



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

**WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**
WEST POINT CITY HALL
3200 W 300 N | WEST POINT, UT

June 16, 2020

Mayor
Erik Craythorne
City Council
Gary Petersen, Mayor Pro Tem
Jerry Chatterton
Andy Dawson
R. Kent Henderson
Annette Judd
City Manager
Kyle Laws

Administrative Session
6:00 PM

Minutes for the West Point City Council Administrative Session held at West Point City Hall, 3200 W 300 N, West Point, Utah on June 16, 2020 at 6:00 pm with Mayor Erik Craythorne presiding. Also available via electronic Zoom Meeting, accessible to attendees by entering Meeting ID #835 2427 3658 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Erik Craythorne, Council Member Gary Petersen, Council Member Annette Judd, Council Member Kent Henderson (attending electronically), Council Member Andy Dawson, and Council Member Jerry Chatterton

EXCUSED: None

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Kyle Laws, City Manager; Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager; Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director; Paul Rochell, Public Works Director; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder

EXCUSED: None

VISITORS PRESENT: Visitors able to attend electronically, no sign-in required.

- 1. Discussion Regarding the FY2021 Budget & Schedule of Fees for West Point City & All Related Agencies – Mr. Ryan Harvey**
Mr. Harvey stated that included with his Staff Report is a summary of the FY2021 Budget, which has been discussed in the past several meetings, but he would like to focus this discussion on the CDRA Fund and the Fee Schedule for FY2021, as well as the Property Tax Rate for Calendar Year 2020. Prior to the General Session, the CDRA Board will meet to hold a public hearing and adopt the FY2021 Final Budget for the CDRA.

CDRA

In regards to the CDRA Fund, this year the City received \$157,890 from tax increment revenues, which is \$8,000 more than last year's revenues. The CDRA continues to have a debt obligation of \$140,000 per year. For FY2021, the only difference in the CDRA budget is that the interest expense will be \$4,000 less, and the debt expense will be \$4,000 more. As long as property tax revenues continue to grow, or at least remain steady, and considering the additional revenue from the apartments that are currently under construction, the CDRA Fund should continue being able to meet its debt obligation of \$140,000 each year.

Fee Schedule

Mr. Harvey stated that there are a few changes to the Fee Schedule from FY2020. The first is the increase in the charge for the first black can fee from \$11.50 to \$11.80, pending the Council's approval of the updated contract with Econo Waste, Inc. The second change is adding the charges to the field use at the City Parks. This is something that was previously approved by the Council, but not added to the fee schedule. They are as follows:

FIELD RENTALS

Field Rental	\$20 per hour
Field Preparation	\$50 per day
Field Rental – Non-Profit	\$10 per hour
Field Prep – Non-Profit	\$25 per day
Deposit (League, Tournament, etc.)	\$50 per event

Property Tax Rate

Mr. Harvey stated that as discussed at the last meeting, due to the COVID-19 situation and its impact on City revenues, and in accordance with the revenue and taxation policy, Staff suggests the Council consider TNT, if for no other reason than to allow us to have a better idea where the budget sits in August. Staff needs direction from the Council and a motion is required if we are to pursue TNT this year. The certified tax rate for 2020 is .000877. That is down from the rate that the Council adopted last year of .000917. The Council needs to decide what rate to declare for the TNT, which is not the final property tax rate but the rate that will be noticed to residents as being considered. When it comes time to finally approve the Property Tax Rate, it cannot adopt anything above the rate that was noticed to residents.

Mr. Harvey presented a chart breaking down the projected revenues for rates in between the 2019 rate and the 2020 Certified Rate (based on the West Point average home value of \$250,000):

Proposed Rate	Projected Revenue	Amount over Certified Rate
0.000917 – 2019 Rate	\$548,672	\$23,934
0.000910	\$544,484	\$19,746
0.000900	\$538,500	\$13,762
0.000890	\$532,517	\$7,779
0.000880	\$526,533	\$1,795
0.000878	\$525,337	\$599
0.000877 – 2020 Certified Rate	\$524,738	\$0

Mr. Harvey also showed a chart detailing the Certified and Adopted Rates since 2006, which was the year that the North Davis Fire District was formed, with the highlighted years reflecting the years the Council adopted a rate above the Certified Rate:

Year	Certified Rate	Adopted Rate	Revenue
2020	0.000877	TBD	TBD
2019	0.000859	0.000917	509,283
2018	0.000881	0.000917	459,924
2017	0.000902	0.000945	434,260
2016	0.000984	0.000984	400,443
2015	0.001005	0.001036	376,649
2014	0.000996	0.001036	356,700
2013	0.001041	0.001111	337,970
2012	0.001111	0.001111	313,495
2011	0.001008	0.001008	308,326
2010	0.000910	0.000936	302,867
2009	0.000876	0.000876	281,926
2008	0.000773	0.000895	281,925
2007	0.000834	0.000834	228,710
2006	0.000909	0.000909	199,212

Council Member Dawson suggested that, because of the uncertainty of where revenue projections will be in August, the rate noticed to residents be the 2019 rate of .000917, so that when it comes to approve the final rate and the final budget, the Council isn't limited on what rate can be approved. The rest of the Council expressed their agreement that the proposed rate notice to residents be the 2019 rate of .000917. Staff will proceed with that direction.

2. Discussion Regarding the West Point City Fraud Risk Assessment – Mr. Ryan Harvey

Mr. Harvey stated that the Office of the State Auditor has created a new requirement that the cities in Utah present to their elected officials the results of the Fraud Risk Assessment at least once per year. The purpose of the Assessment is to help measure and reduce the risk of undetected fraud, abuse, and noncompliance. It is broken down into 9 different sections with varying points. Mr. Harvey reviewed the City's responses to each for the Council:

1. Separation of Duties (200)

More information about this can be found on page 12 of the Implementation Guide. The City was able to answer yes on questions 1, and 5-12. Because we are a small City with very few employees, we answered those 3 question as Mitigating Control (MC). We do allow Megan, the Treasurer to take credit card and check payments, but not cash payments.

2. Policies (45)

The City has written policies for all of the areas listed.

3. Licensed Expert (30)

Marcus Arbuckle, our hired accountant has a CPA, and a bachelor's degree in accounting.

4. Statement of Ethical Behavior (20)

We sent this out to all employees and Council Members and asked that they be returned before the end of the Fiscal Year.

5. State Auditor Training (20)

This training was sent out to Council Members to complete.

6. Yearly Training (20)

The Administrative Services Director meets this requirement through conferences and online training.

7. Fraud Hotline (20)

The City has set up an email address, fraud@westpointcity.org for employees to report any fraud that they see. That email goes to the City Manager and the Administrative Services Director.

8. Internal Audit Function (20)

In talking to our Accountant, he has informed us that he can perform this function for the City. The Audit Committee will provide direction on where to focus this on an annual basis.

9. Audit Committee (20)

The Audit Committee will consist of the City Manager, the Administrative Services Director, and the hired Accountant. We will meet on at least an annual basis.

The Council thanked Mr. Harvey for this information and all confirmed that they would complete the required State Auditor Training and submit their signed Statement of Ethical Behavior before June 30th.

3. Discussion Regarding Trailer Parking in Front Yards – Mr. Kyle Laws

Mr. Laws stated that the at Council Visioning Session in January there was a brief discussion about the City's Code regarding trailer parking in front yards of homes. The Council directed Staff to look into the Code and provide better clarity on what it requires and how it is to be enforced.

Staff has been reaching other cities' codes and has also developed a better understanding of the existing Code, which relevant sections state:

10.05.050 Unlawful parking.

L. Boats and Trailers. Boats, boat trailers, or travel trailers may not be placed, kept, or maintained within the *front yard areas* of any residential (R-) zones, except that such boats or trailers may be located anywhere on the lot except in a clear vision zone of a corner lot for a temporary period not to exceed 24 hours for loading and unloading purposes, or for temporary storage not to exceed seven days if such facility is owned by a bona fide guest of the occupants of the premises. [Code 2000 § 6-2-5]. (*italics added for emphasis*)

17.10.020 Definitions.

"Driveway" means a private road, the use of which is limited to persons residing, employed, or otherwise using or visiting the parcel on which it is located.

