

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF THE  
CITY OF CEDAR HILLS  
Tuesday, April 12, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.  
Community Recreation Center  
10640 N. Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah**

**Present:** Mayor Denise Andersen, Presiding  
Council Member Laura Ellison  
Council Member Mike Geddes  
Council Member Alexandra McEwen  
Council Member Brian Miller  
Council Member Kelly Smith

**Staff:** Chandler Goodwin, City Manager  
Charl Louw, Finance Director  
Kevin Anderson, Public Works Director  
Hyrum Bosserman, City Attorney  
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder

**Others:** Lieutenant Josh Christensen

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

**1. Call to Order, Pledge, and Invocation.**

The City Council Meeting of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Mayor Andersen.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council Member Smith.

The Invocation was offered by Council Member Ellison.

**2. Approval of Meeting Agenda.**

**MOTION:** Council Member Geddes moved to APPROVE the Meeting Agenda with the adjustment of moving item numbers 7, 11, 16, and 17 to be heard first. Council Member McEwen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

**3. Public Comment: Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments.**

*Linda Hutchings* gave her address as 9520 North 4500 West and stated that there is a lost and found problem at Harvey Park. Since March 24 she has gathered 15 coats, numerous shoes, four sets of paddle ball rackets, and people continue to leave items behind. While she is happy to continue collecting these items, it may be prudent to place a collection box at the park so people

know where they can go to look for their lost items. Commissioner Geddes asked if there was space in the snow shack for a lost and found. Mr. Goodwin commented that the problem with a bin onsite is that people think it is a trash can and will use it as such, or items get wet and moldy. The City Building is not an ideal place for these items. Expensive items can be brought to City Hall so Staff can try to find their owners, but coats and shoes need not be a concern.

There was additional discussion regarding what to do with the lost and found items. Mr. Goodwin stated that scheduling staff time to take care of these items would not be ideal and any type of box or bin onsite could be vandalized and/or not taken care of properly. It was ultimately decided that the items could be left on a table at the park where they could be reclaimed. If they are not returned they could be thrown away.

*Sherrie Condie* gave her address as 4221 West Oak Road North. She cited Greek philosopher, Epicurus, and hoped that people could find happiness through peaceful living.

*Tom Harris* gave his address as 9640 Charleston Drive and clarified that his intent was not to stop pickleball. He brought a petition signed by several neighbors expressing appreciation for the sound wall that was constructed to address sound issues. He stated that many do not understand what the wall is for and complain that they do not have a place to watch pickleball. Mr. Harris contended that there are plenty of places to watch. He wanted to see bleachers installed for spectators and disallow wood paddles. He also suggested that to address noise control, the east wall be moved to the opposite side of the proposed bleachers.

*Caesar Falcon* gave his address as 9624 Charleston Drive and expressed appreciation for the fence that was constructed around the pickleball court. It has helped tremendously with noise. He did not see a reason to take the wall down and hoped that the Council would consider the neighborhood and keep it in place. He also hoped to see fiber optics come to the City soon. Mayor Andersen stated that the fiber contract has been signed and is on its way.

*Erica Price* gave her address as 4152 West Oak Road North and stated that this year, Burger King, Kia, Warner Brothers, and Pfizer all changed their logos, as did Cedar Hills. She remarked that logos need to be memorable, simple, and meaningful. The new Cedar Hills logo meets that criteria. Regardless of whether everyone loves it, the logo is fine as it is. She stated that it is not a new law that will have a great impact on anyone's day to life and will be changed at some point in the future. She asked that the Council move forward with the chosen logo and focus on issues that matter.

*Mark Nelson* gave his address as 4075 West Eucalyptus and commented that he has seen the logo come up on the agenda items several times. He thought it was a done deal but stated that as he has spoken with other Council Members, he realized that the Council is revisiting it because of numerous concerns from the public. He appreciated that they were willing to discuss it and involve the public. However, he agreed with Ms. Price that it should be put to rest and allow the Council to move on to more important issues.

