

**SANTA CLARA CITY COUNCIL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2020
MINUTES**

THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH, met for a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, December 9, 2020 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. **The Meeting will be available to view live on the YouTube link:** <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCxLBLm30-XLqM1AEmhpcMA>. Council Chambers will be available to residents, but we will have limited availability and follow Covid- 19 guidelines.

Present: Mayor Rick Rosenberg
Council Members: Jarett Waite, Ben Shakespeare, Wendell Gubler, Leina Mathis and Denny Drake
City Manager: Brock Jacobsen
City Recorder: Chris Shelley

Others Present: Jack Taylor, Public Works Director; Brad Hayes, Parks & Trails Director; Randy Hancey, Fire Chief; Matt Ence, City Attorney; Debbie Bannon, Staff; Kristelle Hill, Staff; Steve Palmer, HintonBurdick; Paul Bussee; Megan Webber

1. **Call to Order:** Mayor Rosenberg called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. He welcomed everyone in attendance and introduced the Council members.

2. **Opening Ceremony:**

- Pledge of Allegiance: Denny Drake
- Opening Comments: Denny Drake

3. **Communications and Appearances: None.**

4. **Conflicts and Disclosures:**

- Leina Mathis said she doesn't think it is a conflict of interest but for item C5, the discussion on refunding the 2019 CIB bond for Chapel Street Bridge the bond is with Zion Bank and Zion bank is her employer.

5. **Working Agenda:**

A. Public Hearing(s): 5:00 p.m.

1. Public Hearing to receive Public Input on a Lot Line Abandonment to merge lots 6 & 7 located at 2108 & 2112 Blair Circle in the Heights West, Plat A Subdivision and to

vacate the public utility easement which runs along the present boundary of both lots. Presented by Bob Nicholson, City Planner.

- Brock Jacobsen, City Manager, read the Staff report from the Building Department concerning this item: “The applicant owns two adjoining lots in the Heights West subdivision, and seeks to merge the two lots into one lot, and vacate the public utility easement along the boundary of lots 6 & 7. The resulting combined lot will be approximately 24,000 sq. ft in area. State law (UCA 10-9a-608 (2) allows the Planning Commission to approve such request at a public meeting (without a public hearing) where the applicant owns both lots and seeks to join the two contiguous lots into one lot. The PC approved the lot merger on Nov. 12, 2020, but the easement vacation is a City Council matter.” He said the applicants came to TRC and discussed combining these two lots. He said the concern then was vacating the utility easement. That was the only concern from Staff.

- Mayor Rosenberg said it would be the easement between the two lots. It runs down the lot line. The lot line would go away, and that easement needs to be abandoned. He asked if the applicant wanted to address the Council.

- Paul Bussee, applicant, said he and his wife bought the two lots and they would like to build one home in the middle of the two lots with room on each side for fruit trees and a garden and have room for their motorhome. He said their request is to remove that boundary between the two lots so they can build on the middle and make better use of the property. He said he assumes that leaves utility easements on either or both sides and they don't have an issue with that.

- Wendell Gubler asked how the neighbors feel about this.

- Mayor Rosenberg said it looks like they have all signed a petition.

- Leina Mathis said there is actually one neighbor opposed to it and another one that didn't sign.

- Paul Bussee said that two of the homes that they tried to contact the people, one house is empty and he believes it is on the market and he said they were told that the other house that the owners live elsewhere in the State and they don't know where but other neighbors told them that they are rarely home. He said they tried for 8 or 10 days to reach them. He stated that one neighbor lady objected and wouldn't sign the petition. He said her reasoning was that it would block the views that she had out her backyard. He said there really isn't much view there. He said that if they built a home on either of the two lots it would still block the view.

5:10 p.m. Public Hearing Opened.

- Brock Jacobsen said there is one public comment that has been submitted online prior to the meeting tonight. The comment is from Sabrina Winkler, 3633 Mitchell Drive. He then read her comment: “I live directly adjacent to this proposed development. I have a wonderful view of the Santa Clara Reserve hills and do not want that obstructed by a monstrous home. When this couple who bought the property came to my door and told me their plans, on conjoining the two properties to make a large single family residence, I expressed my concern over damage to my property as I have an in ground pool located very close to the bordering fence. I also expressed my concern that my view of the hills will be cut off due to the location of their proposed building plans I bought my property based on the fact that no one was going to be building on the two lots and my views

would never be restricted. This couple went around to our neighbors trying to get signatures from us. I DID NOT SIGN and told them I wouldn't sign their petition based on my reasons above. They told me they were building no matter what I said and with that the conversation was finished. They then went to my immediate right neighbor to acquire a signature from them, but they are renters and cannot have anything to say in the matter. I am deeply concerned for the integrity and destruction of my views of the hills and would like this to be addressed.”

