

# **FARMINGTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Wednesday, February 19, 2003

---

## **CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION/KITCHEN AREA OF CITY HALL**

**PRESENT:** Mayor Protem Larry W. Haugen, Council Members David Hale, Bob Hasenyager, Susan T. Holmes, Edward J. Johnson, City Manager Max Forbush, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy Recorder Jeane Chipman. Mayor David M. Connors was present for part of the meeting.

**Mayor Protem Haugen** began discussion at 6:40 P.M. The following items were reviewed:

1. The Boyer Company requested final approval on Phase IV of Farmington Ranches. Staff recommended tabling the item until research could be done regarding road standard upgrades and engineering review.
2. An RDA meeting was scheduled for the evening.
3. It was also requested that the Council adjourn into closed session for reasons permitted by law.
4. A brief discussion was conducted regarding the request by Steve Skinner for a truck route hauling permit. Council members were especially concerned for children at school crossings along the requested routes.
5. Mayor Connors asked to be excused for the first part of the regular session.
6. Mr. Forbush stated that Agenda Item #7 would be a detailed review of the Storm Water Management Plan and proposed fees to implement the Federally mandated program.
7. Agenda Item #9 addressed a resolution for approving temporary street standards for a proposed street at 475 South 1100 West, which will be a nonconforming street.
8. Board of Adjustment interviews were briefly discussed.
9. Issues related to economic development in the City will be discussed under Agenda Item #12. Council members had held several special meetings to gather information and make plans for appropriate economic development.

## **REGULAR CITY COUNCIL/CITY CHAMBERS/CALL TO ORDER**

**PRESENT:** Mayor Protem Larry W. Haugen, Council Members David Hale, Bob Hasenyager, Susan T. Holmes, Edward J. Johnson, City Manager Max Forbush, City Planner David Petersen, City Recorder Margy Lomax, and Deputy Recorder Jeane Chipman. Mayor David M. Connors was excused for the first part of the meeting.

**Mayor Protem Haugen** called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. The invocation was offered by Max Forbush and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Robert Naylor of Scout Troop 1419.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

#### **Motion:**

Bob Hasenyager moved that the minutes of the February 5, 2002, City Council Meeting be approved as written. Susan Holmes seconded the motion. The voting was unanimous in the affirmative.

### **REPORT OF PLANNING COMMISSION (Agenda Item #3)**

**David Petersen** reported proceedings of the Planning Commission meeting held Thursday, February 13, 2003. He covered the following items:

1. The Planning Commission approved the Boyer Wheeler Farm L.C. request for final plat approval for Phase 4 of the Farmington Ranches Subdivision consisting of 43 lots on 25.618 acres located at approximately 2000 West Clark Lane in an AE zone.
2. The Planning Commission tabled Cowboy Partners' request for a recommendation to the City Council to amend the General Plan from "Office/Business Park" to "Medium Density Residential" regarding 8.98 acres of property located at approximately 400 West Burke Lane, and to further rezone said property from BP to R-8 for the purpose of developing 112 luxury apartments.
3. Michael G. Brown and Farmington City had requested a recommendation to rezone 32.903 acres located at approximately 450 South 1300 West from A to AE. The Planning Commission approved the recommendation.
4. Viola Kinney received approval for a conditional use permit to use an accessory building in conjunction with a proposed home occupation business (wood shop) located at 272 South 25 West in an LR zone.
5. Farmington City received site plan approval to construct a community center at the City's Main Park located at 125 South Main in an LR zone.

6. Farmington City also received site plan approval to develop Heritage Park on approximately 10.5 acres located between the Oakridge Park Estates PUD and U.S. 89 north of the K-Mart Shopping center in an LR zone.
7. Michael G. Brown, et. al., requested a recommendation to the City Council for approval of a temporary street standards regarding a proposed public right-of-way located at approximately 450 South 1100 West. A request was also made to extend a nonconforming street beyond 1,000 feet in length and to develop lots on said street which are less than two acres in size. The request for recommendation was approved.
8. The proposal by Buffalo Ranch was discussed. More information would be given during the regular session.
9. Marv Murri had requested a discussion regarding a flag lot, but the request was withdrawn.
10. Don Hokanson wanted the Planning Commission to discuss his request to obtain permission to create an auto sales lot. The Planning Commission wanted to study the issue further.

