

**SANTA CLARA CITY COUNCIL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2016
MINUTES**

THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH, met for a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, June 8, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers of the Town Hall at 2603 Santa Clara Drive, Santa Clara, Utah.

Notice of the time, place and agenda of the meeting was provided to the Spectrum and to each member of the governing body by emailing a copy of the Notice and Agenda to the Spectrum and also, along with any packet information, to the mayor and each council member, at least two days before the meeting.

Present: Mayor Rick Rosenberg
Council Members: Herb Basso, Jerry Amundsen, Ken Sizemore, Jarett Waite, Mary Jo (Tode) Hafen
City Manager: Edward Dickie
Deputy Recorder: Lisa Bundy

Others Present: Brock Jacobsen, Assistant City Manager; Jack Taylor, Public Works Director; Brad Hayes, Parks Director; Dan Nelson, Fire Chief; Matt Ence, City Attorney; Bob Nicholson, City Planner; Captain Rogers; Gary Lamph; Suzanne Webb; Charlie Clayton; Ramona C. Hafen; Gwendolyn Frei; Victor Frei; David Frei; Steve Lang; Phillip Gubler; Gill Hendeg; James L. Spendlove; Jill McArthur; Douglas McArthur; Kinglsey Nelson; Marsha Lyn Gubler; Keith Gubler; Donna K. Gubler; Ralph K. Gubler; Tauna Leavitt; Bill Lyzenga; LuJuanna Hafen; LeGrand Hafen; Alayna Coombs; Edward Coombs; William Lyzsenga; Pam Graf; Don Graf; Kyle Hafen; Tyler Gubler; Rebecca Taylor; Richard Taylor; Debbie McPherson; Denise Webster; Gemini Bush; Donald Bush; Robert Austin; Lance Rigby; Glen J. Gubler; Rachel Gubler; Judy Ogden; Larry Ogden; Scott Leavitt; Sandee Leavitt; Joann Harper; Ben Hegeman; Chris Howard; Dennis Frei; Merriley Hafen; JR Hafen; Eric Drake; Scott Day; Donnette Degen; Ronald Degen; Jim Dreher; Deborah Dreher; Bill Wall; Joanne Wall; Robert Spendlove; Bryan Heroux; Torry Heroux; Lois Lang; Nick Lang; Mary Lynn Reber; Guy Leavitt; Jake Erickson; Peggy Leavitt; F. Leavitt; Angie McArthur; Ron Myers; Trudy Berryessa; Diane Tew; Allan Tew; Derek Graf; Romaine Arnold; Ed Arnold; Mary Alice Gates; Anne Gates; Sheldon Wittwer; RJ Hughes; Becky Dunn; Lainee Frei; Dale Gubler; Sheree Gubler; Donna Stafford; David Leavitt; Jennifer Leavitt; Bud Stafford; Carolyn Judd; Randy Judd; Jason Lindsey; Troy Herman; Cindy Frei; RaeNyce Wittwer; Mary Sevy; Steve Sevy; Shane Mylsoie; Heidi Drake; Nanette Day; Shauna Morwood; Jason Morwood; Braden Morwood; Pam Graf; Andrea Schmutz; Hans Hafen; Brooke Ence; Dennis Mitchell; Jeff Webb; Karen Lessman-Hughes; Debbie ?; Kellie Daugherty; Charity Gough; Gen Grant; John Grant; Brenda Johnson

1. **Call to Order:** Mayor Rosenberg called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

2. **Opening Ceremony:**

- Pledge of Allegiance: Herb Basso
- Opening Comments: Herb Basso

3. Communications and Appearances:

A. General Citizen Communications: None

4. Working Agenda:

A. Public Hearing(s):

1. Public Hearing to receive public input on the Final Operating and Capital Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-2017.

- Brock Jacobsen, Assistant City Manager, said there is a small change to the budget that the Council has in their boxes. The Rap Tax money that was going to be distributed to the DeFoire Center was returned and so that was added back into the budget for next year so there will be a few more Rap Tax funds eligible to be distributed. Also, the City received notice from the County on the property taxes and it was more than anticipated so the amount that they recommended was added into the budget. It was an additional \$23,000 in property taxes, which took the budget from 4.283 to 4.307. The budget is balanced and complies with State law. He showed a power point, which compared this new budget to last years budget. He said that 55% of the City's revenue comes from taxes and he broke down the expenditures by departments.

- Herb Basso asked about the projects and operating costs.

- Brock Jacobsen talked about the projects that the City has been doing.

- Ed Dickie stated that the City has had several meetings and work meeting to go over the budget and this isn't the first time the budget is being presented to the City Council. He said that after a lot of work and a lot of thought that has gone into it this is where the City is now and they are presenting a balanced budget for next fiscal year which starts July 1, 2016 and goes until June 30, 2017.

- Jarett Waite asked what the transfers are, what does that mean?

- Brock Jacobsen stated that there are transfers for debt service and they will transfer some from the Enterprise Fund to the General Fund to cover costs that the General Fund incurs for the Enterprise Funds and some of it will be impact fees that were transferred to cover some debt service that is paid out of the General Fund.

5:15 p.m. Public Hearing Opened.

5:16 p.m. Public Hearing Closed.

B. General Business:

3. Request Approval of Ordinance 2016-07 approving the Santa Clara City Final Operating and Capital Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17. Presented by Brock Jacobsen, Assistant City Manager/Finance Director.

Motion to Approve Ordinance 2016-07 approving the Santa Clara City Final Operating and Capital Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17.

Motion by Herb Basso, seconded by Tode Hafen.

- Jarett Waite said that on the Streets Budget is there any interest in increasing that back

to the \$75,000 that the Council talked about originally. He said that he thinks the \$50,000 is fine but the City does have a surplus so they could spend a little more on streets. He said he had some good feedback from some citizens on the street work that was done recently and he would like to see the ball keep rolling.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that additional money that the City found this week, the \$25,000 could be put back into the street.

- Herb Basso said they can do it now or do it later as the projects roll on.

- Tode Hafen said they could take a look at it and amend it if the money is truly there.

- Herb Basso said that he would like to keep his motion the same but let staff know that there are extra funds so an amendment to the budget can be made.

Voting Aye: Herb Basso, Ken Sizemore, Jerry Amundsen, Jarett Waite and Tode Hafen.

