

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

City of Saratoga Springs
City Council Meeting
December 2, 2014

Regular Session held at the City of Saratoga Springs City Offices
1307 North Commerce Drive, Suite 200, Saratoga Springs, Utah 84045

Policy Session Minutes

Present:

Mayor: Jim Miller

Council Members: Michael McOmber, Shellie Baertsch, Rebecca Call, Stephen Willden, Bud Poduska

Staff: Mark Christensen, Spencer Kyle, Kimber Gabryszak, Owen Jackson, Kevin Thurman, Jeremy Lapin, Sarah Carroll, Chelese Rawlings, Nicolette Fike

Others: Orrin Capener, Branden Watson, Curtis Leavitt, Aaron Sandborn, Chris Porter, Paul and Lora Hardman, Erica Groneman, Jentry McGregor, Jenni Allen, Ashtyn Josie, Josh Mortensen, Chad Groneman, Pam Peeler, Heather Jordan, Mindy Denisie, Sarah A Dean, Alicia Dean, Quinten and Jen Klingonsmith, Jayden Thomas, Amy and Shelby Hansen, Sam Sorensen, Don Whetten, Kyle Rigby, Jaci Howard, Bryan Flamm, Derrick Isaacson, Heath Hooper, Davy Marshall, K. Becraft, Krisel Travis, Richard Richey, Jeff Cochran, Rachael Cochran, Mike Kelly, Roxanne Beal, Steve Larsen, Paul Linford, Andrea and Orrin Capener, B.J. Rosenham, Nate Brockbank

Call to Order 7:02 p.m.

Roll Call - Quorum was present

Invocation / Reverence - Given by Councilwoman Call

Pledge of Allegiance - led by Kevin Thurman

Awards, Recognitions and Introductions

- Awards were presented to Chic-fil-A, Walmart, Little Ceasars, Alpha Graphics of Lehi, Costco, Jimmy Kawato, and Kneaders for help with the Utah Fallen Hero's Family Day.

Public Input – Opened by Mayor Miller

Jennifer Klingonsmith commented on the proposed Springs annexation. She spoke on the proposed use and zoning for the piece. She feels it is too much high density and there are better uses for that area.

Sarah Dean expressed appreciation for the efforts to keep the prison out of the City area. She has lived in an area with a federally imposed prison and it made them feel less safe and there was an increase in crime.

Richard Richey was against the proposed prison and wondered how the annexation would impact the decision.

Council directed Mark Christensen to respond to him after a final decision was made regarding the annexation.

Alicia Dean spent some time researching the prison issue and is now opposed to having the prison in our area or in Eagle Mountain. She had some comparisons to our city and Draper, their crime rate is higher which is attributed to the prison being near.

David Marshall lived in a town with two prisons and he noted times when prisoners escaped and schools were locked down, and searches that would take place in neighborhoods.

Councilwoman Call encouraged those with prison comments to also email those to Owen Jackson at the City so he will have those comments to add to the file to be submitted to the State.

Erica Groneman, thanked Council for the opposition to the prison. She is responsible for the prison survey they have sent out and wonders if she could give those responses to the City.

Staff and Council indicated yes, they would like to take that information.

Public Input – Closed by Mayor Miller

54 **Policy Items**

55
56 **1. Consent Calendar:**

57 **a. Final Plat for Talus Ridge Plat B located at approximately 550 North 800 West, Edge Homes,**
58 **applicant.**

59 **i. Resolution R14-49 (12-2-14): Addendum to resolution of the City of Saratoga Springs pertaining**
60 **to the City Street Lighting Special Improvement District to include additional subdivision lots.**
61 **(Talus Ridge Plat B)**

62 **b. Preliminary Plat for Heron Hills located at approximately 3250 South Redwood Road, Steve**
63 **Larson, applicant.**

64 **c. Amendment to Stillwater's Design Guidelines, Stillwater Homeowners Associations, applicant.**

65 **d. Approval of Minutes:**

66 **i. November 18, 2014.**

67
68 **Motion from Councilwoman Call to approve the Consent Calendar including changes to the**
69 **November 18, 2014 minutes that Councilwoman Baertsch submitted earlier today. Second from**
70 **Councilman Poduska.**

71 **Aye: Councilman Willden, Councilwoman Baertsch, Councilman McOmber, Councilwoman Call,**
72 **Councilman Poduska Motion passed unanimously.**

73
74 Councilwoman Baertsch noted to the audience that the Arts Council is hosting a Messiah sing-in and concert at
75 Westlake High on Dec. 8th, at 7p.m. along with the Eagle Mountain Arts Alliance.

