

PUBLIC HEARING AND CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, September 20, 2011 7:00 p.m.
Public Safety Building
3925 W Cedar Hills Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Mayor Eric Richardson, Presiding
Council Members: Ken Kirk, Scott Jackman, Marisa Wright, Stephanie Martinez, Jim Perry
Konrad Hildebrandt, City Manager
David Bunker, City Engineer
Greg Robinson, Assistant City Manager
Kim Holindrake, City Recorder
Brad Kearl, Chief Building Official
Rebecca Tehero, Finance Director
Courtney Hammond, City Meeting Transcriber
Others: Trent Augustus, Josh Gibb, Cliff Chandler, Cato Jones, Jenney Rees, Karissa Neely (Daily Herald), Gary Gygi, Patti White, Scout Troop 159, Joe McRae, John Hickey, Alex Spencer, Erica Brown, Jerry Dearing, Paul Sorensen, Benjamin Guercio, Matt Sorensen, Angela Johnson, Curt Crosby, Scott Ferguson, Scout Troop 1190, Mary Powell, Diane Sorensen, Zonda Perry

COUNCIL MEETING

1. This meeting of the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Mayor Richardson.

Invocation given by C. Jackman

Pledge of Allegiance led by Josh Gibb, Troop 159

2. Public Comment (7:06 p.m.)

Cato Jones: Mr. Jones stated that the latest city newsletter announced that a splash pad is being developed with anticipated opening on Labor Day. He would like to know where it will be located and how it would be funded. The newsletter came out just prior to elections. He felt that the information about the recreation center and golf course was an advertisement for two of the candidates. The Utah Taxpayer Association stated that the Cedar Hills golf course wastes over \$430,000 in taxpayer money. Cedar Hills has stated that the course earns revenue. That is not true. There is no surplus.

Paul Sorenson: Mr. Sorenson stated that he has lived in the city for 3 ½ years and has noticed similarities between Cedar Hills and the federal government, namely ignoring the wishes of the people, artificial stimulus packages, and unchecked spending. For those reasons, he signed the initiative petition. He feels the councilmembers have their own agenda and are ignoring the will of the people, most notably with the Community Recreation Center. The petition received 500–600 signatures, but wasn't deemed worthy to put in the newsletter. Erroneous information has been put into the newsletter about the golf course statistics. He encouraged the Council to consider item 6, the petition. If they reject it, it will go to the vote, where he believes the majority will accept the initiative.

Jerry Dearing: Mr. Dearing stated that he is a sponsor of the initiative petition to be considered tonight. The petition was certified and signed by over 590 verified signatures. Most people wanted an opportunity to vote on the use of funds, starting with the recreation center. Some language has been said to be ambiguous. He encouraged the Council to pass the ordinance

regarding the petition. There is an item for the amendment of a contract for a city administrator. He feels that the contract in existence is satisfactory. The new contract allows a nine-month severance instead of the current six. He would like copies of the public hearing items available long before the meeting.

Angela Johnson: Ms. Johnson stated that she has learned a lot about city government the last few weeks. There is a need for a positive atmosphere in the City. The petition and allowing people to vote will go a long way to show citizens that the Council is listening to them.

PUBLIC HEARING(S)

3. Designation of Streets and Highways as Open for Street-Legal All-Terrain Vehicle Use (7:20 p.m.)

No comments

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Minutes from the August 16, 2011, Public Hearing and Regular City Council Meeting (7:20 p.m.)

MOTION: C. Perry - To approve the minutes. Seconded by C. Kirk.

Yes - C. Jackman
C. Kirk
C. Martinez
C. Perry
C. Wright Motion passes.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

5. Review/Action on a Boundary Line Agreement Located at Approximately 9243 N. (Lot 25) and 9229 N. (Lot 26) Emerald Lake Cove (7:20 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Greg Robinson stated that both property owners have agreed to this change. The setbacks will be met, though it will be verified through a surveyor.

David Bunker stated that there is a back-lot sewer behind at least one of these properties. It should be verified that there is no issues with easements.

MOTION: C. Perry - To approve the Canyon Heights, Plat A, Lot 25 and Lot 26 boundary line adjustment, subject to a surveyor's verification that the changes will meet setback requirements, the submission of the required legal descriptions to the city recorder, the completion and recording of the appropriate forms with the city recorder, verification that there aren't any issues with the easement on the property and subject to verification that both parties are still in agreement with the proposed boundary adjustment. Seconded by C. Kirk.

