

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

**Tuesday, 21 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 6:00 p.m. She excused Council Member Drury and indicated that Council Member Payne would participate electronically using Zoom.

**Members Present:**

Celeste Johnson, Mayor  
Steve Dougherty, 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  
Nancy Simons, Budget Officer  
Brad Wilson, Recorder

**Members Excused:**

Jeff Drury, Council Member

**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 Orme gave the prayer and/or inspirational message.

**2. Consent Calendar**

- a. Agenda for the 21 June 2022 City Council Regular Meeting
- b. Warrants
- c. Minutes of the 17 May 2022 City Council Work Meeting
- d. Minutes of the 17 May 2022 City Council Regular Meeting
- e. Minutes of the 17 May 2022 City Council Closed Meeting

- f. Minutes of the 26 May 2022 City Council Meeting
- g. Minutes of the 7 June 2022 City Council Work Meeting
- h. Minutes of the 7 June 2022 City Council Regular Meeting
- i. Resolution 2022-17 adopting a certified property tax rate for Midway City
- j. Release the construction bond, minus 10% and any amount for landscaping, and begin the one-year warranty period for the Lower Burgi Hill Subdivision located at 1218 North Interlaken Drive

**Note:** Copies of items 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2f, 2g, 2h, 2i, and 2j are contained in the supplemental file.

Council Member Simonsen asked about the warrants for the Bankcard Center which only had initials in the description. He also asked about the warrant for Mountainland Supply which was only described as water. Council Member Dougherty asked which water tank was cleaned by divers. Mayor Johnson responded that she would follow up on the questions.

**Motion:** Council Member Simonsen moved to approve the consent calendar as listed.

**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	Excused from the Meeting
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. No comments were offered.

### 4. Department Reports

#### Irrigation Company / Transfer Water

Council Member Dougherty reported that the Midway Irrigation Company was discussing a process to transfer water rights out of its system.

#### Welcome Packet

Mayor Johnson reported that items were being collected for welcome packets for new residents.

### HL&P / Rate Structure / New Substations / Bonding

Council Member Dougherty reported that the Heber Light and Power Company (HL&P) would hold a public hearing the following evening regarding a new rate structure. He indicated that the percentage increase had not been decided.

He reported on new substations for HL&P.

He reported that HL&P might issue bonds to stay ahead of growth.

### Boundary Commission / School Property

Council Member Dougherty reported that the Wasatch County Boundary Commission resolved an annexation issue with property on the west boundary of Heber City. The property was planned for a new school.

### Annexations / Noticing

Brad Wilson reported that state law now allowed annexation noticing to be done by mail or by posting a notice on site. He explained that everyone within the annexation and within ½ mile would have to be mailed a notice. He asked which method the Council preferred. The issue of residents versus property owners was discussed.

Mayor Johnson noted that Stringtown Road, which included two new annexations, was under construction and on-site noticing could be problematic.

Council Member Dougherty noted that some annexations would not be on a road and a sign posted on the annexation property might not be visible. Council Member Simonsen recommended that a sign be put on the property and the nearest road or access point.

The Council preferred posting instead of mailing notices.

- 5. Resolution 2022-19 / FY 2022 Budget Amendment** (Budget Officer – Approximately 10 minutes) – Discuss and possibly approve Resolution 2022-19 amending the fiscal year 2022 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.

**Motion:** Council Member Orme moved to approve Resolution 2022-19 amending the fiscal year 2022 budget.

**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	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

**6. Resolution 2022-20 / FY 2023 Budget** (Budget Officer – Approximately 10 minutes) – Discuss and possibly approve Resolution 2022-20 adopting the fiscal year 2023 budget for Midway City.

Nancy Simons made the following comments regarding the proposed budget:

- A maximum of 35% was allowed for the unreserved fund balance.
- The budget notes indicated line items with employee merit increases.

Mayor Johnson explained merit increases would occur on an employee's anniversary after FY 2023.

