

1 Minutes of the Centerville **City Council** meeting held Tuesday, April 5, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at
2 Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah.

3
4 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

5
6 Mayor Paul A. Cutler

7
8 Council Members Tamilyn Fillmore
9 William Ince
10 Stephanie Ivie
11 George McEwan
12 Robyn Mecham

13
14 **STAFF PRESENT**

15 Blaine Lutz, Finance Director/Assistant City Manager
16 Lisa Romney, City Attorney
17 Kevin Campbell, City Engineer
18 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
19 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

20 **STAFF ABSENT**

21 Steve Thacker, City Manager
22 Jacob Smith, Assistant to the City Manager

23 **VISITORS**

24 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

25 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

26
27 **PRAYER OR THOUGHT** Blaine Lutz

28
29 **OPEN SESSION**

30
31 Mark Gabriel – Mr. Gabriel stated many residents are noticing that both black and blue
32 waste cans are being picked up by the same waste disposal trucks, and expressed concern that
33 the citizens are paying for recycling when it's being disposed of in the land fill. He asked when
34 the Council will notify residents that they do not need to be using the blue recycling cans. He
35 mentioned that China is no longer purchasing recyclables from the U.S., and said it is his
36 understanding that both regular and recycling is now ending up in landfills.

37
38 Mayor Cutler responded that the trucks that pick up regular waste and recycling are
39 identical. He said he was informed by ACE Disposal, the company contracted by the city, that
40 Centerville's recyclables have always been taken to the recycling facility, never the landfill.

41
42 **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**

43
44 The minutes of the March 15, 2016 Council meeting and the March 23, 2016 joint work
45 session were reviewed. Councilwoman Fillmore and Mayor Cutler requested changes to the
46 March 15, 2016 Council meeting minutes. Council members Ivie and Fillmore and Mayor Cutler
47 requested changes to the March 23, 2016 work session minutes, and Councilwoman Ivie
48 requested the short-term goals for the Planning Commission listed on page 4 include mention of
49 which items the Council would like returned to them in the second quarter. Councilman
50 McEwan made a **motion** to accept the March 15th regular meeting minutes as amended, and
51 table approval of the March 23rd work session minutes. Councilwoman Mecham seconded the
52 motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

1 **INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH DAVIS COUNTY FOR BARNARD CREEK**
2 **CULVERT PROJECT – RESOLUTION NO. 2016-08**
3

4 Lisa Romney, City Attorney, explained that the City and County desire to enter into an
5 agreement for a cooperative and joint project to replace the Barnard Creek culvert that runs
6 through the UDOT Maintenance Yard property at approximately 1150 North 1300 West. She
7 recommended the motion to approve be subject to RDA approval of funding, and subject to any
8 changes requested by Davis County and approved by City staff. Kevin Campbell, City
9 Engineer, explained that the project is on the City's Master Plan. The existing pipe is
10 corrugated metal, to be replaced with reinforced concrete pipe.
11

12 Councilman Ince made a **motion** to approve Resolution No. 2016-08 approving an
13 Interlocal Agreement between Centerville City and Davis County for the Barnard Creek Culvert
14 Project, subject to RDA approval of funding, and subject to any changes requested by Davis
15 County and accepted by City staff. Councilwoman Fillmore seconded the motion, which passed
16 by unanimous vote (5-0).
17

18 **BID FOR STREETS CRACK SEAL AND SLURRY SEAL 2016 PROJECT**
19

20 Mr. Campbell explained the staff recommendation to award bid for streets crack seal and
21 slurry seal to Intermountain Slurry Seal for 2016. Councilwoman Mecham said the \$4,000
22 allocated by Intermountain Slurry Seal on the bid for striping crosswalks seems excessive, and
23 said she feels the work could be done for less by the Public Works Department. Mr. Campbell
24 agreed, and said the crosswalk striping could be removed from the scope of work. He
25 explained difficulties staff has experienced working with Morgan Pavement Maintenance in the
26 last few years. Even though they were low bid, he recommended that the contract be awarded
27 to Intermountain Slurry Seal. Councilwoman Ivie asked if there is a way to make the crosswalks
28 less slick when wet. Mr. Campbell responded the Public Works Department could be consulted
29 regarding crosswalk materials and options.
30

31 Councilwoman Ivie made a **motion** to award bid for the Streets Crack Seal and Slurry
32 Seal 2016 Project to Intermountain Slurry Seal removing item #4 in the amount of \$217,335.
33 Councilman Ince seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).
34