"Yard, front" means an open, unoccupied area *extending across the full width of the lot* and measured perpendicularly from the front lot line and having, at no point, a depth of less than the minimum required setback distance. (*italics added for emphasis*)

Mr. Laws explained that there is nothing in the Code that excludes "driveways" from front yards. As such, Staff's interpretation of the Code is that these types of vehicles must be parked behind the setback for the home on the property and that they cannot be

parked in the front yard area, including the driveway. However, during the discussion at the Visioning Session in January, there was a question about motor homes or other Recreational Vehicles and whether those should be listed with "boats, boat trailers, or travel trailers". There is also the question of other trailers (i.e., toy haulers, flatbed, construction, dump-bed, cargo or enclosed trailer, livestock trailers, etc.). The Code states:

17.80.240 Recreational vehicles.

A. No recreational vehicle shall be located, placed, used, or occupied for residential purposes in West Point City except within approved and licensed recreational vehicle parks.

B. Recreational vehicles may be stored, but not used for living quarters, anywhere within the city in accordance with the following provisions:

1. Two recreational vehicles may be placed within a structure lawfully existing on the premises; or
2. *One recreational vehicle may be placed on a lot in an R district; provided, that on corner lots it shall not be located within 10 feet of the side property line adjacent to the street; and provided, that it shall not be used for residential purposes. (Italics added for emphasis)*

Considering this language, only one Recreation Vehicle can be placed on any lot (outside of a legal structure). Additionally, Mr. Laws stated that Section 8.15.030(B)(32) also prohibits parking of any vehicle in an area required to be landscaped by City Ordinance.

As Staff has explored the relevant codes of neighboring cities, it appears that West Point's code is the most restrictive. A summary of the restrictions in other cities is as follows:

Clinton City:

There do not appear to be regulations on private property.

Layton City:

10.62.030 Parking Restrictions

In addition to other parking restrictions in this Code, it shall be unlawful:

1. To park any vehicle over, above, on, or across the public easement between the sidewalk and curbing abutting any public street;
2. To park any vehicle over, above, on, or across any sidewalk or portion thereof, or to otherwise park a vehicle in such a manner so as to obstruct access upon, or use of, the entire surface of any sidewalk;
3. To park a vehicle upon any street, or publicly owned or controlled property or right-of-way for the principal purpose of performing maintenance or repairing such vehicle except as is necessitated by an emergency;
4. To park upon any street, public right-of-way, or publicly owned or controlled property a vehicle that is mechanically inoperable or cannot be lawfully operated on public streets. For purposes of this Subsection, "mechanically inoperable" includes, but is not limited to, flat tire, dead battery, any mechanical problem that would prohibit the immediate starting of the engine and proceeding in a normal manner, or any physical condition, such as missing or inoperable lighting, prohibiting lawful operation. "Lawfully operated" includes, but is not limited to, having current registration, inspection, and required equipment;
5. To park a recreation vehicle, trailer, boat, or similar apparatus, in a manner proscribed above, or to park such an item on any public street except for the immediate loading or unloading and never longer than twenty-four (24) consecutive hours;
6. To park any vehicle, trailer, etc. in any fire lane or to otherwise block or obstruct any fire lane established by the City;
7. To park any vehicle, trailer, etc. on any public property, other than in designated parking or obvious parking areas or as legally permissible on roadways; or
8. To park any vehicle in any location that interferes with the delivery and monitoring of essential services, such as utilities, postal services, and refuse collection.
9. To park any vehicle, trailer, boat, or similar apparatus upon any developed parcel at a location other than that designed for parking.
 - a. Areas designed for parking must be concrete, asphalt, or similar solid surface of sufficient size to house the entire vehicle.
 - b. Exception. This Subsection shall not apply to vehicles parked so as to facilitate the immediate loading or unloading thereof or service vehicles actively involved in the construction, repair, or servicing of the premises. (Italics added for emphasis)
10. To park any commercial trailer or semi-trailer, without motive power that is free-standing or disconnected from a truck tractor, upon any public roadway or public property.