Council Member Dougherty asked about law enforcement. Mayor Johnson responded that the 20% increase requested by the Wasatch County Sheriff was included in the budget. She added that the City had 60 days to discuss funding with the Wasatch County Council. Council Member Dougherty indicated that he would vote against the budget because of the issue.

Council Member Simonsen still wanted clarification on the movement of excess revenue among the funds and reserve accounts.

Council Member Simonsen asked that \$20,000 be set aside annually for capital replacement for the City's parks.

**Motion:** Council Member Simonsen moved to approve Resolution 2022-20 and the budget as presented with the following conditions and findings:

- \$20,000 be set aside for capital replacement for the City's parks.
- The City should continue looking at receiving the needed value from law enforcement, with the most significant complaint being not enough coverage.

**Discussion:** Council Member Dougherty made the following comments:

- The City might not pay the additional \$20,000 just because it had been budgeted.
- All evidence suggested that the City was only receiving traffic enforcement with its contract. This was not the most efficient use of the money. It could be used to install traffic calming devices on streets.
- Wasatch County did not budget enough for the Sheriff's Department.
- Was not suggesting that Midway have its own police force.

**Second:** Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Council Member Orme asked who would talk to the County regarding law enforcement funding. Mayor Johnson responded that the Council had to decide how to move forward.

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

Council Member Dougherty	Nay
Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

**7. The Village, Phases 1 and 2 / Final Approval** (Midway Heritage Development, LLC – Approximately 15 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).

Mayor Johnson explained that the master plan agreement allowed the developer to request underground parking. She indicated that request could still be made. She added that the engineering for such parking might not work. Corbin Gordon said that the applicant wanted to proceed with final approval but still wanted the option to make the parking request. Michael Henke confirmed that requesting underground parking might not require a plat map amendment.

Council Member Dougherty asked about an email received from the Wasatch County Fire Protection Special Service District. Corbin Gordon responded that the Wasatch County Fire Marshal requested some changes to the design of the project. He indicated that the City's fire marshal ultimately had jurisdiction.

Clint Neerings, Wasatch County Fire Marshal, made the following comments:

- The District, which provided fire protection to Midway, had fire trucks that needed a width of 19 feet because of their outriggers. This size of truck was needed to meet insurance requirements.
- Some of the roads in the project were only 20 feet wide which provided little leeway and no room for other vehicles to get buy.
- These trucks should not be positioned off the road.
- Did not want to use the curb because it might separate.
- The issue was not jurisdictional.
- The City was asking a lot of the first responders.
- The issues of secondary access and fire hydrants, which he raised in the email, had been resolved.
- Hideout Town had problems when it allowed 20-foot road widths.
- Could work with the parking along the secondary roads. Was most concerned about the two main roads in the project.
- Came to the meeting that evening because the City's fire marshal had not responded to him. He tried to contact him on May 3<sup>rd</sup> and the previous Thursday.
- 21 or 22 feet of width would be a positive change.

Michael Henke gave a presentation and reviewed possible findings and proposed conditions.

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

Mr. Henke made the following comments:

- The project met the minimum fire code requirement of 20-foot wide roads.
- Wasatch County had a width of 27 feet with parking allowed on both sides of the road.
- The City was balancing aesthetics.
- Station Park in Farmington had 20-foot-wide roads.
- The City's fire marshal did not have a problem with the road widths.
- Narrower roads reduced driving speed.
- The applicant was also requesting a conditional use permit.
- The ponds had been moved back and the stormwater basins were shallower.
- Some additional parking could be added with a combined parking plan, off-site parking, etc.

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

- Most roads were 26 feet wide.
- Two roads in the project were 20 feet with parking on one side for a total of 29 feet.
- The applicant was caught between the City and the District.
- Needed final approval from the Council to receive a UDOT construction permit.
- The stormwater basins were one foot deep with sumps underneath.

