

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a time-stamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

Regular Meeting Minutes

5:30 PM, Tuesday, February 18, 2020

Room 200, Municipal Council Chambers

351 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

Roll Call

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth

Councilor Bill Fillmore

Councilor George Handley

Councilor David Harding

Councilor Travis Hoban

Councilor David Sewell

Councilor David Shipley

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

Chief Administrative Officer Wayne Parker

Council Attorney Brian Jones

Council Executive Director Cliff Strachan

Conducting: Council Chair George Handley

Prayer

Beth Alligood

Pledge of Allegiance

Clifford Strachan

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

1. Introduction of the new Grandview South Neighborhood Chair. (20-041) ([0:09:47](#))

Karen Tapahe, Neighborhood Coordinator, announced that Jeff Gardner had retired from his position as Grandview South Chair and Mindy Jepson was elected unanimously.

Ms. Jepson spoke to the Council about why she loves her neighborhood. Families and service projects were some of the things that made the Grandview South Neighborhood enjoyable.

2. A presentation on the Timpview Trail Neighborhood Matching Grant Project in the Indian Hills Neighborhood. (20-042) ([0:12:35](#))

Joshua Kilpack, a young Provo resident, used a neighborhood matching grant, a Go-Fund-Me, and door-to-door donations to raise \$9,200 to make much needed improvements to a trail located above Timpview High School. He shared a video with Council that illustrated his project. The Council gave Mr. Kilpack a well-deserved round of applause.

Public Comment ([0:17:32](#))

Brian Jones, Council Attorney, read the public comment preamble. Chair Handley opened public comment but there was no response.

Action Agenda

3. Resolution 2020-02 consenting to the appointment of individuals to various boards and commissions. (20-003) ([0:19:05](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the resolution, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mayor Kaufusi recommended the following individuals to serve on various boards and commissions:

- Zach Atherton – Arts Council
- Thomas Taylor – Arts Council
- Daren Smith – Arts Council
- David Shipley – Library Board
- Beth Alligood – Housing Authority

Chair Hanley opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell and Shipley in favor.

4. Resolution 2020-03 appropriating \$15,000 in the General Fund for a public bike rack expansion project. (20-040) ([0:22:31](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the resolution, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

David Mortensen, Budget Officer, presented. He explained this was an appropriation for a public bike rack expansion project. The funding for this project comes from the agreement made with Zagster, the electric scooter company operating in Provo.

There would be 80 bike racks throughout town located on public property. There would also be one rack designed to look like the Provo City logo and it would be in a prominent area downtown.

Chair Handley opened public comment, but there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell and Shipley in favor.

5. Resolution 2020-04 transferring \$200,000 from the Community and Neighborhood Services Department to the Development Services Department. (20-039) ([0:24:41](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the resolution, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

David Mortensen, Budget Officer, presented. In fiscal year 2020, the former Community Development Department was split into two separate departments, Community and Neighborhood Services and Development Services. At the time of the fiscal year 2020 budget preparation, it was still unclear exactly which functions and employees would be going to each department. Now the City has a better idea of what the fiscal year 2020 personnel budgets should be for each department. Staff determined that Community and Neighborhood Services was budgeted about \$200,000 more than they need, and Development Services was budgeted about \$200,000 less than they need. The proposed transfer of personnel budget would move \$200,000 of budget from Community and Neighborhood Services to Development Services.

Chair Handley opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell and Shipley in favor.

6. Resolution 2020-05 appropriating \$26,819.85 in the General Fund for a reimbursement to satisfy the Participation and Reimbursement Agreement with Parkway Village Provo Holdings, LLC. (20-038) (0:25:54)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the resolution, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

David Mortensen, Budget Officer, presented. This was a request from Economic Development to satisfy a reimbursement payment as previously agreed upon when the City entered into a participation and reimbursement agreement with Parkway Village Provo Holdings, LLC.

Chair Handley opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell and Shipley in favor.

