

1 **Providence City Council Meeting**
2 **Providence City Office Building**
3 **15 South Main, Providence UT**
4 **Tuesday, September 14, 2004**
5 **6:00 p.m.**

6 **Attendance:** Mayor: Alma H. Leonhardt
7 Council: Randy Eck, Stacie Gomm, Deon Johnson, Ron Liechty, Vic
8 Saunders
9 City Manager: Vern Keeslar
10 City Recorder: Skarlet Bankhead
11 City Engineer: Max Pierce
12 Public Works Director: Dee Barnes

13 **The Providence City Council will meet for a study session at 6:00 p.m. in the City**
14 **Council Chambers. This is a public meeting; however, no public comment will be heard**
15 **and no action will be taken on the agenda items.**

16 **Discussion Items:**

17 Water Report prepared by Max Pierce, Dee Barnes, and Vern Keeslar:

- 18 • R Eck expressed concern that he had not had enough time to study the report in
19 depth.
- 20 • R Liechty asked for clarification of 1999 figures vs. the figures presented in the
21 report. D Barnes explained the City has recovered approximately 500,000 – 700,000
22 gallons per day in detecting and repairing water leaks.
- 23 • D Barnes explained the units will be displaced by what goes into the Cemetery. He
24 also reported the master plan for the landscaping around the shop area requires two 2-
25 inch meters. D Barnes felt secondary water could be used for the shop landscaping.
- 26 • The report indicates, at the worst case scenario, 67 available Equivalent Residential
27 Connections (ERCs).
- 28 • M Pierce explained the 1.5 gpm is the worst case scenario for each ERC. He also
29 explained the report suggests the City acquire sources to supply more than 3,367
30 gpm.
- 31 • S Gomm did not feel the City was ready for more large developments. R Eck
32 explained the 67 remaining ERCs makes him uncomfortable when considering
33 additional property for development. R Liechty agreed.
- 34 • Mayor Leonhardt felt the City should look at its currently owned water shares and
35 have them scheduled so the City can use the shares. At the present time, the
36 irrigation company schedules do not allow the City to combine all its shares. He felt
37 the City should consider not leasing shares until the City can reach a better agreement
38 with the Irrigation Companies. He suggested the City obtain an attorney specializing
39 in water.
- 40 • M Pierce explained the recommendations. Number 1 is talking about better
41 utilization of the City's irrigation shares. Number 2 is increasing well rights, such as
42 buying well rights in another location and transferring the rights. Number 3 is similar
43 to number 2 but works with the Irrigation Company deeding the rights and
44 transferring from surface to ground or change point of diversion and transfer from
45 surface to ground.
- 46 • R Eck asked about compensation and mitigation. M Pierce explained this is part of
47 Number 3. V Keeslar explained it would require cooperation of the Irrigation
48 Companies.

- 1 • V Keeslar explained Number 4 suggests a secondary system would significantly
- 2 reduce the demand on the culinary system.
- 3 • R Eck felt the developers should be looking for ways to develop new water in the
- 4 City. V Keeslar reported the developers are looking at options. M Pierce explained
- 5 the numbers in the report are consistent with the 2000 Master Plan.
- 6 • R Eck asked how much water would be needed to service the annexations that are
- 7 being proposed. V Keeslar reported the exact numbers have not been calculated. M
- 8 Pierce explained the 1.5 gpm could be used.
- 9 • R Eck reported he had been told there are 25,000 acre feet of water rights available in
- 10 the County. He asked how the 1.5 gpm converted to acre feet. M Pierce needed
- 11 more time to study the conversion.
- 12 • R Eck asked about the water that Nibley City is seeking. M Pierce did not think it
- 13 involved the 25,000 acre feet.
- 14 • S Gomm felt water was only one issue in dealing with the large developments. She
- 15 also felt access was a major issue. V Keeslar explained the extension of the second
- 16 access (other than Center Street) hinges on the proposed annexation being approved.
- 17 • D Johnson reported some of the Stan Checketts property has water shares.
- 18 • M Pierce felt obtaining the rights and shares was only part of the battle. There is also
- 19 the infrastructure. He felt perhaps the City could acquire the rights and the developer
- 20 be responsible for the infrastructure. D Johnson felt the City would have to prove it
- 21 was maxed out to acquire more water rights.
- 22 • V Keeslar explained the property could be annexed but not rezoned until the
- 23 developers provided adequate water.
- 24 • V Keeslar reported several years were considered in the report.
- 25 • R Eck suggested the Council consider requiring the developers to build the reservoir
- 26 and then the City fill the reservoir. Mayor Leonhardt explained the City currently has
- 27 excess storage for the current needs.
- 28 • D Johnson felt the cost of pumping needed to be considered.
- 29 • V Saunders asked if the study considered a disaster. V Keeslar reported the study did
- 30 not address a disaster. D Barnes felt in a disaster the citizens would be required to
- 31 stop certain usage, depending on the emergency.
- 32 • V Saunders explained when considering reclaiming water, the rights downstream
- 33 need to be considered. Mayor Leonhardt reported UP&L has rights from Providence
- 34 Canyon.