35 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONE MAP AMENDMENT (REZONE) – 77 WEST LUND LAND**
36 **FROM AGRICULTURAL-LOW TO RESIDENTIAL-LOW**
37

38 On March 23, 2016, the Planning Commission reviewed and recommended for approval
39 the proposed rezone of 4.85 acres of property located at approximately 77 West Lund Lane
40 from Agricultural-Low (A-L) to Residential-Low (R-L). The Mayor disclosed that he knows the
41 applicant, and that his brother and sister-in-law own neighboring property. Lisa Romney, City
42 Attorney, did not feel that the Mayor needed to recuse himself. The Council agreed. Cory
43 Snyder, Community Development Director, emphasized that the application is for amendment to
44 the Zoning Map. An application for conceptual subdivision was submitted to the City at the
45 same time to show what is intended for the property. However, the Planning Commission has
46 chosen to hold the application for conceptual subdivision until the Council has taken action
47 regarding the rezone. If rezone occurs, anything available under the rezone is potentially
48 possible. Mr. Snyder outlined the criteria considered with the rezone request: 1) is the request
49 consistent with the General Plan; and 2) do any internal or external problems exist that would
50 conflict with the proposed rezone. The Community Plan specifies the property as low-density;
51 the General Plan categorizes both A-L and R-L as low-density. Mr. Snyder reported the
52 Planning Commission found the request to be consistent with the General Plan and has
53 recommended rezone of the property.

1 Phil Holland, representing Wright Development Group, stated his firm feels a
2 responsibility to build a great project. They feel the requested rezone is consistent with the
3 City's General Plan. Mr. Holland said it is anticipated that average lot sizes within the
4 development will be .42 acres. He pointed out that most of Centerville is zoned R-L, with the
5 possibility of .25 acre lots. He stated that Wright Development Group is aware of density
6 conflicts within the community, and feels their proposal represents the opposite of high-density.

7
8 Mayor Cutler opened a public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

9
10 Chris Cutler – Mr. Cutler stated he owns property adjoining the subject property on the
11 south. He said he feels the A-L area on the north end of Centerville is an important part of the
12 community. He said he would like the City to maintain the A-L as the last part of Centerville
13 heritage.

14
15 Ron Dean – Mr. Dean proposed the City leave the lot size at .5 acres, and suggested
16 the lot price could be increased to compensate.

17
18 Lisa Robinson – Ms. Robinson stated the City General Plan differs from what she feels
19 should happen for that part of Centerville. She requested the Council look at the City Plan to
20 ensure that the area is maintained the way it is now for the enjoyment of those who have
21 already purchased property in the area.

22
23 Matthew Cutler – Mr. Cutler pointed out that the motto of Centerville City is "The Friendly
24 City by the Great Salt Lake". He added that the word "friendly" means to coexist without harm.
25 He expressed the opinion that on both a global and a city-level, homogenization of culture is
26 harmful. Mr. Cutler stated he feels rezoning from A-L would destroy the cultural integrity of
27 north Centerville and reduce the quality of life for residents in the area. He referred to the
28 recent creation of the Deuel Creek Historic District, and asked the Council to respect the historic
29 aspect of northern Centerville and keep the A-L Zoning.

30
31 Heather Healey – Ms. Healey said her parents own property southwest of the subject
32 property. She said they would like to see the property remain A-L to maintain the integrity of
33 property in the northern Centerville area.

34
35 Mike Holden – Mr. Holden said he bought his lot because it was .5 acres. He said he
36 feels A-L gives options not available with R-L, including the ability to have one large animal,
37 which gives a certain kind of personality to an area. He said he would oppose anything smaller
38 than .5 acre lots.

39
40 John Higley – Mr. Higley stated he owns property directly west of the subject property.
41 He pointed out the small difference between .42 acres and .5 acres, and said to him it is an
42 issue of lifestyle choice, not property size. He said he is in favor of allowing the proposal as
43 shown, given the fact that any changes would have to be presented to the Planning
44 Commission.

45
46 Robert Hawkes – Mr. Hawkes said he is the seller of the subject property, and said he
47 would like to see the requested rezone approved. He stated he chose not to accept bids from
48 firms offering more money with higher density proposals because he did not want to do that to
49 Centerville. He expressed confidence that Wright Development Group will not drastically
50 reduce lot sizes after rezone. Referring to Mr. Cutler's comment, he stated that the cultural
51 collapse of northern Centerville already occurred, with higher-density housing to the west and in
52 nearby Farmington. Mr. Hawks stated he feels the application meets all criteria outlined by the
53 City.

