. In addition, she noted that earlier this week she sent a version of the budget that showed a \$7,000 grant being added to the General Fund. She explained that she added \$7,000 in revenue and \$7,000 in an expense line item in parks for a tree grant the city received. With this tree grant money the city purchased 32 trees to plant throughout the area. She said other changes were done with compensation in the police area: including additional pay raises, removing the eighth officer, and providing overtime pay to cover extra time needs. In addition, she moved the side by side fully to the sewer fund, added money to purchase sewer equipment which measures BOD's at the sewer plant, and added \$2,000 to recognition for Tenure Awards.

Ms. Johnson reiterated that the big thing the council will consider at the meeting will be the final tax rate which will impact the budget and whether the city will be contributing to fund balance or using fund balance to cover proposed expenses. She then showed how their tax rate choice will affect the fund balance.

Mayor Jeppsen said earlier he didn't add that there were twenty comments received at the public hearing and eighteen personal contacts from residences through council members. He then opened a discussion session to the council members.

Council Member Walker said he still feels maintaining the 25.5% over the CTR is too big a jump for the residence. He was thinking more of a 5%, but understands that the city needs to cover the projects we have coming this year and the increased costs for materials. He said he knows that each year it will compound which means less money this year will be less money to compound next year. He said there are a lot of projects and many roads that need fixing, as explained in Jeff Dinsdale slide show from the public meeting. After pondering these things he feels that the 9% or 12.2% above CTR would be a good break even place. He commented that the fund balance doesn't really drop much with those rates and may position us to have the cash needed for grant matches, etc. He said it is hard to know the future but he feels the city will collect more in sales tax revenue than has been estimated. He expressed that the city might be better than what was shown and his stand is to go with one of the two options he mentioned.

Council Member Wight said that it is really important to maintain the rate (of 0.002175%) that we have. Three years ago they put into play a plan that would dramatically enhance the city and provide a significant amount of funds for our roads, parks, and personnel. This plan would require the city to maintain it over a number of years. He said the council was nervous to accept this plan but compared it to the tax increase that Brigham City imposed in that year. He explained that Brigham City planned to go up 115% but settled with a 78% increase in their taxes and everyone thought the reduced percentage was a great deal. He pointed out that in three years Perry City hasn't come close to what Brigham City did in just one year. He thinks that is significant and considerate but realizes the citizens need time to work through this (hardships with tax increases, etc.). He said with the years of growth (and with maintaining the original plan) the city has been able to do more than anticipated and the citizens have received a lot more. He feels that the portrayal of what the city has done was lacking and we need to share what has taken place with the public. However, he wasn't sure how to get this information across to the citizens which also takes their participation or efforts and not just ours. He suggested that the council approve no less than 12.2%, but said ideally they should maintain our tax rate for just one more year. He mentioned there is a lot that can happen next year if the city does this as it will put us in a place that is unprecedented for this city while providing for a significant amount of growth. He said business growth would give an incredible amount of money to give back to the citizen for the things that they need. He indicated that this rate gives money for the parks, additional street funding, and provides additional funds for the police department. It gives the city a rainy day fund that is leaps and bounds above from when he and Mr. Tueller started city council. He said when he started the fund was very low but now it is at a place where the city can actually do something if they need to. His personal choice would be to maintain the 0.002175% tax rate. He noted he would be okay with the next two lower rates.

Mayor Jeppsen said he hasn't been good at recognizing the speakers for the record. He would appreciate it if the members will state their name before they make a comment. Then it will be in the record and help with the translation of the minutes.

Council Member Young said she was very conflicted with her decision and sits somewhere between Mr. Walker and Mr. Wright. She thinks they should maintain the tax rate, yet she also considers the public comments made by the local citizens. She said she has reached out to a lot of citizens and many say they prefer to maintain the tax rate. She emphasized that these taxpayers were from all different income bases. She said the people she spoke with were more worried that next year the city would be further behind (if a tax increase doesn't happen). She feels that the further the taxes get cut it will hurt even more the next year. She was comfortable with 12.2% or 18% and the city can make cuts and use this rate as a stepping stone to get back into maintaining the rate. She said that while she respects the attendance and comments from the public at the last meeting she hasn't personally received any messages. She mentioned that she approached the people at school events or in business settings to ask their thoughts on the tax rate. She expressed that there is larger group of people than what showed up at the public hearing. The people who attended the meeting were mostly the upset or angry citizens. She said the people that don't attend the meetings have an option too and they are our citizens. She feels it's a tough decision trying to listen to the people while keeping Perry City in the black. She doesn't want the burden of laying-off a Perry City staff worker (because of the lack of funds) as was done in the past.