35 Athletic field user fees:

- 36 • R Liechty asked if the Council has concerns they wanted addressed.
- 37 • R Eck felt the City should consider a concession stand for soccer. S Bankhead
- 38 reported, in the past, the soccer coaches did not support the idea of a concession
- 39 stand.
- 40 • R Liechty explained the volunteer committee has not contacted him for months. He
- 41 felt it was time for the Council to move forward with a decision.
- 42 • A discussion of whether to pursue the athletic fees will be on the next study session
- 43 with about 30 minutes of time allotted.

44 Sidewalks:

- 45 • V Keeslar reported 100 East is being considered tonight. The 200 North sidewalk
- 46 from 100 East to 200 East will be evaluated after looking at the budget. D Barnes
- 47 explained his understanding was the 100 East being considered tonight was the first
- 48 priority, then west center, then 200 North. Mayor Leonhardt felt the 200 North and

1 Center Street projects were equal in priority. V Keeslar explained a capital facilities
2 plan would help in prioritizing the projects.

3 **Pledge:** Mayor Leonhardt

4 **Opening:** Vic Saunders, moment of silence for Corporal Allred killed while serving in Iraq.

5 **Approve minutes and update past business:**

6 Motion to approve the minutes – D Johnson, second – R Liechty,

7 Corrections:

- 8 • Page 1 line 18 ~~felt~~ said the road should be built, the city should consider
- 9 • Page 1 line 41 ~~road-side~~ curbside
- 10 • Page 5 line 28 Dave ~~Hare~~ Hair
- 11 • Page 5 line 5 the proposed CMPO
- 12 • Page 5 line 9 irrigation water shares should be included.

13 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

14 nay: none

15 excused: none

16 abstained: none

17 **Item No. 1. Audit Report. Peterson Allred Jackson will present the 2004 Audit report.**

18 Alan Allred and Diana Canal represented Peterson Allred Jackson, CPAs.

- 19 • Diana Canal reviewed the audit report. She thanked the staff for the well organized
20 and documented entries. D Canal reported the City had a very good audit.
- 21 • Mayor Leonhardt thanked the Peterson Allred Jackson firm.

22 **Item No. 2. Presentation. BioWest will present the Providence Logan Transportation**
23 **Corridor Environmental Impact Study.**

- 24 • Blaze Jensen, the project manager for BIO West, presented the findings on the
25 Providence Logan Transportation Corridor, formerly called the 100 East Project. He
26 reported V Keeslar represents the City, Jay Agular represents the CMPO, and there
27 are also UDOT and Logan City representatives. He reported they have held public
28 hearings and requested written comment. He explained, after the scoping phase, they
29 will enter the proposed alternatives phase. After the proposed alternative phase
30 comes the evaluation process, then the decision process.
- 31 • The alternative process will be done through the winter. They will enter the
32 evaluation process in the spring. They look to have a draft document for the public
33 by next fall. Construction is scheduled for the year 2007 (does not include the
34 Providence City portion).
- 35 • B Jensen reported he can get the City a copy of the aerial photo used in the
36 presentation.
- 37 • The Council thanked B Jensen for the presentation.
- 38 • The Council expressed concern the construction schedule does not include the
39 Providence portion of the road. V Keeslar explained federal funds are applied for 5 –
40 6 years in advance. The Providence portion of the road was not part of the original
41 application.

