

Erda City Council Minutes

4/11/2024 – 7:00 pm

Tooele County Building - Auditorium

1. Call to Order 7:00PM
2. Roll Call
 - a. Councilmen: Scott Droubay, Craig Smith, Sheldon Birch, Clyde Christensen, Terry Miner
 - b. Jennifer Poole-City Recorder, John Brems- City Attorney, (Via Zoom) Rachele Custer -City Planner
3. Pledge
 - a. Sheldon led the pledge of allegiance
4. Public Comment
 - a. No comment made
 - b. Sheldon moved to close public comment, Craig seconded the motion
 - c. Voting was unanimous close public comment
 - d. **Public Comment Closed**
5. Approve meeting minutes from 3-28-24
 - a. Scott moved to accept the meeting minutes from 3-28-24, Craig seconded the motion
 - b. Voting was unanimous to approve the meeting minutes from 3-28-24
 - c. **Meeting minutes from 3-28-24 APPROVED**
6. Sheriff's Report
 - a. Sheriff Deputy - 68 details taken with deputies, there were 4 arrests and 69 citations.
 - b. Clyde-Where is Alpine academy?
 - c. Scott- That is just east of me on Erda Way and Droubay.
 - d. Sheldon- What is live for life?
 - e. Craig- They are a boys home. They are located on Bronzewood Cir
7. NTFD Report
 - a. Buck- It's been a normal month, a few medical calls at Live for Life and Alpine Academy. . Our new website is up and running go to NTFD.us In there you'll see the open burning session has begun. Go click on the link you can choose your area, it will be north Tooele. We don't don't control whether you can or can't burn, that's determined by the EPA based on the ceiling height and the atmosphere. We do have a prescribed burn that we are working on. It will involve 2 sites, one just south of Doc Taylor's place. He's had weeds come from the south and pile up on his fence. We are going to target the fence link between the waylands field and the new development. The second prescribed burn will be on Union Pacific property just west of Sheep lane. It will be one burn planned with two battalions. On April 19th you've been invited to the sim table. It's basically a

table with terrain underneath it. We will get to map our valley and put different scenarios and see what happens. We can simulate earthquakes, floods, and others.

- b. Clyde- Isn't the property owner supposed to take care of their own weeds?
- c. Buck- Yes they are, but there are some mitigating circumstances, with the storm that came in and brought in the extra weeds. We did get two grants to do these burns to reduce the fire hazard.
- d. Terry- So do you let people in the City know when you'll be doing those burns?
- e. Buck- We are doing that now with letting you know. We do have to let adjacent property owners know. Just because you can get a burn permit does not remove you from liability. But we will try to reduce the fireload to help the community.
- f. Sheldon- Will your prescribed burn be on your website?
- g. Buck- That will not be posted but we can let you know when we do that.

8. Treasurer Report

- a. Terry- Since our last meeting we had deposits of \$135,339.42. As a disclaimer \$132,183.80 was a transfer from the PTIF account so we could pay these bills. Disbursements we had a total of \$152,078.00. On the CC 916.96 charged. As a heads up we paid County roads 250 grand in the last couple months for roads.
- b. Sheldon- Is it appropriate for me to ask, what is the process for hiring a new treasurer?
- c. Terry- We will just need to get the word out like we did with Jennifer, that we need a permanent part time treasurer.