5:12 p.m. Public Hearing Closed.

C. General Business:

1. Consider a request for a lot merger to combine lots 6 & 7 into one lot and vacate the public utility easement located at 2108 & 2112 Blair Circle in the Heights West, Plat A Subdivision. Paul & Susan Bussee, Applicants, and approve Ordinance 2020-17. Presented by Bob Nicholson, City Planner/Corey Bundy, Building & Zoning Official.

- Brock Jacobsen said that the Staff recommended approval for this item. He said this went to Planning Commission on November 12. The Planning Commission approved the lot merger, but the easement vacation is a City Council matter.

- Leina Mathis said she doesn't have any problems with it, but she has a question. She said that in the petition to abandon the lot line and easement it states that all adjoining property owners by their execution of the position consents to this petition. In this case because it is an adjoining lot it is not required by statute that everyone concurs with it. Is that something we should look to change in our petition?

- Matt Ence, City Attorney, said it would probably be more correct to change that wording a little bit. He said he is not that concerned about it because if they haven't signed to consent then they haven't consented.

- Mayor Rosenberg asked Jack Taylor, Public Works Director, if there are any plans to utilize that easement that we are abandoning in the center of the property.

- Jack Taylor said no.

- Denny Drake said the adjacent property owner is concerned because they thought there would be no homes built on those lots. He said to him the concern isn't a valid point according to what she states.

Motion to Approve a lot merger to combine lots 6 & 7 into one lot and vacate the public utility easement located at 2108 & 2112 Blair Circle in the Heights West, Plat A Subdivision. Paul & Susan Bussee, Applicants, and approve Ordinance 2020-17.

Motion by Denny Drake, seconded by Wendell Gubler.

Voting Aye: Leina Mathis, Jarett Waite, Denny Drake, Wendell Gubler and Ben Shakespeare.

Voting Nay: None.

Motion Carried.

B. Consent Agenda:

1. Approval of Claims and Minutes:

- Nov. 18, 2020 Special City Council Meeting Minutes

- Dec. 2, 2020 City Council Work Meeting Minutes
- Claims through Dec. 9, 2020

2. Calendar of Events

- Dec. 16, 2020 City Council Special Meeting
- Dec. 24 & 25, 2020 City Offices Closed
- Jan. 1, 2021 City Offices Closed
- Jan. 6, 2021 City Council Work Meeting
- Jan. 13, 2021 Regular City Council Meeting
- Jan. 27, 2021 Regular City Council Meeting

3. Consider approval of Ordinance 2020-18, an Ordinance establishing rules and regulations pertaining to the collection and disposal of residential solid waste produced or generated within the boundaries of Santa Clara City. Presented by Matt Ence, City Attorney.

- Matt Ence said the City has entered an updated agreement with the Washington County Solid Waste District. The City has had this relationship with WCSWD for a while. Part of the updated agreement requires us to update our ordinance to reflect the updated rates that have been agreed to for trash pick-up and recycling pick up. This is the primary purpose of this ordinance that is proposed. He said that looking at our existing ordinances he was reminded that in our ordinances that currently exist there are two separate chapters. One chapter for regular trash pick-up and one that we added later when we started doing recycling services which are almost identical with a couple of exceptions. He said we have to update our ordinance anyway to reflect this new contract, so he is suggesting combining these two chapters into a single chapter and have the same chapter address both the regular trash pick-up and the recycling pick up. That is what is done here and is being proposed to the City Council for approval. There is actually very little change from our existing ordinance other than those updated rates and he said they included some clarifications and language on those who opted out of the recycling service. He said it makes sure it is clear that if someone opts out of the recycling service at one location in the City and then they happen to move to another home within the City they could still continue that opt out and that won't terminate their election not to participate. Most of the rest of this is what is already existing in the prior ordinances with the exception that now instead of two chapters there is a single chapter.

- Jarett Waite asked where the Feb. 1, 2020 comes from. What is that based off of?