#### **“BUFFALO RANCHES” HORSE RANCH PROPOSAL (Agenda Item #4)**

As part of the Farmington Ranches development, 340 acres had been set aside by development agreement as a conservation easement. The Boyer Company is considering selling a portion of the open space from the Farmington Ranches development for use as a horse ranch. Lynn Summerhays (Boyer Company representative) was present to give Council members an idea of what would be included in the horse ranch proposal. It was likely the proposal may require some amendments to the Development Agreement between the City and Farmington Ranches. **Mr. Petersen** stated that the Buffalo Ranches developers had not made an official request, but wanted to discuss possibilities with the Council in the early stages of the endeavor.

**Lynn Summerhays** (942 East Oakridge Drive) felt the proposal would enhance the intended use of the conservation easement property. Landscaping would be planted and a new irrigation system would be installed to keep the area green. The property would be fenced for protection with an esthetically pleasing fencing. The project would represent a large investment. Mr. Summerhays was aware that the project may present a few inconsistencies with the conservation easement agreement, but he felt that the horse ranch would be a long term solution to the beautification of the open space.

**David Plummer** ( Buffalo Ranch representative, Fruit Heights resident) said he was in the horse business. He was a native of the area and was glad to return to what he considered “home.” The Buffalo Ranch would be his sixth ranch worldwide. The intended use would be strictly agricultural. Mr. Plummer breeds, raises, and trains thoroughbred horses. There would be no public use of the property. Planned trails would remain in the open space, however, the cross

project trail would need to be moved further to the north to connect to the shoreline trail. Mr. Plummer stated he also planned on having a few cattle on the ranch. He was currently conducting soil tests to make sure the soil could support grazing grasses he would plant. The existing ponds would be maintained. The entrance would be a Farmington rock gateway. He planned to employ between 10 and 15 people on the ranch. The horses planned for the ranch are very expensive. Two homes exist on the property. Easement agreements allow that the two structures could be improved or replaced, but that no more homes could be constructed. Mr. Plummer planned to replace the two homes. He also wanted to build barns for the animals. Residents for employee would be purchased from the Farmington Ranches subdivision.

**Susan Holmes** inquired about security for the children of nearby residents.

**Mr. Plummer** stated there would be 24-hour a day security officers to keep trespassers off the premises. Gates and fences would surround the entire project. He expressed concern with the fact that he would be building on traditional hunting grounds and the activity would pose danger to his animals

**Mr. Hale** commented that the ponds could be stalked with mosquito-eating fish and that there is an effective horse vaccination for the West Nile Virus.

**Lynn Summerhays** stated the facility would house an on-staff veterinarian. The grass would be kept to under 6 inches in height and water for the horses would be culinary.

**Mr. Hasenyager** asked about the location of the proposed buildings.

**Mr. Plummer** said the site plans had not been completed, but that buildings would likely be south of Clark Lane, close to the ponds. Utilities would be easier to reach at that point. When asked if the project would use all of the conservation easement property, Mr. Plummer responded it would not. The Ranch would take up the open space of the conservation property.

**Mr. Hasenyager** asked if the trail would be fenced.

**Mr. Summerhays** stated the trail would not be through the horse ranch, but would be to the north and that there would be an appropriate amount of buffer between the ranch and the trail. Plans for the trail would be forthcoming. No improvements for the ranch would be below the 4212 elevation mark. Land between the ranch and the Great Salt Lake would remain pristine.

**Mr. Hale** stated all interested parties should be consulted regarding the relocation of the trail connecting to the shoreline trail.

**Mr. Plummer** discussed the fence. It was planned to be black because horses cannot see white, slatted fences.

**Mr. Summerhays** felt that the initial plans for the development in west Farmington was

met with negative responses from residents in the area because of the threat to horse property. This project would give a permanent "enthronement" to the place of equestrian use in the area. He felt it would please those citizens who were concerned about the disappearance of rural land in west Farmington.

**Mr. Petersen** reported that according to the City Attorney, the current development agreement directing the establishment of the conservation easement would have to be reviewed by the Planning Commission and the City Council before conditional use could be approved.

When asked about planned timing, **Mr. Plummer** said the construction of the ranch would cost about 2 million dollars (including structures, landscaping, fencing, the tree lined entrance, etc.). Construction would begin 2 weeks after conditional use approval. It would then take 7 months to finish the ranch. If possible, he would like to have the ranch in operation by the beginning of 2004.

**Randy Cline** (Farmington Trails Committee) asked if a map of the trail realignment could be available for the Trails Committee to review. The response was affirmative.