42 **Item No. 3. The Providence City Council will consider for adoption an ordinance**
43 **granting a petition of annexation filed by Stan Checketts for a 220.04 acre (+/-) parcel**
44 **of property located adjacent to the east boundary of Providence City.**

- 45 • R Eck explained with the current information provided, he was not comfortable
46 annexing tonight. He still has questions to consider.
- 47 • V Saunders felt going into a situation with “eyes open” allows for annexation but
48 does not guarantee development.

- 1 • D Johnson felt good about the annexation. He felt the City had adequate bylaws
2 and ordinances for development. He felt development would depend on adequate
3 water and infrastructure.
- 4 • S Gomm suggested the ordinance be changed as follows:
5 . . . before any development that includes real property that lies in Water
6 Zone 3 shall be allowed to ~~begin~~ submit an application on any . . .
7 Streets for access to and from, said 220.04 acres more or less must be
8 developed and in place, before any development shall be allowed to ~~begin~~ submit
9 an application on said 220.04 . . .
- 10 • S Gomm felt the major concerns were water and roads. She just wanted to see
11 where the infrastructure was going.
- 12 • R Liechty reported many citizens have concern that annexing the property puts
13 the City in a position that the City is bound to provide services. V Keeslar
14 explained court rulings change. However, in the past, discretion is given to
15 municipal bodies to determine when to rezone. V Keeslar explained many of the
16 water concerns involve Water Zone Three. V Keeslar reported the City Attorney
17 prepared the proposed ordinance.
- 18 • V Saunders asked why the applicant had asked for the annexation of 220 acres
19 instead of just the amount needed for approximately 25 homes. S Checketts
20 reported he talked with Mayor Leonhardt and V Keeslar. After reviewing the
21 master plan, he felt annexing the entire piece was in the best interest of the master
22 plan. He felt if the City did not annex, it was a lose, lose situation. S Checketts
23 understood that development was dependant on adequate infrastructure. Mayor
24 Leonhardt reminded the Council the entire piece is included in the City's
25 annexation policy plan.
- 26 • R Liechty asked the developer if they understood, even if the property was
27 annexed, without having available water no development would happen. S
28 Checketts, Nathan Ballstaedt, and Jason Christensen said they understood the
29 condition.
- 30 • S Gomm questioned annexing if the Council was not comfortable with
31 development. She reported she had been told once the property is annexed, there
32 are pressures from the developer.
- 33 • Mayor Leonhardt felt the ordinance prepared by the City Attorney stated even if
34 annexed, development would only occur when certain conditions have been met.
- 35 • S Checketts reported there were no water shares on the 220 acres.
- 36 • Mayor Leonhardt asked about the process to get a well approved. Gary Knighton
37 felt a municipality had a better chance of showing beneficial use than an
38 individual. The City can apply for rights; it is just a matter of time. M Pierce did
39 not know if the 25,000 water rights were available.
- 40 • V Saunders explained ground water was over subscribed. The City would need
41 deep water.
- 42 • G Knighton felt a secondary water system would help. G Knighton explained
43 annexing gives the City control. He felt annexation protected the City.
- 44 • S Checketts reported when he recently annexed a piece of property to Logan,
45 Logan was very interested in obtaining property to grow.
- 46 • N Ballstaedt reported he spoke with Bob Fotheringham from the State Water
47 Rights Division. It was Ballstaedt's impression that there were water rights that
48 would be available in the Providence area.