7. Resolution 2020-06 appropriating \$3,638,455 in grant funds and sale proceeds for the design and construction of a new roadway, utilities, and infrastructure at the Mountain Vista Business Center. (20-035) (0:26:46)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the resolution, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

David Mortensen, Budget Officer, presented. On August 15, 2018, Provo City Economic Development was awarded a matching grant from the Economic Development Administration for the construction of a new road and utility improvement from the roundabout in Mountain Vista Parkway to State Route 75, also known as 1400 North in Springville. This new road would provide access to the southern end of the business park and more direct access to I-15 to the west. The road is being built in conjunction with property recently sold to Hall Property Holdings, LLC for the construction and development of the continuation of the business park in the form of new large warehouse, manufacturing, and office buildings. This would appropriate the funds for use.

Chair Handley opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell and Shipley in favor.

8. Resolution 2020-07 of the Provo City Mayor and Municipal Council urging support for educating consumers about where Tier 3 gasoline is sold. (20-031) ([0:28:42](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the resolution, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

John Magness, Policy Analyst, presented. He explained the Mayor's Substantiality and Natural Recourses Committee presented their annual report to the Council in the Work Meeting on January 21, 2020, and asked for the Council to support a resolution regarding the Utah State government taking action to educate the public about which gas stations sell Tier 3 gasoline.

Chair Handley opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell and Shipley in favor.

9. *CONTINUED*** An ordinance amending Provo City Code relating to floor area ratio, setback, and buffer yard requirements in the Research and Business Park (R&BP) Zone. Citywide Application. (PLOTA20190425)**

10. An Ordinance 2020-03 amending Provo City Code to allow restaurants with ancillary microbrewing as a permitted use in certain zones. (PLOTA20190378) ([0:29:59](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the ordinance, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Austin Ardmore, Planner, presented. This item had been continued from the previous month to allow more time for research. Mr. Ardmore said the ordinance had not changed in form since the previous meeting. He noted that he received an email from PEG Development encouraging and supporting this amendment. A survey had also been conducted and 80% of the responses were positive.

The applicant, Quinn Peterson, represented Downtown Provo, Inc. (DPI). Since the previous meeting the survey had been conducted by Council Staff, yielding over 1300 responses, most of which were supportive. Mr. Peterson also had a letter from Qualtrics supporting this amendment. Their employees often lived in Salt Lake City or Park City because they felt there was a lack of activity and drinking options in Provo.

John Magness, Policy Analyst, provided an overview of the survey. There were 1,342 respondents and 546 were registered Open City Hall users, the others were self-selecting. He cautioned this was not a scientific survey. The survey was based upon the issues that were brought up in the January 21, 2020 Council Meeting.

Karen Tapahe, Neighborhood Program Coordinator, spoke about the survey outreach. There were 842 registered Open City Hall users who were notified by email about the survey. There were various social media posts and neighborhood chairs were also asked to send the survey to their email lists. Several news agencies also covered the survey.

Mr. Magness reviewed the data. The majority of people were supportive. Opposition increased with age among both genders. Females were more supportive than males. Of those who did not live in Provo, the older age groups were more supportive than those who live in Provo. Even among those who do not drink, 64 percent of respondents supported brewpubs.

Hannah Salzl, Policy Analyst, reported back to Council with answers to some of their questions from previous meetings. The full report is available online at agendas.provo.org. She said brewpubs would be limited to DT1, DT2, and SC3 zones, this was Downtown, Riverwoods, and Provo Town Center. Seventy percent of sales revenue must come from food sales and 30 percent or less from alcohol. Open containers of alcohol could not leave the premises. Provo City had additional regulations that required premises to be well lit. The DABC conducts annual and random audits and law enforcement often sends undercover officers to places that serve alcohol.

Ms. Salzl had interviewed several police agencies in cities that had brewpubs. They did not have any concerns about brewpubs and had not reported an increase in DUI citations.

The Downtown Redevelopment Agency noted that 75 percent of cities that had brewpubs open in downtown areas resulted in a positive economic impact.

