

1 **PROVIDENCE CITY COUNCIL MEETING**
2 **November 14, 2017 6:00 PM**
3 **Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT**
4

5 Opening Ceremony:

6 Call to Order: John Drew
7 Roll Call of City Council Members: John Drew
8 Attendance: Kirk Allen, Jeff Baldwin, John Drew, Roy Sneddon
9 Excused: Mayor Calderwood, Dennis Giles
10 Pledge of Allegiance: John Drew
11 Opening Remarks – Prayer: Jeena Nilson
12

13 **2017 Municipal Election Canvass:** The Providence City Council, acting as the Board of Canvassers, will
14 canvass the votes of the 2017 Municipal Election.

15 **Motion to open the canvass for the Municipal 2017 for discussion – R Sneddon, second – J Baldwin.**

- 16 • J Baldwin asked how the voting percentage compared to past elections.
- 17 • J Drew stated the 2016 Election had an 80% turn out, but it was a general election.
- 18 • K Allen expressed his appreciation that people followed the issues and turned out to vote.
- 19 • J Drew felt the Providence voter turnout was one of the highest in the county.

20 **Motion to accept the Canvass of the 2017 Municipal Election – J Baldwin, second – R Sneddon**

21 **Vote:**

22 **Yea: K Allen, J Baldwin, J Drew, R Sneddon**

23 **Nay: None**

24 **Abstained: None**

25 **Excused: D Giles**

26 Discussion prior to the vote.

27 S Bankhead reviewed the election results:

- 28 • Mayor candidates: Kirk Allen – 846 votes, John Drew – 936 votes. John Drew was elected
29 mayor.
- 30 • Council candidates: Sharell Eames – 762 votes, Kristina Eck – 895 votes, Jeff Baldwin – 1049
31 votes, Rowan Ernest Cecil – 658 votes. Kristina Eck and Jeff Baldwin were elected to the council.
- 32 • 1,782 ballots were counted; 53 signatures could not be verified and could not be counted; five
33 ballots were postmarked after November 6, 2017 and could not be counted.
- 34 • The overall voting percentage was 45%

35 **Approval of the minutes**

36 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Council will consider approval of the minutes of October 24, 2017

37 **Motion to approve the minutes of October 24, 2017 as amended – K Allen, second – J Baldwin**

38 **Vote:**

39 **Yea: K Allen, J Baldwin, J Drew, R Sneddon**

40 **Nay: None**

41 **Abstained: None**

42 **Excused: D Giles**

43 Corrections:

- 44 • Page 2 line 29 borders
- 45 • Page 2 line 45 principal
- 46 • Page 6 line 14 J Baldwin volunteered to write the ordinance changes.
- 47 • Page 7 line 18 time to obtain react to the getting

48 **Public Comments:** Citizens may appear before the City Council to express their views on issues within

1 the City's jurisdiction. Comments will be addressed to the Council. Remarks are limited to 3 minutes per
2 person. The total time allotted to public comment is 15 minutes The City Council may act on an item, if it
3 arose subsequent to the posting of this agenda and the City Council determines that an emergency
4 exists.

- 5 • Mimi Recker, 280 North 400 East, asked about the proposed reservoir for the north
6 development. R Stapley reported the reservoir discussions are moving forward this week. K
7 Allen explained the proposed reservoir is for drinking water. J Drew explained the City has wells
8 and other reservoirs that the City will use to fill the proposed reservoir. J Baldwin explained the
9 proposed reservoir is for Water Zone 2. J Drew explained it will relieve some of the stress on the
10 Zone 3 reservoirs.
- 11 • M Recker spoke in favor of the City's participation in the Trails Planning Coordinator. She and
12 many she knows value trails for quality of life and transport. She appreciated the county wide
13 perspective.
- 14 • Ramona Rukavina, 994 South 400 East, spoke to Item 6 Corner Lot Obstruction. She explained
15 she is topographically unable to meet the existing code. Her property is approximately eight feet
16 above the level of the road. She asked the Council to consider extenuating circumstances. She
17 felt there needed to be an exception for properties similar to hers. She felt cutting the property
18 to meet the ordinance would ruin the property.