Council Member Ostler said his choice would be between 2.7% and 25.5% because of the pros and cons of each. Due to the \$93,000 rollover money that wasn't reflected in the option chart. He asked Ms. Johnson to present the 2.7% on the chart because he felt it was the breakeven point. Ms. Johnson pointed out that the projected use of unrestricted fund balance shows \$93,000. Those were monies that rolled forward from Fiscal Year 2022 and will be used to complete the uncompleted Fiscal Year 2022 projects in Fiscal Year 2023. Council Member Ostler said all this means is that the proposed expenditures from the various departments are covered in the budget and we neither add to nor take away from fund balance. The proposed expenditures are park projects, public safety overtime requests, and compensation requests that are already in the expenditure numbers. This makes him think that the fund balance becomes an unallocated savings and because of inflation, gas, and grocery bills he feels he can't support adding to city fund balance when he can't add to his own personal household budget. He said if the city wanted to add to the fund balance then the city should've budgeted that money. He pointed out they were talking about road projects and compensation and he said some of that was already put in the budget. He acknowledged the extra money would allow the city to be more nimble to react to a grant opportunity or be used for an emergency situation.

He said he talked to Ms. Johnson about a scenario of a cash burn during a recession when the sales tax revenue and building tanks. He noted that Ms. Johnson indicated that there could be a loss of \$300K-400K a year. Ms. Johnson stated that during the past recession they saw a loss of \$250k in sales tax over three years. The City also lost \$200k a year in building revenue (this is when we covered inspections in house). Ms. Johnson stated that based on this history she predicted that the city could lose roughly \$200 - \$300k per year during a recession. Council Member Ostler said with that in mind, he feels the city could go three or four years with no other adjustments and burn through the savings on hand. He said he was struggling with the conflict of being properly prepared with a nice cushion or having idle tax dollars in fund balance. He mentioned that he looks at municipal financial statements all day long for his job and sees the cash balance just sitting on the balance sheet. He recognized he doesn't know the whole story but it seems to be a lot of idle resources. He gave the example of Box Elder School District having \$75million on their balance sheet. He said he could support the breakeven analysis of the 2.7% but would be less incline to vote for 25.5% even though he sees it merits.

Council Member Ostler offered the takeaway on the public process. He said he wants to be part of the solutions to proactively improve our communication on how our tax dollars are being spent in terms of what we are using the funds for to the city residents and stakeholders. He wants to help explain or educate the citizens on what things cost, for example the roads can't just get fixed because they are expensive to repair and the resources might not be readily available. He would like to take Mr. Dinsdale's presentation and put dollars to each project and then ask the citizens to fund it, or find the money to do these repairs. He also wonders if there was a way for the council to improve managing expectations. He remarked that a C level budget will result in C level of service but the city should still give an A level efforts and often dollars equate to value. He desires to be part of the solution in finding efficiency of city operations then communicate it to the stakeholders. For example, he thinks the city should send the utility bill and town newsletter by e-mail only. It's his opinion that it would be beneficial to have the gun range in its own fund. He also proposed that Utopia come and give an accountability presentation to the city.

Mayor Jeppsen said in reference to using the Internet as a communication tool, it is good if social media is used to gain knowledge from knowledgeable people about the facts. However, there are other websites or social media outlets not sponsored by the city that allows a place for people to express their negative thoughts, but that will not necessarily give them the correct facts. He suggested that we encourage the citizens to ask questions on the city's Facebook page so they may get the correct answers or information.

Council Member Tueller mentioned that as for the communication there was so much that happens behind the line. Since he has been on the council, he commented, they have done some incredible things. He said that Council Member Wright and he sat in public meetings for three months regarding issues with the sewer plant with a neighboring city providing ideas that were originally shot down but eventually the issues were resolved. He said the amount of money spent on roads in the past was \$200-300k. He said he remembers an (engineer's) assessment of needs for our roads that was presented 6 years ago, which projected costs of \$2.6M. He said he believes that the roads budget is now just under \$1M. He explained that the visible things the public sees will be what they will talk about so the city's response and effectiveness on these things are what the council needs to show. However, the critical things that take place are never seen by the public. For example, the people see a dry spot in the lawn at the park but not the infrastructure that caused the problem. He said this situation also requires training for staff to focus on proper maintenance of the parks, and to not maintain the parks like a farm. He said we need to communicate to the public the unseen infrastructure projects that are completed. He reiterated that the visible stuff will be what the city will always get hammered on but if the city's core is right then the visible stuff will be fairly inexpensive to get under control.

