

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
August 4, 2010**

**TIME & PLACE
OF MEETING**

This Special Meeting was called as per the Elk Ridge City Code, Title 1, Chapter 5, Section 4, Paragraph B; by Council Member Weston Youd and Council Member Sean Royslance. It was called for **Wednesday, August 4, 2010, at 7:30 PM.**

The meeting was to be held in the Pavilion area of the Park, behind the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah; due to the number of citizens present, it was moved to the Fire Dept. Bay area; at the same address listed above.

Notice of the time, place and Agenda as well as an Amended Agenda of this Meeting were provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E Utah Ave, Payson, UT, and to the members of the Governing Body, on August 3, 2010.

7:30 PM –

CITY COUNCIL – SPECIAL SESSION AGENDA:

ROLL

City Council: Mayor Pro tempore: Erin Clawson; Julie Haskell, Sean Royslance & Weston Youd (Absent: Derrek Johnson & Mayor: Kenneth O. Lutes); *Planning Commission Members:* Kevin Hansbrow, Kelley Liddiard, Paul Squires, Jason Bullard & Randy Jones; *Building Official:* Corbett Stephens; *Public Works:* Wayne Frandson; *Deputy Recorder:* Janine Nilsson; *Asst. Treasurer:* Annel Meredith; *Fire Chief:* Seth Wait; *Public:* Ken & June E. Christensen, Jamie D. Towse, Kristin Royslance, Krisel Travis, Charles Wixom, Scot Bell, Logan Nilsson, Kent Haskell, Cheyn & Tricia Gennerson, Neil & Ilene Dykstra, Brad & Elizabeth Dayton, Cathie Allred, Careene Eliot, Jennie Wilcox, Kenton Morgan, Sha Mayne & Jack Mason, Lila Christensen, Kevin A. Clark, Amy Boswell, Jodi McKee, Allison Thaut, Emmily Bell, Dale & Joann Bigler, A.J. & Mariellen Christensen, John & Michelle Calcote, Gerald Dye, Sue Peterson, Kyle Houghton, Matt Cahoon, James Mayfield, Chad Christensen, Dylan Christensen, Jon & Karla Adams, Dr. Kevin Colver, Robin Clawson, Sandy Johnson, Alec Johnson, Terry & Delores Gunn, Jennie Olson, Darrell Hodges, Chris & Janene Thorpe, Robert Van Parys; *and the City Recorder:* Janice H. Davis.

**VOTING IN MAYOR
PRO-TEMPORE FOR
MEETING**

In the absence of Mayor Lutes, the City Council voted on electing the Mayor Pro-tempore to Chair the Meeting.
WESTON YOUD MOVED, SECONDED BY SEAN ROYLANCE, TO NOMINATE ERIN CLAWSON AS THE MAYOR PRO-TEMPORE OF THIS MEETING
VOTE: YES (4) NO (0) ABSENT (2) MAYOR LUTES & DERREK JOHNSON

**OPENING REMARKS &
PLEDGE OF
ALLEGIANCE**

Opening Remarks: A prayer was offered by Fire Chief Seth Wait and Weston Youd led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance, for those willing to participate.

**APPROVAL OF THE
AGENDA TIME FRAME**

WESTON YOUD MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA TIME FRAME; ADJUSTING THE START TIME TO 7:35 PM

Discussion:

Council Member Royslance suggested moving the Public Forum portion of the agenda to after Agenda Item #1, to allow everyone to get to the topic he felt most of the public were there to talk about. He explained that the Public Forum is for the purpose of speaking about topics not being addressed by the Agenda. During the Agenda items, there will be discussion on those particular topics.

(Paul Squires: He responded that the majority of the public did not "have a clue" what the meeting was about.)

It was decided to leave the Public Forum where it appeared on the Agenda.

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson called for a second to the motion:

THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SEAN ROYLANCE

VOTE: YES (4) NO (0) ABSENT (2) MAYOR LUTES & DERREK JOHNSON

4:17

PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson explained the rules of the Public Forum:

- If duplicate topics were to be discussed, she asked that there be a spokesperson chosen, to eliminate redundancy.

- Each person speaking was to be allowed 2 minutes to speak.

- She asked that the speakers come to the mike and form a line.

- The comments made in a Public Forum are for the speaker alone and the Council typically does not respond at that time.

- Speakers should state their names.

1. Scot Bell: (Former Planning Commission Member)

He spoke at the last Council Meeting to thank the Mayor for all the things he has been doing. This time he was speaking as a concerned citizen. His concern was based on the Special Council Meeting called; he wondered what was so "special" that it could not wait until the regularly scheduled Council Meeting. He found that the Council Members were to address an amendment to a code. He discovered that the information that went to the Planning Commission inferred that the Fire Chief and Corbett Stephens (who works in Public Works Dept.) were in favor of this change; which he thought strange since typically in the past, the Fire Chief and Public Works have opposed this proposed change.

He called both Corbett Stephens and the Fire Chief that day and asked them both what had changed; and why should he, as a citizen, be in favor of this change? Their response was that the information presented to the Planning Commission was not accurate. He expressed his hope that the City Council would at least give these two individuals the opportunity to clarify their positions.

The topic of Secondary Access Code Change was there (before the Council) because the Planning Commission made a recommendation to change the code; but it was based on "poor" and "inaccurate" information from two individuals that the City relies on heavily for health, safety and welfare. He hoped that the Council present would table this item since, in his opinion; it has "no business moving forward, because it was all based on bad information given to the Planning Commission". As a former Planning Commission Member, he declared that "good information makes good law"...and he felt this was based on "bad" information provided to the Planning Commission.

This proposed change was discussed a year ago; he had a quote from a Council Meeting wherein former Council Member Ray Brown said that under no circumstances should we make this change. Mr. Brown deferred to the Fire Chief and the Public Works to help in making these decisions. The Council vote at the time was 4-1 against making the change. Mr. Bell pointed out that the one that voted for the change is one of the Council Members calling for this "immediate" and "mandatory" meeting...he said that it was Council Member Sean Roylance.

(Mr. Bell was going over his time allotted to speak and he asked if anyone in the audience was willing to "donate" 2 minutes to him to continue...several volunteered. Many of the public asked to be informed of the issue being discussed regarding the proposed code change.)

Mayor Pro-tempore: She interjected that this was the reason Council Member Roylance wanted to wait until this agenda item to discuss the issues at hand; the intent was to answer many of these questions through that discussion. She asked if these questions should wait or to just continue on with the Public Forum.

