

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on January 12, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., held virtually via Zoom, meeting ID 831 1780 1750, and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020. Pursuant to written determination by the Mayor finding that conducting the meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present due to infections and potentially dangerous nature of Infectious Disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham
Corinne N. Bolduc
Dave Maughan
Jordan Savage
W. Seth Teague

Mayor Mike Gailey
City Manager Brody Bovero
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

Administrative Services Director Steve Marshall
City Attorney Paul Roberts
Police Chief Garret Atkin
Fire Chief Aaron Byington
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele

1. Meeting Called to Order/Adopt Agenda

Mayor Gailey called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. as a regularly scheduled meeting, with notice of time, place, and agenda provided 24 hours in advance to the newspaper and each Councilmember. Councilmember Teague provided an invocation and Councilmember Bingham led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM MOVED TO ADOPT THE AGENDA. COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

2. Public comment:

Mayor Gailey stated that tonight's meeting agenda provided instructions for residents to email their public comments to City Recorder Brown by 5:00 p.m. tonight in order for them to be read into the record of the meeting. He indicated no written public comments were submitted to Ms. Brown prior to the deadline.

Mayor Gailey then invited Zoom participants to provide public comments. There were no public comments.

3. Approval of minutes.

The following minutes were reviewed by the City Council: Business Meeting and Work Session of December 8, 2020.

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES LISTED ON THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED AYE.

4a. Common consent: Proposed Ordinance 2021-01 amending the Syracuse City General Plan Map for property located at 4258 W. 1700 S., Low Density Residential to Commercial.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following information regarding the application:

Location: 4258 W 1700 South
Current General Plan: Low-Density Residential
Proposed General Plan: Commercial
Current Zoning: R-1 (Single-Family Residential at Two-Point-Three Units per Acre)
Acreage: 1 acre

The applicant is requesting approval of a General Plan Map amendment from Low-Density Residential to Commercial. This change would facilitate a rezone to allow the creation of a business on the property. There is currently a single-family house on the property which the applicant intends to convert into a commercial space. Properties to the West and North are single-family residential and to the East and South, properties are agricultural. These agricultural properties are owned by the Davis County Sewer District and are part of a buffer surrounding the sewer plant. As such, they are not intended for future development. This may change if the odor containment technology at the sewer plant changes, but the current Sewer District leadership does not intend development to occur in the foreseeable future. The Commercial General Plan designation allows the General Commercial, Mixed-Use Development, Neighborhood Services, and Professional Office zones. These zones are not guaranteed if the General Plan Map amendment is approved, but they are possibilities if the City Council chooses to approve a rezone to any one of the zones. If approved, this would be an island of Commercial amongst several Low-Density Residential

properties, but it is located on a major road which is at this point, one of two accesses to the Antelope Island causeway (the other being 1700 South via 4500 West which is approximately a quarter-mile to the west. The layout of potential island accessways dictates that this property is located on the primary access route which means relatively high traffic counts -- a boon to business operations. A map has been included in this report along with the application showing the reasoning for the request. Because this is a legislative decision, no staff recommendation will be included.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 2021-01 AMENDING THE SYRACUSE CITY GENERAL PLAN MAP FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4258 W. 1700 S., LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO COMMERCIAL. COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4b. Common consent: Proposed Ordinance 2021-02 amending the Syracuse City Zoning Map from Residential (R-1) to General Commercial (GC) for property located at 4258 W. 1700 S.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following information regarding the application:

Location:	4258 W 1700 South
Current Zoning:	R-1 (Single-Family Residential at Two-Point-Three Units per Acre)
Proposed Zoning:	GC (General Commercial)
Acreage:	1 acre

