

# City of La Verkin

435 North Main St., La Verkin, Utah, 84745  
(435) 635-2581 Fax (435) 635-2104  
www.laverkin.org

---

## La Verkin City Council Work Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 3, 2025, 5:00 pm.

111 S. Main, La Verkin, Utah

**Present:** Mayor Kelly Wilson; Council Members: Patricia Wise, Blair Gubler, Richard Hirschi, Micah Gubler, and Darren Prince; Staff: Kyle Gubler, Fay Reber, and Nancy Cline, Public; Brad Robbins and Blair Gardner.

**Called to Order** –Mayor Wilson called the work meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

1. Discussion regarding the Live/Work zone.

Mayor Wilson asked Brad Robbins to explain the zoning.

Fay Reber explained that it's gone through a number of iterations the ordinance has, like most ordinances do planning commission approved a particular version. There were some changes that we needed to make. This version you have in front of you includes what the planning commission approved plus some additional changes, that after talking with Derek, Patty and Brad he made

Brad Robbins explained this has been a planning commission approved. It's been through several different iterations. The location where this would be allowed in the city permitted uses versus prohibited uses, and what the Administrative Land Use Authority is going to be doing, requirements for lived work, and then we'll go through some of the development. Fay passed out our latest version. On page one, it talks about the purpose. ~~There's really nothing new with the lived-work prior to the establishment of zoning. Most people lived in their business.~~ It's kind of flipping the script a little bit and bringing that back to a certain level. Live-work is really not a new concept, it's an older concept. In regard to the town here, where live-work would be allowed would be in your commercial land use designation. And that basically is all your general commercial zoning in the Master plan. It would be allowed in those areas and those areas only, not be allowed in residential areas. This was something that Derek came up with and he agreed with it. No live-work development should be smaller than 3.25 acres and only in the General Commercial. The reason for the acreage restriction is because you just don't want these small buildings. Somebody is building one. It should be a broader type of development. It shouldn't be just one single house somewhere. Permitted uses versus prohibited uses. This is where this is going to be a little bit different than your normal use. And the reason is because of some stuff that Blair had brought up. He's got another one of these developments. He talked about how he had a manufacturer of custom sleeping pads. He didn't know how you capture that in a permitted use other than saying light industrial. The minute you say light industrial, what happens is you can get any type of industrial. Instead of having permitted uses, the only use that's permitted is the residential use associated with it. Any other use permitted will have to be approved by the property owner's association of the development and then approved by administrative land use. There's also some verbiage that can't be noxious, so it provides a little bit more flexibility for somebody coming in. He didn't know how we could figure out every single thing in the zone and it does allow the administrative land use authority to deny these. On page three it provides some permitted or prohibited use. These are uses that are actually in the city's commercial zone with the exception of industrials. These are uses we kind of went through the planning commission looked at and they kind of agreed that probably not the right type or the type of facility. Now that's not to say this can't be expanded, if you guys have some ideas about it, it shouldn't be there, but generally speaking, it's kind of useful. On the next page it comes to requirements for live-work. This whole section here, these ten items have been hashed out a bunch of times. This is what he and Fay were talking about. But, a live-work, occupation of a live work unit solely for residential purposes should not be permitted. The Planning Commission and possibly the City Council doesn't want this to turn into a residential development. It should have a commercial proponent for it. We're trying to avoid that situation. Now there's going to be an

exception to that, we'll get to that in a minute. Any business operating within a live work unit shall be required to obtain a business license, which means that live work shall not be occupied for residential purposes. Any person except the unit owner, long-term lessee, the business manager, employee. We added the lessee at the last meeting. No portion of a live work unit shall be rented or occupied for short-term rental. It was never meant to be a short-term rental type of situation. Client and customer visits to live work are permitted, obviously. Live work shall meet the health, safety, fire requirements of the city. Maximum one employee per thousand square feet floor area is permitted to work, and that's subject to the approval of the ALUA. The reason for that is the parking issue everyone is concerned about. Then a sign would be allowed.