(The suggestion from many of the public as well as Council Member Youd was to just continue with the Public Forum.)

Sean Roylance: He wanted to clarify that the proposed code change was independent of him; he did not have anything to do with the proposal to change the code.

Scot Bell: He gave a bit of history of the City's experience with long cul-de-sacs; the existing ones create danger of no access in case of a fire. There is danger to the residents, fire fighters and the City. Getting a school bus up to that area has been a long-standing problem; now we are proposing to add another long cul-de-sac to our road system to cause more problems...it is not a wise decision. Rather than mitigating the problem, we are expanding the problem. "It is a shame that this is even here being represented tonight. We need to have a total recall and the Planning Commission needs the chance to deal with the truth". He encouraged hearing from the Fire Chief and Corbett Stephens.

He did not feel the listed agenda items were of a "crisis" nature and that they could have been postponed until a regular City Council Meeting.

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson reminded those wishing to speak to keep their comments brief.)

2. Lucretia Thayne:

She felt that there would be an "urgent" reason for calling a special Council Meeting; or some kind of emergency. When she got the agenda, she could not gather enough information to warrant a special Meeting. So, she called Weston (Council Member Youd); and she felt she needed to speak of this publically rather than behind his back. When she asked Council Member Youd why he was calling a special meeting, he said that he had the power to do it, so he was calling one. She said he could not give her any reason on any of the agenda items why they could not wait until a regular meeting. The reasons he did give her were "so nebulous" that she still did not understand why the special meeting to talk about the goals and aspirations of Council Members...that is a "campaign item". She continued that Council Member Youd told her that the Mayor had wanted to vote on this issue (Secondary Access Code) at the last Council Meeting but was "disappointed" that it had been listed incorrectly. The information she gathered from people who were present at that last Council Meeting, indicated that the Mayor wanted to postpone action due to discrepancies he felt should be investigated and resolved prior to voting on the issue.

She questioned the other agenda items as well...they did not seem appropriate for a special meeting.

The only clue she got as to the reason for the meeting, was that the Mayor was out of town. When she asked Council Member Youd if he felt he could not speak as frankly and open about his aspirations and goals with the Mayor present, she said his response was that, "Yes that was sort of true".

There is no reason other than:

1. To exercise power, but not in a needful way
2. To do it without the presence of the Mayor

People at the previous meeting said that the developer commented they would not be building for a while. That would imply there was no emergency.

"When you act in a suspicious way, people suspect something...there is something 'fishy' about this meeting; whether it is power struggle, whether it is wanting to do it without the Mayor...or there was something else that was going to go on when we did not know."

She wanted to know who the Council, specifically Council Member Youd; called to notify them of the meeting...was there any direction to put up signs?

12:49

- 16:15 3. *Jamie Towse:*
She had a problem with the lack of notification for the meeting. She puts up signs for the meetings so people will be reminded. Calling the meeting yesterday for a meeting tonight casts suspicion on those that set up the meeting; or on those that are on the agenda. She does not believe that is what these people desire. She was not clear about the rules governing what is appropriate for the signs she put up advertising the meeting. She stated that the City did not need the appearance of any more "back-door" meetings.
- 17:52 4. *June Christensen:*
She has attended more than a few City Council Meetings due to certain problems with vandalism; and she wants it known that she feels like she has to "walk on egg shells". We have elected officials that have their own agendas, their own personalities and they cannot get along. This is why everyone was present at the meeting...the Mayor is not just out of town...he is on a cruise. One's plans for a cruise are made well ahead of time. She felt that because the Mayor was not available; that is why the meeting took place. She said she was disgusted with the Council Members; she felt they should be getting along and working together for the betterment of the City.
She is working on a "neighborhood watch" program and she feels like she is working alone on this. The only Council Member that has offered assistance is Erin Clawson and that offer is appreciated.
She feels that it is time to either get along or the public needs to find replacements.
- 20:00 5. *Jack Mason:*
He was seeking some clarification: Since this is a public group, the Open and Public Meetings Act should be followed; which says even with emergency meetings, there needs to be proper effort to notify the public. The Act also mentions besides publishing a notice at the building, that notice needs to be provided to at least one newspaper of general circulation within the geographic district of the public body, or a local media correspondent".
(Note: the City Recorder did respond that those legal conditions had been met.)
Mr. Mason continued: Since this wasn't a regularly scheduled meeting, it fell under the category of "emergency meeting"; which means the things being dealt with were of an "emergency or urgent nature".
- He wanted to understand why the agenda items were being considered at this meeting rather than at a regular meeting.
- Mr. Mason listed certain conditions that allow an emergency meeting:
 - A majority of the members of the public body approve the meeting
 - There should be attempt to notify all members of the public bodyHe would have felt more comfortable with the meeting if he had known all conditions had been met.
- 21:53 6. *Jenny Olson:*
She expressed concern over the reason the "emergency" meeting was called: Her husband, Craig Olson, served as the City Fire Chief prior to Seth Waite. He (Craig Olson) was asked for his expert opinion on the situation before the Council regarding the requested code change perhaps 3 ½ years ago. That is how long this development plan has been discussed. Why is this all of a sudden an "emergency" meeting when this has been going on for some time?
- 23:15 Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: She asked if there was any more public comment.
(The request was made from the audience to hear from Chief Wait and Corbett Stephens.)
Chief Seth Wait: (Regarding the Elk Haven Subdivision) His discussions over the last little while have indicated that the International Fire Code and the City Code are "a little different". He submitted a letter to the City Council for the Meeting held 7/27; wherein he stated that he was talked to about the Fire Code and he agrees that the International Fire Code has relevance; but he also claimed that there are other issues that we deal with in Elk Ridge that would prevent a "blanket- type" authorization for what we are trying to do. He encouraged the Council to listen to the issues that were to be brought out.
In the situation of a long cul-de-sac, he could be placed in a position of not being able to put fire fighters in there...and the possibility of not being able to get citizens out in a timely manner. It is his duty to protect the citizens of Elk Ridge in the best way possible...from fire and other emergencies and to provide the best service available.
(Question from Jenny Olson: Have the road grades been changed to be able to get the fire trucks up there?)
Chief Wait had not seen the latest plan; so he was unable to answer the question.
(Jenny Olson: The original plan would not allow the fire trucks to make it up the hill.)
Chief Wait added that he had discussed that issue several years ago. He is not sure what has been done since that time.
(Jenny Olson: She asked of sprinklers in houses.)
Chief Wait said that had been taken care of...they are required in the City Code.
(A comment was made that the City Code does address the slope/grade concerns.)
Chief Wait: He summed up by saying that as far as he knows, the City Code has not been changed in dealing with any of the grade issues; developments have had to conform to the City's Code.
- 27:14 Corbett Stephens: He said he has the same position as Chief Wait expressed. He was talked to about this code change and why we (the City) should not just go with the International Fire Code. His comment at the time to Shawn Eliot; "If it applies, then I don't have a problem with that". But, he does not feel the International Fire Code applies. There are many things in the building codes that are generic code. When the International Codes were written, they were written to be "international"...so everyone uses that as a basis for their own codes. Every city in the state of Utah has adopted amendments to the International Code.