The applicant is requesting approval of a rezone from R-1 to General Commercial. The intent of the rezone is to allow the existing house to be converted into a commercial space with an ice cream shop and local items. Eventually this is planned to grow into a boutique area where local crafts and produce will be sold. All of these are permitted uses in the General Commercial Zone. There are several other potential uses in the General Commercial Zone which are listed in the zone language included as an exhibit in this report. The primary focus of the zone is retail sales and restaurants with explicit limits on office space. Buffer standards for commercial uses next to residential would require Buffer C which requires a 6' Vinyl, Composite, or Precast Concrete Privacy fence, a ten-foot buffer, 1 tree every 50 feet, and five shrubs every 50 feet. Along 1700 South, Buffer table F would be required which is 15 feet and requires one tree every 50 feet. No buffer would be required along the east side of the property as this is agricultural. The proposal represents an increase in traffic and noise at the site and an increase in economic activity and tax base for the city. A completed site plan in compliance with City Code would mean improvements to the property such as landscaping, irrigation, accesses, and ADA compliance which would not be required if it remained residential. If approved, this would be an island of Commercial amongst several Low-Density Residential properties, but it is located on a major road which is at this point, one of two accesses to the Antelope Island causeway (the other being 1700 South via 4500 West which is approximately a quarter-mile to the west. The layout of potential island accessways dictates that this property is located on the primary access route which means relatively high traffic counts -- a boon to business operations. Maps have been included in this report along with the application showing the reasoning for the request. Because this is a legislative decision, no staff recommendation will be included.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 2021-02 AMENDING THE SYRACUSE CITY ZONING MAP FROM RESIDENTIAL (R-1) TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4258 W. 1700 S. COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4c. Common consent: Final Plat approval, Still Water, Phase 9, located at approximately 2000 W. Parkview Drive.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following information regarding the application:

Location:	2000 W Parkview Drive
Current Zoning:	RPC (Residential Planned Community)

The applicant is requesting approval of one final plat as part of the Still Water development. There are still some remaining staff comments need to be rectified before recording with Davis County. The pertinent staff comments are as follows:

- Clair Avenue dead-end road is longer than 150'. There will need to be a fire department turnaround installed that meets the standards of 2018 IFC Appendix D.103
- Include the following language verbatim in the Owner's Dedication: "warrant and defend and save the City harmless against any easements or other encumbrances on the dedicated streets which will interfere with the City's use, maintenance and operation of the streets."
- Three acre-feet per acre of water will be required for the gross acreage of this plat in accordance with the details of the Development Agreement unless payment of a fee in lieu of secondary water for the area located in the final plat is paid, as provided in SCC 8.10.090.

The memo concluded the Planning Commission voted on December 1, 2020 to recommend conditional approval of this item with the condition that all staff comments be resolved prior to plat recordation.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO GRANT FINAL PLAT APPROVAL, STILL WATER, PHASE 9, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2000 W. PARKVIEW DRIVE. COUNCILMEMBER BOLDOC SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED AYE.

5. Annual report from Syracuse City Justice Court Judge Hoskins.

Syracuse City Justice Court Judge Hoskins has been invited to attend the Council meeting to provide a report regarding Justice Court operations.

Judge Hoskins reported on Justice Court operations throughout 2020, focusing on one bright-spot of the COVID-19 pandemic, which is that the Court was forced to entertain opportunities for virtual court proceedings. In many other public and private arenas, operations have been delayed, but that has not been the case in the Justice Court given that any defendant can appear in the Court via a virtual platform. She indicated that the Court has submitted a re-opening plan that will be implemented when the State of emergency shifts to the ‘yellow phase’ under the State’s operating chart. The re-opening plan includes a virtual element whereby defendants will have the option of appearing virtually rather than in person. She noted that she and the Court Clerks have used some free time afforded by the pandemic to further their training and networking with their counterparts in other courts. She stated that the Justice Court revenues for 2020 seem to be lagging when compared with past revenues and she feels that is largely due to the pandemic.