- Brock Jacobsen said the opt out period ended Nov. 30, 2020 so he believes the new recycling period starts Feb. 1, 2021.

- Matt Ence said he just used the date from the contract. He said he can revise that date back. He said if Council wants to pass the ordinance to include that change in the motion and that shouldn't be a problem.

4. Set a Public Hearing for Hydrant Meters rental fee charge for Jan. 13, 2021 at 5:00 p.m.

5. Set a Public Hearing for Low Impact Development (LID) for Jan. 13, 2021 at 5:05 p.m.

Motion to Approve the Consent Agenda as presented except on Item 3 “approval of Ordinance 2020-18” that the date be revised on that ordinance from Feb. 1, 2021 to the actual date of Nov. 30,

2020.

Motion by Jarett Waite, seconded by Ben Shakespeare.

Voting Aye: Leina Mathis, Jarett Waite, Denny Drake, Wendell Gubler and Ben Shakespeare.

Voting Nay: None.

Motion Carried.

C. General Business:

2. Audit Presentation. Presented by Steve Palmer, HintonBurdick.

- Steve Palmer, a partner with HintonBurdick, said they recently completed the Fiscal Year 2020 Audit for the City. He said the City passed the audit. They issued an unmodified opinion. That means it is a clean opinion and in their opinion after going over the finances of the City they are able to give their opinion that the City's financial statements are materially correct. They accurately reflect the City's financial position and the result of operations for the year ending June 30, 2020. He said they expressed this in the independent auditor's report. They are also required to issue a report on compliance and on internal control over financial reporting. He said they noted a couple of things there. They noted some adjustments that need to be made to bring the City's records in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. Because of that they have to issue that finding. He said it is a very common finding among cities. The second one was related to capital assets. They did identify a few capital assets that needed to be added as the City's listing of capital assets. He said the last report they issue is a report on State compliance. The State requires them to go through and do a check on the City's compliance with various laws and ordinances. He said they issued and unmodified or clean opinion there. There was one minor issue in that the General Fund's unappropriated fund balance is a little bit too high. It is supposed to be limited to 25% of revenue and it was a little bit over that, so they had to make note of that. He said he wanted the Council to take a look at the City's finances and how things ended up for FY 2020. He stated that at the end of the year the City's net position (equity) was \$38,172,104. If you were to take the assets of the City and subtract the liabilities that amount is the residual amount. Over time, increases and decreases in net position are an indicator whether the financial health of the City is improving or deteriorating. For FY20 that number of that net position increased by \$2,646,687. About \$1.5 million came from governmental activities, that would be the General Fund, the Special Revenue Funds, Capital Projects Funds and \$1.1 million came from the business type activities such as the utilities. He said the General Fund reported expenditures in excess of revenues of about \$1 million. The fund had budgeted for expenditures to be in excess of revenues at \$2.6 million so that is a positive variance. He said expenditures were higher than revenue because this was planned. At the end of FY19 the City issued a bond for about \$2.1 million for the Chapel Street Bridge. Those monies came in at the end of FY19, so they were included in revenues, but they were expended in FY20. That is why expenditures were higher than revenue. At the end of the current FY there is almost \$2 million of unassigned fund balances in the General Fund. He said they are seeing positive trends over the past 5 years. Assets and equity spiked in 2019 and that is directly related to those bond proceeds just discussed. He said the for the cash trend in the General Fund it has a strong cash position. He said the for the Water Fund the trend for operating revenue and expenditures the revenues have been very stable and increasing slightly each

year and expenditures for the most part have been very stable as well. There is a little bit of a spike in 2018 but overall has been very stable. He said there have been steady increases in the cash trend for the Water Fund. There is a large amount of cash in the Water Fund that is restricted for various uses. Those monies have to be spent in accordance with those restrictions. He talked about the Sewer Fund. The increase in revenues in 2020 mainly resulted from about \$120,000 that was received from developers. The operating expenses have increased slightly over time but overall, the trend is as you would expect. He stated that there is not much restricted cash in the Sewer Fund. Most of it is unrestricted. He stated that in the Electric Fund the operating revenues went down a little bit mainly because impact fees decreased a little bit and in 2019 the City received a pretty significant amount of money from developers to install infrastructure for them. The revenue and the expenses went up proportionately. The cash trend for the Electric Fund has been very stable. He said that in the Storm Water Fund in 2019 there was a significant amount of money that came in from FEMA for the landslide issues so that spiked there. It returned to more normal levels in 2020. The cash trend to the Storm Water Fund is very stable. He said that for the City overall things are looking very well. He expressed his thanks to Brock Jacobsen and Debbie Bannon. They bore the brunt of the audit. He thanked everyone in the office that assisted with the audit.