Elk Ridge is no different; example: we require interior fire sprinklers...that is not a requirement of the International Building Code or Fire Code; so we are more restrictive than the International Code; he sees the current issue as no different. The City's Code allows up to 16 units...he does not think our Code is perfect...no code is; but rather than simply giving carte blanche and approving 30 units...to him that seems "wrong". Developers should be required to mitigate all the hazards created by doing what they are doing. It is not fair to put that burden on the citizens of the community that are already here. Codes change all the time.

29:01

He did not feel his position was represented accurately in the staff report provided to the City Council.
Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson asked the last few citizens wishing to make public comment to please do so, and then the Public Forum would be closed.

7. Dennis Jacobson:

He said he was totally against what was happening at this meeting; he felt the Mayor needed to be present and that the City needs to have his representation. He did not agree with changing ordinances and zoning at these "night" meetings...and that it shows no respect for the Mayor. Why have a Mayor if the Council has meetings behind his back?

8. Paul Squires: (Planning Commission Member)

He was upset because his hard copy of the City Code was not updated as he felt it should have been. He said that he does not have the time or the ability to get online and look at the Code all the time. He depends on his hard copy version at meetings. He turned his book in 6 months ago and he got it back 4 months ago and thought it had been updated adequately. He ended up quoting "old" code on a topic of concern, in a Planning Commission Meeting, which was incorrect and outdated.

Therefore, he made it known that he was handing that code book back to the City and he resigned his position as Planning Commissioner. He felt if he could not get the information he needs to make decisions, there is no point in being on the Commission.

32:57

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: She closed the Public Forum at that time.

SECONDARY ACCESS
CODE CHANGE
REQUEST

Discussion:

Weston Youd: He felt that he should address the reason he felt it necessary to call the Special Council Meeting. History of how the Meeting came about:

There were two items that went through the development code process...the process is such that the applicant petitions the City for a code change or development and it goes through a submission, a technical review...it goes to the Planning Commission and they look at it and review with the Fire Chief, the Safety Officer, the Code Enforcement Officer...it goes through all these checks and a public hearing. This topic went through a public hearing (in fact two). The Planning Commission made a recommendation to the Council. That recommendation was made; in fact two recommendations were made the same night.

(Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson asked if the public hearing and the technical review committee meeting were done with the previous Council.

Council Member Youd responded that they had been done under the current Administration. There was "actually one previous and one in June of this year".

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson asked further if those in attendance at the TRC Meeting were the following: Planner, Building Official, the Engineer, the Mayor & a Council Member. This is what is required by the Development Code.

Sean Roylance: He corrected her saying that code changes are different.

Weston Youd: They are different; but they go through the same steps. There were two items that came from the Planning Commission on June 24, 2010.

"Our Code states that if you submit a request for business to the City Council by Thursday; then it will be on the next Meeting. The next Meeting was actually cancelled by the Mayor and subsequently the next meeting...so there were two City Council Meetings that were cancelled because of no business...when these two petitions were ready to go through."

**(Note: This point was clarified in the following City Council Meeting; that the process for code amendment is actually different from the process for development or subdivision submittal...in the process for code amendment, there is no time frame referred to between the time the recommendation comes from the Planning Commission and the Council takes action.)*

City Recorder: Council Member Youd was corrected that there was only one Council Meeting cancelled (7/13) and the two items were on the next agenda for the Meeting held on 7/27.

Weston Youd: When the agenda did list the two items, one request was up for action..."that's the process...it is submission, review, Planning Commission review and suggestion, then City Council action. Both of those went through that process; but there was a divergence...one went through for action and the other one only went for discussion. And the petitioner asked why...and the Mayor said, 'Can we take action on it tonight?'...when the Recorder said, 'No, it's not listed as action, it is only listed as discussion'. At which time, I said, 'We should look at doing what we can do for that petitioner to get this done as quickly as possible.'"

36:44

He continued, "If you look at our Code, a special meeting... (which this is) can be called by two Council Members or the Mayor, if they feel that the business of the City needs to occur. I felt that it was needed for the purposes of the petitioner and called this meeting."

(Comment: The petitioner agreed at the last Council Meeting to have it taken care of next week at the regular Council Meeting)...the person commenting added that she and others were present at that meeting on 7/27.)

Council Member Youd continued that he had mentioned to her (petitioner) that he would do everything he could to expedite...and that is why he called the meeting.

(Comment: (Unidentified) She felt that the Council Member Youd might want to take care that he is not replaced.)

Jenny Olson:

37:39

She directed a question to Council Members Youd and Roylance: Do they have any "ties" to the petitioner, or any sort of "gain" that they personally would come up with should this plan go through?

Weston Youd: He responded that no he did not; and that he had never spoken to the petitioner outside of a meeting...there is none whatsoever.

Lucretia Thayne:

(Question for Council Member Youd) It was her understanding that the reason the item was on the agenda for discussion only was because there were some discrepancies to be looked at. That would explain a "divergence" of action in the two situations. "Why could there not be six days for those to be resolved?"

Weston Youd: He admonished Mrs. Thayne that the process, once in goes to action...create four outcomes that he had discussed:

- Acceptance of the Planning Commission recommendation by the Council
- Rejection by the Council of the recommendation
- Amend the recommendation to adopt
- Send it back to the Planning Commission

The process is such that...why was one addressed and not the other? If there was a discrepancy, the action should have been to choose one of those four

Sean Roylance: The last choice would be to table the item; he agreed that one of those actions should have been taken.

Bob Van Parys: (Seeking clarification)

As he understood, what the Council Members were saying was that between that day and the following Tuesday, a decision must be made.

Weston Youd: He replied that a decision could be made that night...one of those 5 choices could be made.

Mr. Van Parys:

"Why could that not wait until next week? Why did you make that decision?"