19 **Business Items:**

20 **Item No.1. Resolution 051-2017 General Plan Amendment:** The Providence City Council will consider
21 for adoption of a resolution amending the Providence City Master Plan Sheet No 5-B Future Re-Zone of
22 Existing Districts within the Providence City corporate limits by designating Parcel No. 02-096-0011,
23 approximately 485 West 100 South as Multi-Family High Density (MFH).

24 **Motion to approve Resolution 051-2017 General Plan Amendment – J Baldwin, second – K Allen**

25 **Vote:**

26 **Yea: K Allen, J Baldwin, J Drew**

27 **Nay: R Sneddon**

28 **Abstained: None**

29 **Excused: D Giles**

30 Discussion prior to vote.

- 31 • J Baldwin clarified that this change was recommended by the Planning Commission.
- 32 • R Sneddon displayed the Cache County Parcel Zoning Viewer showing the location of the parcel.
33 J Drew explained the property was just east of Tractor Supply and next to the new roundabout.
34 R Sneddon pointed out the Mark Thompson, Reese Peterson, and LDS Stake Center properties.
- 35 • Marge Townsend asked about the advantage of roundabouts. J Drew explained rather than a
36 traffic light that stops traffic, it allows traffic to flow. K Allen explained it also reduces pollution
37 as traffic moves rather than sitting idle.
- 38 • R Sneddon displayed pictures of multi-family buildings. The buildings had material and color
39 variation on the elevations, breaking up the appearance. He would prefer to see parking
40 underground. He felt landscaping could be expanded or retracted. He felt there were tradeoffs
41 with landscaping and density.
- 42 • R Sneddon reviewed the living units per acre: a 10,000 square foot lot would allow about four
43 dwelling units per acre. The Multi-Family High district allows 18 units per acre.
- 44 • R Sneddon discussed standards for multi-family developments such as lot size, lot width,
45 building height, off-street parking, landscaping, exterior materials and colors, exterior
46 elevations, roof pitch. These things help make the neighborhood more comfortable.
- 47 • R Sneddon explained the City has yet to complete its homework on standards. The standards are
48 in process. He suggested there be no change in zoning until the standards are in place.

- 1 • K Allen felt the points R Sneddon raised should be discussed.
- 2 • J Baldwin explained he brought up the standard discussion during the discussion for the multi-
- 3 family on the corner of 100 North 200 West. He felt design standards gave some confidence to
- 4 existing property owners that good developments will be built.
- 5 • K Allen did not feel design standards would fit all properties. He felt existing neighborhoods,
- 6 topography, etc. would influence the design. He felt the proposal was appropriate for the area.
- 7 He did not feel the Council should wait for the design standards.
- 8 • R Sneddon reported he had a set of design standards that he felt would meet the requirements.
- 9 • J Drew explained there are two items for action, changing the General Plan and changing the
- 10 zone. The current zoning is agricultural. The General Plan calls for Single-Family Residential; the
- 11 property across the street was recently zoned Multi-Family High. He felt the design standard
- 12 discussion for the property on the corner of 100 North 200 West was to help it blend with the
- 13 Historical District. He agreed with Council Member Allen, when talking about the design
- 14 standards he did not feel one size fit all would work.
- 15 • K Eck asked where the City was as in the design standard process. J Baldwin explained the design
- 16 standards were in the very early stages. He explained the developer has proposed a design that
- 17 looks like it would fit the area very well. S Bankhead explained the Planning Commission
- 18 discussed in a previous meeting; they are moving forward with the process. The design
- 19 standards can be used in the proposed in the life-cycle zone as well as other areas in the City.
- 20 • R Sneddon felt the materials for the façade could reflect any ambiance wanted. That is the
- 21 architects job. R Sneddon looks at the ability for fire prevention, durability, and visual pleasure.
- 22 • J Baldwin felt the big issue on the 200 W 100 N property was density. He felt the design
- 23 presented by the developer was an excellent design. His argument for design standard is to
- 24 avoid “cookie cutter boxes” that deteriorate over time.
- 25 • J Baldwin asked if opposition was expressed in any of the meetings. S Bankhead reported one
- 26 person spoke during the City Council public comments in a previous meeting and said he was
- 27 against multi-family development in the area. She also reported Rowan Cecil stated in a
- 28 Planning Commission meeting he had received comments against multi-family in the area.
- 29 However, no one spoke against the proposal in the public hearings.
- 30 • R Sneddon stated this was not a case against multiple family. He just wants to have standards in
- 31 place before proceeding.
- 32 • Kent Dunkley thanked R Sneddon for the presentation. The presentation was good, but the
- 33 parcel across the street has already been approved that will have 140 units without design
- 34 standards. He reported two public hearings were held with no opposition expressed. He was
- 35 surprised with the turn of events taking place. It is two acres next to a church and across from a
- 36 140 unit multi-family development.
- 37 • R Sneddon felt his point is not just to this property; his vision is for something that can be used
- 38 for the entire community. He did not feel 6 weeks would be a burden to wait.
- 39 • J Baldwin reported the 140 units did have a concept with a very good design. J Baldwin felt the
- 40 100 N 200 W was in a situation with existing homes. This area is different. J Baldwin felt there
- 41 was a difference in the two areas and the impact will be different.
- 42 • K Eck felt like this development will be competing against the 140 units. An audience member
- 43 stated these units will be apartments.