- Denny Drake asked if there were any concerns to the accounting principles that are not being adhered to.

- Steve Palmer said it is not that they are not being adhered to, it is just that it is really hard to get everything right all of the time. He explained that as with the capital asset additions they went through and conducted a search to make sure that all the capital asset acquisitions are included in the listing and there were a couple that weren't and that needed to be added. He said a lot of journal entries are kind of complex and not routine day-to-day stuff and it is really easy to miss some of those. It is hard to stay on top of every little thing, so they quite often find things that need to be adjusted to be in accordance with those rules that the Governmental Accounting Standards has set. It is not that anything inappropriate is happening.

3. Consider approval of the 2021 Yearly Meeting Schedule. Presented by Chris Shelley, City Recorder.

- Chris Shelley, City Recorder, showed the Council the yearly schedule that according to State Code needs to be posted. She talked to all the different commissions and there were no changes. The meetings stay the same for Council's regular meetings, Work Meetings, Planning & Zoning Commission Meetings, Heritage Commission and Economic Development. All the dates are still the same. Staff is asking for approval so this can be sent off. It has to be posted by January 1 with the Spectrum and on the Public Notice website.

Motion to Approve the 2021 Yearly Meeting Schedule.

Motion by Ben Shakespeare, seconded by Leina Mathis.

Voting Aye: Denny Drake, Jarett Waite, Ben Shakespeare, Wendell Gubler and Leina Mathis.

Voting Nay: None.

Motion Carried.

4. Budget amendment discussion. Presented by Brock Jacobsen, City Manager.

- Brock Jacobsen said that when the budget came for this fiscal year, we started budgeting and COVID hit and through that budget process we pulled the majority of extra items out of the budget. Anything that wasn't normal operating expenses, projects, equipment purchases, increases for Staff all were pulled out. He said that this would be discussed after the first and second quarter depending on how revenues were. Based on where things have come in at it has come back to Council to discuss some items that Staff would like to put back into the budget. He said that one of the items he would like Council to look at is wage increases to Staff. The total increases to Staff would be \$153,000 with \$111,000 going to the General Fund and \$42,000 going to the Enterprise Funds. He said that we would also look at additions to some equipment and some projects, which would be \$98,000 in the General Fund, which includes the bare necessities that need to be done to the Rachel Drive Fire Station, and also some impact fee projects. The equipment would include for the Parks Department a walker mower to replace the current one and a walker mower to replace the grasshopper and we would like to do the seal coat at Gubler Park and purchase an attachment to one of our current machines that is a sports field resurfacers. That would be around \$70,000 for the Parks Department for those projects and equipment. The fire department would like to purchase a new dryer, a gear, and a washer, which would be more commercial grade. We also need to fix the driveway approaches at Rachel Drive going into the bays and going into the parking lot. There is an issue with the larger apparatuses hitting as they go out. We would also like to install swamp coolers. These items total just over \$26,000. He said also at the Rachel Drive Station, these would be impact fee eligible, doing the bare necessities of remodel work to put in living quarters there and also painting and putting in some carpet. This would be just over \$70,000. These are the things in the General Fund that we would like to bring back to Council for approval. He said that in the Enterprise Funds we need to purchase a new street sweeper. This would be done on a lease. This would be split between the Enterprise Fund and the General Fund and is paid 50% from the Storm Water Fund and 50% from the Street Department. He said that the Power Department would like to purchase a new bucket truck and a dump truck. The dump truck would be a used one. There are some safety concerns with the old dump truck. He said this is just for discussion tonight. This will be brought back to Council another time if things are okay to amend the budget.

- Jack Taylor said the dump truck would not be under the Power Fund. That needs to be moved to Streets.

- Mayor Rosenberg asked if all these items were on the list when we talked about the budget last year before we decided to pull it back.

- Brock Jacobsen said that no not all of them were on the list. Some of them came on at the first part of the year. He said they didn't go back through that list but just decided what we need right now.

- Jack Taylor said the street sweeper wasn't on the list last year.

- Mayor Rosenberg asked if it is replacing the existing street sweeper or supplementing it.