76
77 **2. Public Hearing: Budget Amendments to the City of Saratoga Springs Budget for Fiscal Year 2014-2015.**
78 **a. Resolution R14-50 (12-2-14): A resolution amending the City of Saratoga Springs Budget for Fiscal**
79 **Year 2014-2015.**

80 Chelese Rawlings briefly reviewed the changes. 2 more outfalls in storm drains, Roads and capital funds
81 included Riverside Dr. and Market Street, also defunded some projects that are complete.

82 No discussion from Council.

83
84 **Public Hearing - Opened** by Mayor Miller

85 No input at this time.

86 **Public Hearing - Closed** by Mayor Miller

87
88 **Motion by Councilwoman Baertsch to approve Resolution R14-50 (12-2-14): A resolution amending the**
89 **City of Saratoga Springs Budget for Fiscal Year 2014-2015. Seconded by Councilman McOmber.**

90 **Aye: Councilman Willden, Councilwoman Baertsch, Councilman McOmber, Councilwoman Call,**
91 **Councilman Poduska Motion passed unanimously.**

92
93 **3. Preliminary Plat for Mallard Bay located between 2800 and 3000 South Redwood Road, Holmes Homes,**
94 **applicant.**

95 Sarah Carroll reviewed the Plat. They are requesting that the city take over the actual trail along the
96 lakeshore, not the green space. They made a change to the proposed fencing, now they are proposing a 4'
97 semi-private on a berm along Redwood Rd. Fencing would be maintained by property owners or HOA.
98 She reviewed the revised park plans.

99 Curtis Leavitt for applicant felt they have come up with what would meet the needs of the residents in the
100 development and the City.

101
102 **Public Hearing - Opened** by Mayor Miller

103 No input at this time.

104 **Public Hearing - Closed** by Mayor Miller

06 Councilman Willden appreciated the efforts the developer has made to accommodate the Council's requests.
07 He appreciates that these are HOA parks but that he is including parking. He is for approving the
08 preliminary plat.

09 Councilwoman Baertsch asked for clarification on the fence along Redwood rd.

10 Mike Kelly said they are proposing a 4' high berm and a 4' high fence.

11 Councilman McOmber asked with the HOA if they are going to allow a bigger fence.

12 Mike Kelly responded that no, it should be sufficient.

13 Councilwoman Baertsch appreciated all the work they had done. She is not in favor of maintaining the trail
14 area.

15 Kevin Thurman thought it had been the City's policy to maintain the sidewalk part of the trails.

16 Council felt they needed more clarification on that issue, they were aware of some areas where they did not.

17 Councilman McOmber thought that consistency was needed with fencing and trails throughout the city. With
18 the 4' berm and fence he thinks that is fine. He wants to see where the trail ends up and wants to make
19 sure there are eyes on the trail. He is concerned that the berm may block the trail view. He believes that
20 tot-lots get very little use; he thought more regional type parks were better. He appreciates the parking,
21 and feels the neighbors will be appreciative that people aren't parking in front of their homes. Make sure
22 around the trail parking that there is nice landscaping, not native weed area. He was appreciative of all
23 that the applicant has done.

24 Councilwoman Call is fine with the 4' berm and 4' fence. She commented that many parcels adjacent to them
25 have a more wrought iron style fence; they may want to consider that to make the look more uniform.

26 The flag lots are concerning but staff has not expressed any major concern so she is ok with that. She
27 also appreciates the platform playground being replaced. She is sad to see the restroom go away, even
28 though it is a smaller development and HOA, little ones need to use the restroom and it's hard to take
29 kids home to use the restroom.

30 Councilman Poduska appreciated the work the developer has put forth. He noted this is prime land in
31 Saratoga Springs so he was concerned when some of the amenities were refused. He recommends the
32 conditions put forth in order to produce a high quality product.

33 Councilman Willden requested that they revisit the maintenance of the trails.

34 Kevin Thurman noted they had two options to accept the maintenance or require a public access on the trail.

35 Council considered different areas where they maintained the trail. It is mainly on a development case by
36 case basis. There are some segments the city maintains some that HOA's maintain.