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

A. Public Hearing(s):

2. Public Hearing to receive public input on the approval of a CIB Loan or Grant for Truman Drive Landslide Stabilization improvements.

- Mayor Rosenberg stated that the City is very close to receiving a FEMA grant, a pre-disaster mitigation grant that would help purchase 4 properties that are severely impacted in the top of the Truman Drive landslide. It would remove the properties and the City would be enabled to do some improvements, reduce some of the overburden on the hill and improve some of the drainage that would allow the factors of safety to return to a higher level, a more standard level for the adjacent homes that would remain. He said the City has been going through the environmental clearance process with FEMA over the last few months and we're in the process of getting some title work done to make sure there's clear title available on the properties and when that's completed we anticipated FEMA authorizing the grant. The City is approaching the State Community Impact Board for a loan and a grant to help with a match. FEMA grants require a 25% local match. They pay 75% of the project costs, the local government has to come up with 25% of the project costs. The City has budgeted some time and some material and labor to go toward that project and the CIB funds would supplement that to help the City portion.

- Jack Taylor, Public Works Director, said that in the application as far as cost sharing, Santa Clara City applicant cash would be \$20,000, applicant in kind would be \$19,678. He said the City hopes that from the FEMA grant that the City would get \$1,172,000 and from the CIB fund \$351,000 either in grant or loan. He said that it is possible that the City could end up in the loan amount of \$176,000 and ask for grant of \$175,000 understanding that if the CIB doesn't allow the City to get the grant then the City would be accountable for the \$351,000. He said that this just needs to be approved in the public hearing and then they can move forward and go up to Salt Lake and see if they are willing to give the City a grant or a loan.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that the City was successful last fall in securing a CIB loan and grant for money required for the Hwy 91 project. He said that when that project was bid, the construction costs were actually lower than the estimate and the City was actually able to return that money unspent to the State so the City didn't have to take out that loan

as part of that project and that enabled us to go back and use it for this one. Hopefully when the bids come back in and the appraisals come back in we can see some assistance on this project that same way but this allows us to cover our costs. If FEMA does grant us some money, we would be able to move forth immediately and help secure some of those properties that are extremely high risk today.

5:22 p.m. Public Hearing Opened.

5:23 p.m. Public Hearing Closed.

B. General Business:

4. Request Approval of a CIB Loan or Grant for Truman Drive Landslide Stabilization improvements. Presented by Jack Taylor, Public Works Director.

- Matt Ence, City Attorney, suggested to the Mayor to give a quick explanation to those present about what the CIB is.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that the Community Impact Board is a State-wide Board that is made up of Representatives throughout the State, primarily County Commissioners, and Transportation people. The Board is given money that comes from proceeds that the State collects on gas and oil development and coal and mining from State lands so the royalties the State gets off of energy development primarily, a portion is set aside for the Community Impact Board to help small communities across the State do a variety of different projects. The City has used some of that money before. The Landslide Stabilization is one of those projects under the CIB and we're hopeful to get at least half of the money in grant funds.

Motion to Approve a CIB Loan or Grant for Truman Drive Landslide Stabilization improvements.

Motion by Ken Sizemore, seconded by Herb Basso.

Voting Aye: Ken Sizemore, Jerry Amundsen, Tode Hafen, Herb Basso and Jarett Waite.

Voting Nay:

Motion Carried.

1. Recommendation to City Council for request of a zone change from R-1-10/RA - Mixed Lot Size to Planned Development Residential on 9.89 acres, located at Gates Lane and Clary Hills Drive, consideration of a request for Density Bonus, and consideration of a Conditional Use Permit request for short-term rentals of Sycamore Condos and Approve Ordinance 2016-08. Split Rock Holding, Applicant.

- Bob Nicholson, City Planner, said that there are three items that are part of this overall request: the zone change request from R-1-10/RA to Planned Development Residential on 9.89 acres, the Conditional Use Permit request to allow the owners to put the units into a rental pool for short-term rental use, and consider approval of a density bonus request to exceed the 8 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is Split Rock Development Group, Patrick Manning and Kyle Hafen. The General Plan for the City, which was completed in 2013, designated this property as medium density residential. It is at the south end of Gates Lane on the south side of Clary Hills Drive. The proposed 112 units which includes lockout units, and the lockout units is the opportunity to subdivide a main unit or

a mother unit, and those are the units that could be sold within a main dwelling unit, with all these units combined it's a total of 112 units. There are 7 proposed 3-story buildings with 16 units per building that equals a density of 11.3 units per acre. He gave a summary of the changes that were made after the first Planning Commission Public Hearing, which was held on March 8, 2016. At that time there was a lot of questions that answers weren't provided for and ultimately the Planning Commission recommended denial. The applicants decided to change their plan and make some modifications and try and address some of those concerns and then they came back for a second Public Hearing, which was held on May 10, 2016 at the Planning Commission. The changes made after the first Public Hearing was that they decreased the number of potential dwelling units from 219 to 112. They added additional parking including 45 spaces along Clary Hills Drive. They provided a detailed landscape plan and provided a traffic impact analysis, which was prepared by SunRise Engineering. They are going through this zone change request and they have requested approval under the Density Bonus to have a density of 11.3 units per acre. The recent zoning history on the property, the property has been previously zoned to planned development residential for higher density use and that occurred in 2006 and there was 62.9 acres a much larger area than what we're dealing with tonight. The property was rezoned from this residential agriculture to planned development residential for that 62.9 acres. Then the recession came and the project never grew to materialize and in September 2014 the property owner requested rezone from planned development residential back to single family R-1-10/RA which is the present zoning on the property. He talked about the parking requirements. The base-parking requirement is 2 parking spaces per unit. The applicant proposes a parking ratio of 2.26 spaces per unit, which includes 45 on-street parking spaces, which requires further debate or modification. On-street parking for the zoning code cannot be counted for toward meeting the parking requirements. They propose to have 254 spaces for the 122 units. They have 27 underground spaces per building. They have 2 surface parking lots with a total of 22 spaces. The short-term rental use is under a condition use permit request. The main requirements in the zoning code for short-term rentals are: the property owners provide written approval of that short-term use, a local property management company is the manager for the short-term rentals, that recreational amenities are provided for guest use sufficient for the size of the project, and the project obtains a City Business License for the short-term rental use and pays the required transient room taxes. Planning Commission has reviewed this and does recommend approval of the Condition Use Permit for short-term rentals. The amenities proposed include a clubhouse, two swimming pools and a lazy river that is located above the pools. The project proposes 112 total dwelling units and 7 building, 16 units per building that comes to a density of 11.3 units per acre. Anything more than 8 units per acre require compliance with the City's Density Bonus criteria. Those criteria stipulate that the project has to have some visual architectural interest, a varied roof line, balconies and decks and a detailed landscape plan. The building materials need to be durable stone, masonry, stucco. He pointed out the rendering and said that it shows there is a lot of architectural interest. He said that based on the combination of all these things the architecture, the building, the landscaping and the amenities, the Planning Commission did recommend that it met the Bonus Density criteria for a density of the requested 11.3 units per acre. The City Code limits building heights to 35 feet unless otherwise approved by the Council. The applicants indicate that the building will not exceed 35 feet. In terms of open space, the Zoning Code requires a minimum of 30% of the project