Yes - C. Jackman
C. Kirk
C. Martinez
C. Perry
C. Wright Motion passes.

6. Review/Action on an Initiative Petition (#4) Relative to the Construction or Purchase of Public Buildings in Excess of \$400,000 Excluding the Cost of Land (7:27 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Mayor Richardson stated that this is one of the petitions circulated this year. The number of signatures required were collected and brought to the City. State law is clear that people have the right to refer and initiate law in certain cases.

Kim Holindrake stated that residents of the community have completed the initiative petition process. The petitioners collected signatures and filed the petition packets with the county. They collected 655 signatures, and the county found 590 signatures valid. One resident signed an affidavit to have her name removed. The number of required signatures was 518. Ms. Holindrake has declared the petition sufficient and sent a letter to Jerry Dearing, who was one of the petitioners. The Council now has the following options: adopt the proposed law and refer it to people, adopt the proposed law without referring it to the people, or reject the proposed law. If no action is taken, it will go on the ballot. Based on state law, the petitioners missed the date to put it on the next ballot. The next available election would be in November 2013. The Council has 30 days from receipt of the petition to make a decision or come up with a competing law. To add an initiative petition to a ballot costs about \$3000 because of the voter information packet that is required.

Council Discussion:

- C. Kirk stated that he found some problems with the petition. He sees the need to have an ordinance that protects residents against frivolous spending, but he has questions about this particular initiative. This language calls for approval by the majority of registered Cedar Hills' voters. There are about 5350 registered voters. There would need to be over 2500 votes for a majority. Nothing would get passed in the City if that was required. While the intent is good, the language is poor. The second paragraph states that the requirements are effective for the construction or purchase of any public building for which a final contract has not been executed prior to the date the application of the initiative was filed. The next election is November 2013. This violates the U.S. Constitution, Article 1, 9.3 by violating ex post facto law. There is an ordinance on the books that similarly protects the citizens by requiring voters' approval for general obligation bonds. If this had been in effect a few years ago, when water rationing was tight, the City could not have built the redundant well that protects the City in times of emergency and fixes the rationing problem.
- C. Perry stated that he agrees with C. Kirk's comments. He understands the intent of the initiative petition, agrees with that intent, but the wording is all flubbed up. This is the fourth initiative filed with the City. Several of the previous initiatives were near identical, with minor changes in wording. The 2003 initiative was messed up, and the Council had to correct it. The wording on this initiative is also messed up, and again the Council will need to fix it. He does not agree that it should be a majority of registered voters as opposed to those that vote. The Council should probably propose an alternate law that is similar in intent but fixes the problems. Council members have expressed an interest in fixing this proposed law, in which case both versions would go on the ballot.
- C. Jackman stated that he agrees with the intent that ensures that the City does not go into debt without really clear transparency. Although it is important that the City doesn't inadvertently get into trouble because of wording.
- Mayor Richardson stated that Cedar Hills is one of the most conservative cities in one of the most conservative counties in the country, though it may not be conservative enough for some people. During the time he has been involved with the City, he has been impressed with how fiscally conservative Cedar Hills is. Strong feelings come out at election time. It is not easy to

collect 655 signatures. He understands that the recreation center is not unanimously adored. There are problems with this petition as far as subject matter and legality. It is not well worded. If sloppy laws are passed, sloppy consequences occur. In the past a sloppily worded initiative could have caused the City to be unable to refinance at a more favorable rate. He does not want to be handicapped with a sloppy law. He recommended not adopting the law.

- C. Wright stated that she agrees with everything Mayor Richardson said. There is a way to make the people who signed the petition happier, but still maintain the necessities to service the City. She does not agree with a lot of the politics with this initiative, but respects the fact that residents feel strongly and are doing something. Every one is trying to do what they think is in the best interests of the City. Her goal is to make 51% of the residents happy. She thinks the initiative can be rewritten.
- C. Martinez stated that she agreed with the comments made. The intent is good; the language needs to be changed.