44 **Item No. 2. Ordinance 2017-015 Rezone:** The Providence City Council will consider for adoption an
 45 ordinance changing the zone of Parcel No. 02-096-0011; a 2.86 parcel of property located generally at
 46 100 South 485 West. The applicant is requesting Multi-Family High Density.

47 **Motion to consider for passage ordinance 2017-015 –**

48 **Motion to adopt Ordinance 2017-015 changing the zone of Parcel No. 02-096-0011 from AGR to Multi-**
 49 **Family High Density – K Allen, second – J Drew**

1 **Vote:**
2 **Yea: K Allen, J Baldwin, J Drew**
3 **Nay: R Sneddon**
4 **Abstained: None**
5 **Excused: None**

6 Discussion prior to vote.
7 • No additional discussion.
8 • No comments from the public.

9 **Item No. 3. Participation in County Trails Coordinator:** The Providence City Council will consider
10 participating in the Cache County Trails Coordinator program.

11 **Motion to open the discussion – K Allen, second – J Baldwin,**

12 **Vote:**
13 **Yea: K Allen, J Baldwin, J Drew, R Sneddon**
14 **Nay: None**
15 **Abstained: None**
16 **Excused: D Giles**

17 **Motion to participate in the Cache County Trails Coordinator program – J Drew, second – K Allen**

18 **Vote:**
19 **Yea: K Allen, J Baldwin, J Drew, R Sneddon**
20 **Nay:**
21 **Abstained: None**
22 **Excused: D Giles**

23 Discussion prior to vote.
24 • Dayton Crites, Cache County Trails Planner, reviewed the benefits of trail coordination. He is
25 working toward safe access to schools, parks, work, and to provide options to get to those
26 places. He reported \$790,000 in grant money has been awarded; 12 miles of trails built, opened,
27 or preserved access, 4,600 hours of volunteer labor (majority near Beaver Mountain). D Crites is
28 a trained landscape architect/planner, with a Master degree from USU.
29 • The participation money is used toward the collective agreement that the County and other
30 cities are participating in. It pays the salary and benefits for the County Trails Planner.
31 • K Allen commended D Crites on the job he has been doing. He felt it was an incredible job. He
32 spoke very positively to the program. He mentioned a recent newspaper article about a new
33 trail in Nibley.
34 • J Baldwin asked what services the City could expect. D Crites would like Providence to identify
35 priorities. He will work with staff and develop a proposal to implement the priorities. He will also
36 work with the City to obtain grant money for projects.
37 • J Baldwin felt there should be someone assigned to work with the trails coordinator. K Allen
38 asked if any of the communities use a volunteer in the position. D Crites explained the
39 volunteers generally help with the trails, a council member or community staff members work
40 with the Trails Planner to develop the plan.
41 • J Drew stated he would champion the trails. He is in support of the trails. He felt the Providence
42 Canyon Trail was well used, and very well done. He felt the trails planner for \$1,900 was a
43 bargain.
44 • K Allen would like to see the Bonneville Shoreline improved.
45 • R Rukavina would rather see money go to the trails coordinator than widening roads.

