

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on July 14, 2009, at 7:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Alan Clark
Doug Hammond
Lurlen A. Knight
Douglas Peterson
Larry D. Shingleton

Mayor Fred Panucci
City Administrator Rodger Worthen
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:
Community Development Director GJ LaBonty
IT Director TJ Peace
Fire Chief Craig Cottrell

Visitors Present: Edith Reniker John Wilhite David Hall
TJ Jensen Matt Gertge Gary Mellor
John Hammond Tara Bennett Jamie Nagle
Ray Zaugg

1. Meeting Called to Order/Adopt Agenda

Mayor Panucci called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. as a regularly scheduled meeting, with notice of time, place, and agenda provided 24 hours in advance to the newspaper and each Councilmember. An invocation was provided by Councilmember Peterson and at the request of the Mayor, Boy Scout Jordan Howes representing Boy Scout Troop 585, led all present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COUNCILMEMBER SHINGLETON MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA. COUNCILMEMBER CLARK SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Work Session Meeting of June 9, 2009 were reviewed.

COUNCILMEMBER KNIGHT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF JUNE 9, 2009 AS PRESENTED. COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

The minutes of the Work Session Meeting of June 23, 2009 were reviewed.

COUNCILMEMBER CLARK MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF JUNE 23, 2009 AS PRESENTED. COUNCILMEMBER SHINGLETON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

The minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 23, 2009 were reviewed.

Councilmember Knight stated that page three, line 15, of the minutes includes a reference to the solvency of the Utah Retirement System (URS). He stated the percentage should be 80 rather than 72, which is the number included in the draft minutes.

COUNCILMEMBER KNIGHT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 23, 2009 AS AMENDED. COUNCILMEMBER SHINGLETON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

3. Public Comments

TJ Jensen, 3242 S. 1000 W., stated that during the last City Council meeting the Council discussed the City's budget and a possible tax increase and during that meeting he spoke and said that he believed that the City needed to increase taxes. He stated he now has additional comments about the budget; he is trying to 'wrap his brain around' the fact that the City has 153 employees. He stated that seems like a very large number to him. He stated he is aware that a large number of those employees are part-time, seasonal employees, but the number still seems large. He stated he would encourage the Council to do what the citizens elected them to do and look at all the jobs that the City has and determine if there are any jobs that are not needed. He stated he is sure that the Council has eliminated any unnecessary jobs by now, but taking a look at the number of jobs in the City can not hurt anything. He stated that if there are any jobs that can be outsourced in order to save the City some money the Council should consider doing that as well. He then stated that he found some statistics on a couple of websites and he found that the average wage for a male in Davis County is approximately \$40,000. He stated if there is any employee in Syracuse City that is not in 'top-tier management' that is making more than \$40,000 the Council should

review that position and see why that employee is making that much money. He stated that comment does not apply to law enforcement or fire personnel since those employees are putting their lives on the line for Syracuse residents. He stated that he also wanted to report that the unemployment rate in Davis County has doubled; Davis County is fortunate to have Hill Air Force Base (HAFB), which helps to keep the County's unemployment rate much lower than the national rate. He stated that the unemployment rate in Davis County is close to five percent and City employees need to understand that everyone is hurting and their job at the City should not be viewed as a 'security blanket'. He stated that Syracuse City is a corporation and it should be viewed as a business. He stated that the City is not for-profit, but it is a business and it is here to help the citizens pay for their services. He stated that, secondly, he listened to the Council discuss ideas regarding assisting businesses in the City and one suggestion he wanted to offer is creating a business directory that City residents could obtain at City buildings or the library. He stated the directory could provide information about businesses and the services they provide. He stated that if some businesses wanted to advertise in the directory they could be charged a fee to do so. He stated he thought enough businesses would be interested in the directory and some revenue could be generated. He then stated he thought it would be a nice idea for Councilmen to schedule time to visit a local business and advertise that visit to the public so that citizens could go and meet with the Councilmen and view them in an environment outside of City Council meetings. He stated that Councilmen could rotate through different businesses in the City, which would possibly stimulate the number of patrons spending their money at local businesses.

4. Councilmember Reports

Councilmember Shingleton reported that he visited with the Recreation Department regarding the Heritage Days celebration and staff told him that they felt it was the most successful Heritage Days celebration the City has had to date. He stated that he also visited with some vendors and they were happy with the citizen participation level and they also felt it was the best Heritage Days celebration as of late. He stated that the Recreation Department was very happy with the outcome of the event and he wanted to express that he felt they did a wonderful job. He congratulated the Recreation Department on a job well done. He stated that it is one of his responsibilities as a Councilmember to oversee the Recreation Department and he wanted to simply report that the event was very well organized.

Councilmember Hammond stated that he wanted to echo Councilmember Shingleton's comments regarding Heritage Days. He stated that staff put in a lot of extra time to for the event and it showed. He stated that he would also like to compliment the Fire Department on their actions to control a recent garage fire. He stated that the Fire Department does a good job and they are well prepared. He then stated that when the Council considers item seven on tonight's agenda he will not vote; instead he will abstain because the applicant whose application is being considered is his son. He stated that he will also refrain from making any comments regarding the item.

Councilmember Knight stated that he also wanted to compliment the Recreation Department staff for their management of the Heritage Days event. He stated that he attended activities Friday night, but there was a wind storm that night that forced the cancellation of the outdoor movie. He stated that he understood the City and the sponsor of the event planned to reschedule the outdoor movie and he asked if that has been done. City Administrator Worthen stated that Recreation staff is currently working to reschedule the activity. Councilmember Knight stated he appreciated the cooperation from both parties to get that done. He then reported that he met with Ben Wuthrich from the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) regarding road projects and Mr. Wuthrich provided some ideas about adding City roads to the State road plan in order to allow City projects to qualify for available grant funding. He then reported that while he was recently in Tennessee he met with Kim Kimmons who is the owner of some of the business property in the Town Center. He stated that Mr. Kimmons was concerned about the vacancy rates at the Town Center and he has agreed to meet with the Council when he is visiting Utah in the near future.

