

2 The Lindon City Council held a regularly scheduled meeting on **Tuesday, October 17,**
4 **2017, beginning with a work session at 6:00 p.m.** in the Lindon City Center, City
Council Chambers, 100 North State Street, Lindon, Utah.

6 **WORK SESSION** – 6:00 P.M.

8 Conducting: Jeff Acerson, Mayor

10 **PRESENT** **ABSENT**

Jeff Acerson, Mayor
12 Matt Bean, Councilmember
Carolyn Lundberg, Councilmember
14 Van Broderick, Councilmember
Jacob Hoyt, Councilmember
16 Dustin Sweeten, Councilmember
Adam Cowie, City Administrator
18 Kathryn Moosman, City Recorder

20 **DISCUSSION:** The Lindon City Council met with State Legislators including
22 Representative Stratton and Representative Peterson to discuss matters of common
interest that may be addressed in the 2018 Legislative Session. No motions were made as
24 this item was for discussion only.

Adam Cowie, City Administrator, opened the discussion by welcoming the
26 Legislators to the meeting and thanking them for taking the time to meet with the
Council. Following introductions, the Council discussed the following bullet point issues
28 with the Legislators:

- 30 • Prioritize/encourage UDOT funding towards PG/Lindon interchange
32 improvements & Vineyard Connector improvements.

*The group had some discussion on road funding, the frontage road concept
34 (potential construction frontage road concept), and UDOT identified improvements on
the Blvd. (as it is currently at a failed level). They talked about trying to get ahead of this
36 before it becomes like Thanksgiving Point in Lehi with the traffic issues that have
developed there. Mr. Cowie pointed out this discussion is intended to inform the
38 Legislators (if funding opportunities come up) if they can do anything to help funnel
traffic which would be a great help for the city; they have been meeting with UDOT
40 (Region 3). He then presented a map showing the draft line work noting a lot of impacts
could occur with businesses also. The Legislators stated they all feel, collectively, on
42 how big the issue will be, and would like to move the funding forward before it becomes a
real issue. There was then some discussion on the time line (within 2-3 years).*

- 44 • Proposed Legislation in 2018 session that could impact cities; taxes; etc.
46

2 The group discussed taxing structures including gas, income and sales tax noting
4 there is some imbalance there. There are challenges and there is some validity if the
6 cities want to support specific things and how to fund into the problems with 6 million
8 people needing to get from a to b. They do not dispute ways are needed to supplement
 and transit has to be a part of that plan. Tax reform is also a big issue right now. There
 are a lot of tax credits out there and a lot of those that may be going away. There are
 some real challenges but we are structurally sound with the allocations.

10 There was then some additional discussion on taxes, general funds, education
 funding (teacher shortage) and property taxes noting Utah is 51st in the United States
 with education funding.

12 The Legislatures noted there are things on the horizon for cities to prepare for.
14 There are some things taking place with the Natural Resource Environment and
 Agricultural Committee that may affect cities, (the amount of nutrients being release by
16 the sewage treatment plants along the Wasatch front) and if brought to the level
 discussed by environmental quality groups it would be a 7 billion price tag. If you want
18 road funding then you don't want to spend 7 billion dollars on something that gives little
 incremental benefit to the water. Water is also a big discussion item at the Legislative
20 Session including territorial issues. Education is another issue that will be discussed.
22 What they are trying to do legislatively is to make sure there is proper legislative
 oversight in the rule making authority agencies in the state; we need to make sure there
 are good sound policies in place.

24 • Road maintenance funding

26 There was some discussion on road funding at a city level. Lindon City is looking
28 at all options and questioned if a city can put a sales tax for road funding on the ballot.
30 Lindon has talked about something similar to the PARC tax to see if a certain percentage
 of the public is in favor. The Legislators stated you can enact the 1% through the transit
32 and road maintenance. Together that failed as a county last time (because of UTA) and
 the bill to decouple UTA has failed in committee every time because the legislators feels
34 UTA is the important aspect for the future plans for the state. UTA has been created to
 fill a major need and demand and tying the funding together is the result and they would
 like to change that.