Kyle Gubler asked if he was referring to the sign on the building. It couldn't be very big.

Brad agreed that the exception that he was talking about, is that the ALUA can, based on findings and approval of the Homeowners Association or the property owner, can approve modifications to numbers 1, 2, 4, and 6 above, and that the ALUA may place conditions and limit. What came up at the Planning Commission was what would happen if a business went under, are you going to kick people out? The answer is probably not. If they have a mortgage, you're going to have to deal with it. So, what we kind of came down to is this provides the ALUA with the ability to work with somebody to give them time. To figure out, either move on or something, without just throwing them out. We can't do that legally.

Councilman Prince asked if they could keep them from converting the lower floor to housing.

Kyle replied that it would be residential and not allowed.

Brad added then we can add conditions to it. For any type of flexibility, there can be conditions. And conditions on time frames to housing.

Kyle asked if that is all through the ALUA.

Brad replied that it would be.

Kyle asked Brad to go over who the business owner is.

Brad replied it is a key member. The manager, employee or day-to-day business dealings.

Mayor Wilson commented that they don't want anybody that can rent them. It needs to be someone that is in business operations.

Kyle replied that's what his point was, because he knows we have some short-term rental people, and not that it would happen there. He wasn't saying it would, but what happened in the past based on experience is people rent out a property on their property, and someone comes there, and they're only supposed to let family stay there, and they've got a great big family. They don't. Police treat it like anybody can say they are "family".

Brad added that the long-term lease was something that was added just recently.

Mayor Wilson commented that he could see that being a problem. If you've got an owner, a business manager, or an employee, they're associated with the business, and he agreed that was the purpose of live/ work.

Fay gave the example suppose you've got an owner in there. He lives upstairs. He's got a bakery downstairs, which he owns and operates. The bakery's doing well. He suffers a heart attack, the owner. He needs to go up to Salt Lake to be close to medical facilities. Are you going to prevent him, then, from leasing out the top floor of that residential unit?

Mayor Wilson and Councilwoman Wise said yes.

Blair gave an example that not everybody's going to buy these as owners. They're going to buy it as a commercial application as well, which, under this, as Brad has created such a great document. If you're a business owner and this is an investment, are they allowed, and through this zone, to be able to lease the building to another business. So that's where that language came about. It's not to abuse it, it's to make sure that the owner of the building is responsible for the use. But if, let's say, I've got a gentleman right now that wants to

buy a mirror's garage doors. He won't live there, but he's buying it from commercial use as an investment property. He may store garage doors at the garage level, but that's where these guys came up with the great language to allow for that opportunity for him to lease it out. Because he won't live there, because then that's the beauty of the commercial to residential live-work combination.

Kyle asked what relation to the business would the person he leased to have.

Blair replied that one of the reasons the language came up. If you, let's say you wanted to buy this as a commercial building to rent, and he leases it out to another business that still has to follow along the ALUA approved business, they have to have a business license that comes through the HOA to get approved, so you have these checks and balances to make sure there is nothing.

Mayor Wilson added he can see leasing it out to another business where he lives there, or an employee lives there, or a manager lives there, but he's associated with the business. But if you're just going to rent it out to anybody, then it's just a rental. He wants them to be associated with the business.

Blair replied it has to have a business license. His language there is brilliant. You have to have business license in these units.

Kyle clarified that whoever lives above has to be associated with the business. The guy that bought the building, or whoever he leased it to. His business is still on the bottom part, and he's not going to live there, and he just rents it out to somebody else. That's basically just turning it into an apartment.

Councilwoman wise replied that the nice thing about the Planning Commission having spent so much time, and now we are, is that with the fields, we have a very good example of what it can potentially be, what a live-work unit property can be. Having the 3.5 acres identified that it has to be that size, and it has to be the general or the retail commercial, not tourist commercial, that means that there are seven, she thought, seven to eight properties in town identified that can be live-work. So, when we're making these decisions, we have what Blair's done, and most of that falls into what's it going to look like five years down the road when others come in. Whether you like what Blair's done or you don't like what Blair's done it's a good example of what would work. What are we thinking long term and to her that's where it gets kind of difficult on the wording and in theory it was kind of like when we went through the short-term rentals and to prove 10% which we did and then bring it back to seven half which have been five. We always hope for the best in people but the reality is that you're not always going to get it and so she suggested they be really careful with the wording. Is it in general and retail commercial.