Weston Youd: "Because I committed to the petitioner that we would do everything within our ability to ..."

(Council Member Youd was interrupted by many of the public speaking at once...Kent Haskell announced that the public was out of control and they should allow Council Member Youd to speak.)

Sean Roylance: He stated there are really two reasons for this (presumably meaning the reason for the meeting):

1. The matter was delayed for a full month when it should not have been
2. "The core of the issue is that it is not just this item; there is another item on the agenda tonight...for example...there are other items in the past that haven't been put on the agenda. So, what we needed to do was to show that if items are being ignored for no particular reason, then we need to get those items on the agenda in an appropriate time frame in a way that is fair to the City and that is fair to the applicants. There is other business that doesn't have anything to do with an applicant or whatever...but it is business they have just been ignored and not put on the agenda...that we need to get to."

41:17

(Question from the audience: The gentleman wanted to clarify that what they were saying was that the Mayor is putting off things that should be addressed?)

Sean Roylance: "The truth of the matter is...yes." He then listed a couple of examples:

1. The topic under discussion: Secondary Access Code Change Request:

It was delayed; it should have been the first of July...it was not. It should have been the end of July and it was not again. It is the third Council Meeting it was delayed to. That is not the way we should be doing our business as a City. "If people think that is 'fair'; we will agree to disagree." He felt that if someone submits an application to the City, it is "only fair for us to treat them with respect" and actually hear them.

2. The City Planner is no longer with the City. The City needs a City Planner; the Planning Commission agrees. That has not been put on any agendas...it needs to be discussed.

Council Member Roylance went on to say that many former and current Planning Commission members worked with the former Planner to come up with code that ensures the safety of the City's roads, that there are short cul-de-sacs, that includes fire sprinklers, etc. "We got all that code through because we had a quality City Planner." He felt that Mr. Eliot went far above the call of duty in his job; because he cares about things being done right. We have to have that in a Planner.

44:40

Kevin Hansbrow: (Planning Commission Member) *Some of the audience commented that the topic was "not relevant" and that the discussion should return to the agenda item.*

Mr. Hansbrow felt that the discussion of the City Planner was relevant because things like our City Planner are crucial to the City. He said the Mayor came to the Planning Commission to ask if the Planning Commission could do without a Planner. Mr. Hansbrow felt that would be "impossible".

Sean Roylance: He compared the time with the previous Planner and Mr. Eliot; Mr. Eliot has improved on the lack of organization the previous Planner allowed.

Council Member Roylance addressed certain questions asked within the past few days:

- Does he have financial interest in this requested code change? No, he does not.
- Some suggested he and Council Member Johnson have a financial interest? He did not know how these rumors get started; but it saddens him because they are false.
- There was a comment that Council Member Roylance is "in the back pocket of developers"; he asked Karl Shuler (one of the developers in the pending Elk Haven Development) if he felt that is true.

(Mr. Shuler responded, "No, not even close. We have agreed to disagree many times.")

If anything, he was concerned that perhaps he was too harsh on certain developers. He was concerned about the existing citizens and beauty of the City.

The previous code problems have been "cleaned up" due to the Planner...the City needs this service to proceed in a logical manner to make sure that as the City grows, it is done right.

Because these issues were being ignored, "I felt I needed to back up Weston to call this meeting".

He said that over the last six months, the majority of the City Council has been "shut out and ignored...and issues have been shut out and ignored". He asked the audience, "Honestly, do you guys think I wanted this? I do not want this. Who in their right mind would want this? Who wants to have people stand up and vilify them? No...maybe somebody else does...not me. And people threatening their spouses...people waving sticks at them as they drive down the road...and so on."

(A comment was made that there should have been an effort to notify people of the meeting.)

He only knew of one other person interested in the issue...Nelson Abbott; and he was notified.

Robert Goodwin: (Seeking to clarify)

As he understood: "This meeting has been called because there is a conflict between certain members of the Council and the Mayor. Since the Mayor is out of town, certain members of the Council have taken it upon themselves to call a meeting in order to...what they call...correct some of the directions that the Mayor has been taking...through all your verbiage, did I catch your meaning?"

Sean Roylance: "Close; not quite.

1. I didn't know he was out of town. Somebody said that they found out he was on a cruise...I had no idea. I had heard that he had a family thing...I didn't know until I got here tonight if he would be here or not...that he wasn't here."

Robert Goodwin:

"That is just more verbiage coming back to the same point: certain members of the Council are taking advantage of the Mayor's absence... (the remainder of the statement was unclear as Council Member Roylance began speaking).

Sean Roylance: It is not the Mayor's absence...it's that he does need to know that we are willing to call an agenda..."

Robert Goodwin:

"You are saying that he is not doing his job; therefore you're going to do it for him... (No...) that 's what you said."

50:07

Sean Roylance: In a further attempt to clarify..."I am saying that there are certain items not put on the agenda when they ought to be. We will put them on the agenda." (Mr. Goodwin replied that that is what he is saying.)

Brian Badders:

"Sean and Weston both said they are not getting anywhere with the Mayor...he's 'road blocking you guys. Who road blocked the fence on the water tower? One, two three... (pointing at 3 members of the Council...Council Members Youd, Roylance & Haskell)...All that together; you road blocked the fence on the water tower."

(The Council Members responded that they had voted in favor of the fence...)

Lucretia Thayne:

She relayed that they did so "finally"; that initially they did not.

Sean Roylance: He explained that he had not wanted a "security...prison" fence; and that an entire neighborhood had contacted him with their concerns...so what the City ended up with was more aesthetic and still secures the tank. Elk Ridge has more security than anyone else in the entire Valley.

Mr. Badders:

"My point is very simple: you guys are saying that the Mayor is road blocking you guys; but a couple of months ago, where was the road block coming from?"

Sean Roylance: He disagreed that it was a "road block"; rather a discussion." The difference is that he (the Mayor) is not putting it on the agenda at all...we can't even discuss it." He said that the other matter (fence) was discussed until a resolution was reached.

Mr. Badders:

He wanted to know if the Council Members had exercised their right to vote to put something on the agenda.

Sean Roylance: He disagreed that they have that power.

Lucretia Thayne:

"I was sitting in the Mayor's office when somebody called ...one of the Council Members... (she did not recall what the topic was) and he said, 'well, it's late but if a Council Member asks to have something on the agenda within 24 hours or something like that...I have to put it on'...so don't tell me you can't get it on."

Sean Roylance: "No, that is not true."