Ms. Salzl explained Council had future licensing options available including amending the Class "B" Beer License or creating a Class "F" Beer License.

Chair Handley opened public comment.

Bonnie Marshall, Provo, said she loves the standards that Provo has always had. She worried that brewpubs would make drinking more attractive.

Steve Christiansen, Provo, thought brewpubs would increase drinking and could create more alcoholics. He said this decision would change the direction of Provo for the worse.

Sam Oman, Provo, said the best food in Salt Lake City was at the brewpubs.

Ian Dalton, Provo, loved the vibrant downtown and outdoor activities of Provo. Both he and his wife were non-drinkers but encouraged diversity and wanted to make others feel welcome. He asked Council to consider the good things this could bring.

Joel Rinker, Highland, worked for Explore Utah Valley at the Convention Center. He said Provo was lacking the upscale bars that other cities had. Mr. Rinker thought a brewpub would add to the appeal of Provo. It would need to have a business model that could survive on good food.

Lilian Wilkinson, Provo, spoke in favor of this amendment for the purpose of keeping tax dollars in Provo.

Ashley (last name not provided), Provo, was a non-drinker but supported this amendment. When she left Provo for the first time she left with a fear of things and people that were different. There was already a large cultural gap in Provo, she did not like the message it would send to disallow brewpubs.

Larissa Davis, Provo, previously worked with the Chamber of Commerce and was familiar with the liquor laws in Utah. She did not think a brewpub would make people change their standards. This would help large companies in Provo with recruitment.

George Fry, Provo, thought this was a good way to expand the fabric of our community rather than letting it get destroyed. It would help others to feel more welcome.

Blue Adams, Provo, was a local business owner. She had friends who drove for Uber and they made a lot of their money taking residents to other cities that had brewpubs. She thought having a brewpub would help keep people downtown which would help business owners.

Sherry Spencer, Provo, thought craft beer made drinking more socially acceptable and easier to hide alcoholism. She asked Council to consider the parents of the BYU students.

Jessica Hall, Provo, said alcoholism was not typically fed by expensive drinks. And not everyone who drinks would become an alcoholic. She saw this as an opportunity to educate young adults about responsible drinking.

Dean Jutta, Provo, was a local business owner. He was in favor of this amendment because it would add more diversity.

Chad Pritchard, Provo, was a local business owner and had obtained many liquor licenses. He said one of the safest places for a person to drink was at a restaurant. Mr. Pritchard did not think it was in the purview of the Council to dictate the free market.

Roxanne Hadfield, Provo, did not believe a brewpub would be in the best interest of the community. She was worried Provo's reputation would be made fun of at brewpub.

Jordan Bartholomew was a resident of Downtown Provo. He ran a non-profit to help make the community a better place. He thought this was a way to make Provo a better and more diverse place. He felt ostracized at times because he did drink, this was a way to make all different types feel welcome.

Heather Skabeland, Provo, considered herself a responsible drinker. She was in favor of this amendment. Referring to the appropriation earlier in the evening for public bike racks, she said having a brew pub and bike racks in downtown would be a great thing.

Dave Knecht, Provo, read an email he and other former Councilors sent to the current Council. They were opposed to the ordinance and did not believe it would promote the health, safety, and welfare of Provo. The email was signed by David Atchison, Don Butler, Cali Hales, Stan Lockhart, Cindy Richards, Kim Santiago, George Stewart, Kay Van Buren, and Paul Warner.

Rachel Favreau, Provo, had brewed in her own home and was fascinated by the process. She was in favor of more access and giving every person the right to choose.

Tosh Metzger, Provo, thought this was proactive. Many restaurants sell it anyway, the only difference was brewing it onsite. He thought this was good for downtown. There was more to it than drinking. It was a good business decision.

McKay Linker, Provo, was a high school teacher in Provo. She wished more people would experience Downtown Provo. She did not think it would negatively impact those opposed but thought it would positively impact the City.

Cindy Richards, Provo, was a former Council Member. She said alcohol was a drug; it was a depressant of the central nervous system. Making alcohol more enticing did not reasonably further the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Provo.

