

**MINUTES OF THE
MIDWAY CITY COUNCIL
(Regular Meeting)**

**Tuesday, 17 August 2021, 6:00 p.m.
Midway Community Center, City Council Chambers
160 West Main Street, Midway, Utah**

Note: Notices/agendas were posted at 7-Eleven, Ridley's Express, the United States Post Office, the Midway City Office Building, and the Midway Community Center. Notices/agendas were provided to the City Council, City Engineer, City Attorney, Planning Director, and The Wasatch Wave. The public notice/agenda was published on the Utah State Public Notice Website and the City's website. A copy of the public notice/agenda is contained in the supplemental file.

1. Call to Order; Pledge of Allegiance; Prayer and/or Inspirational Message

Mayor Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

Members Present:

Celeste Johnson, Mayor
Steve Dougherty, Council Member
Jeff Drury, Council Member
Lisa Orme, Council Member
Kevin Payne, Council Member (Participated
Electronically)
JC Simonsen, Council Member

Staff Present:

Corbin Gordon, Attorney
Michael Henke, Planning Director
Wes Johnson, Engineer
Brad Wilson, Recorder

Note: A copy of the meeting roll is contained in the supplemental file.

Mayor Johnson led the Council and meeting attendees in the pledge of allegiance. Council Member Dougherty gave the prayer and/or inspirational message.

2. Consent Calendar

- a. Agenda for the 17 August 2021 City Council Regular Meeting
- b. Warrants
- c. Minutes of the 3 August 2021 City Council Work Meeting
- d. Minutes of the 3 August 2021 City Council Regular Meeting
- e. Ordinance 2021-28 amending the Midway City Municipal Code regarding Special Event Permit Enforcement
- f. Ordinance 2021-29 amending the Midway City Municipal Code regarding Accessory Structures

Note: Copies of items 2a through 2f are contained in the supplemental file.

Corbin Gordon indicated that a business would be put on probation after the first violation of the special event regulations. He added that the license would automatically be revoked after the second violation.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to approve the consent calendar with the agenda, warrants, minutes of the work and regular meetings, Ordinance 2021-28, and Ordinance 2021-29.

Second: Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Aye
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Council Member Payne abstained from approving items 2c and 2d because he did not attend the meeting.

3. Public Comment – Comments were taken for items not on the agenda.

Mayor Johnson asked if there were any comments from the public for items not on the agenda.

MAG

Jess Bedingfield, Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), reviewed the following items:

- Funding opportunities and resources
- Qualifying for Community Development Block Grants
- Resource flyers

No further comments were offered.

4. Department Reports

Park View / Ceremony

Council Member Dougherty reported that he attended a ceremony for the Park View housing project.

Swiss Days / Volunteer

Council Member Drury reported that Swiss Days would be held that year in a reduced fashion because of the pandemic. He indicated that people could volunteer at the event through justserve.org.

Swiss Days / Parade

Council Member Orme reported that she was in charge of the Swiss Days parade. She encouraged people to participate in the parade.

New Zamboni

Council Member Drury reported that a new Zamboni for the ice rink would arrive the following week.

Water / Town Hall Meeting

Council Member Dougherty reported that a town hall meeting was held regarding water. He said that a video of the meeting was available on the City's Facebook page.

PI System / Restrictions

Council Member Dougherty reported that restrictions were still in place for the use of the pressurized irrigation (PI) system.

HL&P / Outages

Council Member Dougherty reported that Heber Light & Power recently had several outages.

Souvenir Shop / Success

Council Member Dougherty reported that the City's new souvenir shop, called Midway Must Haves, was successful.

Rising Ranch / Combination of Lots

Michael Henke reported that the developer wanted to combine two lots in the Rising Ranch Subdivision. Council Member Dougherty was concerned about the driveways for the lots. He preferred that the lots be accessed from Homestead Drive. He recommended that the request be a formal agenda item at the next council meeting.

Note: A copy of Mr. Henke's presentation is contained in the supplemental file.