Kyle responded that Patty makes a good point. Whatever you do, you're going to have to realize that you've got that property that you're dealing with but means that there's six other properties.

Councilwoman Wise continued to say we're kind of lucky in the sense that we have an example that we can look to and we can look at the parking and we can look at the way they've done it, the number of stories and first floor and all of that. It's kind of a good guideline, as we decide what we want for the whole city because that's what we're deciding.

Councilman Micah Gubler asked if they are making the top portion residential why does it matter who lives there. Why do they have to be part of the business. The one tied to the business might be messier and a worse situation.

Councilwoman Wise replied because the idea, this would be the difference between the live work. Where the number of individuals on site is really minimal, like four per building. When you count two employees and the owner and the manager, whatever, and then one to two people living above related to the business. What you're talking about will be the mixed use, where apartments on top and then all commercial on the bottom, and anybody can rent those. Its two different zones. And as far as who lives on top, they could be messy, they could be good, they could be whatever, we, it's a gamble.

Councilman Prince added Mixed use would have a lot more parking. And more apartments above and stuff like that with businesses.

Councilman Micah Gubler responded, let's say I bought one of those businesses and I've got three or four young adult kids that alone take up the parking. He didn't see how regulating it to be connected to the business is going to reduce the number of people that might have cars that are living there. He was looking at it from the business side of things, if we're going to invest and buy that.

Councilwoman Wise replied if you're a business owner you have to decide if you're a good fit for the conditions that are placed on this property. It wouldn't fit everybody.

Councilman Micah Gubler responded that he imagines most small business owners possibly couldn't afford these units. He felt like it would be mostly investors.

Councilwoman Wise added they'll probably be leasing it out to a business owner who doesn't have the capital but can afford a lease.

Councilman Micah Gubler replied now that limits them to lease it out to a small business that is going to agree to live there.

Councilwoman Wise commented that it doesn't have to, residential doesn't have to be occupied as residential. It could be more commercial.

Kyle added that when we first looking at this from the city planning commission when it was first brought up seven years ago the intent was more of mixed use. They weren't worried about it, but what we wanted to do was we wanted to protect the ground level or that portion as retail. We're very limited on what we have for commercial. corridor and so giving it away to anything else can hinder us a lot. The purpose was that if there's going to be affordable housing or attainable housing that first 10 or 12 feet is commercial. Then it could be apartments above it. That was what the original intent was from the city. Like they've done in Salt Lake at the Gateway. And they've done it in St. George down there on Main Street. Originally the city was looking to do mixed use not live work.

Brad commented that he doesn't think you can legally stop somebody from a long-term lease. There's no law that could stop them. There are obviously short-term rental restrictions. You have in your code. He wasn't aware of anything long-term. They do have the ability to lease this long-term. There could be some language added that says you can't sublease it from there. You have upper floor residential and lower business.

Fay agreed he didn't see how they could stop them from long-term leasing it and that is why they wrote it up that way.

Councilwoman Wise added she was concerned with having a business license. She thought they needed to be operating a business. They could have a business license and just have it be a shell and do nothing with it. It needs to be an operating business and she didn't know how legally to say that. On this long-term lessee we don't want a long-term lessee who's residential. If the long-term lessee was commercial great but not just residential.

Mayor Wilson replied to him live/work means you work there and live there.

Councilman Prince asked if that mean a lot of things in the zone are not enforceable? Like the requirement to live above and you have to have a business.

Brad replied that it can be enforced. He was saying he didn't think you can stop somebody from a long-term rental. Somebody purchased that and said I now want to rent it to an X, Y, Z business. They're going to live upstairs.