There were no further public comments. The public comment period was closed.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **4. Approval of the Minutes from the March 1, 2022, and March 15, 2022, Work Session and City Council Meetings.**

**MOTION:** Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Council Member McEwen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

## **CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS**

### **5. City Manager Report.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that the Recreation Department has soccer for K through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade starting up along with Tot-Soccer. The Annual Spring Cleanup will be on April 23 and April 30 and has moved to the St. Andrews Estates Subdivision. The Annual Easter Egg Hunt will take place at Harvey Park on April 16 at 10:00 a.m. Burn Permits can be applied for online through the State. PI activation date is April 20. It was reported that at Heritage Park, the wind blew a tree over onto the Harvey Well House and caused serious damage to the building. On Monday, April 25 there will be a Multi-Council Social at 5:30 p.m. for all area elected officials.

### **6. Mayor and Council.**

Council Member Miller commented that people are excited to get back to the Family Festival. He attended the committee meeting recently and stated that everyone is moving forward with the plans. He and his wife plan to bring back the Baking Contest to the festival.

Mayor Andersen reported that a Town Hall Meeting was held and she was pleasantly surprised at how many showed up. She felt that it went well and looked forward to the next one.

Council Member McEwen reported that Central Utah 911 held a recent meeting on a hiring decision.

Council Member Ellison reminded those present of the Easter Egg Hunt on Saturday. Four different areas were proposed and would be separated by the age of participants.

Council Member Smith stated that the Family Festival meeting was refreshing. She enjoyed seeing how enthusiastic they are and how well they work together. It was noted that there will not be a Teen Hunt at the Easter Egg Hunt, per the Youth City Council.

## **SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **7. Review/Action on a Public Hearing on Preliminary Plan for Mahogany Heights Subdivision located in the R-1-15,000 Residential Zone.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that the subject property is located on Canyon Road on the far south end of the City. The current lot is proposed to be divided into two lots with one being 27,000 square feet in size and the other being 17,000 square feet. The request was found to comply with City Code. The culinary water comes to the property from Canyon Heights and there is an existing sewer line. The main issue for the subdivision will be navigating the various utilities that run throughout the property. Two aqueducts run perpendicular to the front of the lot and Rocky Mountain Power has overhead poles that will need to be considered with height restrictions.

The City Engineer reviewed the application and Staff recommended approval of the subdivision subject to follow-up review by the City Engineer, approval from Utah County for the drive access off of Canyon Road, approval from various utility providers for the work that will need to be performed, and any additional conditions deemed necessary by the City Council. Mr. Goodwin reported there are challenges with the property, but they are not impossible to overcome.

Mayor Andersen asked if there would need to be another driveway entrance off Canyon Road. Mr. Goodwin stated that the City prefers that both properties have their own drive access. He stated that it is in the Wildland Urban Interface area, and they require that driveway slopes be at or below 12%. The applicant has done a lot of research and preliminary work to address the concerns identified.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing.

*Forrest Phillips* gave his address as 383 North 835 East in Lindon and identified himself as the property owner and applicant. He commented that there are numerous hurdles to overcome to develop this property and they are aware of them all. He noted that he has already paid \$48,000 to have the power lines moved, so that is no longer an issue. In the Planning Commission meeting, they were able to address some of the concerns of the surrounding homeowners. Going forward, there will need to be more money spent. He hoped to be able to resolve the issues. With the split entry, each property owner will have a separate access. They preferred to not put in a common driveway. However, the slope of the driveway is currently greater than 8% but less than 12%. Approval is needed from the City Council to move forward with the current slope.

In response to a question raised regarding the power lines, Mr. Phillips explained that there are two sets of power lines. One will be underground and the other cannot be moved. The height restriction at the lowest point of the sag of the power line is 25 feet, which will be addressed at the Building Permit stage.

Council Member Smith asked if Mr. Phillips planned to develop the lot and sell it or build a home on it first. Mr. Phillips indicated that it would depend on the economy. If property remains as scarce as it is currently, he will likely sell the lot. One of the main concerns that came up during the Planning Commission Meeting was the height of the proposed dwelling. Another concern was that the existing home does not have a garage. As a result, he expected to build a garage before selling.