September 11th / Service Projects

Mayor Johnson indicated that service projects would be performed to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks. She asked for ideas for projects.

5. Parks, Trails, and Trees Committee / Update (Rob Bouwhuis – Approximately 15 minutes)
– Receive an update from the Midway City Parks, Trails, and Trees Advisory Committee.

Rob Bouwhuis, chair of the Midway City Parks, Trails, and Trees Advisory Committee, gave a presentation on the Committee's work and specifically addressed the following items:

- Committee members
- Purpose
- Focus on activity and safety
- Subcommittees
- Trails
- Trails map and brochure
- Trails maintenance plan
- Parks and trails survey
- Parks
- Community input
- Michie Lane Park
- Alpenhof Park
- The dog park
- Park maintenance standards and plan
- Trees
- Tree list for trails
- Participation in revising the General Plan
- Trails event on September 25th
- Budgeting

Note: A copy of Mr. Bouwhuis' presentation is contained in the supplemental file.

The Council agreed that the Committee should report to it annually.

6. Ordinance 2021-30 / Development Moratorium (City Planner – Approximately 60 minutes)
– Discuss and possibly adopt Ordinance 2021-30 enacting a temporary land use ordinance (development moratorium) in Midway City.

Michael Henke gave a presentation regarding the proposed ordinance and reviewed the

following items:

- Overview
- Proposed code changes
- What would be affected
- What would not be affected
- Possible findings
- Proposed language

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- Midway was inundated with development.
- Staff needed time to revise the General Plan.
- Lot consolidations would be allowed during the moratorium.
- Building permits would not be affected.
- The moratorium was not related to water.
- Currently he spent about 50% of his time working on development applications and 5% on code amendments.

Note: A copy of Mr. Henke's presentation is contained in the supplemental file.

Wes Johnson asked if the agreement for The Highlands at Soldier Hollow, which included upsizing its proposed well, should be included in the moratorium. Council Member Dougherty responded that it should be exempted.

Council Member Dougherty made the following comments:

- The City was simply patching holes in its Code because of so much development.
- Rural preservation and density reduction subdivisions should be prohibited during the moratorium.
- Development on Main Street included a lot of conditional uses, which took a lot of time.
- The City should incentivize affordable housing instead of large houses.
- Allowing plat map amendments and conditional uses could include a lot of potential requests.
- The moratorium was not about water.

Council Member Payne made the following comments:

- Affordable housing should be addressed.
- Large houses on large lots were different from large houses on small lots.
- Rural preservation and density reduction subdivisions should not be prohibited during the moratorium.
- A moratorium would allow staff to get caught up and focus on needed issues.
- There were a lot of things in the Code that did not reflect the General Plan.

Council Member Simonsen made the following comments:

- There were advantages and disadvantages to prohibiting conditional uses during the

moratorium.

Council Member Orme made the following comments:

- A moratorium was a significant issue.
- Worried that no notice was given for the proposal.
- Was uncomfortable with the timing and how quickly it had been proposed.

Council Member Drury made the following comments:

- For several years he had requested a couple of code changes that had not been put on an agenda.
- Staff's workload was preventing code changes.
- Developers would survive a six-month moratorium.
- The City Planner recommended the moratorium.

Mayor Johnson made the following comments:

- An additional staff member had helped the Planning Department.
- Received many requests for a development moratorium.
- Moratoriums had been done in the past.
- A lot of development applications would have been submitted if more notice had been given of the proposed moratorium. This would have defeated the purpose.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to approve Ordinance 2021-30.

Second: Council Member Payne seconded the motion.

Discussion: Council Member Dougherty asked if Council Member Drury wanted to remove any of the exceptions. Council Member Drury responded that those items took minimal time and should be exempted.

Wes Johnson asked if a will-serve letter for The Highlands at Soldier Hollow should be exempted. Council Member Drury asked if a single request could be excluded. Corbin Gordon responded that all will-serve letters should be excluded.

