

Report Criteria:
Detail report.
Paid and unpaid invoices included.

Vendor	Vendor Name	Invoice Number	Description	Invoice Date	Net Invoice Amount	Amount Paid	Date Paid	Voided
007 MARKETING								
2751	007 MARKETING	14450	Marketing	05/27/2022	200.96	.00		
Total 007 MARKETING:					200.96	.00		
ALSCO / AMERICAN LINEN								
1429	ALSCO / AMERICAN LINEN	LSAL2611455	SUPPLIES	06/06/2022	34.08	.00		
Total ALSCO / AMERICAN LINEN:					34.08	.00		
APPLIED DIVING SERVICES INC								
2729	APPLIED DIVING SERVICES INC	F-22-113	DIVE TEAM CLEANINGS OF TA	05/13/2022	5,750.00	.00		
Total APPLIED DIVING SERVICES INC:					5,750.00	.00		
BANKCARD CENTER								
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	CamilleNH	06/02/2022	44.42	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Flowers Huffaker	06/02/2022	63.50	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Founder Day	06/02/2022	55.77	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Adobe	06/02/2022	14.99	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Evie/Mayor	06/02/2022	140.78	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Acrylic Sign	06/02/2022	27.68	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Park Resign	06/02/2022	31.12	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Founder	06/02/2022	200.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Founder	06/02/2022	85.97	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Janitorial	06/02/2022	22.16	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	CC Budget	06/02/2022	47.79	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Open Enrollment	06/02/2022	37.41	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Open Enrollment	06/02/2022	26.23	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CC 5923 6/2/2	Adobe	06/02/2022	14.99	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CL 5219 6/2/22	Subscription	06/02/2022	357.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CL 5219 6/2/22	CL	06/02/2022	645.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	CL 5219 6/2/22	JH	06/02/2022	645.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Ink Postage	06/02/2022	80.74	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Adobe	06/02/2022	26.86	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	UAPT Board Meeting	06/02/2022	40.60	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Payroll	06/02/2022	530.10	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	CC Meal	06/02/2022	97.66	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Membership	06/02/2022	50.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Founder	06/02/2022	36.24	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Founder Day	06/02/2022	35.91	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Postcard	06/02/2022	70.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Postcard	06/02/2022	195.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	JS 6014 6/2/22	Postcard	06/02/2022	48.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Cleaning	06/02/2022	88.48	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Cleaning	06/02/2022	76.24	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Cleaning	06/02/2022	5.26	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Food Reimbursement	06/02/2022	33.89	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Founder	06/02/2022	19.21	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Coolers	06/02/2022	152.45	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	J. Horrocks	06/02/2022	150.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	K.Webb	06/02/2022	150.00	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Water	06/02/2022	71.89	.00		

Vendor	Vendor Name	Invoice Number	Description	Invoice Date	Net Invoice Amount	Amount Paid	Date Paid	Voided
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Microsoft	06/02/2022	268.11	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Shirts	06/02/2022	28.94	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Founder Day	06/02/2022	120.84	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Founder Day	06/02/2022	339.60	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	RSO 2061 6/2/	Founder Day	06/02/2022	95.17	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	TT 2512 6/2/22	Go Daddy	06/02/2022	21.78	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	TT 2512 6/2/22	Cal not Dock	06/02/2022	120.41	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	TT 2512 6/2/22	Amazon	06/02/2022	213.91	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	TT 2512 6/2/22	Amazon	06/02/2022	55.84	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	TT 2512 6/2/22	Unipak	06/02/2022	235.17	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	TT 2512 6/2/22	Banners	06/02/2022	8.50	.00		
1989	BANKCARD CENTER	TT 2512 6/2/22	Copies/Tourism	06/02/2022	38.30	.00		
Total BANKCARD CENTER:					5,964.91	.00		
Blue Stakes of Utah 811								
200	Blue Stakes of Utah 811	UT202201291	BILLABLE E-MAIL NOTIFICATIO	05/31/2022	104.65	.00		
Total Blue Stakes of Utah 811:					104.65	.00		
BUILDING RENTAL DEPOSIT REFUNDS								
2479	BUILDING RENTAL DEPOSIT RE	06062022	Canceled Rental of Town Hall	06/06/2022	425.00	.00		
Total BUILDING RENTAL DEPOSIT REFUNDS:					425.00	.00		
CASELLE INC								
270	CASELLE INC	117233	Contract Suppoert and Mainetenc	06/01/2022	358.27	.00		
Total CASELLE INC:					358.27	.00		
Celeste Johnson								
2709	Celeste Johnson	06072022	Reimburse Celeste - City Council	06/07/2022	22.64	.00		
Total Celeste Johnson:					22.64	.00		
CHEMTECH-FORD LABORATORIES								
2147	CHEMTECH-FORD LABORATOR	22F0004	colilert AP	06/02/2022	150.00	.00		
Total CHEMTECH-FORD LABORATORIES:					150.00	.00		
COLONIAL FLAG & SPECIALTY CO								
305	COLONIAL FLAG & SPECIALTY	0269756-IN	Administrative Bldg Rotations	05/27/2022	112.00	.00		
305	COLONIAL FLAG & SPECIALTY	0269760-IN	Town Hall Rotations	05/27/2022	45.00	.00		
305	COLONIAL FLAG & SPECIALTY	0269761-IN	Cemetery Flag Rotations	05/27/2022	285.00	.00		
305	COLONIAL FLAG & SPECIALTY	0269764-IN	Hamlet Park Rotations	05/27/2022	112.00	.00		
Total COLONIAL FLAG & SPECIALTY CO:					554.00	.00		
DITCH WITCH OF THE ROCKIES LLC								
2220	DITCH WITCH OF THE ROCKIE	P27201	Parts	04/20/2022	158.08	.00		
2220	DITCH WITCH OF THE ROCKIE	P27250	Parts	04/25/2022	502.20	.00		
Total DITCH WITCH OF THE ROCKIES LLC:					660.28	.00		
DJB GAS SERVICES, INC								
2979	DJB GAS SERVICES, INC	01358848	Marketing	05/31/2022	13.84	.00		

Vendor	Vendor Name	Invoice Number	Description	Invoice Date	Net Invoice Amount	Amount Paid	Date Paid	Voided
Total DJB GAS SERVICES, INC:					13.84	.00		
Executech Utah, Inc.								
2614	Executech Utah, Inc.	EXEC-118960	IT Services	06/01/2022	1,473.00	.00		
2614	Executech Utah, Inc.	EXEC-119557	Non-Agreement or Overage Hour	05/31/2022	1,124.55	.00		
Total Executech Utah, Inc.:					2,597.55	.00		
FINAL COMPLETION DEPOSIT								
2418	FINAL COMPLETION DEPOSIT	FCD 21-215	21-215 FINAL COMPLETION DE	06/13/2022	3,000.00	.00		
Total FINAL COMPLETION DEPOSIT:					3,000.00	.00		
FUEL NETWORK								
2821	FUEL NETWORK	F2211E00910	Fuel Billing	06/03/2022	3,961.90	.00		
Total FUEL NETWORK:					3,961.90	.00		
HEBER LIGHT & POWER								
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153001 5/22	1100 Snake Creek RD - Gerber W	05/31/2022	88.49	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153002 5/22	18153002 75 N 100 W - City Offic	05/31/2022	403.63	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153003 5/22	18153003 Centerey FG PL Light	05/31/2022	186.36	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153004 5/22	18153004 Cottage 3 Pump	05/31/2022	1,478.99	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153006 5/22	18153006 Maintenance Shop	05/31/2022	256.94	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153007 5/22	18153007 City Park	05/31/2022	70.52	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153008 5/22	18153008 Townhall	05/31/2022	495.31	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153009 5/22	18153009 Ice Rink TS Lights	05/31/2022	202.32	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153010 5/22	18153010 Ice Rink Chiller	05/31/2022	363.02	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153012 5/22	18153012 River Road Round a B	05/31/2022	16.30	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153013 5/22	18153013 Community Center	05/31/2022	197.55	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153014 5/22	18153014 BurgiHill Park	05/31/2022	15.09	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153015 5/22	18153015 Centennial Park	05/31/2022	17.50	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153016 5/22	18153016 Ball Park Lights	05/31/2022	14.84	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153017 5/22	18153017 Swiss Days/Ice Rink Tr	05/31/2022	14.84	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153018 5/22	18153018 Alpinhof Tank	05/31/2022	14.73	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153019 5/22	18153019 Town Square Shelter	05/31/2022	324.59	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153021 5/22	18153021 1100 N Interlaken Way	05/31/2022	99.29	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153022 5/22	18153022 1449 N Pine Canyon R	05/31/2022	88.93	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153033 5/22	18153033 Pedestal for Swiss Day	05/31/2022	19.05	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153034 5/22	18153034 Alpenhof Well House	05/31/2022	1,349.75	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153035 5/22	18153035 280 E 900 S	05/31/2022	192.16	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153036 5/22	18153036 250 E Michi LN-Park S	05/31/2022	14.00	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153040 5/22	18153040 300 S 300 E SPRINKL	05/31/2022	15.85	.00		
1421	HEBER LIGHT & POWER	18153041 5/22	18153041 350 S 300 E SPRINKL	05/31/2022	15.93	.00		
Total HEBER LIGHT & POWER:					5,955.98	.00		
HOME DEPOT Credit Services								
1150	HOME DEPOT Credit Services	4192122	M18 Fuel Quik-Lok 10 IN Pole	05/13/2022	292.40	.00		
1150	HOME DEPOT Credit Services	53022	Finance Charge	05/30/2022	37.27	.00		
1150	HOME DEPOT Credit Services	5490234	Supplies	05/12/2022	321.43	.00		
1150	HOME DEPOT Credit Services	5504958	M18 Fuel 3 FT Extension	05/12/2022	74.18	.00		
Total HOME DEPOT Credit Services:					725.28	.00		