**FARMINGTON RANCHES, PHASE IV. FINAL PLAT APPROVAL REQUEST/THE BOYER COMPANY (Agenda Item #5)**

**Mr. Petersen** introduced the agenda item. He reviewed conditions set forth by the Planning Commission in a letter dated February 14, 2003. Condition #3 of the letter indicated that review and approval of the final plat and improvement drawings, including a grading and drainage plan, by the City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, Central Davis County Sewer District, and Weber Basin Conservancy District was not quite complete. He recommended tabling the request until engineering reviews could be completed.

**Mr. Forbush** inquired regarding condition #4 wherein the developer had been required to install a diversion acceptable to the City Engineer for off-site storm water conveyance to the Great Salt Lake. The diversion was to be on Shepard Creek near the western boundary of Phase II and would convey all storm water from the Farmington Ranches. Mr. Forbush wanted to know if neighbors' concerns over watering amounts for stock had been resolved.

**Mr. Petersen** stated resolutions were in process.

**Mr. Hasenyager** stated conservation easements prohibit changes in water bodies and that careful consideration would have to be given regarding impact on wetlands.

**Mr. Petersen** showed on a map where the drainage would be conveyed. He stated the end result of the drainage plan was to provide stockmen with the same amount of water that had been there historically.

**Mr. Summerhays** said his company had spent \$28,000 to improve the drainage system and then another \$8,000 to restore water to the ranchers to the south. Mr. Summerhays then

expressed his concern that the City Council was considering tabling the request to wait for engineering review. He felt that the request could be approved subject to engineering requirements, with which he intended to comply. Other phases had been handled in the same manner and he saw no reason to delay the approval on Phase IV.

**Dick Moffat** (developer's engineer) said it would be very helpful to know there was a plat approval subject to engineering review in order to move forward with financing. The developer was willing to comply with any requirements set by the City Engineer.

**Motion:**

David Hale stated that because staff had recommended the agenda item be deferred until engineering review was complete and because the delay would only be for two weeks, he moved that the request for approval of Phase IV final plat be tabled until the City Council meeting of March 5, 2003. Susan Holmes seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**TRUCK ROUTE HAULING PERMIT/STEVE SKINNER (Agenda Item #6)**

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed conditions set forth for the permit as requested by Mr. Skinner. An excavation permit had been granted to Jonathan Hughes by Davis County, which originally had no termination date. Mr. Hughes had since been informed by Davis County that circumstances had changed and it had become necessary to establish a termination date for the permit. The permit would expire six months from the issuance of the notification (February 7, 2003) or at the time the first residence in the Hughes Farm Subdivision is occupied. Mr. Petersen explained that because of the County restrictions the truck haul route permit would expire on August 7, 2003, or upon occupancy of the first dwelling in the Hughes Farm Subdivision, whichever occurs first. The contractor will revegetate the hillside after excavation.

The City Council discussed the agenda item, including the following points:

- ▭ The contractor did not intend to grade the access road to less than 14 percent because of the amount of dirt removal necessary for such a grade. Condition #7 stated that the permit in no way constitutes approval by the City for any future development proposals within the excavation area to eliminate any misunderstanding that road grades for developments could be steeper than 12 percent.
- ▭ Mr. Forbush wanted to have assurances that Mr. Hughes was in agreement with condition #4, regarding having a public improvement bond in place to cover costs of repairing any damage caused by hauling activity. The Council discussed the issue at some length. Mr. Skinner stated he would be willing to work out an agreement between himself and Mr. Hughes that would guarantee repair of any damage on the roads for the haul permit duration. The condition was reworded to set up a warrantee bond by the contractor and/or Mr. Hughes wherein any road damage would be repaired, absolving the City of responsibility and of resolving any dispute of how or by whom damage may be caused.

- ↯ A detailed route map was requested from the contractor.
- ↯ A discussion regarding the haul route passed schools ensued. Council members were very sensitive to the safety of school children on their way to and from school along the truck route. Even though state roads were involved, Council members asked that Mr. Skinner not have his trucks begin work until after the children were in school in the morning (around 8:45 A.M.). Mr. Skinner stated that could be done.
- ↯ It was clarified that the trucks would not run at night.
- ↯ City Council members felt that Shepard Lane was too narrow for safe passage of the trucks and directed that the agreement exclude permission to use Shepard Lane.
- ↯ Students at all elementary schools in the area, including Reading Elementary to the south, must be protected.

**Motion:**

Bob Hasenyager moved that the City Council approve the truck haul permit as requested by Steve Skinner during the previous City Council meeting held February 5, 2003, subject to a list of conditions to be part of the permit with the following changes and additions:

(1) An acceptable written agreement shall be in place between the applicant and Jonathan Hughes wherein the existing subdivision public improvement bond may be used to cover the cost of repairing any damage to any public improvement related to said subdivision resulting from truck hauling activity covered under this permit.

