

# 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 Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 4, 2026, 6:00 pm.

Council Chambers, 111 S. Main, La Verkin, Utah

**Present:** Mayor Kelly Wilson; Council Members: Darren Prince, Scot Pectol, Amanda Barr, John Valenti, Micah Gubler; Staff: Kyle Gubler, Derek Imlay, Fay Reber, and Nancy Cline. Public: Heath Snow, Theresa Fish, Chester Ence, Scott Stratton.

**A. Called to Order** –Scot Pectol gave the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance at 6:00 pm.

### **B. Presentation:**

#### 1. HVFD

Nick Wright reported that they finally have a board that was approved for the fire district yesterday. The members who are going to be on the fire board are Maureen Cox from the county, Randy Acom represents Springdale, Holloway represents Virgin, Scott Pectol from La Verkin, Todd Sands from Toquerville, Wayne Peterson from Leeds, Dave Fleming from Hurricane, and then Robin Smith from Rockville. That will make up their fire board. They usually meet once a month, the first Monday of the month. He reported Februarys stats.

**C. Consent Agenda:** (Items on the consent agenda may not require discussion. These items will be a single motion unless removed at the request of the Mayor or City Council.)

1. Declarations of conflict of interest
2. Agenda
3. Meeting Minutes: February 18, 2026, regular meetings.
4. Checks & Invoices: \$ 109,709.13

**The motion was made by Councilman Pectol to approve the consent agenda as written. Meeting minutes for February 18, 2026, regular meetings. Checks and invoices in the amount \$109,709.13, second by Councilman Valenti. Roll Call Vote: Barr-yes, Valenti-yes, Price-yes, Pectol-yes, Gubler-yes. The motion carried unanimously.**

### **C. Business:**

1. Discussion of request to vacate the right of way at 205 S. 100 E.

Mayor Wilson explained they discussed this a few weeks ago, but the owner Therea Fish didn't get to give her opinion to the council, so they are going to give her the chance to express her thoughts.

Heath Snow addressed the city council on behalf of Theresa Snow as her attorney. Teresa Fisher asked me if I could come and help talk and represent her interest here. Unfortunately, she wasn't able and did not get notice of attending the previous council meeting. In 2016, the Olsen's approached the city. They owned a parcel that was approximately six point four acres. They asked the city to split that parcel and make a lot under your ordinances. I guess you guys can make a single lot and do not have to put in all of the public improvements. If you notice that this is the final plat that was recorded. It says lot one, but still refers to the parent parcel, parcel A. It's still the original parcel number. So really, that lot is the only lot in what was called the Olsen subdivision. In this plat, there was designated right here on the northern side of her parcel. It showed her property, you can see each point of her property, and it says, "access road." Then again, there's another designation, but it's a pointer down to that same space and says "access easement." If you will look in the owner's dedication on the plat, it says here: That no buyer, man, president, Undersigned owners of the described tracts of land having caused the same to be subdivided into private law, Probably should be in lots and public easements to be hereinafter known as the Olsen Subdivision. Remember, the Olsen Subdivision is

just the one lot: it's not the parent parcel. For good and valuable consideration received, do hereby dedicate and convey to the City for perpetual use of the public, all easements shown on this plot. Sometimes, when an owner splits a piece of property, not in a platted subdivision, they want to reserve some sort of access easement to a road because the owner is going to split off and sell the front part, but they want to keep the back. They reserve for themselves an easement, and it's right there in the deed that gets conveyed. Well, here a whole new lot was being created, and as part of it, there was this dedication that occurred. All easements and roads were dedicated to the city of La Verkin for public use. As part of the one-lot subdivision, the city required that the Olsen's dedicate 100 East, this entire strip area was part of the 6.4 acres, but it got dedicated to the city. It's marked as 100 east. It is a street now. We know it's not an improved street, but it's a street that's been dedicated to the town for public use in that same dedication. The remainder, or parent parcel, has access anywhere to their parcel off of 100 east. His client has this easement across her property. If he were to ask our legal counsel how courts interpret easements, that's a real general question. But normally what he would tell them is they would interpret them narrowly. Look closely at the language of the easement to understand its scope and size. They have to interpret that any omission or anything that is not listed in the easement itself is intentionally omitted. That's the way a court in the state of Utah would look at how they interpret that easement. That easement says access. It's not a utility easement. Now, granted, on the side of every lot in the subdivision, they've got setbacks for which, if the city needed to come up with utility or something they could do that. But that twenty-foot easement is only an access easement. Access to who? That's his client's driveway and it serves no real general purpose. We have asked for the ability to amend the Olsen subdivision plat to eliminate that marking of an easement and reference to access easement only. Does it require the consent of the parent parcel holder? The parent parcel holder is not their property; their 5.64 acres are not part of that subdivision. They don't have to consent to it. He was asking the city, is there any purpose for this? Is there any need why it should be there? Ultimately, it's an easement that doesn't allow the city to put utilities up that way. Even though there is a gas line that comes right up in there. He would assume the courts would interpret that as a non-exclusive easement. But it's an event for public access, so anyone could use it. But really, what is its purpose? They don't see one. They would ask that the city reconsider their prior decision and allow his client to submit. They already had, at the suggestion of staff, spent three thousand dollars on professional fees, having to survey done and a map drawn up. He would ask that his client be allowed to amend this one lot subdivision plat to eliminate the easement language. And if there are reasons why the city would want to keep it, they would like to know.

Fay Reber commented that this is the first he had heard that they wanted to present an amended plat that would eliminate that easement. It's always been presented to the city in terms of whether they want the city to come in and abandon that easement, abandon that right of way, go through that process. To pass an ordinance.

Heath replied it is an easement not a road. It is an access easement. It could fall under the statute in Utah about abandonment, right? Which requires some notice and an ordinance.

Fay replied that it requires some affirmative action on the part of the city to go out and abandon that. The city would be the moving party to do that. This is a little bit different approach.

Heath replied that it is a different approach, and he thought because it is an easement only. He thought it could be accomplished, whether it's abandoned or the city approves an amended plat that eliminates it. It's really the same end result.

Fay added it's the same end result, but a little bit different process.

Heath replied he would put forward, if the city would like, to do it as a road. As an easement abandonment, he would be happy to prepare any documents so that the city doesn't have to pay to do that. He would be happy to pay if there's any notice costs required for it. His client already has thousands of dollars in it.

Fay replied he didn't think that's the issue. We don't, at least from my perspective, it's not so much that it would require effort on the part of the city to prepare the ordinance. Have a public hearing and do all that, but to him, it's just a little bit different to have the subdivision owner now come in and say, "Look, we'd like to amend our plat," and as part of that amendment, they simply delete that right. Then the cities are not required to make a finding. From the city's perspective, that would be the more preferable way, if the council was amenable to that.