Vendor	Vendor Name	Invoice Number	Description	Invoice Date	Net Invoice Amount	Amount Paid	Date Paid	Voided
JIVE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.								
2804	JIVE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	IN7101169847	MONTHLY BILL	06/01/2022	604.90	.00		
Total JIVE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.:					604.90	.00		
Kesko Electric Solutions, LLC								
2928	Kesko Electric Solutions, LLC	110502	PUBLIC WORKS BULDING-ELE	03/29/2022	541.00	.00		
Total Kesko Electric Solutions, LLC:					541.00	.00		
KW ROBINSON CONSTRUCTION, INC.								
1931	KW ROBINSON CONSTRUCTIO	06142022	RIVER ROAD-60 S to 300 N Proj	06/14/2022	190,840.75	.00		
Total KW ROBINSON CONSTRUCTION, INC.:					190,840.75	.00		
LEE'S MARKETPLACE								
2957	LEE'S MARKETPLACE	41776	Parks- for Spraying	06/09/2022	38.01	.00		
2957	LEE'S MARKETPLACE	82-1209723	Donuts Assorted	05/23/2022	19.98	.00		
Total LEE'S MARKETPLACE:					57.99	.00		
LIBBIES BRACELETS DBA								
2975	LIBBIES BRACELETS DBA	201	Tila Bracelet, Adult	05/26/2022	200.00	.00		
Total LIBBIES BRACELETS DBA:					200.00	.00		
MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMPANY								
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104633375.0	SUpport	04/22/2022	2,200.00	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104634632.0	2 PVC S80 BLIND FLANGE-FILT	06/09/2022	1,435.74	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104635996.0	NIPPLE WELDED 12	06/08/2022	414.40	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104642755.0	WATER Meter Pits	04/25/2022	1,636.10	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104673371.0	Hamlet	06/03/2022	179.10	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104679610.0	PARK STRIPS	05/31/2022	463.84	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104704353.0	PARK STRIPS	06/03/2022	494.86	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104709243.0	Stock	05/31/2022	178.73	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104719606.0	SENSUS REPAIR-COMMANDLIN	06/08/2022	75.00	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104723568.0	WATER	06/06/2022	4,397.40	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104723568.0	WATER	06/06/2022	372.04	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104723568.0	Water	06/06/2022	189.06	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104730908.0	PARK STRIPS	06/07/2022	420.74	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104733916.0	PARK STRIPS	06/08/2022	86.81	.00		
845	MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMP	S104736457.0	MICHIE PARK	06/09/2022	202.06	.00		
Total MOUNTAINLAND SUPPLY COMPANY:					12,745.88	.00		
ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LLC								
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	244480959002	PAD, PERF,8.5X11, OD, LGL, RL	05/31/2022	29.05	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	246635313001	Markers	05/31/2022	8.21	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	246635313001	LGL Pad	05/31/2022	27.97	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	24746410200	Wood Coat Rack	05/27/2022	41.57	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	247464577001	Paper	05/26/2022	273.04	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	247464577001	Ink, HP, Tri-Color	05/26/2022	16.72	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	247464577001	STAMP	05/26/2022	3.74	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	247464583001	3FT USB 3.0 Superspeed Device	05/25/2022	10.88	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	248919441001	Binder	06/10/2022	10.62	.00		
875	ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LL	248919441001	Stamp	06/10/2022	6.31	.00		

Vendor	Vendor Name	Invoice Number	Description	Invoice Date	Net Invoice Amount	Amount Paid	Date Paid	Voided
Total ODP BUSINESS SOLUTIONS LLC:					428.11	.00		
O'REILLY AUTO PARTS								
2215	O'REILLY AUTO PARTS	3664-226607	5Galhydroil	06/06/2022	66.99	.00		
2215	O'REILLY AUTO PARTS	3664-228354	Strobe Kit	06/13/2022	189.99	.00		
Total O'REILLY AUTO PARTS:					256.98	.00		
PEAK ALARM CO, INC								
2244	PEAK ALARM CO, INC	1183393 LT FE	Late fee	05/12/2022	4.95	.00		
Total PEAK ALARM CO, INC:					4.95	.00		
PEPPERLANE PRODUCTS								
2904	PEPPERLANE PRODUCTS	11557	ASSORTED JELLY	05/26/2022	51.00	.00		
Total PEPPERLANE PRODUCTS:					51.00	.00		
POINT S								
2164	POINT S	0199970	Tires	06/13/2022	1,116.86	.00		
Total POINT S:					1,116.86	.00		
PUBLIC FACILITIES DEPOSIT								
2421	PUBLIC FACILITIES DEPOSIT	21-168 PFD-	21-168 PUBLIC FACILITIES DEP	05/23/2022	1,750.00	1,750.00	06/07/2022	
Total PUBLIC FACILITIES DEPOSIT:					1,750.00	1,750.00		
RIDLEY'S FAMILY MARKETS								
2377	RIDLEY'S FAMILY MARKETS	C0201	Ice for water bottle coolers/Found	06/04/2022	26.28	.00		
Total RIDLEY'S FAMILY MARKETS:					26.28	.00		
Robert Duncan Studios								
2823	Robert Duncan Studios	67335	Assortment of Cards	05/25/2022	45.00	.00		
Total Robert Duncan Studios:					45.00	.00		
SMITH & EDWARDS WEST JORDAN								
2961	SMITH & EDWARDS WEST JOR	229276	Clothing for Shane	05/28/2022	133.80	.00		
Total SMITH & EDWARDS WEST JORDAN:					133.80	.00		
STANDARD PLUMBING SUPPLY CO.								
1045	STANDARD PLUMBING SUPPLY	QJD519	CMP TEE/XERIMAN TOOL/GPH	05/31/2022	31.40	.00		
1045	STANDARD PLUMBING SUPPLY	QJRL09	GPH DRIPPER-OFFICE	06/06/2022	17.49	.00		
1045	STANDARD PLUMBING SUPPLY	QJVM24	SUPER CONC ROUNDUP-STRE	06/07/2022	122.00	.00		
1045	STANDARD PLUMBING SUPPLY	QKKY32	BXB COUPLING-PARK STRIP	06/13/2022	19.00	.00		
1045	STANDARD PLUMBING SUPPLY	QKL475	SHADE CELLS-DOG PARK	06/13/2022	33.90	.00		
Total STANDARD PLUMBING SUPPLY CO.:					223.79	.00		
TIMBERLINE ACE HARDWARE								
1170	TIMBERLINE ACE HARDWARE	152845	PARKS	05/31/2022	428.40	.00		
1170	TIMBERLINE ACE HARDWARE	152853	LEADER HOSE 6"	05/31/2022	9.99	.00		
1170	TIMBERLINE ACE HARDWARE	152862	ACE DIGITAL WTR TIMR	05/31/2022	239.94	.00		