(2) Use of Shepard Lane shall not be permitted.

David Hale seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED NOTIFICATION OF INTENT (NOI) TO ADOPT STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN (SWMP); CONSIDERATION OF ENGINEERING SERVICES SCOPE OF WORK TO DEVELOP STORM WATER UTILITY FEES; REVIEW OF PHASED PLAN TO CONSTRUCT STORM WATER MITIGATION IMPROVEMENTS IN FARMINGTON (Agenda Item #7)**

Mr. Forbush identified three major decisions facing the Council. All had to do with the management and control of storm water runoff. The first decision pertains to authorizing the Mayor to sign a Notice of Intent (NOI), which will be sent to the State Department of Environmental Quality advising them of Farmington City's intent to adopt a Storm Water Management Plan inclusive of Best Management Practices as required by Federal Environmental laws.

Packet information indicated that in order for the City to comply with its proposed Storm Water Management Plan, which will follow Federal guidelines, and to pay the cost of implementing best management practices required by Federal law, the City would need a new revenue source. Hence, the need for the storm water utility fee. It is the City Manager's recommendation that a storm water utility fee be adopted and made effective the first part of July. In order to meet that schedule, a storm water utility fee study will need to be completed to justify adopting the fee. The City Manager noted that most neighboring cities have adopted or will be adopting similar fees. Authorizing CRS to do the study is the second major decision alluded to above. The third major decision involves a proposed phasing of storm water flooding mitigation projects that were developed by the City shortly after the disastrous July 9, 2001, storm. The packet also included a letter from Steve Tumblin who had requested assistance from the City regarding possible solutions to repeated flooding that occurs on Bennett Circle.

Mr. Forbush stated staff had been working on these proposals for several months. He and Mr. Hirst (City Engineer) reviewed the issues including the following points:

- ▮ The requirement to adopt a Storm Water Management Plan has been mandated by the Federal Government without funding. The County has initiated plans which are being shared with all municipalities in the County. The County will be responsible for certain aspects of implementation as outlined in the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted by Kimball Wallace, Program Manager for the County. The Plan included 6 areas of action: 1) Public education and outreach on storm water impacts, 2) public involvement/participation, 3) illicit discharge detection and elimination, 4) construction site storm water runoff control, 5) post-construction storm water management in new development and redevelopment, and 6) pollution prevention/ good housekeeping for municipal operations. The main focus of Farmington City will be activities under numbers 4, 5, and 6. The County will do numbers 1, 2, and 3 for the benefit of all cities in the County if they choose.
- ▮ Some attention was given to other municipalities in Davis County. All cities will need to address action items as mentioned. Many have already adopted a storm water utility fee with which to finance activities in their storm water management plans.
- ▮ Farmington's plan will include "Farmington City Best Management Practices" being proposed by CRS (City Engineers) in coordination with City Staff. The Plan includes measurable goals in each program activity (areas 4, 5 and 6).
- ▮ The City Manager with Paul Hirst and his assistant presented proposed financing for phased implementation of the City's flood mitigation projects. The cost of implementation was reviewed. Storm water flooding mitigation in the first phase with Scenario 1 (the scenario preferred by staff) would cost an estimated \$337,000.00. Mr. Hirst and Mr. Forbush showed a map of the City and detailed the mitigation improvements for each area. Phase two was also discussed. Maps

and detailed descriptions were included in the packet.

- ▮ A conceptual budget showing revenues to cover the cost were outlined. Residential and non-residential storm water utility fees were noted. The expenditure categories listed include: (1) inspection services; (2) street sweeping and inlet box cleaning; (3) pipe cleaning; (4) inlet box/storm sewer pipe replacement; (5) new pipe installation; (6) the debt service cost for flood mitigation; and (7) miscellaneous costs for administration, mapping, reimbursement costs for studies, etc.

**Motion:**

Susan Holmes moved that the City Council grant conceptual approval authorizing the Mayor to sign the Notification of Intent. David Hale seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

David Hale moved that the City Council approve engineering services to develop justifications for a storm water utility fee with CRS subject to inclusion of a map indicating specific improvements. Susan Holmes seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

[Mayor Connors arrived at 9:10 P.M.]