Councilmember Clark stated that he also wanted to thank staff for their work to organize and manage the Heritage Days event. He then stated that he has received a couple of comments from residents about the roundabout project and one of the comments was that the City finally did something right. He stated that he has not heard any negative comments about the project. He stated that he has talked with staff at Bluff Ridge Elementary and they have had no concerns or issues with crossing students at the roundabout. He stated the roundabout is a good project and it looks great with the flowers that were recently planted there. He stated that one citizen did tell him that they thought the City should hang Christmas lights from the pole in the roundabout to make it look like a Christmas tree.

Councilmember Peterson stated he had nothing to report.

5. Mayor Report

Mayor Panucci reported that the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) is running a little behind schedule on the Antelope Drive road widening project. He stated that they were hoping to be 99 percent finished with the project by this fall and they would come back in the spring to finish minor tasks and perform cleanup of the project area. He stated that he is

hoping that they can pick up speed and get back on track and get the project finished. He stated the intersection of 1700 South and 2000 West is very tough to navigate at this time. He then stated that relative to item seven on tonight's agenda he wanted to report that Councilmember Hammond reported to him that the applicant was his son. Mayor Panucci stated that he advised Councilmember Hammond that he did not need to recuse himself from participating in conversations about the project until the Council was ready to take a vote on the item. He added that City staff was aware that the applicant was Councilmember Hammond's son. He then stated the carwash will be good for the community.

6. Request to be on the agenda – Tara Bennett re: playgrounds accessible to those with disabilities.

Ms. Bennett requested a slot of time on the City Council agenda to discuss the option of constructing a park facility in Syracuse City that would be accessible to those with disabilities.

Ms. Bennett approached the Council and thanked them for giving her time to talk about this subject that is so important to her. She stated the playground she would like to be built in Syracuse City is inspired by her daughter, Chloe, who has cerebral palsy and a seizure disorder. She stated that Chloe has the physical capabilities of a one-month old child though she is actually two years old. She stated that she does not want any limitations placed on Chloe; she may need to do things different than others do them, but she will still be able to do them. Ms. Bennett stated that she has decided to propose that a playground for those with disabilities be built in Syracuse City. She stated that the playground would have a rubberized floor that would be beneficial for children that may be more apt to fall; the rubberized floor would also be easier to navigate for those with walkers or those in wheelchairs. She added there would be wheelchair and high-back swings; there is a 'table play' area with a sandbox that is lifted off the ground so it is more accessible for kids in wheelchairs. She stated the playground contains many different textures, which is important to kids with disabilities that need extra sensory input. She stated the most important thing is that all kids can play at the playground and everyone will realize they are 'in this together'. She stated that parks similar to the park she is proposing provide huge benefits to children with disabilities; they need stimulant input for their brains and that can be attained at this type of park. She stated that is why there are a lot of grants available for this type of project. She stated that she writes a blog for parents of special needs children and she gets between 3,000 and 5,000 hits per day. She stated that there is only one other accessible playground in the State of Utah and there is a fee charged for entry to the park. She stated that a similar park in Syracuse would have a large number of visitors, which would be a good thing for the City. She stated that the actual cost to construct such a facility is overwhelming at \$800,000, but all she is asking the City to do is help her find the land to build the playground on. She stated that she is in the process of organizing a non-profit organization (NPO) that she would use to apply for grants and conduct fundraising for the construction of the playground. She added that she would ask that the City help to maintain the playground once it is constructed. She stated there are several grants available at the Federal and State government level and there may even be some county or other government physical education grants available. She stated that she would first market the project by doing a press release and she would start another blog that would include a way for people to make donations through PayPal. She stated she would also place a sign at the site of the future park saying that the location would be the future home of Sunshine Park in honor of her daughter. She stated that she would like to locate the playground at Jensen Nature Park due to the amenities available at that location, such as water and toilet facilities, as well as the fact that there is a lot of acreage available at that location. She stated many people travel to Jensen Park already and it is an easy location for people visiting from out of town to access. She added that she would implement a nature theme in the playground.

Mayor Panucci agreed that the price to construct such a playground is overwhelming, but that it appears Ms. Bennett has found a way to solve that problem. He added that he would love to see this type of playground built in the community and he felt that the proper course of action would be for Ms. Bennett to meet with City staff and discuss different locations for the playground. He stated that his feeling is that it might be beneficial to build the playground near the City's Fire Station because kids like Fire Stations and if there were ever a health issue with one of the children visiting the park the ambulance would not be too far away. He added that locating the park near the Fire Station would require visitors to drive through the City's business center, which would also benefit the City. He stated that he would be wholly supportive of designating land for this type of use. He then asked if the City would have increased liability if this type of structure was built on City property and he asked if the structure would be certified for use by disabled children. Ms. Bennett stated that she has found that the structure that would be built would be certified for use by children with disabilities and she added that parents assume the risk by taking their kids to the playground.

Councilmember Clark stated this is the second time the Council has received a request for support of this type of project. Councilmember Peterson agreed and stated that his cousin visited with the City Council six months ago regarding a similar project. He suggested Ms. Bennett pool her resources with his cousin in the hopes that they could get more done at a faster pace.

Councilmember Knight asked how much property would be needed for the playground. Ms. Bennett stated she would need approximately two acres. Mayor Panucci suggested the Council direct staff to consider potential sites and then present the options to the Council who can then decide whether to reserve the ground for this type of project. Councilmember Knight stated that he also likes the idea of proposing multiple sites as options for the project, but he agrees that it would be a good idea to try to bring visitors to the downtown area of the City.

Mayor Panucci then commended Ms. Bennett for taking this project on. He stated it is a very big project and her daughter is very lucky to have her mom working on this type of project. Ms. Bennett stated that her goal is to have the playground constructed in five years. Mayor Panucci stated that if Ms. Bennett is able to join forces with Councilmember Peterson's cousin, it may take less than five years. Ms. Bennett agreed and added that she would like to build the playground in Syracuse and then assist with getting similar playgrounds built in different counties throughout the State.

Councilmember Hammond stated that he has a family friend that built a park in Logan upon the death of his child. He stated that he would provide Ms. Bennett with his friend's contact information so that she can gain some information from them regarding the fundraising aspect of their project.