Havock Hendricks, Provo, was a local artist. He said this was a question of the type of alcohol experience people would have in Provo. Mr. Hendricks' friends often talk about the only two bars in Provo and want a different type of experience that is more to their standard.

Julia Smoot, Provo, had lived in Provo for 45 years. She felt Provo had accomplished great goals while protecting family values. She was opposed to this and thought the family environment needed to be protected. Ms. Smoot said breweries required a lot of water which was a previous resource and needed to be protected.

Sage Pearson, Provo, thought it was irrelevant to say this went against family values or the type of community that was wanted. Every family looks different and has different values. Ms. Pearson was a drinker and taught her children about responsible drinking. She preferred to have this out in the open and something that could be discussed. She thought if health and safety was really an issue, then all of the cookie and soda places should be regulated too.

Noah Kershnik, Provo, spoke about inclusiveness and making everyone feel welcome, regardless of whether or not they drink. He also thought this was a way to keep tax dollars in Provo.

Sheryl Lee Wilson, Provo, owned a business in Provo and did business around the world. People enjoyed the family atmosphere in Provo. Alcohol had destroyed many families. It was not healthy. She was opposed.

Laura Hendricks, Provo, was self employed and could live anywhere in the world, but they chose Provo. She was in favor of brewpubs not only for the residents of Provo but those who visit. Provo was becoming more diverse and the people who are "different" were making Provo even better.

Dean Chessman, Provo, thought saying no to something like this sent the wrong message. It makes people who drink feel unwelcome. He encouraged Council to support this amendment.

Clark Oldsperry, Provo, said people who make and/or drink alcohol were not bad. The community was growing, and diversity inclusion was good.

NeCole De Rurange, Provo, considered Provo a safe haven. Having accessibility to brewpubs could have adverse outcomes. She wanted to limit the things that keep Provo different from other places.

Buddy Richards, Provo, was sympathetic to the argument of inclusion but he was not sure increasing the intake of alcohol was the best way to do this.

Kim Ostler, Provo, said families could exist beautifully with alcohol in the home. People should be allowed to make their own choices. She would rather spend her money in Provo than Lehi or Springville.

Gary Matthews, Provo, was raised in Las Vegas and said he was not interested in having Provo go in that direction. He was opposed.

There were no other comments from the public. ([1:57:56](#))

Brian Jones, Council Attorney, explained there were currently five different types of beer licenses available, but there was not one that would permit on-site brewing. A sunrise clause would allow time for a license to be either created or an existing one amended.

Councilor Hoban appreciated all the comments and emails he had received. This was an important decision; he did not take this lightly. Having traveled a lot for work, he had positive experiences in brewpubs and preferred them to bars. He had many personal experiences but wanted to make a practical decision.

Mr. Hoban asked for some pictures to be displayed. The pictures included a large outdoor sign that said "...and brews," a menu with many alcoholic beverages, and a bar. It was clear there was an overall strong emphasis on alcohol. The pictures were taken at Red Robin, a restaurant already in Provo. Legally, there could be a dozen more restaurants just like this tomorrow. He went on to show pictures of Strap Tank, a brewpub in Springville. He thought it was very similar materially to Red Robin.

Councilor Hoban tried to find data that showed the detriments of brewpubs or potential safety issues, but he was hard-pressed to find anything. There were incidents in North Carolina but there were other considerable factors.

Councilor Sewell appreciated the comments that had been made. He summarized what he had heard. His biggest concern was health and safety. He questioned if this would increase alcohol consumption. Some felt there was no distinction between a brewpub and another restaurant that serves alcohol. The implication was it would make no difference in alcohol consumption, but Mr. Sewell disagreed. Councilor Sewell understood there were plenty of responsible drinkers, but his experience was that if the popularity of drinking increases, there was no way to completely separate that from an increase in alcohol abuse.