- 1 • R Eck felt the developer had been forthright in their desire to annex and develop.
- 2 • S Gomm felt the Council also had to consider if the City does not annex, the
- 3 developers could go to another entity.
- 4 • Jason Christensen explained they intend to develop the property rather slowly.
- 5 They intend to submit for the first 25 homes and then more as water is available.
- 6 He felt, in the proper channel, the first step was annexation.
- 7 • Dan Hogan reported his development has taken over 26 years to develop 60
- 8 acres. S Checketts felt with the rule of supply and demand it would take many
- 9 years to develop the property.
- 10 • R Eck felt there needed to be more discussion as a Council. He wanted more
- 11 time to research.
- 12 • S Checketts felt the process had been going on for months. He realized the
- 13 Council was in a good position because it would be difficult for other cities to
- 14 annex. But he felt the Council should make a decision.
- 15 • Dan Turner felt the City had many steps within the ordinances to protect the City.
- 16 He expressed concern that at times cities request details, prior to or with
- 17 annexation, that place a huge burden on the developer, which typically will be
- 18 considered in the development process.
- 19 • D Johnson felt the Council had had at least three weeks to consider the
- 20 annexation request. He felt the Council should make a decision.
- 21 • Clint Thompson felt Millville's attitude toward CELCO is to get rid of the
- 22 headache. He felt a good set of attorneys had decided to sneak the boundary
- 23 adjustment through. He felt the City had two "scorpions" out there. He did not
- 24 feel the city should annex either property.
- 25 • S Checketts felt C Thompson was using scare tactics because development would
- 26 increase traffic in Thompson's neighborhood. S Checketts explained for years
- 27 the City had looked at the development of the property.
- 28 • D Johnson asked how long the CELCO property had been in Millville. C
- 29 Thompson felt about 10 years. D Johnson explained Millville had not allowed
- 30 development for the entire period. D Johnson felt Providence City could also
- 31 control the development.
- 32 • D Hogan reported there are some in Millville that want the CELCO project.
- 33 • V Saunders stated he was all for annexing the 220 acres.
- 34 • D Hogan reported the City currently collects about \$7,200 for a building permit.
- 35 He felt there was 4.5 million dollars in building permit fees alone that would
- 36 come in.
- 37 • D Johnson did not feel that annexing obligate the City to provide services. If the
- 38 City annexes 220 acres and can't service 219 then it sits.
- 39 • V Saunders felt water was a non-renewable resource. It was finite. V Saunders
- 40 asked about modifying the amount property being annexed. V Keeslar felt the
- 41 Council could go less but not more.
- 42 • G Knighton explained the County will work with a development if they have
- 43 made a good faith effort to work with a city.
- 44 • R Liechty expressed concern that people have told him the water report is not
- 45 correct. He needed more time to understand the water situation.
- 46 • V Keeslar explained bringing the property in residential would give the developer
- 47 some rights. However, this property when this property is annexed, it will remain

1 in an agricultural zone. Before development could occur, the City would have to
2 allow a rezone.

- 3 • S Gomm felt there were some things she would like edited in the ordinance. R
4 Eck and S Gomm would like to annex but they still had questions.
- 5 • S Checketts felt the City had reputable information.
- 6 • V Keeslar explained the 358 lots were approved build able lots that had been or
7 were in the loop to be subdivided.

8 Motion to approve Ordinance Modification 026-2004 – V Saunders, second - D Johnson,

- 9 • S Gomm suggested amending the motion to change the word “begin” to “be
10 proposed.”

11 V Saunders withdrew his motion.

- 12 • D Johnson did not feel one or two weeks would make a difference. V Saunders
13 wanted to have the amendments verified by the attorney. D Johnson felt the major
14 issue was water. D Johnson felt water was not an issue in the annexation. He felt the
15 developers understood they had to provide water before development could occur.

16 D Johnson withdrew the second.

17 Motion to table for two weeks to have the amendments reviewed by the attorney and give the
18 council members time to review water report – V Saunders, second – R Eck

19 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

20 nay: none

21 excused: none

22 abstained: none

- 23 • S Checketts requested a copy of the proposed ordinance.

24 **Item No. 4. Resolution 04-070. The Providence City Council will consider for adoption**
25 **a resolution approving a final plat for Creekside Business Park Subdivision Located**
26 **generally at 271 North Spring Creek Parkway, requested by Val Sorensen.**

27 Val Sorensen represented the development.

- 28 • V Saunders reported the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval.
29 One of his concerns was that the CMPO road was adequately marked. This has been
30 done.

31 Motion to approve Resolution 04-070 – R Eck, second – V Saunders

32 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

33 nay: none

34 excused: none

35 abstained: none

36 **Item No. 5. Resolution 04-071. The Providence City Council will consider for adoption**
37 **a resolution approving a final plat for Stirland Estates Subdivision located generally at**
38 **620 South 200 West, requested by Van Stirland.**

39 Gary Knighton and Van and Marty Stirland represented the Development.

- 40 • V Saunders reported he has had a concern voiced by the adjacent property owner that
41 the proposed street was non-conforming.
- 42 • Gary Stauffer explained there is nothing in the ordinance allowing a 42-foot road. He
43 felt this would be a collector road and would require a 50-foot right-of-way. V
44 Keeslar did not agree that this would be a collector road. G Stauffer felt by the
45 definition in the City Code this was a collector road. V Keeslar explained the road is
46 not shown on the master plan; therefore, it is not a collector road.
- 47 • V Saunders asked if the road was built as shown, could the subdivision operate
48 without impacting neighboring property owners. G Knighton reported everything on