46 **Item No. 4. Resolution 052-2017 Shareholder Authorized Agent:** The Providence City Council will
47 consider for adoption a resolution naming an authorized agent for shareholder action associated with
48 Providence Blacksmith Fork Irrigation Company and Spring Creek Water Company.

1 **Motion to approve Resolution 052-2017 naming by title Mayor, or in his absence – Mayor Pro-tem as**
2 **the Authorized Agent, if the new council would like to revisit the issue in January, they can – J**
3 **Baldwin, second – R Sneddon**

4 **Vote:**

5 **Yea: K Allen, J Baldwin, J Drew, R Sneddon**

6 **Nay: None**

7 **Abstained: None**

8 **Excused: None**

9 Discussion prior to vote.

- 10 • S Bankhead explained the bylaws for the irrigation companies require an entity owning shares to
11 designate someone to act as an agent to vote those shares and be the voice for the City. Mayor
12 Calderwood has been very involved with both irrigation companies. This would formalize the
13 action.
- 14 • J Drew explained serving as a board member on the on either of the irrigation company's boards
15 is a different issue.
- 16 • K Allen asked about tabling the resolution until the new council takes office. S Bankhead
17 explained both irrigation companies have shareholder meetings the first part of December.
- 18 • J Drew reported in a discussion with Mayor Calderwood, Mayor Calderwood suggested J Drew
19 be designated to vote.
- 20 • S Eames explained there is a very important vote coming up; the small shareholders are
21 concerned the large shareholders will take over. An amendment to the Articles of Incorporation
22 that would require both the majority vote of the shareholders and a majority vote of the shares
23 for something to change. Currently it is one vote per share. Someone with ½ share gets ½ vote.
- 24 • R Sneddon compared this to the House of Representatives and the US Senate, this change may
25 result in nothing getting done.

26 **Item No. 5. Discussion:** The Providence City Council will discuss capital facilities and impact fees for
27 roads. Discussion may also include water, sewer, parks and stormwater.

- 28 • J Baldwin asked if the City could use the original study and increase the fee to the original
29 recommendation, while working on the new study.
- 30 • Chad Woolley explained the conservative answer would be to wait for the new study. He could
31 argue both sides, it is a bit of a gray area. J Baldwin felt it was a misinformed situation when the
32 original council reduced the fee. K Allen felt a developer would challenge the City in court. C
33 Woolley felt it would be fertile ground for a lawsuit.
- 34 • C Woolley reported the staff had a good discussion with Emily Sim, an impact fee consultant. He
35 was tasked to put together a one-page "cheat" sheet on impact fees. The is for discussion
36 purposes.
- 37 • J Drew suggested three sentences. An impact fee is imposed by the City on a development
38 project to pay for the cost of delivering public services to the new development. For Providence
39 these impact fees are for streets, culinary water, sewer, storm water, and parks. These are fees
40 the City charges developers for the upsizing of streets, water, sewer, and parks that the city
41 must install to accommodate bringing new services to a new development.
- 42 • C Woolley explained when development comes, it brings additional impact for the city in various
43 areas. Impact fees are a way to offset some of the increased capacity costs.
- 44 • J Drew felt the cost of new development should be neutral to the City; and the new
45 development should not pay for cost not part of development.
- 46 • One of the requirements is to have a capital facilities plan. The city's plan is old, it could be
47 challenged because it is old. Impact fees should not be used to increase the level of service. The
48 City cannot say we have an old road system and make a developer pay for a new road system.