Ms. Bennett thanked the Council for their time and consideration and stated that she will meet with Mr. Worthen as the Council suggested.

7. Site Plan Approval, Syracuse Car Wash, located at approximately 1818 S. 2000 W.

Applicant John Hammond is seeking approval of the site plan and architectural elevations for the Syracuse Car Wash located at 1818 South 2000 West. The location of this proposed building site is on Lot 6 of the Gertge Business Park (Lakeview Plaza). The applicant appeared before the Architectural Review Committee on Tuesday June 23, 2009. The primary concern of staff regarding the plans had to do with the fact that there is no direct access to this lot from a public street. All customers will need to enter the site from either the south across through the parking lot of the professional office building or from the north across the parking lot of the new proposed Iceberg restaurant. Other issues of concern were parking for staff, lighting of the vacuum bays, landscaping and site lighting. The applicant did receive unanimous approval from the Architectural Committee with conditions as outlined in letters to the applicant from staff and from Epic Engineering, copies of which were provided to each member of the Governing Body. The Commission discussed at length the flow of traffic to and from the car wash focusing especially on the queuing that may occur at the entrance to the wash (along the north side of the lot) during busier times. Mr. Hammond assured the Commission that his wash could process approximately one hundred twenty (120) cars per hour and the potential for excessive queue lengths was minimal. The applicant assured the Architectural Review Committee and Planning Commission that the type of finish materials for this building will be stone and stucco to match the existing Family Fun Center in the same commercial development. At this time the applicant is not seeking approval for any signage associated with this project. The applicant has indicated that they will apply at a later date for all signage. Staff can recommend that the Council approve the Syracuse Car Wash Site Plan and elevations subject to compliance with all comments from City staff and the Architectural Review Committee.

Councilmember Peterson asked if there will be vehicle detailing services offered at the car wash. John Hammond, owner of the Syracuse Car Wash, explained that in the area nearest to the structure there will be a lane designated for detailing services.

Mayor Panucci asked if there will be lighting on the south side of the building. Mr. Hammond explained that if the Council wants him to add lighting to the south side of his building he will do that. Mayor Panucci stated he would like to see some lights added there to increase security. Councilmember Knight stated he remembered a discussion during the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) meeting regarding lighting on the north side of the building as well. Community Development Director LaBonty stated that lighting will be installed in conjunction with the construction of the Ice Berg restaurant.

Mr. Hammond then reviewed the site plan for the car wash and explained that there were three lanes with arrows on them and that is the area that people will enter from and where they will pay; those areas will be very well lit.

Mayor Panucci asked if there is a landscaped berm on the north border of the property, to which Mr. LaBonty answered yes and explained that will provide a physical separation between lots five and six and there will be an opening to allow cars to pass between the two lots. Mayor Panucci asked if the berm should be as long as it is drawn on the site plan. Mr. LaBonty explained the length of the berm was recommended by the City Engineer due to the fact that the drive-thru for the Ice Berg restaurant is located so close to the property line.

Mayor Panucci asked where the dumpster for the car wash will be located. Mr. Hammond stated that he will share an existing dumpster with the Care-A-Lot facility to the south of his project.

Councilmember Clark stated that he has a couple of concerns about the project. He stated that he uses a car wash facility located near Sam's Club in Layton. He stated that the first concern he has deals with vehicles cueing to use the vacuums. He stated that at the Layton car wash it is not uncommon to see three or four cars cued for the vacuums on a Saturday. He asked where the cars will cue for vacuum use at the Syracuse car wash. He stated that it takes a longer amount of time to vacuum a car than it does to wash one and he asked how people will be able to access the vacuum area if there are vehicles waiting in line for the car wash. Mr. Hammond stated there will be an attendant present to assist with traffic management. Councilmember Clark stated that he is concerned that there could be chaos created by cars trying to get in and out of the car wash and traveling between the car wash and the Ice Berg restaurant. Mr. Hammond explained that people lining up for the car wash will have the option of pushing a button to indicate they want to use the vacuums only. Councilmember Clark stated that at the Layton car wash there are separate areas for cars to cue to use the car wash or the vacuums. He stated he does not believe that the way the facility is designed will work. Mr. Hammond explained the car wash can handle 120 cars per hour and that there will be a VIP lane for people that need to get in and out of the car wash faster. Councilmember Clark stated that is not his concern; rather he is concerned about the vacuum area. Mr. Hammond stated he did not envision a long cue line for the vacuums. Councilmember Clark stated he disagreed with that sentiment. Mr. Hammond then stated that the car wash will also house a separate vacuum service around the back of the building where employees will vacuum customer's cars. Councilmember Clark stated that the Layton car wash has that same service, but they also have approximately 20 (later found to be 14) self-service vacuum stalls that are always full. He stated that he believes there will be a back log of people waiting to wash their cars and the self-serve vacuum area will be blocked.

Mayor Panucci asked how imperative it is that there be three wash bays on the south side of the building rather than two. Mr. Hammond explained that he wants to have three wash bays; one will be used for detailing services and the other two will be used for regular washes.

Councilmember Clark stated he thought that Mr. Hammond had another car wash located in another city and he asked how that car wash is configured. Mr. Hammond stated that the vacuums at his other car wash are located in a different area. He then added that this car wash will be a full service car wash and he believes that customers will pay employees to vacuum their cars rather than doing it themselves.

Councilmember Peterson asked if there is a way to include more vacuums than three vacuums at the car wash. Mr. Hammond stated he would need to rearrange the entire plan in order to do that.

The Council then reviewed the site plan in detail and suggested options for rearranging the site, with Councilmember Clark stated that he does not know what the solution is, but that he does not think the business will work as it is currently designed.

Mr. Worthen asked Mr. Hammond if he has a business plan explaining how many cars will be washed in an hour and how many cars will be washed and vacuumed by employees versus self-service. Mr. Hammond stated that his business plan does include that information and he added that he thought that the number of people that will elect to have their car washed and vacuumed for them will be high based on the VIP program he plans to offer by which customers can purchase a monthly pass for unlimited car washes.