36 The Council pointed out we are a finite land size and we value open space so our
 per person equation of road is far greater than other cities; we lose sales tax so
 something that we could capture like the PARC tax to go towards roads would be great.
38 The Legislators were not opposed to that concept. They added as we entertain this it will
 be scrutinized because it doesn't have the UTA piece to it. UTA has had their own
40 funding district for years and we haven't received any of that for our roads; they are the
 large player and it has been decoupled for years. They pointed out that the city can look
42 at future projections but unfortunately the can has been kicked down the road for cities
 so long that we can't predict the future; we are just trying to catch up with dilapidation
44 and decay on roads and the lack of funding for so long.

46 The reality today is that they approved budget projections and they are fairly flat
 so there is not a lot of funding just sitting out there to be used and it is a real challenge.
 The League of Cities and Towns felt there wasn't enough support at the last legislative

2 session with the concept of a new tax. They will have more discussion with the League
(Cameron Diehl) to see what the realities are and then they can sit down and draft a bill.
4 There has also been a lot of discussion on gas tax and user fees and how to capture that;
we are relatively flat or even decreasing from the gas tax. There was also discussion on
6 how to change the gas tax to create some type of user fee.

- 8 • Update legislation to alter candidate withdrawal dates to better conform to Vote
by Mail requirements. During Primary election the ballots were printed and
10 mailed prior to the State deadline allowing candidates to withdraw and not be
placed on ballot.

12 *Filing dates on mail in ballots was discussed pointing out the withdrawal
14 deadline was after the time the ballots were sent to the printers. The Utah County Clerk
stated it may need some legislative action to change the date. This issue would normally
16 would come through the Utah Municipal Clerks Association but they will check into the
issue.*

18 Following some additional discussion Mayor Acerson and the Council thanked
20 the Representatives for their service and for sharing their valuable input on these
important issues. He then called for any further discussion or comments from the
22 Council. Hearing none he moved on to the regular City Council session.

24 **REGULAR SESSION** – 7:00 P.M.

26 Conducting: Jeff Acerson, Mayor
Pledge of Allegiance: Tyler, Boy Scout
28 Invocation: Carolyn Lundberg, Councilmember

30 **PRESENT**

Jeff Acerson, Mayor
32 Matt Bean, Councilmember
Carolyn Lundberg, Councilmember
34 Van Broderick, Councilmember
Jacob Hoyt, Councilmember
36 Dustin Sweeten, Councilmember
Adam Cowie, City Administrator
38 Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director
Kathryn Moosman, City Recorder

ABSENT

- 40
1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** – The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.
 2. **Presentations/Announcements** –
 - 44 a) **Mayor/Council Comments** – There were no announcements at this time.
 - 46 b) **Employee Recognition Award** – Employee Recognition Award, 3rd Quarter
2017 - Sherrie Laidler, Utilities Clerk:

2 Sherrie Laidler, Lindon City Utilities Clerk, was chosen for the quarterly
Employee Recognition Award. Adam Cowie, City Administrator, read comments
4 submitted by employees nominating Ms. Laidler for this award. He then presented her
with a plaque and gift card in appreciation for her service. The Mayor and Council also
6 congratulated and thanked Ms. Laidler for her exemplary example, service and good
works for the city.

- 8
- 10 3. **Approval of Minutes** – The minutes of the regular meeting of the City Council
meeting of October 3, 2017 was reviewed.

12 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 3, 2017 AS
14 AMENDED OR CORRECTED. COUNCILMEMBER SWEETEN SECONDED THE
MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

16 COUNCILMEMBER BEAN AYE
COUNCILMEMBER LUNDBERG AYE
18 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK AYE
COUNCILMEMBER HOYT AYE
20 COUNCILMEMBER SWEETEN AYE
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 22
- 24 4. **Consent Agenda** – No items.

- 26 5. **Open Session for Public Comment** – Mayor Acerson called for any public
comment not listed as an agenda item. There were no public comments.

28 **CURRENT BUSINESS**

- 30 6. ***Continued Action Item – Ordinance Amendment, Lindon City Code (LCC)***
Ordinance #2017-12-O. This item was continued from the September 5, 2017,
32 September 19, 2017, and October 3, 2017 City Council meetings for continued
deliberation by the Council. The Public Hearing on the item has been closed.
34 Marc Udall, Dry Canyon Ranch, requests an amendment to LCC 17.04.400,
regulating Home Occupation requirements, to allow for Summer Physical
36 Education lessons to have more vehicular traffic than what is currently allowed by
ordinance.

