Planning Commission Chair:	
Planning Commission Vice-Chair:	*Todd Burton*
Commissioners:	*Robert Guiller*
	Scott Dixon
	Glen Woolsey
Secretary:	*Catina Germany*
City Council Representative:	*Greg Johnson*

UINTAH CITY

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, January 22, 2019
7:00 PM

2191 East 6550 South – Uintah, Utah 84405 *(801) 479-4130 Fax: (801)476-7269*

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Called to Order by Tim Petty at 7:00 p.m.
Pledge of Allegiance led by Tim Petty.
Roll Call: Present – Tim Petty Scott Dixon, Todd Burton, Glen Woolsey Excused – Robert Guiller
Declaration of Conflicts of Interest: Commission members are required by law to file a public disclosure statement with the Secretary listing business interests and investments that could create a conflict of interest with the duties of the Commission Member. When a matter in which a Commission member has a business or investment interest appears on the agenda, the Commission member must publicly disclose that interest. Tim Petty asked the Commission if they had any conflicts of interest with tonight's agenda; There were none.
Attendees: Catina Germany, Gordon Cutler, Cody Nye, Dixon Pitcher, Edward Saunders, Lori Woolsey

Agenda Items:

1. **Public Comment (2 minutes per person)** **(recording: 00:00:50)*
   - Greg Johnson: We know that this is Tim's last meeting and I tell you that I have been involved with the Planning Commission and City Council for several years now, not as long as some people but for quite a few years. And I just want to first of all I want to thank the whole Planning Commission for all the work that you guys have done. It's been much busier than it was when I was on the Council. You guys have done a lot more work, there's been a lot more progress, and a lot more effort and time taken out of your schedules to get that stuff done. You've done it professionally, some of that came from the experiences that you all had before you came here, but also your attitude and ability to get stuff done and I appreciate it. And I want to specifically tonight thank Tim because he's made it extremely easy for the Council. Everything is explained properly when he briefs us; the information that he provides that you all gather for him has been exceptional. So on behalf of the Council, and I can say for the citizens of the city, I want to thank you personally for all the work that you've done; really appreciate it. Thank you.
   - Scott Dixon: I would second that, that we appreciate Tim and his expertise and the time and effort that he's put in. So on behalf of the Commission thank you.

2. **Approval of minutes for the Planning Commission meeting held December 4, 2018.**
   *(recording: 00:02:35)
   Presenter: Tim Petty

   Tim Petty stated had comments about the fencing on item five of the Site Plan for Scenic Development Commercial building located at lot #8. He stated that he is hoping that his recollection of the discussion and agreement was consistent with the other Planning Commission members. He wanted the minutes to capture, in more detail, what they agreed on with the fencing. Tim's understanding of what they approved was that the concrete fence would continue to the west and when it got to the end of the parking lot it would turn south so that it would be dividing between the parking area and the drain field. And the concrete fence would extend along the parking lot, and that the rest of the property line would have chain link fence. **Todd Burton** stated it's been a month and a half so his recollection was a little fuzzy and asked if it was recorded and stated the recording needed to be checked for verification. Tim agreed; said the minutes just didn't detail it enough and he wanted to capture as much detail as possible. Tim read item #5, the first bullet: "Scenic Development representative Carl Keyes stated his boss said the fence, where it shows to terminate on the south, will continue west to the sewage treatment area then turn south to the retention pond".

Tim stated the minutes needed to state that this statement is in particular to the concrete fence; that is the alignment of the concrete fence. Tim also asked to see if it could be found in the recording and confirmed. At the end of that sentence he would like to see it appended with: "chain link fence will be placed along the rest of the property line". He stated that he thinks it will be found in the recording and it will show up in some of the subsequent bullets to clarify those same points. Scott asked if it would be helpful to have a drawing that would be a little clearer to understand, just in paragraph form. Tim said sure. Glenn Woolsey stated that the plans showed the fence in an area that he said they were going to move it, so that the drain field would be more protected. So they put it over, against the property line of that residential section that is to the west. Glenn asked if the drawing showed it at the edge of the parking lot. Tim stated that he remembers that there was going to be chain link along the property line, Glenn stated Carl said they would place chain link around the drain field; and Tim stated that would be the property line. Tim stated again he would like to verify this info with the recording.