Councilmember Clark inquired as to the cost to vacuum a mini-van. Mr. Hammond stated that he has not put all his pricing together. Councilmember Clark reiterated that he takes his car to the Layton car wash and there is usually a line of cars cued to use the vacuums on a Saturday and it takes a lot longer to vacuum a car than to wash it. He stated that he is concerned about those customers that will not pay someone to vacuum their car versus vacuuming it themselves.

Mayor Panucci asked if customers with a VIP pass will get their car vacuumed as well as washed, to which Mr. Hammond answered yes. Councilmember Knight asked how many vacuums are located in the area that would be used for employees to vacuum customer's vehicles. Mr. Hammond stated there are nine vacuums in that area. Councilmember Clark asked if there will be nine employees operating those vacuums. Mr. Hammond stated that all nine vacuums may not be operating at the same time. Councilmember Peterson stated that it may be true that no customers want to pay for vacuum service and they want to vacuum their cars on their own. He asked if those customers would be allowed to use the nine additional vacuums if that were the case. Mr. Hammond stated that he had not planned on that happening as the nine vacuums are to be used for full-service customers.

Mr. Worthen then stated that he understands the Council's concerns about cueing issues at the car wash, but he pointed out that in essence the Council is second guessing Mr. Hammond's business plan. Councilmember Clark stated that is not his intent. Mr. Worthen stated that if Mr. Hammond's business plan does not work it will only be impacting Mr. Hammond. He asked if the Council is concerned about some type of safety issue. Councilmember Clark stated that his concern is that the problems could potentially impact the Ice Berg restaurant. He stated that if cars are not cueing correctly they could potentially back-up into the Ice Berg parking lot or onto 2000 West. Mr. Worthen stated that could be possible, but added that if he were driving by the car wash and he saw a line that long he would continue driving with plans to visit the car wash at a less busy time of day. Councilmember Clark stated he would do the same, but once cars get in the lines they

may not be able to get out. Mr. Worthen then suggested to Mr. Hammond that if the lines do become too long it might be possible to take some customers out of line and allow them to vacuum their own car in the full service vacuum area. Mr. Hammond stated that if the problem the Council is talking about occurs he would be happy to make some changes and do that.

Councilmember Knight asked if customers have the option of leaving their car at the car wash to be washed. Mr. Hammond stated that those electing to have their car detailed can leave their car, but those simply having their cars washed will stay with their cars. Councilmember Knight asked if detailed cars will be left in the wash bay once the detail is completed, to which Mr. Hammond answered yes. He added there will be tenants at the car wash at all times to assist customers with whatever they might need.

Councilmember Peterson inquired as to the hours of operation. Mr. Hammond stated the car wash will be open from dusk to dawn and his plans were originally to keep the vacuums open all night.

Mayor Panucci then suggested another option for rearranging the site to solve the vehicle cueing concern. The Council considered that option and suggested additional options with Councilmember Clark stated that he does not how to resolve his concern, but he reiterated that he does have a concern.

Councilmember Knight asked how wide the car wash lanes are. Mr. Hammond stated he believed the lanes are 50 feet wide each.

Mayor Panucci asked Mr. Hammond again if he felt it was imperative to have all three wash bays. Mr. Hammond stated he wants to offer detail services, which is why he wants to have three lanes. He stated it may be difficult to offer detail services if there are only two wash bays.

Councilmember Clark reiterated that he is not trying to second guess the business plan for the car wash, but he is concerned about having the cueing areas for the car wash and the vacuum area overlap. Councilmember Peterson stated that he shares Councilmember Clark's concerns, but he does not think that as a businessman Mr. Hammond will want his customers to sit and wait in line and be unhappy with the service they are given. He stated he believed Mr. Hammond would try to serve his customers as soon as possible.

Mr. LaBonty asked if there will be an on-site manager at the car wash. Mr. Hammond stated there will be an on-site manager and there will be surveillance cameras as well as several other employees paying attention to what is happening at the car wash.

Mayor Panucci stated that if there are no further comments or questions regarding the car wash he would entertain a motion.

COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MADE A MOTION TO GRANT SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE SYRACUSE CAR WASH TO BE LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1818 S. 2000 W. COUNCILMEMBER SHINGLETON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL COUNCILMEMBERS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER CLARK, VOTED IN FAVOR. COUNCILMEMBER HAMMOND ABSTAINED FROM VOTING.

8. Site Plan Approval, Iceberg Restaurant, located at approximately 1792 S. 2000 W.

The applicants, Matt Gertge & Eric Tuttle are seeking approval of the site plan and architectural elevations for the Iceberg Restaurant. The location of this proposed building site is on Lot 5 of the Gertge Business Park (Lakeview Plaza), which is directly south of the Arby's Restaurant. The type of finish materials will be brick, stucco and metal panel. The architect has reference the metal details on the City offices as an example of the type of metal finish on this building. The applicant appeared before the Architectural Review Committee on Tuesday, June 30, 2009. The applicant has also received letters with comments from staff and Epic Engineering, a copy of which was provided to each member of the Governing Body. The applicant has addressed many of the issues outlined in these letters and has committed to address all outstanding issues before receiving a building permit. At this time the applicant is not seeking approval for any signage associated with this project. The applicant has indicated that they will apply at a later date for all signage. This signage application will also include exterior building lighting. Staff can recommend that the Council approve the Iceberg Restaurant Site Plan.

Councilmember Knight stated that during the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) meeting regarding this site plan there was discussion regarding extending the outdoor seating area located at the front of the restaurant and he asked if that has been done. Matt Gertge, owner of Ice Berg restaurant, approached the Council and stated that he could not recall if that change had been made. Mr. LaBonty directed the Council to page five of the documentation provided regarding this item and he explained that the drawing does include an extension to the east side of the building of the outdoor seating area. Councilmember Knight stated that he likes the idea of outdoor eating; it seems attractive to a lot of people. Mr. Gertge agreed and stated that the restaurant's business plan encourages outdoor seating areas.