1 Mila Cutler – Ms. Cutler stated that, in the past, she has felt that public concerns have
2 been ignored by the Planning Commission and Council. She said she did not like the
3 development on the corner of Lund Lane, but felt at the time that her concerns were ignored.
4 She agreed with Matthew Cutler's comments regarding cultural diversity. She said her parents
5 originally bought their property to give their children an opportunity to learn to work with the land
6 and animals, an opportunity not available in the R-L zones. Those living in north Centerville are
7 used to letting their children and grandchildren have free rein of the area without worrying about
8 their safety. She said she would like the property to stay zoned for .5 acre lots.

9
10 Mark Gabriel – Mr. Gabriel suggested that, if the issue is one of cultural change, the
11 ordinance could be changed to allow a large animal on lots slightly smaller than .5 acres.

12
13 Mayor Cutler closed the public hearing at 8:05 p.m.

14
15 Mr. Holland expressed appreciation for the public comments. He repeated that the
16 proposal is consistent with the City's General Plan criteria for the neighborhood. He
17 commented that everyone wants a bigger lot. In America citizens have property rights, and
18 cities have guiding zoning principles.

19
20 At 8:07 p.m. Mayor Cutler allowed an additional public comment.

21
22 Josh Christensen – Mr. Christensen stated he moved to Centerville for a .5 acre lot. He
23 expressed concern that following a rezone to R-L, nothing would prevent the developer from
24 switching to .25 acre lots. He asked Mr. Holland if Wright Development Group will be building
25 the homes on the lots themselves. Mr. Holland responded that his firm will develop the lots as
26 custom lots for anyone wanting to custom-build a home. Mr. Holland commented that the
27 market does not ask for .5 acres or seek animal rights anymore. He said his firm is constrained
28 by what can be done with the property because of shape, and they feel large, custom lots are
29 the right choice.

30
31 Councilman McEwan referred to the multiple criteria in Title 12 of the Zoning Code used
32 when considering a rezone:

- 33
34 1. whether the property, text, or map amendment is consistent with the goals,
35 objectives, and policies of the General Plan
36 2. whether the proposed map amendment is harmonious with the overall character of
37 existing development in the vicinity of the subject property
38 3. the extent to which the proposed map amendment may adversely affect adjacent
39 properties
40 4. for proposed map amendments, the adequacy of facilities and services intended to
41 serve the subject property including, but not limited to, roadways, parks, recreation
42 facilities, police and fire protection, schools, storm water drainage systems, water
43 supplies and waste water, and refuse collection.

44
45 Councilman McEwan agreed that the proposal is probably consistent with the first
46 criteria, but emphasized that all four criteria should be considered. He said he does not believe
47 the proposal is consistent with criteria 2 and 3. Mr. Holland commented that the Wasatch Front
48 is becoming more populated, and all cities have experienced movement from A-L to R-L. He
49 added that projects to the east and west of the subject property were rezoned R-L for
50 development, and responded that the proposal is harmonious with existing development in the
51 area. Mr. Snyder responded he feels it is extreme to say the proposal is not harmonious. He
52 explained that the General Plan specifies the change to R-L will be considered on a case-by-
53 case basis, which naturally creates peninsulas of different zoning as properties develop at

1 different times. Mr. Snyder also pointed out that the Community Plan advises that at least five
2 acres is necessary for agricultural preservation, with agricultural zoning of .5 acres being
3 inadequate. He expressed the opinion that comparing the subject property to open property is
4 an unfair comparison. Mr. Snyder added that .5 acre lots would be difficult on some of the
5 neighboring undeveloped property. Mr. Snyder stated the proposal would not cause economic
6 or infrastructure injury, and said he feels the request of neighbors to handcuff the property
7 owner is more problematic than the arguments against approval.
8