Councilmember Bingham stated the decline in revenues is dramatic; she asked if it wholly due to the pandemic or if there is a reduction in crime being committed in the City. Judge Hoskins stated that law enforcement activities have decreased to limit interactions between Police Officers and residents. However, retail thefts are increasing, and she is still hearing those cases in her court. Councilmember Bingham then stated she appreciates the mentality behind continuing to offer virtual hearings; she can see how the requirement for a defendant to personally appear in court can cause negative results in terms of an individual’s schooling or work. Judge Hoskins agreed; she feels badly that she required people to take time off work or out of school to physically appear in court; now it is possible for someone to make an appointment and appear virtually while only taking 15 minutes away from their other responsibilities. Councilmember Savage echoed Councilmember Bingham’s support for allowing virtual hearings; he is supportive of any changes that make the justice system less punitive.

Councilmember Bolduc stated she is happy to hear that defendants are referred to counseling or other social service agencies to get help for the problems that led to their appearance in court; she believes this will help to reduce recidivism. Judge Hoskins agreed and added that she and City Attorney Roberts continue to explore other mental health service programs to which defendants can be referred.

Councilmember Maughan asked why the State Court system was slow to allow virtual hearing opportunities to justice courts. Judge Hoskins stated there was some resistance to allowing virtual hearings because many feel strongly about the need to allow personal appearance for legal matters. However, the pandemic ultimately forced the issue and she believes courts will be allowed to continue with virtual hearings for certain crimes or if all parties agree, once the pandemic resolves.

Mayor Gailey thanked Judge Hoskins for her report and the manner in which she operates the City’s Justice Court. Judge Hoskins acknowledged he efforts of Mr. Roberts and her Court Clerks for the support they offer, which ensures that the Court is running smoothly. She noted that Syracuse City has the only female Justice Court Judge north of Salt Lake City and that is something to be applauded. She stated the City took a risk when they appointed her, and she is grateful for that.

6. Authorize Administration to award contract for 1200 South Waterline Project.

A staff memo from the Public Works Department explained this project consists of installation of new culinary and secondary mains in 1200 South Street between 4100 West & 4290 West. This project will increase redundancy in the culinary and secondary systems to provide more reliable service. 1200 South Street is a shared city boundary with West Point City to the north. West Point City currently has a subdivision under construction that will pave 1200 South Street which is driving the need to complete this project now prior to paving. This project will also install 5 culinary water sampling stations throughout the City to address deficient coverage areas in our monthly culinary sampling locations. The construction will begin immediately if approved and be complete by early summer 2021. Bids were opened on January 5, 2021. There were 25 plan holders and nine bids were received. The low bidder was Leon Poulsen Construction Company, Inc. with a total bid amount of \$202,879. The funding for this project will come from the following sources:

	50-16-70 Culinary Capital	30-16-70 Secondary Capital	
Total	\$124,525.50	\$78,353.50	\$202,879.00
Budget	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$300,000.00
Difference	\$25,474.50	\$71,646.50	\$97,121.00

The memo before the Council tonight award the construction contract to Leon Poulsen Construction Company, Inc. Public Works Director Whiteley reviewed the staff memo.

concluded the matter is to determine whether to

Councilmember Bingham referenced the potential cost savings for the project and inquired as to the cause of those savings. Mr. Whiteley stated that one cause is that the project scope changed somewhat due to an adjustment made by the City Engineer; he realized that utility redundancy was already available in the vicinity of the project and additional redundancy was not needed for this project.

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE ADMINISTRATION TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR 1200 SOUTH WATERLINE PROJECT. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED AYE.

