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

La Verkin City Council Agenda
Wednesday, November 4, 2026
6:00 p.m. regular meeting
Council Chambers, 111 S. Main, La Verkin, Utah

A. Meeting Called to Order: Invocation by Invitation; Pledge of Allegiance

B. Presentation:
1. HVFD
2. HHS Robotics team

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: October 7, 2026, October 21, 2026, regular meetings.
4. Checks and Invoices: $ 50,748.01

D. Business:
1. Discussion of bids and possible action to award the contract for the secondary water project.

E. Mayor & Council Reports:
Mayor Wilson:
Kyle Gubler: City updates
Fay: City updates
Gubler: Public Safety, Recreation/City Festivals
Prince: Beautification/Trails Committee, Economic Development/Tourism, DTEC
Pectol: Fire District, Ash Creek Special Service District
Barr: Washington County Solid Waste, Historical Preservation
Valenti: Planning Commission/Zoning, Southwest Mosquito Abatement

F. Citizen Comment & Request for Future Agenda Items: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. This item is reserved for the citizens of La Verkin who have items not listed on this agenda. There is a time limit of 20 minutes with each individual taking no more than 3 minutes.

G. Adjourn:

In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify Nancy Cline, City Recorder, (435) 635-2581, at least 48 hours in advance.

Certificate of Posting

The undersigned City Recorder does hereby certify that the agenda was sent to each member of the governing body, sent to the posted on the State website at, posted on the La Verkin City website at www.laverkin.org and at the city office buildings 111 S. Main and 435 N. Main on October 29, 2026
Nancy Cline, City Recorder

City of La Verkin

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

La Verkin City Council Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 7, 2026, 6:00 pm.
Council Chambers, 111 S. Main, La Verkin, Utah

Present: Mayor Kelly Wilson; Council Members: Micah Gubler, Darren Prince, Amanda Barr, John Valenti, and Scot Pectol; Staff: Kyle Gubler, Fay Reber, Derek Imlay, Chief Nuccitelli, and Nancy Cline. Public: Blaine Worrell, Patty Wise.

A. Called to Order – Amanda Barr gave the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance at 6:00 pm.

B. Presentation:

1. HVFD

Nick Wrighty was ill and not in attendance.

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: September 16, 2026, regular meeting.
4. Checks & Invoices: $ 165,326.27

The motion was made by Councilman Pectol to approve the consent agenda, meeting minutes for September 16, 2026, regular meeting. Checks and invoices in the amount $165,326.27, second by Councilwoman Barr. Roll Call Vote: Pectol-yes, Barr-yes, Prince-yes, Valenti-yes, Gubler-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Business

1. Discussion and possible action to approve bidding for the secondary water project.

Blaine explained that the project would replace approximately two-thirds of the city's irrigation system. Its primary goals are to move pipelines currently located behind properties into the city's rights-of-way, replace aging or substandard pipes, and reduce leaks. The system is estimated to lose about 500 gallons per minute continuously, a significant amount of the city's water. The improvements would make the system easier to operate, reduce the liability associated with pipelines in backyards, and limit water loss. The Washington County Water Conservancy District would fully fund the project, including design and construction management, with no impact on city funds or irrigation user rates. If approved that evening, the project would be advertised on Friday, followed by a pre-bid meeting in the building on October 20 and bid opening on October 24. The bids will be presented to the Council on November 4 for approval of the lowest responsible bidder, and the contractor will have 18 months to complete the work. Eighteen months from November 16th, so that we want to have a year and a half from the day that the irrigation system is turned off, so that we're taking advantage of two seasons of no irrigation water being used.

Fay commented that when they bring this back, the Council has a chance to review those bids. The Council would also have an opportunity to review the contract, and before awarding the bid, they could have input on that process.

Blaine explained that bids would be opened on November 3, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. Staff would promptly compare the bids, verify that all required paperwork was complete, and confirm that the lowest bidder was responsive and qualified to perform the work. They would then prepare a recommendation letter stating whether there was any reason not to award the contract and provide it to Derek for distribution to the Council as soon as possible.

The Council might have only about 24 hours to review the materials. A Sunrise Engineering representative will attend the meeting to answer questions.

Councilman Gubler commented they are replacing two thirds the pipes. What is going on with the other third.

Blaine explained some pipes have already been replaced or are new buildings in town.

Mayor Wilson commented that in some parts of town the pipes are already in the street and newer pipes that don't need replacement.

Councilman Valenti said his initial concern was simply a request to review the bid package and contract documents. Although he was familiar with similar projects, he wanted to understand the basic structure of this heavily tailored agreement and its assembled clauses. He described it as a two-part system: the EJCDC documents cover the engineering framework, while Sunrise Engineering provides the details of the proposed work. He noted key figures, including approximately 64,000 linear feet of 4- to 18-inch pipe and 650 connections. These were the details he and Doug had wanted to review, but their request had been sidetracked. He clarified that there had been no tacit or formal approval; they only wanted the documents so they could identify potential issues. Doug had shared comments identifying a few minor items, which reflected Valenti's purpose as well. Valenti said he did not want to prolong the matter but felt it had taken too much effort to obtain the 319-page document, which he found manageable and understandable. He emphasized that his request concerned the bid package, not the design drawings provided at 60 percent and again near completion. He appreciated finally receiving the document, the progress made, and the Council's support the previous week for his review request.

The motion was made by Councilman Gubler to approve the secondary water project going out to bidding process, second by Councilman Prince. Roll Call Vote: Pectol-yes, Valenti-yes, Gubler-yes, Barr-yes, Prince-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Discussion and possible action to approve the MOU for the Zion Corridor Trail.

Mayor Wilson recommended approval because the county would pay for all proposed improvements. In exchange for granting a portion of their property, the Wilsons would receive pavement and a wall. He noted that the city would contribute no funds because the trail is a regional project for which the county had allocated funding several years earlier.

Councilman Pectol questioned the wording in paragraph five regarding costs and expenses. The paragraph stated that the city would be responsible for contributing a four-foot-eight-inch CMU wall, installing a 12-inch drain line and other trail improvements, and constructing 12 feet of asphalt pavement within the temporary construction easement. He asked whether "city" was a typographical error and should instead read "county."

Derek confirmed it is the county paying for everything.

Fay apologized and misunderstood that the county, not the city, was paying for those improvements. He advised the motion should include those changes.

Councilman Prince asked since the paperwork says the city, would the county be paying for it.

Kyle Gubler commented that sometimes in contracts with the county they reimburse the city for cost, but he wasn't aware that was in this contract.

Derek replied that the county would be responsible for paying for it and the contract should be changed. Fay will be drawing up the deed and the MOU with the changes.

Fay misunderstood who was doing the work. He will change the easement agreement to the county and draft a new copy. He will change the contract and email the new contract and get council approval before sending it to the county.

The motion was made by Councilman Pectol to approve the MOU for the Zion Corridor Trail subject to changes in the MOU to reflect that Washington county will be financially responsible to lay asphalt and build a brick wall for Doug Wilson. Fay will make the revisions and email them to the council. Upon receiving approval from the council members about the changes Fay will submit the MOU, second by Councilman Prince. Roll Call Vote: Pectol-yes, Valenti-yes, Gubler-yes, Barr-yes, Prince-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Mayor & Council Reports:
Mayor Wilson: Reported the League of city and towns convention is the 26th of October. The packets for the city council meeting for October 21st will be sent to them on Monday the 19th.
Kyle Gubler: Reported there is a lunch for the Council and planning commissioners by DR Horton to discuss their plans for the Topside. He made a list for who planned on attending. They have submitted the first part of the application. In a future meeting they will discuss the priority list for security cameras.
Fay: Nothing to report.
Pectol: Reported the Fire district awarded the bid for their new administration building and fire station. It was two million under budget.
Barr: Reported there will be a solid waste meeting in November and December.
Valenti: Reported that the council members that didn't want to be informed on his irrigation project should let him know they don't want to receive emails about it.
Gubler: Reported there is a new Ms. La Verkin and youth council. Winterfest has all the vendors they need it will be December 4th and 5th.
Prince: Nothing to report.

G. Citizen Comment & Request for Future Agenda Items:
Patty Wise: Presented the Mayor with a plaque to thank La Verkin for sponsoring a mural on River Road.
H. Adjourn:

The mayor closed the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

_____
Date Approved

_____
Mayor Kelly B. Wilson

ATTEST: _____
Nancy Cline
City Recorder

DRAFT

City of La Verkin

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

La Verkin City Council Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 21, 2026, 6:00 pm.
Council Chambers, 111 S. Main, La Verkin, Utah

Present: Mayor Kelly Wilson; Council Members: Micah Gubler, Darren Prince, Amanda Barr, John Valenti, and Scot Pectol; Staff: Kyle Gubler, Fay Reber, Derek Imlay, Nancy Cline, and Maridee Johnson. Public: Chase Stratton.

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

B. Presentation:

1. Introduction of La Verkin Royalty and Youth Council

Maridee Johnson introduces the new La Verkin Royalty and youth council members.

2. HHS Robotics

They will be presenting at a future meeting but asked for the email address of the city council member working with them.

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. Checks & Invoices: $ 166,069.58

Councilman Pectol, Councilman Gubler, and Councilwoman Barr declared conflict of interest on items 1-4.

The motion was made by Councilman Pectol to approve the consent agenda, Checks and invoices in the amount $166,069.58, second by Councilwoman Barr. Roll Call Vote: Pectol-yes, Barr-yes, Prince-yes, Valenti-yes, Gubler-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Business

1. Discussion and possible action to approve Ordinance No. 2026-*18*, an ordinance amending the zoning map of and for the City of La Verkin to rezone from General Commercial (COMM) to Multi-Family Residential (R-3-6) parcel with the Tax ID# LV-159-A, Located at 740 N Main Street and SR-17.

Fay reported that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the first two zone-change requests and denial of the remaining two. He explained that the City Council is not bound by these recommendations, but its decisions must not be arbitrary or capricious. The discussion should address the five points previously identified, along with any other relevant matters, and establish reasons for approval or denial. The minutes should document that discussion, and the motion should reflect the Council's conclusions. Fay clarified that the meeting was not a public hearing; the Planning Commission had already held one. However, the mayor could allow limited public input at his discretion. Fay said copies of the Planning Commission minutes had been sent the previous day to the Council to review its discussion and reasons for its votes. Those minutes would become part of the record for the meeting. He also explained that if the Council wished to approve a zone change subject to a development agreement, the motion should specify that requirement. The agreement would then be prepared, signed by the mayor, and recorded at the recorder's office at the same time as the ordinance approving the zone change. Recording the agreement would bind the developer's successors in interest to its terms and any plan submitted to obtain approval of the zone change.

Councilman Valenti commented his primary concern was that the general plan dates to 2018, when the town was quite different. Although dated, it still guides City decisions, which must remain consistent with it. The plan's emphasis on larger lots and more space is reflected in the residential zones then in place: R-1-14, R-1-10, R-1-8, and the higher-density R-3-6 zone, which allowed multifamily housing. These zones appear in the plan

and its maps. He noted extensive discussions about Topside, its origins, and its potential for higher-density development. Before updating the general plan, the City created medium-density-eight, high-density-eleven, and mixed-use zones partly in anticipation of development there. Only one had been applied, which he would discuss separately. The 2018 plan also envisioned single-family residences on the overlook. Although the plan is being updated, he believed its current maps and density designations still constrain zoning decisions. He acknowledged that others could reach different conclusions. He emphasized the need to notify residents of their opportunity to provide input during the upcoming review. The community shapes the plan, and the Council adopts it. The existing plan similarly provides community guidance for evaluating zone-change requests. Before addressing individual requests, he wanted to explain how these considerations informed his decisions. He advised the council they might want to read the 2018 general plan and then read the one they are drafting now. It will have a public hearing in the planning commission. He noted that the first two zone-change requests were similar, both proposing to rezone commercial property for residential use. Nearby zoning included R-1-10 behind the R-3-6 area, R-1-8 to the side, and the higher-density R-3-6 zone at Silver Acres. He believed the requests would do more than eliminate commercial zoning: they would expand the R-3-6 area and significantly increase the number of units permitted. Although not a planning expert, he estimated that the roughly three acres could accommodate as many as 28 additional units. That estimate did not account for roads, parks, possible clustering, or whether buildings would contain four, six, or eight units. He did not know whether condominiums were planned but noted that they would require a separate review process. He observed that development across the way appeared to consist mainly of duplexes, which he considered among the least intrusive uses and a better fit for the neighborhood. He suggested that the Council consider a development agreement to guide the project's buildout in exchange for relinquishing commercial land, particularly given residents' concerns about large complexes that might not fit their neighborhood. Returning to his earlier comments, he noted that development under the City's four earlier zones had been similar in appearance. He cited Silver Acres and Pearl Street as examples where the transition from R-1-8 to R-3-6 was not particularly intrusive and development fit well within the neighborhoods. He concluded that the two properties raised the same general issues.

Councilwoman Barr attended the public hearing and the following planning commission meetings. The public had a lot to say. She went by the property, and it is a strange triangular piece of land that would be difficult for commercial business. She agreed the change to residential would fit the neighborhood.

Councilman Pectol commented he to attended the planning commission meetings and got their perspective on this. He felt the proposal of taking this to R-3-6 is consistent and harmonious with the overall general plan and harmonious with the other areas around it. Looking at staff comments and his own perspective, it does not seem to adversely affect any of the other property around it. It does have adequate facilities, and he was not of the opinion that it needs to have a development agreement to be able to change the zone.

Councilman Gubler commented that he read through the minutes from planning commission. He agreed with the staff and planning commission that the zone change would be beneficial. He thought the land was probably lumped into commercial because it was on SR9.

Councilman Prince agreed that commercials do not make sense there and this would open up new opportunities for affordable housing.

There was a discussion about the motion to approve the zone change by commissioner Pectol and a motion to add a development agreement by commissioner Valenti. Fay advised them to entertain commissioner Valenti's motion first.

Councilman Valenti moved to obtain a development agreement for the property. He explained that, although the two requests were being considered separately, both would expand the existing R-3-6 zone and substantially increase the number of permitted units. An agreement would allow the Council to review building

arrangements, consider fourplexes, six-plexes, or twelve-plexes, and guide the development rather than grant unrestricted discretion to the developer. He noted that, depending on how subsequent motions were structured, the agreement could return to the Council and potentially receive further public comment. The Council could also continue consideration of the proposals and request another public meeting. His concern was to give the Council greater control over development. He also raised the unresolved issue of moderate-income housing, noting that some arrangements could direct a portion of developer profits toward reducing purchase prices or rents. He did not know whether the units would be rentals or condominiums and wanted more information, as only a zone change had been presented. He motioned to add a development agreement to the motion to approve the zone change.

Councilman Pectol commented that on business item number one, he was of the opinion that by just being able to grant the zone change and then follow the standards are within the parameters of the intent of the zone change. He didn't like delaying the project and being able to go through multiple rounds of review, having a land use agreement come through, and then being able to have to revote on all of those things would not be worthwhile. He had a different opinion on the other zone request and thinks they would benefit from a land agreement or development agreement.

Councilman Valenti suggested this is a tool for the council. Whether the council wants to address it or not, it's his opinion we should. It allows further comment for the public. He felt he worked for the public and felt it wouldn't hurt anything. If the discussion is time issue, he still would like to know how dense this project would be and what the councils' opinions are on twelve-plex's, six-plex's and duplexes.

Councilman Gubler was concerned they would get into a situation where they are doing a development agreement with every zone change and bottlenecking the progress.

Councilman Valenti responded that the city had overcomplicated zoning, whereas many towns maintained established designations, such as R-1-10, without entertaining changes. He noted that the city had open land and opportunities but lacked a clear plan for what to build, where to build it, or at what cost. He believed better planning would help address these questions. In the meantime, the existing plan continued to create uncertainty. If the City wanted property developed in a particular way, it should clearly state its expectations; ambiguity could lead to unwanted outcomes. He cited the Fields project, which was already underway before the city understood what was being developed. The developer had taken advantage of what the city allowed, leaving it unable to stop the project and negotiating over residential uses in what was essentially an industrial park. After a year of negotiations, the City reached an agreement and created a workable zone. However, the zone caused enough problems that it was shelved and was no longer visible in the code. The project eventually failed, and he was unsure whether the builder would return, although he understood there might be discussions. He concluded that planning should prevent such situations and believed the City's current approach put it in a worse position.

Councilman Gubler asked who sets the conditions for the development agreement and how long would that push this project out from starting.

Derek explained that the maximum units on this property for R-3-6 would only be four-plex's.

Fay explained that if they grant the zone change as is the builder can build anything within the code for that zone. If they made a development agreement it would slow down the project. He would draw up the agreement in terms of what the council wants to see and what the developer has told them they would agree to. They would have to negotiate and approve it. Then it would have to be recorded then the zone change would happen. It would slow the project down.

Mayor Wilson called for a second to councilman Valenti motion to add a development agreement to the zone change. There was no second.

The motion was made by Councilman Pectol to approve Ordinance No. 2026-*18*, an ordinance amending the zoning map of and for the City of La Verkin to rezone from General Commercial (COMM) to Multi-Family Residential (R-3-6) parcel with the Tax ID# LV-159-A, Located at 740 N Main Street and SR-17, second by Councilman Prince. Roll Call Vote: Pectol-yes, Valenti-no, Gubler-yes, Barr-yes, Prince-yes. The motion passed.

2. Discussion and possible action to approve Ordinance No. 2026-*19*, an ordinance amending the zoning map of and For the City of La Verkin to rezone from Retail Commercial (R-COMM) to Multi-Family Residential (R-3-6) parcel with the Tax ID # LV-159-A, Located at 740 N Main Street and SR-17.

Commissioner Prince, Gubler, Barr and Pectol thought this zone change was similar to the previous zone change and were in favor of it.

Commissioner Valenti commented he had the same opinion as the first zone change.

The motion was made by Councilman Pectol to approve Ordinance No. 2026-*19*, an ordinance amending the zoning map of and For the City of La Verkin to rezone from Retail Commercial (R-COMM) to Multi-Family Residential (R-3-6) parcel with the Tax ID # LV-159-A, Located at 740 N Main Street and SR-17, second by Councilman Prince. Roll Call Vote: Pectol-yes, Valenti-no, Gubler-yes, Barr-yes, Prince-yes. The motion passed.

3. Discussion and possible action to approve Ordinance No. 2026-*20*, an ordinance amending the zoning map of and for the City of La Verkin to rezone from Low Density Residential (R-1-14) to 1.97 acres General Commercial (COMM) parcel with the Tax ID # LV-49-A-1, Located between 300 S and 100W.

Mayor Wilson explained the planning commission did not recommend this for approval with a vote 2-3 against. There has been some negotiation going on with this zone change.

Chase Stratton explained that the proposal had evolved through ongoing discussions with staff and comments from residents and the Planning Commission. Although the current item concerned commercial zoning, he discussed both the commercial and residential requests because they were interconnected. The original residential layout proposed townhomes along 100 West and townhomes without garages on the section farther west. In response to feedback, the proposal was revised to include single-family lots of approximately 4,500 square feet along 100 West, while retaining townhomes without garages or apartments to the west. Further revisions increased the lots along 100 West to approximately 6,000–6,500 square feet. He believed the layout in the Council's packet showed ten lots along 100 West, with a road separating them from the apartments behind them. The commercial request sought additional commercial space, while the residential request sought to change the existing R-1-14 zoning. He said the residential proposal contemplated approximately 28–30 units. He was willing to remove two more lots along 100 West, leaving eight lots of approximately 7,800–7,900 square feet and 20 apartment units behind them, for a total of 28 units. He proposed including the layout as an exhibit to a development agreement to establish how the residential property would be developed, while allowing some adjustments to road alignments and apartment building locations. He explained that HDR-11 had been requested because it would accommodate 28 units, whereas an MDR zone would allow approximately four fewer units, or about 24. Other requirements could be addressed in the development agreement. He was open to HDR-11 or another suitable zone, with the proposed layout consisting of eight single-family lots along 100 West and five fourplexes, totaling 20 apartment units, behind them.

Councilman Pectol commented if that revised the exhibit, they would be prepared to use that as a development agreement, and that would include the full development of as two hundred south, and then the expansion of three hundred south with the private roads that are shown inside of that.

Chase responded that a development agreement would only change the things that specifically called out in development agreement. We would be still beholden to all city standards, design standards, and specifications and code that is out there. The only things that would change would be those specifically called out in development agreement. Since we're developing that parcel, all master planned roads would have to be developed out accordingly.

Councilman Pectol added that a lot of the comments that they received were centered around concerns about the small road width, and the increased traffic. By being able to meet those standards that the city has, as part of your development agreement, it would build them out to be full-width roads, and they'd meet the safety standards of the rest of the city.

Chase added those streets would all get more asphalt, curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Councilman Gubler said he had spoken with neighbors in his own neighborhood, where he turns off 300 South. He explained that residents had experienced considerable change, including the sale and development of the Hot Springs property and changes involving the Casa de Hot Springs Motel. He believed this part of town had been affected the most, leaving residents concerned about how further development would change the area. From his review, many concerns centered on HDR-11 zoning, which could allow buildings up to four stories, and the possibility that Interstate Rock might obtain approval and then sell the property. He asked Fay whether a development agreement would remain binding if Interstate sold the rezoned property to another developer rather than developing it.

Fay explained the development agreement would run with the land, so anyone acquiring that property would be subject to the terms of the development agreement. It would Develop in accordance with the development agreement, unless they came to the city and negotiated a change in the development agreement. Of course, there's always that possibility. But other than that, they're going to be subject to the development agreement.

Councilman Gubler said his primary concern was the impact on 100 West. He opposed the original entrance from that street because it would increase traffic and change the neighborhood's character. He appreciated Interstate's willingness to remove the entrance, leaving access to the proposed 20 apartment units from the connecting street via the south streets discussed. He also appreciated the proposal to eliminate two lots, creating eight lots of approximately 8,000 square feet, similar to those in Pheasant Glen. He considered this a suitable transition and believed additional lots would increase neighborhood impacts. He wished more adult residents would participate in city government and run for office, noting the enthusiasm of the Youth Council. The Council had been seeking suitable locations for more affordable housing, including apartments. He recalled that he and his wife initially rented in Hurricane Hills, a government-subsidized development of duplexes and fourplexes, and valued having that starting point. His adult children would like to live locally but could not find or afford housing, even to rent. He believed purchasing an R-1-14 lot and building a home would be beyond many people's means. Planning recommendations to place apartments behind commercial properties as a transition to residential neighborhoods made sense to him. Few suitable locations existed in this part of town, although future development on Topside could provide more options. He viewed apartments behind commercial property, facing an internal connecting street rather than 300 South, 100 West, or 200 South, as a benefit. He also noted the difficulty of attracting development under general commercial zoning, as many interested parties had sought tourism zoning instead. Interstate's interest in general commercial development was therefore positive. Although he did not know what businesses were planned, they would have to comply with the zoning. Residents had long requested a restaurant or other businesses, and he thought such uses might be included.

Based on Interstate's commercial work in Hurricane and its investment in communities, he trusted the developer to pursue an attractive commercial project. Nevertheless, he remained conflicted. He disputed a report that approval was already a done deal, explaining that he had been weighing the proposal and consulting residents, Interstate, and staff to find a workable compromise. He had not decided how to vote. His greatest concern was avoiding rows of two-, three-, or four-story apartments along 300 South and 100 West near established homes. He would prefer to retain the fields, which his uncle and first cousin leased for cattle, and expected they would oppose an affirmative vote. However, he was not opposed to expanding the commercial area, particularly if it brought general commercial development.

Councilman Valenti expressed similar concerns and emphasized the importance of established planning processes rather than fly by the seat of their pants decisions. He believed the City had repeatedly taken an improvised approach since adopting the previous plan, leaving zoning increasingly open to negotiation. He viewed the city as three distinct areas: the commercial strip, infill and older neighborhoods, and Topside. He distinguished moderate-income housing, which he believed the city could build, from affordable housing, which he considered unattainable. The parcel was particularly attractive because it was large enough for substantial development. Unlike smaller infill projects such as Chaco Ridge, where four or five lots with duplexes could fit readily into the neighborhood, projects with 30 or 40 units would have significant impacts. He understood why residents might feel their neighborhood was being bargained away and believed earlier safeguards could have prevented that concern. He suggested that someone might develop the five-acre property with 16 units under R-1-10 zoning. He also cited a code provision adopted with the initial plan that, in his interpretation, allowed R-1-14 lot sizes to be reduced to no less than 10,000 square feet, consistent with the R-1-10 zone then in place. He had discussed this interpretation with Fay and acknowledged their disagreement. Although additional zones may have been necessary, he believed the city had time to refine them before applying them. He considered their current application inconsistent with the 2018 general plan and worried that the plan was being disregarded. He did not believe the proposed development would provide moderate-income housing. He mentioned plans to visit representatives from Dr. Horton has a base home price of $319,000 in some of their developments, which he considered reasonably affordable. He attributed that pricing to the company's construction methods, which local builders struggled to match. The city also lacked a moderate-income housing plan that could use a portion of development profits to lower prices. He was uncertain whether zoning would eventually address that issue, but his principal concern was the continued movement toward unrestricted zoning.

Councilman Gubler asked Councilman Valenti if his biggest concern was updating the general plan and get that dialed in.

Councilman Valenti said the discussion would be different if the parcel were one acre or 20 acres, as either size would allow better planning. His primary concern was the amount of development proposed for such a small area. He questioned whether the Council had the authority to approve it, while acknowledging that others might disagree. He opposed an unrestricted approach that could place 40 units in front of existing homes and did not believe such density was ever intended for the lower city. Referring to the land-use section of the 2018 general plan, he cited its vision statement describing La Verkin as a beautiful, family-oriented rural community that values safe neighborhoods, large residential lots, recreation opportunities, and fiscal responsibility, and supports agriculture, tourism, infrastructure improvements, and business-friendly environments. He urged all Council members to read the plan, calling it the City's blueprint and expressing his belief that failing to follow it would do the city a disservice. He emphasized the importance of adhering to adopted plans and establishing standards the City could consistently follow, rather than allowing individual development proposals to drive its decisions.

Councilman Prince said he had carefully considered the proposal and reviewed residents' emails and the Planning Commission's notes. Given the parcel's location across from the Hot Springs, he expected high-quality development that would benefit the city. He remained troubled by the water rate increases and saw an opportunity to encourage the millions of people passing through downtown to stop and spend money locally.

The hot springs already attracted visitors, and he believed retail space would complement that activity. He acknowledged that Interstate needed to make the project financially viable and considered the proposed transition from larger homes facing the neighborhood to much-needed apartments and then commercial development an ideal arrangement. He believed the project would be attractive and enhance the neighborhood.

Councilman Pectol thanked Chase for answering his questions about the map and whether it would be included in the development agreement. Like councilman Prince, he had considered the parcel's potential and the proposed uses, along with John's concerns about compatibility with surrounding properties and adequate infrastructure. He recalled reviewing a similar conceptual proposal during discussions of the overall plan. He doubted that development under R-1-14 zoning, with one home per 14,000-square-foot lot, was likely in 2026 and saw a need for a zone change. He considered high-density zoning paired with a development agreement a creative approach that met the City's intent by providing multifamily and reasonably priced housing while buffering established neighborhoods characterized by larger agricultural lots. He shared the confidence expressed in Interstate as a responsible builder, citing its workmanship and ability to complete quality projects elsewhere in the county. He believed the company could create a development the city would be proud of. He also appreciated Chase's willingness to reduce the single-family lots from ten to eight, viewing it as evidence of cooperation with the city and consideration for neighbors while pursuing the project's goals. He said these factors would inform his decision and appreciated the opportunity to explain his views.

Mayor Wilson commented that most of this discussion has been about item #4.

Councilman Pectol apologized to the mayor and explained that, like Councilman Gubler, he viewed the two items as interconnected. He envisioned a development agreement covering both the commercial expansion and the residential zone change and acknowledged that he should have clarified this before commenting.

Councilman Valenti noted that the second proposal depended on approval of the commercial expansion and would fail if the first proposal were denied. He therefore agreed that the Council should consider the proposals together while voting on separate motions. He valued the town's distinctive open spaces along the hillside, the western rim, and the southern part of town, which he described as its only remaining open space. He expressed concern about the gradual loss of these areas, noting that hillside development was already underway and the rim was nearby. Although development might represent a better use of the land or be a natural part of growth, he believed some of the town's unique character should be preserved, including the cattle fields.

Councilwoman Barr commented that she has talked to more residents in the past two weeks than she has in the past. There's been a lot of passion about this, and one of the things she heard multiple times is when you drive into town and you cross over the bridge, and it just instantly feels five degrees cooler and they see the cows. She moved here because of ruralness. She loved being able to see the grass fields and not having to hit a whole bunch of traffic. It's hard to let go of that, and she felt a lot of our residents feel the same. She knows we can't stop all development, but we can control it. That's the concerning part and what they need to work on.

Councilman Valenti questioned whom the city intended to serve through new housing: residents' children, people passing through, or the broader population. He noted that the town had enough land to accommodate many homes, including 1,000 moderate-income units in locations such as the upper cattle field or another field across town that might eventually be developed. However, the city had not determined how many units it needed or why. He explained that the document he had shared was intended to prompt discussion about what should be built, where, and for what purpose. He urged the city to identify how much moderate-income housing it wanted, whether that should include condominiums, duplexes, or high-rises, and how many people it intended to accommodate. He said growth to 15,000 residents could be achieved by allowing construction anywhere but questioned whether residents would be satisfied with the resulting character of the town. He believed these decisions required more careful consideration, including financial and tax implications.

Councilman Gubler pointed out that once that property went up for sale it was only a matter of time before a developer was interested. The question is what we want to be there.

Councilman Valenti continued if somebody wanted to build sixteen luxury homes on five acres and sell them to people who can afford them it's not my judgment. It's market force. But again, these things should be considerations when we zone, so that we don't have to go through this and agonize about.

Councilman Gubler commented that he would love it if we could keep things like it was 2018. When people could afford a big piece of land and develop it. He wants a permit to build a detached garage, and it's four thousand dollars just to get plans and soil testing. Costs are out of control and being able to develop this big piece of property is financially difficult.

Mayor Wilson commented that when he grew up there were only 500 people in town. He pointed out all the people who have moved here have changed that and he thinks they are good people. They need to get used to the idea things are going to change and they can have a part in what the change will be.

Chase asked if they could make a motion on item four first. If they turn down that item, then there is no reason for a vote on item three since they need both for their development.
The motion was made by Councilman Prince to switch the voting order. They will vote on item four first then item three, second by Councilman Gubler. All were in favor.

As a result of item four not passing Chase canceled his request for the zone change of item number three.

4. Discussion and possible action to approve Ordinance No. 2026-*21*, an ordinance amending the zoning map of and for the City of La Verkin to rezone from Low Density Residential (R-1-14) to 3.03 acres High Density Residential (HDR-11) parcel with the Tax ID # LV-49-A-2, Located between 300 S and 100 W.

The motion was made by Councilman Prince to approve Ordinance No. 2026-*21*, an ordinance amending the zoning map of and for the City of La Verkin to rezone from Low Density Residential (R-1-14) to 3.03 acres High Density Residential (HDR-11) parcel with the Tax ID # LV-49-A-2, Located between 300 S and 100 W requiring a Development Agreement to include Eight single family units, twenty apartment units no higher than two stories at thirty feet maximum and include an exhibit of the concept to be followed, second by Councilman Pectol. Roll Call Vote: Pectol-yes, Valenti-no, Gubler-no, Barr-no, Prince-yes. The motion did not pass.

5. Discussion and possible approval of the Verkada camera locations.

Kyle reported that all existing cameras were operational. Staff recommended additional cameras at the following locations, in priority order: the hallway near the kitchen at 111 South Main; the storage shed in the southeast corner of the parking lot to improve parking lot coverage; the animal shelter overlooking the new addition; the back of the Welcome to La Verkin sign near the bridge; the river trailhead; the gym; and the cemetery yard. The cemetery camera's placement would be determined after construction of the new building was complete. Kyle planned to meet with the camera provider to discuss battery backups required for some cameras, which could reduce funding available for additional installations. A forthcoming budget amendment would specify the proposed funding, and the Council would determine how much to allocate. Staff would then work with the provider to determine how many cameras the funding would cover. Kyle asked whether Council members supported staff's recommendations or wanted cameras elsewhere and noted that the materials identified existing locations. He said the cameras had reduced vandalism and helped identify offenders, including one individual completing service hours with Mary's assistance. No action was taken; funding would be considered through the budget amendment.

F. Mayor & Council Reports:

Mayor Wilson: Nothing to report.

Kyle Gubler: Reported the WCWCD is building a reuse demonstration facility in La Verkin off of 740 N. He had pictures of the building. It will have a garden and educational demonstration of how they clean the water. January 14, 2027, is the meeting of Whats up Down South. Toquerville has a Vac truck for sale.

Fay: Nothing to report.

Pectol: Reported the Fire district would start construction on their new administrative building including a fire department and training facility.

Barr: Nothing to report.

Valenti: Read a statement: Oftentimes I wrestle with coming to these meetings, and it often occurs who I'm presenting to. The mayor, staff, council, Citizens, developers. I think there's always elements of suspicion between people, you know, in different motives for what people want. Obviously, elected officials, staff, which have the understanding by all parties that their choices are fair, fully explained, reasoned, and hopefully respected. The developer wishes for profit, wishes profitability to develop their land. What to have it appreciated as a place to invest and to live in, perhaps for a lifetime. Citizens invest their livelihood in wishes to own property with the hopes that they'll hold or increase it in value for their lifetime, and it might be passed on to their children. There's certainly a lot of opinions as to where we should go, what direction we should go. But I often think Lincoln said it best: "You can please some of the people, some of the time."

Gubler: Reported they would need volunteers for the information booth at Winterfest.

Prince: Reported at the DTECH meeting they categorize the road projects into three categories of importance. The economy rise has put them over budget by two billion dollars. They brainstormed ideas on how to close the gap and restructure what roads are necessary.

G. Citizen Comment & Request for Future Agenda Items:

Jillian Ballard: Apologized for her outburst and raised concerns about loose gravel on local roads, including State Street. Although her road had been swept after she previously reported the issue, her tires continued to lose traction even at approximately five miles per hour. She also reported that Jed Stout had nearly crashed hir motorcycle and worried that recent rain would worsen the gravel problem. She acknowledged that State Street was a state road and that proper channels had to be followed. Despite calling, leaving messages, and encouraging family members and others to contact the agency responsible, she had been unable to reach the appropriate people. She asked whether the community could help clean up the gravel. She also requested a stop sign at 300 South and 100 West to discourage speeding, improve safety for children crossing near the school, and provide a designated stopping point for drivers turning around to return to the hot springs.

H. Adjourn:

The mayor closed the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

_____

Date Approved

_____

Mayor Kelly B. Wilson

ATTEST: _____

Nancy Cline
City Recorder

La Verkin City
Invoice Register: 10/18/2026 to 10/28/2026 - All Invoices

10/29/2026

Invoice No.	Vendor	Check No.	Ledger Date	Due Date	Amount	Account No.	Account Name.	Description
PR101626-258	AFLAC	55642	10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$78.48			
					78.48	102224	Health Savings Account	AFLAC EE
LSTG1267160	ALSCO		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$46.14			
					0.45	104160.250	Bldg EQUIPMENT OPERATING	
					2.38	104210.250	Police EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	Mats
					10.94	104410.250	Streets EQUIPMENT OPERATI	
					3.06	104510.250	Parks EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					19.69	516340.250	O&M EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					4.81	536310.250	Irrigation EQUIPMENT OPERA	
					4.81	556350.250	Drainage EQUIPMENT OPERA	
LSTG1268301	ALSCO		10/26/2026	10/26/2026	$46.14			
					0.45	104160.250	Bldg EQUIPMENT OPERATING	
					2.38	104210.250	Police EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					10.94	104410.250	Streets EQUIPMENT OPERATI	
					3.06	104510.250	Parks EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					19.69	516340.250	O&M EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					4.81	536310.250	Irrigation EQUIPMENT OPERA	
					4.81	556350.250	Drainage EQUIPMENT OPERA	
	Vendor Total:				**$92.28**			
374120	BUCK'S ACE HARDWARE		10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$25.99			
					25.99	536310.450	Irrigation WATER MAIN REPAIR	Flex tape
374125	BUCK'S ACE HARDWARE		10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$14.58			
					14.58	536310.450	Irrigation WATER MAIN REPAIR	Clamp and Duct tape
	Vendor Total:				**$40.57**			
9024-1026	CenturyLink		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$53.45			
					53.45	104140.280	Admin UTILITIES	435 N Main
03-60771	Davis Food & Drug #4/Farmers Market		10/27/2026	10/27/2026	$35.97			
					35.97	104210.230	Police TRAVEL & TRAINING	Drinks
65-829141	Davis Food & Drug #4/Farmers Market		10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$11.58			
					11.58	536310.450	Irrigation WATER MAIN REPAIR	SS Clamps
	Vendor Total:				**$47.55**			
599155077	DeLage Landen Financial Services		10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$342.07			
					181.30	104140.240	Admin OFFICE EXPENSE, SUP	
					102.62	516660.240	Admin OFFICE EXPENSE, SUP	
					17.10	536310.240	Irrigation OFFICE EXPENSE, S	
					41.05	556350.240	Drainage OFFICE EXPENSE, S	
COMM47412026	EMI Health	55646	10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$2,463.25			
					2,463.25	101562	PEHP/AFLAC Insurance Clearin	Dental and Vision Insurance
3269-1026	Enbridge		10/23/2026	10/23/2026	$44.62			
					22.31	104140.280	Admin UTILITIES	1/2 111 S Main
					22.31	104210.280	Police UTLITIES	1/2 111 S Main
9275-1026	Enbridge		10/23/2026	10/23/2026	$7.16			
					7.16	104510.280	Parks UTILITIES	579 N Main Street
9924-1026	Enbridge		10/23/2026	10/23/2026	$7.16			
					7.16	104140.280	Admin UTILITIES	435 N Main
	Vendor Total:				**$58.94**			
102026	GUBLER, KYLE W		10/22/2026	10/22/2026	$526.20			
					526.20	104140.230	Admin TRAVEL & TRAINING	Travel reimbursement
PR101626-6099	Health Equity		10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$565.00			
					340.00	102224	Health Savings Account	PEHP Health Equity-Family

Invoice No.	Vendor	Check No.	Ledger Date	Due Date	Amount	Account No.	Account Name.	Description
					225.00	102224	Health Savings Account	PEHP Health Equity-Double
11-802	HURRICANE CITY WATER DEPT	55649	10/20/2026	10/20/2026	$1,073.00			
					931.00	516340.410	O&M PRODUCT OR SERVICE	Power for Ash Creek Springs @
					142.00	516340.410	O&M PRODUCT OR SERVICE	Chlorine & Cylinder rental for bot
2027 PO# 6703	ICMA Membership Renewals	55670	10/20/2026	10/20/2026	$738.40			
					738.40	104140.210	Admin BOOKS, SUBCRIPTION	ICMA Membership Dues
045547	JOHNSON, MARIDEE	55651	10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$78.92			
					78.92	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Winterfest Decor
PR101626-147	LEGAL SHIELD	55652	10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$106.76			
					106.76	102225	Misc Payable	LegalShield
003506	NAPA AUTO PARTS		10/22/2026	10/22/2026	$35.98			
					35.98	536310.450	Irrigation WATER MAIN REPAIR	Napa Beam Blade
1026	PEHP Group Insurance	55654	10/20/2026	10/20/2026	$1,004.19			
					1,004.19	101563	PEHP Life Insurance Clearing	Life Insurance
102126	PUBLIC EMPLOYEES LTD PROGRAM	55656	10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$824.94			
					824.94	101562	PEHP/AFLAC Insurance Clearin	LTD
1339481	RED MOUNTAIN TECHNOLOGY SOLU	55657	10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$220.80			
					220.80	104210.250	Police EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	Phone System
1339482	RED MOUNTAIN TECHNOLOGY SOLU	55657	10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$432.42			
					432.42	104160.270	Bldg B&G OPERATION AND M	Phone System
	Vendor Total:				**$653.22**			
100 PO# 6707	Reevive Counseling	55658	10/20/2026	10/20/2026	$1,000.00			
					1,000.00	104210.230	Police TRAVEL & TRAINING	Therapy Services for Law Enforc
3058638	SCHOLZEN PRODUCTS CO INC		10/20/2026	10/20/2026	$9.60			
					0.09	104160.250	Bldg EQUIPMENT OPERATING	Cylinder monthly rental
					2.40	104410.250	Streets EQUIPMENT OPERATI	
					0.67	104510.250	Parks EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					4.32	516340.250	O&M EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					1.06	536310.250	Irrigation EQUIPMENT OPERA	
					1.06	556350.250	Drainage EQUIPMENT OPERA	
7020630	SCHOLZEN PRODUCTS CO INC		10/20/2026	10/20/2026	$305.16			
					305.16	536310.450	Irrigation WATER MAIN REPAIR	Coupling
7020658	SCHOLZEN PRODUCTS CO INC		10/20/2026	10/20/2026	$57.86			
					57.86	536310.450	Irrigation WATER MAIN REPAIR	Compression CPLG PVC, Cross
7021391	SCHOLZEN PRODUCTS CO INC		10/23/2026	10/23/2026	$328.04			
					328.04	516340.450	O&M SYSTEMS MAINTENANC	Water repair supplies
	Vendor Total:				**$700.66**			
435-1026	TDS BAJA Broadband		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$36.06			
					36.06	104140.280	Admin UTILITIES	435 N Main
VP-1026	TDS BAJA Broadband		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$109.95			
					109.95	104510.280	Parks UTILITIES	Vintage park
ZVP-1026	TDS BAJA Broadband		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$109.95			
					109.95	104510.280	Parks UTILITIES	Zion View Park
	Vendor Total:				**$255.96**			
2026	TRUST LANDS ADMINISTRATION	55638	10/20/2026	10/20/2026	$400.00			
					400.00	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Application for firework location
97317 PO# 6718	Union Graphic Company		10/22/2026	10/22/2026	$686.08			
					686.08	104620.610	Comm COMMUNITY DEVELOP	Graphics for Ford Mustang

Invoice No.	Vendor	Check No.	Ledger Date	Due Date	Amount	Account No.	Account Name.	Description
PR101626-501	UTAH RETIREMENT SYSTEMS	102226	10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$14,642.94			
					924.92	102223	Retirement Payable	401k
					11,710.24	102223	Retirement Payable	Retirement
					928.90	102223	Retirement Payable	457
					668.00	102223	Retirement Payable	Roth IRA
					200.00	102223	Retirement Payable	Additional 401k
					210.88	102223	Retirement Payable	457 Loan
PR101626-449	Utah State Tax Commission		10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$2,918.78			
					2,918.78	102222	State Witholding	State Income Tax
2838	Vehicle Lighting Solutions		10/22/2026	10/22/2026	$469.00			
					469.00	104210.450	Police VEHICLE MAINTANCE	Pocketjet Therman Printer
018315	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/18/2026	10/18/2026	$13.92			
					13.92	104210.230	Police TRAVEL & TRAINING	Canes
019850	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$35.61			
					35.61	104210.230	Police TRAVEL & TRAINING	Beartooth Barbecue
022269 PO# 6713	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/22/2026	10/22/2026	$4.81			
					4.81	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Royalty picture for the foyer
027442	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/27/2026	10/27/2026	$108.73			
					108.73	104210.230	Police TRAVEL & TRAINING	Riggatti's
0513034	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$51.37			
					51.37	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Festival Christmas tree
0761834	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$137.05			
					137.05	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Festival Christmas tree
1001862	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$64.24			
					64.24	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Festival Christmas tree
1898 PO# 6714	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/22/2026	10/22/2026	$1,050.00			
					1,050.00	104111.230	Council TRAVEL & TRAINING	What's Up Down South 2027 Re
289568	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/26/2026	10/26/2026	$299.99			
					299.99	516660.210	Admin BOOKS, SUBCRIPTION	Distribution Exam-Stetson
289571	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/26/2026	10/26/2026	$299.99			
					299.99	516660.210	Admin BOOKS, SUBCRIPTION	Distribution Exam-Kaige
3785061	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$24.99			
					24.99	104210.240	Police OFFICE EXPENSE, SUP	Leadership books
5274601	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$78.11			
					78.11	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Festival Christmas tree
6155419	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$396.21			
					396.21	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Festival Christmas tree
6445829	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/19/2026	10/19/2026	$51.91			
					51.91	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	Festival Christmas tree
65-829227 PO# 6711	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK CC		10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$7.89			
					7.89	104140.240	Admin OFFICE EXPENSE, SUP	Super glue to repair computer ke
	Vendor Total:				**$2,624.82**			
PR101626-234	ZIONS FIRST NATIONAL BANK.	102227	10/21/2026	10/21/2026	$18,266.57			
					8,905.18	102221	FICA & FWT Witholding	Social Security Tax
					2,082.66	102221	FICA & FWT Witholding	Medicare Tax
					7,278.73	102221	FICA & FWT Witholding	Federal Income Tax
			Total:		**$50,748.01**			

GL Account Summary

3,288.19	101562	PEHP/AFLAC Insurance Clearin

Invoice No.	Vendor	Check No.	Ledger Date	Due Date	Amount	Account No.	Account Name.	Description
					1,004.19	101563	PEHP Life Insurance Clearing	
					18,266.57	102221	FICA & FWT Witholding	
					2,918.78	102222	State Witholding	
					14,642.94	102223	Retirement Payable	
					643.48	102224	Health Savings Account	
					106.76	102225	Misc Payable	
					1,050.00	104111.230	Council TRAVEL & TRAINING	
					738.40	104140.210	Admin BOOKS, SUBCRIPTION	
					526.20	104140.230	Admin TRAVEL & TRAINING	
					189.19	104140.240	Admin OFFICE EXPENSE, SUP	
					118.98	104140.280	Admin UTILITIES	
					0.99	104160.250	Bldg EQUIPMENT OPERATING	
					432.42	104160.270	Bldg B&G OPERATION AND M	
					1,194.23	104210.230	Police TRAVEL & TRAINING	
					24.99	104210.240	Police OFFICE EXPENSE, SUP	
					225.56	104210.250	Police EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					22.31	104210.280	Police UTLITIES	
					469.00	104210.450	Police VEHICLE MAINTANCE	
					24.28	104410.250	Streets EQUIPMENT OPERATI	
					6.79	104510.250	Parks EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					227.06	104510.280	Parks UTILITIES	
					1,262.62	104540.610	Rec EVENTS, FAIRS, & FESTI	
					686.08	104620.610	Comm COMMUNITY DEVELOP	
					48,070.01		**Total**	
					43.70	516340.250	O&M EQUIPMENT OPERATIN	
					1,073.00	516340.410	O&M PRODUCT OR SERVICE	
					328.04	516340.450	O&M SYSTEMS MAINTENANC	
					599.98	516660.210	Admin BOOKS, SUBCRIPTION	
					102.62	516660.240	Admin OFFICE EXPENSE, SUP	
					2,147.34		**Total**	
					17.10	536310.240	Irrigation OFFICE EXPENSE, S	
					10.68	536310.250	Irrigation EQUIPMENT OPERA	
					451.15	536310.450	Irrigation WATER MAIN REPAIR	
					478.93		**Total**	
					41.05	556350.240	Drainage OFFICE EXPENSE, S	
					10.68	556350.250	Drainage EQUIPMENT OPERA	
					51.73		**Total**	
					$50,748.01		**GL Account Summary Total**	