37
38 **Motion by Councilwoman Baertsch that the City Council approve the Mallard Bay Preliminary Plat,**
39 **located at approximately 2800-3000 South Redwood Road, Holmes Homes, applicant, including all**
40 **Staff findings and conditions. Modifying condition #3 to say that the Redwood rd. and Lakeshore 8'**
41 **trail ownership and maintenance be with the HOA unless precluded by other agreements, and that**
42 **there be a public access included on those. That condition #7 be changed from a 20 ft. gazebo with**
43 **built in benches to show that they have changed that back to a second pavilion. And condition 4 that**
44 **the 4' berm and 4' semi-private fence along Redwood road is acceptable and that the Lakeshore split**
45 **rail fence is acceptable as well. And the condition #8 as newly submitted is accepted for 18 parking**
46 **spots. Seconded by Councilman McOmber.**

47 **Aye: Councilman Willden, Councilwoman Baertsch, Councilman McOmber, Councilwoman Call,**
48 **Councilman Poduska Motion passed unanimously.**

49
50 **4. Public Hearing and Possible Recommendation on the Rezone, General Plan Amendment and**
51 **Community Plan for Wildflower located 1 mile west of Redwood Road on SR 73 and west of Harvest**
52 **Hills Development, DAI/Nathan Shipp, applicant.**

53 **a. Ordinance 14-29 (12-2-14): An Ordinance of the City of Saratoga Springs, Utah, adopting**
54 **amendments to the City of Saratoga Springs' Official Zoning Map for certain real property**
55 **(Wildflower); instructing the City staff to amend the City Zoning Map and other official zoning**
56 **records of the City; and establishing an effective date.**

57 **b. Motion to approve or deny the Community Plan, or to table the decision.**

58 Kimber Gabryszak presented the Community Plan and General Plan amendment. Of note was that UDOT
59 has proposed Mountain View Corridor through the middle of this Development. The applicant is
60 requesting that the density from that acreage be shifted to the remainder of the property. She reviewed
61 public input and Planning Commission input. At this time there is not any double dipping with UDOT
62 buying the property. They have three alternatives depending on how UDOT proceeds with the MVC
63 area.

64 Mark Christensen noted they had included those options because UDOT has not come through yet. And it
65 provides a view to residents and the City of what might happen.

66 Councilman McOmber does not like option C but thinks A and B are fair. He doesn't think the developer
67 should lose the value of the density they have already been given especially if the state forces them to
68 take lower prices. We need MVC so we need to make sure we are straight forward to the developer and
69 residents and he would give that density if needed. We need to look at the ways to make it work.

70 Kimber Gabryszak continued with the proposed plan. She addressed Residential, Commercial and Open
71 space numbers. They are going with ERU's so they can plan for churches and schools. The Regional
72 Commercial zone will remain the same. The applicant has put limitations on the maximum percentage of
73 smaller lots allowed in various phases, or pods. There will be future village plans and subdivisions
74 brought forward for approval with more details. She reviewed new changes to the conditions.

75 Kevin Thurman commented that the Community Plan needs to be consistent with the City's adopted Capital
76 Facility and Impact Fee Condition as in the Engineer's report. There is a development agreement that he
77 has not approved yet, we do not want to imply approval of that agreement tonight.

78 Nathan Shipp for applicant appreciated the work they have been able to do with city staff. They have spent
79 time in this last process working with Harvest Hills neighborhood and HOA, Camp Williams, UDOT,
80 and the City. They wanted to do what makes the most sense. MVC was a large impact into their original
81 plans. They would like some flexibility to be able to still provide the amenities to the neighborhood and
82 city. They have left the plans on the east of MVC and took the 344 displaced lots and proposed to add
83 some higher density to the South west area of the plan, nearer to the Regional commercial area. They feel
84 the Community Plan is the best way to bring this to the City. They don't have a final agreement with
85 UDOT and are trying to work with them and feel they have come up, along with staff, a clear way to
86 address what may happen. Within the commercial area they are looking to preserve the SR73 corridor
87 area also.

88 Brian Flamm was also present to help address questions from the Council.

89 Mark Christensen noted that they had been asking for an appraisal from UDOT for some time now and they
90 have yet to disclose an appraisal to them, either with or without a density on it.

91 Nathan Shipp said they are trying to find a way to move forward and still preserve the space for MVC. He
92 addressed that they have limited smaller lot sizes in different pods and have tried to make sure that they
93 are obligated to fulfil what they have shown.