9 Councilwoman Fillmore agreed that the affect on neighboring properties should be
10 considered, but said the Council also needs to be mindful of respecting property rights, and not
11 set a precedent of limiting property rights. She said she believes this General Plan option
12 respects cultural diversity, allowing those who desire to continue using their property as A-L to
13 do so, while leaving options available to those who want to develop R-L. Councilwoman
14 Fillmore agreed that Centerville has an agricultural heritage, and added that Centerville also has
15 a heritage of change, allowing owners to do something different with their property. She pointed
16 out that Wright Development Group has a desire to keep the property as close to A-L as
17 possible, which may not be the case at some point in the future with a different developer if the
18 rezone is not approved at this time. Councilwoman Ivie stated it is her desire to re-look at the
19 General Plan this year. Councilman Ince referred to the frustration expressed by Ms. Cutler,
20 and said he has felt for a long time that listening to a public hearing and making a decision three
21 minutes later is disrespectful to the citizens who shared opinions. He suggested the Council
22 table the rezone to the next meeting to allow Council members time to consider what was said.
23 Councilman McEwan indicated support, adding that it would be good for everyone to have time
24 to consider the four criteria.
25

26 Councilman Ince made a **motion** to table the Zone Map Amendment to the April 19th
27 meeting. Councilman McEwan seconded the motion. Councilwoman Mecham thanked Mr.
28 Hawkes for wanting to keep big lots on the property. She expressed frustration that there is not
29 a way to zone for what is asked without the risk of allowing .25 acre lots. Councilwoman Ivie
30 thanked the citizens who participated in the public hearing. The motion passed by unanimous
31 vote (5-0). Mr. Snyder commented that the Planning Commission report addresses all four
32 criteria.
33

34 **MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDMENT – SECTION 7-02-024 – POSSESSION OF WILD**
35 **ANIMALS PROHIBITED – ORDINANCE NO. 2016-09**
36

37 Lisa Romney, City Attorney, stated that pursuant to an Interlocal Agreement entered into
38 by Davis County and Centerville City, the County provides animal control services for the City.
39 To simplify enforcement matters the City has adopted by reference the Davis County Animal
40 Control Ordinance as set forth in Title 6 of the Davis County Ordinances. It has come to the
41 City's attention that the County Animal Control Ordinances provide a number of exceptions to
42 the prohibition on the possession of wild animals. While these exceptions may be reasonable
43 for enforcement within the County given the semi-rural development within the County, not all of
44 these exceptions make sense for developed areas of the City. These exceptions also conflict
45 with certain provisions of the Centerville Zoning Code. City Attorney Romney explained the
46 proposed amendment prepared by staff as directed by the Council, which adds protected or
47 controlled amphibians and reptiles to the definition of wild animal, and eliminates the exception
48 currently granted to those possessing a Certificate of Registration from the DWR. The
49 amendment also prohibits housing more than a certain number of non-controlled animals. Ms.
50 Romney explained alterations recommended by representatives of the DWR, including the fact
51 that the amendment could be interpreted to prohibit pet stores. She recommended the Council
52 add pet stores to the list of exclusions.

1 Councilman Ince asked if the housing of controlled birds is included in the ordinance.
2 Ms. Romney responded that the language does not specifically regulate birds. Councilwoman
3 Ivie asked if work animals such as bison, yak, or llama would be included. Ms. Romney read
4 aloud a portion of the ordinance specifying that animals would constitute an unreasonable
5 danger to human life, health, or property if not kept, maintained, or confined in a safe and
6 secure manner. Councilman McEwan pointed out that any animal not considered a commonly
7 domesticated breed would fall under this ordinance.

8
9 Councilman Ince made a **motion** to adopt Ordinance No. 2016-09 enacting Section 7-
10 02-024 of the Centerville Municipal Code regarding the Possession of Wild Animals, with the
11 addition of "pet store" to the list of exclusions as recommended by the City Attorney.
12 Councilwoman Fillmore seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

13 ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS ORDINANCE

14
15
16 Mayor Cutler explained that staff would like further direction from the Council regarding
17 how to proceed with the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance. Council members Ivie and
18 Mecham indicated they would be fine moving forward with attached ADUs, but not detached.
19 Mr. Snyder commented that in his research he has found people tend to prefer detached ADUs
20 so that family members can live somewhat separated from the main residence. Councilwoman
21 Mecham said she would be willing to consider detached following more study, but would not feel
22 comfortable putting it in the ordinance at this time. She said it is her perception that a majority
23 of the public comments have been against detached ADUs. Councilman McEwan stated he is
24 not in favor of accessory buildings at all.

25
26 Councilwoman Mecham said she would like the ADU ordinance to stipulate single-family
27 homes rather than conditional in A-L and R-L Zones. Mr. Snyder responded that multiple units
28 are already allowed in multi-family zones. The ADU requirements might conflict with the multi-
29 family requirements. Councilwoman Fillmore stated that during a previous Council meeting she
30 made a motion to remove detached ADUs from the ordinance, to increase the allowed
31 percentage of the home from 25% to 35%, and also to remove the maximum square footage.
32 She said she would be fine with 35% or 40%.