Vendor	Vendor Name	Invoice Number	Description	Invoice Date	Net Invoice Amount	Amount Paid	Date Paid	Voided
1170	TIMBERLINE ACE HARDWARE	153117	SLCT WEED KLLR	06/08/2022	32.99	.00		
1170	TIMBERLINE ACE HARDWARE	153255	PARKS STRIP	06/13/2022	49.28	.00		
Total TIMBERLINE ACE HARDWARE:					760.60	.00		
TRAFFIC LOGIX CORPORATION								
2984	TRAFFIC LOGIX CORPORATION	SIN16361	TRAILER SPEED SIGNS/SOLAR	05/31/2022	13,198.00	.00		
Total TRAFFIC LOGIX CORPORATION:					13,198.00	.00		
UTAH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TRUST								
1255	UTAH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS T	1599507	WORKERS COMP Invoice	06/10/2022	1,208.61	.00		
Total UTAH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TRUST:					1,208.61	.00		
VERIZON WIRELESS								
1305	VERIZON WIRELESS	9907733532	PUBLIC WORK PHONES	06/01/2022	726.98	.00		
1305	VERIZON WIRELESS	9907733532	PLANNING	06/01/2022	7.20	.00		
1305	VERIZON WIRELESS	9907733532	BUILDING Department	06/01/2022	84.27	.00		
1305	VERIZON WIRELESS	9907733532	city admin	06/01/2022	80.02	.00		
1305	VERIZON WIRELESS	9907733532	Ice Rink Jetpack	06/01/2022	45.19	.00		
2783	VERIZON WIRELESS	9907752553	Cellular Service	06/01/2022	373.12	.00		
Total VERIZON WIRELESS:					1,316.78	.00		
Warner Landscaping								
2530	Warner Landscaping	12302	SOD 39	05/18/2022	468.00	.00		
Total Warner Landscaping:					468.00	.00		
WASATCH AUTO PARTS								
1310	WASATCH AUTO PARTS	250987	HYD HOSE FITTINGS, HYDR HO	06/06/2022	66.56	.00		
1310	WASATCH AUTO PARTS	251157	LUBRIGUARD-WTH LITH GRS L	06/07/2022	32.48	.00		
Total WASATCH AUTO PARTS:					99.04	.00		
WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WASTE								
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	.80293 6/1/202	.80293 CENTENNIAL PARK	06/01/2022	64.00	.00		
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	.80294 6/1/202	.80294 Hamlet Park	06/01/2022	63.75	.00		
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	.90042 6/1/202	.90042 CC	06/01/2022	75.00	.00		
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	.90291 6/1/202	.90291 PARK & OFFICES	06/01/2022	32.00	.00		
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	.90292 6/1/202	.90292 Cemetery	06/01/2022	75.00	.00		
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	.90638 6/1/202	.90638 MICHIE LANE	06/01/2022	32.00	.00		
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	.93287 6/1/202	.93287 SHOP	06/01/2022	75.00	.00		
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	51185	CEMETERY FLOWERS	06/07/2022	45.00	.00		
1360	WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WAS	51205	CEMETERY FLOWERS	06/07/2022	24.00	.00		
Total WASATCH COUNTY SOLID WASTE:					485.75	.00		
WAVE PUBLISHING								
1365	WAVE PUBLISHING	J83884	RECEIPTS	05/19/2022	328.00	.00		
1365	WAVE PUBLISHING	J83887	FOUNDERS DAY POST CARDS	05/19/2022	680.00	.00		
1365	WAVE PUBLISHING	L17604	ORDINANCE CITY COUNCIL	05/19/2022	111.00	.00		
1365	WAVE PUBLISHING	L17610	PUBLIC NOTICE-PLANNING	05/25/2022	166.50	.00		
1365	WAVE PUBLISHING	L17611	OPEN SPACE MEETING	05/25/2022	16.18	.00		

Vendor	Vendor Name	Invoice Number	Description	Invoice Date	Net Invoice Amount	Amount Paid	Date Paid	Voided
Total WAVE PUBLISHING:					1,301.68	.00		
WEX BANK								
1821	WEX BANK	81272722	BACKNET - FUEL	05/31/2022	414.97	.00		
Total WEX BANK:					414.97	.00		
Grand Totals:					258,760.06	1,750.00		

Dated: _____

Mayor: _____

City Council: _____

City Recorder: _____

Report Criteria:

Detail report.

Paid and unpaid invoices included.



Memo

Date: 2 June 2022
To:
Cc:
From: Brad Wilson, City Recorder
RE: Minutes of the 17 May 2022 City Council Work Meeting

Please note that the following minutes are awaiting formal approval and are in draft or unapproved form.

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

**Tuesday, 17 May 2022, 5:00 p.m.
Midway Community Center, 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

Mayor Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

Members Present:

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

Michael Henke, Planning Director
Wes Johnson, Engineer
Brad Wilson, Recorder

Others Present:

Todd Griffin, Wasatch County Assessor

Staff Present:

Corbin Gordon, Attorney

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

2. Property Tax Valuation Process (Wasatch County Assessor – Approximately 60 minutes)
– Discuss the property tax valuation process.

Todd Griffin gave a presentation regarding the valuation process and reviewed the following items:

- Increasing valuations
- Revenue neutrality
- Missed properties
- New growth
- Board of equalization
- State imposed property taxes

- Fixed property tax rates
- Greenbelt
- Urban farming program
- Transient rentals

Mr. Griffin also made the following comments and gave the following responses:

- Valuations must be within 5% of comparable sales prices.
- A detailed review of a property must be done at least every five years.
- Taxes were determined at the budget level but dispersed at the assessment level.
- His office did not have enough staff to assess every property every year to insure equality.
- The County Council determined the size of his staff.
- Had not been able to fill two positions since 2019 because the private sector paid more.
- The State could determine areas that were valued low and mandate that those areas be reassessed. This created inequalities.
- Assessments were fluid until the tax roll was closed.
- It was easier to value subdivisions with similar plans than to value custom homes.
- Recently valued properties received more of the tax burden than properties that had not been valued for some time.
- Properties were regularly reassessed to maintain equality.
- Oregon maintained the same value for a property since it was last sold. The value remained high if the property was purchased at a high price.
- Conservation easements could be broken.
- Assessments were based on the market value.
- The preservation of open space depended on the zoning.
- Some eligible taxpayers did not know about available tax relief.
- There was a new program that allowed taxes to be deferred as a lien until the house was sold.
- The State Constitution would have to be amended to limit property tax increases.
- There was no available program that would reduce the market value of a property.
- The annual property tax notice should be modified to emphasize that some information could be changed. These changes could lower the tax liability. Did not have the authority to make the change.
- Valued a home even if it was under construction.
- A house was automatically listed as a second home which significantly increase the tax liability. The owner had to request that the listing be changed.
- Requested monthly or weekly business license information.

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Celeste Johnson, Mayor

Brad Wilson, Recorder



Memo

Date: 9 June 2022
To:
Cc:
From: Brad Wilson, City Recorder
RE: Minutes of the 17 May 2022 City Council Regular Meeting

Please note that the following minutes are awaiting formal approval and are in draft or unapproved form.

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

**Tuesday, 17 May 2022, 6:00 p.m.
Midway Community Center, 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 6:10 p.m.

Members Present:

Celeste Johnson, Mayor
Steve Dougherty, Council Member
Jeff Drury, Council Member
Lisa Orme, Council Member
Kevin Payne, Council Member
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 Payne gave the prayer and/or inspirational message.

2. Consent Calendar

- a. Agenda for the 17 May 2022 City Council Regular Meeting
- b. Warrants
- c. Release the warranty bond for Phase 1 of the Scotch Fields PUD located at approximately 1200 North Canyon View Drive
- d. Release the construction bond, minus 10% and any amount for landscaping, and begin the one-year warranty period for Phase II of the Scotch Fields PUD located at approximately 1400 North Canyon View Drive
- e. Ordinance 2022-16 affirming that the building inspector is also the designated fire marshal for Midway City

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

Council Member Simonsen asked about the power bill for the ice rink. Council Member Drury responded that it was the last bill for the season.

Council Member Simonsen asked about the warrant for jewelry. Mayor Johnson responded that it was for the souvenir shop.

Council Member Orme asked about the proposed ordinance regarding the fire marshal. Mayor Johnson responded that the City always had its building official be the fire marshal, with the exception of one who did not have the proper certification. She added that the ordinance would formalize that procedure.

Council Member Dougherty asked if the construction bonds for both Scotch Fields, Phases 2 and 3 needed to be released. Brad Wilson responded that it was proposed that both bonds be released. Council Member Dougherty asked if all the landscaping issues had been resolved. Michael Henke responded that he thought all the issues had been resolved with all the owners in the later phases.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to approve the consent calendar with all the items as noted with the exception that Scotch Fields, Phase 3 being added with the same language as for Phase 2.

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

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.

The Kantons at Village Green PUD / Landscaping

Fred Pease gave a presentation regarding the landscaping and made the following comments:

- The PUD was now being built by Regal Homes.
- They had not responded to issues and concerns or blamed problems on the subcontractors.
- Understood that the PUD was a worksite, but there were problems that needed to be addressed.
- The pressurized irrigation, storm drain, and trail landscaping all had problems.

- Did not want Regal Homes to walk away when all the units were built and not fix the problems.