Syracuse City:

11.20.070 Parking of trailers, recreational vehicles.

(A) It shall be unlawful for any person or business to park, place, store, or otherwise leave standing on any public street, public roadway, public alley or City property any unattached trailer of any type, whether for the occupancy of people, storage of items or for towing purposes; any boat, whether the same is loaded or not on an unattached trailer or otherwise; any camper not mounted on a vehicle; any motor home or mini motor home of any length; and any combination of a pulling or towing vehicle with an attached trailer for a period longer than 24 hours.

(B) Such vehicle shall be considered to be in violation of this section if parked in any one location for longer than 24 hours, or if the vehicle has been parked in public right-of-way or streets in one or more locations within Syracuse City for longer than 24 hours, except that a permit may be obtained from the Police Department for a period not to exceed seven days for out-of-town visitors.

(C) Parking of any such trailer or recreational vehicle on private property must not impede visibility of sidewalks and streets from adjacent driveways, nor impede vision on a corner lot for a distance of 40 feet from each of the intersecting streets.

(D) No trailer or recreational vehicle may be used as a place of sleep or habitation while it is parked on a public right-of-way. Recreational vehicles or trailers with a "bump-out" feature, by which the sides of the trailer expand to the left or right in order to increase the space within the trailer, may not have that feature activated while parked on the public right-of-way.

(E) Trailers used in the course of business shall be stored off of the public right-of-way, and may not be parked overnight on any right-of-way in any residential zone. (Italics added for emphasis)

(F) This section does not prohibit the parking of construction trailers on public right-of-way, so long as those trailers are associated with an active building permit. [Ord. 17-19 (Exh. A); Ord. 16-22 § 1 (Exh. A); Ord. 06-08 § 1; Code 1971 § 11-4-3. Formerly 11.20.040.]

Mr. Laws explained that as the City's Code Enforcement Officer has traveled through the City, it is apparent that there is a city-wide problem with violations of this code. There is a parking problem of even just boats, boat trailers, and travel trailers, not to mention if the code is expanded to capture more trailer types or recreational vehicles. The code has not been enforced over the years, mostly due to a lack of knowledge that it existed. Before opening up a project to start enforcing the code, Staff would like to have a discussion with the Council to determine the best path forward, as it is likely to stir up a lot of controversy from residents.

Council Member Dawson expressed his opinion that he is ok with residents parking these types of vehicles anywhere on their properties, as long as they are not on the lawns, blocking the sidewalks, or on the streets. He understands that in some locations it can be difficult for a resident to see around a neighbor's large trailer when backing out of the driveway, but there are numerous violations throughout the City and just keeping trailers off of the road is difficult enough. He would be in favor of a restriction similar to the City's junk car ordinance (must be operable, licensed, etc.) for these types of vehicles.

Council Member Petersen stated that he does not feel "strongly for or against" this Code, and although he understands its purpose, because he does not have a strong feeling about the reasoning behind this code, recognizes that it might be too restrictive. However, he does want to make clear that he is behind a restriction that the vehicle must be behind the plane of the home to maintain a city with nice, clean homes and properties. He added that an exception to this be that they also be allowed to park these vehicles in the driveway, because he would assume it would be temporarily parked there as residents are likely to want have use of their full driveway. Mr. Laws inquired as to how he would feel about circular driveways that essentially *are* in the front yard of a home, or if a home had a gravel driveway. Council Member Petersen stated that there are some different situations that would need to be considered, but that might be a responsibility of Staff or the Planning Commission. In summary, Council Member Petersen stated that he likes the Code the way that it is, but understands that it may be restrictive for some residents.

Council Member Chatterton stated that he agrees with both Council Member Dawson and some of Council Member Petersen's points. As he considered the different codes, he liked Layton City's codes as it covers what he believes the City is trying to accomplish – restricting parking on the sidewalks, public easements, streets, fire lanes, etc.; that a parking space must be designed for parking, be sufficiently sized, and not interfere with delivery of services; and that they must be mechanically operable and registered. He feels that the City's current code needs to be eased as it is not the City's place to be overly restrictive on what residents can and cannot do with their own property.

Council Member Judd inquired as to whether Staff knows if most of the homes with circular driveways have garages or garage doors on the side of the home. Mr. Laws stated that most of the homes with circular driveways that are in violation of the Code do also have a driveway to the garage. Mr. Davis stated that some residents have put in a circular, gravel driveway just for the purpose of parking a trailer there. Council Member Judd stated that she agrees with what has been discussed, but would add that circular driveways would have to be in front of the garage and not in the front yard for a trailer to be parked there.