Council Member Dougherty noted that will-serve letters were discretionary and any of them could be tabled by the Council until after the moratorium. Council Member Drury was uncomfortable changing the proposal to accommodate a single project. Council Member Dougherty worried that the developer would abandon drilling a well and go back to wells for each lot.

Amended Motion: Council Member Drury moved to approve Ordinance 2021-30 with will-serve letters exempted because they were discretionary.

Second: Council Member Payne seconded the amended motion.

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Dougherty Aye

Council Member Drury	Aye
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Motion: Without objection, Mayor Johnson recessed the meeting at 7:38 p.m. She reconvened the meeting at 7:47 p.m.

7. Ordinance 2021-16 / Zone Map Amendment (Midway Heritage Development – Approximately 90 minutes) – Discuss and possibly adopt Ordinance 2021-16 amending the Midway City Land Use Map as it relates to the proposed Village development located at 535 East Main Street (Zoning is R-1-11 and R-1-22). Recommended with conditions by the Midway City Planning Commission.

Michael Henke gave a presentation regarding the request and reviewed the following items:

- Proposed zone map amendment
- Location of the proposed development
- Area proposed for rezone
- Zoning map
- Approved concept plan
- Rezone concept plan number one
- Rezone concept plan number two
- Significant differences between the two rezone concept plans.
- General Plan
- Planning commission motion
- Possible findings
- Proposed conditions

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- A new concept plan for the project was discussed in that evening's work meeting.
- The City could not stop someone from applying for a theater in the proposal but it would require code text and master plan amendments. No plan had been submitted that included a theater.
- The residential development in the project could not have commercial uses except home offices.
- The zone change would be void if the auto repair business and storage sheds were not purchased and the property included in the project.
- The approved concept plan would guarantee the amount of open space. The zone change could also be conditioned on providing a certain amount of open space.
- The road just to the east of the proposal was only a commercial driveway.

Note: A copy of Mr. Henke's presentation is contained in the supplemental file.

The Council, staff and meeting attendees discussed the following items:

- Any motion of approval should include the parcel ID number for the auto repair business and storage sheds.
- The zone change should be contingent upon the master plan amendment and not a plat map.
- Both sides had reasons to negotiate in good faith.
- The original plan, which met the current zoning, should not be built.
- The original plan would be abandoned with the master plan amendment.
- The commercial zones were some of the least restrictive in the City.
- The master plan agreement could specify what would and would not be allowed in the rezoned area.
- The five-year sunset clause was a concern because a new owner could wait for it to end. Should the term be longer?
- The zone change could be conditioned upon the original plan being abandoned. If the project failed, then the property owner could apply under the unchanged zoning.
- The previous master plan would also be voided when the revised plan was approved.
- The zone change and master plan approvals were discretionary but preliminary and final approvals were not.
- There could not be multiple applications for the same property.
- It would be wise to have a street that would connect to the road coming out of the Whitaker Farm Subdivision. The City could only require an easement if the street was not on its roads plan. The road from the Whitaker Farm Subdivision was planned to be further to the east near the Hamlet Park.
- The Wasatch County Fire District would only allow the west access to be removed if the east access, to the road from the Whitaker Farm Subdivision, was built.
- The exact location of the easement could be determined later.
- Should other uses allowed in the C-2 zone, such as gas stations and car washes, be specifically prohibited from the project? Some uses like residential treatment facilities could not be prohibited. If a use was not prohibited, then was it allowed by default?
- Allowing transient rentals throughout the project would help the City retain the resort communities tax.
- The Municipal Code indicated that the transient rental overlay district (TR-OD) was included in the commercial zones. The TR-OD map should be amended if the Council wanted to include transient rentals in the project. The applicant should be the one to request the change.
- The zone change was the time to solidify any restrictions.
- A car wash could be included in one of the commercial buildings.
- Twenty residential units per acre was too high for the commercial zones.
- The development should be done right because it was on the last large parcel of property on Main Street.
- Any approval should specify the number of allowed commercial buildings.
- There should be flexibility for architecture.
- Breaks in the commercial buildings should be allowed.
- Any approval should specify that the setbacks were based on the concept plan.