Scott Dixon said that he did not attend the meeting but wanted to address a letter he sent to Tim Petty about the speed limit on 6600 S. His concern was that his vote would have been 30mph instead of 35mph. He outlined some details in similar communities, what the speed limits were, and the drive times from what it currently is to what it would change to; he wanted to make sure that either the letter sent or notes made on the minutes. Tim stated he thinks the letter was read in the meeting but would like to confirm it in the recording and capture it in the minutes.

The minutes from the Planning Commission Meeting held December 4, 2018 were tabled for clarifications of the fencing in the minutes for Scenic Development Lot #8 and the addition of Scott Dixon stating that he would have voted to reduce the speed limit to 30mph instead of 35mph per a letter received by the Planning Commission.

Scott made a motion to table the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting held on December 4, 2018 until the next Planning Commission meeting so the clarifications can be confirmed and added. Seconded by Glenn Woolsey. All in favor, motion passes.

3. **Discussion/Action for Site Plan Review for Cody Nye; Nye's Tree Service located at 2580 E 6550 S, Uintah.** **(recording: 00:08:47)*
Presenter: Cody Nye

Tim Petty stated the Commission last met in June about Cody's site plans and there was quite a bit of discussion at that point. Tim stated Cody did not submit any new drawings but wanted to be on the agenda and asked Cody to give an update of where he is and what he wants to get done today. Cody stated that on the original drawings he planned to demolish the house but is now renting it because it was discussed that it was within the ordinances and so that changed what he wanted to do with the property. He stated he will continue to rent the house and wants to place a new building northeast of the property.

Cody asked if he was required to have fencing and if so what kind. Todd Burton stated he was trying to recall if the purpose of the fence was to stop wood chips from blowing in the wind. Tim stated it was a unique property but it was for separation of the residential from the commercial area for safety; it's bordered by the railroad so there is nothing around it but they can take a look back at the minutes to see what was discussed. Cody read the following from a document he had that stated "no fencing is shown for the property. The Planning Commission will need to decide what fencing is needed if any at the site". Tim Petty stated he did not remember that being an issue. Cody then asked if he was good on that issue. Tim stated that they will need an actual Site Plan in order to give a response and they do not have one. Tim stated that the last time he met with the Commission there was a plan and they made comments but they do not have any new plans. They need to know what he wants a response

on. Tim then took a look at the plans from the last meeting; the plans still showed the demolition of the existing house. Tim asked if he ever prepared plans not showing the demolition of the house. Cody then asked if he could come up to the Commission; he had a set of plans that were redlined with adjustments. Cody then explained the plans visually to Tim and the Commission. Tim again stated that in his opinion that he would like to see fencing between the residential and commercial area; some type of solid fencing for safety. Cody stated he planned to do fencing.

Scott Dixon wanted to know the location of the property; it was pulled up online for him to view and was shown where the property is located. Tim asked if he was just coming in to get their input before he gets his plans prepared, and is he was aware that nothing will get approved today based on these plans. Cody said yes. Scott asked what it was he was trying to get approved; if it was a business. Cody stated he does have his business license currently and he is operating out of there now. Tim asked if he was going to be building a shop on the site and Cody stated yes. Tim stated that one of the things he remembered from the previous meeting that they had decided that it would be appropriate for the setbacks to be based on commercial property standards for the commercial building, where it would be ok for the building to be right against the property line.

Tim said they also discussed the storm drainage easement to get drainage off the site through the railroad property but ran into same problems with the railroad that most people do when dealing with them. Cody stated he did not receive a response when he tried contacting the railroad so that changed his plans. He stated he would like to just continue with the natural drainage he currently uses around the building once built and also continue to use the existing natural materials for drainage off the property. Tim stated he will have to demonstrate through his engineered plans that the impervious surface he is adding, whether it is gravel or permeable pavement, will not contribute more drainage offsite.