Mayor Johnson made the following comments:

- The City had been considering the development for months.
- It was problematic to address the road widths that late in the process.
- Many places in the State had 20-foot roads.
- Safety was always a concern.
- An improved map had been provided that listed the units that would be in the Transient Rental Overlay District (TROD).

Dan Luster, applicant, made the following comments:

- The City suggested the lane concept. Was reluctant at first but saw the aesthetic benefit.
- Narrower roads also slowed traffic and increased pedestrian safety.
- It was problematic if people parked on both sides of a narrow road.

Wes Johnson made the following comments:

- The concrete pan added an additional three feet and was stronger than the asphalt. Mr. Neerings responded that they were trained not to use the pan.
- Would widening the roads reduce the open space to below the required amount?
- Asked for flexibility for him and Mr. Berg to adjust the ponds during construction.

Council Member Dougherty made the following comments:

- The City had to balance against the risk.
- He was concerned with the two accesses for one lot in the Rising Ranch Subdivision. The Council accepted that risk.
- All developments could not be free of risk.
- Appreciated the information from the District, so that the Council could include it in its deliberations.

**Motion:** Council Member Dougherty moved to grant final approval and conditional use permits to The Village, Phases 1 and 2 located at 541 East Main Street with the following findings and conditions:

- The proposal would benefit the City financially by creating a greater tax base.
- The proposal might help the City better comply with State requirements regarding the ability to collect the resort tax depending on the number of units that would be rented on a short-term basis.
- The developer complied with both the commercial and residential parking requirements which included building 23 temporary stalls with Phases 1 and 2.
- The proposal appeared to comply with the requirement of 20% commercial square footage required by the mixed-use code.
- A wall would be planned next to the southwest parking lot north of the Wilde property to mitigate light trespass from vehicles.
- The amount of water rights and parking for each commercial building would be submitted and included on the recorded plat.
- UDOT issued a permit for the project.

**Second:** Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Mayor Johnson noted that if UDOT did not grant a permit then the project could not proceed. Mr. Luster asked that UDOT be allowed to issue the permit up to the beginning of construction. Wes Johnson noted that UDOT had seen and accepted the project plan and was comfortable that a permit would be issued. Mr. Luster recommended that construction not begin until the permit was granted. Council Member Simonsen asked that be included in the development agreements.

Mr. Gordon recommended that the approval be conditioned upon approval of the development agreements.

**Amended Motion:** Council Member Dougherty amended his motion to grant final approval and conditional use permits to The Village, Phases 1 and 2 located at 541 East Main Street with the following findings and conditions:

- The proposal would benefit the City financially by creating a greater tax base.
- The proposal might help the City better comply with State requirements regarding the ability to collect the resort tax depending on the number of units that would be rented on a short-term basis.
- The developer complied with both the commercial and residential parking requirements which included building 23 temporary stalls with Phases 1 and 2.
- The proposal appeared to comply with the requirement of 20% commercial square

- footage required by the mixed-use code.
- A wall would be planned next to the southwest parking lot north of the Wilde property to mitigate light trespass from vehicles.
- The amount of water rights and parking for each commercial building would be submitted and included on the recorded plat.
- Construction could not begin until UDOT issued a permit.
- The development agreements for Phases 1 and 2 be approved.

**Second:** Council Member Orme seconded the amended motion.

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

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Council Member Simonsen noted that the approval of the proposed road widths was reasonable, considering the timing in the process, but added it was wise to consider more width.

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

Corbin Gordon explained that all issues raised at the last meeting had been resolved.

Council Member Simonsen requested that the large commercial building along Main Street have jogs and other measures to cancel out the reflection of noise. Dan Luster asked that the requirement allow him flexibility for design. He said the building would have stucco or rock.

Michael Henke indicated that all the commercial buildings would be reviewed by the Vision Architecture Committee (VAC).