38 COUNCILMEMBER HOYT MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.
40 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT
VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

42

44 Hugh Van Wagenen, Planning Director, led this agenda item by explaining this
item was continued from the September 5 and October 3, 2017 Council meetings. He
noted in the October 3, 2017 meeting the Council suggested that up to 14 vehicles could
46 be parked at the property provided that at least 8 vehicles were parked in off-street
parking spaces (allowing 6 vehicles to be parked on-street). He mentioned the latest draft

2 of ordinance 2017-12-O has added language (based on the Council’s request) regarding
parking requirements.

4 Mr. Van Wagenen commented that subsequent to the previous meeting, Mr. Udall
expressed concern about providing eight off-street parking stalls. He noted Mr. Udall is
6 also requesting formal allowance to have perpendicular parking in front of the home and
has given examples of the parking in front of the Community Center and Lindon
8 Elementary as having perpendicular parking and staff has been evaluating this request.
Mr. Van Wagenen stated that recently, the City has removed other angled parking from
10 roadways, namely adjacent to the cemetery on 200 East and on Main Street and adjacent
to the Castle Park event venue. Mr. Van Wagenen then referenced Ordinance 2017-12-O
12 Home Occupation Requirements (LCC 17.04.400) followed by some general discussion.
He then turned the time over to Mr. Udall for comment.

14 Mr. Udall addressed the Council at this time. He came prepared with a power
point presentation including photos. Mr. Udall stated even though the talk is as if their
16 home is a hub of activity in all actuality 300 days a year it is not busy. For eight years Mr.
Walker’s his drive has not been blocked. He stated they have normal family activities
18 and he wants to maintain the perpendicular parking (on street parking). He also feels the
law should be applied evenly to everyone and could violate fairness; please consider this
20 unintended consequence regarding the 30-ft. deep perpendicular parking.

Mr. Udall then presented examples (photos) of on-street perpendicular parking,
22 noting the city is full of them, including city owned properties. If their property is
imposed they should all be imposed and have to go too. They plead for all of these people
24 and more that nothing is imposed with perpendicular parking for all. Mr. Udall spoke
about other home occupations (with or without a business license) that will be in
26 violation with imposed changes with perpendicular parking. He feels it should be
grandfathered in to use their driveways (for business purposes) for perpendicular parking
28 (including the Lindon Senior Center). In summary, they propose that the city grant their
petition that the traffic match the parking previously granted. He then presented a sketch
30 of their home noting three perspectives to refresh tonight as follows:

- 32 1. We would petition this parking style to be grandfathered into place. This parking
style precedes our business and our occupancy of the home by nearly a decade
and has been going on for nearly 40 years, a large part of a century.
- 34 2. We have experimented with parking over the years and the current configuration
is clearly the least dangerous configuration.
- 36 3. We remember both the planning commission and the council talking about
making an ordinance change for basically one person as being poor policy. The
38 talk was more slanted towards positive change. Stating “we don’t like making
changes to the code to basically benefit one person because it goes city wide.”
40 However, it appears that it’s okay to make changes to the code that negatively
affect one person that may similarly have ramifications that would go city wide.
42 Again, we realize the similarity to a constitutional convention. We are asking that
the council just do nothing in this regard, there is no compelling reason to change
44 our parking. The precedent has been set and in play for decades. Allowing the
status quo is not condoning or promoting anything. (However, we are still willing
46 to consider giving up all of our business related perpendicular parking and create
the parking lot we offered at great sacrifice to us; and destroy some green space

2 that was seen as an important plus in the Jorgensen petition. In return for
4 compromise, concessions one of which is leaving our personal parking lives out
of this.

6 Mr. Udall also reviewed what will happen with personal parallel parking if it
comes back to their home. Noting first of all, they will only have two remaining parking
8 places in front of their house. Their family and friends will certainly park cross the street
as was done years ago because that is the closest to their door. As noted there is no
10 regulation in relation to where people can park for personal visits.

12 Mr. Udall stated their perpendicular parking is not like that on Center Street in
Provo where a person, out of necessity, backs up into and occludes a traffic lane. There is
a wide shoulder at their property. In addition, people are going slow because they are
14 coming from a stop. Even so, it has been suggested by city staff that eliminating
perpendicular parking would only affect them, but there is another entity that will be
16 affected. This entity has a similar broad shoulder with their perpendicular parking, and in
addition has off street parking which fills to overflowing. They don't condemn the use of
18 their neighbor's frontage and parking spaces and walking across the street.