33
34 Councilman McEwan made a **motion** directing staff to prepare the ADU ordinance with
35 no provision for detached, and allowing the square footage of an attached ADU to equal up to
36 50% of the structure. Councilman Ince agreed with the 50%, but stated there should be
37 restrictions on parking availability and numbers. Councilman Ince stated he feels detached
38 could be appropriate on a large enough lot. Mr. Snyder pointed out that the allowed occupancy
39 is determined by the maximum square feet in the ordinance as written (1 occupant per 200
40 square feet). Councilwoman Fillmore stated her intent was to not be concerned with a specific
41 number of occupants. She said she is comfortable with the occupancy varying depending on
42 the house size. Councilwoman Mecham said she is not comfortable with variable occupancy.
43 Mr. Snyder pointed out that the proposed 25% and 800 square-foot limits are intended to
44 prevent a single-family residence from being turned into a duplex. The number of occupants
45 has many impacts, and potentially doubling the occupancy of a neighborhood could over time
46 significantly change the neighborhood. Mr. Snyder stated he believes allowing more than 25%
47 of the residence and more than 800 square feet would be a mistake.

48
49 Councilman McEwan said he would be comfortable limiting the number of occupants per
50 structure by square footage. Ms. Romney pointed out that trying to limit the total number of
51 occupants in a home would bring up legal issues. Mr. Snyder expressed the opinion that a
52 default occupancy limit could be challenged with the Fair Housing Act. Councilman Ince pointed
53 out that the objective in putting together an ADU ordinance was to bring residents not in

1 compliance into compliance. Councilwoman Fillmore expressed the opinion that if a square-foot
2 limitation is included it should be higher than 800 square feet.

3
4 Councilman McEwan made a **motion** directing staff to prepare an ADU ordinance that
5 does not include detached structures, and allows the square footage of an attached ADU to
6 equal up to 50% of the structure, and directing staff to examine and provide legal opinions for
7 restricting the number of occupants in an ADU, whether by square footage or another
8 mechanism. Councilwoman Ivie seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

9
10 **LIAISON REPORT**

11
12 John Higginson, the City's liaison with the Wasatch Integrated Waste Management
13 District, reported on the new PARC & Save program, and the new mixed waste processing
14 facility. He explained that Wasatch Integrated will be looking into the possibility in the coming
15 months of adding additional separation equipment to separate out more recyclables. Richard
16 Hamik with ACE Recycling and Disposal reported that Centerville recyclables collected by ACE
17 have never been diverted by ACE to a landfill. Mr. Hamik, Mr. Higginson, and the Council
18 discussed the current recyclables market. Responding to a question from Councilman Ince, Mr.
19 Higginson stated that the lifespan of the landfill has been lengthened in large part due to the
20 mixed-waste separation efforts, and city recycling programs. Mr. Higginson suggested public
21 education efforts regarding what should and what should not be placed in recycling cans.

22
23 **SOLID WASTE COLLECTION CONTRACT**

24
25 Larry Gibbons, Business Development Director for Rocky Mountain Recycling, explained
26 the relationship between Rocky Mountain Recycling and firms like ACE. He agreed that the
27 current recyclables market is bad, but stated that recyclables are not piling up at the transfer
28 stations, and are not being diverted to a landfill. Efforts have been made to find buyers in the
29 United States. Only very dirty recyclables go to the landfill after separation at the transfer
30 stations. Mr. Gibbons stated that Centerville has a low contamination rate, and agreed with Mr.
31 Higginson's suggestion for public education. He asked the Council to continue supporting the
32 life of the landfill by continuing the city recycling program. Mr. Gibbons and the Council
33 discussed which materials are recycled by Rocky Mountain Recycling. Mr. Gibbons pointed out
34 that items do not need to be rinsed out by residents. The Council appeared to be in agreement
35 that more public education is necessary regarding what and how to recycle.