94 Councilwoman Call asked how the minimum lot sizes were calculated.

95 Brian Flamm responded that it was done mainly on a case by case basis based on the housing types in each
96 pod.

97 Nathan Shipp said they were trying to balance between a contractual obligation and flexibility for anticipated
98 open space and changes that might need to be.

99 Councilwoman Call would like to open public hearing and then they could take all the input to further digest
100 and bring it back in a work session.

101 Nathan Shipp added a graphic that helped to show comparisons of densities to Harvest Hills.

102 Mark Christensen added that there will also need to be schools and churches that will need to be factored in
103 the future.

104 Jeremy Lapin noted that ERU's for a church were about 3-5 the highest was the High School at about 50.

105 **Public Input – Opened by Mayor Miller**

106 Jennifer Klingonsmith appreciated the additional clarity from the developer. She had some concerns on
107 the transfer of density and that they are working the 144 acres into the rest of the area. It doesn't
108 match the 10,000 square.feet lots in a true R3. The land is zoned R3 and he should be able to get a
109 fair amount for the land. She thinks the surrounding neighborhood properties and schools pay the
110

11 real price. If UDOT cannot pay fair price for the land they should consider building the MVC further
12 to the west. Please consider refusing the request for multi family dwelling. This area already has a lot
13 of high density housing, and this can double it. She appreciates that they have moved the high
14 density areas further away from Harvest Hills but it will still impact the demographics and schools,
15 traffic and property values. Proposition. 6 forces the city to show that only 7% of the city are
16 attached homes or stamped units. She hopes the city council does not set aside the city's wishes by
17 passing a development with 40% multifamily units. Grandfathering should not be allowed since the
18 application was not approved earlier. She asks that they reject this plan. She referenced Legacy
19 Farms and how it changed from what it was expected to begin with. She believes the smaller lots are
20 not necessary. She sees many larger lots that back up to Bangeter in the north. She believes the
21 product they have brought tonight is a great jumping off point. Please keep it in line with an R3 zone.
22 Jeff Cochran commented that he appreciated the applicant coming to the city. He is concerned with
23 density. He feels that currently Proposition. 6 limits are being exceeded. Approving this will further
24 exceed those limits. There is some denser planning coming forward already. He feels in a well
25 planned community there is some room for multi-family units. But this more than doubles the
26 number of high density units in this area. He is concerned that the high density housing is all
27 clustered mainly in this area of the city. He thinks any good developer will do a Performa and he
28 thinks that it is the developer's responsibility to negotiate a fair price with UDOT, it is not the City's
29 responsibility to make up the difference. He does not think this furthers the City's purposes of the
30 Land Use and Dev. Plan. He noted 19.17.4 and 19.17.6.

31 Erica Groneman asked how this would affect the prison.

32 Council noted this is not the property the prison is proposed to be on. It is just to the East of that parcel.

33 Rachel Cochran thanked them for public comment time. She is frustrated with the imbalance of the high
34 density areas in the city. So much of it is in the North. This does not meet the intent of Proposition 6.
35 She is frustrated that they knew MVC was coming and that the developer needs to deal with UDOT.
36 We should be adding more low density to this area of the city. She wanted to know what the actual
37 density was without MVC being included in the area. She asked them not to approve putting all the
38 extreme high density in one spot. It should all be one community.

39 B.J. Rosenham was concerned with why we needed to be fair to the developer, as a landowner we all
40 have risk, it shouldn't be transferred to everyone else. They should try to get the R3 price from
41 UDOT before anything is approved. He doesn't think that all the density should be transferred to the
42 area because of whatever UDOT does. It should remain R3 throughout. He appreciates what is being
43 done but thinks it can be done better.

44 Quinten Klingonsmith said keeping this R3 will improve our quality of life. It keeps with the clear
45 message voters made. To approve this is not a good idea. Recently Legacy Farms shows us what can
46 happen. Troubling is the goal to transfer density, it comes at an expense of residents currently in the
47 city. This is really a change from lower to higher density. They should negotiate for R3 zone prices.
48 If there is a public taking, let's not have it residents vs. developer losing value, it should be UDOT
49 taking that loss.

50 Davy Marshall, noted they had a lot of commercial development already in this area. There is none
51 further south. If they want more high density put it further south. Not all right there.