Councilmember Clark asked where the handicapped parking stalls for the restaurant were located. He stated that it might make more sense to move them to the opposite side of the building to prevent car wash traffic from impeding access to

handicapped stalls. Mr. Gertge stated that the proposed location of the handicapped parking stalls is the best location, but if the placing the handicapped stalls on the north side of the building would not violate any codes or standards he would not be opposed to that. Councilmember Clark stated that he was only thinking about that issue from a safety perspective and he recommended that Mr. Gertge review that option. Councilmember Hammond added that one negative aspect of locating the handicapped parking stalls on the north side of the building would be that more snow and ice may build up on the north side of the building during the summer months.

COUNCILMEMBER SHINGLETON MADE A MOTION TO GRANT SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE ICEBERG RESTAURANT TO BE LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1792 S. 2000 W. COUNCILMEMBER KNIGHT SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

9. Consideration of Bajio Grill's application for a Class B beer license.

Gary Mellor, owner of Bajio Grill, has applied to the City for a Class B license to sell beer at his new restaurant facility located at 2107 W. 1700 S., Suite 1 in Syracuse. Mr. Mellor has submitted all of the properly completed application paperwork and fees for this license. Mr. Mellor's application has been researched by the Syracuse City Police Department and they have found that Mr. Mellor has no criminal record. City Staff has evaluated the geographic location of Mr. Mellor's place of business in order to assess that he has met the criteria for both City and Utah State Code regarding the distance from the "nearest entrance of the restaurant" to the closest boundary of protected "community locations". At this time staff recommends that the City Council grant Mr. Mellor's request for a Class B license to sell beer at the Bajio Grill located at 2107 W. 1700 S., Suite 1, subject to meeting all of the requirements of Syracuse City Alcoholic Beverage Regulations (Title Five, Chapter Two).

Councilmember Knight inquired as to when Bajio Grill will open for business. Gary Mellor, owner of Bajio Grill, approached the Council and explained he planned to open for business in four to six weeks.

Councilmember Peterson asked if other Bajio Grill locations serve alcohol. Mr. Mellor stated that not all Bajio Grill locations serve beer, but there are three other Bajio Grill locations in the Salt Lake Valley that serve alcohol. He stated they have margarita machines; he is not sure how they work, but they comply with alcoholic beverage regulations. Councilmember Knight asked Mr. Mellor if he would have one of those types of machines in his restaurant, to which Mr. Mellor answered yes. Councilmember Knight asked if that type of machine is allowed according to the City's alcohol beverage control regulations. Mr. Worthen stated he would need to review State Code. City Recorder Brown added that the City is considering granting a beer license and Mr. Mellor will be required to apply to the State for his liquor license.

COUNCILMEMBER CLARK MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE BAJIO GRILL'S APPLICATION FOR A CLASS B BEER LICENSE. COUNCILMEMBER KNIGHT SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

10. Proposed Resolution R09-19 amending the Syracuse City General Plan Land Use Map adopted in 1976, as amended.

In reviewing the Town Center Master Plan, staff discovered that there were no explicit zonal boundaries defined in association with this the Master Plan. On Tuesday, June 2, 2009 staff presented the language for an amendment to Title X to create a new Town Center Overlay Zone to the Planning Commission. This language is meant to supplement, not override, any existing zones. This amendment was adopted unanimously. The new language was also presented to the City Council for adoption on Tuesday, June 23, 2009. The amendments were also unanimously approved by the City Council. Staff hereby presents the amendments to the General Plan map that correlate with the new language for Town Center Overlay Zone and explicitly identify the geographic boundaries where the zone restrictions will apply. Again, it should be noted that these changes to the General Plan map represent an "overlay" zone and as such do not affect any existing General Plan zones that have been previously established. Staff recommends the Council approve the proposed amendments to the General Plan Map, regarding the "Town Center Overlay Zone".

Mr. LaBonty briefly reviewed the staff memo regarding this item that was provided to each member of the Governing Body.

Councilmember Clark asked if changes were made to the General Plan Land Use Map to recognize changes recommended by Councilmember Hammond in a previous meeting. Mr. LaBonty stated that Councilmember Hammond's recommendation has been included in the updated Land Use Map. Councilmember Knight asked if that is the only change being made to the Land Use Map. Councilmember Clark stated that the Town Center Overlay Zone has been enlarged somewhat. Mr. LaBonty agreed and stated that the intent is to place a more definitive boundary on the south end of the Town Center area.

COUNCILMEMBER HAMMOND MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION R09-19 AMENDING THE SYRACUSE CITY GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP ADOPTED IN 1976 AS AMENDED. COUNCILMEMBER SHINGLETON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

11. Proposed Resolution R09-20 amending the Syracuse City Current Zoning Land Use Map.

In reviewing the Town Center Master Plan, staff discovered that there were no explicit zonal boundaries defined in association with this the Master Plan. On Tuesday, June 2, 2009 staff presented the language for an amendment to Title X to create a new Town Center Overlay Zone to the Planning Commission. This language is meant to supplement, not override, any existing zones. This amendment was adopted unanimously. The New language was also presented to the City Council for adoption on Tuesday, June 23, 2009. The amendments were also unanimously approved by the City Council. Staff hereby presents the amendments to the Current Zoning map that correlate with the new language for Town Center Overlay Zone and explicitly identify the geographic boundaries where the zone restrictions will apply. Again, it should be noted that these changes to the Current Zoning map represent an “overlay” zone and as such do not affect any existing General Plan zones that have been previously established. Staff recommends Council approve the proposed amendments to the Current Zoning Map, regarding the Town Center Overlay Zone.

Mr. LaBonty briefly reviewed the staff memo regarding this item that was provided to each member of the Governing Body.

Councilmember Knight asked if Founder’s Park is located in a General Commercial (GC) zone. Mr. LaBonty stated that Founder’s Park is currently zoned for GC use, but the general plan states that the land shall be open space.

Councilmember Hammond stated that there is a parcel of property on the map that is colored yellow with red hash-marks through it, but there is nothing in the map’s legend that defines what the coloring means. Mr. LaBonty stated that yellow is residential R2 zoning, but he thought that the parcels being referenced by Councilmember Hammond were supposed to be zoned for Professional Office (PO) use and he will make the appropriate correction to the map to reflect that change.