Mr. Sewell spoke about what made a brewpub different from a restaurant. Marketing was one of the biggest differences, alcohol was the primary product. A unique brand and unique flavors were the differentiating factors and they would be heavily marketed. Councilor Sewell was comfortable dining in a brewpub himself, but he would not take his kids or grandkids there because there was such an emphasis on alcohol. One result of this difference in focus would be increased consumption.

Councilor Sewell said alcohol was probably one of the most dangerous drugs available; it killed about 88,000 people every year in the United States. He was concerned that allowing brewpubs in Provo would have a negative long-term impact on the health and safety of Provo residents.

Councilor Fillmore said this was a tough decision. This was not about consumption versus no consumption – there were already 60 beer licenses in the City. This was not a moral or religious decision. He viewed this as a health, safety, and welfare issue. He said reasonable minds could differ. Mr. Fillmore acknowledged the potential benefits of a brewpub. But the social costs outweigh the benefits. He did not feel the survey results were representative of the constituents in his Council District. He agreed with Mr. Sewell's assessment of the difference between brewpubs and restaurants with beer licenses. A brewpub was not critical to citizens choosing to stay in Provo.

Councilor Shipley was persuaded by the public participation throughout this process. He was glad the per bar ratio in Provo was 1:60,000; it was 1:6,000 in Salt Lake City. He was happy to be known as the most sober metro area in the U.S.

Healthy, safety, and welfare had been cited as reasons to not allow brewpubs. But the meaning of health, safety, and welfare was different for everyone, said Mr. Shipley. There was science and data that showed drinking in a public setting was a positive indicator for future drinking habits. There was data that more expensive beer reduces consumption. Drunkenness could be accomplished for a lot less money by going to a liquor store instead of a brewpub.

Councilor Shipley believed legislators should not apply different standards to different things because of their beliefs. If the concern was health, then they needed to regulate cookie and soda stores too – there were more unnecessary deaths due to obesity than there were due to alcoholism. If the issue was about access and appeal, then grocery stores and convenience stores had been perpetuating alcoholism. A consistent and objective standard needed to be applied.

Councilor Shipley thought if this were a question of bringing Buffalo Wild Wings to Provo, this discussion would not be necessary, even though a Buffalo Wild Wings would bring more alcohol consumption than possibly a brewpub.

Councilor Shipley said the staff and Planning Commission had provided good data and he felt it was being overlooked.

Provo's motto was "Welcome Home." Inclusivity was an important part of our community. Mr. Shipley thought people should feel welcome even if they don't look and act like we do. He disliked hypocrisy and having different standards for different things.

Some people worried that a brewpub would make alcohol or craft beer seem more appealing to the youth of Provo. Mr. Shipley said there were many brewpubs in the town he grew up in and they had nothing to do with teenagers' decision to drink or not drink. Kids would not start drinking because of brewpubs.

The fear that the beer would be pushed and heavily advertised was not realistic, said Mr. Shipley. Strap Tank had an 80/20 split of food to alcohol sales. They did not promote their beer outside of the restaurant because they did not want to exceed the 30 percent limit set by the state and risk losing their liquor license. Their focus was on their food.

Councilor Shipley reserved the remainder of his comments but said he would be voting for this because it was important to apply consistent standards.

Councilor Harding thanked staff, his fellow councilors, and those that had been a part of the conversation. It had been a thoughtful discussion so far. Alcohol abuse was a serious societal problem with high societal costs. Some will enter a brewpub and later on become an alcoholic and Mr. Harding said there would be consequences. Some would have their first experience with alcohol at home because there were not good alternatives for public consumption. Consumption of alcohol in public, a brewpub or restaurant, was the safest place for it to happen. There would be less problems in the future with alcohol abuse by allowing public consumption in safe environments. Mr. Harding believed this amendment would lessen the net impact on alcohol abuse.

Councilor Harding emphasized how small this land use change was. He said it was time to review alcohol licensing in general and that would be where public health concerns could really be addressed. He saw this as a minor adjustment to the code, especially considering what was already permitted in restaurants.