Mayor Andersen expressed appreciation to Mr. Phillips for the clean-up work he had done.

Council Member Geddes asked if new easements will be created if the power poles are moved. Mr. Phillips responded that there will be new power easements and the lines will run underground. Council Member Geddes stated that they do not have the right to protect views and restrict building heights. Mr. Phillips understood that but wanted to create harmony in the neighborhood and ease the concerns of the existing homeowners. Additionally, there are enough design restrictions with specific nuances, and it might be easier to either build an approved dwelling or sell the property with approved plans.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Andersen closed the public hearing.

Mr. Goodwin reiterated that they do not protect viewsheds in City Code but there are height requirements. However, with the power lines, the height of the dwelling will not likely be an issue. He also stated that the driveway requires City Council approval to go higher than 8% grade. Because it is less than 12%, it falls within the requirements for the Wildland Urban Interface.

**MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE the preliminary plans for the subdivision Mahogany Heights Plat A, subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Review by the City Engineer.**
2. **Get approval from Utah County for additional driveway access onto Canyon Road.**
3. **Get approval from various utility providers as to the work that will be performed.**

**Council Member Geddes seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Smith-Aye, Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Abstained, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye. The motion passed unanimously with one abstention.**

**8. Review/Action on a Resolution in Support of Preservation and Restoration of Utah Lake.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that he drafted a Resolution supporting the preservation of Utah Lake. Current methods were used as well as a science-based approach to clean up the water to preserve the lake for public recreational use. Concern was expressed for the Utah Lake Authority. It was noted that the resolution is based on other city resolutions but is unique to Cedar Hills. Other cities passed resolutions during the most recent Legislative Session in response to some of the proposed bills. Those bills have since been signed and passed into law, however, Mr. Goodwin felt that it was still important to express the importance of the Lake to Cedar Hills in the Resolution. The Council Members expressed their support for the Resolution.

Council Member Geddes reported that it is a non-binding Resolution. He stated other issues could be addressed as well as other options for Utah Lake. He hoped to see the lake become deeper and cleaner.

**MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 04-12-2022B, a Resolution in support of the preservation and restoration of Utah Lake. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Nay, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed 4-to-1.**

**9. Review/Action on a Golf Course Bridge Bid.**

Finance Director, Charl Louw reported that over the last month, the City has submitted four Requests for Proposals (“RFP”) to the State. One involved the re-decking of the golf cart bridge, two pertained to the Heritage Park pavilion and hardscape, and another was for the building next to the short course. No qualified bids were submitted for any of them.

Last year, Mr. Louw received a bid for \$52,000 from a company that builds the bridges for the re-decking and approximately \$30,000 for the railing. When the budget was presented in February, \$100,000 was set aside for the bridge and an additional \$70,000 for golf equipment. He was disappointed with the one bid that came in from the state at \$161,000. He reported that Staff does not recommend this option. The hope was that the original bidder will have an opening and be able to do the job within budget.

Council Member Geddes reported that he recently drove over the bridge and that it is still structurally sound, at least for the time being. He asked about other material options. Mr. Louw explained that if they use a different material, it will have to be reviewed by the City Engineer and would require more time and money. Council Member Geddes was not in favor of spending money until it is necessary.

Mayor Andersen asked about the cost of materials. Council Member Geddes stated that southern pine is currently the most stable because there is an abundance of it. He noted that now may not be the best time to order lumber. Mr. Louw stated that the base bid from the original company is lower than it was last year. He noted that the expenditure was presented in the Preliminary Budget Report but was not approved. Council Member Geddes suggested that the item be tabled until additional information can be gathered.

**MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to reject the bid and table the item to a future date. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.**

**10. Review/Action and Public Hearing on a Resolution Adopting Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Amendments.**

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Mayor Andersen closed the public hearing.