Council Member Henderson stated that his only concern is in regards to safety; he has seen trailers parked near the corners of properties that cause vehicles to have to pull out in front of it enough to see traffic coming, and others that are parked close enough to their neighbors that the line of sight is blocked for the neighboring resident when pulling out of their driveway. He would like to address those situations in the code. Council Member Dawson agreed and stated that both Layton's and Syracuse's codes have good language examples that could be incorporated.

Mr. Laws inquired as to whether the Council would like to expand the definition of this code to include any type of trailer or recreational vehicle. The Council was in agreement that the definition should be expanded. In regards to the restriction of only one recreational vehicle being allowed on a lot, the Council agreed that the restriction should be expanded to say that additional recreational vehicles are allowed as long as they are behind the front plane of the home and on an acceptable parking surface. Council Member Dawson expressed his concern that if too many vehicles are allowed, it might entice residents to 'rent' their parking spaces out, which he has noticed is becoming a popular thing to do in some cities. Council Member Petersen stated that this practice would be regulated in other parts of the Code because it would be considered a business, but agreed with Mr. Davis'

statement that it would be hard to police. Mayor Craythorne stated that if there were multiple vehicles of the same type on a resident's property, it would likely catch the attention of the City's Code Enforcement Officer and be addressed.

Staff was directed to work with the Code Enforcement Officer to bring a proposed amendment to the Council for future discussion and consideration.

4. Discussion Regarding the Law Enforcement Contract with Davis County – Mr. Kyle Laws

Mr. Laws stated that he has been in contact with the Davis County Sheriff's Office to discuss the renewal or extension of the City's current contract with them for Law Enforcement Services. The DCSO acknowledges that the City's previous multi-year contract was terminated before its expiration and want to be sensitive to the fact that the new contract had a significant price increase that the City had to absorb in order to provide residents with law enforcement services. Because of this, the DCSO has proposed that the current contract be extended for one more year to June 30th, 2021, and remain at the same fee. At the County's request, we will re-evaluate the hours spent in the City and discuss the possibility of a multi-year contract to follow.

The Council felt that the extension of the contract for one year with the same fee is a good deal for the City. Mr. Laws stated that he will have the agreement for the Council to consider for approval at the next meeting.

5. Other Items

No other items were discussed.

The Administrative Session adjourned.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
ELECTRONIC MEETING
NO PHYSICAL MEETING LOCATION
June 16, 2020

Mayor
Erik Craythorne
City Council
Gary Petersen, Mayor Pro Tem
Jerry Chatterton
Andy Dawson
R. Kent Henderson
Annette Judd
City Manager
Kyle Laws

General Session
7:00 PM

Minutes for the West Point City Council General Session held at West Point City Hall, 3200 W 300 N, West Point, Utah on June 16, 2020 at 6:00 pm with Mayor Erik Craythorne presiding. Also available via electronic Zoom Meeting, accessible to attendees by entering Meeting ID #835 2427 3658 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Erik Craythorne, Council Member Gary Petersen, Council Member Annette Judd, Council Member Kent Henderson (attending electronically), Council Member Andy Dawson, and Council Member Jerry Chatterton

EXCUSED: None

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Kyle Laws, City Manager; Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director; Paul Rochell, Public Workers Director; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder

EXCUSED: None

VISITORS PRESENT: Visitors able to attend electronically, no sign-in required.

1. **Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance** – Mayor Craythorne welcomed those attending the electronic meeting.
2. **Prayer** – Offered by Mayor Erik Craythorne
3. **Communications and Disclosures from City Council and Mayor**

Council Member Henderson – The Mosquito Abatement District Davis met the previous week and they are continuing with the different abatement tactics and field testing, and the season is going well. The District also discussed returning to in-person meetings, but voted to continue electronic meetings for at least the next month.

Council Member Chatterton – None

Council Member Judd – None

Council Member Petersen – None

Council Member Dawson – The North Davis Sewer District met the previous week and voted to adopt the Certified Tax Rate. The Board chose to do this as the District was able to pay off some of its bonds and so has less of a need for income at this time.