space to be landscaped open space. The landscape plan has been provided and it shows that they do meet this minimum 30% requirement. Traffic concerns: at the Planning Commission hearing back in March there was a lot of concerns and questions about traffic impacts that this project might generate. The applicants hired SunRise Engineering to prepare a level of service analysis for the Sycamore Condominium project. That report was finished and provided to the City on April 19, 2016. This traffic study evaluated 2 different levels of development activity: a 70-unit project and a 300-unit project. The 300-unit analysis seems to be a more appropriate analysis considering future development. In the summary of the traffic report it says the existing level of service at the intersection of Gates Lane and Santa Clara Drive is a level of service A, the best service you can have. With the additional 300 dwelling units in the area the LOS would remain at a level A. They stated that the average delay at the intersection increases from 0.9 seconds to 3 seconds with the additional units. The intersection capacity utilization during the peak hours increases from about 40% to 47% with the project and SunRise Engineering concludes "the level of service remains essentially the same during the peak hours studied." They don't see a great impact to Gates Lane and Santa Clara Drive. The City's Master Transportation Plan and Impact Fee Analysis does some traffic modeling and traffic generation rates. The report says that it is projected that Santa Clara Drive near Gates Lane is expected to increase from 10,000 cars per day in 2012 to 15,000 cars per day by 2025 and that traffic increase is due mainly to the expected growth which occurs west of central Santa Clara which includes Ivins, Kayenta and the Gun Lock areas. There is also a second bridge proposed in this year's City budget crossing the Santa Clara River to meet the fire code standards and for overall public safety concerns. A second access over the Santa Clara River is needed. A plan for a low flow river crossing at the end of Chapel Street south of Santa Clara River, the plan is to connect Chapel Street to Clary Hills Drive and connect to Gates Lane. This access would provide the needed second access to developments on the south side of the river. On May 10, 2016, the Planning Commission held a second Public Hearing and at the conclusion of that 2 hour Public Hearing, they did vote 5-1 to recommend approval of the rezone to the Planning Development Residential along with the approval of the Density Bonus up to the 11.3 units per acre and also approval for the short-term rental use. In the end, the Planning Commission recognized that it was consistent with the City Master Plan, which was approved back in 2013 recommended approval.

- Herb Basso asked if Bob Nicholson feels that the conditions that merit a Bonus Density increase is well met and not marginally met.
- Bob Nicholson said yes and the Planning Commission in both meetings went over that. The criteria of the building architecture met that standard. The landscaping and the amenities requirements were met.
- Herb Basso said that Bob mentioned that in the parking requirements that something needed to be worked out. Should it be worked out before and if the Council moves forward.
- Bob Nicholson said the idea is that if they were to expand the right of way that's one option. They've talked about the idea of having an additional surface lot. He said they need more off street parking. He said that in the code it does state in the short-term rental section that some on street parking can be considered. It's a little open-ended. The public street that goes up the south hill up to the water tank, they are proposing showing some parallel spaces along there. They actually show 12 parking spaces.
- Herb Basso said they need to have more off street parking if this project is going to go.

This is not something we should go lightly on.

- Jarett Waite said that he had a question on the traffic study. He asked if the number of cars on the p.m. peak traffic time is correct. He said it seems more to him.
- Jerry Amundsen went over the diagram, which is on the last page of the report. He said that the Trip Generation Manual for a condominium town home development indicates that there is a rate of 0.52 trips per hour on the peak hour so if you multiply 300 units by 0.52 that is 156 vehicles in the peak hour that would be generated by 300 units. He explained the method that is used to estimate the number of vehicles entering or exiting an area.
- Herb Basso asked about non-peak hours and residential versus short term rentals.
- Jerry Amundsen stated that typically you only look at peak hours because it's the most traffic that impacts an area. The morning isn't the same as the evening. He said they looked at traffic from 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. and based on that count came up with the peak hour for that study and the peak hours were from 8 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. to 6 p.m.
- Tode Hafen said that she wanted to declare a conflict of interest. Her son is involved with the developer.
- Mayor Rosenberg said that it was so noted but they may call on her to vote. He also declared a conflict of interest because his employer has done work in the past for this property owner. They are not doing work with him on this particular project but they have done work with him in the past. He stated that for the record.
- Patrick Manning, the applicant, said that on the parking, the Planning and Zoning heard this, but the reason that there is a little ambiguity on the parking is because they are basing the numbers on what will likely never happen which is a 100% occupancy and everyone that calls in takes the smallest unit possible. He said they have never seen that happen before. He said they have the ability and the land to add more parking and there would be none on the street. He said their recommendation is to build the first couple of buildings and see how it goes. He said they noted the options going forward and as they have some data to analyze, they may be in a position to either decide that there doesn't need the amount of parking that the ordinance currently calls for or they made additional off street parking or they may eliminate a building. He didn't want to be forced into having additional parking than what he thinks will be needed. Speaking to the location, he said he realizes and very much respects the opposition to the location. He said he does understand. He said their position is that being on the west end of Santa Clara and not close to a high residential zone being on the edge of the BLM and the south side of the river both lends itself well to the resort guest experience and is less impactful than almost anywhere else they could be in Santa Clara. He said that there is not any study he can find based on a high-end hotel's crime rate. He said that looking at their own data at Entrada, they have the Inn and that has been in existence and operating for nearly 14 years with no crime, never a call to the police department. He said that he believes that most feel they will do a good job with the design, the build and the initial operation. He believes that the concern is that down the road it would degrade. He said the key to this being different is that it will be ran by a single hotel operator. It is onsite managed. It won't have the feel of a hotel, it won't have a brand or a flag but it will be operated by a well-known hotel operator. He said that the reason that is important is that you don't have property owners competing with one another to lower the price. The CC&R's and the rental agreements will not allow owners to select their own furniture packages and whether or not they have the right to replacements. He said that they are doing a lot of

construction cost analysis on both the Sycamore's project, the single-family residences, and also for the condo project and they are projecting a sale price per square foot of probably \$100 more per square foot for the condos than the single-family residence so he said we're talking about a very high quality product.