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

Wes Johnson made the following comments:

- \$63,000 was being held for landscaping.
- Some money was released as each unit was built, but no more would be released until the issues in the common area were addressed.
- Only had two or three developments with landscaping issues during his time with the City.
- The Municipal Code did not address landscaping.
- Did not look at the landscaping in detail such as the quality of the sprinkler heads, coverage, depth of the topsoil, etc.

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

- Bond money for the landscaping should not be released when each unit or house was completed.
- The release process, including when bond funds were released, should be reviewed, and made stricter in the Municipal Code.
- Street signs, etc. were not landscaping.
- The project should be shut down to get the developer's attention.
- The City Attorney should review the development agreement to determine the City's options.
- Some bond money should be held for one year after the landscaping was completed to insure proper installation.
- Should there be a separate bond for landscaping?

No further comments were offered.

4. Department Reports

Boosters / Cannery / Founders' Day

Council Member Drury reported that the Midway Boosters completed the remodel of its cannery building. He indicated that the Boosters would help with Founders' Day. He asked that the flower beds be tilled for the event.

Culinary Water

Council Member Dougherty had not received any complaints about the culinary water system.

PI System / Restrictions / Cleaning Filters

Council Member Dougherty reminded everyone to follow the restrictions on the use of the pressurized irrigation system. He also reminded everyone to clean their sprinkler system filters to help maintain water pressure.

HL&P / Rate Study / Capital Projects / Power Prices

Council Member Dougherty reported that Heber Light & Power Company was doing a rate study. He indicated that rates would change in October and could be based on the time of the day that the power was used. He added that HL&P had a lot of capital projects that needed to be done and the cost of wholesale power was increasing dramatically.

Welcome Packets

Mayor Johnson reviewed the idea of giving welcome packets to new residents.

- 5. Tentative FY 2023 Budget / Public Hearing** (Budget Officer – Approximately 10 minutes) – Receive public comment on and possibly discuss the adopted tentative FY 2023 Budget for Midway City. **Public Hearing**

Public Hearing

Mayor Johnson opened the hearing and asked if there were any comments from the public. She closed the hearing when no public comment was offered.

Mayor Johnson indicated that the final budget would be considered on June 21st.

- 6. Resolution 2022-15 / Appenzell PUD Master Plan Amendment** (City Planner – Approximately 15 minutes) – Discuss and deny, continue, or approve Resolution 2022-15 amending the master plan for the Appenzell PUD located at 700 South Center Street.

Council Member Dougherty explained that he represented David Tew in a legal issue. He noted that Mr. Tew had resigned as president of the Appenzell HOA, but he would still recuse himself from consideration of the request.

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

- Background
- Development agreement
- Land use summary
- Location of the PUD
- Property proposed for sale
- Landscaping plans
- Area not counted as open space
- Landscaping plan provided by applicants
- High Valley Ranch Subdivision

- High Valley Ranch PUD
- Open space plan
- Items of consideration
- Incentives
- Possible findings

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- His staff report addressed what was presented at the last meeting. Had since received a different proposal.
- A barn on the property had been sold and moved.
- The real issue with the request was adjusting the outside boundary of the project. Adjusting interior lot lines was not as significant.

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

Skeeter Gehring, representing the applicants, gave a presentation and reviewed the following items:

- Update
- What was being requested
- Alternate scenarios
- Density
- Open space
- Funding
- Damaged irrigation system

He also made the following comments:

- Was the second owner to move into a unit in the PUD.
- The development had been nothing but problems.
- The landscaping issues had been presented to the Council this year and several years earlier.
- The developer was Regal Homes and the landscaping looked like what was in The Kantons at Village Green.
- David Tew was no longer going to buy a unit in the development.
- David Burton was the new HOA president.
- Was trying to get help remediating the problems.
- The fixes would be costly.
- Wanted to use the area, where the barn used to be, as credit to replace the lot that they wanted to sell.
- The Ford family wanted to buy the lot so that their son could build on it.
- The landscaping was an eyesore that needed to be fixed.
- The berm was too steep to mow.
- The irrigation system had been destroyed by construction.
- There were a lot of weeds and thistles.
- Almost all the neighbors supported fixing the problems.

- Requested a final decision that night.
- Several proposals would increase the amount of open space.
- The request did set precedence and complied with the 2016 Municipal Code.
- The landscaping would affect everyone.
- Buyers assume that the City Engineer approved the drainage, slope, etc.
- Ditches for drainage ran across sidewalks and into driveways.
- Was not comfortable with D minus work.
- Each request to sell open space would be considered on its own merits.
- Could not sue the developer.
- The developer received concessions but did poor work.
- The City should insure that the landscaping was installed well and after all of the units had been built.
- The City needed to have landscaping standards.
- The property owners would lose a lawsuit because the developer had documentation from the City that the landscaping was adequate.
- No bond money had been retained for the landscaping in the common area which was in terrible condition.

David Burton made the following comments:

- Indicated that the HOA met with an attorney.
- The attorney did not think that the HOA could win a lawsuit.
- Regal Homes dragged out court cases.

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

- The request still had the required amount of open space to comply with the Municipal Code in 2016. It was not an exception to the Code.
- More open space would be provided.
- The landscaping was a weed patch and did not look good.
- It would not be bad to allow the request.
- The barn should not have been moved.
- The Council should have a basis for whatever was approved.
- The request would not change the 2016 Code.
- The City had to consider other HOAs wanting to sell off open space. Several had already inquired about the possibility.
- A lot of work and negotiation went into a development agreement. It became the code when it was signed.
- A certificate of occupancy was not a guarantee of quality construction.
- The landscaping was an issue between the property owners and the developer.
- There should be a significant bond amount that was held for one year after an entire PUD was completed.
- The City could not become involved in every dispute between property owners and a developer.
- Amending a development agreement and reevaluating concessions would set precedent.
- Both parties had to agree to amending a development agreement.
- An increase in open space could have mitigated other issues that a future council might not know about.
- The City did not require the developer to keep the barn which was a requirement of the

development agreement.

- Many property owners would not have the money for a special assessment to install the landscaping.
- The project was along the entrance to Midway.
- The City had allowed boundaries in other developments to be changed.
- The situation was difficult.
- The issue of the landscaping was not a hardship for the property owners.
- More houses required more infrastructure.
- Selling the property would reduce open space.
- The Village was proposed with more than 50% open space. Could this be reduced in the future?
- The overall approval for a development needed to be considered.
- There were areas that did not qualify as open space but functioned as such.
- What prevented other PUDs from having financial problems and requesting to sell off open space?
- It was not realistic to think that the property would be sold and remain as open space.
- The building codes had requirements for construction but not for landscaping.
- It was difficult for the City to inspect landscaping because it did not have applicable requirements.
- For governments to function they had to have immunity from liability.
- It was the developer's responsibility to install the landscaping.
- The City Engineer should not have to count the number of bushes in a development.
- The City was not use to developers who did not care about landscaping.
- What was enforceable was the contracts between the owners and the developer.
- Understood why the owners did not want to sue the developer.
- The City was holding \$21,000 for landscaping.
- The landscaping plan for the development was not specific.
- The City inspected to see where the blue grass and the natural vegetation was in a project. It determined if the sprinkler system turned on.
- The request was precedence setting.
- The landscaping was not the City's fault.
- HOAs had to eventually fix roads which was expensive. Would they remove their clubhouse and sell the land for open space to pay for the fixes?
- The applicants were not blaming the City.
- The City was limited to the bond amount that it set aside for landscaping.
- Regal Homes had requested that the bonds for Appenzell and Kantons be released.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to deny Resolution 2022-15 with the finding that its adoption would set an unacceptable precedent for future development agreements.

Second: Council Member Payne seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

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

Council Member Dougherty	Recused
Council Member Drury	Aye
Council Member Orme	Nay

Council Member Payne Aye
Council Member Simonsen Aye

Council Member Simonsen indicated that he could see both sides of the issue.

7. The Village / M&I Water (City Engineer – Approximately 15 minutes) – Discuss and deny, continue, or approve the use of municipal and industrial (M&I) water to meet the needs of The Village located at 541 East Main Street (Zoning is C-2).

Wes Johnson gave a presentation regarding the request and reviewed the following items:

- Alpenhof-Weber well capacity and usage
- Alpenhof-Weber well capacity including all proposed M&I water

Mr. Johnson also made the following comments:

- Several years earlier the City, Midway Irrigation Company, and Loughlin Water Associates did a water rights assessment.
- The City owned all the rights in the Alpenhof-Weber well. Water from the well could be used for outside use without any special arrangements.
- The well had been test pumped for 24 hours up to 550 gallons per minute (gpm) which was the City's capacity to dispose of test water at that time. The State Engineer approved 500 gpm. Was convinced that the well could pump more water.
- Test pumping the well again would take it offline for two weeks and it would not be able to fill the Alpenhof tank.
- None of the M&I water owned by the City had been transferred into the well.
- The City's water sources were metered.