Paul Berg, Berg Engineering Resource Group and representing the applicant, made the following comments:

- The zone change had to be approved for preliminary and final approval to be granted for each phase of the proposal.

- The concept plan prevented accessory buildings.

Dan Luster, applicant, made the following comments:

- He could not revert to the original plan once the master plan amendment was approved.
- Did not care about the sunset clause or its length. He had no incentive to wait for it to end.
- Did not want the City to back out of the project.
- There would be grass on the roof of the underground parking.
- The lots that were near the easement, to connect to the road coming from the Whitaker Farm Subdivision, were the most valuable because they were isolated from through traffic. This road would also reduce the amount of open space.
- The reason for the zone change was to spread out the density.
- The conditions of the rezone should only apply to the property being rezoned. Including the property already zoned commercial complicated the process.
- The total square footage for commercial should be specified rather than the number of buildings. This would allow flexibility.
- Would need to add additional commercial space if the code text amendment regarding garages was not approved.

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to approve Ordinance 2021-16, zone map amendment request, with the following findings and conditions:

- The proposal was a legislative matter, and the City had broad discretion.
- The proposal would require open space to be left along Main Street.
- Density would be reduced by 13 residential units if the property was rezoned.
- The property containing the storage units and automotive shop would be included in the proposal and would become open space.
- All code requirements would need to be satisfied and would be reviewed in detail with the master plan approval and preliminary and final approvals for each phase.
- Some neighboring properties would be more impacted with the proposed zone change than with the approved concept plan.
- The City Council could require conditions on the proposed zone change that would be listed specifically in the master plan agreement.
- The amendment to the Land Use Map was not official until a master plan agreement was signed and recorded by the applicant and the City.
- The concept plan, recorded with the master plan, was the only development that could occur on the property and the layout would be substantially similar to the approved concept plan.
- The density of the development was limited to 143 residential units.
- The minimum setbacks would correspond with what was shown on the concept plan included as Exhibit 5 (Proposed Rezone Concept Plan (August 17)) in the supplemental file for the meeting.
- Adjustments could be made if all parties agreed.
- The automotive shop and other buildings on Parcel 00-0006-6261 would be included in the master plan application as open space.
- Acknowledged that the first application would have to be withdrawn so that the second application could be approved.
- All commercial uses except Home Occupation Businesses, as defined in the City Code,

would be located only in the buildings designated as commercial on the revised concept plan.

- Both the Developer and the City agreed that gas stations and car washes were not compatible with the design and were no longer permitted uses with the acceptance of the agreement.
- A maximum of 20% of the residential units would have direct driveway access to a public road with the garage facing a public road.
- The developer would negotiate with the City to provide a road access easement near the northeast corner of the development shown as open space.
- The area proposed as open space, as currently defined in the City Code, would be no less than 8.32 acres less the width of the road access easement.
- Any large buildings on Main Street would have architectural and landscaping design elements to reduce noise reflection as reviewed by the Vision Architecture Committee and City Architect.
- The TR-OD line would remain as drawn on the map prior to this motion. The TR-OD would no longer encompass all of the commercial zones.
- If any portion or all of a unit was in the rezoned area, then it could not be a transient rental.

Discussion: Council Member Simonsen noted that his motion did not include proposed condition number six, which required that the master plan be recorded within five years of approval of the zone map amendment. He said that proposed condition number one, stating that the change was not official until the master plan agreement was recorded, addressed the issue.

Amaria Scovil said that the current situation was caused by a previous conditional zone change not reverting when a commercial project was not built. Council Member Simonsen emphasized that the zone change would be dependent upon completion of the master plan

Dan Luster preferred that the zoning revert to C-2 and residential if the process was unsuccessful. Council Member Dougherty emphasized that the zoning would only change to commercial if the master plan process was successful.

Council Member Drury thought that removing the proposed condition number six would allow the zone to remain commercial without the conditions in the motion. Council Member Simonsen responded that no one wanted the residential portion of the project to be commercial if the master plan was not approved. Corbin Gordon explained that the zone change occurred only when the master plan agreement was recorded. He added that the master plan agreement should not expire.