Heath added that he thought about that when Theresa first came to him. He had assumed that the easement had been given as a reservation to the prior property owner in back through a deed, but as he got looking at all the documents, he discovered this is a one-lot subdivision; Theresa owns the one lot. If it's a matter of public disclosure and letting everyone have their say, an amended subdivision plat has to go through the exact same process that a subdivision plat does, which means a public hearing at the planning commission level. That's the way he recommends it for his colleagues. Everyone's going to get a chance to be heard and give their say about it, but they would like some clarity and direction because they were told for some reason they didn't have to go to the meeting. He knows that one of the former council members and legal counsel was present at the last meeting. He didn't know what was asked in that meeting, but the former council members shouldn't have a lot of say available to them other than they can get up and speak at a public hearing on it. The city council said, "We don't like it." There must be a reason, even though fire code that's an insufficient size. For fire apparatus access. Plenty of signs along the newly dedicated 100 east. Historically, if you were to look there is a twenty-four aerial. He pointed out his client's parcel, her driveway, and a lot of that driveway is the twenty feet. This was historically how Mr. Olsen and his contractor used to get up there, and whether authorized or unauthorized, we know how Scott, I love Scott he is a good guy.

Mayor Wilson commented he is sitting behind you, watch yourself.

Scott Stratton commented that it is a conflict of interest.

Heath continued to say again, historically, that's how they've accessed is through that bend off of 100 east. He assumed that if there is a singular home built up there, that's how they would want to access. He also assumed that if they wanted to build more than one home, they would not want to call it a flag lot and have a nonconforming staff flag being up the side because if it's a flag lot they could only build one house up there on the newly leveled area. He thought this was a win-win for everybody, but it just eliminates the easement on his client's property. There's just that unsure nature for his client of what can happen. Obviously, there's been work done up there. It's just a matter of knowing, is this going to be somebody else's driveway. Is it for one house? Is it more than one house? And why should it not be on this newly dedicated portion of the street.

Councilman Prince asked when you say, "access Easement", is your contention that that was only created for access to this first parcel?

Heath replied that he wasn't sure of the intention, but he didn't know if they can interpret from the plat itself what the intention was. If the intention was to have that as an easement for the back parcel, it was not done properly. The engineer didn't properly note it. There are no plat notes about it. There's just that designation. And there's the dedication language that says that all easements are dedicated to the public and city for use by the public. There should have been a reservation of easement noted in there or a notation that says an easement is for parcel A, the current parcel that remained after the one lot is carved out.

Mayor Wilson explained those houses were built as a flag lot. Then that twenty-foot access easement cannot be used for another flag lot. Anything that's built up there is going to have to come off of 100 east anyway, which they understand and know that. He thought part of the argument they had was about that twenty-foot access, it would be for the fire trucks if they needed to make the circle and come back around. Heath mentioned maybe that does not meet the fire code.

Heath commented that he didn't look up the appendix and the fire apparatus access.

Nick Wright said it was twenty-four feet.

Heath added the city ordinance says twenty-five. He believed that Toquerville and Virgin were twenty-six. That's the reason why everyone's had that number, not twenty. He could understand at the time that it would be created with it being originally a flag lot. This whole parcel of 6.4 acres was a flag, and this right here was the staff of the flag. Later it was dedicated to the city. He could tell them the instrument number and the prior owner, Mr. Sanders. He was the one who dedicated that piece to the city, so it's no longer a flag, in that sense, it's a platted lot, it meets and bounds legal description parcel all up front.

Councilman Pectol asked if this is called an access easement? Who owns it? Who owns an access easement.

Heath replied he looked at who and how it was given, and it was given by the Olsen's through a plat. It and the conveyance in the dedication. The language on the plat that says, "we hereby dedicate and convey to". That is the conveyance language. A plat is nothing more than a deed. You convey land either through a deed or through a plat. And in that plat, it conveyed that easement to the city for use by public.

Councilman Prince added that one of the scenarios that he was looking at was if they compared this to a home that had an alleyway in the back, and the law has been pretty clear that they keep those alleyways because it's so advantageous to get back there for the homeowners, is that the right scenario to look at?

Heath replied that it couldn't be their primary access, and it would be a matter for maybe the Hurricane Valley Fire District to say whether they see any need. To have that easement remain for just that very reason to possibly loop.

Councilman Prince replied he wasn't thinking about access for fire, but what about say, a contractor who needed to get his equipment around this circle? It's much easier to have access on this side because from what he understood on the easements, both parties had to agree. But you are saying the back part doesn't have to agree.

Heath replied that my client was a subsequent owner, and the Olsen's owned both at the time they platted or conveyed that lot, and with it being subject to a public easement. So, the Olsen's agreed with themselves, and the city approved that agreement by signing off on it and allowing it to be recorded. Does that answer your question?

Councilman Prince commented it sounded like in your description that it's its own plat. Typically, when you abandon an easement, there is a party that's affected.

Heath replied yes, and that's a great point. That's where he was going with the whole thing is that to say that easement is just for the parcel back behind, that we couldn't clearly say that. It's not dedicated that way, and his client's lot was originally done as a bigger flag lot. When the Olsen's came back in to take that bigger flag lot and make it a one lot subdivision because they did not want to have to pay for the cost of improving 100 east, they dedicated all of 100 East. So, they now created public frontage right along the rest of their parcel that was not part of the subdivision. So, it kind of went from being originally a flag lot to being a conforming lot, except for he thought their parcel, the Olsen's parcel, only fronts on ninety-four feet and requiring R-1-14 requires hundred-foot frontage.

Kyle Gubler commented that what Darren's probably getting at is if the Olsen's wouldn't have any say in the matter if it was a plat amendment.

Health added although they want to say that access is for the back lot. The way the plat reads, it's for the public and it was given to the city. And they're not part of the subdivision. And when we are amending a subdivision plat, the owners within the subdivision are the only parties that have to apply for and sign off on an amended plat, which would only be his client.

Councilwoman Barr commented that actually clarifies a lot of things for me. Originally, when we first heard it, we didn't know the "why", and everyone was talking in circles, and no one was saying why it actually wanted to be done or why it needed to be done. So, thank you for clarifying that. She appreciated it.

Fay added that the real benefit to the city is there's two ways to do this. One, the city could initiate an abandonment by having a public hearing, going through the public hearing process, passing an ordinance. As part of that ordinance, we'd have to make a very specific finding that vacating this road is not going to hurt any other person, it won't result in anyone's detriment, et cetera, et cetera by doing it. This way, we avoid having to do that because they file an amended plat. They would just simply go through the ALUA, and it wouldn't come back to the city council.

Mayor Wilson asked who would file that.

Fay replied that Theresa Fish would file an amended plat; it would be reviewed by the ALUA. And, then if the ALUA feels like it meets all the requirements of the city, of our subdivision ordinance, they would approve it.

Health added that this survey engineering company that did the record of survey for his client could turn it into a plat.

Councilman Gubler commented to Derek that because we've been saying that we can't determine why the Olsen's did that on the plat. You signed off on it. From your recollection, what was the purpose of that?

Derek replied that he honestly doesn't remember why or how that twenty foot access got put on there, and when we were talking about it originally, it's usual that either it's going to be something more dealt with in the deed of dedication, or it will actually would have two lines referencing both pieces of property with some language there, saying that's a shared access easement, but they just have the twenty-foot access with one arrow pointing to Theresa's property. That was the question that we had. And going back to the original point when Steve Sanders built that it was a flag lot. And the second property, when the Olsen's came in would have been accessed off of 100 East. So, whether we can claim that it's still the flag lot probably is not a flag lot anymore, but the flag lot ordinance itself only allowed one homeowner to access that flag lot for that particular piece of property.