**MOTION:** Council Member Geddes moved to table the item. Council Member Miller seconded the motion. **Vote on motion:** Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

**11. Review/Action on a Resolution Indicating the Intent of the City of Cedar Hills to Adjust the Common Boundary with Pleasant Grove City (Dennis Dahl Property).**

Mr. Goodwin reported that typically a boundary adjustment is an easy item to take care of but in this case, the proposed property is in Pleasant Grove, which requires additional action. He commented that it is a lengthy process, which includes submitting applications to both cities. Both cities are then required to adopt a resolution specifying the intent to adjust the common boundary between the two cities. Doing so will trigger a 60-day protest period. If there are no objections, each city can then adopt an ordinance adjusting its boundaries. The matter then goes to the State for final approval. The process typically takes four to six months.

**MOTION:** Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 04-12-2022A, a resolution indicating the intent of the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah to adjust the common boundary with Pleasant Grove City, Utah; authorizing a Public Hearing thereon and providing for notice of said hearing. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. **Vote on motion:** Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

**12. Review/Action on an Ordinance Amending City Code Title 3 Chapter 1 Related to Short-Term Rentals.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that the City recently passed a Short-Term Rental (“STR”) Code. It requires that short-term rentals be inspected and gives authority to the Fire Marshal, the Chief Zoning Official, and the Chief Building Official. The intent of the amendments is to work out some of the language in the Code. An issue that has developed is the need for an inspection. During the final inspection of the home, the home is inspected as a short-term rental, so there is not a need to have it inspected again. The proposal was to eliminate the need for an additional in-person inspection if the home already has a Certificate of Occupancy. The City would provide a self-inspection checklist. The option was still open for the City to perform inspections as needed but it simplifies the process for the homeowners.

Council Member Geddes asked if the Code requires access from the main home to the STR. Mr. Goodwin confirmed that it does. It was confirmed that it can have its own entrance. Council Member Geddes asked if the access can be through a garage. It was determined that the location of the access is not important.

Council Member Smith stated that the intent of the Code was to prevent people from converting the home into a duplex. She expressed support for the proposed change.

**MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 04-12-2022A, an Ordinance amending Cedar Hills City Code Title 3, Chapter 1I related to short-term rental inspections. Council Member McEwen seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.**

**13. Review/Action on a Resolution Approving the 2021 Municipal Wastewater Planning Program.**

Mr. Goodwin presented the Annual Report required by the Utah State Department of Environmental Quality.

**MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 04-12-2022C, a Resolution approving the 2021 Municipal Wastewater Planning Program. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.**

**14. Review/Action on a Resolution Adopting the 2022 MAG Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that Mountainland Association of Governments (“MAG”) prepared the 2022 Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan as required every five years. The report specifies that the City is not participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (“NFIP”). The concern with participating is that the City has a very little area that is in a flood plain. If they were to adopt the NFIP they would be subject to a myriad of regulations that may not ultimately help the City. Mr. Goodwin described the City’s exposure to disasters including wildfires, landslides, and earthquakes. The plan sets forth what the City will do to mitigate certain disasters. The City has installed secondary water meters to help mitigate the drought problem and the annual weed abatement on the hillside helps with the wildfire threat. Additional possibilities would be to implement landscaping ordinances that incorporate fire wise landscaping, especially for homes on the bench. The City works with Pleasant Grove City to keep the ditches clear as well.

**MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 04-12-2022D, a Resolution adopting the 2022 Mountainland Association of Governments Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.**

**15. Review/Action on Cedar Hills’ Participation in the Utah Lake Commission.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that Cedar Hills has participated in the Utah Lake Commission for about five years. Council Member Smith currently serves on the board. In the coming year, HB-232, will transfer authority to the Utah Lake Authority and Cedar Hills will no longer have representation. The question was whether the City would be willing to help fund the transition in

the amount of \$1,200. He stated that the goals of the Utah Lake Authority and Cedar Hills' vision for Utah Lake may not align.

Council Member Smith was not interested in going to meetings or spending money to set up a program that the City has been eliminated from. Other cities were considering leaving the board as well.