MOTION: C. Kirk - Finding an existing desire in the community to further protect their interests and to come more in compliance with the Constitution of the United States and to provide a realistic way for participating voters, not just registered voters to express a majority concern, I move to reject initiative petition #4, currently under discussion, and require the City Council to submit an alternative ordinance for the voters to consider at the next municipal election of this City to be submitted under the current submission requirements established by the state and the county. Seconded by C. Wright.

Further Discussion:

- Mayor Richardson stated that he thinks it appropriate to list specific findings on why the petition is rejected.

AMENDED MOTION: C. Kirk - To find that the current initiative as submitted is not in compliance with the U.S. Constitution and the ex post facto law and that it is physically impractical for a majority of registered voters to be calculated and come up with a majority during the general election or special election of this community. Accepted and seconded by C. Wright.

Further Discussion:

- Mayor Richardson stated that he would add: (1) the initiative deals with an administrative item that is not eligible for an initiative; (2) the initiative deals with a financial item, which is also ineligible; (3) the initiative is another appeal on the recreation center, which has been addressed by the Board of Adjustments; (4) the initiative has more than one part or subparts, which makes it ineligible; (5) there are problems with the effective date.
- C. Perry stated that the intent of the filers seems to stop the construction of the building, while the intent of the signers was to have a voice.

Yes - C. Jackman
C. Kirk
C. Martinez
C. Perry
C. Wright

Motion passes.

Further Discussion:

- C. Perry stated that the City Council will construct an alternative ordinance that will appear on the ballot alongside the initiative petition.
- Mayor Richardson stated that rejecting the petition means that the law is not adopted today, but will go on the next municipal ballot (November 2013). He asked C. Perry and C. Martinez to

- work on the alternate law.
- Kim Holindrake stated that if an alternate ordinance is decided on in the next 30 days, it cannot be later changed.

7. Review/Action on the Avanyu Acres Homeowners Association Request (8:05 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

David Bunker stated that he received a request from the Avanyu Acres HOA board. There have been some legal proceedings centered on bonding issues with Avanyu Acres. The HOA is requesting information on the bonding and that the safety improvements be performed by the City prior to the completion of the legal proceedings. There are some legitimate pending safety issues. The estimate for immediate improvements is \$311,600. The drainage is the most costly improvement issue.

Council Discussion:

- C. Perry stated that this, in effect, asks all the taxpayers in the City to pay to fix the problems that this developer left. If is a true safety issue, the improvements need to be made. If it is about a dispute between the HOA and the developer, then it is not a good use of taxpayer funds. The City is in litigation, this is a private road, and it is a gated neighbourhood. He understands that the residents of Avanyu Acres are in a precarious position. The city attorney has made it clear that the City cannot spend taxpayer dollars to fix problems behind gates on private properties. Safety issues need to be fixed even if the City does not get it back through litigation.
- Mayor Richardson stated that if there are some especially egregious safety issues, the City needs to get on it. By doing so, the funds will come out of general funds, which could hinder the city's ability to collect from the developer in court. The manhole covers could be fixed at \$1000 each, but would hinder the city's ability to collect on the bond.
- C. Jackman stated that because these are private roads, the City would not normally repair those roads or address the issues. If these are improvements the City would be doing anyway, then he would say go ahead even if the bond is not recovered.
- C. Kirk stated that the bond has been in litigation for more than four years. He doesn't want to see safety impaired for any citizens, but wants more information about how it would compromise litigation.
- C. Martinez stated that she lives in an area where there were manhole cover issues, and it can be a big safety concern.

Matt Sorenson, Avanyu Acres HOA representative, stated that the reason the City is in a lawsuit is because the developer broke the contract with the City. The HOA is dependent on the City to vigorously pursue the bonds. The HOA's priorities are the manhole covers and storm drainage. They have one written bid for the storm drains for \$8000.

MOTION: C. Jackman - Recognizing the importance of safety issues and the risk of litigation, I move to continue this item until the next time we meet and in the meantime get answers from the attorney and city engineer to understand the issues more clearly. Seconded by C. Perry.

Yes - C. Jackman
 C. Kirk
 C. Martinez
 C. Perry
 C. Wright

Motion passes.

8. Review/Action on Ordinance Amending Title 7, Utilities, of the City Code (8:36 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Rebecca Tehero stated that staff recommends changes to the utility ordinance, including applying utility payments to the water fee last to allow the City to shut off water for partial payments, charging base utility fees to the owner even if the property is vacant, requiring billing errors to be reported within three months or the bill is deemed correct, allowing the City to impose a tax lien on the property for delinquent utility fees, and requiring that a resident who files for bankruptcy to provide the City with a deposit within 30 days or the City may discontinue utility services.