7. Continued discussion and/or action regarding potential partnership with private property owner regarding "Boysen Village" project concept at approximately 4000 W. Antelope Drive.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the IBI study and Economic Development Strategic Plan have both recommended that in order for the City to capitalize on the tourism traffic passing through the city on its way to Antelope Island State Park, there needs to be a place created that will entice tourists and residents to stop for shopping, eating, and/or recreating. The vision is to build a space that is charming and reflects on the city's agricultural past. The idea of creating a 'Gardner Village' type space has been popular in early conversations. Gardner Village is a collection of historic buildings that have been relocated and arranged on the donor site creating a cohesive and charming boutique shopping experience. The city has had an opportunity arise to create a similar space. There is a willing landowner and 'free' historic houses that have presented themselves with serendipitous timing. In connection with the Antelope Drive widening, UDOT has begun demolishing homes in order to make way for the widened road. Some of the homes have historic significance and charm. When asked if UDOT would be willing to 'donate' the homes to the cause, they agreed to cooperate and even verbally offered to contribute some of the budgeted costs of demolition towards relocation. The catch is that the remaining homes are slated to be demolished by January. Relocating the homes would cost money that has not been budgeted. Prior to collecting actual estimates for the home relocation, it is desirable to know the interest level of council to participate in the creation of the village. Not too long ago, the city was entertaining the idea of relocating the 'Mia Design' building for preservation. Approximate costs for relocation, bracing, foundation, site work, and construction costs were about \$100,000. Assuming there are four of the UDOT homes that could be located this year, it would be an estimated cost of \$400,000. There may also be other homes in the community that could be relocated to the donor site in the future that are slated for demolition. Also, additional study of the donor site is needed to evaluate both the maximum number and the most ideal configuration of relocated buildings to create the desired experience. The site is located at approximately 4000 W and Antelope Drive with good visibility from Antelope, which would be ideal for tourism traffic. The landowners are open minded and excited about the opportunity, but immediate funding is limited and participation by the city would be needed to cover the expenses of the building relocation. Also, the exact parameters of a partnership have not been quantified as far as what the city's role in the creation of the space both initially and long term. City Council expressed interest about the idea on November 10 and directed staff to further investigate. Decide if taxpayer dollars should be budgeted to get the project rolling and direct staff as to the level of involvement the city should participate.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and solicited feedback from the Council regarding the project concepts that have been discussed among City Administration, Councilmembers Bolduc and Savage, and the Boysen's. Councilmember Bolduc stated that upon further exploration of the homes that could be moved to the Boysen property, it was determined that some homes could not be moved in the condition they are in; however, it may be possible to salvage historical elements from any of the homes and reuse them on new structures to be built on the property. Mr. Steele indicated that UDOT is willing to contribute some funding to salvaging historical materials. Councilmember Maughan stated that Mr. Boysen has indicated he can perform some of the salvage work on his own and he is supportive of that given that any damage caused by that process would not be of great impact as the homes will eventually be demolished. The only question for the Council to consider is whether to support the project as a whole and whether similar support would be offered to other private individuals or entities who pursue a similar project in the future. He noted he wants to help the project, but he is concerned about the financial implications for the City's general fund. This led to discussion about different funding options for the project, including a loan of tax increment financing (TIF) from an existing redevelopment area (RDA) or community development area (CDA); or utilization of park purchase impact fee revenue for a portion of the project in exchange for the Boysen's incorporating an open space or park element in the project that would be open and free to the public. Councilmember Maughan stated the Boysen's indicated they do want to include a playground in the project, and he would like to explore opportunities for utilizing park impact fee revenue for that purpose. City Manager Bovero stated he will explore that option.

The Council concluded not to move any of the home structures, particularly the brick home – based on direction from a home mover that the structure could not be moved without first removing the brick from the exterior. They stated they support salvaging historical elements from each of the homes that have been made available to them; these historical elements should be used in new construction at the site. The Boysens stated this is acceptable to them. Mayor Gailey stated that the only building that any longtime resident of the City would consider to be historical is the old Rampton home, which is the brick home. He does not feel that residents will be upset about the action to salvage historical elements from the home and reuse them in a new project at the Boysen property.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO SUPPORT AN AGREEMENT WITH THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (UDOT) TO SALVAGE HISTORICAL ELEMENTS FROM EACH OF THE HOMES TO BE DEMOLISHED IN ANTICIPATION OF THE WEST DAVIS CORRIDOR PROJECT AND USE THOSE ELEMENTS IN NEW CONSTRUCTION IN A PROJECT AT THE BOYSEN PROPERTY. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL VOTED AYE.