Councilmember Knight asked when the Founder’s Park ground was re-zoned for GC use. Mr. Worthen stated he could not remember when that happened and he would need to do some research to find the exact date. Mayor Panucci added that the ground has been zoned for GC use for a long time.

COUNCILMEMBER KNIGHT MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION R09-20 AMENDING THE SYRACUSE CITY CURRENT ZONING LAND USE MAP WITH THE AMENDMENT RECOMMENDED BY MR. LABONTY. COUNCILMEMBER SHINGLETON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

12. Authorize Administration to execute agreement with Davis County for 2009 Municipal Election services.

The 2009 Municipal Elections are fast approaching. Syracuse will fill three positions during the 2009 Election; Mayor and two Council seats. Syracuse has opted to conduct its election via electronic means; therefore it is necessary to execute an agreement with Davis County memorializing the services that will be provided to the City by the County. The exact services to be provided are detailed in the agreement; however, due to the high number of variables to be considered in planning an election, it is not possible to determine the exact cost of the services to be provided by the County until shortly before, and sometimes after, the Primary Election has taken place. The total budget for the 2009 Election as approved by the Council is \$35,000. The actual election costs should not exceed the total budget amount.

City Recorder Brown briefly reviewed the staff memo regarding this item that was provided to each member of the Governing Body.

Councilmember Hammond asked what the cost for past elections has been. Ms. Brown stated that in 2007 the City’s election budget was closer to \$40,000 and that was because there were two referenda on the City’s ballot and it was necessary to create voter information pamphlets and pay for postage to send those pamphlets to all households in the City. She stated 2007 was the first time that Syracuse City had done an electronic election, so the election budgets for elections held prior to 2007 would have been considerable lower due to the fact that elections were conducted using paper ballots. Councilmember Clark asked for clarification as to whether a paper ballot election is less expensive than an electronic election. Ms. Brown stated that paper ballot elections are less expensive than electronic elections.

Councilmember Knight asked how much the 2008 election cost. Ms. Brown stated that she did not have the answer to that question because that election was conducted by Davis County. She added that she was sure that the cost to the County was much higher than the cost to the City during a municipal election year because they have four or five polling locations in Syracuse City versus the single polling location used in the City during a municipal election. She stated the largest cost in an election is for poll workers and when a single polling place is used the labor costs are greatly reduced.

Mayor Panucci inquired as to the difference in cost in running an electronic election versus a paper ballot election. Ms. Brown stated that the difference in cost is approximately 33 percent.

Councilmember Hammond stated that he wanted to comment on Ms. Brown's professionalism in managing an election; she has done a great job in the past and he felt the voters have acknowledged that as well.

COUNCILMEMBER HAMMOND MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE ADMINISTRATION TO EXECUTE AGREEMENT WITH DAVIS COUNTY FOR 2009 MUNICIPAL ELECTION SERVICES. COUNCILMEMBER CLARK SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

13. Authorize Administration to execute Audit Engagement Letter with Woods, Richards, and Associates.

Mr. Worthen stated Woods, Richards, and Associates will be conducting an audit of the City's budget that ended June 30, 2009 and they are asking that the City execute a letter of engagement detailing the services to be provided. He stated that this will be the fifth year that this vendor will perform the City's audit and the City will likely use a different auditor next year. He stated that the auditor will review the City's financial statements and other activities relating to funding in the City.

Councilmember Hammond asked if the City has been satisfied with the nature of the audit in the past. Mr. Worthen stated the City has been satisfied and Woods, Richards, and Associates has done an excellent job for the City over the past four years. Mayor Panucci added that an auditor must be certified to conduct a municipal audit. Councilmember Hammond inquired as to the cost to conduct the audit. Mr. Worthen stated that last year the City paid the auditor approximately \$9,000 for their services. Councilmember Hammond asked how much time the auditor physically spends at City Hall. Mr. Worthen stated they typically spend about one week at the City offices. Councilmember Hammond asked if Councilmembers have the ability to meet with the auditors while they are conducting the audit. Mr. Worthen stated that historically has not occurred. Mayor Panucci stated that the auditor presents the audit report at the end of the audit process. Mr. Worthen stated that is correct.

Councilmember Knight stated that he feels it is a good idea to contract with different auditors for the audit service. Mr. Worthen stated that the project will be put out to bid next year. Councilmember Clark stated that he felt that changing audit firms would likely drive the cost of the audit up 10 or 15 percent.

COUNCILMEMBER KNIGHT MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE ADMINISTRATION TO EXECUTE AUDIT ENGAGEMENT LETTER WITH WOODS, RICHARDS, AND ASSOCIATES. COUNCILMEMBER CLARK SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

14. Proposed Ordinance 09-11 amending Section 1-19-2 of the Syracuse City Code regarding control of the City Administrator.

Mayor Panucci stated that one comment he has about this issue is that as he reviewed Title One he found there are numerous mentions of a City Manager. He stated that Syracuse City does not have a City Manager; rather, the position is titled City Administrator. He stated that it is necessary to amend every section of Title One that references City Manager and change that reference to City Administrator. Councilmember Clark asked if the position of City Administrator is included in the definitions section of Title One. Mr. LaBonty stated that neither of the terms – City Manager or City Administrator – is defined in Title One.

Councilmember Knight stated he feels there is a lot of work that needs to be done to updated Title One, but tonight the Council is only considering amending one paragraph of the Title and that is the paragraph referring to the control of the City Administrator. Councilmember Clark agreed and stated that he would prefer the Council only consider the issue noted on the agenda. Mayor Panucci disagreed and stated that tonight the Council is considering complying with the ballot title that was voted on by voters and he read the ballot title as follows:

“Shall Ordinance 06-20 be approved? The ordinance was passed in October 2006. Ordinance 06-20 provides language specifying City's form of government. It removes the Mayor's title of Chief Executive Officer. It changes the title of the office of City Administrator to City Manager who reports to the Governing Body as a whole rather than the Mayor only and designates the Manager as the Chief Executive Officer of the City. The Ordinance provides that the City Manager shall review and recommend contracts to the City Council and shall sign the contracts on behalf of the City.”