Glenn Woolsey asked about the position of the proposed building, if it was right on his property line, Cody stated yes. Scott Dixon then asked if it would be a zero lot line, Tim stated yes. Glenn Woolsey then asked if the leased area will have asphalt Cody stated no. Tim stated that it shows that on the old drawings and he will need to prepare new ones. Tim said that anything off of the property line will have to be demonstrated that he has an easement for it. The Commission looked over Cody's older plans he submitted previously. Scott asked if he was utilizing the rest of the property or was the intent just for the shop. Cody stated he plans to build the shop and place his equipment inside. He said that he is currently dying mulch chips on the part of the part that he leases from the railroad. Tim stated that he will need to capture everything that is happening on the property on his site plan. Todd Burton asked if he will be paving any areas around the building, Cody said probably the entrance portion will have asphalt but it is getting too costly for more asphalted areas. Scott again asked about what is shown on the old plans as far as the asphalt. Cody stated he will need to get the updated plans to the Commission. Cody asked if they will make their decision once he submits the new plans next month. Tim and the Commission stated cannot say for sure, they will need to see the official engineered plans first. Cody stated he did not have any other questions and apologized for not being prepared.

4. **Discussion/Action on Site Plan Review for Dixon Pitcher; Commercial Storage Building located at 6600 S 2464 E, Uintah.** **(recording: 00:23:21)*
Presenter: Dixon Pitcher

Dixon Pitcher started by saying this is phase two of what was done two years ago and he is adding five more 10X20 storage unit bays to the north and a new building. Dixon then showed visually what he was doing on his plans with the Planning Commission. Tim Petty asked if these plans complete his whole property. Dixon stated yes, that what they are looking at is the site plan for the entire property.

Tim stated that the biggest issues are the geotechnical issues. There are two issues: the property is located on up to 25 feet of undocumented fill and the slope stability behind the other units on the north. There was clarification of the property location and position for Scott Dixon. Tim Petty asked if the

eastern boundary has always been the same or if he had acquired property from Weber Basin. Dixon stated that he did acquire additional property. Tim stated that he knows they use the pit to dump their sludge from their sedimentation basins at the top of the hill; he says undocumented but it is really settled silt which is not good building material. Dixon stated the fill did not come from there, that he filled it in from the Layton interchange that D.O.T. completed. Dixon said they showed him what they had and stated their whole project is on the very same fill that was brought in from the D.O.T.

Todd asked what was in the material he acquired and if there were rocks in it. Dixon stated some, but most of it was really good. Some of it was engineered fill; a lot of it was pit run. It was the material they used for the bridge at the Layton Interchange. Tim asked if it was placed in any kind of lifts or compacted. Dixon stated no, it was compacted with machinery but not placed on any kind of lifts.

Tim asked what his plan was for the slope stability on the north side. Dixon stated it cannot be seen on plan but he actually has an 8 foot retaining wall that runs the whole distance, so he will continue the wall all the way to the east boundary. Dixon stated that it was engineered with about four of five dead men in between where the cement comes out and there is a reinforced buttress against the wall. Tim asked if the wall was part of existing building, Dixon stated yes, it is the back wall of the existing storage units. Tim asked if the building was engineered and designed to support the slope behind it. Ed Saunders of Saunders Construction stated that the back foundation was designed to be a retaining wall. Ed stated he did not actually do that one, but it has a substantial footing underneath it. Tim asked if the cut was still behind there or if it had been backfilled to the foundation like it could be. Ed Saunders said no, some of it has and there is about six feet of the retaining wall exposed. Tim stated if this is approved, he thinks one of the requirements would need to be that it is backfilled and re-vegetated to stabilize that slope.

Scott asked if the wall is in place and if that wall will become the wall of the building. Dixon stated that was correct. Ed stated it is an existing building with 15 bays and will be extended to have five more bays. Todd Burton asked if the wall had been stamped off by an engineer. Dixon said he could not recall because it's been three or four years, but he believes so. Dixon stated they will take the excavation from the new building and place that behind it. Tim stated that the point is that the final product will need to stabilize that slope and backfill it.

Scott asked for Ed or Dixon to come up and walk him through everything on the plans. Ed then explained the Site Plan to Scott Dixon and the Commissioners visually. Tim stated that there will also need to be a drain also when it is being backfilled to be able to drain from behind the building and has to drain on his site, cannot go onto another property. Todd asked if there was already a storm drain behind it, Dixon stated yes and it will be connected to his current drainage; he showed him on the plans that it drains under the building into the Weber River. Tim asked if there were any other questions before moving on to the other two 40X60 units. Todd stated that the backfill will need to qualify to meet the 2:1 slope.