9. Consideration of **Ordinance 24-06 Compensation of Clerk / Recorder (Timestamp 20:15)**

- a. Sheldon-This is just a slight modification to the wording on the compensation of the clerk/recorder. On number 2 we are changing the wording to an average of 29 hours weekly instead of a cap of 29 hours so that Jenn can bill appropriately.
- b. Terry- We might want to add a line three where we pay overtime for anything over 40 hours in a week. But it must be pre-approved by three councilmen and the pay would be time and a half.
- c. John- When you talking about government employees you could also do it instead of overtime we can do comp time where she can claim those hours at a later time.
- d. Scott- What does it mean to have comp time?
- e. Terry-So instead of having 3 hours of overtime it would be saved for three hours of administrative time that she could use at a future time.
- f. Sheldon- So she could go on vacation and bill those times later.
- g. John- Also something to be aware of if she averages over 20/hr a week for a year's time she is entitled to URS.
- h. Terry- Is that 20 or 29 hours?
- i. John- I looked it up today and was surprised to see it says 20 hours on their website. Maybe you can talk to Dave. He might have more experience in this.
- j. Craig- I was talking with John about this today and I think it was saying if the employee was hired for a full time position and your hours are scaled back that at anything over 20 hours you're still full time. If you go under 20 you lose that. I've left a couple of messages for them to get more clarification on that.
- k. **Terry- I propose an item 3 that explains overtime pay at time and a half with the option of doing comp time, to be pre-approved by 3 council members prior to working., Scott seconded the motion**

- l. Craig- I think getting this done the way Terry described it makes sense.
- m. Sheldon motioned to open public hearing, Craig seconded the motion
- n. Voting was unanimous to open public hearing
- a. **Public Hearing Open**
- b. No Comment Made
- c. Craig moved to close public hearing, Scott seconded the motion
- d. Voting was unanimous to close public hearing
- e. **Public Hearing Closed**
- f. **Sheldon- We will consider the motion that was given by Terry and seconded by Scott to approve Ordinance 24-06 with the addition of the third line that explains overtime pay at time and a half with the option of doing comp time, to be pre-approved by 3 council members before the clerk is allowed work those hours.**
- g. **ROLL CALL VOTE: Scott-Yes, Craig-Yes, Sheldon-Yes, Clyde-Yes, Terry-Yes**
- h. **ORDINANCE 24-06 APPROVED 5-0**

10. Consideration of **Resolution 24-05** Appointing Michael Jensen to the Erda City Planning Commission replacing Jerry Hansen **(Timestamp 31:05)**

- a. Sheldon- This is a follow up from the last meeting. Is there any discussions on this?
- b. Terry- I don't know why we are trying to re-define the procedure on this. When we did this in the beginning it was pretty simple. The reason we set it up the way we did was so that it couldn't be manipulated by a simple majority of the council. If I remember right we asked for volunteers for the districts and the at large position. We had over a dozen applicants. We sat here and we all went through it. We each got to pick and appoint our own representative for our districts without the consent of the council because that's our appointment. It doesn't require anything from the council. I can't tell you who you appoint, you can tell me who I appoint. We've gone through this a couple of times with Kael. He got to appoint who he wanted. Now when we are going with the at large, this is specifically why we did this was that it required the consent of all districts. So all five of us went to the selection point. We discussed them all in an open meeting and then we all agreed on the two at large. Then the next week they were officially appointed by resolution to make the appointment official. That is exactly how it was done, and that's how I think it should still continue to be. If you also remember we tried to make it a neutral occupation to try to avoid any potential of influence. I just think it should be done the way we've done it before. We should use the past practice, that is the way it was done before and should continue to do in the future. This would be an opportunity that since both at large positions are coming up we could just cancel that position. And just have the regular five that we appoint to the commission and be done with it. Otherwise we should be doing this like we done in the past, all going over this list of names or if we wanted to narrow it down and each give a couple of names then talk about it like we are now. Then we all five agree on who the at large is, just like we did in the beginning. It wasn't a simple majority, it was all five consented to those two at large.
- c. Sheldon- I wasn't here to know what the process was before. So I reached out to the City attorney and tried to follow his advice. It didn't contain that explanation so I didn't follow that procedure. The second comment I disagree with one thing, I don't think all the names should be discussed in an open meeting. If we are discussing anyones character or qualification it should be done in a closed session not in an open public meeting.