20 Mr. Udall then presented a photo of the Lindon Senior Center across from the
Lindon Elementary. He asked if he is assuming correctly that perpendicular parking was
deemed safe enough here in spite of the many children walking with a lot of traffic at the
22 beginning and ending of school. He noted at their home they avoid the rush hours with
their lessons and schedule lessons in the summer when there's less traffic. Mr. Udall
24 stated he is petitioning on behalf of the Senior Center to leave its parking and their
parking as is.

26 In conclusion, Mr. Udall stated at this time they would like to withdraw their offer
of creating total off street swim lesson parking. They do accept the city's suggestion of
28 having a combination of on-street and off-street parking. They would like to use the
frontage of their house with perpendicular parking for six cars and the remaining five to
30 be in their driveway, off the street.

32 Following some general discussion Councilmember Lundberg commented that
she would really like to see something reasonable worked out. She noted Mr. Udall
presented pictures of people who park on their driveways and she is not sure that is a
34 problem. Staff addressed this issue stating there has been some misunderstanding. Mr.
Van Wagenen clarified the required parking spaces for commercial and residential and
36 private residences. Mr. Cowie also clarified there is nothing in the code that prohibits
someone from parking in the front 30 feet of their driveway or setback, but they can't
38 designate a certain number of spaces/stalls.

40 Mr. Udall stated they are just asking that the council consider their petition for
trips to and from their home and asking that perpendicular parking be left as is. He stated
they are still open to discuss all other options (including their prior offer). They realize
42 their position is weak in that they can't command or demand anything and must rely on
the council for help but they just asking that it be fair.

44 Councilmember Bean brought up the fact that part of the cars parked
perpendicular is that they are in the city right of way, whether for business or personal, so
46 that is the issue and not the distinguishing factor. Councilmember Sweeten asked for
clarification that when this was previously discussed he thought they had come to an

2 agreement and the perpendicular parking was a separate issue as it has to work for
4 everyone in the city. Councilmember Hoyt explained what the council is ready to move
6 on today is to grant the change to the ordinance that allows Mr. Udall to have six on
street and eight off street parking spaces which essentially allows for the trips and
parking needed.

8 Mr. Cowie mentioned he sent an email to the council stating himself, the city
engineer, and police chief visited the site and evaluated the perpendicular parking
10 request. He noted they provided a summary of recommendations and they all felt they
would not approve perpendicular parking as part of this home occupation business
12 request at this location. Mr. Udall stated he assumes this would be applied city wide. Mr.
Cowie stated this would-be site specific but could also be applied at other locations.

14 There was then some additional discussion regarding the amount of on-street and
off-street parking. Councilmember Lundberg pointed out the Udall's available frontage is
16 unique and she would like to see how the council feels about considering having a caveat
that if a residence has this type of occupational use and has the additional frontage to
18 allow more than six on-street spaces (if it is contained in their frontage) and if it is not
impacting any other resident. She added the Udall's have been very proactive and
20 conscientious and have informed their patrons where to park; they have proven they
would follow whatever the council asks of them.

22 Councilmember Broderick stated he has no problem with that and would love to
approve this ordinance and see the lessons continue. He would also like to see them be
24 able to park along center street and 400 east but to not be a traffic hazard and if parking
parallel (on days with family etc.) to be able to park perpendicular. Councilmember
Sweeten pointed out this is a law on the books and we do not do the patrolling.

26 Councilmember Lundberg would like to see something codified that is
enforceable but fair for all. Mrs. Udall pointed out when they park on center street the
28 patrons walk through the gate and through the back to their property. Councilmember
Broderick stated the issue to vote on tonight is to increase the amount of legal parking
30 and we are not addressing anything regarding the parking at the Udall's; the fourteen
allowed in the zone adjustment and increasing the amount of traffic. Following some
32 additional discussion, the council was in agreement to approve the ordinance amendment
with the self-regulating verbiage (based on frontage) included. Mr. Van Wagenen
34 clarified the difference in what is currently allowed and what is suggested is the 14
vehicles. Councilmember Hoyt agrees this will be self-governing.

36 Mayor Acerson called for any further discussion or comments. Hearing none he
called for a motion to close the public hearing.