Council Discussion:

- Mayor Richardson stated that there have been instances when large water-using entities have reviewed decades' worth of utility bills to correct any overcharges. Utility fees are zero sum; refunding overcharges from years past affect taxpayers of today.
- C. Martinez stated that Section B.2. in 7-1A-2 states that the property owner is liable for the payment of services and fees until the owner notifies the City that the property is sold. It may be better to have it be the transfer of title.
- C. Perry stated that he would like to see a way to appeal the average water use for winter months. At one point he had a broken toilet that ran and then had to pay that higher rate for a year because of the average that was taken during the time of the broken toilet.
- C. Kirk stated that the amendments need to clarify culinary verses pressurized irrigation water.

MOTION: C. Perry - To approve Ordinance No. 9-20-2011A, an ordinance amending Title 7 of the City Code of the City of Cedar Hills, with the amendment that instead of three months it is 180 days and specifying "culinary" water as the last item to which utility payments are applied.
Seconded by C. Jackman.

Further Discussion:

- C. Martinez stated that she would like a change to specify that payments of utility fees are required until a change in occupation of the residence.
- C. Perry stated that there is sometimes a lag in occupancy. It is an important point, but there is no easy answer. It may be better to examine it at a different time.

Vote taken by roll call.

Yes	-	C. Jackman	
Yes	-	C. Kirk	
Yes	-	C. Martinez	
Yes	-	C. Perry	
Yes	-	C. Wright	Motion passes.

9. Review/Action Regarding Amendments to Animal Units, Small, in all Zones (9:01 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Brad Kearn stated that the small animal ordinance has been through a number of changes. This most recent amendment looks at lot square footage and includes a graduated scale of number of allowed animals. Even small lots can have up to two animals. The distance from a neighboring residence is determined by the building envelope because it is a calculation that does not change with a house addition, for example. The distance to the building envelope also follows a graduated scale based on the size of lots. The smallest lots require 15 feet from the neighboring building envelope.

Council Discussion:

- C. Wright stated that she doesn't like that there is a restriction on commercial use. If a child wants to sell eggs door-to-door to earn money, he should be allowed to.
- C. Kirk thanked the Planning Commission for spending so much time on this issue. Some people will not be happy about this, but it will be palatable to many. It's a good ordinance.
- C. Perry stated that someone could theoretically put 40 chickens right against your back fence. That seems like an issue.

MOTION: C. Kirk - To adopt Ordinance No. 9-20-2011B, as discussed with appreciation to the Planning Commission for the hard work they have done. Seconded by C. Martinez. Vote taken by roll call

Yes	-	C. Jackman	
Yes	-	C. Kirk	
Yes	-	C. Martinez	
Yes	-	C. Perry	
Yes	-	C. Wright	Motion passes.

10. Review/Action Regarding the Designation of Streets and Highways as Open for Street-Legal All-Terrain Vehicle Use (9:17 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Mayor Richardson stated that he requested this item. People ride their ATVs on the road all the time. He does not like to criminalize behavior that happens all the time, but he favors setting forth the requirements to make it legal. For that reason, he is in favor of this ordinance. He understands that most people are not going to meet all the requirements.

Greg Robinson stated that this ordinance is based on Highland City's ordinance, which follows state code. In order to ride on the roads, an owner would have to register and upgrade their ATV. While extensive, this ordinance allows an avenue to allow people to make their ATV street-legal.

Council Discussion:

- C. Jackman stated that he does not believe that many will go through the process to become street legal. This will not help the problem. Many ATV owners want to drive on the streets, but don't want to meet the requirements.
- C. Kirk stated that he worries that this ordinance will open Pandora's box. Many will just notice

that ATVs are legal on the streets without meeting or knowing about any of the requirements. He is an ATV owner but has a problem with ATVs on the road. The boundary with Pleasant Grove makes it legal in one city and possibly illegal the next street over. Some citizens want this, but he doesn't believe the majority does. He believes it places an extra burden on law enforcement. Currently any ATV on the street is illegal. With this change, police would need to check for registration, license, modifications, etc.