Scott asked if it was passed by Matt Hartvigsen. Tim stated it wasn't passed by him and that he has expressed the same concerns over the geotechnical issues. Scott stated the Dixon acquired the geotechnical report that Matt requested. Tim stated the report mirrored the same concerns they have with the site. Scott asked if Matt was satisfied with what was presented, Dixon said yes and that he met with Matt. Tim then read a couple of emails he received from Matt:

"I am worried about the slope stability of the cut behind Pitcher Storage phase one buildings. I asked Dixon to get a geotechnical engineer's opinion on the slopes. Dixon submitted a report, which is attached, and the report confirms that there is a problem. Also attached is a memo recommending that the property owner also find a solution. I see the second phase of the storage unit construction project is on the agenda for next week. The geotechnical report specifically talks about the instability of the slope below the proposed storage buildings in the next phase. The report also addresses the undocumented fill underneath the proposed storage buildings which extends to a depth of at least 25 feet. Dixon is looking at ways to mitigate the

risks for settlement by over excavating the footings to get properly compacted soil under them; however, there will always be an increased risk of the structure settling unless all the undocumented fill is removed and the soil under the building is properly compacted. I really appreciate Dixon's attempt to mitigate the risks but I cannot say how effective they will be. If the city is uncomfortable with the unknown risks for the development then I would suggest that you have Dixon look into it further".

Tim stated that was the last email that was sent by Matt on January 18th, 2019. Dixon stated he spoke with Matt and Mark Christiansen, the person that did the study, and all parties felt good about it. Ed Saunders went over what they discussed in their meeting:

That they will have a minimum of 24 inches of forward excavation and compacted in 8 inch lifts. They will do that under the 4X4 footing to support the main columns of the steel buildings so it would be down 30 inches below the finished grade with the bottom of the footing with an additional 24 inches of over excavation and compacting that back in at 8 inch lifts. This is the minimum recommendation of the soils report.

Tim stated that the soils report actually recommends that for pavements, that is not a foundation recommendation. For foundations it talks about things like micro piles, and which in his experience, the options are to remove undocumented fill and bring in good fill or use a deep foundation system. Tim stated that these are really the only things that would pass the standard of practice for the design of a foundation. Ed mentioned section 5.5 in the soils report, concrete slab on grade construction; which mentioned the same information as he stated before.

Ed Saunders read the following from the soils report:

" As indicated in section 321, at least 25 feet of undocumented fill underlies the side of the proposed building. These fill soil present a high risk of settlement, may provide uneven support for flatwork. In section 521, it is therefore recommended all undocumented fill be removed from below the concrete flatwork. However we understand the removal of all undocumented fill and replacement with properly place compacted structure fill may be cost prohibited. If the owner is willing to accept risks associated with leaving some of the undocumented fill in place, then at a minimum we recommend at least 24 inches of undocumented fill be removed from below the free drain gravel and be replaced with structured fill."

Tim wanted Ed to finish the paragraph so he continued:

"It should be understood that leaving any undocumented fill below the concrete flatwork presents some risk of differential settlement and uneven support which may cause distress of the overlying concrete resulting in cracking and settlement which may become severe. The owner should be made aware of and be willing to accept the risks involved if undocumented fill is left below the concrete."

Tim stated that their job as the Planning Commission is to see from a future owners perspective; it doesn't matter if there is a future owner or not, which expects that the building officials in the city would have things built per standard of practice. Tim felt this does not fit that thought. Dixon stated the entire complex is built on the very same fill and they have not had any issues. They are building storage units, not residential, that nobody occupies. He also stated that they had a compaction test and it passed, but was not asked for a soils report with the current buildings. He also stated that there is no difference between the soil they were on right now and the soil in his complex. Tim asked if he looked at the option of a micro pile type of foundation and stated they are not as expensive as he thinks. Dixon said he did and they

really are expensive and this is basically a steel shed, metal buildings, he is building. Dixon stated that he was told by Matt Hartvigsen that if there was a problem in the future that it there was a way to rectify it and if there was a problem it could be adjusted and that he has substantial rebar going into the slab and that he thinks they have a good plan to hold up the weight of the building. Dixon also stated he thinks he has enough things in place where there will not be a problem and that they have probably over engineered. Tim said from an engineer's point of view he does not think so; this is what he does. Dixon stated that Matt told him he thinks this will work. And that Matt stated his job is to do the optimum, and under optimum conditions if they are going to put in a brick and mortar building it is an entirely different situation.