- d. Terry- I think that its got to do if they are working for us. It's not their conduct. I could see if it was Jennifer as she works for us there could be things that we could say that might be disparaging but in this case there would be nothing. We don't know these people well enough to make any kind of conjecture or anything. With Mike, I don't know him that well. He might be a really good one to put but my issue is the process. We didn't use the correct process, we did use the one we did in the past that's been proven so that it takes more than the simple majority. So that it can't be stacked. John seems to be the scapegoat on a lot. I hear "well I talked to John " well he advises not directs we've gone against his advice in the past. I go by what actually happened at the time. I don't know that John was there at that time.
- e. Craig- My recollection of exactly what happened is slightly different than yours. We did have a list of people we did not go in depth about them in a public meeting. We did discuss them among ourselves quite a bit prior to the meeting. When Jess did appoint the people he did all five of us were in agreement. But anytime there is a resolution we get a vote. That's what a resolution is. We are here to vote. These people go in by resolution.
- f. Terry- That's not appointing them. There's two things: there's the selection.
- g. Craig- When you are appointed by someone you go in with a resolution, that's what makes it official. You can't go in without a resolution.
- h. Terry- The selection is a totally different process. Then the resolution makes it official, that's all it does. That is not appointing them. That is making the appointment that was already done. If I gave you that name you can not say they can't. It specifically says that only at large has to have the consent of the council. The individual district does not have to have consent. You are trying to bend things to say that the council has to have consent on your appointment because we get to vote on a resolution. That's not the way it was written.
- i. Sheldon- What's the difference between consent and voting on the resolution?
- j. Terry- Like I said, you don't have the right to tell me who I appoint to my district. To make it official it has to be by resolution.
- k. Craig- Which we all vote on.
- l. Terry- But you can't say no because we've never voted no on an appointment to the planning and zoning.
- m. Craig- Not yet. But if I get a vote I can always say no.
- n. Terry- You are still trying to skew it on the appointment of at large you want just three of you to decide who goes in there.
- o. Craig- No, I would hope all five of us can agree on who goes in there. If there's an issue, I would expect someone to say what their issue is.
- p. Terry- Well we all know what mine is, it's the process. I still don't think it's being done correctly.
- q. Craig- I'm not sure what part of the process you're upset about. A month ago Sheldon asked for input. If you didn't give him any input then you are a part of the issue with the process.
- r. Terry- We talked about it and I felt we should ask for volunteers. That's why I brought it up again. This one wasn't like that. This was simply you telling him who he should appoint to the council.
- s. Craig- I didn't tell him who to appoint to the council.
- t. Sheldon- That is not accurate.
- u. Terry- You told me you got his name from Craig.