Council Member Tueller said another focus he's had for the past six years was on infrastructure of the core things. He feels the city has stayed strong and on point for several years, which put us in a good place. He mentioned the Lodge was an opportunity for the city to grab. He mentioned that by paying the bond with retired bond funds and selling the property we have set the city up for years. The tenants in the Lodge are paying half the monthly loan payment and he thinks the maintenance costs will be covered if we rent the upstairs correctly. He said he is a lot about perspective and not going to be caught up in the show of things.

Council Member Tueller expressed he feels that most of the sales tax revenue comes from solid essential type businesses and this will grow for the city over time. He said he's ready to vote on the tax and move onto the next thing. He commented that again that some projects will be unseen and the parks or roads will be what the public will focus on. He expressed that infrastructure is a big deal because of the growth coming and we need to be ready for it along with the need to communicate our readiness for growth and what we have accomplished. He feels the 0.002045 18% over CTR is a good option and he won't go below 12.2% because the city is trying to get infrastructure things done that aren't ascetically pleasing but are massively important.

MOTION: Council Member Wright made a motion to approve Resolution 2022-15 Adopting a Final Tax Rate with 0.002045 rate and the Budget for Fiscal Year 2023. Council Member Tueller seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Council Member Wright, Yes

Council Member Tueller, Yes
Council Member Walker, Yes
Council Member Young, Yes
Council Member Ostler, No

Motion Approved. 4 Yes, 1 No

B. Ordinance 22-J Subdivision Amendments

Mr. Barnhill explain that this was an ordinance amendment from the Planning Commission. He said this proposal was created because of subdivisions with multi-family units and the need for the ordinance to be corrected and updated. Currently the ordinance reads that when the developer doing the infrastructure receives their conditional acceptance he is given a one year warranty period where the city holds through that warranty period 10% of the deposit money. This ordinance amendment will allow approved exceptions on sidewalks, curb, gutter and other types of improvements. It will also require the building permit to include a deposit that will pay for these types of things if they get damaged. This ordinance will update and broaden the exemption list. The infrastructure responsibility will be transferred from the developer once a building permit is accepted. The update has the building permit requiring a \$4,000 deposit (previously \$2,500) and includes code enforce compliance. Council Member Ostler asked if this is only for residential. Mr. Barnhill said it will be done per building permit so it depended upon the builder's relationship with the buyer. He mentioned that the city is requiring a more robust construction of the sidewalks so hopefully it will help with possible cement damage.

Mr. Barnhill said that sometimes a developer just wants a preliminary approval to flip the property. They don't have the long term vested interest for the community or the vision and identity of the city. He and the Planning Commission feels because of this the city might have missed opportunities for creative communities. They want to include that an overall layout of the residential subdivisions greater than 10 acres be designed by a Certified Planner or Landscape Architect. He said that hopefully it will develop the city into this planned vision. Council Member Tueller responded that the layout ideas from a Landscape Designer was what was needed in the recent denied conservation subdivision request. Council Member Ostler questioned if the Civil Engineer had an in house Landscape Designer could they just sign off on the plat. He also pointed out that there might be value in adding that they use an independent Certified Landscape Architect to the ordinance. Mr. Barnhill said that most firms don't have a Landscape Designer on staff. Council Member Tueller mentioned that firms are changing to accommodate the need for one. He said that both the Certified Planner and Landscape Architect can bring the creativity and aspect to create the community we want. In addition they know what the industry is doing and the technologies available in the market. He said he wants to be involved with the city design standards along with donating his time for the city office building's landscape design. Mr. Barnhill answered Council Member Ostler that it would be hard to require firms with in house landscape designers to use other landscape architects.

Council Member Walker said he likes the intent to get something more creative. He said Perry is land locked with Brigham on the north, Willard on the south, the bird refuge on the west, and the mountains on the east. Since the area can't expand he fears that Perry will just build out and have stuff that is not really great for the citizens. He said there is a need for something like this and wants to be more explicit on driving developers towards considering green space, trails, and community amenities that are a benefit to the city. He wants to explore more explicit ways of driving towards

good community. He said that at one time they wanted to have a work session to discuss ways to encourage the conservation subdivision. He said they need to incentivize or require the developers to take the conservation subdivision more seriously because it is good for our city to have it.