52 Derrick Isaacson asked would it be appropriate for the city to influence UDOT to give a fair price to the
53 developer.

54 **Public Input - Closed** by Mayor Miller

55
56 Nathan Shipp appreciated the comments and asked if Council had questions.

57
58 Councilwoman Call would like to go through Council and have just high level concerns and come back with
59 a work session to get into the details.

60 Councilwoman Baertsch asked what the mixed use area is; it seems odd outside by itself.

61 Nathan Shipp said they did not have a specific use for that area at this time. It was a separate parcel at this
62 time and it would need to be brought in later under a site plan.

53 Councilwoman Baertsch noted that technically Prop. 6 did not talk about densities. She ran some numbers
54 and what they proposed is overall lower density number of houses than what this is. Prop 6 does talk
55 about types of houses and she is concerned with the clustering of that density. That is a massive amount
56 of that all together. If they accepted this she would rather see that spread out. As far as the overall,
57 Harvest Hills is not R3 either, it's an R3 PUD. This plan is missing larger half acre/acre lots. In the JLUS
58 area they want nothing more dense than 2 units per acre. As for other items she is not ok with the
59 5' setbacks on both sides of the houses. She still has questions about the density transfers. If she would do
60 the plan without the MVC they would still have to build a lot of roads that would take out some of that
61 area. She appreciates the move to ERU's. They might be able to do some sort of hybrid where houses are
62 not just shoved out further because a church goes in. She would like to study the item further before they
63 approve it.

64 Councilman McOmber thought it was important to show that the development has truer R3 than Harvest
65 Hills does now. There will be added Open space. They believe in having like communities near like
66 communities and he feels it is important that they look at the density that is like density to existing.
67 Having all the high density in one space is concerning. If there was more space to spread those
68 apartments out it would be a superior product. Consider spreading it out through the development. With
69 the MVC, it was on the Master plan earlier and they knew it was coming. UDOT should not force them
70 to sell it at agriculture value, it should be at and R3 zone. With the density it is feathering west and Eagle
71 Mountain has high density coming close to this area. We need to be cognizant that Eagle Mountain has
72 no problem putting high density and industrial right on our boarder and we don't want to lose this land to
73 Eagle Mountain and get a worse product. We need to do the best we can to feather that high density to
74 lower towards Harvest Hills. We don't want to push these developers to choose a neighbor that doesn't
75 have a problem with zero lot lines or industrial and smaller lot sizes. They could put some townhomes in
76 the northern area perhaps. He thinks the larger lots should not be right near the freeway. He recommends
77 that their roads go over the MVC, not under to keep the MVC low down. He thinks they could have
78 gotten something from Council today but they don't want to make a sloppy decision.

79 Councilwoman Call agrees with Councilwoman Baertsch on missing larger lots in the plan. She doesn't like
80 5' setbacks; she would like the applicant to change the large bracketed ranges to smaller bracket-right
81 now they vary by sometimes 50% in lot size and on the lot reduction criteria, perhaps up to 10 %
82 reduction rather than 25%. She shares the same concern with ERU's and dispersing higher density. She
83 is having trouble with the quantity of the density. She thinks without MVC the plan looked like less
84 units, around 900.

85 Nathan Shipp said they calculate the density before open space is taken out.

86 Councilwoman Call understands that he needs some flexibility and she would like to give that without giving
87 a PC zone. As it looks right now, it's too high of density.

88 Councilman Poduska believes they will have the freeway built. He doesn't agree with Harvest Hills wanting
89 to be surrounded by R3 when they don't have that large of neighborhoods themselves. He doesn't have a
90 real problem with the proposed density as it matches what is surrounding. He thinks it will be hard to
91 have the community feel with a freeway going through the middle. He suggests dividing the community
92 into two separate projects. Perhaps they could feather out the density from the freeway out, with smaller
93 lots near the freeway. That may help to spread out the density more.

94 Councilman Willden knows that the developer is being challenged with this project. He appreciates the
95 feathering idea and having the concentrations on the west side of the freeway. He noted that many people
96 in Harvest Hills bought property with the understanding that R3 would be next to them.

97
98 Nathan Shipp said they have been working on this for over 18 months. They will have lots of opportunities to
99 discuss details as the village plans come. They have motivation to make sure it's done right on the front
100 end.

101
102 Councilman McOmber commented that they normally don't have a meeting coming on in the next few
103 weeks; he would be willing to have a work session in a few weeks. He doesn't think it's fair to make
104 them wait until January.