Mayor Panucci reiterated that the ballot title specifically references the change from the title of City Manager to City Administrator and he reminded the Council that the voters voted to not approve Ordinance 06-20. Councilmember Clark stated that approving a motion made tonight should take care of that problem. Mayor Panucci stated that as long as references to City Manager are corrected the problem will be taken care of.

Councilmember Clark asked if he is correct in his assumption that the purpose of this discussion is to ensure that Title One meets the requirements of the referendum. Mayor Panucci and Councilmember Hammond stated that is correct. Councilmember Clark stated that he does not want to be 'nit-picky' in the Council motion for fear that something may be

missed. Mayor Panucci stated that he did not believe it would be 'nit-picky' to change the title of City Manager to City Administrator because that is what the referendum said the City should do. Councilmember Clark agreed and he felt that a motion should take care of complying with the referendum. Councilmember Shingleton stated that when someone makes a motion they can simply add that all references to City Manager should be changed to City Administrator. Mayor Panucci stated that would be sufficient.

Councilmember Hammond then stated that during tonight's work session there was a discussion about what the definition of Governing Body is; he stated he felt there was some confusion about that. Ms. Brown stated that the term 'Governing Body' is defined in the City's code.

Councilmember Knight stated that he would prefer to vote on the change that has been advertised on the agenda and take some time to review the rest of Title One and write an additional ordinance to make any further needed changes. He stated that changes to 1-19-2 have been advertised on the agenda. He stated that the ordinance that amended that section was originally adopted to try to clear up some confusion and he would like to thoroughly review the rest of Title One to avoid any future confusion. Mayor Panucci reiterated that what the Council needs to do is comply with the referendum that the citizens voted on; the vote was to eliminate the title of City Manager and replacing it with the title of City Administrator. He stated the Council needs to make that change to be in compliance. He stated the citizens were very clear as to what they wanted; there was a group that trying to reach a different outcome. Councilmember Knight stated that he understands what happened in the past and he clarified that two different versions of amendments to Title One were proposed and after one was adopted there was a group that circulated a petition, etc., but at this time he would prefer to thoroughly review the entire Title to make sure that the correct changes are being made. He stated that the Mayor is asking the Council to vote on something that they do not have in front of them. He stated he agrees with what the Mayor is saying. Mayor Panucci stated it is very clear in the ballot title that the citizens were asked whether the title should be City Manager or City Administrator. Councilmember Clark stated that is very clear, but he shares the same concern as Councilmember Knight in that the agenda item was specific to one section and he asked Ms. Brown if that creates any problems for the Council. Mayor Panucci asked if there would be a problem with making a motion to change all references of City Manager to City Administrator. Ms. Brown stated there would not be a problem; there was no public hearing set for this item, but the agenda language did only include a reference to Section 1-19-2 of Title One. She stated that if the Council desires to make a motion to replace all references to City Manager with City Administrator that is their prerogative. She stated that this discussion will be in the record. She added that there are several other sections of Title One, besides the references to City Manger, that need to be reviewed and updated by the Council. She stated that the entire Chapter regarding elections is grossly outdated. She stated that she talked with the City Attorney about Title One and staff would like to have an item on an agenda in the near future to make significant changes to Title One.

Councilmember Clark asked if there is a problem created by the fact that neither the position of City Manager or City Administrator is defined in the City Code. Ms. Brown stated that the first section of Chapter 19 of Title One states that the office of City Administrator has been created in accordance with State Law. She stated that same type of language is not present relative to the position of City Manager. She added that the City Administrator's general duties are defined in that Chapter as well and throughout that Chapter most references to the position say City Administrator. She stated she believed there were only four references to City Manager remaining in Chapter 19 of Title One. Mayor Panucci stated that he found more than four references to City Manager.

Councilmember Hammond stated that one issue raised by the City's Human Resources Director is that there is a difference in the pay range for the positions of City Manager and City Administrator so it is necessary to clarify that as well. Mayor Panucci stated that page three of the packet information includes references to City Manager.

Councilmember Peterson asked if this is the ordinance that was voted down by the voters, to which Mayor Panucci answered yes and explained that is why the changes being discussed are necessary. Ms. Brown stated that is not totally accurate. She explained that Ordinance 06-20 was adopted in October 2006 and it was the ordinance that initially changed the title of City Administrator to City Manager. She added that it also removed the title of CEO from the Mayor and assigned that title to the City Manager. She stated there were numerous other changes made to Title One; the City's form of government was defined and the section regarding the control of the City Administrator was amended, in addition to many other changes. She stated six weeks later the City was dealing with an issue where an employee was appealing his termination, but the City's Employee Appeal Board (EAB) had not been created correctly. She stated the City Attorney wrote another ordinance that created the EAB, but there were also other sections of the Code that were changed to make the EAB valid. She explained the City Attorney used the title of City Manager because it had been implemented by Ordinance 06-20. The second ordinance dealing with the EAB, Ordinance 06-24, was adopted, but it was not subject to the referendum that was filed regarding Ordinance 06-20; the ballot title clearly refers to Ordinance 06-20. She stated that the Mayor is correct that the sections of Ordinance 06-24 that were in conflict with the referendum should have been repealed. Mayor

Panucci added that to provide consistency throughout an employee should be called the same title, which should be City Administrator. Ms. Brown stated that is correct; the Title should refer to City Administrator.

Councilmember Clark stated he simply wanted to make sure that any change being made is being made in a legal manner. He asked if the City Council needs to hold a public hearing regarding this issue. Ms. Brown stated it is not necessary to hold a public hearing, though the Council can hold a public hearing regarding any issue. Councilmember Clark stated he simply feels that the Council is being asked to make changes that were not advertised, even though he agrees that the changes are necessary. Ms. Brown stated that she does not want the impression given that Ordinance 06-24 was a 'back-door' approach to keeping the title of City Manager and that staff did not repeal sections of Title One that were in contradiction to the referendum. Mayor Panucci stated that is not an issue at all.