- Herb Basso said that he met with both sides, the developer and their partners and with residents. He said that he saw some really good reasons why this is a good project. He said that he went to the site. He said he has read the facts. He said he doesn't think that this is a good project for this neighborhood. It's a neighborhood that is there and one that is coming. It's agriculture. He said he felt it. He said it doesn't feel good there.

- Mayor Rosenberg reminded the audience after some applause that there is to be no shout outs or applause from the audience and there is no being critical of anyone. He said that is there is, they will empty the room.

- Herb Basso said there is no right or wrong on this. He said maybe this property belongs further up the hill. He said there are a lot of questions they don't have answers to. He thinks this is a great idea for our community but not in this place.

- James L. Spendlove, 3812 Nicholas Drive, said his concerns with the traffic study that was done. He talked about the last page of the traffic study. He said the traffic study that was done was done for the purposes of midrise condominium and townhome community. He said that it sounds like from the developer that this is more akin to a hotel and the rates for a hotel are actually higher than they are for condominiums. There is no public transportation to this project. The IT standards are 52% trips are generated. The in and out depending on the times are 67% in and 33% out so instead of having 68 cars trying to turn left on to Gates Lane there would actually be 109 cars between the hours of 5 p.m. and 6 p.m. Santa Clara Drive, one of the highlights of our town has two lanes with currently no possibility to expand even to a third lane. This would create some significant backup issues especially on busy weekends. For that reason he feels like there are some real concerns with traffic. He said that he has been handed some petitions that have been signed and there are approximately 450 names on it. The position of community, the people that bought there, is a clear anticipation that it would continue to be single-family homes. It's important to look at the standards for review by the land use according to City Council that's at 17.18.090 of the Santa Clara Ordinance. He quoted that ordinance. The developer said that these units may be more per square foot but doesn't say adversely effects the value of property for any use. There are substantial reasons why the property cannot or should not be used as currently zoned. He said Santa Clara has an existing ordinance regard to vacation homes. He said his main concern is the density. He said that if this is approved others might follow suit. He said the bottleneck will be Santa Clara Drive. He said if we continue on this path it will feel like Sunset. He said they are currently planned for single-family development. He thinks there are some significant issues that need to be addressed that haven't been properly addressed. The traffic issue needs to be addressed more than just a report. What would the cost actually be to improve that. He said that at the very least that this shouldn't be approved today and some sort of answer to all these questions and an appropriate level of study and cost study be done.

- Dennis Wright, 1448 North Santa Clara View, said they met with Jack today and admitted that he misled some of the audience. He said he told everybody that Santa Clara is the highest community in Southern Utah in everything, power, water, impact fees. He apologized and said we are right near the top but not the highest community in Southern Utah. He showed a map of the country over across from the bridge. He said the

everything that is private property between the subdivision that's already in there is about 114 acres. He said that high-density property brings more money than single-family. He said that he doesn't know if it can be stopped. He said that's 114 acres that is agricultural. Everybody that's over there, that 114 acres want high density because it makes their property worth more. He told the Council that whatever decisions they make they are looking at another 114 acres of high density the way he sees it. He said Santa Clara is a very different community. It has it's own look. The decision the Council makes about high density will change that look. He loves the cows at Swiss Day and the Christmas lights at Christmas time. He said that cars backed up on that road, there isn't anybody who wants to be where there is a lot of traffic. He talked about an article in the Spectrum on June 2, 2016. He read parts of it. He talked about how the St. George Council voted unanimously to turn back a proposed rental focused development group in a subdivision called the Joshuas. The City of St. George denied all short-term rental units. Or denied that project. He said they had an outside firm do a study. He asked if there had been an outside firm study this.

- Mayor Rosenberg asked if he meant a study of short-term rental impacts. He said no the City hasn't.

- Dennis Wright said that Hurricane put up a couple of units but have had a lot of problems with parking and they stopped that project because emergency vehicles couldn't get in because there was too much parking on the road. He said the ones in Dixie Downs are single family, where the family is going to rent that out. He said what they propose to do is have the HOA which they say will alleviate that problem if the HOA takes it over. The problem is if an HOA takes it over, like Entrada, the HOA will tell you what goes on. Their bylaws override the City inside of their project.

- Matt Ence stated that HOA bylaws don't override city ordinances. They are in addition to so they can be more restrictive. But if the city has a higher restriction, the HOA bylaws aren't going to change that.

- Dennis Wright said that there are a whole lot of kids that cross that street to go to Santa Clara Elementary. The sidewalks have made it safer. This won't create a better environment for those kids.

- Phillip Gubler said that he owns property that is immediately adjacent on the west end of the proposed condos. He said that it's safe to say that he speaks for 99% of the people in the room. He said the attendance at the meeting goes to show how important this is. He said that a traffic study that was done years ago about the traffic coming from Kayenta, Ivins and Gunlock. That's traffic that is not going to have to stop. With the proposed condos, traffic will back up and have to stop. He feels the figures are off as well on the most recent study that was done. He said they are not seeing typical traffic right now because of the construction. He thinks the traffic will be an issue. He said another safety issue is that the City does not have a fire truck that would be able to handle a fire for a condo. They don't have a ladder truck and the City would have to purchase one. He said they are planning on developing their property and have put a lot of money into it already. He said they have been told that to develop their hill they are looking at about 1.2 million dollars to develop that hill. He said they fear that the condos will decrease their property values. He said if that decreases their value it would force them to go more high-density because they wouldn't be able to afford to do anything different. He quoted Section 7.68.30 of the Santa Clara ordinance and that a property needs to have a positive impact on adjacent developments and this will not have a positive impact on their property. He said that they have several people who have reserved lots on his

property tell him that if this goes through, they do not plan on purchasing from their development. He said the property needs to accomplish the objective of the City's General Plan. He said the vision of the plan was not to have condos. He said the citizens would have thought of perhaps a little higher density with smaller building lots with more homes but not condos. He said to think about the consequences that will follow if the Council does allow condos. It's not going to stop there. It will open the door to more high density. He said it doesn't fit in the area. He said he has concerns with the two pools and the lazy river that they are proposing. He said it is right next to their property and there will be a lot of noise. He asked that they leave the community as it is. He said they won't know their neighbors because of short-term rentals. He said that development is coming and change is coming. He said they are concerned with the high-density growth and the condos and the problems that it's going to propose. He said let's keep the zoning as it currently is.