16 **Motion from Councilwoman Call to table the Ordinance 14-29 (12-2-14): An Ordinance of the City of**
17 **Saratoga Springs, Utah, adopting amendments to the City of Saratoga Springs' Official Zoning**
18 **Map for certain real property (Wildflower); instructing the City staff to amend the City Zoning**
19 **Map and other official zoning records of the City; and establishing an effective date. And to Table**
20 **the Community Plan, inviting applicant to come back in a few weeks with for a work session.**
21 **Second from Councilman Willden.**

22 **Aye: Councilman Willden, Councilwoman Baertsch, Councilman McOmber, Councilwoman Call,**
23 **Councilman Poduska Motion passed unanimously.**

24
25 Council agreed to meet with applicant in two weeks.

26
27 **5. Potential Acceptance of The Springs Annexation petition for further consideration located west of the**
28 **proposed Wildflower project, approximately 1000 North 1000 West, adjacent to the south border of**
29 **Camp Williams, Western States Venture, applicant.**

30 Kimber Gabryszak presented the request for annexation. They are asking for an amendment to the zone map
31 and General Plan land use map. This is just for the city to consider accepting the petition for further
32 consideration. There would be further process to approve or deny the annexation.

33
34 Councilman McOmber asked Legal Counsel if they are allowed to talk about the densities tonight.

35 Kevin Thurman replied that it's a legislative decision right now, at some time further they would have to
36 have that discussion, when it's annexed they will attach a zone to it.

37 Councilwoman Call said if they do nothing after 14 days it automatically goes through the process.

38 Councilman McOmber wanted to talk to what the densities might be. He alluded to earlier comments where
39 this property is situated, along a power corridor and next to Eagle Mountain industrial. For him that
40 creates a natural feather buffer to what Eagle Mountain has put right next to this. We have to look at the
41 view of feathering the densities, higher next to shops and industrial. With this annexation he thinks that
42 they need to allow the higher density, especially to keep the prison out. This is the better option.

43 Councilwoman Call encouraged the applicant to work with the Staff and Council and welcomed them to the
44 city.

45 Councilman Poduska recommends that they consider this annexation and go forward.

46 Councilman Willden echoes Councilman McOmber's comments about feathering this out; it makes sense
47 and will line up. He would much rather have this as high density rather than a prison.

48 Councilwoman Baertsch is willing to go through the process of looking at this annexation.

49 Mayor Miller thanked them for the application and looked forward to going through this process.

50
51 **Motion from Councilwoman Baertsch to accept the Annexation petition for further consideration for**
52 **the Springs, located approximately 1000 North 1000 West, adjacent to the south border of Camp**
53 **Williams, Western States Venture, applicant. Second from Councilman McOmber**

54 **Aye: Councilman Willden, Councilwoman Baertsch, Councilman McOmber, Councilwoman Call,**
55 **Councilman Poduska Motion passed unanimously.**

56
57 **6. Motion to enter into closed session for the purchase, exchange, or lease of property, pending or reasonably**
58 **imminent litigation, the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual.**
59

60 **Councilwoman Call made a motion to enter into closed session for the purchase, exchange, or lease of**
61 **property, pending or reasonably imminent litigation, the character, professional competence, or**
62 **physical or mental health of an individual. Seconded by Councilwoman Baertsch.**

63 **Aye: Councilman McOmber, Councilwoman Baertsch, Councilman Willden, Councilman Poduska**
64 **and Councilwoman Call. Motion passed unanimously**

65
66 Meeting Adjourn to Closed Session 9:45 p.m.
67
68

59
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Closed Session

Present: Mayor Miller, Councilman Willden, Councilwoman Baertsch, Councilman McOmber, Councilwoman Call, Mark Christensen, Kevin Thurman, Spencer Kyle, Nicolette Fike

Closed Session Began at 9:55 p.m.

Present:

Mayor: Jim Miller

Council Members: Michael McOmber, Shellie Baertsch, Rebecca Call, Stephen Willden, Bud Poduska

Staff: Mark Christensen, Kyle Spencer, Kevin Thurman, Nicolette Fike

Closed Session Adjourned at 10:05p.m.

Policy Meeting Adjourned at 10:05p.m

January 30, 2015
Date of Approval



[Signature]
Mayor Jim Miller

[Signature]
Lori Yates, City Recorder