Councilwoman Wise clarified the lease would be commercial not residential.

Brad agreed.

Councilman Prince replied he thought they were saying you could lease it residential separate from the business.

Brad explained that the first step is going to be the property owner's association. They've got to get through that first. And they go to the ALUA. And that's why we try to figure out this other little caveat we've got, in case something does go wrong like what you're talking about.

Councilman prince added that the homeowner's association is going to resolve the concerns that you have.

Councilwoman Wise was also concerned about the HOA. She has lived in different complexes that have had HOAs. And when they're good, it's great. When they're not good, it's horrible because you don't have anybody to go to. When the situation isn't bad enough to go to the police, but you can't talk to the neighbor because they're just not going to be willing to talk. And you have an HOA who won't do anything. Then the offender says, the HOA won't do anything about it. What are you going to do? She felt that there's a property owner association is not enough. It seems like we need to somehow identify that property owner association is a business in good standing. They have experience. They're local, or at least they have a local representative. When Blair sells these off, he's going to be gone, and Blair's just an example, so there could be more of these in town, and those, we've got to think about that. If the HOA could be non-existent, it could be there on paper, but could be non-existent, and then what do we do? So, we can't put too much reliance on the HOA, and then the ALUA, when you get right down to it, that's pretty much, somebody from the Planning Commission and city staff. La Verkin is growing, and city staff is not going to have time to handle the little things that come up around. We need to have this whole ordinance very strong before we approve it. That way the things that do end up in ALUA are minimal, or good enough. We have some steps to take care of before we can make a decision as to overall zoning.

Councilman Micah Gubler asked Blair how much the units would be sold for.

Blair replied they are selling for \$645,000, which is the base price. The concept of flex living and live workspace, as Brad says, it's not new. It's old. It's just becoming more modern. You made a comment about what people can't afford. Well, we're getting to the point where people can't afford a house, and they can't afford a business. This is an option to combine. There's also, in terms of flex, commercial owners that want to invest, but never use the facility that they own. It allows them to do that. The restrictions that Brad's put in there and Fay has encompassed are the best he has seen. Even Hurricane City has a live work zone that's currently in place. He likes this one better. He came in here with the concept of let's just build these as commercial only, and then there was the opportunity that there's a potential for a mixed use, which as Brad and Fay have described, and all of you, they're different. Mixed use and live work, they are different animals. As a developer he likes to see that diversity within a city. If someone wants a retail bottom and rent the apartment up top, it's not us. If you want to own your own facility with your own individual tax ID number and not rely on a landlord, we're an option. If you want to run a business and live there, we are an option. We don't want nightly rentals. I did the parking specifically so there's not a lot of traffic. And in this day and age, businesses are not manpower. They might be internet power. They might be a UPS truck coming in and out once a day. The checks and balances for us, and you're 100% right, the HOA will be turned over just like every other HOA in time. The original starter of any HOA, I couldn't tell you who originally owns the HOA that they started 10, 15, 20 years ago. Do we set everything in motion and in place that we want it to be structured as clean as possible and work perfectly? Absolutely. Is it going to? Absolutely not. We're 100% right. I'm going to sell all of these out probably and the HOA will be transferred over into an internal board like most HOAs or there's going to be a professional. HOA manager that will come in and regulate. The ALUA was a great suggestion city-wide to say how much liability the city want to say yes you can and no you can't. The ALUA is a great checks and balances, then you have the HOA is a checks and balance. Then you have the business license. I can't even sell one until their business that's going to be used in that facility is approved through the business license team, the ALUA and the HOA. We're trying to put everything in place to eliminate or lessen as much of the liability to the city, to us, along the board. So that's kind of the short history of what this is. We've tried to identify putting things into a box and with this flex space the beauty about it is there's really no box that it all fits in. Now that can be really scary because it's

like we don't know what's going to happen. It also creates a lot of opportunities for people that don't have any other opportunity other than this. He 100% supports what the process is, slow, correct, and applicable. We don't know who's going to be there. And it's not going to work for everybody on purpose. We don't want to have a huge parking lot and a bunch of traffic and a bunch of this and that. We want to have very specific people that will follow the guidelines. There are a lot of checks and balances here that'll scare a lot of people away. That means the ones that are actually going through the process and are going to hopefully follow the process. Brad's done a great job in trying to separate live work and mixed use. It is very clear and defined as to what is allowable within live work and what is also allowable in mixed use.