Todd stated there is inherent risk and that Dixon is willing to accept that risk and wanted to know if that can be documented in the building permit in some way for future owners to be aware. Dixon stated he would have to put it in a disclosure report if it is sold anyway. Dixon gave examples of other disclosures: water in a basement, problems with underground water, sewer issues, etc., that they would have to be stated on a disclosure.

Scott Dixon stated they he thinks they have read the portion regarding slab on grade but there is whole other section, 5.3, that talks about foundations and the bearing of the building that talks about, to Tim's point, micro piles and helical piers. Scott said just so we are aware that what they are reading about slab on grade with just the flat work was a different section than what the soil engineer has addressed.

Todd asked if, after Matt's review of the plan, if he was comfortable with it and is that documented even though there are some inherent risks and if they had that documented somewhere. Tim stated that the email he read was the last documentation from Matt. Tim stated that over excavation is not an option because of the adjacent buildings; the only other option would be a deep foundation system which would be something like a micro pile system and said in his experience they are not that expensive. They are used to shore up houses and residential construction and that he is not talking about bringing in a rig and pounding piles; nothing that invasive. It is the same type of drill rig used for a well. Tim stated that he thinks it's not expecting too much for Dixon to at least investigate that type of a system. Tim stated that Section 5.5 in the soils report is not about foundations, it's about slabs on grade which is not a foundation system and it's not talking about it as a matte foundation. What Dixon is showing is not a mat foundation. Tim said if Dixon was talking about putting the whole building on a mat foundation that is totally different but that is not what he is doing. Section 5.5 is not applicable to what Dixon is showing in the sketch. Tim said is a tough one for him because what Dixon wants to do does not fit within the standard of practice as far as an engineer's perspective.

Tim acknowledged that this type of building is forgiving when it comes to movement and that it is mostly the owner that is at risk but it is hard for him to sign off on something that he knows is not within the standard of practice. Tim said if he is in the minority and the rest of the Planning Commission feels like it's enough that Dixon is willing to take the risk, he can understand that perspective and he is not adamantly opposed to it either.

Scott asked if it would be appropriate to have Gardner Engineering, who prepared the soils report, sign off on the site plan. Todd and Glenn agreed this was a good recommendation. Todd Burton stated that if the engineer had a P.E. license they would have a professional obligation to verify the structural integrity of the design. Scott stated that if they had Matt Hartvigsen sign off it would be accepting some liability on behalf of the city. Tim stated he would not consider the last thing they received from Matt as a sign off on the site plan. Tim wanted to verify that the approval of the site plan contingent upon the approval of an engineer's stamped off drawings of the foundation system. Scott brought up the fact that Gardner Engineer is a civil engineer and they might need to have a structural engineer do the approval. Tim stated it is structural, but a civil P.E. could also do it.

Scott stated that there are similar buildings in the location and he understands the building is a forgiving type building but the slab on grade is going to move and then there will be cracks. But that is an inherent risk that Dixon Pitcher has to take upon himself.

Ed Saunders stated that the other buildings that are adjacent to these were built about two years ago. When he read the section under slab on grade he guessed it was an interpretation on what this building actually is because other than the foundation for the columns of the steel buildings, the remainder of the building is just a slab on grade. He stated that is why he thought under that section of slab on grade that they would meet the criteria of the soils report. The buildings there have the footings similar to this and then it has the thickened slab reinforced with rebar around the perimeter and then a reinforced slab throughout the rest of the building.

Tim stated a lot of these things will have to be approved by Jeff Monroe as well with the building permit. Tim, looking at the site plan, asked about a spread footing in each column and the typical condition between those; and stated there's a frost up issue there as well that needs to be dealt with. Scott stated about him having the 30 inch frost up and Tim stated that was just the column footing not a strip footing. Scott then asked if there was a continuous foundation or if it was just a thickened edge. Ed Saunders stated it has a thickened edge which is the same way all the other buildings were built. Scott then asked if there was any foundation between each column and if the footing would only be at the individual columns.

Tim asked what the offset was between this building and the existing one; Dixon stated three feet. Tim then asked what the depth of that foundation was; Ed Saunders stated that it was just the thickened slab, the same as being proposed here. Darinda Wallis asked if it was just going to be storage units or warehousing, and if there would be businesses ran out of them. Dixon stated they were storage units only, no businesses. Tim stated that was a good clarification because if anyone did business from there that it is not consistent with the site plan.