- Jack Taylor said that if the old one is traded in then we will probably get \$15,000 so he would prefer to keep it and use it as a secondary that way we will have two. The old one breaks down a lot.

- Ben Shakespeare asked if the one that is going to be purchased would be a brand-new machine.

- Jack Taylor said it would be a new machine. It would be a leased purchase.

- Ben Shakespeare said if the old one is that bad why not take the money, we could get by trading it in.
- Jack Taylor said we can do that or try to sell it ourselves and see if we can get more money than what the company would offer to take it in trade. It would be nice to have a backup so if one does break down, we have one so that the crews can still go out and clean the streets. It is paid for. When they do break down a lot of times, we have to order parts from back East and so we could be two or three weeks before we can go back to street sweeping.
- Mayor Rosenberg asked about the revenues. Do we have the revenues coming in to pay for these?
- Brock Jacobsen said the revenues have been consistently increasing so we feel good about moving forward with these.
- Ben Shakespeare asked if there is a record of what was proposed in the budget and what was pulled out and what is being put back in. He would like to see that.
- Brock Jacobsen said he can get that for Council.
- Denny Drake said included in this is the money we have in excess.
- Brock Jacobsen said yes. He said the one of the things he talked with Steve Palmer about is creating a Capital Project Fund in the General Fund that we can transfer money into that. This is an item that will be brought back at a future time to create that fund. We are using some of those excess funds along with revenue. It has exceeded expectation this year. He said we feel comfortable coming back and having this discussion.
- Mayor Rosenberg said that Brock will put these numbers together and we'll see this probably in January.
- Brock Jacobsen said we will come back in January with more details and then we will amend that budget and have to come back for a public hearing to do that. He just wanted to make sure we were okay moving that direction.

5. Discussion on refunding the 2019 CIB Bond for Chapel Street Bridge. Presented by Brock Jacobsen, City Manager.

- Brock Jacobsen said he got a call yesterday from Mark Anderson with Zion Bank and he had sent information about the Chapel Street Bridge bond and refunding through JP Morgan Chase who actually holds our MBA bond and we got a great rate with them and Mark Anderson said he thinks this can happen. When he called yesterday, he said that Chase is being selective with who they are doing it with. He said they are not interested in doing it. We could possibly try to see if we could get a better rate elsewhere or directly through Zion Bank.

6. Reports:

A. Mayor / Council Reports

Ben Shakespeare:

- Nothing to report.

Leina Mathis:

- She has an appointment with Lowry Snow next week to talk to him about the EMS contracts and what we are doing with EMS outside of Santa Clara boundaries.

- Mayor Rosenberg asked if there has been any discussion about this with the County Commission. Are they going to be involved with that? They collect the tax money for it. We may not get money from this every year, but we may get money to purchase new apparatuses or something else when it is needed from the County since we provide service out in the County.
- Fire Chief Hancey said their thought is maybe getting some type of yearly allowance or reimbursement back from the County for our service out to these unincorporated areas that EMS transports from.
- Denny Drake said we should visit with the County Commissioners to discuss this.
- Mayor Rosenberg said this effort needs to be coordinated if we are going to go to the Legislature. Let's make sure that the County Commission is aware of what we are doing especially if we are going to ask them for money. He asked Leina and Denny to coordinate that effort. He said that Chief Hancey is available to assist. He asked Chief Hancey about the study that a woman was doing for the County.
- Chief Hancey said he talked to her a couple of times.
- Mayor Rosenberg said the County is doing some sort of financial analysis as far as combining the fire district north of the City.

Jarett Waite:

- He complimented the Staff on the Christmas lunch.
- He has a Mosquito Abatement Meeting tomorrow.
- He said the committee has met several times concerning distributing the small business grants from the CARES Act and they were able to approve one more business this last Tuesday. They are waiting on documentation from two more businesses. They have given out almost \$100,000 to small businesses here in Santa Clara. The Chamber of Commerce was able to send out \$20,000 in loans to businesses in Santa Clara.

Denny Drake:

- He thanked the Staff and the volunteers who decorated Santa Clara Drive. It is very attractive.

Wendell Gubler:

- He thanked the Staff as well. We have had a really good year with the Staff and with the City and with COVID going on and with Parks and Recreation keeping things going Staff has done a wonderful job. All of the Staff has including the Fire, Power, Water, etc.
- He said the Washington County Solid Waste District has a meeting next Monday.