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

Dan Luster, applicant, made the following comments:

- Had 28.82 AF of irrigation company shares for The Village.
- Overestimated the amount of water needed for the three restaurants in the project.
- Could not get any of his water back was the applicable plat map was recorded.

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

- The water assessment did not have the information needed to make a decision about the City's water sources.
- Only the City could authorize someone else to own rights in the Alpenhof-Weber well.
- The City should know what water rights were assigned to the well. It should ensure that amount of water could be provided. The remaining balance should be tracked.
- The City needed to know how the water from all of its sources was allocated.
- The City owned irrigation shares, but the Midway Irrigation Company still owned the water right.
- Many developments in the future would provide foreign water rights.

- The water sources could be compromised by the drought.
- Assumptions were not being made about the well to facilitate new development.
- Which sources did the City's irrigation shares come from?
- The needed water rights for The Village were increased by the Midway Water Advisory Board from 166 AF to 181 AF.
- None of the City's M&I water rights needed to be transferred to the well because they were for outside use.
- The City needed to know how much of its water was allocated to indoor and outdoor uses.
- Unused water rights were not allowed to be transferred into the well.
- Any excess water could be used on the next phase until the last phase was approved.
- If the uses changed and required more water, then that water would have to be provided to the City.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to approve 28.82 AF of M&I water to be allowed to be imported into the Alpenhof-Weber well with the following conditions:

- Any point of diversion or transfer paperwork be borne by the applicant and the state engineer.
- This water, if it was not already in the development agreement, could only be used for The Village development.

Discussion: Council Member Simonsen asked the history of the water rights proposed for the development. Corbin Gordon explained that it was a lease from a special service district that got the water from the Jordanelle Reservoir and the Central Utah Project.

Council Member Drury noted that the residents in the project would have to pay the lease costs in perpetuity. Mayor Johnson did not like that a developer would use the water to make the project happen, but the residents would have to pay the long-term cost.

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

8. Kay's Landing Annexation / Further Consideration (Berg Engineering – Approximately 45 minutes) – Discuss and deny, continue, or approve for further consideration the Kay's Landing Annexation located at 1591 South Stringtown Road (Zoning is RA-1-43).

Council Member Payne disclosed that he did not have any financial ties to the Kay's Landing Annexation but would submit another annexation that abutted it. Corbin Gordon indicated that Council Member Payne did not have to recuse himself from consideration of the item. Paul

Berg, representing the petitioner, stated that the two annexations were not contingent on each other.

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

- Summary
- Location of the annexation
- City boundary
- Concept plan
- Unincorporated peninsulas
- Park annexation fee
- Discussion items
- Possible findings
- Annexation process

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- The Council was deciding that evening if they wanted to consider the annexation.
- Wasatch County wanted a city to be responsible for the entire road if it was touched by an annexation.
- Only county peninsulas going into a city were prohibited.
- The associated development would have a public road.
- The property was proposed for annexation to receive culinary water from the City.

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

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

- The proposed zoning in the City would be the same as in the County.
- Previously the area had its own culinary water company which had since been acquired by the City. Previous area developments were able to connect to culinary water without having to annex.
- The amount of the park annexation fee was arbitrary.
- The petitioner had the necessary water shares from the Midway Irrigation Company.

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

- Sewer was available for the property.
- It made more sense for the petitioners to request a will serve letter and agree to participate in a future annexation.
- The Municipal Code required annexation if it was possible.
- The City could annex the property but require the property owners to plow the roads.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to pursue the annexation and move forward.

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. Ordinance 2022-03 / PUDs and Subdivisions (City Planner – Approximately 60 minutes) – Discuss and deny, continue, or adopt Ordinance 2022-03 amending Chapter 16.16 (Planned Unit Developments and Subdivisions) of the Midway City Municipal Code regarding planned unit developments and subdivisions. Recommended by the Midway City Planning Commission.

Michael Henke gave a presentation regarding the proposed ordinance and reviewed the revisions since it was last considered by the Council.

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- The Planning Commission recommended a specific code for affordable housing.
- Required parking and open space with PUDs and subdivisions increased the cost of the units.
- An infill code could be adopted.
- Up to four units were allowed per building.
- The PUD code allowed for condominiums.
- The Municipal Code and the ordinance did not limit the maximum size of houses.
- Some issues had been raised with the subdivision portion of the ordinance.
Recommended that any approval include the opportunity to make those changes.

Note: A copy of Mr. Henke’s presentation was contained in the supplemental file.

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

- The ordinance was not affected by recently adopted Utah State House Bill 303.
- A 3,000 sq. ft. pad was not too large if it included a garage. A 1,000 sq. ft. pad was good without a garage.
- The ordinance could be modified to include internal accessory dwelling units.
- The ordinance should be adopted, and work begun on an affordable housing code.
- Infill parcels would be lost if the City waited to work on affordable housing.
- A notice of pending ordinance could be adopted for affordable housing.
- What was the tipping point when affordable housing could be profitable? That question could be determined by establishing building costs.
- There could be a lower water requirement for small affordable units.

- Roads and open space eliminated affordability.
- Affordable housing was more than tweaking the proposed ordinance.
- The revision of the General Plan needed to be done before an affordable housing code could be prepared.
- An affordable housing code would require real creativity and could take six months or more to complete.
- Was an affordable housing expert needed?
- The ordinance should not be approved if it was not ready.
- Issues like open space, water, negotiated approvals, etc. still needed to be addressed.
- Significant incentives were needed to make affordable housing work. It could only be done with subsidies.
- Did the City want PUDs in the RA-1-43 zone?
- Open space provided as part of a lot did not benefit a community.

Motion: Council Member Dougherty moved to continue the matter indefinitely.

Discussion: Michael Henke asked for direction on pad size. Council Member Dougherty did not want to negotiate that issue that late in the evening.

Council Member Simonsen thought that the ordinance was close but needed a few tweaks. He indicated that it did not have to be considered at the next meeting.

Mayor Johnson suggested that the ordinance be adopted by August of that year.

Second: Council Member Drury seconded the 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: Council Member Drury moved to continue the meeting to consider the next item on the agenda.

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

10. Closed Meeting to Discuss Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation and the Purchase, Exchange, or Lease of Real Property

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to go into a 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

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

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to go out of the 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

11. 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 10:37 p.m.

Celeste Johnson, Mayor

Brad Wilson, Recorder



Memo

Date: 9 June 2022
To:
Cc:
From: Brad Wilson, City Recorder
RE: Minutes of the 26 May 2022 City Council Meeting

Please note that the following minutes are awaiting formal approval and are in draft or unapproved form.

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

**Thursday, 26 May 2022, 8:00 a.m.
Midway City Office Building, Upstairs Conference Room
75 North 100 West, 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

Mayor Johnson called the meeting to order at 8:08 p.m.

Members Present:

Celeste Johnson, Mayor
Steve Dougherty, Council Member
Jeff Drury, Council Member
Lisa Orme, Council Member
Kevin Payne, Council Member

Brad Wilson, Recorder

Others Present:

None

Staff Present:

Nancy Simons, Budget Official

2. FY 2023 Budget – Review and discuss the budget for fiscal year 2023.

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

- IT
- Computer hardware replacement program
- Administrative Department
- Non-departmental
- Contract services
- Planning and Zoning Department
- Building Safety Department
- Public health and safety
- Law enforcement
- Parks and recreation
- Trails
- Utilities

- Donations by the City
- Souvenir shop
- Leasing space in the City's buildings
- Capital Improvement Projects Fund
- Trails
- Town Square improvements
- Purchasing versus leasing equipment
- Water Fund
- Water resources
- Resurfacing and painting the ice rink slab
- Booking dividends from Heber Light & Power Company

Motion: Without objection, Mayor Johnson recessed the meeting at 10:54 a.m. She reconvened the meeting at 11:04 a.m.

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

- Midway business map

3. Closed Meeting to Discuss the Character, Professional Competence, or Physical or Mental Health of an Individual.

Motion: Council Member Dougherty moved to go into a 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

Note: Pursuant to Section 52-4-206, Utah Code Annotated 1953, the closed meeting was not recorded nor were written minutes kept. An affidavit affirming the purpose of the meeting is contained in the supplemental file.