The bigger concern for Mr. Harding was the community response to such a small change. This was indicative of some underlying issues that were bigger than this proposal. He had once been asked how Council would keep Provo from becoming like Salt Lake City. Mr. Harding was from Salt Lake, but there was a divide in the community in Salt Lake, it was an us versus them mentality. There was contempt and intolerance. Mr. Harding wanted to be careful not to subscribe to the us versus them mentality. It was possible to be respectful to people with different values. Mr. Harding cautioned calling into question other people's motives.

Councilor Ellsworth discussed the health, safety, and welfare of the city. The application of this was arbitrary. Using numbers to regulate, like cutting off beer sales at 10:00, seemed arbitrary. Sugar had not been legislated, nor had caffeine. These were not healthy. Air quality was not regulated enough. People were generally responsible with alcohol, but council was arbitrarily putting it on trial. This made Ms. Ellsworth uncomfortable. The data should be taken seriously.

Councilor Ellsworth hoped Provo could be as welcoming as other places she had visited. In the mid-west it was easy to find someone who could point you to the best bar and the best church, they were not mutually exclusive. She hoped Provo residents would welcome everyone, regardless of their lifestyle or values.

Disneyland and Disney World were the most family friendly places on earth, and they served alcohol. Councilor Ellsworth hoped Provo could also serve alcohol while remaining a family friendly place.

Chair Handley struggled with this vote more than any other vote he has made. He had great respect for the community and the people on both sides of the argument. When he first spoke with Quinn Peterson it seemed like an easy choice to allow brewpubs but then it became a more complex issue. He disliked seeing things get polarized and certain factors emphasized, it made it difficult to think clearly. It was important not to lose sight of what was already allowed in Provo.

He was serious about public health and safety, but he did not want to moralize about someone having a drink. Diversity and inclusion were the reasons Mr. Handley ran for Council.

People in favor amplified how vital it was to downtown and put a deemphasis on the difference between a brewpub and a restaurant. But if it were vital to business to have a brewpub, then it must be because it is different from a restaurant, otherwise they would not be asking for it.

Chair Handley could not be persuaded that it would lead to some of the dangers that had been described, but it was not benign. His concern was that the community had been too alarmist and exclusionary in the way this had been discussed. A beer with a meal should not be equated to moral depravity.

There was little evidence that a single brewpub would have such an impact. If it was similar to a restaurant, why did Provo need it? Chair Handley asked if the community had exhausted its creativity to make Provo appealing to locals and visitors. If a brewpub made an economic difference, that signals something is not quite right with the culture being built in downtown.

Chair Handley loved Velour and he wanted to see more live music downtown. The music group Neon Trees had been interviewed by NPR a few years earlier and explained one of the reasons they enjoyed performing in Provo was because the focus was on the band, not alcohol. Chair Handley said a business model that says we need more variety of drinking options in downtown to be successful might be using alcohol as a crutch. He was more interested in a model that used creativity to succeed.

Chair Handley, a non-drinker, offered to buy a beer for anyone offended by his vote at the new brewpub. He did not want this vote to be an excuse for a divided City. Overall, he felt this had been a pleasant experience with dignified conversations.

Councilor Sewell said the community was the most important part of this decision. Community members were passionate about this, on both sides. He thanked everyone for their participation and efforts to be respectful.

Councilor Ellsworth asked if Mr. Handley's decision was based on economics alone. He responded that he was not persuaded that this was the most important thing needed to stimulate economic activity in downtown. Ms. Ellsworth did not think that was not the impetus of the proposal.

Councilor Harding made a motion to substitute the exhibit to which the motion applied. He wanted to include a sunrise clause to allow the proper licensing to be implemented. The alternate exhibit was displayed. Councilor Sewell seconded the motion.

Chair Handley called for a vote on the motion to substitute the exhibit.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Harding, Hoban, Sewell and Shipley in favor.

Chair Handley called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 4:3 with Councilors Ellsworth, Harding, Hoban, and Shipley in favor. Councilors Fillmore, Handley, and Sewell opposed.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 8:50 p.m.