1 They can help pay for the impact of their development.

- 2 • J Baldwin asked who decides the level of the impact.
 - 3 ○ It was explained the state code is very specific. The capital facility plan outline what the
 - 4 City wants to develop. The requirements for an impact fee facility plan are established
 - 5 by state code. It sets a baseline for existing level of service and outlines the projects that
 - 6 need to increase capacity. An impact fee consultant uses the plan, industry standards,
 - 7 and state code to determine the appropriate fee. Very seldom will impact fees pay for
 - 8 an entire project; generally, there is a percentage the city will pay for to maintain level
 - 9 of service. Income sources should also be identified. The staff, City Engineer, and Council
 - 10 all participate in the development of the plan.
- 11 • Providence City generally charges the impact fee with the building permit.
- 12 • R Sneddon explained in a perfect world you would come out even. However, he felt there was a
- 13 strong probability of the City losing, if the city installs infrastructure and development does not
- 14 come. C Woolley didn't think the probability was to lose money; but it is a possibility. J Drew
- 15 explained the risk is the timing of development; it may not happen as quickly as the City
- 16 anticipates.
- 17 • The staff has recommended three street projects: the two Spring Creek Crossings and 100 South
- 18 west of 200 West; and asked if the Council agreed with the projects. J Drew discussed the
- 19 possibility of a portion of Spring Creek Parkway being annexed into River Heights. C Woolley
- 20 reported the staff is working with River Heights.
- 21 • J Baldwin felt the city as a whole should be looked at. He felt there may be different impact fees
- 22 within the city. Max Pierce explained you look at the city, but not at specific developments. J
- 23 Drew asked if an improvement on the east could be argued by a developer on the west the east
- 24 side improvement did not improve their site. M Pierce felt it could be argued, but did not feel
- 25 the development would win. M Pierce felt as small as Providence is he didn't think it would be a
- 26 problem. Nate Wright explained one of the challenges of breaking the City into different areas is
- 27 narrowly restricting where the fees can be used.
- 28 • Nate Wright explained with the new requirements in state code, projects should fall within a 10-
- 29 year window. M Pierce explained with all of the changes to the impact fee laws a new study
- 30 would be required to make a change.
- 31 • M Peirce explained the city can do a project then incorporate it into an analysis and study.
- 32 • Brent Fresz, Planning Commission member, felt the money should be spent on a plan rather
- 33 than legal fees if the old plan was challenged. He also reported the Planning Commission is
- 34 mostly looking at the east benches.
- 35 • There was some discussion about including all services in the plan. S Bankhead explained
- 36 focusing on one element, in this case streets, would allow the City to get the new fee for streets
- 37 in place and start collecting the new fee, while continuing to work on the other elements of the
- 38 plan.
- 39 • The Council felt the street plan should come forward in January.

40 **Item No. 6. Discussion:** The Providence City Council will discuss proposed amendments to Providence
41 City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 9 Supplemental Regulations in all Districts, Section 2
42 Corner Lot Obstruction.

- 43 • J Baldwin suggested Deputy Bartchi give his report. Deputy Bartchi stated the Sheriff could be
- 44 here due to a scheduling conflict. Deputy Black also had a scheduling conflict. Deputy Bartchi
- 45 reported deputies patrolled the area of 535 South Garden drive; they issued warnings to 7
- 46 people, the many lived in the immediate area, a vast majority lived in the surrounding
- 47 neighborhoods. The amount of traffic was dependent on time of day. All in all, the majority of
- 48 the time the traffic was fairly light. The radar showed speeding about 5 miles over. Most of the