- v. Sheldon- Yes, I did.
- w. Terry- Then you called him to see if he wanted the job.
- x. Sheldon- Correct, in addition to others. So I got a name from Craig of someone who he knew was interested.
- y. Terry- Then we got those 12 other names.
- z. Sheldon- I have had personal conversations with at least 80 percent of the people that applied and there are many good candidates. I am excited to get more of them at the next appointment.
- aa. Terry- Well you guys are going to do what you're going to do anyways. I've said my piece.
- bb. Craig- This isn't that much different. I talked with Kael considerably about his appointments to the Planning Commission.
- cc. Terry- You still can't tell him who he gets to appoint.
- dd. Craig- I didn't, I had many discussions with Kael on who he might appoint. This isn't anything new. Scott talked about his appointment before. Me and Jess talked about his appointment and my appointment. They are all discussions that we've had and input that we've given back and forth to each other. It's our appointment, we get to make that appointment, and no one has ever questioned that.
- ee. Terry- It doesn't say we don't get to appoint each district with the consent of the council. So it shouldn't require the okay of the council to get each district person on board.
- ff. Clyde-If the chair gets to choose the person from their district and then appoint the two at large, in theory they could load the Planning Commission.
- gg. Sheldon- That is a valid concern. I am in agreement that the chair may skew the Commission. I am trying to explain that I did not try to ignore the process. I did the best I could with the explanations that I was given. I did reach out to those that had applied. I did not feel that any were better options than the one that I had already picked. I do maintain that we should not discuss each of these candidates in an open meeting. I did have Jenn add the option do have the option to call a closed meeting
- hh. John- My understanding of what I wrote is advice and consent, he elicits advice from the council then needs consent of at least 3 people on the council to approve it.
- ii. Scott- I agree and I think we all agree that no one gets to tell me who to get to put into the Planning Commission. But if no one but Me and Craig can support that I need to go back and get someone else. We do both, we get our own choice, this particular nomination today was by advice from us, then we give our consent.
- jj. Terry- I agree mostly, but I feel that no one gets to tell me who I can appoint. I get to submit whomever I feel will best represent my district and the rest of the council has to vote yes on the resolution to make it official. It doesn't take a simple majority to approve it. Then to make it official it has to be done by Resolution.
- kk. Clyde- Can a Planning and Zoning Commissioner be pulled out of their appointment?
- ll. Terry- It says if they miss 4 consecutive meetings in a row we can remove them.
- mm. Sheldon-I believe there is something in City Code that allows us to remove it.
- nn. Terry- It states that members of the Planning Commission can be removed by 4 affirmative votes from the City Council.
- oo. **Sheldon- Motioned to approve Resolution 24-05 appointing Michael Jensen to the Planning Commission, Craig seconded the motion**
- pp. **ROLL CALL VOTE: Scott-Yes, Craig-Yes, Sheldon-Yes, Clyde-Yes, Terry- Abstain**
- qq. **RESOLUTION 24-05 Appointing Michael Jensen to the Planning Commission APPROVED 4-1**

11. Consideration of **Resolution 24-06** Amending Erda City Council Rules of Procedure

(Timestamp 56:10)

- a. Sheldon-There are two amendments to the procedure here. 2.2.3 Where it defines our public comment period. The second is adding a number 9 which is adding an additional Public Comment to the end of our meeting and gives the definition of the purpose of that public comment. We are open for discussion on this resolution.
- b. Terry- I think we should go through the whole thing. I am going to start with 1-1, I know we talked about this before but I think where it says the council chair shall be deemed as Mayor should be taken out of the equation. There is no need for a Mayor or deputy Mayor or all the stuff that I've seen by statute says that a governing body can be the City Council or city commission or Mayor council form of government. This Chair or whole purpose of the Chair is to chair the meeting and sign the documents that's it. They are not an acting Mayor, they are not the Chair of the City. They are none of that stuff, to stop the confusion we should just take out all mention of "acting Mayor" out of this.
- c. Scott- I do remember that being a part of the discussions.
- d. Terry- I don't know what it stayed.
- e. John- This is my brain child. There are certain obligations of a Mayor and the code is full of obligations to the Mayor.
- f. Terry- We don't have a Mayor.
- g. John- You don't have a Mayor, and if there is no designated Mayor, who will fulfill those obligations?
- h. Terry- Like what? In the two plus years I've been here there's been no call for a Mayor to do anything.
- i. Craig- No, there's been a lot of calls for it and the Chair has been doing it.
- j. Terry- That's another point I want to bring up. We are all the city council. It shouldn't be a funnel to where it stops at the chair, it should be an hourglass. To be given to the rest of us, so we are as informed as the chair is.
- k. John- That makes sense, you should always be as informed as anybody else. But that was my solution to the problem of no mayor. I don't know of another city besides Lake Point that doesn't have a Mayor. I put that in there to avoid any problem. For example a Mayor is the only one that can sign an emergency declaration.
- l. Terry- We have it so the emergency operations do that.
- m. John- No, a Mayor is the only one that can sign a disaster declaration. Statute is pretty clear on that.
- n. Sheldon- Terry will you allow me to research and work with John a little bit on that and get back to you?
- o. Terry-Sure. And then according to this it's Roll Call, Pledge, Public Comment, then we are out of order.
- p. Sheldon- So our agenda is out of order of the Policy, so should we move the agenda or the Policy.
- q. Terry- We should move meeting minutes to number 4 before the treasurer report. In 7-1 it says you have to be in the chamber to vote. I think we should change that to any councilmen participating in the meeting.
- r. Craig- It says that if you are in the chamber you shall vote, it doesn't exclude you from voting. We could state it that any council member participating in the meeting shall vote and remove the chamber.
- s. Terry- In part 6.1 it says you can vote, Yes, No and abstain, then it clarifies that abstaining means-no. I want it to be changed to say that abstaining means neither a yes or no vote.