**MOTION: Council Member Miller moved to direct staff to notify the Utah Lake Commission of the intent of the City of Cedar Hills to withdraw its membership effective July 1, 2022. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.**

**16. Review/Action on the Pickleball Sound Barrier at Harvey Park.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that pickleball was approved for Harvey Park because it is such a popular game. There are six courts at the park and several noise complaints were received last year due to pickleball. Sound barriers were installed on the north, east, and west sides, and pickleball players expressed concerns that they could not see into the courts. It is potentially a public safety issue as well. The City has tried to get cameras installed but it is taking longer than expected. Pickleball players also want to start early in the mornings and play well into the night – especially in the heat of the summer. Even though the park curfew was changed from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., pickleball players show up at 5:00 a.m. to begin playing. During the winter, time-lock gates were installed to prohibit entry before 7:00 a.m. The gates keep people out of the courts at night. Time-locks were also installed in the bathrooms.

The sound barriers were installed in the winter of 2021-2022 and have only been in effect for a few weeks. Since that time, there have been no complaints from the neighbors about the sound but there have been complaints from pickleball players who have requested that the panels be removed. They are not easily moved as they are quite heavy. With the onset of warmer weather, Staff will be busy with other projects and will not have time to re-install the barriers if they are removed. Public Works Director, Kevin Anderson stated that they could be taken down in a couple of days, but it would take four people about one week to put them back up.

Council Member Ellison asked about the reasoning behind taking the walls down and if they prevent players from playing pickleball. Mr. Goodwin said that it does not prevent anyone from playing but they make it difficult for spectators to watch.

Council Member Smith stated that some of the concerns include the issue of where to put the paddle while waiting to play. Also, Family Festival is planning a pickleball tournament and they do not have room to set up their tent for the check-in area for the tournament. Mr. Goodwin recognized the concern but hesitated to take the panels down just to have to put them back up after the tournament.

Council Member Geddes asked if it was possible to remove one panel on each side of the gate. Discussion ensued regarding the options for watching matches leading up to the final match and

ways to accommodate both the players and the neighbors. Mr. Anderson stated that bleachers could be set up for the Family Festival and there would be sufficient room to accommodate them. Mr. Goodwin commented that once the cameras are installed they will be able to determine if there are any public safety issues. If so, they would address the sound barrier walls again. Otherwise, he felt that the walls should remain in place.

Council Member Smith was not in favor of spending money on benches. Mr. Goodwin stated that the bleacher idea is a good one and if it works, it could be a permanent solution.

**MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to NOT instruct Staff to remove the sound barriers on the east side of the pickleball courts at Harvey Park and to keep working out other solutions. Council Member McEwen seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Ellison-Aye, Council Member Geddes-Aye, Council Member McEwen-Aye, Council Member Miller-Aye, Council Member Smith-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **17. Discussion on City Branding and Logo.**

Mr. Goodwin discussed the options previously considered regarding the new City logo, including reaching out to Chase Media to see about getting some alternatives. He contacted them on March 18, and they were excited about getting a bid to the City, however, he had not heard back from them. Staff had been working on ideas he shared with the Council. After getting feedback from the public, the consensus was that the primary logo that is green with a white background is not a favorite. The badge logo seemed to be more acceptable. The City wants people to be informed and Staff has been working on the website and created a 'Rumors and News' tab that has created public interest.

There have been questions regarding the building behind Walmart. When Staff responds to those types of questions, they include the badge logo. Other questions include progress on the short course and Heritage Park improvements. These are just a few ways the City is implementing the logo for residents to see and become accustomed to.

As mentioned at the previous meeting and as Ms. Price mentioned in her comments tonight, Staff deals with these issues daily. When correspondence is received that does not have a logo, it can and should be construed as spam. Mr. Goodwin stated that the logo provides officiality to any document being sent. Some items need to be purchased, such as letterhead and envelopes that will bear the official City logo, however, until a decision is made, they are in limbo. The City wants to order picnic tables for the new Heritage Park pavilion as well. The problem is that if the tables do not carry the logo, they tend to disappear. When they are branded, they stay in place. There has been a lot of interest in the pavilion and people want to rent it and use it, but they need tables.