Dale Bigler:

He wanted to know who decides the agenda. (Sean Roylance responded that the Mayor decides.)

Jamie Towse: (She referred to Roberts Rules)

She said that those rules state that Council Members can put items on the agenda.

Sean Roylance: "If we change the code, then we can...or if two of us call a meeting, then we can."

(Jamie Towse: She suggested voting to change the code to allow that.) He felt that would be addressed.

Jennie Olson:

She wanted to know if the Council could see what the public's concern is about. "You, who have been voted in by us, to represent us...look how easy it is for you to get us here."

52:50

53:54

Sean Roylance: He added that he loved that everybody was at the meeting...that is usually not the case.

Jenny Olson:

She continued that it did not take more than a couple of signs and postings on Face book. "Please don't tell us that certain Members or the Mayor are "pushing things under the door or blocking things...if it is important to you, as our Council Members...because it is important to us...you'll find a way to get it there at the appropriate time...not calling emergency...special meetings."

54:39

Sean Roylance: He explained what is important to him: he stated, "We have lost 30% of staff since the start of the year." (*When asked how many people that is, he responded...*) "Three out of 10...and there might be more...there are indications that there might be more. We could have half of our staff gone by the end of this year."

City Recorder: She stated that she knows staff...and she felt that was not a true statement. There is no one threatening to quit.

Sean Roylance: "Oaky...so we are at 30%." (*Question: Why?*) Though the Council is questioning, why...he said they were not intentionally bringing it out and throwing it out in front of everything. There are very clear reasons why...and this is one step in the Council exercising its power to say, "Look, we've sat back since the beginning of the year and we haven't done anything. All that's happened is that we have been taken advantage of. We have to stand up for our selves to say...look we are elected too. This is not a one-man show; there are actually other people here as well. And so, as these other people, we need to be factored into that. This is a...basically, we thought...until everyone showed up...the most subtle way...the simplest way, to basically say...look..." (*Public comment interrupted regarding the comments "standing up"...to what? and "subtle"*) Council Member Roylance went on to explain, "Stand up for being able to do the jobs we were elected to do."

(*Question: What do you think the repercussions will be when the Mayor comes back Home? Do you think nothing is going to happen?*)

Sean Roylance: "No, not at all."

Erin Clawson: (Addressing Council Member Roylance) "A few months ago, after Planning Commission Meeting, you approached me to talk to the Mayor and said that if I did not talk to the Mayor...that you had three votes to run the town and you would use them."

Sean Roylance: "That is not what I said at all."

Mayor Pro-tempore Erin Clawson: "That is what you said."

Brian Badders:

He said, "I heard the same thing."

Sean Roylance: (Directed to Mr. Badders) "You have never talked to me...I don't think I have ever said, 'Hi' to you." (*Response: "Maybe you should."*)

Discussion regarding running for office and other topics off the agenda item.

Jennie Olson:

"Do you see what this is turning into?" She suggested tabling the discussion, "This is what it is turning into...a 'witch hunt'...a 'man hunt'...because you are going behind the citizens' backs and the Mayor's back.

Sean Roylance: He responded that perhaps tabling the discussion "would be the most appropriate thing to do". "To answer your question, 'What's going to happen?...Yes things will happen...that's why we did it because nothing was happening. We have to have some things changed so that's why we did it.

I did not want to do it. I waited all this time. I had private conversations multiple times. I wanted things to change; I didn't want to come to this. It didn't happen. So, if you would rather that I just back down and step aside and just 'rubber stamp' everything...let me know; I would like to know that; but my feeling was that when I ran for City Council and was elected; my feeling was that you wanted me to look at the issues, to study them, to actually provide input on them and to actually do my job. But if that's what you don't want, feel free after the meeting, to contact me and let me know that you don't want me to participate more."

Bob Goodwin:

"We would like those who would like to be Mayor to run for Mayor, so we can vote for them...rather than play Mayor while the Mayor is gone."

58:51

Kent Haskell:

"What I would like to see is some of the citizens put their names on to run for Mayor; instead of....(*interrupted with applause*) instead of sitting here complaining about all this stuff...get your names on the Council agenda to run and the same with the Mayor."

Sean Roylance: "I do not want to be Mayor and I am not playing Mayor...what I am doing is I am making sure that the business that we need to take care of, gets to us. That wasn't happening."

Robert Van Parys:

He felt one of the things they (the Council) was missing: "That is...when I was called last night by a prior Council Member and was told that there would be a special meeting tonight...my first inclination was that there is 'something rotten in Denmark'. It's a perception...it's all perception. Now whether you had the best intentions...all of you had the best intentions...of doing the best thing you can for the City...the Mayor is gone...and now there's a special meeting. It wasn't well publicized. It's perception. Now you have a lot of citizens here who probably...if I brought out a vote...would 'hang you from the yard arm'..."

(*Many citizens felt that was not an appropriate expression.*) Your position is not an easy position." Mr. Van Parys was upset about the meeting and had to ask why the Council is doing this when the Mayor isn't here?

1:00:40

If you are having problems with the Mayor, and the Mayor is not allowing things to go through that you feel should be going through...that needs to be brought to the public...not through this forum because this one looks like a 'back-door' procedure. Go door to door and talk to the residents. If you are having problems with the Mayor, there is such a thing as 'call to re-call'. But the thing is, we don't know what's going on." *A comparison was made to the administration in Washington wherein issues are "shoved down the citizens' throats."*

Mayor Pro-tempore Erin Clawson: She called the meeting to order and declared that the conversation should be focused on the agenda item.

Sean Roylance: He expressed his appreciation for the comments made by Mr. Van Parys. He agreed that the perception was "terrible". He also declared again that he did not know that the Mayor could not be at the meeting. He did not know he was on a cruise. I did not know he was in Alaska. For all I knew he was staying in his house and going up to Park City every day. I did not know and that would not have changed my actions except for...you made a very good point; if I had it to do over again, the perception was terrible. My bad... I will speak for Weston...Weston's bad...whatever. That was bad, I agree. I totally see where you are coming from." He apologized for that perception.

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: She wanted the public to know that she did try to get a meeting with our City Council, Mayor and City Attorney to mediate it. He (the Attorney) would only mediate the meeting if the decision to meet was a unanimous decision..."to work out these types of problems". She said that the decision was almost unanimous to have the meeting..."

Sean Roylance: He admitted that, to his knowledge, he did not get back to her on the decision; but he also heard that the Mayor was not sure he was in favor. (*Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: The Mayor was in favor of it.*) Council Member Roylance heard differently. He does not believe it would have helped.