Motion: Council Member Dougherty moved to go out of 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

4. Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Dougherty seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Celeste Johnson, Mayor

Brad Wilson, Recorder



Memo

Date: 13 June 2022
To:
Cc:
From: Brad Wilson, City Recorder
RE: Minutes of the 7 June 2022 City Council Work Meeting

Please note that the following minutes are awaiting formal approval and are in draft or unapproved form.

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

**Tuesday, 7 June 2022, 5:00 p.m.
Midway Community Center, 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

Mayor Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

Members Present:

Celeste Johnson, Mayor
Steve Dougherty, Council Member
Jeff Drury, Council Member
Lisa Orme, Council Member
Kevin Payne, Council Member
JC Simonsen, Council Member (Arrived at 5:09 p.m.)

Staff Present:

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

2. Springer Village / Concept Plan (Atlas Holdings, LLC – Approximately 40 minutes) – Receive and discuss a concept plan for Springer Village located at 65 North 200 West (Zoning is C-3).

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

- Land use summary
- Location of the development
- Zoning
- Reasons for the zone boundaries
- Concept plan
- Phasing

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- The Municipal Code would have to be amended to allow the proposed affordable housing.

- Affordable housing needed a high aesthetic standard, but parking and open space increased its cost.
- The amount of required parking had not yet been calculated. There would be sufficient room for parking. There could be a combined parking plan.
- The road through the project would not be a named city street.
- The second floors of the buildings would be nightly rentals, but they could be any permitted use for the zone.

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

David and Kayla Springer, applicants, gave a presentation regarding the proposed development and reviewed the following items:

- Family history
- Exterior of the new house on 200 West
- Interior of the house
- Concept plan
- Exterior of the other buildings
- Gardner Village
- Architectural inspirations
- Midway mice

They also made the following comments:

- Their family owned the property since the 1880's.
- Wanted to create a legacy.
- It was too expensive to renovate the existing house.
- Promised The Midway Bakery at Main a space in the house.
- Wanted it to be a gathering place and to look like an old European square.
- Wanted affordable housing or commercial in the back. The housing would have four to eight units per building.
- The porch on the house, along 200 West, would not be raised. A raise porch decreased accessibility.
- The project would have history plaques.

Note: A copy of their presentation is contained in the supplemental file.

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

- Parking could be an issue for the affordable housing and the events center.
- The entrance should be as inviting as possible.
- Some people did not like franchise businesses.
- The project should have year around businesses.
- There needed to be adequate snow storage.
- The City should have attainable housing not just more housing.
- Nightly rentals competed with affordable housing.

- The rentals would be good for the retail if the workers could live in them.
- Rents would need to be monitored or restricted.

3. Animals on the Town Square / Discussion (City Attorney – Approximately 20 minutes) – Discuss sections 5.03.070(A)(5) and 6.04.010(B) of the Midway City Municipal Code regulating animals on the Midway Town Square located at 150 West Main Street.

Corbin Gordon gave a presentation regarding the issue and reviewed the following items:

- State criminal process
- Administrative civil process
- Civil infractions

Mr. Gordon also made the following comments:

- Should the punishment be criminal or civil?
- The City would act when there was a formal complaint. It would investigate the complaint. The complaint would then be heard by the City's administrative law judge.
- The Mayor could grant enforcement powers to a city employee or someone else.
- Currently, having animals on the Town Square was a crime.

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

- Did service animals need to be addressed?
- The City actively enforced its zoning code including signs and fences.
- It did not actively look for unlicensed vehicles and lights that were too bright.

The Council agreed that the issue should be pursued.

4. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Celeste Johnson, Mayor

Brad Wilson, Recorder



Memo

Date: 15 June 2022
To:
Cc:
From: Brad Wilson, City Recorder
RE: Minutes of the 7 June 2022 City Council Regular Meeting

Please note that the following minutes are awaiting formal approval and are in draft or unapproved form.

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

**Tuesday, 7 June 2022, 6:00 p.m.
Midway Community Center, 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 6:10 p.m.

Members Present:

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

Staff Present:

Corbin Gordon, Attorney (Left at 11:12 p.m.)
Michael Henke, Planning Director (Left at 11:12 p.m.)
Wes Johnson, Engineer
Brad Wilson, Recorder

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

2. Consent Calendar

- a. Agenda for the 7 June 2022 City Council Regular Meeting
- b. Warrants
- c. Minutes of the 3 May 2022 City Council Work Meeting
- d. Minutes of the 3 May 2022 City Council Regular Meeting
- e. Minutes of the 11 May 2022 City Council Meeting
- f. Minutes of the 17 May 2022 City Council Work Meeting
- g. Minutes of the 17 May 2022 City Council Regular Meeting
- h. Minutes of the 26 May 2022 City Council Meeting
- i. Release the construction bond, minus 10% and any amount for landscaping, and begin the one-year warranty period for the Haven Farms Rural Preservation Subdivision located at 1700 South Center Street (Zoning is RA-1-43).

Note: Copies of items 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, and 2i are contained in the supplemental file.

Brad Wilson indicated that the minutes for May 17th and 26th had not been completed.

Council Member Drury asked about the public facilities deposits on the agenda. Michael Henke explained the deposits.

Council Member Dougherty asked if there was any landscaping in Haven Farms that was related to the bond. Wes Johnson responded that there was no related landscaping.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to approve items 2a through 2e and 2i removing the wording “and any amount for landscaping”.

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

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.

The Kantons at Village Green PUD / Landscaping

Fred Pease gave a presentation regarding the landscaping and reviewed the following items:

- Aerial view of the PUD
- Organization of the Kantons at Village Green
- Common area landscaping

Mr. Pease made the following comments:

- Previously brought the issue before the Council.
- The Council talked about delaying the release of the bond until the development was completed.
- The landscaping was dying because the developers were not maintaining it.
- The developers did not cut the weeds until the City sent them a violation letter.
- Construction had destroyed some of the sod.
- There was time to fix the problems unlike in the Appenzell PUD.

- How could the developers transfer financial responsibility to the HOA?
- The developers had no incentive to complete the common area landscaping if the landscaping bond was release as each unit was completed.

Mayor Johnson responded that the City would consider what it could do legally. Corbin Gordon said that he would review the development agreement for the project.

Wes Johnson indicated that \$63,670 was being held for landscaping and would not be released until the entire project was completed.

Council Member Payne said that the City should explore whatever it could do to eliminate the problems and give property owners more influence.

No further comments were offered.

4. Department Reports

Stringtown Road / Culvert

Wes Johnson reported that the new culvert was being installed in Stringtown Road.

Main Street Trees / Grant

Mayor Johnson reported that some remaining grant money would be used to replace trees along Main Street.

Arborist / Training

Mayor Johnson reported that the Public Works Department would be trained by an arborist.

Sod / Organic Treatment

Mayor Johnson reported that the City's sod would be treated organically that year.

HVSSD / Fee Increases

Mayor Johnson reported that the Heber Valley Special Service District (HVSSD) would increase its fees.

Founders' Day / Gardner Land Donation

Mayor Johnson reported that Founders' Day was successful. She added that Kem Gardner, at the event, signed the paperwork for his land donation.

5. Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (UDOT – Approximately 30 minutes) – Received an update from the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) regarding the Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement.

The item was not considered.

6. High Valley Arts / Temporary Use Permit (City Planner – Approximately 15 minutes) Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or grant a temporary use permit, and waive the application fee, for High Valley Arts to exceed the allowed sound levels for a musical production at 200 South and 400 East.

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

- Summary
- Noise limit chart and map
- Decibel levels at the event

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- The request was from mid-June to mid-July.
- Some neighbors supported the request because it kept the property as a vacant field.
- The applicant asked for a waiver of the application fee.

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

Stu Waldrip, applicant, made the following comments:

- Requested the variance until 10:30 p.m. each evening.
- Was still working on moving performances to Soldier Hollow.
- High Valley Arts was a 501(c)(3) charitable institution.
- Was trying to save money by requesting the fee waiver.
- The financial benefit to the City outweighed the expense of the application.
- Would use the same sound equipment.
- Neighbors heard the performances but supported them being at that location.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to approve the temporary use permit but not to waive the application fee.

Second: Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mayor Johnson noted that the City had a policy and system for waiving fees for its buildings. She said that the denial of the waiver was not directed at the organization.

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

7. Vincent Annexation / Further Consideration (Berg Engineering – Approximately 30 minutes) – Discuss and deny, continue, or approve for further consideration the Vincent Annexation located at 1315 South Stringtown Road (Zoning is RA-1-43).

Council Member Payne recused himself from consideration of the annexation because he had a financial conflict.

Note: Council Member Payne left at 6:46 p.m.