Tim then asked the Planning Commission if they had any other discussions. Todd stated that they are aware of the issues but, as the Planning Commission, always want to defer to a licensed P.E. for the approval and then the city engineer will document his concurrence before proceeding with an approval. Tim asked Todd if he was opposed to approving it with contingencies or if he wanted to see the engineer's approvals first. Todd asked Dixon if he was on a time constraint. Dixon stated yes, that is why he tried contacting Tim to sit down with him directly to try to resolve some of the issues before the Planning Commission meeting but Tim was tied up. Dixon stated he has no problem with the Commission approving his site plan with the contingencies they want him to do he will get them done. Dixon stated he really didn't have an issue; that if he had problems with the other units, if there had been any cracking or weight load problems with sinking, then it would have been a concern to him. But it is the very same soil and it has worked out well and he has not had a problem. Dixon stated he is willing to accept any risks associated. If there is a problem then, as he was told by Matt, he will have people come in a push up a foundation.

Tim wanted to know as a point of clarification, since Dixon said his other buildings are the same, if they are built with the same system as far as the framing. Dixon stated they are all steel beamed with steel structure. The Commission discussed the contingencies for approval if approved. Tim stated he does not think he could vote for it but Dixon would only need the other three members to vote yes. The contingencies decided upon were: ***1.) the cut behind the building/retaining wall will need to be backfilled and re-vegetated to stabilize the slope meeting the 2:1 slope requirements, 2.) a professional engineer design with a stamp of approval on the building design including the footings and associated structural elements; followed up by the city engineers stamp of approval of those plans, 3.) a disclosure from Dixon Pitcher indicating that he understands the inherent risk proceeding with the development according to this design; to be notarized and a part of the building permit submittal.***

Motion made with the above contingencies by Todd Burton, 2nd by Glenn Woolsey
All in favor, except Tim Petty. Motion passes.

5. **Discussion/Action on Amendment of the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure for the Inclusion of Alternate members** **(recording: 01:02:00)*

Presenter: Tim Petty

Tim stated that this is to address the fact that everyone is busy and the Commission is usually missing at least one person for the meetings if not more. A few months back the meeting did not have a quorum and was cancelled. Tim stated it seems that under article A-1 a second bullet needed to be added stating a certain number of alternates that can be appointed by the Mayor that may be called upon by the Planning Commission Chair. Tim read the Section A-1 which stated:
"Five *Commissioners shall be appointed by the Mayor subject to the advice and consent of the City Council* "

Tim stated that it seems that a second bullet can be added; he stated that they may need to pick a number of alternates appointed by the Mayor that may be called upon by the Planning Commission Chair to fill the quorum. Tim stated there is already a mention of alternates in the next section so they will just need to add that the Mayor can appoint the alternates. He did not think there was anything else that needed to be done with the Rules other than the Mayor can appoint alternates.

Glenn asked who the Mayor would appoint and if it could be a City Council member. Tim stated he does not think it can be a City Council Member; it has to be a separate body. Mayor Gordon Cutler stated that they were advised not to appoint City Council members. He did think about doing that because they would be knowledgeable about what was going on in the city. Gordon spoke with Jeff Monroe and decided that would be a conflict of interest because they would have a vote in the Planning Commission meeting and possibly voting again in the City Council meeting. Glenn Woolsey stated it makes sense but will somehow they need some kind of a process to have the alternates read in for each month so they know what is going on. Gordon stated they will need to make sure they have the minutes and will need to attend the meetings to keep up with what is going on. Darinda Wallis stated that it would basically be a seven member Commission and they would all attend the meetings and step in if needed.

Glenn asked if they would be required to be notified a week in advance if they were required to attend a meeting. Would there be a timeline that would have to be adhered to, three days, four days, or a week? Glenn stated what if nothing is said until the night of the meeting. Gordon stated that was a good point; that the alternate would have to be notified in advance so they will have enough notice and they can get up to speed on the meeting information.

Scott Dixon asked if there was a pool of people in the community that were willing to serve. Gordon stated they do not know yet. Scott deducted that they are not that far in the process yet. Glenn stated there might possibly be several people that were willing to serve. Gordon said they have had discussions and several names were thrown around in the staff meeting; people he thought may be interested and have the skill set to be beneficial to the Commission.