- 1 deputies felt the visibility of the intersection was fine.
- 2 • J Baldwin reviewed his research. He found that with increase of traffic comes increase in traffic
 - 3 control, the need for the clear view area dissipates. In a rural area, where there are less
 - 4 controls, the clear view is more important.
 - 5 • J Baldwin felt topography needed to be taken into consideration. He felt there needed to be
 - 6 exceptions for natural topography.
 - 7 • J Baldwin explained the current code measures from the property line. In areas where the City
 - 8 has a 90-foot right-of-way, but is only using a narrow portion of the right-of-way, he feels the
 - 9 adjacent property owner is penalized because they have to measure the clear view area from
 - 10 property line, leaving a large portion of property (city right-of-way) without landscaping in
 - 11 comparison to where the cars are actually driving.
 - 12 • J Baldwin explained ideas of allowing property owners to landscape in the city right-of-way. He
 - 13 felt the triangle should be measured from the road, not the right-of-way line. The cars are on
 - 14 the road, that is where the visibility needs to be. With narrow roads, visibility becomes very
 - 15 important. As cars inch out, they inch into the lane. Starting with a basic clear view area, but
 - 16 changing the triangle to a longer visibility, the triangle will change based on the elements of the
 - 17 intersection. If the City widens the road or improves the right-of-way, J Baldwin felt the adjacent
 - 18 property owner would be okay with landscaping being removed, because they would
 - 19 understand it was on City property.
 - 20 • J Baldwin felt the greater impact comes from blocked view when making a left-hand turn and
 - 21 the view of someone using the sidewalk perpendicular to the location of the driver. He felt
 - 22 traffic mitigation, such as a 4-way stop, could be used to compensate for reduced visibility.
 - 23 Starting with a basic clear view area, a chart listing conditions would be used to move the area
 - 24 based on a variety of conditions.
 - 25 • J Drew asked if the staff and average resident could interpret the variations. J Baldwin felt it was
 - 26 much easier than the current code. J Baldwin explained a property owner would not have the
 - 27 argument for the City to prove where the property line is, if the edge of asphalt is used.
 - 28 • J Baldwin explained this is a first draft and would like Planning Commission to review it. J Drew
 - 29 would also like to have staff input on being able to interpret and enforcement.
 - 30 • Staff asked if speed limits, stop signs, etc. are changed, does the landscaping also need to
 - 31 change, or is it grandfathered. J Drew reviewed the city code for non-conforming uses or non-
 - 32 complying structure.
 - 33 • R Sneddon felt the only thing that was fixed was the property line. If we do not use the property
 - 34 line, we are in a constant state of flux. He felt the numbers could move from the property line.
 - 35 • B Fresz asked if this would only apply to new development. C Woolley explained since this is a
 - 36 public safety issue there is a higher standard for “grandfathering”, something may not be
 - 37 “grandfathered”. C Woolley explained this discussion illustrates the difficulty in writing code.
 - 38 Generally speaking, only some things can be “grandfathered”.
 - 39 • Enforcement was discussed. R Sneddon felt enforcement should come from complaints. J
 - 40 Baldwin felt that allows neighbors to go after other neighbors. C Wooley explained the concept
 - 41 of enforcing when people complain is very valid. It has been upheld in courts that it is okay to
 - 42 enforce only on complaints. It may not be the very best way, but it can be upheld in court. C
 - 43 Woolley commended J Baldwin on the draft; he felt it made a lot of sense. There are some
 - 44 issues that need to be worked out. Working through the issues with the staff will be very
 - 45 helpful.
 - 46 • M Pierce explained one of the problems with allowing certain vegetation in the clear view area
 - 47 is the problem may get worse as time goes on. B Fresz explained the current code says trees less
 - 48 than 12” diameter.

1
2 S Eames explained she is nervous about the water company meeting. She expressed concern she may
3 not have explained the proposed change to the Articles of Incorporation clearly.

4 **Staff Reports:** Items presented by Providence City Staff will be presented as information only.