38
40 **COUNCILMEMBER HOYT MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.
COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL PRESENT
VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.**

42
44 Mayor Acerson called for any further comments or discussion from the Council.
Hearing none he called for a motion.

46 **COUNCILMEMBER HOYT MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S
REQUEST FOR ORDINANCE AMENDMENT #2017-12-O WITH THE LANGUAGE**

2 AJUSTMENTS AS DISCUSSED. COUNCILMEMBER LUNDBERG SECONDED
THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS FOLLOWS:

4 COUNCILMEMBER BEAN AYE
COUNCILMEMBER LUNDBERG AYE
6 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK AYE
COUNCILMEMBER HOYT AYE
8 COUNCILMEMBER SWEETEN AYE
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 10
12 7. **Public Hearing — 2017-18 Budget & Fee Schedule Amendment; Res. #2017-
20-R.** The Council will review and consider recommended changes to the 2017-
18 budget and fee schedule. *NOTE: This public hearing has been advertised but
14 is recommended to be continued to the Nov. 21, 2017 meeting.*

16 Adam Cowie, City Administrator, stated Staff has had computer and server
glitches this past week and had to recreate some of the lost work and financial analysis
18 that was done. He explained this issue has caused some delays and because of that staff
does not have everything ready for the budget amendment discussion at this time. Mr.
20 Cowie asked that this item be continued to the November 21, 2017 meeting.

22 Mayor Acerson called for any comments or discussion from the Council. Hearing
none he called for a motion to continue.

24 COUNCILMEMBER HOYT MOVED TO APPROVE CONTINUE THIS ITEM
TO THE NOVEMBER 21, 2017 CITY COUNCIL MEETING. COUNCILMEMBER
26 LUNDBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS RECORDED AS
FOLLOWS:

28 COUNCILMEMBER BEAN AYE
COUNCILMEMBER LUNDBERG AYE
30 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK AYE
COUNCILMEMBER HOYT AYE
32 COUNCILMEMBER SWEETEN AYE
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 34
36 8. **Discussion Item — Review 2017 Aquatics Center Season; Lindon Days;
PARC Tax.** Lindon City Parks & Recreation Director, Heath Bateman, and
Finance Director, Kristen Colson, will present financial overviews and statistics
38 for the 2017 Aquatics Center season, Lindon Days, and review PARC tax
allocations to determine if changes are needed. General feedback will be provided
40 but no motions made.

42 Mr. Cowie opened this discussion by explaining Lindon City Parks & Recreation
Director, Heath Bateman, and Finance Director, Kristen Colson, are in attendance to
44 present the financial overviews and statistics for the 2017 Aquatics Center season,
Lindon Days, and to also review the PARC tax allocations to determine if changes are
46 needed. He noted general feedback will be provided by the council but no motions are
needed as this item is for discussion and informational purposes only.

2 Kristen Colson, Finance Director and Heath Bateman, Parks and Recreation
4 Director, presented their financial overviews and statistics for the 2017 Aquatics Center
6 season, Lindon Days, and the PARC tax allocations to the Council. They began by
reviewing the Pool Statistics by Sportsman Participant Numbers/Transactions from 2016
and 2017 and showed the differences by year.

8 Mr. Bateman and Ms. Colson also presented the following Aquatics Center
statistics for discussion purposes as follows:

10 **Financial:**

Punch Pass Sales Breakdown

12 10 Punch – 680

25 Punch – 202

14 50 Punch – 75

Res. Flow – 16

16 Non. Flow – 11

Water - 25

18 **Challenges:**

Guard Retention

20 Idea: \$.25 per hour worked if employees stay to the specified closing date.

Coming Pool Maintenance Items:

22 Flowrider Pump Service 2017/2018

Tile repair 2017/2018

24 Deck Calking 2018

Painting/Staining 2018

26 Concrete Treatment Ongoing

Flowrider Surface 2020/2021

28 Mr. Bateman and Ms. Colson then referenced the Aquatics Center Financial
30 Report (dated October 13, 2017) showing revenue and expenditures followed by some
general discussion. Following the Aquatics Center presentation, they went on to cover the
32 Parc tax fund including revenue, facilities maintenance, aquatics center improvements,
community center improvements, parks & trails improvements, miscellaneous
34 contingency and contingency balances and total ending balances. There was then some
additional discussion by the council regarding the information presented.