- 1 the Stirland property meets the ordinance. G Knighton explained they are developing
2 the full width of payment. They will not be developing the north park strip and
3 sidewalk.
- 4 • R Eck expressed concern storm water would impact the neighboring property owner.
 - 5 • G Stauffer explained if the balance of the road is built there will not be enough side
6 yard setback from his home. G Stauffer insisted that he would not be developing his
7 side of the property.
 - 8 • V Keeslar reported the zone is SFT.
 - 9 • S Gomm would like to see the existing structures on the plat. V Keeslar explained
10 the structures are shown.
 - 11 • G Knighton explained from the right-of-way line to V Stirland's home there is more
12 than the required 30 feet for setback. G Knighton explained upon completing the
13 street, G Stauffer's side yard setback would be seven feet short. G Knighton
14 explained they are developing the full width of payment. They will not be developing
15 the north park strip and sidewalk.
 - 16 • G Stauffer felt the minimum public road was a 50-foot right of way. He did not think
17 the final plat could be approved because the only way it meets City Code is if some
18 of the right-of-way is on the Stauffer property. G Stauffer again stated he has no
19 intentions of ever developing his side of the property. Therefore the road would
20 remain unfinished.
 - 21 • S Gomm asked where the road would go in the future. V Keeslar explained the road
22 could extend southward. He explained in the future the neighboring property owner
23 could apply for a variance or a zone change to allow a street side yard of less than 30-
24 feet.
 - 25 • G Knighton explained a private lane will only allow 6 lots to access. They designed
26 the development to eventually complete a street on the City's master plan.
 - 27 • G Stauffer felt this road would be on the back of lots if his property is developed. He
28 did not feel now, nor has he ever felt this road would benefit his property. He does
29 not intend to ever develop the property on his side of the road.
 - 30 • V Keeslar explained because the road is not designated on the master plan, it is not a
31 collector or an arterial road.
 - 32 • G Stauffer expressed concern about emergency vehicles with a smaller cul-de-sac. V
33 Keeslar reported the plans were submitted to the Fire Department. G Knighton felt
34 this was a better situation than a private road.
 - 35 • G Stauffer reported the notes on the plat say future 60-foot right-of-way.
 - 36 • G Knighton reported the planting strip and the sidewalk would be on the Stauffer
37 property. V Keeslar reported the plat is showing a 60-foot right of way. G Knighton
38 explained the 60-foot right-of-way is an error; it should be 50-foot right-of-way.
 - 39 • V Keeslar read from the City Code and explained G Stauffer's interpretation.
40 However, because the road is not shown on the master plan it is not a collector street.
41 V Keeslar also read 11-5-9 discussing negotiation with neighboring landowners. V
42 Keeslar explained the developers are building approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the road.
 - 43 • R Eck explained when the road is built the crown will cause water to run to the
44 Stauffer property.
 - 45 • V Keeslar explained if the entire road is built on the on the Stirland property, when
46 the adjacent property develops they will reimburse the Stirlands.
 - 47 • V Keeslar felt the Council should consider a text amendment reducing the side yard
48 setback to 20 feet, instead of 30 feet.

- 1 • G Knighton questioned why the Council was rehashing an issue that was discussed
- 2 in two previous stages.
- 3 • S Gomm felt the Council needed a better method for research and information to
- 4 come to them.
- 5 • V Saunders explained he brought up the ½ road early in the process. G Knighton felt
- 6 they have complied with all the requirements placed on them during the previous two
- 7 steps.
- 8 • G Knighton stated, as the City Engineer he could not recommend that the street be a
- 9 private road. The developers are not interested in a private road.
- 10 • D Johnson asked V Stirland what he would do if the situation was reversed. G
- 11 Knighton explained this development tried not to limit future development. G
- 12 Knighton explained the only thing not being developed is the park strip. R Eck
- 13 expressed concern about putting the snow against the Stauffer property. G Knighton
- 14 explained where the white fence is built the full right of way will be built.
- 15 • D Barnes expressed concern about a double frontage lots if the Stauffer property
- 16 develops in the future. G Knighton explained they felt the Stauffer property could be
- 17 developed to front the road.
- 18 • The Council felt this may have been discovered earlier in the process if the Planning
- 19 Commission member had talked with the property owners involved. V Keeslar
- 20 reported the Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment members cannot talk to
- 21 the property owners when acting.
- 22 • R Eck asked if the Council was comfortable with the partial road.
- 23 • G Stauffer stated as long as the development can stay on the Stirland property he is
- 24 fine with the development.
- 25 • D Barnes explained if the road is moved, the cul-de-sac will require 120 feet.