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

- Summary
- Location
- Zoning map
- Location in relation to the Kay's Landing Annexation
- Definition of an unincorporated peninsula
- Concept plan
- Easement on the north
- Annexation plat map
- Discussion items
- Peninsula code language
- Possible findings

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- The annexation was in the City's growth boundary.
- Wasatch County would want Midway to maintain Stringtown Road along the annexation. Could trade the maintenance of this portion of road for a section further north.
- There would not be a road between the proposed annexation and the Kay's Landing Annexation.
- Kay's Landing would be deed restricted.
- A public system was required if more than six houses were on the same well.
- Wasatch County required that any lot on a well be at least five acres.
- There were no internal roads
- There was a mobile home and a separate house on one parcel. That would need to be address during the process. The petitioner wanted to keep the mobile home on the parcel as long as her son lived in it.
- The petitioner wanted to sell the connections for the mobile home when it was removed. It was worth the water rights and the impact fees.

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

Note: Council Member Payne returned.

Council Member Payne indicated that 0.33 acres in the annexation would be added to his lot on the north. He indicated that the acreage was not an easement.

Council Member Simonsen was open to the mobile home staying on the property

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to proceed with the annexation request for further consideration with the following findings:

- The proposed annexation complied with the intent of the annexation code.
- The application was complete to consider for further consideration.
- Further consideration of the petition by the City Council did not guarantee the property would be approved for annexation by the City Council.

Second: Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

Discussion: Council Member Drury noted that the City did not have procedures or a mechanism to sell connections. He needed a strong reason to consider that request. Michael Henke indicated that connections had been sold in the past.

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	Recused
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

- 8. Ordinance 2022-17 / Zone Map Amendment** (Mark and Shanna Nelson, Scot and Jan Lythgoe, and Darin and Nancee Heckel – Approximately 30 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve Ordinance 2022-17 amending the Midway City Land Use Map to include three parcels located at 85 South 100 West, 70 West 100 South, and 60 West 100 South in the Transient Rental Overlay District (Zoning is R-1-7). **Public Hearing**

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

- Land use summary
- Location of the parcels
- Land use map
- Property left outside of the Transient Rental Overlay District (TROD)
- Possible findings

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- A portion of one of the parcels was already in the TROD.
- The zone would not be changed. Transient rentals would require conditional use permits because the zone would remain residential. Both the business license and the permit could be revoked.
- A different process would be needed to include the entire block in the TROD.
- The City's transient rental code worked well. No complaints had been received for years. Only one license had been put on probation. The required property managers did a good job.
- Some municipalities restricted transient rentals because they competed with affordable housing.
- Only one of the houses on the parcels was a primary home. The other two were long-term rentals.
- The State's internal accessory dwelling unit code did not allow for transient rentals.
- Parking could be a problem.
- The property owners to the north had been noticed twice but had not responded.

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

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

- Transient rentals were less problematic if the owner also lived in the house.
- The Planning Commission recommended approval because it helped maintain the resort communities tax.
- The Council should be provided the minutes from the Planning Commission's meetings.

Council Member Orme noted that her sister was one of the applicants. She asked if she needed to recuse herself. Corbin Gordon responded that she did not need to recuse herself.

Public Hearing

Mayor Johnson opened the hearing and asked if there were any comments from the public.

Alan Giles

Mr. Giles made the following comments:

- Owned the red barn and property south of Café Galleria.
- Requested that the commercial zoning for his barn not change.
- Insufficient affordable housing was a problem.

Jeff Kelly

Mr. Kelly made the following comments:

- Lived in the neighborhood, which had been part of his life for 57 years, where the

- change was proposed.
- Now lived in his grandparents' house.
 - A neighborhood was its people.
 - Had wonderful neighbors.
 - Opposed nightly rentals.
 - 100 South was already a busy street. Was concerned about the safety of the road which was use by children to get to and from Midway Elementary.
 - Progress should be controlled.

Lynette Wilson

Ms. Wilson made the following comments:

- She and other neighbors opposed the amendment.
- Moved to the neighborhood and knew that it was residential and did not want to change that.
- People who wanted transient rentals should have them on their own street.
- Was concerned about safety.
- Several people said the City would not consider their opinion.
- Because the City had not heard from law enforcement did not mean there were not problems.
- Parking for Café Galleria was a problem.
- The neighborhood did not have any sidewalks or streetlights.
- There were other places in the City that were better suited for transient rentals.

Mayor Johnson closed the hearing when no further public comment was offered.

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

- There had not been any recent problems with transient rentals. The amendment should not be considered if there had been any problems.
- Doubted that transient rentals were competing with affordable housing in this case.
- Some communities had become transient rental towns.
- Transient rentals were allowed throughout Heber City. That should not be the case in Midway.
- Renters had to check in with the property manager for accountability.
- It was awkward to expand the TROD but leave out a section of the same block.
- Parking was a separate issue from the amendment.
- The resort tax was 25% of the City's revenue.
- There was a drastic undersupply of affordable housing.
- Some of the zoning boundaries created confusion.
- Should transient rentals and their locations be considered as a whole instead of with individual requests?
- Residents did not expect transient rentals in well-established neighborhoods.
- Hoped that Midway would retain some farming but that might be eco farming.
- The City needed revenue.
- Average citizens should be able to have transient rentals.
- Midway should not become a transient rental town.

- Residents were afraid that over time what they liked about Midway would be lost.
- The transitions between some zones were a problem.

Motion: Council Member Orme moved to approve Ordinance 2022-17 with the following findings:

- One of the proposed properties was contiguous to the TROD.
- Three-fourths of block four was currently within the TROD boundary.
- The applicants would need to apply for a Conditional Use Permit if the zone amendment was successful.
- Renting the property would generate more transient rental taxes for the City.
- The City Council was under no obligation to approve the request but could do so if they felt it would benefit the community.

Second: Council Member Dougherty seconded the motion.

Discussion: Council Member Simonsen asked if the rest of the block should be included in the TROD. Michael Henke responded that would require a separate process. Council Member Simonsen suggested continuing the item and asking the applicants to consider including the entire block. Council Member Drury did not think that was fair. Council Member Dougherty indicated that there would always be transition issue between zones. He added that the City needed to enforce its transient rental regulations.

Council Member Simonsen noted that no one wanted transient rentals with street parties. He asked if the Council needed good reasons to revoke a license or permit. Mr. Henke responded that it did.

Council Member Simonsen asked if the regulations could be refined. Mr. Henke responded that they could be refined and even made stricter.

Council Member Payne asked if the request could be conditional for a period of time. Mr. Henke responded that conditional use permits had been provisional in the past. Council Member Orme noted that was part of the CUP process and not a zone map amendment.

Vote: 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	Nay
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

9. The Village, Phases 1 and 2 / Final Approval (Midway Heritage Development, LLC – Approximately 30 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or grant final approval for Phases 1 and 2 of The Village located at 541 East Main Street (Zoning is C-2).

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

- Land use summary

- Location of the development
- Sensitive lands
- Site plan
- Phasing
- Open space
- Trail plan
- Landscaping plan
- Mitigation measures
- Commercial
- Retention basins
- Road profiles
- Proposed plat maps
- Main Street improvements
- Irrigation plan
- Discussion items
- Renderings of buildings
- Lighting plan
- Station Park
- Letter from the City Attorney
- Letter from the Wasatch County Solid Waste Special Service District
- Water board recommendation
- Possible findings
- Proposed conditions

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- Midway Automotive had been purchased and would be razed.
- There was a request that the masonry wall continue along the west side to mitigate light trespass.
- UDOT would not give final approval until the Council granted its own final approval.
- The required water rights had been reduced because of the needed hard surface.
- The County Recorder requested that the name of the project be changed.
- Temporary parking in a future phase would accommodate parking for Phase 1.
- Did not know if there would be extra parking. More intense uses could require more parking and water.
- The Vision Architecture Committee (VAC) approved of the theming.
- Individual buildings would be reviewed by the VAC.
- All the conditions of the rezone had been met.
- The west side wall was discussed with Inez Wilde.
- The amount of water would be broken out by phase and by commercial building.
- A plat map amendment would be needed to change the amount of water between phases or commercial buildings.
- The commercial would have to be at least 20% of the development. The square footage comparison provided to the Council was incorrect.

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

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

- The flower boxes and walls would be back ten feet to accommodate the public utility easement.
- The garbage dumpsters would be next to but not in parking spaces.
- The culinary and sewer lines were shallow at Main Street and would be close together. The State Division of Water Quality would have to approve a mitigation plan for closeness of the lines. The City had to make the request.