Tim stated one thing that would help is that when the packets are distributed that the alternates would not need the hard copy but at least send them the electronic PDF, even if they will not be attending. Darinda Wallis stated that they need to work as a seven Commission and the alternates be included in everything. Tim stated it would not be able to be called a seven member Commission or they would need four members for a quorum.

Tim the rule right now reads: "***Commissioners and alternates are expected to attend Planning Commission meetings regularly***", so they would be expected to attend regularly.

Greg Johnson asked how long in advance is the current notification when a member will not be able to attend a meeting. Tim stated a day or two. Greg stated that if everyone has the meeting info and is

asked to read it every month they can send questions to the Chair or Vice Chair then all they would need is a day or two notice. Darinda stated that if one of the members knows they are not going to be able to attend that it should be up to that member to call an alternate and brief them on what their thoughts are or what they are thinking. Glenn Woolsey stated he agreed. He gave an example of an alternate having to attend and someone is back on the agenda with a history the alternate can be in the know of their history and what is going on. There was discussion if there was an actual need for the alternates. Scott Dixon stated that they have always had enough members for a quorum except the one time a few months ago. Glenn stated that was the only time it has happened since he has been on the Commission. Scott stated he hopes they are not jumping to a conclusion. Glenn stated he does not think it's a bad idea to have alternates. Tim stated he does not see any harm in having them available if needed. That right now they just need to vote to allow for alternates, and the Mayor has to appoint the alternates. It will not go through the City Council; and it will be an amendment of the Planning Commission's Rules of Procedure.

Tim stated that Section C-2 also needed to be amended to eliminate the one year service requirement for the Planning Commission Chairperson. His first day on the job he was appointed Chairperson. The Commission discussed the number of alternates needed decided two would suffice. Todd asked if there would be two alternates if they will need four for a quorum. Mayor Cutler stated no, it would stay the same, just adding alternates for when they are needed to step in for a meeting.

Todd Burton motioned to amend the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure for the inclusion of two alternates to be appointed by the Mayor to be added to Section A, to strike the one year requirement of service for the Planning Commission Chairperson to be appointed in Section C2, and amend the process of how alternates will be called upon for service. Seconded by Glenn Woolsey.
All in favor, motion passes.
Glenn Woolsey asked if the alternates would need to be sworn in before they can serve and Tim stated yes.

6. **Discussion/Action on the Appointment of a new Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair.** **(recording: 01:13:19)*
Presenter: Tim Petty

Tim stated he has not had to time needed for the Planning Commission; he is stepping down as the Chair. He has a busy year ahead. Tim stated he is planning to come back to the Commission. Glenn stated he appreciates his service and he has been and great Chairperson.

They did not have a full Commission to move forward with the vote; Robert Guiller was excused for the meeting tonight. The vacancy announcement will go out on the city website, the city's Facebook page, in the city newsletter, and posted at City Hall to see if anyone is interested in the position.

Tim stated he asked Robert Guiller if he was interested and he also stated he did not have the time to commit as Chairperson. Tim also made mention of possibly becoming an alternate to stay in the know of things going on in the city.

This item was tabled until there is a full Planning Commission to vote.

Glenn made the motion to table the election of a new Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair until they have a full Commission to vote. Seconded by Todd Burton. All in favor, motion passes.

7. **Commissioner's Responsibility Reports and follow-up from previous meeting.** *(recording: 01:15:15)

- Business Licenses- Catina Germany
    - None

- CUPs – Robert Guiller
    - None
- Commercial Building – Scott Dixon
    - None
- Training – Glen Woolsey
    - None
- Nuisance – Todd Burton
    - None.
- Other – Tim Petty
    - None

Dorinda Wallis said a few kind words to thank Tim Petty for serving as the Planning Commission Chairperson. Mayor Cutler also expressed his appreciation for Tim's service as Planning Commission Chairperson.

8. **Meeting adjourned.** *(recording: 01:21:06)
    - Scott Dixon made a motion to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting for January 22, 2018.
    - Seconded by Glenn Woolsey.
    - All in favor, motion passed.

APPROVED by the Planning Commission this 06 day of February, 2019.

Planning Commission Chair