He also mention that he wants to look at the unintended behavior that will be driven by this ordinance update. The action that will be different from what the city council actually intended. He said that perhaps people will start to develop subdivisions that are under 10 acres so they can do anything they want. Council Member Tueller explained his thoughts on the recent conservation subdivision application process they were handling. With what he has learned he recommended that the conservation subdivision implements a rule that the will allow higher density multi-family housing without having to do a special developer agreement. Unless the council wants to have their fingers in everything then they may say that all subdivisions will require a development agreement. They continued to discuss different aspects of the conservation subdivision ordinance. Council Member Young asked for the definition of green space and Council Member Ostler said it is defined in the conservation subdivision ordinance. Council Member Walker said he would like to expand the explanation the definition of green space to include more creative thinking that may be done to better the community.

Mr. Barnhill said another changed proposed by the Planning Commission was to limit how many units can be in a multi-family structure, pro-rate it with other single family, and address consolidation of districts. They decided that maybe they could be a little softer and give a straight forward density approach. He mentioned that most cities have density number per acre. This ordinance update says 16 units per acre and shall be pro-rated with single family mixed in the development. Another criteria that will change is for 30% of the site to be landscaped. He showed the council examples of subdivision plans and how they work or will not work for multi-family developments. Of the developments that met the requirements he said it showed that they can make money, have success and be happy with the product at a lower unit per acre. He wanted to show the council examples to get a feel for the tightness of the density in the development to help them make a decision on the unit number per acre. Council Member Tueller said he likes the grid system because the requested units might consume all that was available in the district grid and this layout helps with density and allows for affordable housing. Council Member Ostler said that they should legislate to the developers who only develops the minimum requirements. He said that the importance of the number (per acre), is so we get the communities and products we hope to get out of a development.

Mr. Barnhill said the definition for improvement and infrastructure in this provision is clear; however, he gets calls from the developers about finishing the curb and gutter along the highway. He feels they should clearly state in the ordinance that they need to include improvements on streets operated by UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation). He said that hopefully it will deter a debate. In addition, he wants to better define the garbage collection and dumpster enclosure in multi-family dwellings, apartments, and commercial properties. He said the updated wording in the ordinance also allows for an exception if it's preferable to the city.

Council Member Walker asked with our multi-family dwellings that have 30% landscaping, what provision do we have that identifies who is required to take care of the landscaping. Council Member Tueller said it is a private HOA who is responsible to maintain the landscaping. Mr.

Barnhill said with twin homes the property is maintained by the property owner. Council Member Wright asked if we regulate it like a code violation. Mr. Barnhill said the storm water pond is to be maintained by the HOA and we require it as part of the development application to make sure the city interest is covered.

Mr. Barnhill said the next update was that the building permit deposit name will be changed to building permit deposit for adjacent improvements, infrastructure, and code compliance. Along with updating the amount of the building permit deposit from \$2,500 to \$4,000. He explained that this change will make it easier to collect the fee on any violations. City Attorney, Morris agreed that this may be used as a code enforcement tool. He mentioned that at this time they could make a change to the code to make release of escrow funds an administrative function instead of a council approval function. Mr. Barnhill said a basic amendment stating that the escrow funds may be release by the city engineer or community director may be done in this update.

Council Member Ostler wanted clarification on the ratio pro-ration for the 16 units per acre. Mr. Barnhill explained that the intent was, for example, if a development has 30 single family homes and 12 multi-family homes the city was only going to base the 16 units on the multi-family units. Council Member Tueller said this does not circumvent the grid system for units in the area. Mr. Barnhill reiterated that they should change the language from pro-rated to calculate and include public roads in the amended section of the provision.

Council Member Ostler was concerned whether the deposit line should include non-residential. There was a discussion on whether or not there was a need to change the language to include only residential or to include commercial to the wording. Council Member Wright said they can do it like the public safety fees and write it as non-residential unit per square foot. Mr. Barnhill said they can come up with a calculation but he suggested they keep it for single family only because in any other development we will only work with one builder. He said he feels the deposit line in the provision should say "deposit per single family residential dwelling". He pointed out that the deposit is to allow the developer to get out of his warranty period.

Council Member Ostler wonders if 16 multi-family units per acre is the best number or if it should be lower. Council Member Wright commented that perhaps the younger generation wants a smaller space. Council Member Tueller said (the mixed housing) gives the perception of entry level homes and he thinks this gives more affordable buying options which is what we are trying to accomplish. Council Member Wright remarked it doesn't appear that way because they sure cost a lot. He then expressed it is critical that the city is covered yet we don't want to over regulate it because it is not our property. He said we have certain standards that have been put in place and are outlined pretty well. There will always be someone that will try to get around the requirements and he feels these updates added to the ordinance are enough for now.