## 2. Water Rates

Mayor Wilson explained it was brought up in our last City Council that people got high water bills in July. We might want to help those people. He thought a lot about this and thought maybe there's something we could do. He thought it would be absolutely wrong to change the ordinance and do something different than we already voted for. We did the right thing we went through all of the steps that we needed to go through. We did a water study, and then we discussed to the city council what's the best approach. Given the data that the engineers gave us and given the fact that he guessed 95% of the cities in this state don't charge enough for the water. What happens is when you go to do a big project, you don't have the money available to do it, and so you go to the state, the drinking water board, or the CIV board, and you say, we want to do this project, can you give us some money. Hopefully you'll give us some grant money. They'll look at what our water rates are, and they'll say, we can't give you any money because you're not charging enough, you couldn't pay this back to us. That's based on over 20- or 30-years' time. They go through all of that stuff. They've been preaching this for 25 years. Not very many cities have done anything about it. We've taken the steps, and I think right now we're probably in a good position, where we're charging enough for repairs and maintenance on our system, and replacing it overtime, and that's what we need to do. Because over time, you've got to replace that system. It's going to get old, the pipes will get undersized. We already have some that are undersized in our community, but because we've done some things, it's adequate right now. But as the city continues to grow, we're going to have to replace some of those pipelines, replace some of the valves. We're already starting to replace some valves that have blown up on us. But those are things that need to be taken into consideration. There are valves that have been in the ground for over 25 years, and back then they didn't have stainless steel bolts on them, and so the bonnets are blowing up. The bolts rust out, and it blows up through the street, and you have a big hole, and it's quite a big repair. That is happening now. But over time, they've perfected some of those products like solid bolts, valve now comes with stainless steel bolts. They'll last a long time. They might last 50 years but those are things we have to take into consideration. With what we have done we can go to the drinking water board and say look we need some money to do a project, and this is the project we want to do will you loan us the money and we can pay it back. He thought they had done what they needed to do, and we've also built into that a conservation factor so that people aren't just wasting water. We found out in July's bill that there were people wasting water. He gave a couple examples. One example was that the guy had a leak for over a year, and he didn't fix it. He'd been notified a whole bunch of times. It was over a hundred gallons an hour and so when he got his bill it was \$1,200 in July. The leak's fixed. And I got a list of leaks. He thought there are 85 people in town right now that are on the leak list. The meters we have will tell the residents whether they got a leak or not. We notify those people that you've got a leak. He received a notification a couple months back that he had a leak. He immediately started looking for a leak. It was the toilet. The flapper on the toilet was leaking. It was just a small leak, but he was able to fix it. So that's a good thing that we've done. We can notify the people that they've had a leak. There was a friend of mine that had a leak. He got notified. He found the leak. He fixed it. And those things need to be taken care of. Some people overuse their water. One single lady lets her kids turn the sprinkler on to play in. The water was on all day long and on the trampoline. she got a high-water bill. She isn't doing that anymore. Now it was a wake-up call for quite a few people there were a hundred and twenty-three people in July that had gotten into tier five, which is ten dollars a thousand gallons over 33,000 gallons. Some of them got a really high-water bill. One of the comments was this was not just a wake-up call but a slap in the face. Some commented they wish they had known. We tried to let people know the best we could. We probably could have