Mayor Rosenberg:

- The Mayor's Association meets every Tuesday on a Zoom call and the Health Department and the Hospital as well as the School District and the University participates in these calls. We have been getting weekly updates on the number of cases of COVID. Dr. Ferguson from the hospital typically gives the hospital report. He was in a state of distress this last Tuesday. The number of deaths that they had at the hospital on Monday and the intubations that they did were high. They have 43 COVID cases in their ICU. Their ICU is only equipped with 32 beds, so they have expanded a second ICU. The deaths Monday were the busiest so far at the hospital. Staff is working 7 days a week and there is no anticipated time off coming in the immediate future. They need support and they still feel like family gatherings are causing the most dramatic problems and the

increased number of cases. The vaccines are supposed to ship on December 14. They are coming to Dixie Regional Medical Center to be distributed amongst the health care professionals. The first responder vaccines will be here mid-February. They have accelerated teachers so some of that first wave as well. They anticipate it being available to the general public before July of next year. The cases in the School District are staying low. There are 63 cases of students out of 35,000, which is a pretty low percentage. There are 45 students at the university. He said a lot of the college students aren't getting tested. They will test the students when they start coming back after Christmas break. Tourism is still strong. There have been 5,500 visitors a day to Zion National Park and this is their slow season.

- He said the updated interlocal agreement for the desert tortoise is anticipating their take permit decision will be issued mid-January. This is a 25-year renewal of the agreement that was passed 25 plus years ago on the desert tortoise's established reserve and allowed development to continue on private property in the County. That take permit allows that to happen. They just have to do clearances on all properties, but they will be done through the HCP Staff so there will be some changes. It does propose some fee decreases. It eliminated the \$250 per acre that is collected at platting. They are going to look at the percentage of the assess value that they do at building permit. That agreement will come back in January. He forwarded it to Brock and Matt for review and it will come to Council sometime in January. They would like to get that signed by the City prior to the decision document being issued.

- "What's Up Down South" Economic Summit is scheduled for January 14. Council will be getting some information about this. It is going to be a big virtual event. They have some presentation from the City. Kristelle sent them some video. He asked Kristelle to forward the video from the Staff Christmas party to them. There were some good overhead shots of the commercial area in that video. There will be a short presentation at this Summit that will spotlight Santa Clara.

- The Chamber wants to do a State of the City presentation on February 17. He said the Chamber will send out more information on that.

- Mayor Rosenberg said he will be out of town next week for the City Council Meeting. He asked Jarett to be the Mayor Pro Tem.

- Brock Jacobsen said that we have the option on the Electric Bonds to refund them. Mark Anderson gave us two options. We can go to a 5-year amortization on those two bonds or an 8 ½ year. The 8 ½ year rate would cause our payment to come down a little bit but on the 5 year our payment would go up about \$60,000 annually but it would bring the one that still has about 9 years to pay off down to 5. We would be dealing with Zion Bank so we would have to modify our agreement with them to allow them to do this direct purchase through them.

- Mayor Rosenberg said to bring this up when the discussion happens for the amended budget.

- Brock Jacobsen said he also discussed with Mark Anderson about the new money for the new generator. He sent a quick analysis that estimates that if we refunded new money the cost of interest for those six months that we would be holding before we would pay would be about \$6,600 in interest for that time period. If we did it in two bonds the cost of issuance for the two bonds are going to way outweigh the cost of refunding and putting the new money in at the same time. The cost of issuance is going to be at least \$30,000 to \$40,000.

- Leina Mathis said it costs us less to do the refunding and roll the generator in to the existing amount and keep the uniform payment.
- Brock Jacobsen said he will bring it back to Council for discussion, but we can get it started or bring it back for actual full approval.
- Ben Shakespeare said he would like to have an overall look at all of it. With rates where they are and the fund balance where it is at and the things that are coming in it might be an opportunity. It would be nice to have an overview of what we can pay off and what we can set aside and what do we anticipate coming up and try to consolidate some things and shorten up some things and get a better rate and close things out sooner.

- Jack Taylor said they have ordered Christmas lights to go up the rest of the way up the hill. They should come by Monday and he hopes to have them installed on Monday afternoon.

7. **Executive Session:** None.

8. **Adjournment:**

Motion to adjourn by Denny Drake.

Seconded by Wendell Gubler with all members present voting aye.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

Chris Shelley – City Recorder

Date Approved: _____