Council Member Smith mentioned some of her concerns and stated that at Heritage Park there are 35 tables and 20 garbage cans, plus a big sign. She was concerned that after investing so much money in park renovations, the items that are there will have a different logo than the new one. Mr. Goodwin stated that the logo that is on those items in the park was simplified from the original and he does not have a copy to replicate it.

Council Member Geddes said that there have been at least two comments from the public tonight indicating that they support the logo. He suggested that the City move on to more important issues.

Council Member Smith argued that there will be two different logos at the park because it will never be changed.

Mr. Goodwin did not consider it to be a significant issue and stated that the City has the following four options:

1. Keep the existing new logo at no additional cost to the City.
2. Go back to the old logo or some variation of it. It was noted, however, that the logo does not exist in a reproducible vector format. As a result, the City would have to pay someone to produce a logo set. The new logo can be used in several ways.
3. Have a design firm come up with new ideas and present those ideas to the City for a vote. Chase Media charged \$8,000 for the previous new logo, but in 2012, the cost with a different firm was \$18,000. It could get expensive and would take up to one year to complete the process.
4. Residents could submit ideas and have some kind of contest. The issue of creating the logo set and brand guide, as well as the time issue, would remain.

Mayor Andersen stated that in November 2021 the Council voted to move forward with the current design set. The issue continues to come back and has created other problems. Council Member McEwen remarked that it seems as if the decision should be undone based on feedback the City has received. Council Member Geddes felt that too much time has been spent on this issue and that is irrelevant considering other items that come before the Council. He would like to move forward. There was discussion regarding the importance of being able to justify the vote to the public and making it resident-driven. Council Member Smith expressed concern that it could have been a celebration with the residents, and she wished it had been handled differently. Mayor Andersen stated that the City has been rolling out the new logo on the website and elsewhere and has not received any complaints. She had seen a lot of positive comments. Council Member Smith clarified that she was mainly responding to the lack of positive feedback from the public and not the few that posted on Facebook who were critical of it.

Council Member Miller stated that the most difficult part is the process. He felt that Staff and the Mayor pushed the issue too quickly. He was presented with two options, and neither was ideal. He recognized that the plan is to move forward with rebranding. There were originally around 200 residents who responded resoundingly negatively to the new logo. That is a small number of the total resident population, so he questioned if the rest were in silent support or ambivalent about the issue. The negative response was driving the discussion. He commented that it would have helped the Council to know what should be an administrative decision and what is legislative. He also expressed displeasure that the City continued to roll out the logo despite the concerns the Council had in the beginning.

Mr. Goodwin stated that he is in a difficult position because he does not have any clear direction. He needs to move forward with critical items and felt that all that has been done to date is sink money and time into it. He would like to be done with it. Discussion continued regarding the new logo and whether the City should move forward with it. Staff desires a new logo because the old one is complicated to produce in screen printing or embroidery and other issues. Council Member Smith proposed waiting another five years and rebrand on the 50-year anniversary with an unveiling and more resident input. The consensus was that people generally do not care about the logo.

City Attorney, Hyrum Bosserman stated that the matter would need to be put on the agenda as an action item to vote on it.

Council Members McEwen, Ellison, and Smith supported moving forward with the new logo with a heavy preference for the badge option. Council Member Miller did not like the new logo but if the Council decides to move forward, he would agree to that. Council Member Geddes was highly supportive of moving forward. It was ultimately agreed by the Council to stay with the new badge logo and end the discussion.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

### **18. Adjourn.**

Council Member Smith confirmed that the Beautification Committee would come back to present ideas for the landscaping changes. The City would be applying for the grants discussed during the Work Session. It was confirmed that that was the case.

**MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to ADJOURN. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.**

This meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Approved by Council:  
May 3, 2022

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC  
City Recorder