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: "We should try to work it out. That is what they're (meaning the public) asking us to do."

She asked if there was any more discussion on the agenda item.

1:03:45

Kenton Morgan:

He said that a potential issue was brought up: that there are problems with the Mayor. He said he does not know the Mayor or what problems there might be. His point was that the public was there and is concerned...if there is a problem, at least it should be discussed what the process should be for addressing that. He agreed that it was not right that the Mayor was not present. He said, "I am not willing to move on...you said there is a problem, but nothing had been proposed as to how to solve it."

Sean Roylance: "I don't know how to solve it; but I will tell you this about what is happening:

1. He and others have felt like "we need to show him (Mayor) that we are not just going to roll over; we can't. In fact, I almost feel good about what's going over".

2. "Our Lawyer is coming here in a couple of weeks and he is going to talk to us all about how to try and resolve everything. So, we are taking steps; but one thing I do know in my dealings over the last seven months, is that we have to show that we are willing to stand up for ourselves."

Linda Goodwin: "You know, if you can stand up for yourselves; we want you to stand up for us."

Sean Roylance: To clarify: "As a City Councilman, In order to do the job that I was elected to do; regardless of how badly I do it...I felt like that's what had to happen. I fully supported the Mayor when he ran for office; I thought he was going to do great. I still think he has the potential to do great...I think we can work things out; but unfortunately sometimes we have to have some strong things occur. I did not intend this to be a big public thing...it really was supposed to be a message to somebody that would get it...and it wasn't intended to go out to the public." (*Council Member Roylance was interrupted by much public comment at this point.*)

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: She called the meeting to order.

Linda Goodwin:

She felt that this had been a very valuable experience for the Community:

1. For support

2. The public wants things to be done right and for the City Council to work things out

"We are not trying to choose the Mayor over you; but we are saying, let's do this right and table our problems for tonight and address them again at the next meeting when the Mayor will be here. I think most people would be happier."

1:06:53

Sean Roylance: Explanation of the first Agenda item:

He gave a brief history:

The applicant has come forward to petition for a code change. She (developer) found that the City had contradicting code that needed to be clarified...or do something other than her request.

1. We had code that was part of the big effort described earlier (Fairway Heights). That code said: for a cul-de-sac, it is limited to 1,000 ft. "We took into account all of our fire and safety concerns...snowplow and everything else...and we limited it to 1,000 ft. for a cul-de-sac. Because of lot frontage restrictions in the hillside area...what we discovered was that practically meant that there was a limit of 16 lots for that cul-de-sac. If the developer were to go ahead and say, 'I am willing to give open space to the community, and I am willing to do whatever else...there are a few requirements...if they did that, then they could get smaller lots. That would allow them that 100' frontage instead; which would allow them to do 20 lots on a cul-de-sac."

He said that was the basic code that was discussed...20 or 16 units on a cul-de-sac.

Weston Youd: He made the point that it is important to know that there is a difference between *cul-de-sac* (bulb like) and *single access* (with a potential to have a continuation of the road).

This code is asking which applied to what? Does the 16/20 on a cul-de-sac apply to a road that stubs for future use? That is what the applicant is asking...what is the code that is going to be applied?" He spoke from the International Fire Code, which allows 30 units.

1:09:06

Mayor Pro-tempore: She asked if an example of that would be Salem Hills Drive.

Weston Youd: Salem Hills Drive and High Sierra Drive would be examples. These roads dead-end, but could continue on in the future. 16 or 20 units refer specifically to cul-de-sacs; what are we going to do with single access roads?

Sean Roylance: He indicated on a map where the future through road would be in Elk Haven, Plat E. Off of that single access road, there would be a cul-de-sac. We have already said that cul-de-sacs can have up to 20 lots; so the question would be, how many additional lots would be appropriate, if any, on the "through" road (single point of access)? He knows there were minutes fond indicating discussion of this matter; but "generally the discussion with the Planning Commission and the City Council was about the *cul-de-sac*. " He went on to say that the actions taken are proof that the discussions centered around the idea of cul-de-sacs. He said the code says that a single access has 16 units; "but by definition, a cul-de-sac is a single access; yet we allow for 20. So right there you can see there was an over-sight going on...that we had 20 lots on a cul-de-sac and we had 16 on a single access."

The other point: He indicated Escalante Drive coming onto Alpine and Mahogany Way... (Referring to a proposed Fairway Heights Subdivision, which was abandoned): In that proposed development, they did the open space requirements and got the 20 lots on the cul-de-sac. So they had an additional 16 lots...and then there were already another 3 lots on the cul-de-sac...so it came in just under 20...I think it came in at 19 lots. That fit within our Code." He continued that if you look at the single access with this plat, there were actually 23 to 25 lots that were at the single access point. This was the first application under this code.

His point in all this was that consideration of the 16 units on a single access was not even consistent with what was in the code at the time; nor was it consistent with the first application of the code when reviewing the Fairway Heights Development.

Due to this oversight; he feels the issue should be reconsidered and determine what is appropriate for a single access; or to adopt the International Fire Code standard.

Dennis Jacobson:

He asked what the conflict was between the Mayor and the Council over this issue.

Sean Roylance: "Because it is not being brought to the City Council in a timely manner. Instead, what was happening..." Council Member Roylance said he didn't want to "get into it"...simply that it was not brought to the Council.

Dennis Jacobson:

"Is he opposed to that?"

Weston Youd mentioned that he (Mayor) does not have a vote.

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson added that they could not answer for the Mayor.

"It seems straight forward that you could have a fairly basic discussion about it; it seems to me that to get it on the agenda to have discussion...I just don't see why that's so hard." (Sean Roylance: "Exactly.")

So, to be able to sit down with the Mayor and say, 'Can we put this on the agenda so we can discuss this...a lot of people have some anxiety about it...can we talk about it?'...if he told you, no...I would be one of the first ones to know about it...because my first phone call would be to him to say, 'Why can't you discuss this?'

And I think anybody here would do the same thing. Can you ask the Mayor why you can't discuss it?"

Lucretia Thayne:

"But it was on the discussion last week."

Weston Youd: "But it should have been for *action*...according to the process."

Dennis Jacobson:

"Do we know what his issue is?" (Sean Roylance: "I don't want to speculate.") "He hasn't voiced his opinion about the issue?"