- C. Wright stated that she is more concerned with underage drivers than of-age drivers driving a street-legal ATV.
- C. Perry stated that in America there are laws and rules and inherent risks, but the government shouldn't decide what it can and can't do and what is safe enough. He feels that this is an example of government gone too far.

MOTION: C. Wright - To approve Ordinance No. 9-20-2011C, an ordinance relating to the Designation of Streets and Highways as Open for Street-Legal All-Terrain Vehicle Use Ordinance.

Seconded by C. Perry.

Further Discussion

- Greg Robinson stated that currently OHVs (off-highway vehicles) are allowed on city trails. The Council may want to review a designation between paved and unpaved trails.
- C. Wright clarified that it is legal for a 14-year-old to be on the trails (with parent supervision) but not on the streets.

Vote taken by roll call.

Yes	-	C. Kirk	
Yes	-	C. Martinez	
Yes	-	C. Perry	
Yes	-	C. Wright	
No	-	C. Jackman	Motion passes.

11. Review/Action on a Federal Surplus Property Program Application (9:35 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Greg stated that this is a resolution to participate in the federal surplus property program. The government requires this application.

Council Discussion:

- C. Kirk suggested adding the Community Recreation Center Director, and Jeff Maag to the list of approved representatives.
- C. Perry stated that the list of representatives should be at the purview of the city manager.

MOTION: C. Jackman - To approve Resolution No. 9-20-2011A, a resolution of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, to participate in the Federal Surplus Property Program. Seconded by C. Perry. Vote taken by roll call.

Yes	-	C. Jackman	
Yes	-	C. Kirk	
Yes	-	C. Martinez	
Yes	-	C. Perry	
Yes	-	C. Wright	Motion passes.

12. Review/Action on Resolution Adopting Fees (9:39 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Kim Holindrake stated that this clarifies the percentage charged for plan checks, adds a fee for a local entity plan (pass through with the County), adds a \$300 bankruptcy deposit, and amends the GRAMA request fee to charge the lowest employee salary rate to process the request.

Council Discussion:

- C. Perry stated that he would like to see the plan check fees based on the actual cost of the plan check rather than a percentage of the building permit fee.
- C. Kirk stated that the fee for the GRAMA request should state that the employee that can process the request should be determined by the city manager.

MOTION: C. Kirk - To adopt Resolution No. 9-20-2011B, a resolution adding, amending, or deleting certain fees to the official fees, bonds, and fines schedule for the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, with the addition of the comment on the GRAMA request to add “as determined by the city manager.” Seconded by C. Martinez.

Further Discussion:

- C. Perry stated that he doesn’t feel that the City is passing through the actual cost of the plan check fees.

Vote taken by roll call.	Yes	-	C. Jackman	
	Yes	-	C. Kirk	
	Yes	-	C. Martinez	
	Yes	-	C. Wright	
	No	-	C. Perry	Motion passes.

13. Review/Action on the Canvass of the 2011 Municipal Primary Election (9:47 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Kim Holindrake presented the statement of disposition, tally list, and the poll book for each precinct to the Council, acting as the canvassing board, to review.

MOTION: C. Martinez - The City Council, acting as the canvassing board, accepts the election results for the 2011 Primary Election held on September 13, 2011. Seconded by C. Jackman.

Further Discussion:

- C Perry stated that he would like to see better voter turnout.
- C. Wright thanked those who took the time to get trained to be poll workers.

Yes - C. Jackman
C. Kirk
C. Martinez
C. Perry
C. Wright Motion passes.

14. Review/Action Regarding the Lone Peak Public Safety District (9:55 p.m.)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Konrad Hildebrandt stated that the City is a party to the Lone Peak Public Safety District (LPPSD) along with Highland and Alpine. Cedar Hills participates in the fire/EMS portion of the LPPSD. Cedar Hills has representation on the Board with Councilmember Perry serving as the Cedar Hills representative. The three city managers act as administrators for LPPSD. Sometimes the needs analysis is district-based; other times it is more city-based. There are a few ongoing issues including representation on the Board and participation of the cities. The City should also develop plans B and C because of the nature of the Board and not being in control of the decisions of the Board.