**Motion:** Council Member Simonsen moved to approve Resolution 2022-21 as provided in the packet with the following change:

- Language be included that the large commercial building, along Main Street, have jogs and other measures to cancel out the reflection of noise. This requirement was general and allowed flexibility within the building footprint.

**Second:** Council Member Dougherty seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Council Member Dougherty noted that the name of the development would change. He asked if that would need to come back to the Council.

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



Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

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

**Motion:** Council Member Simonsen moved to approve Resolution 2022-22 as provided in the packet with the following change:

- Language be included that the large commercial building, along Main Street, have jogs and other measures to cancel out the reflection of noise. This requirement was general and allowed flexibility within the building footprint.

**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	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Mr. Luster did not anticipate that underground parking would change the plat map.

Mr. Luster was interested in increasing the area of the project included in the TROD, so that some units did not straddle the boundary. He asked if the Council would support the change. Mr. Henke responded that could cause other units to straddle the boundary.

**10. Reed Bezzant Subdivision, Lot 11 / Amendment** (Whiting Trusts – Approximately 15 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve an amendment to the Reed Bezzant Subdivision located at approximately 100 South 700 East (Zoning is R-1-11).  
**Public Hearing**

**11. Kim Bezzant Subdivision / Second Amendment** (Whiting Trusts – Approximately 15 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve a second amendment to the Kim Bezzant Subdivision located at approximately 100 South 600 East (Zoning is R-1-11).  
**Public Hearing**

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

- Background
- Location of the subdivisions
- Edelweiss Meadows
- Approved plat maps
- Possible findings

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- Lot 11 would be removed from the Reed Bezzant Subdivision and added to the Kim Bezzant Subdivision.
- The Kim Bezzant Subdivision included a future road that was on the City's master street plan. The road would not continue east.
- The amendments would help the applicants decrease their tax liability.
- State code required that the amendments be approved if they complied with the City's land use code.

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

Cheryl Whiting, applicant, made the following comments:

- Lot 11 would become part of a parcel that had reduced property taxes because of the Utah Urban Farming Act.
- Preferred not to deed Lot 11 to the City for a road at that time.

### **Public Hearings**

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

**Motion:** Council Member Orme moved to approve the Reed Bezzant Subdivision amendment taking out Lot 11 with the following findings:

- Reed Bezzant Lot 11 was created to house a future road.
- Kim Bezzant "Remaining Parcel A" did not have a building right until the lot received entitlement through a subdivision process.
- State law allowed the adjustment of a lot line regardless of whether the lots were in the same subdivision.
- State law required a land use authority to approve a lot line adjustment if the exchange would not result in a violation of any land use ordinance.
- State law stated that a plat amendment could be considered by the land use authority at a public meeting.
- No public street, right-of-way, or easement would be vacated or altered.

**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	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

**Motion:** Council Member Orme moved to approve changing the boundary for the Kim Bezzant Subdivision to include Lot 11 which was in the Reed Bezzant Subdivision with the following findings:

- Reed Bezzant Lot 11 was created to house a future road.
- Kim Bezzant “Remaining Parcel A” did not have a building right until the lot received entitlement through a subdivision process.
- State law allowed the adjustment of a lot line regardless of whether the lots were in the same subdivision.
- State law required a land use authority to approve a lot line adjustment if the exchange would not result in a violation of any land use ordinance.
- State law stated that a plat amendment could be considered by the land use authority at a public meeting.
- No public street, right-of-way, or easement would be vacated or altered.

**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	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

**12. Ordinance 2022-18 / Special Events** (Mayor – Approximately 15 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or adopt Ordinance 2022-18 amending Chapter 7.07 (Special Event License) of the Midway City Municipal Code regarding special events.

**13. Resolution 2022-23 / Special Events** (Mayor – Approximately 5 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve Resolution 2022-23 amending the Midway City Policies and Procedures regarding special events.

Mayor Johnson explained that the proposed ordinance was the product of reviewing the City's

special event regulations.