- Jerry Amundsen asked Phillip Gubler how many lots are on his proposed development.

- Phillip Gubler said 25 to 30 lots.

- William Lyzenga, P.O. Box 545 Santa Clara, said his questions are related to natural resources of the area. Is there a proposed DNR or BLM information that is given from the developer to the City? How is this going to affect the wildlife out in this area.

- Mayor Rosenberg said it's not a requirement of the zoning ordinance right now to do that.

- William Lyzenga said that this is a fly zone for the migratory waterfowl that fly through here and they land in his fields all the time and he wondered if this would affect the zoning the way it is.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that he doesn't know if the traffic would have an impact on the waterfowl out there. BLM has a strong resource management plan in place for the property that's just adjacent to this behind. There's 1,500 acres of BLM property within the City that has a resource management plan that the City has been negotiating with the County and the BLM since it came out last summer that voices a lot of impact on those types of things but there's not a requirement on the applicant to address this as part of the zone change.

- William Lyzenga said that he is a little concerned about the pedestrian traffic that will be part of this development. He said there is a small trail that everybody uses to go on top of the hill. He said there is going to be an impact on that.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that if it's the trail he is thinking of, there's two trails on their side plan. He said the trails will be maintained as part of the project.

- William Lyzenga said he is concerned about the wildlife being disturbed as part of this development.

- Larry Ogden, P.O. Box 966, Santa Clara, thanked Jarett Waite to the response of his email and Herb Basso for looking at both sides. He said he did attend the Planning Commission. He said they didn't listen to the residents. He thanked the Council for being more concerned to the voices of the citizens. He said he thinks this will change the historic aspect of downtown Santa Clara. The immediate adjoining property owners have talked and it will impact what they want to do and how they will develop. He said he has spent 30 years representing developers throughout the Country and his experience has always been that these type of projects decrease the property values of adjacent properties and excuse the development opportunities of adjacent properties. He said that once you go in with multi a lot of the other individuals don't want to develop single families around those types of projects. He believes that Ivins has a major development coming, a

medical school. The South Hills is a wonderful area for the professionals, the managers that will be moving in to support those developments. He said that this is not a bad project, it's just the location. As to vacation rentals, currently he represents a lot of ranchers and cowboys. It's not going to be like Entrada and the golf club. A lot of people since the Planning Commission have said that they didn't know about the Chapel Road access and when he listened to all the traffic up and down Santa Clara Boulevard bumping it down a couple of blocks to Chapel Road doesn't make a lot of sense. He said there is too much traffic and exhaust on Santa Clara now. He would suggest reconsidering in the Master Plan that particular aspect. He said any development in the Hills requires additional access. He thinks a lot of things need to be thought through a little more. He hopes that the Council will not pass this rezoning or at least delay it and get more studies.

- Matt Ence talked about the Chapel crossing and the concern about that. He said that's not on the agenda tonight regardless of what the Council does with this particular item. It may not affect the Chapel Street bridge at all. That Chapel Street crossing is still going to have to happen at some point based on the studies we currently have.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that Matt is right and that the City's fire codes requires by the 100th building permit on the south side of the river that at least two accesses are provided and that's primarily for fire and emergency service access. There are over a hundred properties that could submit to the City for building permit application that counts the existing subdivision lots that have been built and haven't pulled their permits yet and that counts the subdivisions that have been approved and are under construction and that counts for the farm properties that have a parcel. Based on that the City Council initiated a plan that when the City reached 25 building permits on that side of the river that they would solicit for design of this structure at Chapel Street. A study was done 10 or more years ago that looked at all the available accesses between Santa Clara Drive and the South Hills. They looked at the Lava Flow Drive area and down in that end of the town, they looked at Old Farm Road, they looked at Chapel, they looked at Gates. There's a planned bridge connection as part of the Western Corridor out near the Rosenbrook Property. There were five potential locations where the bridge could be put. The Gates Lane bridge was chosen and the developer that came in and had the initial zone change elected to build it there and it made sense. The next logical one based on the study was at Chapel Street because of the existing bedrock. It would be easy to found a bridge in the bedrock. That effort is in the City's budget for next year. This will begin the process of getting the right of way acquisition in place and the design done and as building permits are issued throughout the City a portion of those impact fees that are collected for transportation are being designated to that project to be able to construct that second structure that will provide emergency access across the river. That will take us well into the future. This will be a narrow bridge structure.

- June Ogden, P.O. Box 966, thanked Jarett Waite for his reply to her email. She thinks one of the problems was that the residents felt no response from the Planning Commission. She said she appreciates the input tonight from the Council Members. She said she has spoken with several realtors and they have brought up an issue. They propose that single-family rentals sell much better than condo type hotel rentals. She said that people want to invest in those single-family. She said the condos might not sell as well and they could be partially empty. She said that empty buildings do not build a healthy community. She wants to reemphasize what the Spectrum said. She said to the Council to please listen to this community who voted the Council in to represent the

citizens.

- Van Leavitt said that his family and him own property just to the north across to the north of the proposed project. He said that he has been there a lot of years. It's a lot harder now to conduct agricultural business even with additional traffic. He said that even to get into his haystacks it's almost a disaster trying to back in there with the traffic. He suggested that the City might want to put some quarter mile paintings along the road for people racing up and down there on motorcycles and four wheelers. He asked where the water was coming from for the pools and the lazy river. Will it be culinary water, agricultural water. Has that been addressed?

- Mayor Rosenberg said they can ask the applicant if they have irrigations shares they are going to put into that or are they going to plan on using culinary water. He repeated what the applicant in the back said that they do have irrigation shares that they own and control but they would probably use culinary water for those outdoor amenities.