8. Proposed Ordinance 2020-32 amending Section 10.40.030 of the Syracuse City Municipal Zoning Code pertaining to tandem parking for multifamily residential uses.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Section 10.40.030 of the City Code prohibits tandem parking. This ordinance was meant to prevent unrelated people from being parked behind each other in a commercial or multifamily setting. The resulting shuffle would be cause for conflict and inefficient circulation patterns. City Council discovered that a recently proposed MXD project proposes tandem parking. Council felt that in this narrow circumstance perhaps tandem parking could be allowed. Council is seeking the Planning Commission's advice as to under which circumstances tandem parking could be allowed in a mixed-use development, if at all. Please see a draft potential rewording of the ordinance. The Planning Commission reviewed the item and held a public hearing on November 3, 2020 and is recommending approval of the proposed amendment as enclosed. The matter before the Council is to vote either to approve, approve with conditions, deny, or table the item for more discussion.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the proposed ordinance. Councilmember Maughan stated he is hesitant to make a permanent change to the City Code that would apply to all multi-family projects; he would rather consider a development agreement that provides certain tandem parking allowances. This led to high level discussion among the Council regarding the types of multi-family projects in which tandem parking would not be appropriate and whether it would be appropriate consider an exception to a land use ordinance for a specific project or property. City Attorney Roberts stated the Council can consider an exception for a single project if they follow a defined process and hold a public hearing regarding the requested exception.

Mr. Steele stated that a development agreement specific to this project has already been approved and it allows tandem parking; the proposed ordinance amendment would apply to multifamily development projects that have garages attached to the living unit. The tandem parking space is only allowed in front of the garage. Councilmember Teague asked if the ordinance amendment would make it difficult for the City to negotiate adequate parking allowances and/or appropriate parking distribution for future multi family projects. Mr. Steele answered no; the parking ordinance provides guidance for parking allowances and parking distribution. Councilmember Teague stated for that reason, he would like to codify the regulation rather than leaving it open for individual future projects. Councilmember Maughan stated that he wants to be clear that he is in favor of allowing tandem parking in the Jerry Preston project, but he is concerned about codifying the amendment as he fears it will result in future applicants seeking narrow parking allowances for their project. Councilmember Savage stated that the one thing that addresses that concern is the fact that tandem parking would only be allowed in multifamily projects in the mixed-use zone only. Councilmember Bingham agreed and stated she is supportive of codifying the amendment.

There was brief high-level discussion about the parkin requirements for

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 2020-32 AMENDING SECTION 10.40.030 OF THE SYRACUSE CITY CODE PERTAINING TO TANDEM PARKING FOR MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL USES. COUNCILMEMBER SECONDED THE MOTION; VOTING 'AYE': COUNCILMEMBERS BINGHAM, BOLDUC, AND TEAGUE. VOTING 'NO': COUNCILMEMBERS MAUGHAN AND SAVAGE.

9. Continued discussion of potential text amendment in Section 10.30.020 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to building materials.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the Council requested to review the exterior cladding requirements for multi-family housing. Ordinance 10.30.020 explains that the 'option 3' that allows 0% brick, rock, stone cannot be applied to townhomes, apartments, and nonresidential structures. However, there is a mixed use, multi-family housing project which is requesting to include a 'barn' design that does not have any brick, rock, or stone by design. On November 3, the Planning Commission discussed the item during its work meeting and felt that it was not in the best interest of the city to allow option 3 on multi family structures since the larger facades would be more likely to become overly monotonous contributing to a lower quality development. The Commission envisioned the mixed-use and higher density residential areas to be held only to the highest quality materials and design. Additional consideration for option three is in need of discussion concerning smaller lot residential areas and if there is a similar sentiment towards the 100% hardy facades in those types of development as well. The 100 percent hardiboard facade is consistent with the popular 'farmhouse' found on large single-family homes and large lot developments but whether or not that style is thought to be appropriately transferred onto multi family or small lot residential is the question at hand. Planning Commission is forwarding a recommendation to not amend the ordinance at this time, it was agreeable to continue allowing 100 percent hardi on single family only but to not allow it 100 percent on attached housing or commercial. On December 8, 2020 Council discussed the