Heath commented that he would think that Olsen's or Scott would want to not call it a flag lot because then there's that limitation to one home. If they think that there's enough land and ground up there and if they want to get some sort of zone change or something that allows them to do something a little denser. Then they could probably do that as long as access is off of the new dedicated 100 East.

Derek added that when they talked about it last time, when Alen and Scott were here, we made sure, Kyle made sure that the fact that they knew that was only access and all improvement costs and primary access would be just shy of two hundred feet would be from that portion. And then the other question about twenty-foot access is why we want it if we still require twenty-five feet. It's been long ago, long enough ago that he didn't remember, and our surveyor has now passed away. He didn't remember why they did it.

Councilman Gubler commented that in his mind, it's either the city or the surveyor, someone decided it would be twenty and not twenty-five. Mr. Olsen invited me out there. That retaining wall you can see it up there at the top. You know he explained that his intention and when it was done, he could pull up with his trailers in there and have a way to come back down. He said he put about twenty thousand dollars into retaining wall. Then, after this plat had been recorded, once that was established, he invested money and put that in. So, according to him, that was the intent. But it's just a question of why twenty feet?

Derek replied that he has contemplated that. He didn't know why, because that's not the normal number we use. It could be twenty-five for fire. Accessibility is not necessary for just the road. He didn't know.

Heath commented that should have been noted access. Easement for parcel LV-56. That's all it would have needed to clarify that, but it didn't. It only states access easements that all these are dedicated to the city. Sorry, his opinion, if it was Mr. Olsen, he probably advised him to go and have a heart-to-heart talk with his engineer who didn't properly note or do his intentions, if that was his intentions. Can we get some sort of indication because we don't want to go and spend any additional money getting the record survey converted into a preliminary and a final plat, get on your agenda, if this is something that we're not going to get.

Councilman Pectol asked what it was Heath wanted them to do exactly.

Heath explained this is a discussion only, no action to be taken. They are asking if instead of the city abandoning it, which would require you to make a finding, as the single lot owner in the subdivision, do they have objection to them bringing an amended plat to do this? His client has a limited income and wants to be conscious of expense and time.

Councilman Gubler had more questions and would like to discuss it further whether tonight or another time.

Councilman Prince wanted to do more research and understand the issue better. He asked if it was city council's decision to have it go before the ALUA or to the city council to vacate the property.

Fay replied that it would be their decision. Tonight was just a discussion but ultimately, they decided whether they wanted to go through the abandonment process or what would they be willing to entertain a filing an amended plat. They would make that determination.

Mayor Wilson asked if they decided to file an amended plat, does that have to come through the council.

Derek explained if they filed an amended plat it would go through the ALUA. If they did go through the process, there would be nothing that would stop them from filing. And if they meet all the criteria, then they're going to go forward.

Fay agreed.

Heath responded that was how he understood it.

Chester Ence commented he and Scott Stratton were the other interested party in the meeting. Really it comes to this, he thought it is a public easement, right? And the city does have rights to it. There is a party behind it that does have something that would be affected by it. There is twenty feet. They talked to John, the chief or whatever he was. He said twenty feet for fire access up there now. It's not twenty-five; it's not twenty-four; it's twenty, and that was from his mouth. Heath is a lawyer; he's good at talking. He thought there might be a conflict of interest with him and Scott, especially the way that he was talking about Scott.

Heath commented that he likes Scott; he thinks Scott's great. He didn't know what conflict of interest is. The owner is the Olsen's, and he checked the property records and it's not Scott.

Chester replied that they could go buy the property tomorrow if they need to.

Heath replied he can only work off what the public record says. My understanding is Scott is the contractor.

Chester commented they are willing to work with you guys and have a city on it and come to some type of agreement on it, but it is a public easement.

Scott Stratton commented that his investigation showed when she bought this property, look at her deed, and it says that her deed is subject to that. And she bought it that way, knowing that she just deeded it back into her own trust. And she's actually recognized by the way it's been in place. that's all he would have to say and now she wants to get rid of it.

Theresa Fish brother commented since they opened this meeting up a little. He would not talk about the property at all. What he was going to talk about is he has been a heavy equipment operator for twelve years, and he was a professional firefighter for the city of Orem as a truck operator and engineer. He went back and worked at 9-11 as a firefighter. He knew what it takes to run fire equipment and how to get it out. It's funny that fire trucks have a reverse on them, and as a firefighter and truck engineer operator, he didn't know how many alleyways he had gone down, we've successfully put fires out and then backed back out. Being that he lives with Theresa and is her brother he has walked the property. He didn't know if all of them had, but they could get up there. He could turn around an eighteen-wheeler up there all day long. So, for them to put in this little bit about, we've got to have to put our equipment out there and to take our track hoe out of there and everything, and ruin that blacktop and to continually have them run equipment up there because they have a developer that wants to buy this and fill his pockets full, and he wants his way because he is used to it happening. That was insane to him. He understood they are a little town. He loves little towns. That's why they moved here. They looked for two and a half years to find the perfect place to live for the rest of their lives. And what we chose was La Verkin. They love La Verkin. We are citizens of La Verkin, and they are not here to turn a buck. They are here to be part of the community and to be good neighbors. All the Gubler's are our neighbors and friends, and they love everybody there. They don't care who builds up there, but they want them to be good neighbors and have respect for them too. That's why there are fences, and they don't want to possibly leave the fence open to where kids can impede. If we're here all the time with the city council because they've stepped over their boundaries to get what they want. He thought city council had it in their hands to take care of this and didn't need anybody pressing on the top of their heads to tell them the decisions they are going to make. They are the council and the city administrator, and Derek. That was his own personal feeling, they needed to choose one way or another and put aside all the friendships. But do what is right for the community. He wanted to talk as a firefighter. And as someone that's willing to help people. He wanted them to know that big piece of ground above us has plenty of room to move things around. That's the only insight he wanted to share. If they have time, come and drive up there. They are all welcome to look at the property before they change their minds or make up their mind. He wanted to invite them. Thank you for your time.

Councilman Valenti commented that they have gotten a lot of different views tonight, and he thought there's some thought to be given to this.

Heath commented that the deed that his client took title through did not say this specific easement. It just says, "subject to all easements of La Verkin". The plat is a public document and a record, but to say that it specifically referenced this one would not be accurate.

Fay suggested that maybe they are not quite ready. His suggestion would be that they put this on the agenda again for next meeting. Prior to the next meeting, they have a work meeting at five o'clock just to discuss this issue only so that they can really understand all of the different aspects of it. Then come into this meeting and then make some sort of determination, which way they would like to go.

Commissioner Prince agreed with Fay's suggestion.

Mayor Wilson asked Fay if the property owner could go ahead and do an amended easement without the council. Is that right?

Fay replied that the amendment to this plat could be done without final approval from the council.

Heath added that this is being processed as an amendment to the plat. It would go through the approval process. If it's an abandonment, it's you guys. If it's a plat amendment, who is your administrative land use authority in La Verkin?

Fay replied that we have several people that sit on that board. The tricky part about this is that there are some aspects involving under the subdivision portion of the Utah code having to do with amendment of a plat. And if you're amending the plat to vacate a roadway, then generally speaking, you have to go through this petition process. Then you have to go through public hearing and determination made by the city. There's no use for the roadway. There's no material harm to anybody by vacating the roadway, et cetera, et cetera. But with the ALUA as we've adopted that, that kind of bypasses that section of Utah code. And that makes me a little nervous that we would just simply let the ALUA make that determination.

Heath replied that there's a reason why the ALUA process was created in the recent revisions. And if the ALUA is a separate land use authority, it should not be taking direction if that is delegated power to them. If the council directs them and tells them how to make decisions, then there's no independence. That was one of the bigger reasons why final plats and plat amendments were taken out of control of councils or planning commissions, which were bodies.

Fay asked what they do about the language in the code that requires a petition, public hearing, and a finding by the city council? He thought it says specifically "city council" or "the city" he thought it says "the legislative body" on road abandonment and the legislative body. He didn't think it was the ALUA. He thought the legislative body gives it to the city council.

Heath clarified that it is for a road and this is an easement.

Fay understood what he was saying, however, there is just a little bit of ambiguity between the state statute and then the provisions regarding these when it comes to abandonment of a roadway by an amended plat.

Mayor Wilson asked Fay if his suggestion was still a work meeting?

Fay replied that he would suggest a work meeting. But as they have noted and as Heath has noted, they don't necessarily have to wait for the city to do that, for the city council to make that determination. They can file an application for an amended plat approval and submit it to the ALUA. They can do that without our approval and without going through this process. He thought the whole purpose of them coming tonight was to get some consensus on the best way to proceed. If they're willing to take that risk of preparing the plat and then submitting it to the ALUA, he supposed they could do that.

Councilman Prince added when he took this to land use at the county, they indicated that to abandon this both parties need to agree to it. So, he understood that side of it. But in light of this new assertion by Mr. Snow, did Fay agree that they were wrong? That only one party has to agree to this. That the second party wouldn't have a say in this amendment.

Fay replied yes, he didn't think it's a matter of one party agreeing and the other party not agreeing. If we go the route of the city council making determination, we don't have to have the approval of either party.

Councilman Prince was worried about avoiding liability.

Fay added that in terms of a written agreement, we can make a determination that that roadway serves no purpose. We can declare the surplus property. We can go back out and then do a roadway abandonment if we have absolutely no use for it. That's one way of doing it, or we can just simply go through a roadway abandonment under the subdivision amendment statutes, or the third way would be to do it through amending the plat process, which would go through the ALUA.

Mayor Wilson commented it wasn't a roadway it's an easement.

Fay replied that it's an access easement, yes. Access to public access easement, obviously that's a little vague itself. He didn't know if it was ever intended for public access. He didn't know what was intended for. That's part of the problem. What was the purpose for that public access easement.

Councilman Prince biggest concern was that we do it right, that we don't put the city in liability.

Fay agreed and thought that was what they all wanted.

Councilman Prince added that recommendation from the land use person, they only had a few minutes, and he wasn't saying this is gospel by any means, but that this is a civil matter and this should be handled civilly, not through the city council.

Fay replied that the city council doesn't have to take any action. We don't have to make any determination. That would leave them, if they wanted to pursue it, they could file an amended plat and take it to the ALUA.

Councilman Prince said the county said they would be crazy to get involved.

Fay commented that one way or another we are involved. What approach should be from city council? Just simply to say, we're not going to do anything. We're not going to abandon it. We're just going to leave it as it is. But that still wouldn't prevent them from coming in and filing a plat amendment that would be reviewed by the ALUA. City council wouldn't be making that decision; it would be ALUA.

Councilman Prince added that the ALUA also need to watch out for the city to make sure that they're not putting the city in jeopardy.

Fay replied that the ALUA should always be cognizant of that. He always wanted to make sure that they follow the ordinance, they follow state statute, and all of that. He didn't know how the state statute pertaining to plat amendments and vacation of roadways, how that fits in with our ALUA concept. That's the little wrinkle for me.

Councilwoman Barr added that according to the 2023 Utah State Legislature adopted the Senate Bill One Seventy-Four, which amended various land use and development requirements for municipalities and counties,

including subdivision review procedures. Therefore, it's necessary for the market city to update ordinances. So it sounds like legislature gave us a lot more authority with ALUA?

Fay responded that we went through the whole process. We went through the whole process of amending our subdivision ordinances to comply with that statute. We created the ALUA to handle some of these smaller subdivision questions so that and they were just purely administrative approvals basically. They weren't legislative approvals. Those were just simply handled by the ALUA and not the city council.

Councilman Valenti agreed that in the code that simple subdivisions go through the ALUA. He didn't know if Fays 'wrinkle' was a big enough problem to move it to the city council.

Councilman Prince wanted Fay to research it further. He sees both sides. If he was Ms. Fish, he would not want that to be an easement. If he was Stratton's, he would want that. He wanted to hear what Fay determined before he decided.

Fay replied if they put it on the agenda again for next meeting. He could send a memo to the council of what he thought should be the appropriate action. In the meantime, should they elect to do so, they could always file a platted amendment and take it to the ALUA without waiting for two weeks.

Councilwoman Barr added that sounds like it's their right to do so.

Mayor Wilson suggested putting it back on the agenda in two weeks if the council wanted to.

Councilman Gubler agreed to have a work meeting unless they get some pretty clear direction.

Kyle suggested they can always put it on the agenda and make it discuss that possible action. And then they don't have to take action, but they have possibility, if they wanted to they could.

Fay agreed that putting it on the agenda is a safer way. Allowing them to proceed if we want to or pass it over again if we don't want to.

## 2. Discussion regarding the Ultra Water Efficiency Standards.

Mayor Wilson explained he and Kyle attended Washington County Water Conservancy District meeting on Monday, and they passed this standard for the water district. It's left up to each individual city as to whether or not they want to pass that and implement it. However, there was quite a bit of discussion whether the cities would want to do it for individual lots, or whether it would be better just to do it in subdivisions. The main thing about that is that if you decide you want to say a subdivision come in, wanted to have this ultra water efficiency standard, they will have to commit to what the standard means, and that goes with the property from then on. No grass, no swimming pools; it's all desert landscape. He didn't think it would fit in the bench because we have secondary irrigation, and we want people to have use the secondary irrigation to do their landscaping, whether it's desert landscaping or not. But with the possibility that we're going to have some subdivisions up on top of the hill, that could be a real option for them. The reason they would want to do it is because the impact fee is reduced by, he thought \$5,000 per lot. So, it is an incentive for a developer to want to do the subdivision that way. Once they do it if they sell that house years down the road, somebody wants to put grass, they can't. They want to put a swimming pool in, they can't.

Kyle added that they're not supposed to have grass or a pool but that's part of the problem. If someone breaks the rules, then who's going to police that.

Councilman Pectol added that the one that got really weird for him was the soft water treatment stuff. To be in there and not have a water softener. Do they really think they can tell somebody that they're not going to have a water softener in their house after the fact.

Mayor Wilson replied that there are other ways to soften the water without salt. That's what they were saying. It would be tough to police, but the only way they could really tell would be if you're using a lot more water than eight thousand gallons a month. If they decided to put a pool in their backyard and didn't tell anybody about it, and they are using a lot of water for your pool, or you planted some grass and you're using a lot of water for the grass. They are going to be paying a lot of money for that extra water because once they get past eight thousand gallons, it's very expensive. Right now, it's ten dollars per thousand.

Councilman Prince commented that on the Topside some of those lots are millions of dollars.

Mayor Wilson added that there are some developers that are looking at that property and they're looking at some million dollar lots.

Councilman Pectol commented they will want pools.

Mayor Wilson added that they don't have to do the whole thing. Certain areas they could do a section that is the standard point five nine, which you can have a pool and grass. They still pay once you go past a certain amount on new construction, they are still going to pay a lot of money for that water. But if there was a section up there that they wanted to do only desert landscaping, and they could apply this then they wouldn't pay the extra money. This was only a discussion tonight. Do we want to do it? Make it an option for developers?

Councilman Prince commented that Desert color did amazing work with that in sections.

Mayor Wilson added it's just a way of making us aware. They can have more lots, more development, and extend their water out further. Just like with the agreement the city made with the water district, if we just do a point five nine from here on out, we'd get about twenty-two hundred something connections. If we did it all ultra efficiently, we'd end up with about thirty-four hundred connections. It's just a matter of whether or not we want to adopt that and allow a developer to come in and say they want to do that for that section. It is all voluntary. The city could adopt it, but they could determine if or where they want it. If they do it would be on their plat if it's that way because they're getting five thousand dollars off on impact fees.

Councilman Valenti if the only enforcement record would be through CCNRs. Is that the only method of enforcement?

Mayor Wilson responded that they didn't really come up with that. That was the sticking point.

Councilman Valenti added if we put in this CCNR and are we still going to get that credit toward the greater amount of connections?

Mayor Wilson replied that we would if it was on say a subdivision part of that subdivision. We would get the extra credit because they're only using the .39 and there's no obligation. We could adopt it, but if nobody wanted to do it, that's fine.

Councilwoman Barr added it sounds like it's kind of a waste of time to adopt it. If people can do it, if they want. And builders are already nowadays. If they are building up the top, there is going to be an HOA because that's how they do new neighborhoods. So, they're going to be the ones enforcing and they're going to be the ones doing it because they got credits. Even outside of the breaks on the impact fees, they're going to get tax breaks and everything to do this anyways and to do low water. So, it kind of sounds like a waste of time. She generally thinks it's a good idea to save water, but it sounds like it's a waste of the council's time to go through this.

Councilman Prince explained that we want to do it, so they have the option to get the impact fee reduction.

Kyle explained if they don't pass it then the builder won't get the credit off the impact fee even if they did ultra efficient water plan.

Councilwoman Barr added that's kind of opposite what the water conservancy district said months ago. They said that they're doing this for a lot of people, but if that's the way it is, she didn't have a problem with it. She thought it's kind of what everyone's doing nowadays, anyway.

Councilman Prince commented that we want them to have the option to do this because some of them are going to do this and they're going to market this and they're going to save a ton of water. And it's going to be a good thing for some of those people.

Mayor Wilson added that the home builders association were there as well, and that was their comment, they were supportive of that option. If we don't adopt it, then they don't have that opportunity here. So, it would be something that we could adopt, and whether they want to go that route or not. But to do it down on the bench doesn't make sense because of the secondary irrigation.

### 3. Consideration and possible action to approve Ordinance No. 2026-06. An ordinance to change details in the General Commercial zone.

Derek explained that he highlighted the changes and added a page of explanation. All three zones will have the same changes. These similar findings will be considered by the planning commission. So that takes that ability away from staff and puts it at the planning commission. Which is better for them to make decisions on whether they are close enough to what permitted uses are to be allowed. Setbacks when butting against city streets move from 25 feet to 15 feet, and the 15 feet must be landscaped. Commercial business that back up to residential. If you go to the map, the first map is actually of the parcel directly across from Farmer's Market. The second one is the property next to a park. He designated lines representing 20, 30, and 50 foot. The first one is Farmers Market. You see the lines because that's the only section that runs up against commercial or residential. Everything else is commercial; it doesn't have the same impact. So, the red line represents 20-foot, the blue line represents 30-foot, and green line is fifty. Those are three measurements you need to keep in mind. So basically, commercial business setbacks from residential first 20-feet, ten of it has to be landscaped. Height of the building cannot exceed 18 feet for the initial 30 feet. After setback 50-feet, the height can be the max allowed in that zone. The planning commission really wanted to focus on that to protect the neighborhoods and residential aspects there. So basically, 50 feet is where they have to be in order to start getting up to maximum height, and that can be what the zone allows.

Councilman Gubler commented about the little motel units being put on 300 South being right next to the residential. Essentially, if we passed this, then they wouldn't have been able to go so high so close to the property, which he felt bad about those.

Derek replied if they had this in the zone already, they wouldn't have been approved. Remember we were always talking about the changes that would come along with the new development. We didn't know we had a problem with the code until people started to apply it. So, these are some of the corrections. Structures on lots should not exceed fifty percent of the total lot area. The biggest shock in that was the number of buildings they were able to put on that 3.5-acre parcel property, which they were allowed to do under current ordinance. This would correct that and basically cut that in half. So that was another one we found that we were short in having enough ordinance development standards. We included block walls, vehicular access, parking, loading areas, traffic volume, street curbsides, sidewalk paving. Even though that spread throughout our design criteria, we felt it was better to have a standard in the commercial design guideline. He reminded them that they adopted the commercial design guidelines and the standards. The application part of it requires a precise plan, agricultural drawing studies, and landscaping and signage. This is different than we've ever done before. Most of the time our signage is all contained within one area, and it's applicable, whether it's commercial, what type of commercial residential and so on and we're precise on the signage. So that can go on with these zones. We've identified that they have got to provide site plans and sign structure. Building signs are allowed under commercial zones are allowed monument signs, pilot signs, and tailgate signs. And those are defined in the site ordinance and the sign ordinance itself. But we wanted to call out, particularly, these are the only signs that will be allowed in those areas. So, we're taking another step in letting them have the signs that they need to advertise what they're trying to advertise and not get carried away. Then we spelled out the lighting ordinance, and that's the light ordinance which takes care of glare. Which is in our ordinance, but it wasn't specifically put in each one of these zones. He felt it needed to call more attention to that because they don't want to start getting light pollution. We want to keep our night skies as dark as possible, providing minimal light for

people to feel safe and to get around. So, those are the highlighted sections that are in there. The map shows them how the planning commission went about figuring it out.

Councilman Gubler clarified that number three, four, and five on our agenda are all the same changes that we're asking for.

Derek added they didn't know we had a deficiency until we actually started to get people building to that code. Then we talked about it in those meetings and found out we needed to jump on it. They have already built some of those buildings. He thought what everybody assumed was, we already had it in the code.

Councilman Prince commented under tourist commercial under permitted use are car washes. Help me understand why that would be in the in the tourist commercial.

Derek replied that it is in all zones.

Councilman Prince asked if that was a common practice.

Derek explained that they were talking today about hotels in every one of our zones. Car washes are spelled out in some of the zones, and that's typically what we've always had. Not saying that we can't change it, but that's always been a permitted use.

Councilman Prince commented it seemed more of a general commercial zone than a tourist commercial zone.

Councilman Valenti commented that the codes that a lot of these things go way back. What we had twenty years ago or thirty years ago, it was still in the code. They're looking at starting to clean that up, but it's a lengthy process.

Councilman Prince added that it would seem like tourist commercial to him would be a walkable restaurants, museums and stores that people would stop here and spend time. Nobody's going to walk into a car wash. The tourist commercial should be that kind of thing.

Derek added that that would be the next part that we do once we get through this. They will go through and start looking at permitted uses and make those changes because they all may not fit within what we deemed necessary or what we want to have in there now. So, we can go through and start taking it out and changing it. They had to start with this because that was the biggest problem that they had with development.

**The motion was made by Councilman Valenti to approve Ordinance No. 2026-06. An ordinance to change details in the General Commercial zone. seconded by Councilman Micah Gubler. Roll Call Vote: Barr-yes, Valenti-yes, Prince-yes, Pectol-yes, Gubler-yes. The motion carried unanimously.**

4. Considerations and possible action to approval Ordinance No. 2026-07 an ordinance changing details in the Retail commercial zone.

**The motion was made by Councilman Gubler to approval Ordinance No. 2026-07 an ordinance changing details in the Retail commercial zone. seconded by Councilman Pectol. Roll Call Vote: Barr-yes, Valenti-yes, Prince-yes, Pectol-yes, Gubler-yes. The motion carried unanimously.**

5. Consideration and possible approval of Ordinance No. 2026-08, an ordinance changing details in the Tourist Commercial zone.

**The motion was made by Councilwoman Barr to approval Ordinance No. 2026-08 an ordinance changing details in the Tourist commercial zone. seconded by Councilman Valenti. Roll Call Vote: Barr-yes, Valenti-yes, Prince-yes, Pectol-yes, Gubler-yes. The motion carried unanimously.**

6. Consideration and possible approval of Ordinance No. 2026-09, an ordinance amending the definition of the detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs) to allow short-term rentals (vacation rentals) for lot/parcel that are 10,000 sq. ft. or larger in residential zones within the community; providing an effective date.

Councilwoman Barr commented that one of the things in the research that she had been reading on this was that no one or very few people actually talk about the crime rate. She found a couple studies nationwide. There's only been a handful of studies that have been done on the effects of crime in communities that have a lot of short-term rentals. Whether it's on the same property or separate properties, the biggest issue isn't necessarily the tourists that are coming in and renting the properties committing the crimes. It's locals who know where the short-term properties are and know that tourists have no support system, they know they're leaving their place for a long period of time, breaking into those properties, that kind of thing. That's a concern with more properties that open up. More availability. Even if it is the homeowners that are living on property and opening up their backyard or side yard. However, there is concern with the homeowners and the neighbors just because you're having someone hidden in the backyard. So, they will scope out the neighborhood. This is my criminal justice background, so I apologize but it is a concern. Right across the street from her they had three different groups of people living on one piece of property, and only one of them, she believes, was supposed to be there. We couldn't see who was living in the trailer that was behind. It was unpermitted. We didn't know who they were, we had no idea when they were moving in, what they were doing. That's a concern because we have people coming in and out. Another issue is that sense of neighborhood. Commissioner Bice said the same thing. When you have multiple people coming in on a regular basis to a neighborhood that aren't residents of that neighborhood, we lose a lot of the sense of community. They lose a lot of that neighborhood feel. If she had people coming in and out of her neighbors across the street, even if she knows who owns the house, she can't be friends with the pass-through neighbors across the street. But if they're having multiple people coming, are those people there renting? Or are they meant to do harm to my neighbors or to the neighborhood? So that's also concerning having unknown vehicles coming in and out of your neighborhood. Those are my two biggest concerns. Another one is, how is the city going to verify that the homeowners actually reside in the main home? Because again her biggest example were the people across the street. They bought the house, lived there for six months and moved. They've been renting it out like they live there, so that's another concern. How are we going to enforce that versus having to rely on people making reports to the city. How is that going to be enforced?

Councilman Prince replied that he led this charge and where he picked up on the value of this is Lydia and Toko. He had three of these types of rentals where they were in ADUs or DADUs. The ones that he observed and talked to were very similar to a lot of the people that were here petitioning for it under the planning and zoning. One of them was a single mother who had an ADU. It was great that she had that extra income to help her pay for her mortgage. But when her kids were in town, she had that opportunity to have that open for them. The Hidemans have had one for a number of years. A lot of these ADUs are small, so you don't have that problem with a big group or a lot of noise. It's usually hikers who come in, like the hideaways. They always have hikers who come in the evening, leaving in the morning. They really don't see them, And it's great for them because it's the same situation. They can make some money to help with their mortgage. But when their kids come, they have that space available. How many people came to the planning meeting.

Councilman Gubler replied twelve were in favor and two against.

Councilman Prince added that we live in this prime spot where this is an opportunity for our citizens to have that opportunity to take advantage of their property and make a little extra money. Going to your comment on crime, from what he had read, when these are owner occupied on the property, those rates go way down, and the problems go way down. The letter that he read from Allen was saying that you know you can't control this, no matter what. That we will have these problems. That's not what he observed. It's much more controlled when the owner lives on the property. They're pretty strict on them. They evaluate them and you evaluate them and they need to keep good ratings to keep up their rankings. They're going to make sure that those are taken care of. And my last point is that Allen said that it would raise the property values. He would love to have that discussion: Is that our job as city council to keep the property values down? He didn't know that would be a negative

Councilman Valenti replied that maybe it's not to keep property values down, but as you increase property values, you also increase taxes on other homes that are not involved in this enterprise at all. If a home goes up in value as the county assesses property and a mass evaluation, all those prices are caught up. They do in effect raise other people's property taxes that have nothing to do with this. He watched this process for several years now when it first started out. The city sought to designate only business areas or commercial areas, or typically areas that maintain hotels or motels or that type of business to have these vacation rentals. Then there was a period where we allowed them in residential areas. Then we went through several gyrations, we took out the old ward maps, and we tried fifteen percent and seven percent and five

percent. All of that was aimed, to Amanda's point, at keeping some sense of community. We also got corporate interest that got involved and helped out of state interest that we didn't control. He thought fifty percent or better of the vacation rentals now have no ownership in town. Then they started to deny other people only based on whether or not they live in the house, which really is not material. His opinion was they become the pickers of winners and losers. Even under the current guidelines. He thought there was a legislative bill that would make cities allow ADUs on ten thousand square foot lots, and it'll probably pass. It doesn't pass this session; it'll pass in a future session. Maybe if they're successful in that, they'll come back and look at eight thousand square foot lots. Right now, fully under this proposed plan, probably sixty percent of the city would be able to engage in this. Are we becoming a tourist town that has fifty percent of its homes given to vacation rentals. The school is already under debate whether or not we even need a school now. The intention initially of the DADU use was for families or to create stock in residential units so that we could add to the population of permanent residents. It's not temporary residence. He had trouble supporting this. When it went to the planning commission, it ended up three to two out of the five members wouldn't approve it. He would like to adopt their view of things. We can always revisit it again in the future at some point in time. He thought it opens up a lot of problems for our city.

Councilman Prince replied that we don't have to look too far to see this in action. Washington city allows ADUs in all the city. Hurricane city allows two ADUs if you held over point eight acres.

Councilman Valenti commented they are discussing a specific item which is allowing short term rentals in ADAU's.

Councilman Prince replied that's what he was saying. It's allowed in Washington city; it's allowed in Hurricane city.

Councilman Valenti added that those cities are much bigger than us, too. He had the feeling we're going to be swallowed up in this one way or another. He couldn't support it, and he respected his opinion. The city's own commissioner of planning says he's identified numerous problems, and it's not only this planning commission. Other planning commissions over the time he had been here felt a similar way limited, limited, limited. What this is going to do is it's going to expand it, and it's going to be very indiscriminate as far as how it's applied. He thought the ordinance, as it's constructed, was clear enough to prevent them from just being swamped.

Councilman Gubler commented that he wanted to preface this that he appreciates the planning commissions point of view. He appreciated that it's all coming from what's going to protect our community. When they first started talking about ADUs, it was a big step. There was hesitancy from the planning commission. John mentioned, we are going to be swallowed up in it. That was thrown out there a lot. He asked Lisia today how many ADU permits were pulled 2025. There were two. He thought they had been talking about it and operating it on, this is just going to explode because he felt they're getting confused with what we saw with the standalone vacation rentals that anyone could own. He always felt bad about that. When he first came in they said we're going to approve it for 5%. But they allowed 10%. And immediately they started to see these outside interests come in. They started to lose the community. Right now, we allow someone to have them within their home or if it's even connected with a roof line to do it. He has two of those within a block of him. He only sees some cars parked. He never sees people. He and his wife walk around a lot, they're as quiet as can be because they are small rentals. No one's complaining about crime or noise or other things with these, where we have a resident living there, and they're allowed to do it connected to their house. He didn't see any difference if they have a separate ADU that's small on the property, whether it's connected to the side of the house or with the roof line or sitting separately. The results are going to be the same. It'll be a small quiet vacation rental. He thought it was pretty telling six to one from the residents they were saying, look, this is something that they need. Some say for convenience. He personally liked that. Convenience doesn't work for everyone, but the convenience of having a separate dwelling where if my family comes into town, there's a place for them to stay. But when they're not, he wanted to be able to use it. If it's a long-term rental you lose that flexibility. He thought that it's a right that someone that lives in La Verkin should be able to have. He thought it helped with the affordability. He thought it would help bring families. He thought a lot of these homes in Hurricane and in Toquerville the owners' only way to make it work was building this little ADU or having this vacation rental apartment because they couldn't make the payment otherwise. So, it helps these families to be able to get into a residence. It also could help people trying to retire make their payment. And we give them a chance because they live here to be able to take advantage of it. He believed it helped with affordability. The taxes part of it's always hard. He lived in La Verkin all his life and he has always been glad that his home appreciated. He realized that the time is coming when it's going to flip and he will want that to stay. With their community they are going to have both sides to that. Some will like

it increasing in value and others not. He thought there would be more at the public hearing that would not support it. But to have six to one say yes, they would like that. He felt they were limiting it being for ten thousand square feet or bigger. And someone could be on acre lot. He is on acre. He has an older home, it's two thousand square feet. He would like to be able to build a slightly bigger one. He thought they limited it well, and it's been thoughtful. He referred to the two that are just a block away from him and they're both right by each other and quite as could be. They're helping those families be able to be in their homes. They love it, and it's a benefit for them. And looking at what happened with ADU permits he didn't think they were going to be swallowed up in it. No one can come in from outside money, buy a lot or buy a home and rent it out. They have to be residents. He loved it.

Councilman Valenti replied that he didn't think it was good comparison that fifteen people showed up out of 3,000 voters and that was a measure on how the community felt. He didn't think that was a good gauge.

Councilman Gubler commented that those who came most were for it. That should tell us something.

Councilman Valenti added that but ten more could have come and voted the other way, and it would have been completely different. The other concern was when they pass an ordinance like this, that permitted use becomes grandfathered in and almost impossible to change. The population we have now and the population we have in ten years, twenty years, fifteen years may be completely different. He saw it as more of a protection of the city, to not allow this.

Councilman Pectol commented that he appreciated Amanda's concerns about the criminal activity, maybe having more folks in a location than was permitted and for the loss of sense of community and known vehicles Having strangers around. Those are all valid concerns. He balanced that with what it takes for somebody to be able to afford a house here in our area and moving forward. He wasn't saying that this is the silver bullet to be able to fix it, he did not feel like it's his place to be able to limit somebody to have an opportunity to be able to do something on their own property. If somebody feels inclined to be able to build an ADU and market it and register it properly and pay the taxes on the income that comes into it. Paying for the stress on the infrastructure, and they meet all of the rules that go along with it. He didn't feel he should limit them. If it's a mechanism, like Micah said, to have a chance to be able to have young families have an opportunity to be able to stay in our community where our property values are going up, and they have an opportunity for someone to be able to go to work and maybe somebody stays home and takes care of an ADU, and they make a little bit of money, and that helps them be able to stay here in the community. He would want to be able to keep my kids around here. If that was the decision to allow them to be able to do that, or if that was the tipping point, a few thousand dollars that might be able to come in and help that. He would be in favor. He felt he was giving people freedom. to invest in their own property to be able to hopefully capitalize on the inevitable tourists that are going to come through our valley anyway. Why prevent them from being able to take advantage of that same kind of economic opportunity that is in their backyard and helps them to be able to afford it. He balances the concerns with what it takes to be able to keep our kids around. And be able to have affordable housing for them? He knows people that this was the thing that helped push them over the edge. The idea that a dad can go to work and a mom to maybe be able to stay home and take care of an ADU and be able to bring some income in and be able to make things work. And that's a big deal in some folks' lives. And he is sympathetic to that. He wanted to be able to allow that kind of a situation to exist

Councilwoman Barr commented those are all great points. She didn't think this one was ever going to make everyone happy. They can see both sides.

Councilman Valenti commented that zoning has been around since the turn of the century The 18th century, the 19th century. If there was no zoning the town would be full of bathhouses and bars and bordellos. This concept is that people want to allow you to do what you want to do but protect the city in a certain way. This city is unique in a lot of ways. He has been here 15 years now and would hate to see it lose some of that. He felt it would take away from that. He felt it would do nothing but increase values of homes.

**The motion was made by Councilman Prince to approval Ordinance No. 2026-09 an ordinance amending the definition of the detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs) to allow short-term rentals (vacation rentals) for lot/parcel that are 10,000 sq. ft. or larger in residential zones within the community; providing an effective date. seconded by Councilman Pectol. Roll Call Vote: Barr-no, Valenti-no, Prince-yes, Pectol-yes, Gubler-yes. The motion passed.**

## 7. Discussion regarding the city Verkada camera list.

Kyle showed the views from several cameras they have around town.

Councilman Prince asked if they had motion sensors because most crime happens at night and if they can't see because it's dark that won't help.

Kyle explained they have all the locations on the list. The staff has gone through some of the potential new camera locations that we would like to see would be out at the cemetery to get a little better coverage of the cemetery yard. We have one out there already and we used it when the guy ran into the cemetery sign. We saw the taillights as he came in from Main Street. He was intoxicated and went out towards State Street. When he went out, he hit the pole and busted it. We were able to find him and get that taken care of. It's cut down on a lot of vandalism. The bathrooms at Wanless Park are mostly finished. We're getting ready to open them up. We are going to need to do something with the cameras there, because those cameras were built to only look at one doorway. And now we have two on each side. When and if they decide to get more cameras then we'll replace those cameras that are there with some that show a little bit wider angle that will show both door entrances. Then we'll place those other cameras somewhere else. Behind the 111 South Main building we recommend a camera that shows the basketball court and the old fireplace. We want to put one in the council chambers. The ones here are made for projecting onto social media. They're not surveillance cameras. We'd probably put one in the corner that would show the back of the council but show the rest of the room. We're still having someone coming and messing with these microphones. Someone is getting in here and playing with these microphones and we've spent a lot of money on this system. We want to put one out by the hallway near the kitchens that will show the bathrooms and the hallway, the outside doors into those inside bathrooms so that when people rent the place, we can kind of keep track. Possibly one in the southeast corner of Power Plant Park that would look west because our cameras right now, look east. We couldn't see the stairs at the park, and we did have recently someone who had a couch out in front of their house that was free and someone picked it up and threw it over the cliff. We did have a volunteer go pick it up and bring it back up top and set it by the bathrooms. The animal shelter looking at the new addition could use a camera. There is ongoing money that we spend every time we put a camera up. There is a fee for it; it's minimal, but to put a camera up, the city council has approved anywhere between twenty-five and thirty-five thousand dollars that we put into a budget. Then we just go down the list and put as many cameras as we can with that money. Now there are other places that we did have some vandalism out on the new trailhead that they painted some tags. That could be a possible location now. Putting one there would be problematic with no power, but we did have one up on the upper tank where there's no power. It's solar powered. They tend to be more expensive, so when you do one of those, it chews up the budget a little quicker than normal. We had an incident on the twenty fourth of July where a can of something blew up, and we were able to pinpoint that. There was also one that shows the street in front of the city office. There was a kid that got on a motorcycle, come ripping down the road right by the city office, and without stopping at the stop sign he went right out in front of the water truck. It clipped him and messed up his leg. We were able to say that the water truck wasn't at fault. The cost of cameras varies depending on the view and quality.

Councilwoman Barr asked who installs and maintains the camera?

Kyle replied that Verkada does both. They are local and come right out when we have any issues. He estimated it was about fifteen hundred bucks a camera for one on average. The cost of installation. We were signed up for a five year contract. The cost of internet and some having solar power, in his opinion, was cheaper than the money they spent on Wanless park bathrooms, fixing them three or four times a year when the kids go in there. Now the bathrooms are a lot better now. They installed all stainless-steel sinks and toilets. They can be power washed.

Mayor Wilson said it's been better since they know they're on camera.

Councilman Gubler asked if they have any signage up letting them know they are being recorded?

Kyle replied that they don't, and we're worried a little bit that that might cause them to break in.

Councilman Valenti commented that he thought the city has the obligation to provide some general signage. Is the information stored on tape?

Kyle replied they are stored for a month It recycles itself, so if something that's longer than a month, a month and a half, probably not going to have it. But usually, we find out what happened quicker than that. He, Derek and the police chief are the only ones that have access to going back through the tape.

Councilwoman Barr agreed and thought it was good deterrents for a lot of crimes. She thought they're an excellent tool to use when the inevitable happens.

Kyle commented that it is more money but it's what the staff would like to see in the future. Unless they have some ideas of where they want to put them, besides where we suggested. Staff usually have a pretty good idea of what we need as far as visibility and every time we get a new park or anything new, it will probably require that we put something out there.

#### **F. Mayor & Council Reports:**

**Mayor Wilson:** Nothing to report.

**Kyle Gubler:** No report

**Valenti Reported:** The planning Commission meeting held on April 22, 2026. I've given you just a general outline of what was going on with the legislature, it's probably completely changed and may change again tomorrow, but that's kind of the nature of things.

**Prince Reported:** I got a call from Cameron over at HCP, and he's they're really ready to get things going down the confluence. So he loves my idea of this trails committee. I told him I've been putting it off because I'm really busy right now, but so he's arranging a meeting with Victor and Gil and Leslie, Krista and Mike from Ash Creek Sewer and Casey Lofthouse, Ben Skow, Jessica Kenrose to kind of get us all on the same page of what we want Confluence to look like. So maybe Patty would like to join us on that, but I think that's exciting. I want to see Confluence just be a star for our capital program.

**Micah Gubler Reported:** The recreation department had their first "I Love the park" photo contest in February. There are some beautiful pictures submitted. They're online. Easter egg hunt is coming up on April 4th the Easter Bunny will be there. Easter egg hunt starts at 9:30. The fair is just over a month away. That'll be April 10th through the 18th. La Verkin is the spotlight city so we're going to have a ten by fifteen city display at the fairgrounds. I think we have grand marshals' rides. That's going to kick off on the tenth of April and run for just over a week. We'll have the princesses involved.

**Pectol Reported:** I met with the Ash Creek Special Service District last month. Everything seems to be going well there. I was impressed with their commitment to safety, and they had a good safety briefing and what they had going on

**Barr Reported:** I Actually just got in touch with historical preservation today. So, they're going to start planning a meeting here in the next couple weeks or next month. They said they meet about four times a year.

**Fay:** No report

#### **G. Citizen Comment & Request for Future Agenda Items:**

Maridee Johnson is over the youth council, and I've talked to the staff, but the youth council is assigned to either a key staff member or a city council or mayor. There is one that reflects your position, and they would like to have like a job shadow or interview with their person. So, I am just putting it out to you. I've told them that they need to be responsible for setting that up. I'll get your information to them, and they'll be responsible for setting it up with you. I guess what I'm saying is to maybe expect that meeting happening in the next few months, and then we'll be switching councils as we approach the summer. And then the next one might approach you as well. It doesn't need to be long. It could be a half hour to an hour. They are teens, so that's about their attention span. But you could take them, you could bring them here or you could take them to mosquito meetings or whatever. They will ask you some questions and hopefully get them interested more in what we do as the city. So, if by chance, there's something that you have a problem with, or if you're not



comfortable. If you just let me know soon, I don't give them your information and maybe make arrangements for them to meet with somebody else.

**H. Adjourn:**

The mayor closed the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

April 1, 2020  
Date Approved

ATTEST: Nancy Cline  
Nancy Cline  
City Recorder

Kelly B. Wilson  
Mayor Kelly B. Wilson