done a little bit better. We should have notified people on Yoppify. That goes out to a lot of people in town and all the ones that have a cell phone. Maybe we could have done better, but now they know. My proposal is not to change the ordinance, but give them a reprieve for July, August, and September. We got the data on August already because the bills went out yesterday. There were about 80-something people in Tier 5 and 60-something people in Tier 4. So, it's gone way down. There were 62 in Tier 4 and 123 in Tier 5 in July. So, it's gone down. He suggested giving them a reprieve on tier 4 and 5, billing them for tier 3, which is \$3.76 per thousand. Some would get credit for those three months, but that allows them the opportunity to fix some leaks, make some changes on how they're using their water. By October we'd given them plenty of time that they've got the notice in their water bill. That's my proposal. It's up to the council whether you want to do something like that or just say it is what it is. The more he thought about it, we probably should have implemented this May 1st. On the 1st of June, people would have been adjusting the water system.

Councilwoman Wise replied we discussed it we passed it on April 16th meeting but then it came back to the council for technicalities we added in the 3% annual increase. She told councilman Prince if it makes you feel any better, she actually pulled up the council meeting and looked at the minutes from the April 16th meeting every single one of us were concerned about the negative impact on people who couldn't afford it. If we're going to help people out, are we helping them out on the whole bill or are we helping them out with the difference and that's the consideration. Which kind of falls with what the mayor suggested of the fours and fives take them down to a tier three.

Mayor Wilson added he looked at the data and 87% of the people in town were in the first tier. He looked at his water bill. His June and July bills he used 7,000 gallons. In July his kids visited and used more water than normal. His bill increased from June to July \$11.50. To him that was not a huge increase for a family. But if he had been overusing that water, it would have been a lot more. For those who are just wasting water it needs to be painful for them.

Kyle added its city policy that if someone has a water leak and they come into the city and they have a water leak, we take them down to a lower tier. They only have to pay the lower tier if they can show they have a water leak. Now, if they've used it to water their grass, then that's a different story. The guy you talked about did get a credited to his bill already. He was taken down to a lower tier to pay for it. You can't not make them pay for the water, but you can reduce the price of it.

Mayor Wilson replied that we know who has the water leaks. We've got a list of them. There's 85 people that have leaks. And some of them are being fixed right now. But they can't come in and say, hey, I think I've got a water leak. We know whether you've got a water leak or not. It shows right up on the meter.

Councilman Prince replied that he was not disputing any of that. His biggest concern is when your bill goes from \$200 to \$800 or \$900, that's a slap in the face, right? They probably did have a leak. They don't irrigate with it or anything. But there's a bunch of those. Derek said we collected \$67,000 in those two tiers. He would like to give them a little break. Get them through the summer and then go full board.

Kyle added that a lady called today, and she's a renter, and she doesn't have a leak. Water bill is \$400. The landlord basically waters the lawn with it. He's not going to change it. The landlord makes a decision to use irrigation or not. She's in the situation now, if she wants a lawn in front, because the landlord won't convert over to irrigation she has a big bill. She's already made payment arrangements. She'll still pay her water bill. So she's in that situation with a landlord that refuses to make a change.

Councilman Prince replied that the mayor's suggestion would give her some reprieve through September. She can figure it out through June.

Mayor Wilson added that he felt like people are watering their grass more than they need too.

Councilman Prince replied his grass is green as anyone and he knew this was coming and told his family to not waste water and his bill was under 8,000 gallons and they have a 40-foot pool and hot tub, and so it can be done.

Mayor Wilson added he didn't think people realized they were watering so much. He gave an example of a citizen who was watering four times a day, and he didn't know it, because his sprinkler clock had done something, and so he was watering four times a day. Kyle Lovelady went over to his house and talked with him. They figured it out and he fixed his clock, and so he's not using a whole lot of water.

Councilwoman Wise asked about the mayor's proposal of dropping tier 4 and 5 down to the price of tier 3. If that would be for everyone in tier 4 and 5.

Mayor Wilson responded that it would be all residents in tier 4 and 5. There's about 200 people that were in Tier 4 and 5 in July. And there's 130 or so in Tier 4 and 5 for August.

Kyle added he thought there should be credit issued to their accounts. Not a check sent in the mail.

Councilman Prince agreed that citizens would be happy with that.

