

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

**Tuesday, 21 May 2024, 6:00 p.m.
Midway Community Center, Council Chambers
160 West Main Street, Midway, Utah**

Note: Notices/agendas were posted at 7-Eleven, The Market 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 6:02 p.m. She excused Council Member Drury and Council Member Orme.

Members Present:

Celeste Johnson, Mayor
Kevin Payne, Council Member
Craig Simons, Council Member
JC Simonsen, Council Member

Staff Present:

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

Members Excused:

Jeff Drury, Council Member
Lisa Orme, 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 Payne gave the prayer and/or inspirational message.

2. Consent Agenda

- a. Agenda for the 21 May 2024 City Council Regular Meeting
- b. Warrants
- c. Minutes of the 7 May 2024 City Council Work Meeting
- d. Minutes of the 7 May 2024 City Council Regular Meeting

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

Mayor Johnson read the consent agenda.

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to approve the consent agenda as proposed.

Second: Council Member Simons seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

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

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	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.

Transportation and Safety Committee / North Center Street

Steve Dougherty made the following comments:

- Complemented the City on the new playground equipment at Hamlet Park.
- Noted that the City had an active parks committee.
- Recommended that the City form a committee regarding safety and transportation. This would allow residents to give input on the two issues.
- Streets and safety needed more attention.
- Congratulated the City on receiving a grant for a trail along the north section of Center Street.
- Residents should have more input on the north section of Center Street.

Mayor Johnson responded that a similar committee regarding safety and streets had stagnated.

No further comments were offered.

4. Department Reports

Affordable Housing Board / Workforce Housing

Council Member Payne reported that the Wasatch County Affordable Housing Board was considering a workforce housing proposal from Watts Enterprises.

HL&P / Rate Increase / Peak Usage Times

Council Member Payne reported that Heber Light & Power Company (HL&P) would increase its rates that month. He added that HL&P had also implemented rates based on peak usage times.

HVRR / Grant / Cars / Steam Engine / North Pole Express

Mayor Johnson made the following comments regarding the Heber Valley Railroad (HVRR):

- Had received a \$2 million grant from the State.
- Several railroad cars were being restored.
- Dining cars were being added.
- Tickets for the North Pole Express would be available the following month.

HVSSD / Advisory Board / Odor

Mayor Johnson reported that the Heber Valley Special Service District's (HVSSD) advisory board met that week. She added that HVSSD was having success reducing the odor from its sewer treatment plant.

5. Tentative FY 2025 Budget / Set Public Hearing (Budget Officer – Approximately 5 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or reschedule a public hearing, on the tentative budget for FY 2025, for 4 June 2024, 6:00 p.m. at the Midway Community Center (160 West Main Street, Midway, Utah).

Brad Wilson asked that the public hearing for the tentative budget be rescheduled to 4 June 2024. This would allow the final tax reimbursements to Ridley's Family Markets to be processed and the FY 2025 budget to be adjusted accordingly.

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to reschedule the public hearing for 4 June 2024, 6:00 p.m. at the Midway Community Center.

Second: Council Member Simons seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

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

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

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 proposed permit and reviewed the following items:

- Overview
- Noise limit chart
- Location with dBA readings
- High Valley Arts dBA measurements

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- Performances had been held at the location for 13 years.
- No complaints were received regarding the performances.
- Received letters of support.
- The applicant also asked that the permit fee be waived.
- Had not measured the sound levels to the west of the stage.
- The noise carried to the north.

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

Council Member Simonsen liked the performances and thought that they were good for the community.

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to approve the application for the noise variance without waiving the fee with the following finding:

- The City had valid reasons for the fee.

Second: Council Member Payne seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

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

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

7. Kantons at Village Green PUD / Amended Final Approval (Regal Homes – Approximately 15 minutes) – Discuss and possibly amend the final approval for the Kantons at Village Green PUD to change the landscaping plan.

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

- Overview
- Requests
- Location of the development
- Landscaping plan from 2013
- Revised landscaping plan from 2015
- Map of proposed changes
- Letter from Dade Rose (Applicant)

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- The Council considered the issue in July 2023.
- The Council requested an agreement between the developers and the HOA.
- The development had two landscaping plans that worked together.
- The development was mostly completed.
- The City still held the landscaping bond. It would not be released until the original or amended landscaping plan was completed.
- The development signs were not included in the landscaping bond. They were the developer's obligation.
- Approximately 80% of the unit owners supported the amendment.
- The proposal had not changed since it was last considered by the Council.
- The south trail was no longer needed because it was too close to the units and there were sidewalks throughout the project.
- The public trails would remain.
- The agreement was between the City and the developer who still controlled the HOA. Eventually the unit owners would control the HOA.
- The unit owners were worried that the money, which would have been used for the landscaping items being removed, would be spend before they took over the HOA.

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

Wes Johnson made the following comments:

- Did not have any issues with the amendment.
- \$46,000 remained in the landscaping bond.
- The HOA agreed to remove items from the landscaping plan if they received the money that would have been used for those improvements.
- The rest of the landscaping was satisfactory.
- The warranty period was completed.

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

- The developer could change.
- The unit owners should obtain in writing that the developer would not spend the remaining money for the landscaping.

- The unit owners would inform the City when the saved money was transferred and the bond could be released.
- Eliminating the trail would reduce maintenance costs for the unit owners.

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to amend the final approval for the Kantons at Village Green PUD with the following findings and conditions:

- The listed items were allowed to be removed from the landscaping plan not including the monument sign as listed as item six in the packet.
- The listed items included a private trail, pergola, and minor berms which could be removed from the landscaping plan.
- Release the warranty once the developer made the promised contribution to the HOA account.

Second: Council Member Simons seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

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

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

8. Rocky Mountain Power / Conditional Use Permit Amendment (Rocky Mountain Power – Approximately 60 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve an amendment to the conditional use permit for Rocky Mountain Power to rebuild the existing Judge transmission line located along the west boundary of Midway City.

Katie Villani gave a presentation regarding the request and reviewed the following items:

- History
- Location of the line proposed for upgrade
- Wildfire mitigation plan and standards
- Pole heights
- Pole height increases
- Pole diameter increases
- Referenced standards
- Applicant’s proposal
- Applicant’s position
- Analysis
- Possible findings

Ms. Villani also made the following comments:

- The applicant wanted the amendment so that the pole heights could be increased.

- Did not receive the diameter changes for each pole.
- A 16.2-foot average increase in pole height was requested.
- The current approval was for a ten-foot average increase.
- The City had requested specifics on the regulations for the height and diameter of power poles, but none were provided. Was concerned that no standards had been cited. The applicant should speak to these standards.
- Was concerned about transparency and what would be built. Was not concerned about the lack of notice.
- The amendment had not been considered by the Planning Commission.
- Did not have the pole heights for the approved conditional use permit.

Note: A copy of Ms. Villani's presentation is contained in the supplemental file.

John Hutchings, inhouse counsel for Rocky Mountain Power (RMP), introduced the team members working on the proposed project and made the following comments:

- RMP wanted an amendment to the CUP.
- The coversheet for the application was inaccurate and apologized for the mistake.
- Updated sheets and information had been provided to the City.
- The design had not changed.
- The upgrade was for wildfire mitigation and a high priority. It should be completed before the hottest summer months. Would like to begin in two weeks. It was not about upgrading to 138 kV.

Mr. Hutchins reviewed proposed language that required the applicant to notify the City of any intent to upgrade the line.

Nicole Kindall, manager of pole design for RMP, reviewed the following items:

- Total pole heights
- Pole design

Ms. Kindall also made the following comments:

- All heights included the buried portion of the poles.
- Lighting and avian protection were added to pole design eleven years prior.
- Space between the phases was increased for wildfire protection.
- Wanted the wires to sag.
- Wires had to be at least 28.3 feet from the sag to the ground.
- Ten percent plus two to four feet of each pole would be below ground.
- The greatest change was from the top to the shield wire, which was for lightning protection.
- The proposed line was spaced for 138 kV. It could not support two 138 kV circuits.
- The line would have to be rebuilt for two 138 kV circuits. The space between phases would have to be increased. The structures would have to be replaced because the line was in a wildfire area. Some poles could be reframed.
- Did not have the elevation changes for the line.
- The design was limited by the hardware and the need to keep the line level.

- New hardware would be installed but the current wire would be replaced later.
- The project could not happen, and the community would be put at risk if the amendment was not approved.

Mayor Johnson made the following comments:

- The City would have to pay the difference in cost if the line was buried.
- City staff asked for specific information and the CUP was granted based on that information.
- The City had been put in a bad position with the new request, which was different from what was originally requested.
- The City's staff had been treated poorly by RMP.
- The City wanted what was safe.
- There was a lack of trust between the City and RMP.
- A resident found the errors in the information provided by RMP.
- Was uncomfortable with the situation.
- Should the request be granted strictly for safety reasons?
- Any approval of the amendment should be conditioned upon future changes to the design or line being approved by the Council.

Council Member Payne made the following comments:

- There was not a lot of wildfire potential with the sections of the line that went through Midway.
- RMP denied that the new 970 South transmission line could support two 138 kV circuits. A RMP employee that worked on the line privately told him that it could support two 138 kV lines. This employee had no incentive to be dishonest. Struggled with this contradiction. Ms. Kendall responded that the conditions of the settlement agreement for the 970 South line had been met. She acknowledged that Council Member Payne's nephew worked on the project, but she designed the line. She indicated that the line was not designed for a second circuit. Council Member Payne stated that he strongly disagreed.
- Calculated that some poles were 20 feet higher than needed.

Council Member Simonsen asked the reason for a 90-foot pole as opposed to a 70-foot pole. He wanted to see a pole-by-pole justification for the heights. Ms. Kendall responded that structural drawings could be provided. She added that taller poles were required for corners.

Council Member Simons indicated that he received more inquiries regarding the proposed upgrade than on any other issue. He thought the issue had come down to trust.

Abhineet Sabharwal, manager of the project for RMP, made the following comments:

- The poles for the second phase had been delivered.
- A 30-week lead time was needed for poles.
- Tried his best to keep the City informed.
- Did not have the line design but tried to provide as much information as possible.
- Would provide information based on the strictest codes.
- Wanted to protect the wild area and the environment.

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to deny the Rockey Mountain Power conditional use permit amendment with the following findings:

- The proposal was an administrative review and approval.
- The proposed use was an amendment to a previously granted conditional use permit (CUP) and the City may deny the request or approve the request and impose reasonable conditions to mitigate identified issues.
- The proposal included taller and wider poles that would be visible to the residents of Midway, visitors of Midway, and the surrounding residents of Wasatch County.
- The stated purpose of the proposal was to reduce the probability of utility related wildfires and to mitigate damage to electric facilities because of wildfire.
- The General Plan described the surrounding zones to the proposed rebuild as an area of relatively large lots in an agricultural setting. The proposed lines would not be in harmony with this description although lines did currently exist along this route and had for several decades.
- The proposed amended CUP sought by RMP sought an additional average pole height increase of 6' (in addition to the 10' previously granted) and diameter increase up to 4" would create a greater visual presence for the transmission line than the existing poles and CUP previously granted.
- The applicant requested and was previously granted a CUP to rebuild the Judge Transmission Line replacing wooden poles with steel poles, to increase pole height an average of 10 feet per pole, and to increase pole diameter an average of one to two inches.
- The applicant bore the burden on its application for amendment to clearly demonstrate the need for the amendment and why the rebuild could not safely be accomplished within the parameters of the CUP previously granted based upon the needs professed by the Applicant at the time of application.
- To date, the applicant had not clearly identified the additional wildfire mitigation safety it believed the amendment would supply, that these measures were necessary in this zone, and/or that this could not be achieved under the CUP granted on November 7, 2024.
- The applicant cited industry and legislative standards generally as the basis for its request for additional height and width of poles, however, the applicant had represented that no industry or legislative standards required the additional height and width requested on this application.
- The applicant had proposed no mitigation measures to address the detrimental impacts of the requested amendment.

Second: Council Member Simons seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

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

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

Motion: Without objection, Mayor Johnson recessed the meeting at 8:08 p.m. She reconvened the meeting at 8:19 p.m.

9. Growth Boundary (City Planner – Approximately 30 minutes) – Discuss the possible expansion of the Midway Growth Boundary (Annexation Declaration).

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

- Discussion
- General Plan
- Growth boundary expansion
- Reasons to annex
- Current land use map
- Current east boundary
- 1750 West
- Northeast boundary
- Heber City growth maps to 2020-21
- Wasatch County Zoning Map
- Agricultural protection zones
- Routes for the proposed bypass of Heber City's Main Street.
- Noticing process

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- Staff needed direction from the Council.
- How far east should the boundary extend?
- Recommended that both sides of 1750 West be included if the boundary went that far east.
- The fields on the south side (south fields) of Hwy 113 did not have the same access as the fields on the north side (north fields).
- Wasatch County wanted through roads every quarter mile.
- At one time Heber City's growth boundary went to 1750 West. It had been retracted to the location of the new high school.
- The City's zoning was denser than the County's zoning.
- A public facilities zone and a zone like the County's A-20 would need to be created. Agricultural protection zones, which were different from conservation easements, would also be needed.
- There was an RA-5 zone to the southeast.
- How far east should the boundary go and what zones should it be included?
- The property on the southwest corner of Hwy 40 and River Road intersection might be annexed into Heber City.
- There was little motivation for the owners of established subdivisions to annex.
- The current boundary went to the River Meadows Ranch Subdivision on River Road.
- Properties would need to be forced in, or a creative route used to annex Soldier Hollow into the City. This would be difficult without creating a peninsula.
- County approval was needed to leave unincorporated islands or peninsulas.
- Property owners in the north fields had to drill a well or annex into a city to get culinary water. Fire flow was also needed, which was expensive.

- Providing power in the north fields was a challenge.
- There were alternative septic systems that were above ground. These could be used in the north fields if the property did not pass a percolation test.

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

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

- Should the boundary go to the end of River Road?
- The Wasatch County Council and Heber City Council agreed on a bypass road with protection for open space.
- A bypass road would open the north fields for intense development.
- Heber City had a different philosophy on growth. If Heber City would not protect the north fields, then Midway should. The Council should be bold.
- Midway City granting increased density in the north fields was counterproductive to preserving it.
- The City could grant agricultural protection to property owners in the north fields.
- There could be rural development zones with clustering in the north fields.
- Any zone could discourage water and sewer hookups. A water system in the north fields would be expensive.
- Both sides of Hwy 113 should be considered for inclusion in the boundary.

Michael Henke would come back to the Council with a map including possible boundary lines and zones.

10. Open Space Bond Funds / Lundin Family Property (Wendy Fischer – Approximately 15 minutes) – Receive an update and discuss the preservation of open space on property owned by the Lundin family at approximately 900 West Bigler Lane.

Corbin Gordon made the following comments:

- The Lundin family had reached a settlement agreement with two family members being bought out.
- Certain parts of the agreement needed clarification. A full release was needed if Midway City paid funds for preservation. This would need to be discussed with opposing counsel. A draft conservation easement could then be prepared.

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

- Associated trails and roads needed to be finalized.
- A second access was needed for the Swiss alpine area. Developers had previously paid money to the City to help construct the road.
- The Lundin family did not like the proposed route for the second access. An alternative was a road from Sunburst Ranch going north.
- Kohler Lane was another alternative route. Joe Tesch, who had represented the owners of this route, said the owners would be willing to discuss it.

11. Resolution 2024-15 / Water Line Assumption Agreement (City Attorney – Approximately 60 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve Resolution 2024-15 adopting a water line assumption agreement, between Midway City and the Cottage Creek Homeowners Association, for the Cottage Creek PUD located at approximately 400 North Pine Canyon Road.

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

- Cottage Creek Court plat map
- Master meters

Mr. Gordon also made the following comments:

- The City use to allow master meters for developments. The HOA was responsible for all the water infrastructure on the side of the meter opposite the main line.
- The Cottage Creek HOA was unable to get insurance on their culinary water system because of the associated fire hydrants. The HOA approached the City to find a solution to the problem. This was not an optimum situation. It would be the first time the City assumed responsibility for a private water system.
- There were ten to eleven other developments in Midway that had private culinary water systems.
- The City negotiated with Swiss Oaks to help with its private system. An agreement was not reached because of new requirements from the State.
- Then council member Steve Dougherty, Wes Johnson, and himself negotiated the proposed agreement. The City would assume responsibility for the water system in the development.
- The lines for the water system were not in the locations preferred by the City. Some were in landscaped areas and not the road.
- The agreement indicated that the City would have the necessary easements and would not be responsible for the landscaping, sprinkler systems, etc. if it had to make repairs. It also required a meter for each group of units.
- The State discouraged private water systems.
- The HOA instead of the individual unit owners would be billed for the culinary water.
- Only the City and not the HOA should shut off culinary water.
- The water system was 30 years old with a six-inch main line being 600 feet long.

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

Wes Johnson made the following comments:

- The culinary water system was the City's most valuable asset.
- Untreated water could be brought into the culinary water system if a leak was not repaired properly.
- Valves and other mechanical devices needed to be inspected regularly.
- Did not like fire hydrants on private lines.
- The State now required more for private systems such as certified water operators, inspections, etc.

- Assuming private water systems was different from assuming private roads.
- The City needed to be sure that residents would not work on water meters and would only work on water lines with the City's employees present.
- The City no longer allowed master meters.
- The cost to replace all the private water systems would be under \$2 million.
- The water lines went underneath the buildings to connect to each unit.
- Mr. Dougherty reported on the issue during department reports.
- The hydrants did not need to be replaced.
- Were construction standards followed when the system was installed?
- The HOA had been good to work with when creating the agreement.

Bix Dimeo, representing the Cottage Creek Court HOA, made the following comments:

- The private system did not connect to any other developments.
- The HOA had access to fix the entirety of each line.
- One of the hydrants might not function for various reasons.
- Installed backflow preventers, at the HOA's cost, in accordance with an original version of the agreement.
- The City should not require any additional funds that might not have been paid over the years.
- The HOA had paid what the City required.
- The City might not have to replace the line for some time.
- One-inch laterals went from the main line to the buildings.
- The City did not sign the original version of the agreement but there was a memorandum of understanding.
- The HOA did its part.
- Had not needed to repair the line.
- A 20-foot easement would be granted. It would be mostly along the curb but would allow the City to put the line in the road.
- The City was good at maintaining and managing water systems.

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

- The HOA would pay the culinary water bills from its dues and not bill each member individually.
- Two fire hydrants were part of the private system.
- Water lines could last from 15 to 80 years depending upon the conditions and materials.
- If the City assumed the system, then it would be included in its 10-year maintenance plan.
- Assuming the system would solve the HOA's insurance problem, but would that create additional liability for the City? It would better protect the system.
- Would the City set an unwanted precedence if it assumed the system?
- Had water impact fees been required for the development?
- How much had the residents in the development paid for culinary water over the years?
- How much money did the developer and unit owners save by having a master meter?
- Should each unit have a meter? Should each unit be charged a water impact fee?
- The City did not approve installing the backflow preventors.
- Was the City willing to assume all the private systems in Midway?
- The private system would have to be replaced soon.

- Residents should not be penalized for past mistakes but the City should be fair.
- The City liked to have control of its culinary water infrastructure.
- Other HOAs would request that their private culinary water systems be assumed by the City.
- The City should not have allowed master meters.
- The HOA had shown good faith.
- A compromise could be reached.
- The meter costs should be determined.
- It was important to protect the City's water resources.
- What would the revenue from a normal fee have been over time?
- The Council needed another two weeks to consider the request. It needed to consider the request based on all residents and developments.
- Any calculations prepared by the City would be provided to the HOA.
- The cost to install the meters, a comparison of what had been paid and what could have been paid, replacement and repair costs for the system, and impact fees paid needed to be determined.
- Should the main lines in the system be moved? Did that need to be in the agreement?
- Where was the sewer located for the project?

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to continue the item until the next council meeting with the items listed by the City Attorney to be reviewed.

Second: Council Member Simons seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

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

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

Motion: Council Member Payne 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 Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

12. Closed Meeting to Discuss Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation

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

Second: Council Member Simonsen seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

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

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	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 Simons seconded the motion.

Discussion: None


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

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

13. Adjournment

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 p.m.



 Celeste Johnson, Mayor



 Brad Wilson, Recorder