- Van Leavitt said that is the main drainage that goes down to his property. He said they get flooded out as it is and with this additional black top, roof tops, cement, it's going to be increased a lot unless the City requires storm drains.

- Jack Taylor said that at this time the developer would run a 24 inch pipe up all the way to the top and they will run another pipe from their property over to that area. Any water that they produce in their rooftops or their parking lots, they have to maintain that on their development. They can't run that off onto Van Leavitt's property.

- Van Leavitt said the developer talked about crime not being increased. He said he wished the same thing about vandalism. He said he does have vandalism already and that he has lost several spare tires. Maybe it's not crime but it could be vandalism. One of his concerns about the approval of this high density area is if this is approved and they do own additional properties on the north side of the river, which is adjacent to some of his property, then it would be much harder for him to protest high density high rises there. He said he just sees it continuing. He said that he sees the on street parking going across the lane on the north side of the road. He said he has put up signs that say "no parking" but it doesn't do a lot of good. He has no way of enforcing it. He said when he gave the easement to the City for power and utilities there he moved his fences back 15 feet so the City would have accesses to their power boxes. He said he can see that he would have to move his fences 15 feet further to the road all the way across Gates Lane and all the way down to the bridge to protect himself. He said just a week ago he had to wait for people to come back in order to get his gates open and get his swather out. It cost him an extra hour to wait for somebody to move their vehicle. He said that this project is not in keeping with this agricultural area to have high-rise apartment/condos right next to where he is trying to raise a few cows and have agricultural land.

- Dustin Hammer, 4405 W. 1700 N. Santa Clara, said he is a realtor and land developer. He knows the developers. He doesn't like to tell people what to do with their land. That is not why he is at the meeting. He is also a 4th generation Santa Clara native. He talked about the proposed roundabout that takes up part of his land. He said he's not sure they want to sell that. If max density right now is 8 units per acre. He said when he applied for a density increase in Ivins, they laughed at him and told him no. They also said they had a height restriction. He said if the City is going to approve a project that is a multi-family project or high-density project, the developers need to stay within the parameters that are currently zoned. He said that if they do get a zone change they still need to stay within those parameters. He said there is no justification for a density increase on just sheer numbers. As far as a short-term rental exception, we have Paradise Village on the

Heights, which has been an exceptional beyond successful nightly rental project. It's next to a school and ballpark, which doesn't effect quite as much local communities. There are other rental properties in the area that have been in existence since the 80's. Having this project across from downtown Santa Clara, he doesn't believe this is the right zoning or use for that ground. It's not the best fit for the community. He said the bridge proposed on Chapel Street is very well needed. He said he attended countless meetings about the Western Corridor it will affect ground that he owns. He said that if the City is going to put resources into a new bridge it should be one that will last. If the City is going to allow a development there, there is the 20 acres next to it that have been flooded. There are washes that come across the Gubler property to the Leavitt property that continues to get runoff of glass, shot gun shells, debris that come unto our ground. If the developer is going to do this he requests that the City require them to have a large enough bond that it will cover the infrastructure to deal with these kind of issues. He said concerning traffic he feels that there needs to be a turning lane there at that bridge.

- Jack Taylor said they will have a turning lane as the road is done. There will be a turning lane at his property.

- Mayor Rosenberg thanked the audience for following the rules that were set for tonight and for being appreciative of other people's opinions.

- Patrick Manning said that he has been told that the number of prosecutions for people who are violating overnight rental use of homes is in the 1,000's. There is way more inventory coming off the market that has ever been built. Those rentals are going to go somewhere. From an inventory standpoint there is a dramatic reduction coming over the next couple of months.

- Ken Sizemore asked Matt Ence about there being three different issues. One being legislative and two being administrative.

- Matt Ence said that if the issues were being brought separately, he would agree with Ken but where they are being brought together, he thinks the applicant wants them to be heard together he doesn't think it's the same. He said the legislative action is clearly the zone change. The other two actions that they are requesting, they may be administrative but they are dependent upon the legislative action the Council takes. He said that what he recommends to the Council is if they have a concern about taking all three issues together, then take them separately. He said he thinks the Council has the ability to do that by the way they make their motions. The applicants may have their own feelings about how that should be done.

- Ken Sizemore said that he is making the recommendation to the Council that they consider these things separately. He said that he thinks they need to consider the zone change on it's own merits and then deal with density bonuses and conditional uses.

- Herb Basso asked Matt Ence about the conditional use and how binding that is and if there is a term on it.

- Matt Ence said that it is like any other conditional use approval of any zone in the City. When the conditional use is approved, there are certain conditions set and those conditions have to be followed and as long as those conditions are followed the conditional use will continue. On that particular conditional use, it is somewhat unique because the City's ordinance actually lists specific conditions. The Council has some flexibility to talk about other reasonable conditions that are designed to mitigate the potential negative impacts of the conditional use.

- Herb Basso asked if some people can still live there as a primary residence.

- Matt Ence said they could subject to their covenants.

- Jarett Waite said that the feedback that he got from his neighbors is that they all live by Paradise Village and it has been successful and they haven't seen extra traffic or extra crime. He said you do lose a little bit of the neighborhood feel. That may be lost in South Hills. Other feedback he got was that if vacation rentals do happen in the South Hills maybe they need to look more like Paradise Village, like a house. He said he has been pulled aside by people who are opposed to this and he feels strongly that it doesn't quite fit that area.
- Jerry Amundsen said that the traffic has been his issue. He thinks the report concerning the traffic is in line. He said regardless of this development going in there is going to be a lot of traffic because of the homes going in there. He agrees there needs to be turning lanes. He agrees that there have been no problems with Paradise Village. He thinks the higher density with single-family residence on both sides doesn't seem to fit.
- Ken Sizemore asked the Fire Chief to help the Council understand what rolling stock the fire department has to fight a fire in a high-rise building like this.
- Dan Nelson, Fire Chief, said right now they have Engine 32, which is a 15,000 GPM Structure Engine. This building would be sprinkled which is safer than any other house in Santa Clara. It would have features even better than Lava Ridge Intermediate. The insurance would require a ladder truck for 3-story structures. Also to rescue people you would need not only the ladder attached to the vehicle but also the ladders that are stored inside the vehicle. He said that he would feel comfortable having that project, that type of building in the City but the City needs to have plans to upgrade the fleet.
- Ken Sizemore said that he has heard loud and clear from the neighbors around this proposal and from a planning perspective he agrees with the concerns of putting such a high-density intensive development in the middle of two residential subdivisions. He said he thinks the Council has made some decisions in previous meetings to establish a neighborhood feel out in the South Hills. He said this intense density probably isn't appropriate in that kind of a context. That being said, we have heard that the traffic impacts, the safety impacts and so on can be addressed.

