MINUTES OF THE REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL, HELD ON JUNE 3, 2026 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.

Mayor and Council Members Present:
Mayor Heidi Hammond
Rhett Butler
Derek Dalton
Brittany Skinner
Jake Thomas
Jeff Williams

Council Members Excused: none.

Appointed Officers and Employees Present:
Michael Resare, City Manager
Alicia Fairbourne, City Recorder
Tysen Barker, City Attorney
Bill Cobabe, Community Development Director
Shelby Moore, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Citizens and Guests Present or on Zoom: Les Peterson, Delia Kirk, Michael Lifferth, Tresia Casal, Nic Jenkins, Greg Mackley, Julie Mackley, Joseph Kempe, Paul Linford, Jeremy Bendixen, Bill Comeal, Ed Burrola, Heidi Jeffries, Craig Durfee, Chance Peterson, Michael Miller, Kevin Casey, Rick Barchers, and others who may not have signed in or used their full name via Zoom.

Mayor Hammond called the meeting and public hearing of the Grantsville City Council to order at 7:00 p.m. and conducted a roll call of Councilmembers present.

She asked Les Peterson to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA:

1. **Public Comment**

   Mayor Hammond opened the public comment period at 7:02 p.m. and noted that agenda items five through nine were public hearing items. She stated that comments regarding those items would be accepted during the respective public hearings and invited comments on any other matters. No public comments were offered in person or online. Mayor Hammond closed the public comment period.

2. **Summary Action Items**

   a. **Approval of Minutes from the May 18, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting**

   Motion: Councilmember Butler moved approve the May 18, 2026 City Council Regular meeting minutes as presented.

   Second: Councilmember Williams seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Aye"; Councilmember Skinner, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion carried.

b. Approval of the bills

Motion: Councilmember Dalton moved approve the invoices.

Second: Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Aye"; Councilmember Skinner, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion carried.

3. Update from the victim advocate

Chief Sager provided a Victim Advocate program update as required by the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant. He reported that the program served 465 individuals and provided 2,982 services in 2025. During the first five months of 2026, the program had already served 495 individuals and provided 2,148 services, demonstrating a significant increase in demand.

Chief Sager explained that due to the workload and need for additional support, the Police Department reallocated an officer position to make Victim Advocate Vanessa Knickerbocker a full-time employee. Additional staffing adjustments were also made within the department to improve records management and operational support.

Delia Kirk reported that the expanded staffing had helped address service gaps and reduce burnout. She introduced victim advocate interns Sarah and Jenny from Brigham Young University, who had completed required background checks and training and had begun assisting victims. She also noted that an additional intern, Melissa, from Utah State University would join the program in the fall.

Ms. Kirk explained that the program was expanding services beyond Grantsville City by providing advocacy support in the Tooele County Justice Court for victims outside Tooele City who otherwise lacked access to advocacy services. The interns would assist with protective orders, notifications, and other victim rights services required by state law.

Mayor Hammond thanked Ms. Kirk, Ms. Knickerbocker, and the interns for their service to both Grantsville City and Tooele County.

4. Consideration of Resolution 2026-40 authorizing the addition of a solar energy component to the Wastewater Treatment Plant capital project and authorizing the use of bond proceeds for solar development

Mayor Hammond introduced Resolution No. 2026-40, which would authorize the addition of a solar energy component to the wastewater treatment plant project and allow the use of bond proceeds for potential solar development. City Manager Michael Resare explained that the proposal was being explored as a means of reducing future operating costs associated with the new wastewater treatment plant, which was projected to incur approximately $500,000 annually in electrical expenses. He emphasized that the resolution did not commit the City to constructing a solar project but would allow the City to pursue grant funding and preserve eligibility for available federal incentives.

Bill Comeal, a solar consultant, presented a preliminary feasibility analysis of potential solar and battery storage options for the wastewater treatment plant. He explained that governmental entities are currently eligible for a direct federal payment equal to 30% of qualifying project costs and that eligibility for the incentive required action before a July 4, 2026 deadline. Mr. Comeal reviewed several project scenarios ranging from a half-megawatt to one-megawatt solar installation paired with battery storage. Depending on the final configuration, projected annual savings ranged from approximately $157,000 to $285,000, with estimated 20-year savings between $5.5 million and $6.9 million. He stated that the preliminary analysis indicated project payback periods of approximately five to nine years.

Mr. Comeal outlined a phased decision-making process. The first phase would involve applying for grant funding and preserving eligibility for federal incentives at no cost to the City. Subsequent phases would include engineering studies, updated financial analysis, and a final decision on project construction.

Councilmember Butler expressed concerns regarding the location and land requirements for a solar array, including the amount of acreage needed and potential impacts from wetlands near the wastewater treatment plant. Mr. Resare stated that City-owned property adjacent to the treatment facility appeared to provide sufficient space for a potential installation. Councilmember Dalton asked whether the proposed location would interfere with future expansion of the wastewater treatment plant, and staff indicated that future expansion was anticipated to occur to the west and would not conflict with the proposed solar area.

Councilmember Skinner confirmed that the initial phases would not require City expenditures and stated that there was value in applying for available funding to further evaluate the opportunity. Mr. Resare noted that a future engineering study would be required before any construction decision was made and that the project could significantly reduce future operating costs. Mayor Hammond inquired about the potential savings to individual households, and Mr. Comeal estimated that annual savings could equate to approximately $40 to $50 per household per year, depending on the final project configuration.

Councilmembers Skinner and Thomas expressed support for pursuing the grant application and further evaluating the proposal, noting the potential to reduce future sewer utility costs for residents.

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to approve Resolution 2026-40 authorizing the addition of a solar energy component to the Wastewater Treatment Plant capital project and authorizing the use of bond proceeds for solar development.

Second: Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Aye"; Councilmember Skinner, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion carried.

5. Public Hearing Item: Consideration of Ordinance 2026-22 approving a General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-065-0-0074 and 01-065-0-0014, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138, amending the future land use map from Mixed-Use Density, High Single-Family Density Residential, and Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential for the Mack Canyon Subdivision

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore presented a proposed General Plan Amendment for the Mack Canyon Subdivision located near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138. She explained that the amendment would change the future land use designation from a combination of Mixed Use, High Single-Family Residential, and Low-Density Residential to Medium-Density Residential. Ms. Moore stated that the proposed development would contain approximately 170 dwelling units on 113 acres, resulting in a net density of approximately 3.7 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the Medium-Density Residential designation.

Ms. Moore reviewed the proposed development concept, which included approximately 2.78 acres of commercial property, more than 41 acres of open space, approximately two miles of trail connections, detention facilities, and recreational amenities. She explained that the associated Master Development Agreement would require completion of the collector road, construction of amenities and open space improvements, dedication of Mack Canyon Road improvements, development of the commercial component, and adherence to the approved layout and unit count. She also noted that the proposal included half-acre lots adjacent to existing residential properties to provide buffering between the new development and surrounding neighborhoods.

At 7:32 p.m., Mayor Hammond opened the public hearing.

Jewels Mackley expressed opposition to the amendment. She stated that the surrounding area consisted primarily of half-acre and larger lots and argued that the existing General Plan and zoning should remain unchanged. She questioned the need to amend the General Plan to accommodate the proposed subdivision and stated that nearby developments already provided parks and commercial uses.

Joseph Kempy also opposed the amendment. He stated that residents had purchased property based on the expectation that surrounding development would remain consistent with the existing plan and zoning. He expressed concerns about increasing residential density, changing long-established planning decisions, and creating development patterns that differed from what residents had originally anticipated for the area.

Rick Barchers, spoke in opposition and emphasized the importance of property owners being able to rely on adopted land use plans. He stated that residents had invested significant time in creating the current General Plan and cautioned that rezoning the property could have unintended long-term consequences if ownership of the property changed in the future.

Ed Burrola stated that he opposed changing the existing zoning and preferred development that was consistent with the current half-acre lot pattern in the area.

There being no further comments, the floor was closed at 7:41 p.m.

The developer addressed the Council and stated that the proposal would not increase the total number of dwelling units that could be constructed under the existing zoning. He explained that the project was designed to provide additional community benefits, including approximately 41 acres of open space, trail connections, recreational fields, landscaping requirements, and construction of transportation improvements. He stated that if the amendment was denied, the property could still be developed with approximately the same number of lots under the existing half-acre zoning but without many of the proposed amenities and open space features.

Councilmember Skinner questioned the benefits of maintaining the existing half-acre designation if the same number of dwelling units could be achieved under either development approach. Discussion focused on the tradeoffs between preserving the existing land use pattern and obtaining additional open space, trails, recreational amenities, and transportation improvements.

Councilmember Butler expressed concerns about departing from previous land use decisions and maintaining consistency with surrounding half-acre developments. Councilmember Dalton questioned whether the same number of lots could realistically be achieved under the existing zoning given site constraints and drainage features. Councilmember Williams discussed prior Council efforts to preserve larger-lot residential development along the bench area and noted concerns about maintaining the character of the area. Councilmember Thomas acknowledged the benefits of the proposed open space and trail system but expressed concern about deviating from long-standing planning expectations established by prior residents and adopted planning documents.

The Council discussed the proposed amendment, including its consistency with the existing General Plan, surrounding land uses, open space benefits, infrastructure improvements, and long-term planning objectives. Several Councilmembers expressed concerns about deviating from prior planning decisions and established development patterns within the area.

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to deny Ordinance 2026-22 approving a General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-065-0-0074 and 01-065-0-0014, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138, amending the future land use map from Mixed-Use Density, High Single-Family Density Residential, and Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential for the Mack Canyon Subdivision.

Second: Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Nay”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. The motion carried 4-1

6. **Public Hearing Item: Consideration of Ordinance 2026-23 approving a rezone of parcels 01-065-0-0074 and 01-065-0-0014 from R-1-21 (Single Family Residential, 21,000 square foot minimum lot size) to R-1-12 (Single Family Residential, 12,000 square foot minimum lot size) for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138**

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to deny Ordinance 2026-23 approving a rezone of parcels 01-065-0-0074 and 01-065-0-0014 from R-1-21 (Single Family Residential, 21,000 square foot minimum lot size) to R-1-12 (Single Family Residential, 12,000 square foot minimum lot size) for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138

Second: Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Nay”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. The motion carried 4-1.

7. Public Hearing Item: Consideration of Ordinance 2026-24 approving a Master Development Agreement for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to deny Ordinance 2026-24 approving a Master Development Agreement for the Mack Canyon Subdivision, located approximately near Mack Canyon Road and SR-138.

Second: Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Nay”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. The motion carried 4-1.

8. Public Hearing Item: Consideration of Ordinance 2026-25 amending Section 4.5 of the Grantsville Land Use Management Code regarding lot standards and street frontage; amending the applicability of the lot proportion requirement

Ms. Moore presented a proposed amendment to Section 4.5 of the Grantsville Land Use Management Code regarding lot standards and street frontage requirements. She explained that the existing code limited lots of one-half acre or less to a maximum length-to-width ratio of three-to-one. However, because a lot with the minimum required frontage of 70 feet and a three-to-one ratio would only contain approximately 14,700 square feet, the current language did not align with the size of a one-half acre lot. The amendment would revise the applicability threshold from one-half acre lots to lots of 14,000 square feet or less, thereby correcting the inconsistency and ensuring the standard functioned as intended.

Councilmember Butler noted that the amendment appeared to correct the code so it would operate as intended. Ms. Moore stated that the Planning Commission had reviewed the amendment and forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council.

At 8:14, Mayor Hammond opened the public hearing.

Rick Barchers commented on the proposed language and suggested that the frontage requirement could alternatively be addressed by increasing the minimum lot width. He also expressed concerns regarding language related to acceptable access and recommended retaining requirements that lots front on public or private streets.

There being no further comments, Mayor Hammond closed the floor at 8:18 p.m.

Following the public hearing, Ms. Moore clarified that the amendment only modified the applicability threshold for the lot proportion requirement and did not alter access requirements or other provisions of the code. Councilmember Dalton confirmed that the amendment primarily affected R-1-12 lots and smaller parcels. Councilmember Butler noted that the proposal simply corrected the mathematical inconsistency within the existing ordinance. The Council expressed general agreement that the amendment was a housekeeping change intended to align the code with existing lot frontage requirements.

Motion: Councilmember Williams moved to approve Ordinance 2026-25 amending Section 4.5 of the Grantsville Land Use Management Code regarding lot standards and street frontage; amending the applicability of the lot proportion requirement.

Second: Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Aye"; Councilmember Skinner, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion carried.

9. Public Hearing Item: Consideration of Resolution 2026-37 declaring intent to consider an increase in property tax revenue above the certified tax rate for fiscal year 2027; publishing a property tax impact disclosure; adopting the Fiscal Year 2027 tentative budget to serve on an interim basis; and establishing the date, time, and place of the Truth in Taxation public hearing

Finance Director Aspen Clegg presented Resolution No. 2026-37, which declared the City's intent to consider a property tax increase above the certified tax rate, published the required Property Tax Impact Disclosure, adopted the Fiscal Year 2027 Tentative Budget on an interim basis, and established the date, time, and place for the Truth-in-Taxation public hearing. She explained that the tentative budget reflected direction previously provided by the Council and included a proposed 5% property tax increase. The increase would generate approximately $104,000 annually and was intended to fund an additional Parks and Recreation employee. Ms. Clegg noted that no other substantial changes had been made to the tentative budget since the Council's prior discussion.

At 8:22 p.m., Mayor Hammond opened the public hearing for residents to address the council with their concerns.

Kevin Casey opposed the proposed tax increase and expressed concerns regarding the growth of City revenues, personnel costs, and government spending. He stated that government revenue had increased at a faster rate than population growth and questioned how those additional revenues had been utilized. Mr. Casey argued that government bureaucracies are inherently inclined toward growth and characterized them as "parasitic by nature" because they consume resources generated by taxpayers. He urged the City to identify and eliminate expenditures before seeking additional revenue from residents and businesses and questioned what spending reductions had been made prior to proposing a tax increase.

Police Chief Robert Sager responded to comments made during the public hearing and stated that City employees and public servants should not be characterized as parasites, noting the important services they provide to the community.

Brian Griffith spoke in support of the proposed tax increase and commended City staff for their professionalism and assistance. He stated that City employees provided valuable service to residents and should be fairly compensated.

Joseph Kempy expressed concern regarding the impact of rising taxes on residents and encouraged the City to seek operational efficiencies before increasing taxes. He questioned whether growth-related costs were being adequately borne by development and suggested that impact fees should more fully address infrastructure demands created by new development.

There being no further comments from the public, Mayor Hammond closed the public hearing at 8:32 p.m.

Ms. Clegg clarified several points regarding property taxes. She explained that even with the proposed 5% increase, the City's tax rate would remain lower than it had been five years earlier and substantially lower than rates in prior decades. She stated that the proposed increase would equate to approximately $19.94 annually, or about $1.66 per month, for the average homeowner. She further explained that the tentative budget and Truth-in-Taxation process established only a maximum potential increase and that the Council could ultimately adopt a lower increase or no increase at all following the Truth-in-Taxation hearing.

The Council discussed the City's historical tax rates, fund balances, employee compensation, and budget priorities. Councilmembers noted that departments had significantly reduced or deferred requested expenditures during the budget process and that the tentative budget already included cost-of-living adjustments for employees. Discussion also occurred regarding the possibility of conducting a compensation study to evaluate employee pay levels, though concerns were expressed regarding the cost of such a study.

Councilmembers expressed appreciation for City employees and staff efforts throughout the budget process and discussed the importance of balancing fiscal responsibility with the need to provide quality municipal services and retain qualified employees. The Council also discussed the upcoming Truth-in-Taxation hearing and acknowledged that a more complete picture of year-end fund balances would be available before final budget adoption.

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to approve Resolution 2026-37 declaring intent to consider an increase in property tax revenue above the certified tax rate for fiscal year 2027; publishing a property tax impact disclosure; adopting the Fiscal Year 2027 tentative budget to serve on an interim basis; and establishing the date, time, and place of the Truth in Taxation public hearing as August 5, 2026 at 7:00 p.m. at Grantsville City Hall and electronically via Zoom.

Second: Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, Absent; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

10. Presentation of the Property Tax Impact Schedule

Ms. Clegg presented the Property Tax Impact Schedule as required by the Truth-in-Taxation process. She reported that the proposed property tax rate would increase from 0.001368 to 0.001436, generating an estimated $104,149 in additional property tax revenue. Ms. Clegg explained that the proposed increase represented a 5% increase above the certified tax rate and reviewed the estimated revenue impacts and property tax calculations contained in the published schedule. She noted that the Property Tax Impact Schedule was available at the meeting and had also been published on the City's website.

11. Presentation of the annual Fraud Risk Assessment

Ms. Clegg presented the Fiscal Year 2026 Fraud Risk Assessment, which is required annually by the State of Utah. She reported that Grantsville City received a score placing it in the very low-risk category for fraud. Ms. Clegg explained that the only area in which the City did not receive full points was the absence of a formal internal audit function, which she attributed to staffing limitations. She noted that the assessment is reviewed by the City's external auditors as part of the annual audit process.

At the request of Councilmember Thomas, Ms. Clegg provided additional information regarding the assessment process. She explained that the assessment evaluates the City's internal controls, policies, and procedures designed to prevent fraud, including policies related to conflicts of interest, procurement, ethics, travel, purchasing cards, information technology security, cash handling, deposits, payroll processing, and separation of duties. She stated that financial processes are structured so that transactions are reviewed by multiple individuals, helping ensure accountability and reducing the risk of fraud or misuse of funds.

Councilmember Butler asked whether the City's score had changed from prior years. Ms. Clegg reported that the City's score was consistent with the previous year's assessment. Councilmember Dalton inquired about the City's audit committee, and Ms. Clegg explained that the committee was established by Resolution No. 2024-69 and currently consisted of Mayor Hammond, Councilmember Williams, and herself, with the option for the City Manager to appoint an additional member. Ms. Clegg also confirmed that the City undergoes an external financial audit each year.

12. Discussion of proper usage of city property in regard to political signage

Mr. Resare introduced a discussion regarding the placement of political signage on City-owned property. He explained that the City had received requests to place political campaign signs at City Hall and sought Council direction regarding whether political signage should be permitted on City property.

City Attorney Tysen Barker reviewed legal considerations related to political speech and signage. He explained that if political signs were allowed on City property, the City would be required to allow all political candidates and causes equal access and could not favor one candidate or issue over another. He further noted that political signage at City Hall could create the appearance of City endorsement and that any policy would need to be content-neutral. Mr. Barker advised that the City could prohibit non-City signage on City property if the policy was applied uniformly and served a legitimate governmental purpose, such as maintaining neutrality or preventing visual clutter.

Councilmembers discussed whether allowing political signs could lead to requests for other types of non-City signage and expressed concerns about City property becoming cluttered with signs. Several Councilmembers indicated support for limiting signage at City Hall and other City facilities to City-sponsored events and activities. Councilmember Dalton stated that sufficient opportunities already existed throughout the community for political signage and did not support allowing political signs on City property.

The Council also discussed situations involving temporary candidate appearances or public events held at City facilities. Mr. Barker explained that restrictions on permanently placed signs would differ from individuals exercising free speech by holding signs during events or demonstrations. Councilmembers discussed the possibility of allowing temporary signage associated with an event while discouraging unattended campaign signs placed on City property.

The Council generally expressed support for maintaining political neutrality and limiting non-City signage on City property. Staff indicated that a formal policy or ordinance could be presented for future Council consideration. No action was taken.

Prior to moving to the closed session, the Council discussed the July 2026 meeting schedule in light of the City's Fourth of July activities and related commitments. Staff noted that City-sponsored events were scheduled throughout the week surrounding Independence Day and that holding the regularly scheduled July 1 meeting would create conflicts for staff and Councilmembers. The Council discussed alternatives and reached a consensus to cancel the July 1, 2026 regular meeting and hold the next regular meeting on July 15, 2026. The Council also discussed the possibility of scheduling an additional meeting later in July if necessary.

Mayor Hammond discussed volunteer opportunities associated with the City's Fourth of July activities, including the annual hot dog service provided during community events. Staff reminded Councilmembers that at least one volunteer serving food must possess a valid food handler permit. Councilmembers discussed volunteer scheduling and shared suggestions based on experiences from prior years.

13. Closed Session – (Imminent Litigation, Real Estate Negotiations, Personnel)

There being no further public business, Mayor Hammond asked for a motion to proceed into a Closed Session to discuss imminent litigation, real estate negotiations, or personnel items.

Motion: Councilmember Thomas moved to proceed into a Closed Session.

Second: Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, Absent; Councilmember Skinner, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". There were none opposed. The motion carried.

Present: Mayor Hammond, Councilmember Butler, Councilmember Dalton, Councilmember Skinner, Councilmember Thomas, Councilmember Williams, Michael Resare, Tysen Barker, Alicia Fairbourne.

Upon conclusion of the Closed Session discussion, Mayor Hammond asked for a motion to proceed into an open meeting.

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to proceed into an open meeting.

Second: Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, Absent; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

14. Adjourn

There being no further discussion items, Mayor Hammond asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Councilmember Thomas moved to adjourn.

Second: Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, Absent; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas “Aye”; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.