Ms. Scovil reiterated that a previous conditional zone change, for the property, had not reverted when the commercial project failed. Council Member Simonsen responded that the City did not want to repeat that type of mistake. Council Member Orme emphasized that if anyone bought the property they had to abide by the agreement.

Mr. Gordon stated that the City did not want to orphan the property and it should be tied to the approved plan in perpetuity. He thought this would address the concern of a different person developing the property. Council Member Simonsen added that any development would be at least as good or better than the approved plan.

Ms. Scovil asked if someone could purchase the property and still put one large house on the area currently zoned residential. Mr. Gordon responded that would be possible if all parties

agreed to change the agreement. Council Member Payne noted that a request to change an agreement for The Reserve at Midway was denied by the Council.

Cheryl Whiting was concerned that a future mayor and council could change the agreement and allow whatever they wanted on the property.

Council Member Drury asked if there was any harm in including proposed condition number six in the motion. Council Member Simonsen indicated that the plan had less than the maximum allowed density. He emphasized that only the agreement allowed most of the property to be rezoned commercial. Mr. Gordon used the Homestead Resort as an example of a master plan agreement that was binding on a property. Mr. Gordon acknowledged that a future council could change a master plan agreement.

Council Member Dougherty indicated that city staff told the developer that a zone change was needed. He noted that it avoided creating a new zone with all the additional code text.

Ms. Scovil stated that the zone for the property had previously been changed without noticing the neighbors. Michael Henke responded that the State Code now required that neighbors be noticed.

Council Member Orme did not like the plan that met the current requirements of the Municipal Code. She said that the zone map amendment would allow a better project.

Launa Nielson asked that any agreement be concrete.

Council Member Orme asked what was wrong with the proposed condition number six. Council Member Simonsen responded that it could jeopardize the most recent plan and enable something less desirable. Council Member Dougherty and Council Member Payne agreed. Council Member Dougherty stated that he wanted the agreement to be in force in perpetuity.

Mr. Luster said that he was willing to grant an access easement, on the northeast side of the project, only if the City did not require the access road on the northwest side. Council Member Simonsen responded that connectivity and the northeast access would reduce the traffic burden. He doubted that the Wasatch Fire District would approve the project without an access on the north. Mr. Luster said that he would not sign an agreement if both the northwest access and the northeast easement were required.

Mr. Henke indicated that three points of access were needed because two points were both on Main Street and so close. He also indicated that it would be more difficult to build a road on the northeast instead of the northwest.

Council Member Payne suggested requiring three or four points of access that would be finalized with the Fire District. Mr. Luster responded that it was unfair to require another road at that point in the process. He said that the units on the northeast were the most valuable because they were not near a through road. He said the option could be noted but should not be a condition of approval.

Council Member Drury pointed out that the item could be tabled to resolve the various issues. Mr. Luster responded that his primary concern was delaying approval. He noted that it had been a month since the public hearing. Council Member Dougherty did not support tabling the item.

Council Member Simonsen explained that he was looking at the big picture including road

connectivity, but he would not condition approval on the northeast access. He added that Mr. Luster was still willing to discuss it.

Revised Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to approve Ordinance 2021-16, zone map amendment request, with the following findings and conditions:

- The proposal was a legislative matter, and the City had broad discretion.
- The proposal would require open space to be left along Main Street.
- Density would be reduced by 13 residential units if the property was rezoned.
- The property containing the storage units and automotive shop would be included in the proposal and would become open space.
- All code requirements would need to be satisfied and would be reviewed in detail with the master plan approval and preliminary and final approvals for each phase.
- Some neighboring properties would be more impacted with the proposed zone change than with the approved concept plan.
- The City Council could require conditions on the proposed zone change that would be listed specifically in the master plan agreement.
- The amendment to the Land Use Map was not official until a master plan agreement was signed and recorded by the applicant and the City.
- The concept plan, recorded with the master plan, was the only development that could occur on the property and the layout would be substantially similar to the approved concept plan.
- The density of the development was limited to 143 residential units.
- The minimum setbacks would correspond with what was shown on the concept plan included as Exhibit 5 (Proposed Rezone Concept Plan (August 17)) in the supplemental file for the meeting.
- Adjustments could be made if all parties agreed.
- The automotive shop and other buildings on Parcel 00-0006-6261 would be included in the master plan application as open space.
- Acknowledged that the first application would have to be withdrawn so that the second application could be approved.
- All commercial uses except Home Occupation Businesses, as defined in the City Code, would be located only in the buildings designated as commercial on the revised concept plan.
- Both the Developer and the City agreed that gas stations and car washes were not compatible with the design and were no longer permitted uses with the acceptance of the agreement.
- A maximum of 20% of the residential units would have direct driveway access to a public road with the garage facing a public road.
- The area proposed as open space, as currently defined in the City Code, would be no less than 8.32 acres.
- Any large buildings on Main Street would have architectural and landscaping design elements to reduce noise reflection as reviewed by the Vision Architecture Committee and City Architect.
- The TR-OD line would remain as drawn on the map prior to this motion. The TR-OD would no longer encompass all of the commercial zones.
- If any portion or all of a unit was in the rezoned area, then it could not be a transient rental.

Second: Council Member Dougherty seconded the motion.

Note: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Nay
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Mayor Johnson asked that a copy of the motion be provided to the Council and staff within two days. Council Member Dougherty asked that staff prepare the master plan agreement as soon as possible.

8. Ordinance 2021-21 / Parking Violations (City Attorney – Approximately 30 minutes) – Discuss and possibly adopt Ordinance 2021-21 amending the Midway City Municipal Code regarding parking violations.

Corbin Gordon presented the proposed ordinance and reviewed civil infractions. He made the following comments:

- There would be a discount if the violation was paid within a certain amount of time.
- If the infraction was not paid then it would become a criminal violation and sent to the justice court.
- An infraction could be appealed to the administrative law judge.
- How long should someone be allowed to park on a street before it was an infraction? Currently it was 72 hours.
- Did the Council approve of the amounts for the fines?
- Usually, it was a neighbor who called on a resident overparking their vehicle.

Note: A copy of Mr. Henke's presentation is contained in the supplemental file.

The Council, staff and meeting attendees discussed the following items:

- Parking on a public trail should be a violation.
- Was 72 hours too short of time to hold a hearing on a towed vehicle? Should this be three days in which the City was open for business? It should be 24 to 48 hours.
- Were four infractions too many before something became a criminal violation?
- Vehicles parked on Main Street for sale was a problem.
- The ordinance should allow hearings to be held electronically.
- The City would pay back any fine that it lost on appeal.
- The Sheriff's Department rotated who it called to tow vehicles.
- Residents would become upset if they were being fined for parking in front of their house.
- The proposal should not empower neighbors to harass someone.
- The City would determine how the proposal would be enforced.
- A former code enforcement officer was willing to help the City with the issue.

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to approve Ordinance 2021-21 as presented with the following findings and conditions:

- The City needed to have a process to handle parking violations and work with the Sheriff's Department regarding those violations.
- Section 8.02.010(1) should prohibit parking on or over a trail.
- Section 5.07.080(5) should change the 72 hours to three City business days. It should also state that the hearing could be held by electronic means as needed.

Second: Council Member Payne seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Aye
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to continue conducting business for the closed meeting.

Second: Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Aye
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

9. Closed Meeting to Discuss the Purchase, Exchange, or Lease of Real Property

Motion: Council Member Orme moved to go into a closed meeting.

Second: Council Member Simonsen seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
--------------------------	-----

Council Member Drury	Aye
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Note: Closed meeting minutes are sealed and strictly confidential. Access to such minutes must be obtained through a court of law.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to go out of the closed meeting.

Second: Council Member Dougherty seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Aye
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

10. Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Orme seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:04 p.m.



Celeste Johnson, Mayor



Brad Wilson, Recorder