- t. Sheldon- So he wants to have the ability to not vote.
- u. John-I don't think there is any legal reason, but in every Roberts Rule of order I am aware of it says that an abstain is a no vote.
- v. Sheldon- So removing that portion in 6.1 where abstain is a no vote we remove that portion.
- w. Terry-yes.
- x. Sheldon- The next portion is adding a Public Comment to the end of the meeting. I am not in favor of adding this.
- y. Terry- My reason for adding public comment at the end is so that citizens who heard items in the meeting if they had questions they could ask them. We've had several people come up and ask questions about items they heard about.
- z. Clyde- So in the County I wanted to know why we weren't hearing about a certain subject. I was told that they weren't taking any comments about that.
- aa. Jenn- The main difference between Public Comment and a Public Hearing is a Hearing should be about that specific item, public comment is for anyone to comment about anything they would like to.
- bb. Craig- I am more with Sheldon on this, the public should come up to us and ask direct questions.
- cc. Sheldon- Is there a possibility that we can open public comment a second time during the meeting?
- dd. Scott- Yes I believe with the majority of the council we could reopen public comment later in the meeting if we chose.
- ee. Craig- It is already in Rules of Procedure that we can rearrange the meeting order or go back to any item and reopen it with a majority vote of the council.
- ff. Scott- The council may by motion go out of order or return to any order of business.
- gg. Clyde- I've seen the Planning and Zoning do that a time or two.
- hh. Scott- I would support that as long as it's not in every meeting. Or one of us wants to return to public comment, you can even define it, like I want to open to public questions about items we've discussed.
- ii. Sheldon- John is there any reason we need to amend it so we can return to public comment if needed.
- jj. John- This allows this as written.
- kk. Scott- I think this allows us to do what we are speaking about.
- ll. **Sheldon-I move to approve Resolution 24-06 updating the language in 2.2.3 that we are rearranging the order of the agenda to approve meeting minutes to # 4 and treasurer report is #5 and actions items are after that, removed the new proposed number 9 and removing the phrase abstain shall be considered a no vote in 6.1 and changing 7.1 to read any council member participating in the meeting shall vote, Craig seconded the motion**
- mm. Terry- We don't have a "Call to Order on our procedures"
- nn. **ROLL CALL VOTE: Scott-Yes, Craig-Yes, Sheldon-Yes, Clyde-Yes, Terry-Yes**
- oo. **RESOLUTION 24-06 APPROVED 5-0**