Motion to Approve Zone Change from R-1-10/RA - Mixed Lot Size to Planned Development Residential on 9.89 acres and would not include Conditional Use Permit for short-term rental of Sycamore Condos.

Motion by Ken Sizemore, seconded by Jerry Amundsen.

- Mayor Rosenberg asked if under the Planned Development Residential zone if there is flexibility to change the plan after the zone change is granted.
- Matt Ence said that there is some flexibility because in some projects there are changes from when the PD is adopted to when the site is actually subdivided and construction drawings are actually put into place. He said not knowing how significant the redesign would have to be, he said he is not sure if there is enough flexibility to allow the developer to do that under the PD approval. He said the reason for the Mayor's question is because the PD incorporates all the plans that have already been submitted to the City. The PD that the City is being asked to approve includes all that part and parcel if it does get approved. That does potentially present a challenge. If the changes are significant enough the City may be justified in asking for a reapproval in the future and that puts the developer in a tough spot.
- Herb Basso said it sound like the Council has decided to split this motion up. He said that if one of the concerns is density, the density bonus item is question could be

addressed and density controlled tonight by simply denying that. He said that if the Council approves the density bonus the City has less ability to control that density after that point.

- Matt Ence said the challenge with that is based on the ordinance that allows the density bonus it also is dependent upon the factors: the design of the building, the elevation and so on. He not sure the Council can take just the density bonus questions without also addressing the larger PD.

- Bob Nicholson said that the application requirements for a planned development residential zone and it includes a site plan and typical elevation drawings and he quoted, "If approved the rezoning becomes effective and the project plan becomes the official plan of the district.". He said that he doesn't think you can approve a plan but say it's not this. He said you have to have a plan concurrent with that PD application. You don't want to separate those. That wouldn't meet the City's ordinance. You don't want to have a PDR zone without a site plan associated with it.

- Herb Basso asked if that means the three parts of the motion can't be separated.

- Bob Nicholson said the Council can take the three different issues: a zone change, short-term rental, and the density bonus but just the rezoning to a PDR requires a site plan and building elevations.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that the Council can approve the motion as is but what it would end up doing is they would have to eliminate buildings to drop it down to the 8 units per acre. That way the floor plans and the elevation and the site plan are all still valid. The plans the Council approves become part of the zone. That's the project that will be built.

- Matt Ence said that he's not sure the developer would be able to go forward with the approval given tonight and not have to bring a new plan for a new PD approval.

- Kyle Hafen said that in each building the lock-out units are six so there are 32 additional units that they are looking for the increase bonus density that technically can be alleviated and everything stays the same. Instead of having a lock-out it just becomes a three bedroom.

- Mayor Rosenberg asked what the density would drop to.

- Kyle Hafen said it would drop to 80 units on 9 acres.

- Mayor Rosenberg said it would be 70 units and it would be on 9.89 acres.

- Kyle Hafen said it would be 8.72 they would be too low.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that would be one way the developer could do it is to eliminate the lock-outs which would also reduce the number of required parking stalls.

- Jarett Waite said that part of the argument was that it was PD so it should be back to that and he said that he has spoken to citizens who said that they didn't want PD in the first place and it went through despite opposition so he doesn't know if that argument really stands. He said that changing just the zoning doesn't make sense to him.

- Matt Ence said he would ask Ken Sizemore to clarify on the vacation rental portion of the motion because he's not sure when Ken made the motion if he specific as to the rental portion.

- Ken Sizemore said that his statement was that it would not include a conditional use approval for short-term rentals.

Voting Aye: Jerry Amundsen and Ken Sizemore.

Abstained: Tode Hafen.

- Tode Hafen said that if she voted it would be detrimental down the road. She said that

she feels the City needs to do a better job informing the public. She said this is a paradigm shift to a certain extent in Santa Clara. She thinks it's time to have an open house, maybe some more input on what people really want. You say no to this but what does that mean you do want? It hasn't be addressed so much but one of the big themes in this is the increase recreation use in that area. The rate they've closed the South Hills entrance from Green Valley that impacts. Some of the use and traffic that we're talking about is going to be there anyway. Who would have known years ago that mountain biking would be so popular. We already are talking about all kinds of use out there. We've talked about putting in another park that will increase traffic. She said that she thinks we need to take a look at this. One side of this is if these units are in, you are going to have your people staying there and that will keep them from coming from coming back and forth. Can we shut off the use of that? Are we to the point where we want to take another look at Santa Clara and make it a restricted community? All we want are single-family residences. We get pressure all the time for more affordable housing. She said she would appreciate and does appreciate input that comes in from residents. She would be open to things but it needs to be based on the truth and that's what is difficult, when people sign petitions and this type of thing when it states something's that are not actually part of the big picture. We are faced with difference. Santa Clara is becoming very awake. The tourism that comes into the St. George area is leaking over here. We may not be able to change that. It's coming so how do we handle it? How can we tell people they can't develop? She said she is honestly confused about which direction Santa Clara wants to go because what the Council primarily hears is "no we don't want that" but she has a hard time hearing "but this does look good". She feels like because of her relationship to the developer and there is such an adamant feeling, if she votes "yes" that would come back in a landslide. She said she thinks people need to know what is capable of developing.

- Herb Basso told Tode Hafen that if she voted yes we know the direction this is going to go and there are two more portions of this motion. If she votes no it would kill it or it would be like tabling it and there is time to get more information and have the developers work with the community and see if we can't come back with something different.

- Matt Ence said that since there has been so much discussion that the vote needs to be reviewed so far. Let's have Councilwoman Hafen vote and if there are different motions they can be considered as well.

- Mayor Rosenberg stated that his count is that there are two in favor and two opposed. He stated that the motion doesn't grant everything that has been requested from the applicant. There are still two critical elements that would be pending. He asked Tode Hafen if she is willing to vote and if she says no that is okay.

