

SOUTH WEBER CITY COUNCIL MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 23 September 2014

TIME COMMENCED: 6:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Mayor Long

PRAYER: Council Member Thomas

PRESENT: MAYOR: Tammy Long

COUNCILMEMBERS: Scott Casas
Randy Hilton
Michael Poff
Marlene Poore
David Thomas

CITY RECORDER: Tom Smith

CITY MANAGER: Duncan Murray

Transcriber: Minutes transcribed by Michelle Clark

*A PUBLIC WORK MEETING was held at
5:30 p.m. to
REVIEW AGENDA ITEMS*

VISITORS: Barry Burton, Jared Bryson, Bryon Saxton, Linda Marvel, Bob Marvel, Debi Pitts, Perry & Amy McCorkle, Mark Burnett, Carol Christensen, Laura Parker, Alice Yeates, Jeff Parker, Sherrie West, Toni Johnson, Michael Michelsen, Delene Hyde, Gardner Crane, Tami Sheffield, Dak Maxfield, Peggy Bon, Randy Schreifels, Rob Osborne, Nathan Boyce, Jan Ukena, and Carl Case.

Mayor Long called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Council Member Thomas moved to approve the agenda as written. Council Member Poff seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: There was no declaration of conflict of interest made by the City Council.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- Approval of 9-9-14 City Council Work Meeting Minutes

- **Approval of 9-9-14 City Council Meeting Minutes**
- **Approval of 9-16-14 City Council Work Session Minutes**

Council Member Poff moved to table the consent agenda. Council Member Poore seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

Council Member Poff moved to go to the approval section of the agenda. Council Member Thomas seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

Council Member Poff moved to open the public hearing for Dust mitigation at the Staker/Parsons gravel pit. Council Member Thomas seconded the motion. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

******* PUBLIC HEARING *******

Dust Mitigation at the Staker/Parsons Gravel Pit: Dak Maxfield, representing Staker/Parsons gravel pit approached the City Council and those in attendance. He gave a brief history of Staker/Parson Companies. He said the gravel operations commenced at the South Weber pit in the late 1950’s. Residents did not exist quite some distance from the pit, at that time, and it continued that way until the late 1990’s. Multiple residents began building within .25 miles of the pit in 2001-2002. In December 2003, the City and operator entered into a development agreement and fugitive dust monitoring agreement. At this time, Dak said measures were agreed to and put into place. As outlined in the development agreement, use of main and sprinklers will be used to wet down the gravel pit operations on a daily basis. All roads within the pit and in ingress/egress access points will be watered daily by water trucks. They also use magnesium sulfide on all gravel pit exposed roads twice a year (currently, also being used on heavily traveled (egress/ingress) roads in, around, and out of the pit. Four or five years ago they began the use of wind fences. They have been placed in strategic places along the west side. They also left the asphalt surfaces during the 2002 Olympics to help control the dust as well. They grass seed every year areas that are not currently growing. This helps control the dust and helps with erosion. They have also done some beautifications projects around the pit. They have spent a lot of money on the berms. They also conduct air monitoring on days the City designates. The Fugitive Dust Monitoring Agreement includes: operator must perform air sampling at its own cost and expense, sample in designated areas, operator records results and certified by an independent lab, results are supplied to the City, the operator and City agreed to a stipulated standard of 265 micrograms per cubic meter for any given 24 hour period. Anything above constitutes an exceedance. Any sampling that would otherwise be an exceedance will not constitute an exceedance when the wind speed exceeds 25 milers per hour within the 24 hours sampling period. Dak reported that since entering into the agreement in 2003, current records indicate there have been four exceedances. Three of those exceedance occurred in 2007 (highest production rate in history of pit). All but one recorded exceedance occurred during a period when winds exceeded 25 miles per hour. Dak said since this slide presentation, he was informed by his environmentalist that there was one exceedance this year. Council Member Poff said they are only measuring certain size particles. Dak said they measure the particles that are harmful to humans. Dak said to measure and determine wind speed, that data from the KUTSOUTH

Meteorological Data station directly behind the Charter School is used. He said if there is an exceedance, the penalty is between \$50 to \$475.

Dak then discussed the mining and reclamation plan. There were three phase identified in the development agreement with Phase 1 being the mining of old South Weber Drive, Phase 2 being mining of the southwest half of the south pit, and Phase 3 being mining of the southeast half of south pit. Dak said historically, they were aloud to mine in Phase 1, 2, & 3 while simultaneously mining in the floor of the north pit and work our way south, but now they are focused in one location being the north pit on the floor.

Council Member Poff asked if they are done with Phase 2 & Phase 3. Dak said they are done with actual extraction with the exception of going down to 180 ft. level. He said currently, Phase 2 & Phase 3 are down to the pre-existing floor level.

He said they have just wrapped up mining product out of phase 3 and are concentrating solely on the floor of the pit with no more than five acres exposed on the final floor open at one time. He said they are no longer operating in two different areas. He said they are done with phase 2 and phase 3 down to pre-existing floor level. He reported that reclaiming will occur behind mining operations; as new acreage is opened up, old will be reclaimed.

Council Member Thomas asked about the finished slopes and if they will be re-contoured to a 2:1 or 3:1 or 4:1 slope. Dak said the current slopes to pre-existing floor level are in accordance with the development agreement. He thinks it is 2:1 slope. Council Member Thomas said he thinks the agreement says 3:1 but he would like 2:1. He said something so that it has more of a gradual slope down. Dak said that is a possibility because they do have excess material that has been pushed aside as they have chased the rock. He is willing to talk about that further. Dak said the agreement states 1:1/4 slope. Council Member Thomas said it would be nice to work on the slopes so they aren't as steep in terms of final grade.

Council Member Thomas said according to the development agreement, the final date is 2025 and he thinks the way that we read the agreement or the way it was set up, it was staged in phases and each phase had a certain number of years. He knows at some point in time we need to resolve the final date. Dak said the language in the agreement is projections and anticipations. He said to stick to that is virtually impossible because as the pit is mined there are different products. He said a lot of it depends upon the demand. Council Member Thomas said the phasing was set up in that fashion so that we wouldn't be in this situation. He said this certainly needs to be resolved.

Dak then reviewed the 2003 Topo map which includes: phasing, mining & reclamation plan. He said according to this map we haven't opened up the north pit floor as extensive as this shows. Council Member Thomas said but the five acre limitation applies. Council Member Poff said you are not in compliant with the development agreement because you are now planning to go back to different phases. Dak said the agreement says mining will continue to 180 feet. He referenced the language in the development agreement and stated, there are three phases again each phase is based on mining 600,000 tons of washed material per year with total sales of 1.1 million tons out of the pit per year. He said depending on the market, phase 1 is estimated to take 3 to 5 years, Phase 2 is estimated to last 5 to 8 years, and phase 3 is estimated to last 5 to 8 years. He said cross-sections are included to show the depths of the pit during each phase. From

the cross-sections on pages 18-24 of the development agreement, the pit will not be mined below 180 feet from the existing surface to a mine elevation of 4820. Dak said on the first page it states during the mining of concrete aggregates sand will be mined in the North pit. After the mining of concrete aggregates, sand can continue being mined in the North Pit with an agreement from South Weber City. Council Member Poff said he is concerned because what is the purpose of an agreement when Parsons is doing what they want with each Phase and then leaving open areas that creates dust. Dak said to summarize the mining activity they are wrapping up phase 3, reclaiming that slope, and then solely focusing on the floor of the pit with no more than 5 acres exposed at one time. He said reclaiming will occur behind us as we open up additional acreage, we will close acreage to maintain that five acre finish floor requirement.

Alice Yeates, 2060 E. 7400 S., said she is representing a lot of people, not just a few who have signed a petition. She said individuals are experiencing sand in their lawns that creates mud when water is added. She said her lawn is all backed up. She has dirt in her windows and inside her home. She said this is affecting people all over not just old South Weber Drive. She would like to see more sprinkling in the pit, especially at night. She said the mud goes right out into the streets. She said a lot of individuals have signed a petition stating something needs to be taken care of.

Jeff Parker, 7384 S. 1950 E., said he has met with Susan Wisenberg of the Division of Air Quality as well as City Manager Worthen. He said he has lived in the City for ten years now and the dust has gotten a lot worse in the last two years. He changes his furnace filter frequently. He has to power wash his driveway monthly. He said if his truck is parked outside, he will have an inch to inch and half of dust on it. He would like to know where they are measuring. He feels the measurements need to be taken where the residents reside. He understands they are doing what they can, but he doesn't know if that is enough. He recommended the Council read the Technical Memorandum for Utilization of Staker/Parsons and Geneva Pit. Council Member Poff said if a particle is larger than a certain size then it doesn't count. Dak said if it is smaller, that can be inhaled. Council Member Poff said but if it is larger then it doesn't count.

Jan Ukena, 7948 S. 2100 E., said she has lived in South Weber for 44 plus years. Her first home was located by the pit. She said South Weber has wind and wind blows dust. She said you have to deal with the dust because you decided to live in this City. She suggested the City contact Geneva to look at the possibility of a development agreement with them as well. She said if you live here you have to learn to live with it.

Council Member Thomas moved to close the public hearing for Dust mitigation at the Staker/Parsons gravel pit. Council Member Hilton seconded the motion. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

******* PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED *******

Council Member Poff moved to open the public hearing for the City's General Plan. Council Member Thomas seconded the motion. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

******* PUBLIC HEARING *******

Update to the City's General Plan: Barry Burton, City Planner, said late last year the Planning Commission and staff began looking at updating the general plan. He then reviewed the projected land use map. He said there were several requests for rezones that didn't match the general plan. He we also looked at adding a land use category for moderate high density category. He said there is a shift in the demographics with an aging population. He said the baby boom population is beginning to retire. He said there are a lot of people looking for an alternate in the style of home. He said the city can't control the age of people purchasing a home, but we did create a patio style home zone. As a result, the city modified projections for build out population with it being 12,662, which decreased some. He said we looked at environmental impacts, noise impact from Hill Air Force Base, etc. He said the City's median household income figures are now higher than the County. He said there are significant changes in the moderate income housing. Barry identified the amendments to the Transportation Map with potential streets. He then reviewed the trails plan with the addition of more trails.

Mayor Long asked if there was any public comment.

Mark Burnett, 8021 S. 2700 E., questioned the two properties located along 2700 East (frontage road). Barry said some of these amendments came about from public open house. Mr. Burnett is concerned about the property located next to his home. He would be happy with small retirement homes, but not apartments, town homes, etc. He is concerned about the patio zone with the lot sizes being smaller. He would like to know how this higher density would affect his property value. He is also concerned that this property would need a detention basin. He said this area has issues with flooding to those the west. He is opposed to higher density zones in that neighborhood. He would be happy with retirement homes. He said they would not add too much traffic. He doesn't understand the push for high density in this particular area. He said putting something in the general plan is essentially the City endorsing something.

Council Member Thomas asked Mr. Burnett if he would be more comfortable with medium density. Mr. Burnett said he would request keeping the property residential moderate. Barry said this was not in response to any development request, but the gap that the City had between zones. He said there has been a demand for something in between.

Carol Christensen, 8143 S. 2475 E., said some of us didn't really know what to expect on this City plan. She is also concerned with the new moderate high density. She asked about requirements of the patio style zone. Barry reviewed the requirements for height, set back, lot size, etc. He said the City can't regulate who purchases the lots, but the developer can.

Linda Marvel 8087 S. 2700 E., lives next to this same property on 2700 East. She questions why do we have to defend prime property in South Weber. She likes the idea of a patio home, but she doesn't like the moderately high density. She feels it is open to interpretation. Barry said a developer can record covenants that go with the development. She would like to see it dictated to one level and a basement if they want it. Council Member Poff said those would be items to be discussed with a developer. Barry said the zone does restrict the number of units.

Mr. Burnett is concerned about the densely packed homes that would be on this property.

Toni Johnson, 8081 S. 2575 E., said you can stipulate the square footage on the main floor.

Bob Marvel, 8087 S. 2700 E., said it seems to him that a lot of the anxiety of this property is the result in the ambiguity in the definition of the zoning.

Carol Christensen is opposed to this identified zone as it stands. She is concerned about how the community looks as you drive down Highway 89. She said that area already has town homes and she questions why the area needs more high density.

Carl Case, 2043 Deer Run Drive, asked what does it do with the general plan if it isn't approved tonight. He said there are run off issues with this particular piece of property.

Nathan Boyce, 8080 S. 2575 E., moved into South Weber City in May. He said his house does have flooding issues. He is not in favor of changing the zone. He feels if higher density is targeted then the developer should be required to put something in there to beautify the area.

Randy Schreifels, 2505 E. 7800 S., asked about 6605 South and why that street is being protected. Barry said that street is narrow. He said 7800 South is a narrow street as well. He would suggest the City take a look at that as well.

Council Member Thomas moved to close the public hearing for the City's General Plan. Council Member Hilton seconded the motion. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

******* PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED *******

Council Member Thomas said he has never been comfortable having patio homes for the property along the frontage road. He doesn't feel this is the right place to put it. He said if someone wants to amend the general plan and a rezone with a specific plan, something that can be tailored made, that is one thing, but just having patio home is different. He is also concerned about the commercial property on the east side of Highway 89. Barry said the problem is that this is such an odd piece of property. He said they understand that this is not prime commercial but possibly office space. Council Member Thomas is concerned with the major collector in the future going from 1200 East to 1900 East. He is uncomfortable with those kinds of slopes cutting into the hillside. He is troubled with going from 1160 East along the face of the hill. Barry said it is put there as a result of a study by the City Engineer. He knows that this street would allow for a gradual slope verses the other road.

Council Member Poff is concerned about the language on page 11 concerning the contamination. He is also concerned about page 14 item #3 "another method of encouraging very low density development is to provide cost incentives". Barry said low density is costly to develop so if that is what we want we would put it in the development code. Brandon said we currently don't have any provisions for that in the City standards. Council Member Poff then addressed the abandoned road behind Ray's Market. He then referenced page 25 concerning the connection from 1900 East to Layton City.

Council Member Thomas addressed the Transportation Map and the major collector that comes off of 1160 East and then connects to 1900 East. He asked Brandon what the cut would need to be. Brandon said it would require some cuts but the grade of the road is 8% or less, which is appealing to him. He said that is the reason why it is shown as a major collector and 1900 East is shown as more of a minor collector.

Council Member Hilton addressed the Land Use Map. He feels that patio homes would be great on the property along the frontage road. He said the property is limited to access and it would be difficult to fit larger lot sizes. Barry said the City is somewhat limited in what we can put into a zoning ordinance. He said if you require a minimum square footage, it can be difficult.

George Hendrickson, 1656 East 7325 South, is not in favor of going from low density to moderate density. He thinks it should stay at low density. He has lived in this subdivision for 19 years.

Council Member Thomas moved to make a limited motion to change the proposed Land Use Map by take off the property on the frontage from moderate high density to moderate density (to keep it the way it currently is). Council Member Casas seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

Council Member Poff moved to approve the general plan with the following changes:

- 1. Delete the reference to the Old South Weber Drive on page 24.**
- 2. Delete the language on the bottom of page 25 & 26 (*This road has been constructed to grade and with design parameters to accommodate a future public road that would provide a connection to Layton City. The alignment of this road has also been studied in order to ensure hillside stability*).**
- 3. Amend Map #3 by adding the annexation policy color to all parcels up to the Weber River.**
- 4. Amend Map #5 by removing the future major collector road which goes past the South Weber Elementary School, and which goes up to the water tank; but not removing the portion at South Weber Drive. This will connect 1160 East to 1900 East and will be a proposed local road.**
- 5. Amend Map #6 on text referencing canal trail adding language "*agreements have been made with the property owners*"**
- 6. Amend Map #6 running Old Fort Trail from 1375 East to Central Park.**

Council Member Thomas seconded the motion. Further discussion on the motion took place. Council Member Thomas asked about amending the major collector road to be a local road. Council Member Poff was not in favor of that amendment. Brandon said if it is not on the map, you will lose your opportunity for that to ever happen. He said a developer can't solve that problem if there is no place identified. **Councilmember Thomas, Hilton, Poore, and Casas voted yes. Councilmember Poff abstained. The motion carried.**

Councilmember Thomas moved to amend the motion to connect 1160 East to 1900 East and identify it as a proposed local road. Councilmember Hilton seconded. Council

Member Thomas, Hilton, Poore, and Casas yes. Council Member Poff voted no. The motion carried 4 to 1.

APPROVALS:

Final Payment Request and Change Order for Canyon Meadows Park Pavilion Project

Brandon Jones, City Engineer, has reviewed Stacey Enterprise's request for final payment on the Canyon Meadows Park Pavilion Project and recommends payment of \$64,155.40. They have completed all the punch list items and are complete with all the work specified in the contract.

Council Member Hilton moved to approve the final payment request and change order to Stacey Enterprises (SEI) for \$64,155.40 for Canyon Meadows Park Pavilion Project. Council Member Poff seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

Approval of Municipal Code Online Agreement: Duncan reported the City's current service is through Sterling Codifiers. This agreement would be through Municipal Code Online. It is in the budget for \$3,000; however, the cost is \$1,500. Duncan said he is in favor of going with Municipal Code Online because it is a system that is more user friendly for the city staff and public. It is also user friendly with a mobile device.

Council Member Thomas moved to move forward with the purchase of Municipal Code Online. Council Member Poff seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

Check Approval List

Council Member Poff moved to approve the check approval list. Council Member Hilton seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

Monthly Budget to Actual Financial Report: Duncan said this report is for the month of July. He said eventually we will get caught up. This is everything that was budgeted for and spent. Council Member Thomas asked Duncan if he is comfortable with this report. Duncan did discuss this with the City Treasurer.

Council Member Poff moved to approve the monthly budget to actual financial report. Council Member Casas seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

Purchase of Weber Basin Water: Duncan said the City has secondary and culinary water needs. He said culinary water is much more limited. He said Weber Basin is the City's culinary water provider. He said Brandon Jones, City Engineer, has identified a list of options for the City's water needs. According to Brandon, the City is currently 200 AF deficient in having sufficient source for the existing residents plus the lots that have been approved but are not yet built on. Brandon feels the Council needs to make a decision concerning the 200 AF. He said there is more development anticipated with the general plan being approved. Brandon then

referred to his memo of 23 September 2014. He is in favor of option #4 concerning wholesale water from Weber Basin Water Conservancy District (WBWCD). He said WBWCD has created an Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and performed the associated Impact Fee Analysis (IFA), so that they can legally charge an Impact Fee. However, the charging of this fee has to be implemented by the City. This arrangement would allow the City to collect the Impact Fee on behalf of WBWCD. This Impact Fee essentially covers the Capital Improvements portion of water plus a small amount to cover the first year's worth of O&M. Based on the number of Impact Fees collected and sent to WBWCD on a quarterly basis, the City would then be under contract for the equivalent amount of culinary water (i.e. 1 ERC = 0.448 AF). The city would only pay the O&M portion of this water from then on, which would be payable on January 1st of each year, for the year following the actual use of the water.

Brandon said the current impact fee for District II water is \$2,903/ERC. The on-going annual cost that the City is then contracted for is \$110/AF. Contrast this to the \$361.59/AF cost for the current District II Take of Pay Contracts. When District II water is no longer available, then the District III costs will go into effect. The impact fee for District III water is \$4,363/ERC. The on-going annual cost that the City is then contracted would still be approximately \$110/AF. Contrast this to the \$546/AF cost for the District III Take of Pay Contracts.

South Weber does not currently have any such arrangement with WBWCD. The main caveat to this approach is that the City would need to include WBWCD's IFFP and IFA in the City's IFFP and IFA for culinary water. The City Council just authorized that we begin the process of updating the culinary water Capital Facilities Plan, IFFP and IFA. So, this approach could be added into the study.

The City is currently 200 AF deficient in having sufficient source for the existing residents plus the lots that have been approved but are not yet built on. Given the information in this memo, our recommendation to the City Council was to purchase between 250 - 300 AF of District II water. The reason for this recommendation was to cover the current deficit and purchase an additional 50 – 100 AF more than is needed to give some buffer to cover anticipated developments in the next year or so, plus allow time for the new IFFP and IFA to be adopted, which would include the necessary provisions to be able to charge the WBWCD Impact Fee and receive the discounted water rate contract (as shown in Option #4). The City Council made a motion at the September 23, 2014 meeting (last night) to purchase 110 AF of District II water and direct Staff to pursue efforts to get the 10% reduction of source requirement from the State.

Brandon's recommendation, at this point, is to proceed with efforts to put Option #4 in place. This option ensures that the City would always maintain the correct amount of source per ERC, and would be fairly simple to administer. This also requires that the new residences pay for the capital portion of the new water; essentially allowing the City to have new development "pay their way" without dramatically impacting the overall cost of the water to the existing residents.

Council Member Thomas likes the solution moving forward because it makes development pay its own way. He said according to State Administrative Rule, the maximum of authority can reduce it by 10%.

Council Member Poore said she contacted Weber Basin and in 2011 we used 452 AF and paid \$142,209 for that year. She said we threw away approximately \$52,000. She said it looks like

we are throwing away money every year. She would like to get a lower figure of what we reasonably have to have. Brandon said we don't have the luxury of changing the State rule. She asked if the City really needs 300 AF. Brandon said based on upcoming development the City needs at least 300 AF. He said the City needs a minimum of 200 AF for what has already been approved. Council Member Casas would like to know how to go about modifying the State rule. Council Member Poff asked if there is a penalty involved with the State. Brandon said not that he knows of.

Council Member Thomas is in favor of purchase 110 AF. He is concerned about District II water being gone if the Council doesn't make a decision. He is also in favor of going to the State Engineer to see if the City can get that 10% knocked off. He then feels the #4 solution can be in place by next Spring. Council Member Poff is concerned about the potential for this to create extremely high impact fees. He said the City could experience a slow down in development. It was stated it would cost approximately \$40,000 for 110 AF of District III water.

George Hendrickson said he is a senior citizen and has lived in South Weber City for 19 years. He said on a monthly basis he doesn't use over 6,000 gallons of water. He installed a circulating system which has decreased the amount of water he uses. He would suggest such a system be installed for new development. He said it limits the amount of water being used.

Duncan said the council is not trying to raise rates, but there are decisions that need to be made in planning for the future.

Bryon Saxton, of Ogden Standard Examiner, asked who is responsible for paying the \$40,000 per year and how is that cost passed along. Brandon said a Utility Rate Analysis would then take place.

Council Member Thomas moved to approve 110 AF of District II water from Weber Basin and direct city staff to seek the 10% reduction under the State Rule. Council Member Poff seconded the motion. Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Member Thomas, Hilton, Casas voted yes. Councilmember Poff and Poore voted no. The motion carried 3 to 2.

Council Member Poore moved to amend the motion to table until more information is obtained. Motion died due to lack of a second.

Tom called for a roll call vote. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Jeff Parker, 7384 S. 1950 E., said he has a problem with snow removal along South Weber Drive. He said there is a new sidewalk along South Weber Drive along the Charter School. He wanted to know why his tax dollars are being used to plow those property owner's sidewalks. Council Member Thomas said because the City forced the sidewalk to be installed. Mr. Parker said why does the City enforce a commercial property owner to plow their snow. He suggested looking at some sort of change to the City ordinance. He then discussed the sidewalks along the

west to South Weber Elementary. He wanted to know what the City is doing about code enforcement. Duncan said South Weber City unfortunately only has enough time to react to complaints. Council Member Poff said 1250 East needs to be improved because there is no where to push the snow. Mr. Parker is also concerned because there isn't a crosswalk at the Charter School. Duncan reported that the city staff is working on that. Mr. Parker said he is now cleaning sand and mud out of his gutters.

CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

Trees Arrived for Parks: Duncan Murray, City Manager, reported that the Public Works Department will be planting trees in the Parks.

MAYOR'S ITEMS:

Mayor Long reported that Hill Air Force Base is doing a series of gate closures.

CITY RECORDER'S ITEMS:

Tom Smith, City Recorder, explained that because there are times when the information isn't available, some attachments to the Council's packet may come out later. Tom reported that he has met with the crossing guards at South Weber Elementary to discuss their concerns.

ADJOURNED: Council Member Casas moved to adjourn the City Council Meeting at 9:25 p.m. Council Member Hilton seconded the motion. Council Members Casas, Hilton, Poff, Poore, and Thomas voted yes. The motion carried

APPROVED: _____ Date
Mayor: Tammy Long

Transcriber: Michelle Clark

Attest: _____
City Recorder: Tom Smith