12. Discussion on Amending Erda City Code 4-5-2 Appointment to the Planning Commission
(Timestamp 1:22:05)

- a. Sheldon- We have the current city code in front of us.
- b. Terry- So where does that come into play with Ordinance 22-08?
- c. Jennifer- The City Code is the most current. Ordinance 22-08 was adopted in January of 2022, this was adopted in June of 2022. This would be the ruling ordinance, the City Code. Is that correct John?
- d. John- Yes that's correct.
- e. Terry- So what's changed? Does anybody know the change from the ordinance to the City code?
- f. Jennifer- I have no idea.
- g. Terry- In this ordinance it tells us when each person's term is up.
- h. Jennifer- That is in the last page of the packet, it has that in the City Code.
- i. Terry- This is where we can decide if we want to go down to a five person commission or if we want to change the term limits we have four people leaving in one year.
- j. Scott- I am in favor of keeping the 7 but alter the length of some.
- k. Terry- I am more aligned with doing the 5 with the 2 alternates.
- l. Craig- So they will usually attend the meetings and if needed they will sit up and vote. I am in favor of keeping it as is. We need to space this out better. Another change we should probably make with all of them is their terms end in June but at the beginning of each year they appoint a chair and vice chair. I think we should have all of their terms end in Dec.
- m. Terry- So I think we should decide if we do it as a 5 member with 2 alternates or keep it as it is.
- n. Clyde- My only concern is that the Chair can stack the Planning Commission.
- o. Sheldon - So it seems like we want to stick with the 7 positions but maybe change the wording on how the at large are appointed. It's defined still as being appointed by the chair but needing a super majority or 4 out of 5 to pass.
- p. Clyde- My point of view is I wouldn't want to be an alternate and go to those meetings but never get a vote or say.
- q. Sheldon- So perhaps stick with the 7 but change the wording on how it is approved with a 4 out of 5 vote.
- r. Scott- I'll go that far.
- s. Terry- Read Ordinance 22-08.
- t. Sheldon- So how do we fix this?
- u. Craig- We could have a discussion with the Planning Commission at their next meeting and see what they think they'd like to do.

13. Council Representative Reports (Timestamp 1:34:00)

- a. Scott-We have the railroad putting ruffraff on the side of the railroad and not being properly prepared. They have some 2.5 ft boulders roll down the hill. I mean some were as tall as this table. I've contacted several people. The last guy said he'd have the supervisor call and of course he hasn't. No one will really talk to me. I'll keep trying to watch that. Terry and I should probably put together something where we can prepare what to do in case of a wildfire. Or if we don't have power for an extended period of time and what we can do.
- b. Terry-At the direction of Craig we got a meeting with the City Planner and Engineer so we can speak and get on the same page for what we want. We also have feelers out on what it would cost to resurface that mile and a half on Erda Way.
- c. Scott-So how much leverage does that railroad have to push the value of those properties down?
- d. John- Well they do have the ability to do eminent domain, but they should pay fair market value.
- e. Scott- Who decides that?
- f. John- At the end of the day if they can't agree it's decided by a judge and jury.
- g. Terry- I would like the whole deal of flashing lights and the arms where that railroad will cross our road.
- h. Craig-UDOT will be closing 201 by 21st south and tearing out the bridge. They are encouraging everyone to go on I-80 now.
- i. Scott- We need that information posted on the city website.
- j. Craig- A little over a year ago we had a resolution on how to put things on the Planning Commission agenda. We've broken this rule a lot. We need to fix that, I'm not sure what that is. But we need to come up with how we send things to the planning commission for them to start working on it. I would lean more to 1 or 2. If it's 3 or more of us telling them what to do then it feels like we as a City Council are telling them what to do and we shouldn't be doing that because they are their own independent body.
- k. Terry- I'll agree with you with the 3 people.
- l. Craig- I would rather see it be 2 but it won't be something I have to stick on. This is just for the initial sending to the planning commission.
- m. Sheldon-Unless there is some legal not to I would lean more to 3.
- n. John- There is no legal reason, but if there are 3 of you, you can tell them to look at this so it can come to us and we'll vote on it.
- o. Scott- I would lean more towards 2, but from my understanding most other places anyone can put something on the Planning Commission.
- p. Craig- All the planning commission handles is Land Use, that's all they do.
- q. Sheldon-We need to have a resolution brought to us next week
- r. Craig- What does fully developed mean? Representatives from Oquirrh Point have come to ask what does fully developed mean?
- s. Clyde- All houses are put in, everything is done.
- t. John- I'd have to give more thought to this, but I'd lean more to Clyde's thought, roads, sewers, houses. Fully developed means fully developed.
- u. Scott- To me it would mean the roads, the utilities, and all necessary items for someone to come in and build a home.
- v. John- Does it say fully developed lots?
- w. Scott- I'm not sure.
- x. John- I need to review this and see what the exact wording is.