36
37 Mr. Gibbons emphasized that Rocky Mountain Recycling sells all recyclable materials
38 they receive, but considering the market, a change to the financial arrangements is necessary.
39 Phil Markham with ACE Recycling and Disposal thanked the Council for considering an
40 extension of the waste disposal contract. He explained that in November 2015 Rocky Mountain
41 Recycling began charging a tipping fee of \$15 for every load dropped off at their facility, and
42 now charges a contamination fee of \$55 per ton. Mr. Markham proposed a 50/50 cost-sharing
43 arrangement between ACE and Centerville for the cost of processing Centerville recyclables,
44 with the same 50/50 arrangement for any revenue generated in the future. The Council and
45 Finance Director Blaine Lutz discussed the cost-sharing proposal. Based on the proposed two-
46 year contract extension, Mr. Lutz said he recommends holding the citizen rates even except for
47 a small increase to the green waste rate to compensate for the increase in the green waste fee
48 from ACE.

49
50 Councilman McEwan made a **motion** directing staff to prepare a two-year extension of
51 the contract with ACE, with modified terms to cover the increase in green waste disposal.
52 Councilman Ince seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0). Councilwoman
53 Mecham expressed appreciation for the quality of drivers operating ACE collection trucks.

1 **MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDMENTS – TITLE 14 - TRAFFIC CODE**

2
3 Due to the late hour, Councilman McEwan made a **motion** to table this item.
4 Councilwoman Ivie seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

5
6 **MAYOR'S REPORT**

- 7
8 • The Mayor included the February monthly report and the 2015 annual report for the
9 South Davis Metro Fire Agency on NovusAgenda.
10 • Mayor Cutler reported that the Forest Service Job Corps is looking for projects that
11 would provide a service and give training to students. He suggested Council
12 members keep the opportunity in mind in relation to their liaison assignments.
13 • The Davis County Health Department is putting together programs intended to help
14 prevent teenage and adult male suicides. The Health Department also has an online
15 forum for anonymously reporting a polluting vehicle.
16 • Mayor Cutler referred to a proposal to start the July 4th parade earlier than 9:00 a.m.,
17 and said he would recommend keeping the start time close to 9:00.
18 • The Mayor reported on a meeting held with property owners regarding the 1825
19 North Street Reconstruction Project. Councilwoman Fillmore said she would like the
20 bid to include the possibility of a solution that would allow tree roots to grow in park
21 strips without affecting sidewalks. Councilman McEwan said he would be more
22 comfortable leaving new trees out of the bid, considering the potential cost of such a
23 solution. He pointed out that a lot more education would be needed, and he would
24 not want to hold up the project. Councilman Ince suggested the City proceed with
25 the 1825 North Project, but start looking into other options for the future.
26 Councilwoman Fillmore responded that staff would not be happy if the Project was
27 postponed, but the Project is not an emergency. She stated that if the bid is sent as
28 currently planned, and the Project occurs as currently planned, the City may be
29 limiting the possible success of future trees, so she would like more information
30 before actual work is done. Councilman Ince asked if the Project could be put off
31 until next year to have a policy in place. Mayor Cutler pointed out that staff has felt
32 some urgency with the Project because of liability. Councilwoman Ivie said she
33 would like the Council to get more education quickly. Councilwoman Mecham
34 pointed out that the cost of the Project would likely increase if the City waited a year.
35 A majority of the Council agreed that staff should go through with the bid as planned.

36
37 **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

38
39 Ms. Romney reported that she sent a letter to the DWR regarding the reptile house on
40 Applewood Drive being in violation of City Zoning Code. She said she feels it would be best to
41 let the situation play out as far as possible with the DWR. She will bring an update to the
42 Council at the first meeting in May.

43
44 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

45
46 Council members Ivie and Ince discussed funding for wildfire prevention.

47
48 **RDA MEETING**

49
50 At 10:42 p.m. Councilman McEwan made a **motion** to move to a meeting of the
51 Redevelopment Agency of Centerville. Councilwoman Ivie seconded the motion, which passed
52 by unanimous vote (5-0). In attendance were: Paul A. Cutler, Chair; Stephanie Ivie, Vice-Chair;

1 Directors Fillmore, Ince, McEwan, and Mecham; Blaine Lutz, Finance Director; Lisa Romney,
2 City Attorney; and Katie Rust, Recording Secretary.

3
4 The Council returned to regular meeting at 10:44 p.m.

5
6 **ADJOURNMENT**

7
8 At 10:45 p.m. Councilman McEwan made a **motion** to adjourn the Council meeting and
9 move to a closed meeting for the purpose of discussing pending or reasonably imminent
10 litigation. Councilwoman Ivie seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

11
12
13 

14
15
16 Marsha L. Morrow, City Recorder

4-19-2016

17
18
19 Date Approved

20
21 
22 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