5 Rob Stapley:

- 6 • R Stapley reported the Little Baldy road is not ready to be open to the public. It may not be
7 plowed by the City this winter. They have not completed the minimum improvements. R
8 Sneddon asked about the stability of the soil by the power lines. R Stapley explained the
9 developer is working with the power company.
- 10 • K Allen expressed concern about the road cuts in 1000 South from new development. The
11 number of driveway cuts was also a concern. J Drew reported Millville City does not allow any
12 new driveway cuts in 450 North (our 1000 South). R Stapley felt the same concerns apply to the
13 Little Baldy road. The developer has stated they will keep cuts at a minimum.
- 14 • K Allen asked about the driveway cuts for the Canyon Creek Subdivision. It was explained two
15 homes are sharing one driveway.
- 16 • Green waste bin abuse was discussed. The leaf pick-up was also discussed. The leaf bags must
17 be opened before putting the leaves in the green waste bins.
- 18 • The bucket truck has been utilized a great deal.
- 19 • Infiltration in the wastewater system was discussed. R Stapley explained over the years there
20 have been I&I and the City has worked to resolve them. With homes that have too many 45°
21 angles, it is more difficult to repair. There is new technology the we are trying. R Sneddon asked
22 about the cost to put a meter in front of the Logan meters. It was estimated at about \$20,000.

23 S Bankhead:

- 24 • S Bankhead reminded the Council they received the invoice register for October.
- 25 • S Bankhead reported when the Council approved the development agreement for Providence
26 Gateway, we required a fee in lieu for water. The developer is now considering installing a
27 secondary water system. The City Code allows for credit for system improvements. S Bankhead
28 explained she spoke with Craig Smith and rather than having the developer pay the fee in lieu at
29 this time, the City can have the developer escrow the money until the City and the developer
30 have had time to explore the secondary system. S Bankhead asked the Council if they would
31 allow the developer to escrow the money. The Council agreed to escrowing the fee while the
32 secondary system is considered.
- 33 • J Drew reported Curt Webb also asked about a secondary system in the southeast bench area.
34 Grants and low interest loans for the installation of a secondary system were briefly discussed.
- 35 • S Bankhead reported the oath of office will be on January 12.
- 36 • S Bankhead reported the city office will be closed the day after Thanksgiving. It is not a paid
37 holiday, employees may work or use a personal day.
- 38 • The next council meeting will be December 12.
- 39 • S Bankhead will be setting up a city email for each council member, and getting business cards
40 for the council members.

41 **Council Reports:** Items presented by the City Council members will be presented as informational only;
42 no formal action will be taken. The City Council may act on an item, if it arose subsequent to the posting
43 of this agenda and the City Council determines that an emergency exists.

- 44 • J Baldwin felt is something had not been resolved with the Charter School parking lot lights, the
45 City should step in. J Drew reported he, Mayor Calderwood, and City Attorney Kevin Fife met
46 with the homeowner and looked at the impact inside the home. K Fife is working on the issue. S
47 Bankhead reported Paul Berntson, Cache County Building Official, is going to work with K Fife on
48 the building code perspective.

- 1 • K Allen – no report
- 2 • R Sneddon – no report
- 3 • J Drew reported he and S Bankhead are considering options for someone to administer the oath
- 4 of office. He and S Bankhead also talked about organization and workload issues. J Drew as
- 5 Mayor will take on some of the duties S Bankhead is currently performing. J Drew also reported
- 6 the City is looking into a CBDG grant to help with downtown streets. It is for lower income parts
- 7 of the City. A resident survey is involved. J Drew would like the City Council to take the survey to
- 8 the residents. We will also be doing training on the 9th and 23rd. J Drew would like to see the
- 9 Council more involved in city and other community events. He plans to inform the Council of
- 10 trainings and civic events.

11 **Executive Session Notice:**

12 The Providence City Council may enter into a closed session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent

13 litigation as allowed by Utah Code 52-4-205(1)(c).

14 The Providence City Council may enter into a closed session to discuss professional competence or other

15 factors allowed by Utah Code 52-4-205(1)(a).

16 The Providence City Council may enter into a closed session to discuss land acquisition or the sale of real

17 property Utah Code 52-4-205(1) (d) and (e).

- 18 • No closed meeting held

19 **Motion to adjourn – J Baldwin, second – K Allen**

20 **Vote:**

21 **Yea: K Allen, J Baldwin, J Drew, R Sneddon**

22 **Nay:**

23 **Abstained: None**

24 **Excused: D Giles**

25

26

27

28

John Drew, Mayor Pro-Tem

Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder