

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Wednesday, December 4, 2019

5:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

8000 South Redwood Road

West Jordan, Utah 84088

COUNCIL: Mayor Jim Riding, and Councilmembers Alan Anderson, Dirk Burton, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, and Chris McConnehey. Councilmember Whitelock attended electronically.

STAFF: David R. Brickey, City Manager; Korban Lee, Assistant City Manager; Rob Wall, City Attorney; Scott Langford, Community Development Director; Danyce Steck, Finance Director; Brock Hudson, Community Preservation Director; Brian Clegg, Public Works Director; Derek Maxfield, Fire Chief; Ken Wallentine, Police Chief; Dave Naylor, Parks Manager; Duncan Murray, Assistant City Attorney; Jared Tingey, Assistant City Attorney; Larry Gardner, City Planner; Kent Page, Associate Planner; David Murphy, Engineering Manager for CIP; Tauni Barker, Communications and Events Manager; Joe Bryant, Procurement Manager; Paul Brockbank, Fire Marshall; Rachel Mackay, I.T. Administrative Assistant, and Jamie Brooks, Interim City Clerk.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Riding called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Scott Langford.

III. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Carmen Valdez said she believed West Jordan was a beautiful city, but was disappointed the City had not moved forward with renewable energy. She briefly explained HB 411, and asked the City Council to commit to 100% clean energy by 2030 by passing a City resolution in support of HB 411 prior to December 31, 2019.

Russ Ridge, West Jordan resident, expressed dismay over the masonry block chosen for the new Public Works building, and said he would be persistent in seeking a resolution.

Steve Jones, West Jordan resident, asked the Council to get back to basics and provide for public safety. He said he was tired of feeling he did not get anything in return for his tax dollars, and said he was beginning to feel unsafe in his own neighborhood.

There was no one else who wished to speak.

AUDIT PRESENTATION

Marcus Arbuckle with Keddington & Christensen presented the audit report of the Consolidated Annual Financial Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019. A clean opinion was issued. Internal controls were examined and found to be adequate, with no recommendations for improvement. Mr. Arbuckle explained compliance findings included in the report, and answered questions from the Council.

MOTION: Councilmember McConnehey moved to approve Resolution 19-207, accepting the audit report and presentation by Keddington & Christensen, LLC of the Consolidated Annual Financial Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019. Councilmember Jacob seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Yes
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 7-0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL ORDINANCE 19-45, AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT FOR 10.02 ACRES FROM VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AND REZONE FRO RR-1D (RURAL RESIDENTIAL 1-ACRE MINIMUM LOTS) ZONE TO R-1-12F (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL 12,000 SQUARE FOOT MINIMUM LOTS) ZONE AND RE-20F (RESIDENTIAL ESTATE 20,000 SQUARE FOOT MINIMUM LOTS) ZONE; 7401 SOUTH 5490 WEST; BARBER PROPERTY, PETERSON DEVELOPMENT, LLC/RYAN PETERSON

Larry Gardner explained that the application put before the Council with public hearings on October 23, 2019 and December 4, 2019, requested the following:

- 1) Amend the Future Land Use Map from Very Low Density Residential to Low Density Residential.
- 2) Rezone from RR-1D (Rural Residential 40,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area) to R-1-12F (Single-family residential, 12,000 sq. ft. minimum) and RE-20 (Residential Estates, 20,000 sq. ft. minimum).

The proposed amendment would affect 10.02 total acres at approximately 7401 South 5490 West. The southern parcel (20-25-300-008) contained one single-family dwelling; the northern parcel (20-25-300-007) had no existing dwelling; both parcels had been used for agriculture.

If the land use map amendment and rezoning were approved, the applicant proposed to subdivide the properties into 19 single-family residential lots. (Please see Exhibit D)

Exhibit D was a revised Concept Plan submitted before the City Council. The Concept Plan showed 19 lots over 10.02 acres with R-1-12 and RE-20 zoning. Because the rezone application from Planning Commission to City Council had been revised to have less dense potential density, staff believed it was not necessary for the Planning Commission to give a recommendation based on this revised Concept Plan.

One of the concerns voiced in the August 20, 2019 Planning Commission meeting was the potential conflict between lots zoned Rural Residential (RR) with greater animal rights and lots zoned just "Residential" (R-1-12). Since the August 20, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, the rezone application was revised to show R-1-12 and RE-20. However, unlike Rural Residential zones, Residential Estate zones did not provide additional animals rights over just Residential zones, so the potential conflict between animal rights would still exist.

The subject property's surrounding zoning and land uses were as follows:

	Future Land Use	Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	Very Low Density & Low Density Residential	RR-1D & RR-.5D	Agriculture & Single-family Residential
South	Low Density Residential	R-1-12F	Single-family Residential
East	Medium Density Residential	RR-1E	Single-family Residential
West	Very Low Density & Low Density Residential	A-1 & RR-1D	Agriculture & Single-family Residential

Section 13-7C-6: Amendments to the Land Use Map

According to City Code, Section 13-7C-6, any amendments to the general plan, including maps, shall be approved only if the following are met.

Finding A: *The proposed amendment conforms to and is consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the City General Plan.*

Discussion: Statements, goals, and policies in the General Plan support and do not support the proposed Land Use Amendment (pp.18-32)

Goal	Conforms
Maintain Stability & Consistency In Land Use Decision-Making	No

Continually & Consistently Update the Future Land Use Map, Zoning Map, and Zoning Ordinance for ease of Reference and Administration	Neutral
Promote Land Use Policies & Standards that are Economically Feasible & Orderly, which also Protect Desirable Existing Land Uses & Minimize Impacts to Existing Neighborhoods	Neutral
Provide a Safe & Healthy Living Environment for All Citizens of the City	Neutral
Establish Community Pride through Creation of Attractive, Well-designed, & Maintained Neighborhoods	Neutral
Manage Growth Occurring Within the City	Neutral
Encourage a Diversity of Dwelling Unit Types & Densities in Residential Areas	Yes

“Land use decisions shall, as much as possible, be guided by the maps, goals, and policies of the General Plan.” (p.18) The General Plan calls for this property to be “Very Low Density Residential.”

The General Plan states that lower density single-family residential uses are most preferred while a range of residential densities and housing types should be provided (p.23).

The General Plan defines “Very Low Density Residential” as up to two dwellings per acre; “Low Density Residential” is defined as 1 to 3.0 dwelling units per acre (p.24).

The Future Land Use Map calls for the two parcels (in this rezone application) to continue to be “Very Low Density Residential”; R-1-12 (the proposed rezone) is considered “Low Density Residential” but not “Very Low Density Residential”.

The General Plan advises to “Update the Future Land Use Map on an as-needed basis after positively finding that the location of the new or changed use is appropriate for the area and that no negative impact will be created to the neighborhood or the city because of the change”. (p.19) The General Plan is dated 2012, and growth around subject properties have since changed acceptable fire response times. Public road 5490 West is master planned as a 60-foot collector street.

The City has changed the land use and zoning on properties to the south to R-1-12.

Finding: The proposed GLUP (General Land Use Plan) map amendment conformed to the City’s General Plan.

Finding B: *The development pattern contained on the land use plan inadequately provides the appropriate optional sites for the use and/or change proposed in the amendment. (See Comprehensive General Plan, pp. 23-32)*

Discussion: The City has relatively few undeveloped acres classified as “Low Density Residential”. Most “Low Density Residential” properties are built-out.

It is a General Plan residential goal and policy to provide a safe and healthy, living environment for all citizens of the city and to ensure safety, accessibility, and walkability within and between neighborhoods (p.26). While the official Future Land Use Map should accurately represent the future land use needs and goals of the city (p.19), walkability within and between “Very Low Density” or “Low Density” can be unrealistic.

Finding: The development pattern contained on the land use plan inadequately provided the appropriate optional sites for the use and/or change proposed in the amendment.

Finding C: *The proposed amendment will be compatible with other land uses, existing or planned, in the vicinity*

Discussion: The proposed amendment is compatible with adjacent “Low Density Residential” and single-family land use to the south; but it will be less compatible with adjacent “Very Low Density Residential” to the north and to the west. The Future Land Use Map calls for this property to remain “Very Low Density Residential.”

“Low Density Residential” is often not compatible with “Very Low Density Residential” because zones considered “Very Low Density Residential” need more acreage to conduct rural residential land uses such as the maintaining and keeping of large animals. However, the adjacent “agricultural” land is minor agricultural – often considered “hobby farming”. And, zones classified as “Very Low Density Residential” need more acreage to buffer potential nuisances (insects, odors, noises) between properties that maintain animals and fowl and properties which do not. Only the Rural Residential (RR) zones classified in the “Low Density” designation allows the maintaining and keeping of animal and fowl; most zones in this designation do not allow the maintaining and keeping of animal and fowl.

Finding: The proposed amendment would be compatible with and incompatible with other land uses, existing or planned, in the vicinity.

Finding D. The proposed amendment constitutes an overall improvement to the adopted general land use map and is not solely for the good or benefit of a particular person or entity.

Discussion: The application holds the burden of proof that the proposed amendment constitutes an overall improvement to the adopted general land use map and is not solely for the good or benefit of a particular person or entity.

The application before the City Council, addresses whether the amendment is an overall improvement to the adopted general land use map by answering the following questions with the following answers:

1. Public purpose for the amendment in question.

The public purpose for the amendment in question is to change 10.02 acres to a zone and land use that fits well with the adjacent zoning and land uses and will be a good fit for the adjacent existing neighborhoods.

2. Confirmation that the public purpose is best served by the amendment in question.

Low density single family lots are the best fit for these parcels when considering the existing land uses surrounding this site. Due to the shape of the parcels, with the intent of keeping one lot with an existing home as a lot, we will have varying lot sizes. The smallest lot we are seeking would fall within the 12,000 square foot minimum lot size requirement. All others are larger so we are requesting the R-1-12F zone to meet this minimum requirement.

3. Compatibility of the proposed amendment with general plan policies, goals, and objectives.

The proposed amendment is compatible with the general plan policies, goals and objectives. The adjacent zones are RR-1D to the north, RR-1E to the east, R-1-10D(ZC) to the south-east, R-1-12F to the south and A-1 to the west. The surrounding land uses are very low, low and medium density residential. This is a prime location to put low density residential with lots ranging in size to match the adjacent lots and home sizes.

4. Consistency of the proposed amendment with the general plan's timing and sequencing provisions on changes of use.

The proposed amendment is consistent with the general plan's timing and sequencing provisions of changes of use. This property has not been submitted for any changes in zone or land use in the past year.

5. Potential of the proposed amendment to hinder or obstruct attainment of the general plan's policies.

The proposed amendment supports the general plan's policies regarding keeping a majority of new development as single-family lots. The proposed amendment also supports the general plan's policies on the location of low-density single-family housing.

6. Adverse impacts on adjacent land owners.

The impacts to adjacent landowners will be minimal. Access to this subdivision will be gained from the existing stub road in the Bella Estates subdivision and from 5490 West. Due to the 4-minute response time for fire/emergency vehicles it is required that we stub onto 5490 West. We are proposing 17 lots (19 with revised concept) so there will be minimal impact on traffic through the existing neighborhood. It will trigger the development of 5490 W. adjacent to and south of these parcels into a public street so there will be less traffic drawn through the existing neighborhood to the south and will allow a more direct route onto 5490 W. and out onto the arterial street 5600 W. This will allow for more direct vehicular and pedestrian access from the existing neighborhood to the commercial center on 5600 W. and 7800 S.

7. Verification that the correctness in the original zoning or general land use plan map is correct for the area in question.

The original zoning is consistent with the general land use plan map.

8. Impacts on City services such as water, sewer, storm drain, public streets, traffic, fire and police services.

There is water, sewer, and storm drain stubbed in 5400 West. 5490 W. will be constructed on the portion adjacent to this project. There will only be an estimated 17 lots in this project so impact to traffic will be minimal. This project will not have a large impact on fire and police services.

9. Impacts on schools.

This project will have minimal impact on schools due to it only including 16 new lots (19 with revised Concept Plan).

10. Impacts on the local economy and other factors as requested by the planning department.

This project will have minimal impact on the local economy.

Finding: It was unclear whether the proposed amendment constituted an overall improvement to the adopted general land use map.

Finding E. *The proposed amendment will not adversely impact the neighborhood and community as a whole by significantly altering acceptable land use patterns and requiring larger and more expensive public infrastructure improvements, including, but not limited to, roads, water, wastewater and public safety facilities, than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change.*

Discussion: The City's Transportation Master Plan identifies 5490 West street to become a two or three lane collector regardless of this proposed amendment; as a result, 5490 West's right-of-way is in the process of widening.

Finding: As mentioned in Finding A, the proposed amendment would and would not adversely impact the neighborhood and community as a whole by significantly altering acceptable land use patterns and requiring larger and more expensive public infrastructure improvements than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change.

Finding F. *The proposed amendment is consistent with other adopted plans, codes and ordinances.*

Discussion: Staff is not aware of any other adopted plans, codes, and/or ordinances that are consistent with or inconsistent with this request.

Finding: Staff was not aware of any other adopted plans, codes, and/or ordinances that were consistent with or inconsistent with this request.

Section 13-7D-7(A): Amendments to the Zoning Map

Prior to making a positive recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Map amendment, the Planning Commission considered the following findings:

Criteria 1: *The proposed amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.*

Discussion: The rezone application is to change the current RR-1D (Rural Residential, 40,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area) to R-1-12F (Single-family Residential, 12,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area) and RE-20 (Residential Estate, 20,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area).

This question has essentially been answered already under "Finding A": the General Plan says that lower density single-family residential uses are most preferred while a range of residential densities and housing types should be provided (p.23).

The 2012 General Plan defines Very Low Density Residential and Low Density Residential land use designation as follows:

“Very Low Density will include development having up to two dwelling units per acre. Characteristics of land in this category range from extremely large acreages of land still in agricultural production, to fairly large lots (an acre or more) some of which may allow horses and other farm animals to be kept. Very low density residential uses are appropriate as a buffer between higher density single-family development and dedicated open lands or on hillsides where sensitive slopes make higher density development inadvisable.” (p.24)

“Low Density Residential will include development providing for low intensity single-family detached residential uses typically found in suburban and traditional neighborhoods.” (Page 25)

The current zoning map shows few properties zoned R-1-12, and the Future Land Use Map shows few properties classified as Very Low Density Residential.

The General Plan classifies the proposed zone of R-1-12 as “Low Density Residential” and this particular property to be “Very Low Density Residential.”

The following is the Residential Density table from the General Plan:

Residential Density - Adjusted Net Density		
Density Designation	Density Range (Dwelling Units Per Acre)	Zoning Districts
Very Low Density	Up to 2.0	All A, RR, RE Zones, PC, PRD
Low Density	1 to 3.0	RR, RE, R-1-12, R-1-14, PC, PRD
Medium Density	3.1 to 5.0	R-1-8, R-1-9, R-1-10, PC, PRD
High Density	5.1 to 10.0	RM, R-1-5, R-1-6, R-2, R-3-6, R-3-8, R-3-10, PC, PRD
Very High Density	10.1 and up	R-3-12, R-3-16, R-3-20, R-3-22, PC, PRD

The proposed R-1-12F zoning is compatible with the southern adjacent property zoned R-1-12F. However, it is not compatible with the A-1 property to the west, the RR-1D to the north, nor the RR-1E to the east. (This general area will continue to experience pressures for denser zoning due to surrounding areas having denser zoning.)

With sufficient road dedication, the concept plan is compliant with the master transportation plan for 5490 West to become a two or three lane collector road.

The proposed rezone to R-1-12F is not in compliance with the current General Plan’s land use designation of “Very Low Density”, and the proposed rezone to RE-20 is probably considered “Low Density” while RE-40 is considered “Very Low Density”.

Finding: The proposed amendment was consistent with and inconsistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.

Criteria 2: *The proposed amendment will result in compatible land use relationships and does not adversely affect adjacent properties.*

Discussion: Changing the land use from Rural Residential, one-acre minimum to Residential, 12,000 square foot lots minimum and Residential Estate, 20,000 square foot lots will be positive for the existing R-1-12 adjacent properties, but it will be negative for the remaining Rural Residential adjacent properties. Rezoning (and the subsequent development) will allow the City to acquire additional right-of-way for a master planned two or three lane collector along 5490 West.

Finding: The proposed amendment would result in compatible and incompatible land use relationships and did and did not adversely affect adjacent properties. The current and the proposed land uses were both single-family.

Criteria 3: *The proposed amendment furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City.*

Discussion: The rezone application's concept plan shows potential in furthering public health, safety and the general welfare of the citizens of the City with the proposed amendment. Staff has been working with the applicant to improve visualization of how this property, if rezoned, can best be utilized to further the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City.

As stated earlier, it can be reasonably argued that the proposed amendment furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City; it can also be reasonably argued that the proposed amendment hinders the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City.

The proposed rezone's concept plan can establish community pride through the creation of an attractive, well-designed, and maintained neighborhood. (p.27)

Finding: The proposed amendment may further the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City.

Criteria 4: *The proposed amendment will not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.*

Discussion: The proposed amendment will not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities, but it will stretch fire response times without

development of 5490 West. The Fire Department says that the concept plan submitted with this rezone application provides adequate emergency access.

Finding: The proposed amendment should not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.

Criteria 5: *The proposed amendment is consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.*

Discussion: This property is within the Airport Overlay Conical Zone (Ac): “A zone that commences at the periphery of the horizontal zone and extends outward therefrom a horizontal distance of four thousand feet (4,000').” The Conical Zone is considered the least impactful area of the Airport Overlay Zone. When this property is platted, the plat should state that this area is within the “Airport Overlay Conical Zone (Ac)”.

Finding: The proposed amendment was consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.

This application’s proposed Future Land Use Map amendment from Very Low Density Residential to Low Density Residential, and proposed Rezoning from RR-1D to R-1-12F and R-E-20 was partially supported by the General Plan.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Jacob, Fire Marshall Paul Brockbank explained that emergency response time could be within the required four minutes if the proposed development connected to 5490 West. He said it would be possible to limit the access at 5490 West with a gate.

Mr. Gardner stated that converting 5490 West to a dedicated public road was part of the City’s transportation master plan. He explained that in response to concerns raised by the Planning Commission, the applicant altered the proposed development plan to put half-acre residential lots along the east boundary of the development, adjacent to existing half-acre lots. Scott Langford commented that the Council would need to decide whether or not they wanted to continue the trend of development in the subject neighborhood. He said there was precedent in both directions.

Mayor Riding opened the public hearing.

Tiffany Ostrander, West Jordan resident, said she lived directly east of the proposed development. Ms. Ostrander said she attended a neighborhood meeting with Peterson Development and thought a resolution had been reached regarding animal properties, but seeing that non-animal lots were included in the development plan in the staff report, it appeared a resolution was not reached. She said only 2% of the neighborhoods in West

Jordan had lots of one acre or more, and emphasized that open agricultural areas should be preserved. Ms. Ostrander stated the proposed development was not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and asked the Council to consider how important the remaining 2% was to the City.

Steve Sheeley, West Jordan resident, said he moved to West Jordan to have a one-acre lot. He felt the proposed zoning would lead to contentious relationships between neighbors and was in opposition to the proposed rezone.

Marly Spruff, West Jordan resident, said the ability to have large animals was a large part of why she chose to purchase property in West Jordan. Ms. Spruff said she felt the proposed rezone would set a precedent that would change the integrity of the entire area with no buffer for existing residents. She stated she was not opposed to development, but was saddened that the Council was willing to let go of the unique agricultural areas.

Steve Jones, West Jordan resident, said he agreed with the residents who had spoken, and believed existing agricultural use should have a place in the City.

Milton Scow, West Jordan resident, said his property was directly east of the proposed development. He did not believe the proposed development was the proper plan for the subject property. Mr. Scow pointed out that the Planning Commission did not recommend approval of the proposed rezone and his preference for the subject property would be half-acre lots with animals allowed.

Ryan Peterson, applicant, said his goal with the proposed development was to provide new lots and new housing in the community. He recognized that there was a time and place for each type of development. Mr. Peterson said the development plans had been amended, and said he would be open to allowing animal rights in the area. Mr. Peterson pointed out that 5490 West as a public right-of-way was included on the City's master plan independent of the proposed development.

Bret Burgon, West Jordan resident, said he moved to West Jordan to have horse property and open space. Mr. Burgon indicated this was the fifth meeting he had attended regarding this issue, and he did not understand why the discussion was continuing when appropriate fire access had not yet been included in the plan. He said he would like to see half-acre lots on the entire subject property.

Kelvin Green, speaking as a West Jordan citizen and not as a member of the Planning Commission, emphasized that the decision before the Council was about setting direction of public policy. He said he wished the Council to understand that the decision would affect multiple properties in the future.

Lynn Bowler, West Jordan resident, developer, and HOA President for 5490 West representing 50+ HOA members, said he loved West Jordan City. He said listening to the discussions he had heard several concerns or issues repeated:

- 1) Compatibility issues regarding animal rights and lot sizes;

- 2) Access at 5490 West (private road);
- 3) General plan for the area – Mr. Bowler said it would make sense to first take a macro-view; and
- 4) 450-foot cul-de-sac length that would allow two lots.

Mr. Bowler asked that the Council approve development in a smart and orderly fashion.

Amy Martz, West Jordan resident, stated that residents relied on the zoning that was in place when they purchased property, and asked that the Council withstand pressure from developers.

Justin Hendricks, West Jordan resident, felt the proposed development would be a continuation of development begun with the Bella Estates and Winter Circle developments, and would fit in the West Jordan area. Referring to lot sizes, he did not believe bigger was always better.

Randy Bowler, West Jordan resident, said he had experience farming land and developing land. Mr. Bowler did not see a clear pathway to complete the proposed development, and suggested the Council not approve the requested rezone until a clear pathway was in place. He felt the property should be zoned R-.5 to retain animal rights.

Jeff Seaman with Petersen Development said he was at the recent meeting with neighborhood residents and heard a few primary concerns: 1) no one wanted change; and 2) concern regarding increased traffic as a result of the project. He did not believe the HOA residents were familiar with the HOA covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs).

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, Mayor Riding closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Jacob commented that animal rights could not be granted in an RE Zone. Staff agreed, and suggested an RR-20 Zone could be approved instead of an RE-20. Councilmember Jacob said it was his understanding that the Council had the choice between the current zoning and the proposed zoning. Mr. Gardner responded that it was within the Council's legislative discretion to determine appropriate zoning consistent with the zoning map.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Jacob, Staff said they were not aware of any complaints about animals originating from the Bella Estates development.

Councilmember McConnehey questioned whether the City had the right to dictate who could or must connect to 5490 West, which was a private road, and questioned whether the proposed development would put an undue burden on the owners of 5490 West.

Councilmember McConnehey said he liked the idea of animal rights being incorporated into the subject property. He commented that the Planning Commission forwarded a negative recommendation for this application multiple times, and said he appreciated Staff's comments. Councilmember McConnehey said he felt the developer was headed in the right direction, but said he was leaning toward a denial to allow further discussion.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Anderson, Rob Wall explained that the Council could approve a similar or less-intensive use than proposed, but a more-intensive use than proposed would require a public notice process. Councilmember Anderson said he had heard conflicting opinions – some wanted 5490 West to remain a private road, and some wanted 5490 West to become a public right-of-way.

Councilmember Burton said he appreciated all comments shared in and out of the public meeting. He said he wondered if 5490 West residents were in favor of keeping 5490 West private to retain some control over development. He encouraged continued cooperation between the developer and residents.

Councilmember Lamb commented on the change that had taken place in the area in a relatively short time. He said he believed the proposed development was not the right fit for the subject property.

Councilmember Whitelock said she felt it was important for the City to maintain properties with animal rights.

Councilmember McConnehey said he did not want to create the assumption that the City would jump in and start maintaining 5490 West without the road first becoming compliant with City road standards.

MOTION: Councilmember McConnehey moved to deny Ordinance 19-45 based on the criteria laid out by the Planning Commission.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Councilmember Jacob said he believed the proposal was close, but not quite ready for approval. He said he would rather see the proposal tweaked than denied.

Mr. Gardner explained that the intensity referred to was intensity of regulation.

Councilmember Jacob suggested that RR-20 on the east portion of the subject property would be an appropriate compromise.

Mayor Riding invited the applicant to respond to comments made.

Ryan Peterson pointed out that the conceptual plan included 18 units on 10 acres, which was less than the two units per acre allowed with the existing zoning. He commented that Peterson Development would continue to work with the neighbors and the City as the process continued.

Councilmember McConnehey said he would like to see the proposed modifications go back to the Planning Commission for further discussion and public comment, and said he was in support of denying the application.

Councilmember Anderson agreed with Councilmember Jacob that a compromise could be found. He referred to the Staff comment that there was a similar intensity between RR-20 and RE-20, with RR-20 allowing animal rights.

MOTION: Councilmember Anderson moved to approve Ordinance 19-45 as written, replacing RE-20 with RR-20 throughout the document. Councilmember Jacob seconded the motion.

Councilmember Burton asked if Councilmember Anderson would consider altering the motion to designate RR-20 across the entire property. Councilmember Anderson responded that he would not approve that amendment to the motion because it did not match what the applicant presented.

Councilmembers McConnehey and Whitelock said they would be interested in knowing how many of the citizens in attendance were in favor of the change from RE-20 to RR-20. Mayor Riding asked for a show of hands.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	No
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	No
Councilmember McConnehey	No
Councilmember Whitelock	No
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion failed 3-4.

Councilmember McConnehey said he would be in favor of the applicant returning with a proposal with a clear pathway for completion that was recommended by the Planning Commission.

MOTION: Councilmember Lamb moved to deny Ordinance 19-45. Councilmember McConnehey seconded the motion.

Mr. Wall informed the Council that City ordinance prohibited an applicant after a rezone denial from reapplying with a substantially similar application for at least one year.

Councilmember Lamb withdrew his motion.

Councilmember McConnehey said he felt it was clear the Council considered RR-20 to be substantially different from RE-20. Staff stated that RR-20 and RE-20 had historically been treated as substantially similar. Councilmember McConnehey asked if the Council could make a motion to deny the application but allow the applicant to return with a proposal that included an RR element in less than a year. Mr. Wall said he believed that would be enough

of a change. Staff suggested the Council table the item and ask the developer to work with Staff, or direct the issue to go back through the Planning Commission process. Mr. Wall suggested the Council could table to a time certain, or the applicant could begin the process again with a new application.

MOTION: Mayor Riding made a motion to table the issue to the second meeting in February, which would allow the applicant time to go to the Planning Commission with a new application. Councilmember McConnehey seconded the motion.

Councilmember McConnehey asked the Mayor to consider amending the motion to remand the issue to the second Planning Commission meeting in February, and to be forwarded to the City Council thereafter.

Rob Wall recommended that it should not be referred to as a “new” application but as an additional review.

Councilmember Jacob suggested further amending the motion to remand review of the issue to the Planning Commission no later than the second Planning Commission meeting in February, *to allow review sooner if possible*. Mayor Riding accepted the amendment. Councilmember McConnehey withdrew his second, stating he would rather set a specific date for the benefit of the citizens.

AMENDED

MOTION: Mayor Riding made a motion to remand review of the issue to the Planning Commission no later than the second Planning Commission meeting in February, and to the City Council when appropriate thereafter. Councilmember Anderson seconded the amended motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	No
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed by majority vote 6-1.

MOTION: Councilmember McConnehey moved that the meeting recess until 8:00 pm. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Jacob and passed unanimously.

The Council recessed at 7:51 and the meeting reconvened without Councilmembers Burton and Jacob at 8:02 p.m.

Councilmember Burton returned at 8:03 p.m. and Councilmember Jacob returned at 8:06 p.m.

**RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL
RESOLUTION 19-201, APPROVING BUDGET AMENDMENTS
CLARIFYING THE ANNUAL COMPENSATION OF THE MAYOR
AFTER JANUARY 6, 2020**

Danyce Steck explained the Office of the City Manager, Office of the City Attorney, and Finance Department recommended the following text-only changes to the budget for clarification purposes:

In the General Fund Summary under Notes, the budget includes the following narrative (with recommended amended text in red):

1. “In November 2017, the residents of West Jordan voted to change the form of government from the Council-Manager to the Council-Mayor Form of Government. Below is the **estimated** annual personnel cost of this transition. One-half of this cost **and** has been included in this year's budget since the change will not take effect until January 2020 (or mid-budget year). These costs are estimates and based on full benefits (family-coverage). The actual cost will **be determined after (i) the City Council votes in a separate action on the annual salary of the “Mayor (New)”**, and (ii) **vary depending on the candidates and employees who occupy the four positions shown under “Additions” select a medical benefit coverage**. In addition, there will be some one-time building renovations costs needed to accommodate these changes.”
2. In the Appendix: Staffing Document section of the budget, the effective date of the Mayor’s salary was listed as 01/01/2020, however, since the Mayor will not be sworn in until 01/06/2020, it is recommended this date be changed in the budget document and a note be added.

MAYOR'S OFFICE

Mayor (thru 12/31/2019)			\$89,500 per year		0.5
Mayor (after 01/06/2020)			*\$120,000 per year		0.5
Intergovernmental Liaison		38.51	54.79	GR77	1
	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>			<u>2</u>
					<u>0</u>

* The number of \$120,000 shown above for the Mayor’s salary is an estimate only and included for budgeting purposes. The final Mayor’s salary will be determined by separate vote of the City Council in a subsequent action.

Councilmember Burton said he believed this item and the next agenda item would be a conflict of interest for him as Mayor-elect. Councilmember McConnehey agreed that the next agenda item would be a conflict of interest for the Mayor-elect, but suggested this item, being only a change in date, would not be a conflict of interest.

Mayor Riding opened the public hearing, and seeing that no one wished to speak, the Mayor closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Councilmember McConnehey moved to adopt Resolution 19-201. Councilmember Anderson seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Yes
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 7-0

**RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL
ORDINANCE 19-46, AMENDING TITLE 1 “ADMINISTRATION” OF THE
2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING
COMPENSATION OF THE MAYOR AND OTHER ELECTED OFFICIALS**

Councilmember Burton declared a conflict of interest, stepped down from the dais, and left the meeting.

Rob Wall explained that UCA 10-2-818 provided that the governing body fix by ordinance the compensation of the office of Mayor. Commencing prior to the adoption of the FY 2019-2020 budget (“Budget”), the West Jordan City Council had discussed the salary and benefit entitlement of the office of Mayor as well as the manner of adoption of such under the Council-Mayor form of government which would commence January of 2020 in West Jordan City.

Recent changes made by the City Council to the West Jordan City Code (“City Code”) that became effective January 6, 2010 provide that the Mayor would be paid an annual salary consistent with the compensation schedule approved with the annual budget. The Budget (and attendant Budget document) provided funding for Mayor and elected official compensation. However, questions arose during recent City Council discussions as to whether certain language of the Budget document also sets the specific salary and benefits for the office of Mayor under the new form of government, as required by the soon-to-be-effective City Code changes.

The subject of this *Request for Council Action* was a proposal to assist the City Council in resolving the Mayor compensation question. If adopted, the proposed ordinance would provide and/or would clarify the following in the City Code:

1. The salary for the first elected Mayor under the new form of government;
2. The benefits to which the first elected Mayor was entitled under the new form of government;
3. The process for setting the salary and the benefits for any elected mayor that was elected following the first four-year term of the first elected Mayor under the new form of government;
4. The compensation to which an individual appointed to fill an unexpired term of a departed mayor was entitled; and
5. The role of the West Jordan City Ethics Commission in the determination of compensation of West Jordan City elected officials.

If the City Council chose to adopt the proposed ordinance, the motion to adopt the ordinance should specify the dollar amount of the annual salary for the office of Mayor that would become effective on January 6, 2020. To assist the City Council in determining the specific dollar amount of the annual salary for the office of Mayor, the City Manager's Office provided a copy of a survey conducted by the Human Resource Office. The survey showed a comparison of Mayor compensation among nine cities in Utah that currently governed under the Council-Mayor form of government. The survey was included at the end of the materials that accompanied this *Request for Council Action*.

Councilmember Anderson questioned whether setting Mayor compensation with adoption of the budget each year made sense, considering it would be the Mayor who would present the budget document to the City Council. Mr. Wall responded that the Council would need to include Mayor compensation in the adopted budget so that funds would be available. He agreed there might be a better process. Mr. Wall emphasized that the Ethics Commission would only be involved if the Council chose to increase the Mayor compensation.

Councilmember Jacob said he approved of the proposed process since the Council would have ultimate control of the budget. He said he would include a cost of living adjustment (COLA) for the Mayor, but not for the City Council.

Mayor Riding opened the public hearing.

Amy Martz, West Jordan resident, said she felt the Mayor's responsibilities were changing significantly, and said she was in favor of a higher salary for the Mayor. Ms. Martz expressed the desire to attract highly qualified individuals with appropriate training and education.

Steve Jones, West Jordan resident, said he saw no reason to pay the Mayor an amount that was not somehow tied to what the Mayor provided to the City. He said he did not feel the Mayor should need additional staff to help him make decisions. Mr. Jones commented that corruption had a way of weaseling in as salaries increased.

Mayor Riding closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Jacob spoke in favor of approving the annual compensation amount already included in the budget document (\$120,000).

Councilmember Whitelock said she believed the average West Jordan household income was \$73,000. She argued that the amount of work done by the Mayor would depend on the individual in the position. She suggested \$89,500 was a fair amount for annual Mayor compensation.

Councilmember Anderson said he agreed with Councilmember Whitelock, and stated that the \$120,000 in the budget was a placeholder while the discussion continued. He suggested the time commitment for the Mayor would not change significantly from the current time commitment.

Councilmember McConnehey said he felt a higher salary tended to attract more public attention, and suggested the public would watch more closely and be more likely to demand excellence from a Mayor with a higher salary. He stated there was a lot required with the job, and there should be a reasonable salary associated with it. However, he said the position of Mayor was a public service and should not be compensated on par with the private sector. Councilmember McConnehey said he believed \$120,000-\$130,000 per year was a reasonable amount.

Councilmember McConnehey suggested altering Ordinance 19-46 to allow approval of Mayor compensation with a separate resolution rather than approval of the entire budget prior to the candidate filing deadline. He suggested removing the proposed COLA associated with Mayor compensation.

MOTION: Councilmember Jacob moved to approve Ordinance 19-46, amending Title 1, “Administration” of the 2009 West Jordan Municipal Code regarding the salary of the mayor and other elected officials, and to set the initial annual salary of the mayor for the first mayoral term following the change in form of government effective date at \$105,000.00, striking Paragraph B regarding COLA and renumbering appropriately. Councilmember Lamb seconded the motion.

Mr. Wall suggested striking the words “fail to” from the document in the phrase “should the City Council fail to...” and insert the word “not” after numeral (i), and strike the words “fail to” after (ii) and insert the word “not”.

Councilmember Lamb pointed out that the Mayor compensation had not changed in six years. He agreed with the \$105,000 suggested by Councilmember Jacob. Councilmember Jacob amended the motion to include the language change suggested by Mr. Wall.

AMENDED MOTION: Councilmember Jacob moved to approve Ordinance 19-46, amending Title 1, “Administration” of the 2009 West Jordan Municipal Code regarding the salary of the mayor and other elected officials, and to set the initial annual salary of the mayor for the first mayoral term following the change in form of government effective date at \$105,000, striking Paragraph B regarding COLA and renumbering appropriately,

and including altered language suggested by Mr. Wall. Councilmember Lamb seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Recused
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Yes
Councilmember Whitelock	No
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 5-1.

David Brickey stated that Councilmember Burton was not in the room during the discussion, did not participate, and was not present in the room during the vote. Following the vote, Councilmember Burton returned to the meeting.

V. COMMUNICATIONS
CITY MANAGER AND STAFF COMMENTS/REPORTS

Tauni Barker-

- Reported that over 2,100 guests attended the recent holiday event at City Hall. She expressed appreciation to the Councilmembers who attended and helped, and thanked the Facilities Staff for their help.

Korban Lee-

- Stated a meeting was scheduled to get feedback from the business community regarding water rates on December 10, 2019, and asked if the Council would want to schedule a presentation and potential decision on the December 11 Council meeting agenda. Councilmember Jacob said he believed a decision would not be made by the Council until January at the earliest. Councilmembers McConnehey and Anderson said they would prefer to take time to consider and make the right decision.
- A Council retreat was scheduled for December 18, 2019.

Brian Clegg-

- A Public Open House regarding design of the Maple Hills Park was scheduled for Dec 10, 2019.

Danyce Steck-

- Reported that financial statements from October were emailed to the Council.

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS/REPORTS

Councilmember Anderson-

- Said he appreciated receiving financial reports from Ms. Steck.

- Expressed appreciation for the City Council and Administrative Staff he had the opportunity to work with.

Councilmember Jacob-

- Expressed appreciation for snow removal by the Public Works Department.

Councilmember Lamb-

- Thanked the Public Works Department for their fine work plowing snow.
- Asked for an update regarding the Arts Center at a future meeting.

Councilmember Burton-

- Expressed appreciation for those who had plowed snow for the City.
- Reminded citizens that City ordinance prohibited removal of snow onto public streets.

Councilmember McConnehey-

- Spoke very highly of City Event Staff for their hard work at the recent holiday event.
- Spoke very highly of City Water Staff, particularly Troy Murphy.
- Asked if it would be possible to address water infrastructure on the north side of 9000 South in conjunction with the planned 2020 project.

VI. *CONSENT ITEMS*

- a. Approve the minutes of March 13, 2019 as presented**
- b. Approve Resolution 19-202, to award a contract to ProBuild Construction Inc. and authorize the Mayor to execute a contract with ProBuild Construction Inc. for the Zone 3 North 3 MG Reservoir project for an amount not to exceed \$4,498,868.97**
- c. Approve Resolution 19-203, to award a five-year contract to Ready Made Concrete and authorize the Mayor to execute a five-year contract with Ready Made Concrete to provide Class 4000 & 5000 concrete identified in Attachment A in the Invitation for Bid on an as needed basis, for an amount not to exceed \$200,000.00**
- d. Approve Resolution 19-204, to award a contract to CN Concrete LLC and authorize the Mayor to execute a contract with CN Concrete LLC for the installation of a 4-foot high black polymer coated steel chain link fence to surround the Wild West Jordan Playground in Veterans Memorial Park in an amount not to exceed \$34,632.00**
- e. Approve Resolution 19-205, authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract involving the City's purchase of real property from Dinawa, LLC as part of the widening of 7000 South**

- f. Approve Resolution 19-206, declaring Maples East Park no longer surplus**
- g. Adopt Ordinance 19-47, amending the 2009 West Jordan Municipal Code Title 4 (Business and License Regulations) regarding the change to the Council-Mayor form of municipal government**

The City Council pulled Consent Item 6d for discussion.

**MOTION: Councilmember Anderson moved to approve all Consent Items except 6d.
The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnehey.**

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Yes
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 7-0

VII. CONSENT ITEMS DISCUSSION
DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING 19-204, TO AWARD A CONTRACT WITH CN CONCRETE, LLC FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A 4-FOOT HIGH BLACK POLYMER COATED STEEL CHAIN LINK FENCE TO SURROUND THE WILD WEST JORDAN PLAYGROUND IN VETERANS MEMORIAL PARK IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$34,632,00.

At the request of the City Council, Staff advertised a bid for a four-foot high fence to be installed around the new Wild West Jordan Playground at Veterans Memorial Park. The initial request for bids was advertised in the summer, and no bids were received. Feedback received from the contractors recommended bidding in the fall when they would be available for work.

The City advertised a second time on the Utah Public Procurement Place website with bids due November 7. The City received one responsive bid from CN Concrete LLC. The City was able to negotiate a decrease in the submitted cost of the 12-foot wide mow strip, reducing the cost of the project by \$5,980.00.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Burton, Brian Clegg showed on a map where the fence would be located. Councilmember Burton said he was not sure a fence was needed around the entire Playground area, and suggested eliminating the fence on all but the side nearest a parking area.

Councilmember Anderson disagreed with Councilmember Burton, stating that a fence around the entire perimeter would allow the playground to be for all ability levels.

Councilmember Whitelock agreed with Councilmember Anderson, adding that children with special needs and their parents would feel safer with the full fence.

As a parent of young children, Councilmember McConnehey agreed it was difficult to keep young children contained. He said having a fence would provide security and peace of mind.

MOTION: Councilmember Jacob moved to adopt Ordinance 19-204, to award a contract with CN Concrete, LLC for the installation of a 4-foot high black polymer coated steel chain link fence to surround the Wild West Jordan Playground in Veterans Memorial Park in an amount not to exceed \$34,632.00. Councilmember Anderson seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Yes
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 7-0.

VIII. BUSINESS ITEMS

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RESOLUTION 19-208, APPROVING THE 2020 ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE FOR THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN

Jamie Brooks explained that a resolution had been prepared to designate the Annual meeting schedule for the City of West Jordan Redevelopment Agency that deals with the public's business. If adopted by the Board of Directors, the Interim Board Clerk was directed and authorized to publish a copy of the approved Annual Meeting Schedule at the principal office of the public body, on the City's website, Utah's Public Notice website and at least one time in the "legal notices" section of the Salt Lake Tribune newspaper.

Some comments made by Councilmembers were as follows:

- It would be preferable to have the strategic planning session on a Monday or a Tuesday
- It would be preferable to have the strategic planning session on two consecutive Fridays, the second Friday designed for staff to provide a response to Council direction provided on the first Friday
- April 8-10, 2020 was a break for the Jordan School District and also just before Easter. Some councilmembers may have travel plans.
- The July 22, 2020 meeting was moved to the following Wednesday (July 29, 2019)

- so as to reduce potential conflict with Pioneer Day
- There was a suggestion to have a Council meeting **every** Wednesday—workshop one week, regular meeting the next, etc.

MOTION: Councilmember Jacob moved to approve Resolution 19-208, approving the 2020 annual meeting schedule for the City of West Jordan. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnehey seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Yes
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 7-0.

IX. REMARKS

No remarks were made.

At 9:25 p.m., the Council took a break and reconvened at 9:31 p.m. in Workshop format.

X. WORKSHOP

DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLES 12-15, PERTAINING TO THE CHANGE TO THE COUNCIL-MAYOR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Murray explained proposed changes to Titles 12-15 of the Municipal Code, and answered questions from the Council. Councilmember McConnehey expressed concern regarding the change in Council land-use authority. Staff agreed that Council control would be different.

DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 2, CHAPTERS 3-18 (ALL OTHER CITY COMMITTEES), PERTAINING TO THE CHANGE TO THE COUNCIL-MAYOR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Murray and other staff members discussed proposed changes to Municipal Code Title 2, Chapters 3-18 with the City Council.

DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 3, CHAPTERS 3-9 INCLUSIVE (REVENUE, FINANCE AND TAXATION) REGARDING THE CHANGE TO THE COUNCIL-MAYOR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Details of proposed changes to Municipal Code Title 3, Chapters 3-9 were reviewed with the City Council and suggestions made. Councilmember McConnehey said he would like to see a report of fees waived by the City.

DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 3, CHAPTER 1 (PROCUREMENT), PERTAINING TO THE CHANGE TO THE COUNCIL-MAYOR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Danyce Steck introduced Joe Bryant, the City's new Purchasing Manager. Mr. Bryant walked the City Council through the proposed Procurement Code. The Council indicated the proposed Procurement Code could be placed on the agenda for the next Council meeting for further discussion and approval.

XI. CLOSED SESSION

DISCUSSION OF THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE, OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL; STRATEGY SESSION TO DISCUSS PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION AND STRATEGY SESSION TO DISCUSS THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY, INCLUDING ANY FORM OF A WATER RIGHT OR WATER SHARES

It was determined that a closed session was not necessary.

XII. ADJOURN

MOTION: Councilmember Burton moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Anderson and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:28 p.m.

The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.

**Chad Lamb
Mayor Pro Tem**

ATTEST:

**Tangee Sloan
Deputy City Clerk**

Approved this 8th day of January 2020