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

- Could the masonry wall be a thick hedge?
- UDOT found funding to put in the signal light at Main Street and River Road. It would not be installed that year.
- The TROD map could become out-of-date. The units that could be transient rentals should be listed and referenced on a map with a date. Any changes should be an amendment to the development agreement.
- The development agreement should create a mechanism for the City's final approval to not be effective until UDOT also granted final approval.
- The plat map or any document should not lead someone to believe that enough water had been provided for any possible uses in the project.
- Should the exhibit, listing the water rights by phase, be part of the development agreement?
- The shape of the retention ponds should be more free form with a natural change in grade.
- The proposal for the Daybell Garage was continued because it did not have approval from UDOT.
- The language in the development agreements did not match the UDOT approval process.
- Minutes from UDOT regarding a project should be provided to the Council.
- The UDOT permit matched the approved plans stamped by the City.
- More time was needed to finalize the approvals and the development agreements. There was nothing major that needed to be changed.
- The Council needed to be confident that all necessary items had been addressed and included in the agreements.
- All questions should be answered for the next meeting.
- The Council should not discuss again the issues covered that night.
- Any new issues before the next meeting could be addressed in the development agreements.
- The Council should have the final versions of the agreements before any approvals were granted.
- The Council was not trying to delay the project.

Dan Luster, applicant, made the following comments:

- Wanted to start work on the project that summer.
- Requested that final approval be granted that night and that the development agreements be finalized at the next meeting.

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to continue the item to the next meeting, knowing that it was close to getting final approval, with all the edits discussed that night, any other concerns that the Council might bring up, and with the edits from the following list:

- A condition on Phase 2 for a masonry wall on the west parking lot boundary, with a landscaping barrier in Phase 3.
- Exhibit C from the staff report, with the water calculations, would be added to the development agreement.
- Adjust the retention ponds to show a natural shape and grade change from Main Street as discussed in the meeting.
- Create a table that listed unit numbers that would be in the TROD and tie it to a dated map that showed the location of the units specific to the TROD line as it existed that evening.

Second: Council Member Drury seconded the motion.

Discussion: Council Member Simonsen recommended that the Water Board review the revised amount of water rights for the project. Council Member Dougherty indicated that the Board would not meet until August. He noted that the Board was only a recommending body. Mayor Johnson also noted that the revised amount was based on the formula used by the Board.

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 9:28 p.m. She reconvened the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

10. Resolution 2022-21 / The Village, Phase 1 Development Agreement (City Attorney – Approximately 5 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve Resolution 2022- adopting a development agreement for Phase 1 of The Village located at 541 East Main Street (Zoning is C-2).

11. Resolution 2022-22 / The Village, Phase 2 Development Agreement (City Attorney – Approximately 5 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve Resolution 2022- adopting a development agreement for Phase 2 of The Village located at 541 East Main Street (Zoning is C-2).

Council Member Drury requested the following changes to the agreements:

- Section 3, A, ii, e - Fire and snow storage locations were mentioned as shown on a map, dumpster locations should be referenced in the same manner.

- Section 3, A, ii, f – Changed to address the circular approvals from UDOT and the City.
- Section 3, A, ii, o - Provide a list of the unit numbers allowed in the TROD as defined on a specific, dated map to remove any ambiguity.
- A condition on Phase 2 for a masonry wall on the west parking lot boundary
- Exhibit C from the staff report, with the water calculations, would be added to the development agreement.
- Parking needed to be shown per phase and commercial building.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to continue Items 10 and 11 with the changes that he, the applicant, and anyone else mentioned at that evening’s meeting and before the next meeting. He further moved that the agreements should state the traffic study and access started in Phase 3.

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

12. RAP Tax / Notice to Place on Ballot (City Recorder – Approximately 5 minutes) – Discuss and possibly approve a letter notifying the Wasatch County Council that Midway City intends to place a RAP Tax on the 2022 general election ballot.

Brad Wilson gave a presentation on the RAP tax and notification letter.

Note: A copy of Mr. Wilson’s presentation is contained in the supplemental file.

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

- How the tax revenue would be spent.
- Would Wasatch County put it on the ballot that year?
- How the revenue would be allocated if the County adopted the tax.

Motion: Council Member Orme moved to proceed with sending the letter, as provided to the City Council, to the County for the RAP tax to be placed on the ballot.

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

13. Ordinance 2022-02 / Setbacks in Residential Zones / Reconsideration of Adoption

Motion (City Attorney – Approximately 30 minutes) – Reconsider and possibly amend the motion adopting Ordinance 2022-02 amending Chapters 16.7, 16.8, 16.9, 16.10, 16.11, and 16.12 of the Midway City Municipal Code regarding setbacks for residential zones.

Motion: Council Member Dougherty moved to go into a closed meeting to discuss pending or threatened litigation.

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

Second: Council Member Drury 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

Mayor Johnson made the following comments:

- The council member who made the motion adopting Ordinance 2022-02 asked that the motion be reconsidered.
- The request had been withdrawn after a discussion by the Council.
- The City Attorney would respond to specific questions that he had received.
- The City Attorney would also speak with anyone regarding the issue after the meeting.

Note: Corbin Gordon and Michael Henke left at 11:12 p.m.

14. Pine Canyon Storm Drain, 100 North, & Main Street Project / Award Contract (City Engineer – Approximately 5 minutes) – Discuss and possibly award a contract for the Pine Canyon Storm Drain, 100 North, and Main Street Project.

Wes Johnson made the following comments:

- The project included two roads and a storm drain on Pine Canyon Road.
- Recommended that the contract be awarded to JB Gordon Construction, who was the low bidder, and the Mayor be authorized to sign the documents.
- The only detour would be for Pine Canyon Road.

Council Member Payne indicated that bundling the projects saved money.

Motion: Council Member Drury moved to award the contract for the Pine Canyon Storm Drain, 100 North, and Main Street Project to JB Gordon Construction and authorized the Mayor to sign the documents.

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

15. Closed Meeting to Discuss Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation and the Purchase, Exchange, or Lease of Real Property

An additional closed meeting was not held.

16. Adjournment

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

The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 p.m.

Celeste Johnson, Mayor

Brad Wilson, Recorder

DRAFT



RESOLUTION 2022-17

A RESOLUTION SETTING THE REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX

Be it resolved by the City Council of Midway City, there is hereby levied a tax rate on all real and personal property within the municipality not otherwise exempted by law as follows:

General Fund	0.000507	\$963,911
--------------	----------	-----------

This tax rate will increase the anticipated property tax amount from \$878,716 to \$963,911.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Midway City Council on the day of 2022.

MIDWAY CITY

Celeste Johnson, Mayor

ATTEST:

Brad Wilson, Recorder

Tax Rate Summary (693) CTY

Preliminary Data

Data Entry (Auditor)	Auditor's Certified Rate Approved	Data Entry (Entity)	Proposed Rates Entity Approved	Proposed Rates County Approved	Proposed Rates USTC Approved "OK to Print"	Final Tax Rates USTC Approved	Rates Finalized
----------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	-----------------



Save **Approve**

Proposed Tax Rate Value: \$ 1,901,205,281
Budgeted Revenue / Proposed Tax Rate Value = Proposed Tax Rate

(1) Budget Code	(2) Budget Name	(3) Election Date	(4) Voted Rate Limit	(5) Utah Annotated Code	(6) Maximum By Law	(7) Calculated Certified Tax Rate	(8) Auditor's Certified Tax Rate	(9) Auditor's Certified Rate Revenue	(10) Proposed Tax Rate	(11) Budgeted Revenue	(12) Final Tax Rate	(13) Final Budgeted Revenue
10	General Operations			§11-6-133	.007	0.000507	0.000507	963,911				
20	Interest and Sinking Fund/Bond			§17-12-1 sinking	Sufficient			0				
190	Discharge of Judgement			§59-2-1328 & 1330	Sufficient			0				
	Total Tax Rate					0.000507	0.000507	963,911	0.000000		0.000000	

NOTES:

(JR 4/27/22) Applied PP Exemption of \$13



June 21, 2022

Brad Wilson
Midway City Recorder
75 North 100 West
Midway, Utah 84049
(Sent by E-mail)

Subject: Burgi Hill Subdivision, Construction Final, Warranty to Begin

Dear Brad:

Burgi Hill subdivision has received a final construction inspection. All items appear to be complete as shown on the approved construction drawings. Horrocks Engineers recommends the one year warranty period begin. As the development receives construction final approval, the construction bond may be released, minus the 10% warranty bond.

We appreciate working with you on this project. Please call our office with any questions.

Sincerely,
HORROCKS ENGINEERS

Wesley Johnson, P.E.
City Engineer

cc: Michael Henke, Midway City Planner (sent by e-mail)
Tex Couch, Midway Building Department (sent by e-mail)
Becky Woods Midway Sanitation District, (sent by E-mail)
Chris Dunn Developer (sent by e-mail)