Councilmember Knight asked if the Council should make a motion to replace references to City Manager with City Administrator, but at this time they should not ask that Title One be repealed and the version of Title One that was in place prior to the adoption of Ordinance 06-20 be re-implemented. Ms. Brown stated that she has already repealed Ordinance 06-20 and any changes made to Title One by that ordinance have been removed. She stated that there are still some sections may still refer to City Manager, but the content of Title One has been changed to its pre-Ordinance 06-20 state with the exception of Section 1-19-2. She stated that Ordinance 06-20 was totally repealed by the voters and any change made by that ordinance has been pulled from Title One. Councilmember Knight asked why the appropriate changes were not made to Section 1-19-2. Ms. Brown stated the change was not made to Section 1-19-2 because that section was also affected by Ordinance 06-24, which was not repealed by the referendum. She stated that she had included a copy of Ordinance 06-24 in each Councilmember's packet so they could see the changes made by that ordinance.

Mayor Panucci stated the Council's motion should be to adopt Ordinance 09-11 and change any reference to City Manager to City Administrator. Councilmember Clark stated he agrees, but he is confused. He asked if Ordinance 06-24 was adopted during the creation of the EAB. Ms. Brown stated that is correct. Councilmember Clark stated that if section 1-19-2 was amended by Ordinance 06-24 and Ordinance 06-24 was not subject to the referendum he was confused as to why the Council is being asked to make changes to repeal Ordinance 06-24. Ms. Brown stated that even though Section 1-19-2 was amended by Ordinance 06-24 it is in violation of the referendum ballot question and must be amended to be in compliance with the referendum. Councilmember Shingleton stated that the intent is to amend Title One so that it complies with the referendum. Councilmember Clark stated he understands that, he was simply confused as to why Ordinance 06-24 came into play. Ms. Brown then stated that the language that has been inserted in Ordinance 09-11 is taken from Title One in its pre-Ordinance 06-20 state. Councilmember Clark asked if these changes affect the EAB. Ms. Brown stated the EAB will still be in affect and valid.

Mayor Panucci stated that the recommendation to replace the title of City Manager with City Administrator simply provides consistency.

Councilmember Peterson stated there is a letter in the Council packets from the City Attorney that states that there may be some moderate risk to the City if the Council takes this action. He asked why that is. Ms. Brown stated that the City Attorney is stating that this new ordinance, Ordinance 09-11, could now be subject to a referendum if they feel that the Council should not make the change regarding the control of the City Administrator. Mayor Panucci stated that is true of any ordinance passed by the City Council. Ms. Brown agreed. Councilmember Knight stated that he was not sure that the change is such a big issue because the language still states that powers and functions of the City Administrator will be subject to the control of the Governing Body.

COUNCILMEMBER KNIGHT MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 09-11 AMENDING SECTION 1-19-2 OF THE SYRACUSE CODE REGARDING THE CONTROL OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR AND TO REPLACE ALL REFERENCES TO THE TITLE OF CITY MANAGER WITH CITY ADMINISTRATOR. COUNCILMEMBER HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

15. City Administrator Report.

Mr. Worthen stated that he recently sent an email to the Council regarding the suggestion that bio-solids be used for fertilizer at City park properties. He stated he spoke with an employee of West Point City and they told him that they use it as a soil amendment when constructing a new park rather than placing it on existing grass as fertilizer. He stated there is some difficult in spreading the material as well as controlling the smell. He stated that he also spoke with Kevin Cowan from the North Davis Sewer District and he also recommended that the material be used as a soil amendment and that it be tilled into soil prior to development of a park, but that the material not be used as a fertilizer. He stated that bio-solids were used at Bluff Ridge Park some time ago and it burned the lawn and it took a couple of years to repair the problem. He stated the bottom line is that he does not recommend using bio-solids as lawn fertilizer. Councilmember Knight stated that the City should take advantage of the availability of the material and till it into the ground; the best time to apply the material is during the fall months when the weather is cool. Mayor Panucci asked if there are any park areas that the City is considering

developing where the bio-solids could be tilled into the ground. Mr. Worthen stated there are no plans to develop park ground this year. Councilmember Knight stated that it could be used on the south end of Jensen Park; it could be spread and allowed to sit until development takes place. Mayor Panucci asked is a large amount of fill dirt will be needed on the south end of Jensen Park, to which Mr. Worthen answered yes. Mayor Panucci stated the bio-solids could be mixed with the top soil in that area. Mr. Worthen stated that would be a good idea. Councilmember Hammond stated that he has a question for Councilmember Knight that he could ask of the North Davis Sewer District Board; they do an amazing job in their processing at the plant and he is wondering if they are doing any research into opportunities for stimulus funding to breaking the bio-solids into a more granular state so that it can be used as a fertilizer. Councilmember Knight stated there is a company from Japan that is looking to buy all available bio-solids for use in various projects. Councilmember Hammond stated it would be interesting to see if the District has any future plans. Councilmember Knight added that the District has very green grass and it is watered with their nutrient-rich water. He stated that if the City could figure out a way to use that water it would be beneficial because every time the grass is watered it is fertilized. He stated the District has talked about pumping it to the Layton Canal for secondary water use.

Mr. Worthen then stated that during item 11 on the agenda there was discussion about making a correction to the zoning map to correct the zoning of two parcels of property that were listed as professional office property. He stated that in the General Plan the property is listed as professional office property, but the property owner, Mr. Barber, applied for a rezone some time ago to change the zoning to R2 so that if he decides to develop the property for residential use that will be allowed, but he could also apply for a professional office rezone and that would be in compliance with the General Plan. He stated the map that was provided to the Council was correct.

Mayor Panucci then asked if there is any update on the cross connection issue the Administration has been dealing with. Mr. Worthen stated that he should have an update by this Thursday. He is currently working with the property owners and the contractors that were involved during the connection phase of construction.

Councilmember Hammond asked Mr. Worthen if he has an update regarding the trees at Craig Park. Mr. Worthen stated that he has no update regarding that issue, besides the fact that the City has told the contractor they need to install the trees. He stated the City has bond money and they can use that money to plant the trees if the contractor does not complete the work. Mayor Panucci suggested the City give them a deadline to get the work done. Mr. Worthen stated that is what the City has done and it is up to the contractor if they meet that deadline.

At 8:57 p.m. COUNCILMEMBER CLARK MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Fred Panucci
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: July 28, 2009