Council Discussion:

- C. Kirk stated that Cedar Hills is represented by one person, whereas each of the other cities has two board members. This is because Cedar Hills doesn't participate in police service, but it also means that Cedar Hills only has one vote on fire/EMS issues.
- C. Perry stated that as Cedar Hills' representative to the LPPSD Board, he does not vote on police issues because Cedar Hills doesn't participate with police. He feels Cedar Hills is underrepresented. Funding for fire is allocated according to property valuations and EMS is allocated on population. This can be changed by a vote of the Board, but representation would have to be changed by change in the interlocal agreement. LPPSD presented a growth plan years ago. Taking advantage of post-9-11 grants allowed LPPSD to grow faster. The plan went from volunteers to full-time personnel. At first LPPSD only went full time in Alpine. Highland then built its own station where fire then moved. Tom Butler from Highland, a recently elected official, has only looked into the recent history rather than the long-term plan. He has questioned why Cedar Hills is staffed when previously there were only personnel in Highland. He argues that Cedar Hills has demanded personnel. Highland is more populous and pays more overall, though not more per household. Mr. Butler argues that Highland shouldn't have to pay to staff Cedar Hills. C. Perry stated when a call comes in, the nearest available station is the one that dispatches regardless of city boundaries. There are three board members who view the Board as representatives of LPPSD, with two board members viewing themselves as representatives of their cities. All firemen are mobilized for each call. It is hard to justify why Alpine should pay more because of higher property values. He feels like the fee allocation based on population alone is fair. This change would not materially affect what Highland pays (+ \$29,000), but would affect what Cedar Hills pays (+ \$111,000) and what Alpine pays (- \$81,000). He proposed that if Cedar Hills gets equal representation, it will go along with the population-based fee schedule. LPPSD provides phenomenal value.
- Brad Freeman stated that the Highland mayor looked into bringing in contract paramedics and volunteer fire. It costs more. Splitting the cities would also cost each city more. He would challenge anyone to look at any other city in Utah and find a better cost/value.
- The Council agreed with C. Perry that with fair, equal representation, funding based on population is fair.

15. Review/Action on Employee Contract Amendments (10:42 p.m.)

See handouts.

Presentation:

Mayor Richardson stated that the city manager's contract is reviewed every year. At the Council's request, the contract was updated to reflect changes that have happened over time. There are no new changes to the contract. The city manager's position is based on the skills he brings and the supply and demand curve.

Council Discussion:

- C. Jackman stated that the compensation section should say "monthly base salary range" as opposed to "annual base salary range."
- C. Perry stated that he would prefer to see the salary listed rather than a range from minimum to midpoint to maximum with the \$100/month for miscellaneous expenses added into salary. He would also prefer to see administrative leave explained in a transparent way.

MOTION: C. Kirk - To extend the Council meeting until 11:30. Seconded by C. Jackman.

Yes	-	C. Jackman	
		C. Kirk	
		C. Martinez	
No	-	C. Perry	
		C. Wright	Motion passes.

- C. Kirk stated that has not seen this contract reviewed annually. He feels a nine-month severance is too long. He would like to see it changed back to six.
- C. Perry stated that he feels nine months is an appropriate period of time. The city manager, unlike many employees, it subject to the political whims of a changing Council.

MOTION: C. Perry - To continue this item, and that the mayor will compile all agreements, addendums, and modifications to city manager's employment agreement along with other city employees with whom the City has contracts so the Council has a single authoritative source of the nature of the agreements with the employees so the Council can work to codify those agreements in a single employment contract. Seconded by C. Martinez.

Yes	-	C. Jackman	
		C. Kirk	
		C. Martinez	
		C. Perry	
		C. Wright	Motion passes.

16. City Manager Report and Discussion

MAYOR AND COUNCIL REPORTS

17. Board and Committee Reports

EXECUTIVE SESSION

18. Motion to go into Executive Session, Pursuant to Utah State Code 52-4-204 and 52-4-205

19. Motion to Adjourn Executive Session and Reconvene City Council Meeting

ADJOURNMENT

20. Adjourn

This meeting was adjourned at 11:25 p.m. on a motion by C. Jackman and seconded by C. Perry.

Yes	-	C. Jackman	
		C. Perry	
		C. Wright	
No	-	C. Kirk	
		C. Martinez	Motion passes.

Approved by Council:
October 18, 2011

/s/ Kim E. Holindrake
Kim E. Holindrake, City Recorder