Mayor Craythorne – For the meeting record, he would like to note that social distancing is being followed by all those attending the meeting.

4. Communications from Staff

Mr. Laws stated that the Miss West Point Pageant was held virtually this year and wrapped up this last weekend. Yesterday, he and Mr. Harvey received the judges' scoring sheets to audit and finalize the results. The Pageant Committee is going around this evening to crown the winners and get pictures. They will announce the winners on their Facebook page, after which the City will

also share the post. Mr. Laws stated that the results were very close, and the event went smoothly, even though it had to be held virtually. Mayor Craythorne congratulated all of those that participated this year and thanked the Committee for its work.

5. Citizen Comment

No comments received.

6. Consideration of Approval of the Minutes from the May 19, 2020 West Point City Council Meeting

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve
Council Member Judd seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

7. Consideration of Approval of Resolution No. 06-16-2020A, Adopting the FY2021 Schedule of Fees for West Point City and All Related Agencies – Mr. Ryan Harvey

Mr. Harvey stated that as the Council has discussed in previous meetings, there are two changes to the Fee Schedule for FY2021. The first is the increase in the charge for the first black can fee from \$11.50 to \$11.80 (pending the Council's approval of the updated contract with Econo Waste, Inc). The second change is adding the charges to the field use at the City Parks. This is something that was previously approved by the Council, but had not been added to the fee schedule. They are as follows:

FIELD RENTALS	
Field Rental	\$20 per hour
Field Preparation	\$50 per day
Field Rental – Non-Profit	\$10 per hour
Field Prep – Non-Profit	\$25 per day
Deposit (League, Tournament, etc.)	\$50 per event
Unauthorized Field Use Fine	\$100

The Council had no further discussion on the FY2021 Fee Schedule.

Council Member Dawson motioned to approve Resolution No. 06-16-2020A
Council Member Judd seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

8. Consideration of Approval of Resolution NO. 06-16-2020B, Amending the Garbage Waste Collection Contract with Econo Waste, Inc. – Mr. Kyle Laws

Mr. Laws stated this amendment to the current contract with Econo Waste, Inc. is to authorize a fee increase of \$.30 for residents' first black garbage cans. Econo Waste, Inc. requested this price increase and the Council has discussed the request for the past several meetings. At the last meeting, the Council agreed to accept the fee increase through the termination of the contract in 2022. The \$.30 fee increase will become effective July 1st. The amended contract is included with the Staff Report for this item, which has already been approved and signed by Mr. Val Sanders (owner).

The Council had no further discussion on the amendment to the current contract.

Council Member Judd motioned to approve Resolution No. 06-16-2020B
Council Member Henderson seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

9. Motion to Move into a Closed Session

Council Member Chatterton motioned to move into a closed session
Council Member Henderson seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

Closed Session

1. Motion to Open Closed Session

Council Member Petersen motioned to open the Closed Session
Council Member Judd seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

2. Call to Order and Roll Call

Mayor Erik Craythorne called the June 16, 2020 Closed Session to order

Roll Call -

Mayor Erik Craythorne

Council Member Gary Petersen

Council Member Kent Henderson*

Council Member Annette Judd

Council Member Andy Dawson

Council Member Jerry Chatterton

**attending virtually*

Kyle Laws, City Manager

Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager

Paul Rochell, Public Works Director

Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director

Casey Arnold, City Recorder

The Council discussed items regarding the following issues:

3. Purchase of Real Property, Pursuant to UCA §52-4-205(1)(d)

4. Pending Litigation, Pursuant to UCA §52-4-205(1)(c)

5. Personnel, Pursuant to UCA §52-4-205(1)(a)

*Mr. Davis, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Rochell, and Ms. Arnold were excused from the meeting for this discussion.

6. Motion to Adjourn Closed Session and enter the General Session

Council Member Henderson motioned to close the Closed Session and enter the General Session
Council Member Petersen seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

10. Motion to Adjourn the General Session

Council Member Henderson motioned to adjourn the General Session
Council Member Petersen seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed


ERIK R. CRAYTHORNE, MAYOR

July 7th, 2020


CASEY ARNOLD, CITY RECORDER

July 7th, 2020