Sean Roylance: "If you want to talk to me afterward, I could tell you the reason why we have a problem with it; but I don't want to get into all of that...suffice it to say that we felt it was necessary to do this."

(Suggestion: to place it on the agenda for the next meeting.)

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: She explained that it is already on the agenda for the next meeting.

Scot Bell:

He suggested tabling the issue for now; he said he would like to hear the Mayor's answer to this.

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: (A portion of her statement was inaudible) Since July 27, 2010 was the first time she was able to discuss this issue with the Council, she would like to have answers to some of her questions.

1:16:14

Jodi McKee:

She has heard many different issues; but from what she has heard at the meeting regarding the statements from the Fire Chief, Corbett Stephens and the Planning Commission; she was curious as to the problems with the number of lots requested. (*There was reference made to the Planning Commissioner that resigned...there was confusion as to the reason for his resignation.*)

Paul Squires: (*Planning Commissioner who resigned*)

In an effort to clarify his reason for resigning, Mr. Squires reiterated those reasons with those present. He resigned due to his code book not being updated as he thought it was and he had quoted old code on a particular matter. He felt frustrated due to this lack of consideration from the City Office. He needs correct information.

Jodi McKee: (Question)

Whether the matter was tabled or not, it seemed to her that there was a miscommunication between the intentions of the Fire Chief and Mr. Stephens and the information provided to the Planning Commission and what they understood. As a citizen, she advised before a vote was taken, that everyone is clear on the concerns. She felt a bit of anxiety that a vote would be taken based on the Planning Commission's recommendation, which did not include the current information from the two gentlemen that spoke (Chief Wait and Mr. Stephens). She was counting on the Council to be cautious and have all the information available; she advised against "jumping to a decision" prematurely...she did not feel another six days would make a difference.

Sean Roylance: He felt Mrs. McKee made some good points and he felt that the action taken would likely be to table the topic; but he would still like to be fair to the applicant. (Mrs. McKee added that "fair" should be accompanied by "accurate".) Council Member Roylance agreed.

Jodi McKee:

She felt the major message in the meeting was that there was miscommunication on many sides.

ERIN CLAWSON MOVED, SECONDED BY SEAN ROYLANCE, TO TABLE THE SECONDARY ACCESS CODE CHANGE REQUEST AGENDA ITEM UNTIL THE REGAULR CITY COUNCIL MEETING TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2010; THE REQUEST SHOULD BE ON THE AGENDA FOR ACTION VOTE: YES (4) NO (0) ABSENT (2) MAYOR LUTES & DERREK JOHNSON

Kevin Hansbrow:

He encouraged those present to get involved more often. He has been on the Planning Commission for a while and seldom do people want to serve on committees.

Jennie Olson:

This Community also has many people who have served diligently and end up being treated with disrespect. (There were some derogatory comments made and Mayor Pro-tempore called the Meeting to order once again and announced that the Meeting would proceed.)

1:21:46

REVIEW OF
DEVELOPMENT
PROCESS &
PROCEDURES

Weston Youd: To avoid the type of issue being dealt with at the meeting, he felt it would be beneficial to discuss examples of code and clearly define the process to be followed.

He explained that there is a level of "political appointment", which is the Mayor and the Council...and then there is the Planning Commission and staff, and they are "administrative" and they should be "protected or separated as such" ; "so that the process goes through staff and administrative to a certain point...and only until then allow for the political side to occur...which is 'this'...so that would clarify it."

Council Member Youd spoke to David Church and there is "complete freedom...anybody can talk to anybody...you can talk to the Mayor; you can talk to a City Councilman about development. What we want to look at is taking the process and the application process and say: until a certain point, a political entity cannot get involved in the process until it reaches the conclusion of that administrative phase; so that you have that completely unbiased or uninfluenced opinion from the City's safety engineer, from the Fire Chief, from the Planner, from the Planning Commission. So I would like to begin looking at examples of that. I believe Santaquin City has an example of that whereby those on the Council and those that are elected officials, i.e. political entities...cannot get involved in the application process until the point that staff and administrative people have been able to thoroughly "vet" it and say, 'this conforms to code...this conforms to the General Plan of the City...in its whole, it matches with everything that we need to take away any ambiguity. Then at that point, it triggers the conclusion, which is a political process, i.e. coming before the City Council and saying, 'is this appropriate or is it not'...and apply those 5 things. Basically, so that there is no 'discussion only' point that can then cause an influence on those aspects...so that you truly get that separation and those administrative people can give that uninfluenced opinion and it is truly their own."

He wanted to know what the Council's thoughts were.

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: Her thought was to work on this when everyone can be present to do so.

Julie Haskell: She expressed that it is important that people are heard after following all the procedures. "After following all the steps, how would every one of you feel if you weren't heard?" (Some one asked for her to repeat her statement because it could not be heard the first time.) She repeated what she had said and added, if all the steps had been followed and "it came to the point where it was time to come before the City Council and they were denied that...how would they feel? "I feel that's wrong."

Tricia Gunnerson: (Responding to Council Member Haskell's question)

She has had an issue come before the Council before with the previous administration...and perhaps some of these Council Members. I had to come before the Council; and twice in a row I was told to be present and it did not get on the agenda. Even though I have been a resident here for almost 9 years, a "special" meeting was not called to deal with my issue. I waited patiently and took care of it, even though it was a painful item...until the next week. I wasn't heard but eventually we worked through the process and I was heard. I don't think the expense of this special meeting was appropriate."

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: She asked for any further discussion on the agenda item. She asked if the Council was going to move forward with the discussion at the Council Meeting.

(The City Recorder asked if this was being tabled until the next Council Meeting.)

Weston Youd: He stated that he did not see that there was a critical need; but he did want to bring it up in this setting, so it could be avoided in the future. The process should be clearly defined in our code.

1:27:33

He suggested postponing this item until the Council Meeting at the end of August, so the process can be refined...he said he would work with David Church.

CITY PLANNER
DISCUSSION

Sean Roylance: He felt he had already explained his position on this matter.

Weston Youd: He expressed his concern and felt that the City Council needs to address the fact that the City is without a City Planner. "That valuable resource is no longer available to us; and what, as a Council, are we going to do to rectify that?" He felt that the reason for the Planner's resignation should be known.

Jack Mason:

He asked why the City no longer has a City Planner.

(Since the former Planner was in attendance, he was asked if he cared to comment.)

Shawn Eliot: He felt there were road blocks in trying to following procedures.