26 Motion to table until 9/28/04– V Saunders, second – R Liechty

27 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

28 nay: none

29 excused: none

30 abstained: none

31 **Item No. 6. Resolution 04-074. The Providence City Council will consider for adoption**
 32 **a resolution approving a custom road profile for Sunset Cove, generally located at 875**
 33 **South 300 East.**

- 34 • R Eck reported he spoke with Rod Blossom. R Eck explained the Council’s
- 35 suggestion. C Kendrick reported he understood the proposal and did not have a
- 36 problem with the suggestion. R Eck asked that the developer inform homeowner’s
- 37 there is one foot between the sidewalk and the property line.
- 38 • V Saunders asked about trees.

39 Motion to approve Resolution 04-074 – V Saunders, second – D Johnson

40 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

41 nay: none

42 excused: none

43 abstained: none

44 **Item No. 7. Resolution 04-072. The Providence City Council will consider for adoption a**
 45 **resolution awarding the bid for the Asphalt Projects 04-10, 04-11 04-12.**

- 46 • D Barnes explained 4-10 is 300 East and Center, 4-11 is 100 East 100 South to 200
- 47 South, and 04-12 is on 300 East 400 North.

- 1 • D Barnes reported the City got a good price on the bids. D Barnes explained the City
- 2 would use millings under the road and have road base on the top.
- 3 • R Eck felt if the City was buying crushed gravel, buy it now, stock pile the millings,
- 4 and put the milling in the canyon in the future.
- 5 • D Barnes explained additional work in the canyon will require material.
- 6 • S Gomm questioned with the bid being so close would the pit run clause make a
- 7 difference. R Eck and D Barnes said no.

8 Motion to accept the Parson bid with crushed gravel and use the millings in the canyon and
 9 the millings on shoulders – R Eck, second – V Saunders

10 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

11 nay: none

12 excused: none

13 abstained: none

14 **Item No. 8. Resolution 04-073. The Providence City Council will consider for adoption a**
 15 **resolution awarding the bid for the 100 East Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter Project No. 03-**
 16 **194.**

17 Motion to accept Resolution 04-073 awarding the bid to Velocity – S Gomm, second – R Eck

18 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

19 nay: none

20 excused: none

21 abstained: none

22 **Item No. 9. Resolution 04-075. The Providence City Council will consider for adoption a**
 23 **resolution approving the Providence City Council Bylaws.**

- 24 • Mayor Leonhardt expressed concern that the City Manager may be determining when
- 25 the City Recorder attended the meetings. V Keeslar explained this is in the event the
- 26 City Recorder cannot attend a meeting.
- 27 • S Gomm questioned the use of council and governing body. She felt the policy
- 28 should be consistent in using the terms.
- 29 • S Gomm suggested deleting the last sentence of 4.4
- 30 • S Gomm questioned the 24 hour notice for special meetings. V Keeslar explained an
- 31 emergency can be held without 24 hour notice.
- 32 • S Gomm questioned the opening be intended to be non denominational. She felt
- 33 praying was denominational. V Keeslar explained this was taken from direction
- 34 given by David Church and Bruce Jorgensen. Invocation starts a meeting.
- 35 • In 6.3 e. S Gomm questioned opening to public comment. V Keeslar explained the
- 36 bylaws do not have the force of law.
- 37 • R Eck suggested a podium in the council room.
- 38 • C Thompson recommended someone on the council bring the public up to speed on
- 39 the issues to be discussed in the public hearing.

40 Motion to continue this to the next council meeting – R Eck, second – V Saunders

41 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

42 nay: none

43 excused: none

44 abstained: none

45 **Note: At any time during the meeting, the City Council may vote to go into an**
 46 **executive session pursuant to Utah Code 52-4-5.**

47 Motion to enter into an executive session – R Eck, second – R Liechty

48 Vote: yes: R Eck, S Gomm, D Johnson, R Liechty, V Saunders