- Tode Hafen said she has to say no for a number of reasons but she said she is serious about now is the time in Santa Clara's history that we really need to revisit these growth issues. She said that everyone on the Council has the very best interest for Santa Clara at heart and are trying to make the right decisions. She said that she abstains from voting. She asked the public to be open-minded and positive and issue some positive ideas.

- Mayor Rosenberg said that when the developer first met with him about this project it took him back a little bit. He said that this wasn't something he had ever foreseen in the valley. The project itself took him back primarily due to the size of the buildings, the fact that there was adjacent farms and adjacent single-family residential properties surrounding it, and it was highly visible from Santa Clara Drive. He says he is going to go with his initial reaction. The developer has done a good job of designing this project

and he said before he votes he would like to encourage him. He has additional property farther from the valley, deeper into the hills, maybe that would be a better location for this development. A little more separation from the existing farms and the existing neighborhoods that are there that maybe this project could work. He thinks that the intent that the Council and the Planning Commission had when the General Plan was adopted. Those areas of medium density that were identified on that General Plan was we knew we were going to have to reserve a significant amount of open space in the South Hills areas due to the problematic soils, due to the BLM not wanting to release anything that had sensitive species on it. Now the BLM is telling that we may not see any development. The Resource Management Plan said no development in the South Hills property. When Council annexed it the goal was to provide a place for the City to continue to grow because we are landlocked on the east, the south and the north. What we have is what we have. There is impact on a community when growth stops. He said that he would hope that on some of the fringe work we can consider this type of development at some point in the future but he feels that to protect the character and the integrity of the community that this is to close to the valley. He said he will vote no.

**Voting Nay: Herb Basso, Jarett Waite and Mayor Rosenberg.
Motion Denied.**

- Matt Ence said because of the result of this motion, that makes the other issues moot.
- Mayor Rosenberg said that the zone change has been denied by a vote of 3 to 2 and he encouraged the developer to consider that project on another property farther away from the farms and some of this. This has been a good exercise for the community and he said he hopes the residents would learn something from this process as well. He said the Council reads every email they are sent. He thanked the audience and the applicants and he said he looks forward to seeing more from the applicants in the future.

2. Request to Amend the Final Plat for Paradise Village, Phase 2. Presented by Bob Nicholson, City Planner.

- Mayor Rosenberg stated that his firm did this subdivision so he has a conflict on this one.
- Bob Nicholson said they are going back to their original plan. The purpose of this plat amendment is to change unit 51 to a triplex as was originally planned and make unit 59 a 4-plex also as originally planned. That was part of their original preliminary plat approval. The Planning Commission recommended approval. The developer still owns all of the units therefore we don't have to go through a public hearing.
- Jarett Waite asked if unit 59 would change to a 4-plex and if it's dimensions would change.
- Bob Nicholson said yes 59 would change to a 4-plex. 59 has become the 4-plex.

Motion to Approve the Request to Amend the Final Plat for Paradise Village, Phase 2.

Motion by Jarett Waite, seconded by Herb Basso.

Voting Aye: Jarett Waite, Jerry Amundsen, Tode Hafen, Ken Sizemore and Herb Basso.

Voting Nay: None

Motion Carried.

5. Reports:

A. Mayor / Council Reports

Jerry Amundsen:

- Flood Control Authority was cancelled this month.

Tode Hafen:

- Heritage Commission is working on the architectural guidelines. They are about there. It should go to Planning Commission soon.
- Bob Nicholson said they have talked about having a property owner meeting with the Heritage Commission. It's in draft form and can be emailed out to all the Councilmen. Dick has been a tremendous help. There's a lot of detail and information on it.

Jarett Waite:

- The Mosquito Abatement Meeting report is the district was highlighted in a news story recently about the kind of trap they use. It is innovative, effective and saves money. Other entities have contacted them to look at their design. All the crews are out spraying. The director would like to come and speak to the Council and give a report on the state of the District and Zika.
- Ed Dickie said he can schedule for June 22 if the Council wants.

Herb Basso:

- Working on a mission statement and objectives.

Ken Sizemore:

- Was unable to attend JPAC meeting.
- The Vet Memorial Committee met last night. Rick's crew has been able to get some information about the site at the cemetery. Last night they were able to refining the site plan and getting things identified on the site. In the next month there should be a rendering that can be used for fundraising and moving forward.
- Charlie spent 12 hours putting flags on every veteran's grave in the cemetery this past Memorial Day and he doesn't get any recognition for his effort.
- Mayor Rosenberg said they have recognized him a couple of times for the work that he has done but maybe there needs to be some help given him in doing that project. Maybe some Scouts. We can go to the district and put some pressure. It would be a great service project for all the Troops in the City. He said he can put something in the Mayor's article recognizing him there. He said let's get him some help from now on.
- Jerry Amundsen said on the last Thursday of the month there is an LDS BSA is having a coordination meeting where both Stakes and the district are present. So if the seed is planted they can discuss it at that meeting.

Mayor Rosenberg:

- Has a key to the City. He had Ed get 10 keys. This is for a special award presentation type of deal. Get with him if there is someone who is deserving of this type of award.

The first key will go to Britton Shipp and the second one will probably go to Joe Emphy the missionary that was hurt in the bombing in Belgium.

- Ed Dickie asked the Mayor if he wants to get this on the agenda coming up to present the keys to the City or does the Mayor want to just go visit them.

- Mayor Rosenberg said he just wants to take them to them and he invited the Council to come and said he would take pictures. But he said Britton can come to Council and he will leave that up to him.

- Mayor's Association didn't meet and neither did the Flood Control Authority.

6. Executive Session: None.

7. Approval of Claims and Minutes:

- May 11, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes

- Claims through June 8, 2016

- Ken Sizemore said there needs to be two spelling corrections in the minutes: (two names).

Motion to Approve the Regular City Council Meeting Minutes from May 11, 2016 with the correction of the spelling of the two names and claims through June 8, 2016.

Motion by Ken Sizemore, seconded by Herb Basso.

Voting Aye: Herb Basso, Ken Sizemore, Jerry Amundsen, Jarett Waite and Tode Hafen.

Voting nay: None

Motion Carried.

8. Calendar of Events

- June 19, 2016 Father's Day

- June 22, 2016 City Council Meeting

- July 6, 2016 City Council Work Meeting

9. Adjournment:

Motion to adjourn by Jarett Waite.

Seconded by Herb Basso with all members present voting aye.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Chris Shelley – City Recorder

Date Approved: _____