Council Member Young asked about limiting the multi-family units to four-units in a building. They reviewed the subdivision examples and discussed how this limit would change developments and would it be less effective. Council Member Tueller said that Perry City has a lot of quirky shaped properties and that the grid system regulates the overall density but, he said he is not opposed to a 4 unit per building requirement. Council Member Young said she would like to see them held to the same standards as the subdivision with the beautiful and creative spaces. Mr. Barnhill remarked

that development agreements are also an option for the developers. Member Walker said that he can see the value in the 4 unit requirement with green space between the buildings.

MOTION: Council Member Walker made a motion to approve Ordinance 22-J Subdivision Amendments with following the modifications: that in Section 3 that they replace the word “pro-rated” with “calculated” and add in the exclusions “public streets”. And modify the deposit fee title to say “Deposit per Single Family Dwelling”. Council Member Tueller seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Council Member Wright, Yes
Council Member Tueller, Yes
Council Member Walker, Yes
Council Member Young, Yes
Council Member Ostler, Yes

Motion Approved. 5 Yes, 0 No

ITEM 4: MINUTES & COUNCIL/MAYOR REPORTS (INCLUDING COUNCIL ASSIGNMENTS)

A. Approval of Consent Items

- August 11, 2022 Truth in Taxation Meeting Minutes
- August 11, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes

Shanna Johnson said the minutes are not fully ready to be passed and asked if they may be tabled.

Consent Items Tabled.

B. Mayor's Reports

Mayor Jeppsen thanked the council for their accomplishments of the evening and for their participation in general. In his opinion Perry City is in the best position that it has ever been and totally because of the council's participation. He is glad that he is a part of this.

C. Council Reports

Council Member Young – none.

Council Member Walker mentioned he met with Mont Johnson to help organize the 911 Memorial Service project in our community. It is being organized at a county level and being built at the nature park trail. The improvement needs are to re-establish the trails, cut a lot of brush, digging up or spray the weeds, clean up and/or reapply the road base on the trail. Then perhaps remove the log building because of a collapsing roof, however, he wasn't sure if it had historical value. Mr. Barnhill said we will need to check with Brandon about the history of the log house and if it needs to be rescued. Mr. Wagstaff advised that the mentioned road base talked about was broken asphalt and shouldn't be used for the trail. The material put on the trail was purchased slag. Council Member Walker said the sidewalk by Dale Young Park needs to be cleared for safety. He then suggested that the sagebrush area at Mt. View Park gets water (lines) added so they may convert it to a useful area.

Council Member Ostler asked about the email he received for the 2022 Wasatch Choice Transportation workshop and if he needs to attend it. Mr. Barnhill said he often goes to these workshops and has planned to attend this one.

Council Member Wright said he had the opportunity to go to Washington DC, visit the Smithsonian, and was able to see the Declaration of Independence. He is grateful for the country and city we live in and the council is an example of what it's all about. He feels they accomplished good things in the meeting and maybe next year they can fix a few things. The tax decision was a great representation of the council's responsibilities and he appreciates all involved this process.

Council Member Tueller appreciates the work done in the last few months and now they are on to the next thing.

D. Staff Comments

Chief Hancey – none.

Mr. Barnhill said he is working with Utopia for a representative to come talk to the city. He expressed he talked to Mr. Miller, the Box Elder Community Development and their attorney because the state statute allows the county to pass an ordinance to use Front Runner tax money for other transit related projects. They are hoping the county will approve the use of funds for the Historic Orchard Pathway, grant matches, and other road improvements. This should save the city about \$200,000 and hopefully will hear the results by the end of September.

Ms. Johnson thanked the council and acknowledged their hard work on the budget and said that they did a good job.

Mr. Morris – none.

Mr. Wagstaff said he wanted to thank Nathan for all his help to get the trees in around the city. If they all survive it will be great for the parks. He thanked everyone involved with the budget, especially Shanna.

Mayor Jeppsen said they will critique the budget process in the future to compare this year to prior years. He said there were more improvements this year and feels they are moving in the right direction.

E. Planning Commission Report

None.

ITEM 7: EXECUTIVE SESSION

None.

ITEM 8: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Council Member Tueller proposed to adjourn the meeting.

Motion Approved. All Council Members were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Shanna Johnson, City Recorder

Kevin Jeppsen, Mayor

Anita Nicholas, Deputy Recorder