- y. Clyde-I think I maybe missed it. I thought they were going to build it all.
- z. Sheldon- I think in amendment three we've changed some of those uses in POD E.
- aa. Craig- Currently Erda has like 900 homes. Once Oquirrh Point goes in they will add another 1200 homes. I don't know overall what will be best for the City but it would be good to look this over and see what would fit best in that space.
- bb. Clyde-The commercial stuff to me, you can say this is commercial space but I don't know if there are people knocking down doors to build right there.
- cc. Sheldon- There is the potential for a large park in that area. Could we perhaps if we like that idea having a regional park we can plan out a bit better what goes in that space. So John will look into what "fully" developed might mean.
- dd. Clyde-We didn't want Oquirrh Point but we got it anyway. So why does Erda City have any input in it now?
- ee. Craig- We've amended the original agreement before. So far these amendments have been very good to us. We will receive a lot of money in property from Oquirrh Point.
- ff. Sheldon-We are still working on audio stuff. I also got advice from Clyde on where to look. I know we've had some discussion here about Tooele County Roads reports in this meeting but we haven't seen anything.
- gg. Terry- Scott and I can handle that when we have our meeting with them.

14. Comments from Council Members **(Timestamp 2:08:45)**

- a. Terry- Not that I had it clear to start with but I can tell there is information that the chair and co chair have that the three other council members have no clue about. I would like to see anything doing with the city that it would involve the whole council that the whole council would be made aware of it. So we can be involved in the daily and we get the same information.
- b. Sheldon- Are you speaking of Oquirrh Point?
- c. Terry- No, I'm talking about anything. If there is something that comes into the council to you as chair and Craig as co-chair I can tell by a lot of the stuff you talk about. I know myself and I've asked Scott about whether he knew of it and he didn't have a clue. But I'm just saying instead of being a funnel an hourglass. So when information comes in it's dispensed out to the rest of us.
- d. Sheldon- How would I do that, what would you like?
- e. Terry- Just shoot an email to say hey this is happening. Another thing if you'd like to help Jenn out. Jenn did someone send you an email out about that stuff with the fire department and did you attend the meeting?
- f. Jenn- They emailed me directly.
- g. Terry- So they have her attending these meetings instead of one of us. I don't know if we need to watch that or not. But we are dispensing money when we send her to places.
- h. Sheldon- So you'd like me to try to communicate more to the whole council with what's going on. When I have one on one conversations with developers you want me to pass on as much information as possible.
- i. Terry-If it involves the city. Like I'd like to know if there's construction going on on the roads. And if we can help Jenn out and lighten her load. On one of her days she had an 8 hour day. I don't know if any one of us has had an 8 hour day since we started.

- j. Sheldon- Well councilman is not my paid position but it is her paid position, an 8 hour day seems reasonable to me.
- k. Terry- We just need to help her not exceed her part time hours.
- l. Sheldon- Okay, I will try to communicate as much as I see needs to be communicated. I don't feel like I'm trying to withhold anything.
- m. Terry- So you'll decide.
- n. Sheldon- I'll decide what?
- o. Terry- What you think we need to know.
- p. Sheldon- I'm not going to give a transcript of every conversation.
- q. Terry- Well not a transcript, just a general knowledge of what's going on.
- r. Sheldon- Well that's what we do here in the meeting.
- s. Craig- We did just have representative reports.

15. Adjournment

- a. Scott moved to adjourn the meeting, Craig seconded the motion
- b. Voting was unanimous to adjourn the meeting
- c. **Meeting adjourned.**

Note: these minutes represent a summary of the meeting and are not intended to be verbatim.

Prepared by: Jennifer Poole, Erda City Recorder

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Council this 25th day of April, 2024.

ERDA

ATTEST:



Jennifer Poole, City Recorder



Sheldon Birch, Chair