Corbin Gordon indicated that the ordinance gave the City's special event manager the discretion to approve an event or refer it to the City Council. He added that a decision by the manager could be appealed.

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

- Insurance would not be required for events on private property.
- The special event application seemed specific to public property.
- Would High Valley Arts' performances be subject to the proposed regulations?
- Events with 500 or more attendees would have to be approved by the Council.
- The proposal delegated the Council's authority to the manager. Why would an appeal go to the Council? The language was in the wrong section of the Municipal Code because it was an appeal of the Council's own delegated authority.
- The manager should not have to decide on a large rally of 300 people.

**Motion:** Council Member Dougherty moved to table Items 12 and 13.

**Second:** Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Council Member Simonsen asked if the City could require insurance for an event on private property. Mr. Gordon doubted that the City could require it.

Council Member Simonsen asked when insurance would be required on public property. He asked if the Farmers' Market had insurance. Michael Henke responded that larger events should have insurance.

Council Member Simonsen did not want the insurance requirement to be burdensome and unnecessary.

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

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

**14. Resolution 2022-18 / Fee Schedule** (City Recorder – Approximately 5 minutes) – Discuss and possibly approve Resolution 2022-18 updating the fee schedule for Midway City.

Brad Wilson gave a presentation on the proposed resolution and changes to the fee schedule.

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

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

- The proposed fees for special events should be higher to cover staff's time.
- A wedding on private property could be a special event with issues such as parking.
- A special event permit would never be a conditional use permit. The City might have some ability to mitigate the negative impacts of a special event permit.
- The City could say no to an event until its concerns were addressed.
- Some residents might not realize that they needed a permit for a large family reunion in their backyard.
- The special event fees should be more detailed and possibly tiered. These fees could be shown as pending.

**Motion:** Council Member Dougherty moved to adopt the changes as set forth in Resolution 2022-18.

**Second:** Council Member Simonsen seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Wes Johnson requested that the deposit for a small development be changed to \$2,000.

Council Member Payne asked if a higher fee was needed for a special event application that came before the City Council.

**Amended Motion:** Council Member Dougherty amended his motion to adopt the changes as set forth in Resolution 2022-18 with the deposit for a small development being \$2,000.

**Second:** Council Member Simonsen seconded the amended motion.

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

Council Member Dougherty	Aye
Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

**15. Ordinance 2022-19 / Civil Infractions & Enforcement** (City Attorney – Approximately 30 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or adopt Ordinance 2022-19 amending Title 2 (Municipal Government) and Title 5 (Health and Safety) of the Midway City Municipal Code regarding civil infractions and enforcement.

Mr. Gordon made the following comments:

- The ordinance expanded civil infractions to animals on public property.
- The Mayor could issue infractions or delegate that authority.
- Enforcement would only occur if there was a formal complaint.
- No changes had been made since the proposal was considered at a work meeting.
- The Mayor could annually grant authority for weed enforcement, etc.
- Did not want someone to say that the City was selectively enforcing infractions.

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

- The language regarding what the City actively enforced did not include all relevant items. It should be removed or expanded.
- The City actively enforced fence heights, signs, and weeds.
- The ordinance should not be limited by exceptions. It could include language that the policy of the City was generally not to seek out violators.
- An infraction might be a violation of a permit.
- Mr. Gordon should train anyone who was delegated the authority to issue infractions. Written training could be prepared.
- The fine for an infraction should be more than \$55. The fine could be tiered.

**Motion:** Council Member Simonsen moved to adopt Ordinance 2022-19 with the edits discussed and then reviewed by the City Attorney.

**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	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

#### **16. Closed Meeting to Discuss the Purchase, Exchange, or Lease of Real Property**

**Motion:** Council Member Dougherty moved to go into a closed meeting to discuss property acquisition.

**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	Excused from the Meeting
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 Simonsen 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	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

## 17. Adjournment

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Celeste Johnson, Mayor

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brad Wilson, Recorder