Councilman Micah Gubler asked how many connections the city had.

Mayor Wilson responded about 1500. 86% of the people are below tier 4 and 5 and using the water responsibly. But there's about 8% of the people that are in that tier and those are the ones that are complaining.

Kyle added that at the vintage park they don't have access to irrigation. It's one of the few places in town. If they want grass, they're going to be watering with culinary water.

Councilman Micah Gubler added that he thought they've done the right thing. If we're wasting water we need to figure it out and fix it. Across the county if other cities haven't done it all rates are not going to stay the same. He agreed that a reprieve was a good idea to help the public prepare for next summer.

Mayor Wilson agreed and that was his train of thought on how to help the citizens. This will be something that needs to go on the agenda.

Fay explained that we'd have to draft up a resolution. Amending the rates for those particular months

Mayor Wilson continued to say there were roughly 200 people that were in those top two tiers the first month. We may have a few less in September. He suggested in September to draft a letter and send to those people that are in those tiers and explain to them what we're doing and why we're doing it and tell them, yes, we gave them a reprieve, but in October it's over.

Kyle agreed and said it's got to be very clear because you'll have that person that still doesn't do it complain in October.

Mayor Wilson agreed and with the letter make it clear there would be no excuses because they were not notified.

Councilman Blair Gubler commented that he doesn't get out and about amongst the community as much as he used to, but when he did, he knew a lot of them that were on fixed incomes. His mother was one of them. Her and dad brought in \$800 a month, so that was it. Is there any out there in the community that would be on that kind of income?

Kyle replied he was sure there were those on fixed incomes but didn't know how to identify them. We talked about hardship, but you're going to have to develop what the criteria would be to meet that. Hardship. Because everybody will claim it if you don't have something that qualifies them.

Councilman Prince added he the post that he put online, and he apologized if that was inappropriate. He was just trying to gather feedback from the community on how this was affecting them. One of the comments was from a senior citizen who said they are on fixed income and couldn't pay more for water.

Mayor Wilson replied that those who are on fixed income are probably not using that much water, and, if they're under 8,000 gallons and the increase is small.

Councilwoman Wise added that, if somebody's using 8,000 gallons, the old rate would have been \$50.08. The new rate is \$65.67, so the difference is \$15.59. But \$15.59 could be a lot, but she thought as far as helping people who are on really fixed incomes, we had a couple of different ideas. There's another city, Milford or something like that, Blaine from Sunrise had searched out, and he couldn't get a good handle on it. It was suggested people on Medicaid would qualify. None of us had any solutions, and none of us really knew where to go to look. So, it would almost be something where La Verkin as a city would have to decide to develop some kind of a hardship program for any number of things and have the budget to do that.

Councilman Prince pointed out he only had one hardship case mentioned on Facebook with his post. He thought there would be more on fixed incomes.

Councilman Blair Gubler added when we look at our water bills every month, and they come in and they're using 4,000 gallons month after month after month, and they do that for a year, and then they have a high-water bill because of a break do we work with them?

Councilman Micah Gubler clarified that's what Kyle was saying we do have it built in our ordinance if they can prove they've had a break they drop down the cost to the lower tier rate.

Councilman Blair Gubler added he hates to hear every time we do this is, we need to conserve water. What good does it do us to conserve water just so Washington City and St. George can build another suburb? If we've got the water right, we've got the water, let's let it run down the gutter until we build a house that we can put a meter on.

Councilwoman wise asked if they are giving an unfair break to the tier 4 and 5 users and not to others.

Mayor Wilson did not think so. They would be paying tier three. He asked if they wanted Fay to draft the resolution.

The city council agreed they should write up the resolution.

Mayor Wilson ended the meeting and asked everyone to go to the council chamber to start the meeting.

**The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.**

Oct 15, 2025  
Date Approved

ATTEST:

Nancy Cline  
Nancy Cline  
City Recorder

Kelly B. Wilson  
Mayor Kelly B. Wilson

Handwritten text, possibly a signature or date, located in the bottom right corner of the page.