item and the majority felt that the amendment should not take place. This was a self-initiated discussion, so no action is required but it is recommended to deny this item to create a formal record.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion and debate among the Council regarding the appropriateness of allowing 100 percent hardboard construction in multi-family projects; there was a focus on the recommendations from the Architectural Review Committee and the Planning Commission regarding the issue, with the Council – excluding Councilmember Bingham – choosing to leave the architectural standards as is and not allow 100 percent hardboard construction in the multi family zone. Councilmember Savage stated his position is based on his concern that hardboard must be painted every 15 to 20 years and if a multi-family project owner does not perform that painting, the project could fall into disrepair. Councilmember Teague stated that concern is not completely eradicated by opposition to this amendment as the current ordinance allows 70 percent of a multi-family project façade to be hardboard; this means the owner will need to paint 70 percent of the project within 15 to 20 years.

Councilmember Bolduc noted that this City Council has taken actions relative to residential density and different product types that could change the City’s buildout trajectory; with the consideration that the Council is allowing mixed-use and multi-family projects, she wants to take every measure possible to ensure these types of projects are high quality.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO DENY A TEXT AMENDMENT IN SECTION 10.30.020 OF THE SYRACUSE CITY CODE PERTAINING TO BUILDING MATERIALS AND ALLOWING 100 PERCENT OF A MULTI FAMILY PROJECT FAÇADE TO BE HARDIBOARD. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED AYE, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM, WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

10. Discuss idea of holding town hall meetings in 2021.

An administrative staff memo explained Mayor Gailey directed staff to include this item on the agenda responsive to an email sent by Councilmember Savage to the entire Council. The topic of the email was to consider possibly holding town hall meetings to provide additional opportunities for public involvement and input.

Councilmember Savage stated that he has experienced frustration in the past related to the Council’s policy for taking and responding to public comments. He loves when residents choose to participate in City Council meetings and provide their feedback, but he has witnessed their frustration at the fact that the Council cannot respond to their comments unless they relate to a specific item on the meeting agenda. For that reason, he is suggesting the Council hold town hall meetings once each quarter to allow residents to meet with the Council and discuss any topic and receive feedback from the Council regarding their comments. This led to high level discussion about the types of interaction that can take place during a town hall meeting and the need to develop guidance about how such a meeting should be conducted in order to ensure compliance with the Open and Public Meetings Act (OPMA) for the State of Utah. City Manager Bovero suggested that a town hall meeting be scheduled to discuss a specific issue that is generating public interest. The Council supported the idea of focusing on a specific topic or topics, with the opportunity to accept public input regarding future topics of discussion. Mayor Gailey asked each Council to submit a few suggested topics of discussion to Mr. Bovero in order for him to develop a list of optional topics for discussion in a town hall meeting; the list will be presented at a future Council meeting for continued discussion and a determination regarding the topic of holding town hall meetings.

11. Public comment.

There were no public comments.

12. Mayor/Council announcements.

The Council and Mayor provided announcements about upcoming community events and other opportunities for public involvement. The Council also discussed requests for future agenda items.

Mayor Gailey also invited City Manager Bovero to make any necessary announcements. He reported on the status of various capital projects; he also discussed transactions that will be presented to the Council for their consideration in the near future. Finally, he noted the 2021 Utah Legislative Session starts in the coming days; Administration would like to open a communication channel with the entire Council in order to keep the entire group informed of pending legislation that could impact the City. The Council expressed their willingness and desire to be assigned to monitor one legislative topic throughout the Session and be prepared to report to the group regarding the impact the legislation could have on the City.

13. Consideration of adjourning into Closed Executive Session pursuant to the provisions of Section 52-4-205 of the Open and Public Meetings Law for the purpose of discussing the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual; pending or reasonably imminent litigation; or the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property.

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO CONVENE IN A CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 52-4-205 OF THE OPEN AND PUBLIC MEETINGS LAW FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OR REAL PROPERTY AND PENDING OR

City Council Regular Meeting
January 12, 2021

REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

The closed session began at 8:22 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:48 p.m.

At 8:48 P.M. COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mike Gailey
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: February 9, 2021