36 Mayor Acerson called for any further comments or discussion from the Council.
Hearing none he moved on to the next agenda item.

- 38
- 40 9. **Discussion Item — Review of Commercial Farm Ordinance.** During recent
discussions regarding the Commercial Farm (CF) zone, several comments were
made by Councilmembers desiring possible changes to the CF ordinance.
42 Councilmember Lundberg requested that a discussion on the CF ordinance be
placed on an agenda for consideration by the full Council. The City Council will
44 discuss possible changes desired for the Commercial Farm ordinance and give
direction to Staff. Desired amendments to the CF ordinance will be presented to
46 the Planning Commission whose formal ordinance change recommendations will
be made back to the City Council for final consideration. General feedback will

2 be provided but no motions will be made on this discussion item.

4 Mr. Van Wagenen referenced the Commercial Farm zone ordinance as is
currently adopted. He noted the discussion tonight will be the ordinance itself noting staff
6 is asking for direction on what updates may be wanted or desired. He stated the Planning
Commission is scheduled to review the ordinance in a public hearing at their upcoming
8 meeting on October 24, 2017 where staff will present the Council's recommended
changes to the Planning Commission for consideration.

10 Councilmember Lundberg mentioned a concern she has is that the current
ordinance doesn't require owner occupied in this zone. She feels this would engender
12 good neighbor relationships and it may be a loophole that should be closed. The council
was in agreement that owner occupied should be a requirement. There was then some
14 discussion regarding acreage amounts.

16 Alan Colledge gave some background on where the five-acre number originated
when this zone was implemented to preserve open space. He pointed out unless we are
proactive there will be no open space. He was in a position (with a historical sense of
18 preservation) and just fell into the wedding business. They first had a conditional use
permit and then expanded to the castle that needed bigger parameters. No one can predict
20 the future and there has been a lot of trial and error. When the five-acre parcel was
discussed it was about agricultural production and that was the green belt standard; there
22 are not many in Lindon that could qualify or maintain the green belt status or threshold.

24 Councilmember Sweeten pointed out as the ordinance currently sits it requires
40% in some type of agricultural production. He questioned if we really think this is a
good thing for the city and just because this location is smaller it still provides some more
26 open space in the city of Lindon, so he is in favor as it is still preserving open space we
otherwise wouldn't have. He is not in favor of increasing the acreage, however, he would
28 still consider looking at what commercial uses may be allowed.

30 Councilmember Hoyt stated he likes the open space in Lindon. He likes the
owner-occupied aspect but he does have concerns with permitted uses and buffering to
protect the neighbors as to not be negatively impacted. He thinks that adding more
32 acreage may help with the buffering issue.

34 There was then some general discussion including acreage, permitted uses,
buffering and open space. Mr. Van Wagenen commented he will bring to the planning
commission the following issues for discussion: minimum acreages, owner occupied
36 issue, burden of proof for 40% agricultural use, review permitted or conditional uses and
potential impacts and buffering (minimal distances) and the measuring of noise decibels.

38 Mayor Acerson called for any further comments or discussion from the Council.
Hearing none he moved on to the next agenda item.

40

Council Reports:

42

There were no council reports given at this meeting.

44

Administrator's Report:

46

Mr. Cowie reported on the following items followed by discussion.

Misc. Updates:

- 2 • October newsletter
- 4 • November newsletter article: Jake Hoyt - Article due to Kathy Moosman last week in October
- 6 • UTOPIA/UIA update
- 8 • CDBG grant funding –elevator project for 2018/19; ADA door upgrades at Senior Center
- 8 • Misc. Items

10 **Upcoming Meetings & Events:**

- 12 • October 30th 5:30pm-8:00pm – Hallows Eve Party at the Community Center
- 12 • November 7th – General Election Day (No Council meeting)
- 14 • November 23rd – Mayor’s Thanksgiving Dinner at the Community Center
- 14 • November 23rd, 24th – City offices closed for Thanksgiving

16 Mayor Acerson called for any further comments or discussion from the Council.
Hearing none he called for a motion to adjourn.

18 **Adjourn** –

20 COUNCILMEMBER BRODERICK MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING
22 AT 9:35 PM. COUNCILMEMBER SWEETEN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL
24 PRESENT VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

26 Approved – November 21, 2017

28 _____
Kathryn Moosman, City Recorder

30
32
34 _____
Jeff Acerson, Mayor