Weston Youd: (Directed to the former Planner) He asked if there were things that could be done with the code; "like putting a more stringent development and code process in place to ensure that there are repercussions or a recourse when that is not followed...to help say that the City Planner is important...he or she needs to be able to do the things that are necessary as a Planner for the City to keep things going..."

Mr. Van Parys:

He wanted to know if what they were saying was that they wanted to separate the political side from the administrative side of the process...let's say something within the City plan would have to come forward for there to be an action."

(Weston Youd: "Those 5 action points...once it is done it says, this is ready for action.") In other words, a political person cannot step in and make recommendations or try to nullify what is going on..."

You can be informed of what is going on; "you can't influence"; the involvement would be strictly receiving information...direction would not be offered at that time."

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: What about when the staff report is incorrect...would there be opportunity to ask questions of the individuals involved?

Sean Roylance: He felt there was an "extremely important point made: "We're part time people; we just live down the street; and we are trying to do our best to make good decisions for the City. If we cannot rely upon our staff to give us their special opinions, who can we rely upon at that point?" He said he does not know enough about the fire station and those concerns...I don't know enough about our engineering concerns. I have to be able to take what they tell me and make decisions".

Neil Dykstra: *(Question)*

"From what the Fire Chief and the engineer have said, their recommendations and concerns were ignored."

(Julie Haskell commented that there was no engineer present.)

Sean Roylance: He emphasized that they have not ignored them; in fact the Council had just tabled the item. Their points have yet to be discussed.

Krisel Travis: *(Developer of Elk Haven, E)*

She made the point that it is very hard, as a developer, to work with the City without a Planner.

Weston Youd: There has just been a re-subdivision of three property owners who wished to address a drainage issue; without a Planner who knows the Code (from an administrative role); then those three citizens without that resource would have been confused as to the direction to take to solve their issues. With a Planner, he can direct them and give suggestions to resolve the issues. A Planner can provide this resource, not only to developers but to residents of the City.

Kelly Liddiard: *(Planning Commission)*

Is there not a process in place? "To my understanding, that process is not being followed." He asked if that is one of the issues that caused the special Council Meeting that night. *(Weston Youd: "Yes.")* He felt that is what all those present needed to understand. "It is not that you are trying to 'back-door' the Mayor; I just learned about it today. It is something that needs to happen. We need to follow the process that is in place. Just like the judicial system in the United States or the State of Utah...it is not perfect, but that's what we have...and it does work. So, if the Mayor and the Council and the Planning Commission and all the staff follow that process, it'll work. There are probably some issues that need to be refined on it; but that is something that these guys need to look at with the Mayor. That's the advantage of having this meeting; now we have come to a head...and it will be addressed. It can't be "back-doored" any more."

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: She felt that everyone on the Council was in agreement that the City needs a City Planner; so, she suggested moving on with the agenda.

Weston Youd: He also suggested that the City Council and the Planning Commission play an active role in decisions surrounding the Planner. He wanted to have a resolution that says that the candidate would be presented for acceptance by the City Council and the Planning Commission...for advice and consent. It is important that the right person be found for the job. *(Council Member Haskell agreed.)*

Sean Roylance: He also agreed. He referred to the Planner we had prior to Mr. Eliot, who caused problems with code and the application of the code; whereas things have changed for the better with Mr. Eliot.

Julie Haskell: She considers it a "great loss" to lose Shawn Eliot as the Planner. He has been a great resource.

Weston Youd: He added that a lot of knowledge was lost with him.

Kelly Liddiard: *(Planning Commission)*

He asked what it would take to get him back. What would need to be resolved?

(The comment was made that since he reported to the Mayor, then the Mayor should be present to add to the conversation.)

1:35:59

Jason Bullard: (Planning Commission)

He asked if it was true that questions were asked suggesting that “we figure out ways to get rid of the Planner”. Was this suggested to any member on the Council that we figure out a way to replace the Planner? If so, who asked?

Sean Roylance: He stated that he has known since last November (11/2009) that there was “interest in getting rid of our Planner”. It was the Mayor that showed this interest.

Jason Bullard:

He wanted to know if reasons were given. He has worked with Mr. Eliot on the Commission and felt that he knows a great deal and has an interest in the City. The Planning Commission has relied on him for guidance. If there are issues with the Mayor, this should be addressed at the next meeting with the Mayor to find out why he was not pleased with Mr. Eliot’s performance. He does not know anyone that is not happy with his performance.

Unknown: Comment: That the people that are making comments in very “shallow terms”. He felt that perhaps that it was appropriate not to speak of the Mayor or to complain without him being present. He wanted to know if these same people making comments were willing to speak up in concrete terms at the next Council Meeting, about what the concerns are...and what is getting in the way.

1:40:00

Jason Bullard:

He questioned the procedure regarding hiring...is it the Mayor?

Weston Youd: He answered that after a presentation to the Council, it is “with advice and consent to the Mayor for that position”....he went on to say that this applies to firing as well as hiring.

Jason Bullard:

He hoped that Shawn Eliot would “put his name back in” for the position of the Planner. He also felt that from the developer’s standpoint, applications should be dealt with in a timely manner due to high costs involved with development. He felt it is an “embarrassment” for a developer to show up “meeting after meeting” expecting action. He apologized to the developer for her to have to be involved with personality conflicts or discrepancies. The economy is bad enough without making it harder on developers. He also felt that the welfare of the City should be considered.

1:45:10

Unknown: (Comment/suggestion)

The kind of meeting that is being discussed for the next scheduled Council Meeting tend not to have a high level of success due to the tendency to fall into a “hearsay” situation...with all parties defending themselves. He felt it would be better to settle the issues between the Mayor and Council in a non-public meeting. He suggested coming to the Meeting with a plan on how to improve the problems. He felt that approach has a higher probability of succeeding than coming with defenses prepared...with the public interrupting the process. *(The gentleman was corrected and informed of the Open & Public Meeting” laws of 3 or more of the Council constituting a “public meeting”.)*

1:43:24

Mayor Pro-tempore Clawson: She suggested moving to the other agenda items.

**WESTON YOUD MOVED, SECONDED BY SEAN ROYLANCE, TO TABLE THE REMAINING TWO AGENDA ITEMS TO “A LATER TIME”
VOTE: YES (4) NO (0) ABSENT (2) MAYOR LUTES & DERREK JOHNSON**

(The City Recorder had asked if Council Member Youd meant to table the items until a specific date...he did not.)

ADJOURNMENT

The Mayor Pro-tempore adjourned the Meeting at 9:20 PM.

City Reorder