Susan Holmes moved that the City Council approve Phase I of Scenario I as the preferred plan to construct storm water flooding mitigation improvements in Farmington. David Hale seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**MINUTE MOTION APPROVING BUSINESS OF CONSENT (Agenda Item #8)**

**Motion:**

Susan Holmes moved to approve the following items by consent as follows:

13. Approval of Real Estate Purchase and Sale Agreement pertaining to Mary Myers' property as enclosed. The closing on this property is scheduled for February 25, 2003.
14. Ratify approval of Financial Advisory Agreement with Zions Bank Public Finance previously signed by Mayor Connors This agreement documents the work completed by Zions Bank as part of the Recent sale of Park & Recreation G.O. Bonds.
15. Approval of Interlocal Agreement with Davis County for Animal Control Services. There is no increase in fees for the services this year.
16. Authorization to mail response letter to Michael Schwab, as enclosed in the packet.

Bob Hasenyager seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**RESOLUTION APPROVING TEMPORARY STREET STANDARDS FOR A PROPOSED STREET AT 475 SOUTH 1100 WEST; AUTHORIZING THE EXTENSION OF A NON-CONFORMING STREET (Agenda Item #9)**

**Mr. Forbush** explained the agenda item and said that the resolution approving temporary street standards for the proposed street at 475 South 1100 West had been recommend by both the Staff and the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission did recommend that an equestrian trail be established on one side of the street in compliance with previous policies in west Farmington. However, Mr. Forbush was not sure that the road would ever extend through, thus making an equestrian trail unusable. It would also make it difficult to make an assessment for sidewalk, curb, and gutter fair for both sides of the street.

**Motion:**

David Hale moved to adopt Resolution No. 2003-08, a resolution approving a temporary street standard for a proposed street at approximately 475 South and 1100 West: authorizing the extension of a non-conforming dead-end street and approving non-conforming lots adjacent thereto. Susan Holmes seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, by consensus the City Council agreed that the equestrian trail was likely not needed. Voting showed the motion passed by unanimous consent.

**PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION ORDINANCE (Agenda Item #10)**

Craig Call, Ombudsman for the State of Utah, had contacted the City informing the City that they had not sent in its copy of the private property protection ordinance which was required by Utah statutes. The City Attorney's office had been asked to prepare the Private Property Protection Ordinance as contained in the packet. Comments were made that the ordinance didn't have a lot of legal teeth in it; but because of the request by the State, the City would act on the ordinance.

**Motion:**

Susan Holmes moved that the City Council approve Ordinance No. 2003-09, an ordinance of Farmington City adopting Section 1-4-106 of the Farmington City municipal doe relating to constitutional taking issues. Larry Haugen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**PARKS AND RECREATION G.O. BOND PROJECT ISSUES; UPDATED BUDGETARY INFORMATION; AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES AGREEMENT (Agenda Item #11)**

Packet information indicated that additional costs had been incurred because of the addition of rock on the Community Center, water conditions at the site, expanded kitchen area, and other changes. There were also increases in the cost of Heritage Park because of the track

length and other adjustments.

**Mr. Forbush** reviewed the agenda item. He reported that one resident near the proposed park was not happy with the contemplated lot sale by the City.

**Mayor Connors** said he would be happy to meet with the individual and review reasons for the sale.

**Mr. Forbush** suggested that even though the projected budget was over revenue amounts, it would be well to put the projects up for bid to see exactly what amount would be needed for the scope of work described. It would then be possible to review elements of the project in light of actual costs.

**Motion:**

Susan Holmes moved that the City Council approve the Architectural Services Agreement between Butler & Evans and Associates for architectural services on the G. O. Bond projects. Larry Haugen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT OPTIONS/FURTHER DIRECTION RELATED TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNING (Agenda Item #12)**

**Max Forbush** stated that in response to direction by the City Council, Mr. Petersen had been working on a suggested outline for future direction related to economic developing planning for Farmington.

**David Petersen** reviewed the suggested timeline, including scheduled work on general plan amendments, committee meetings, public hearings, zoning text changes, and at what point a consultant could be hired to aid the process. The City Council discussed issues at length.

**Mr. Hasenyager** expressed concern that the future revenue needs of the City to provide infrastructure and desired services be adequately covered, while still protecting the rural character of Farmington as wanted and expressed by citizens.

By consensus, it was decided that Farmington citizens who had expertise in economics could be asked to advise the Council regarding projected revenue needs. It was also mentioned that the citizens should be consulted about what private services they would want in Farmington.

**CONCEPTUAL DIRECTION FOR AMENDING STORM WATER IMPACT FEES (Agenda Item #13)**

**Mr. Forbush** introduced the agenda item. Staff had been working with Tischler & Associates to amend the fees for the west Farmington area. Tischler & Associates had given alternatives, including a fee structure that could be narrowly focused on neighborhoods or the fee structure could combined all of west Farmington into one average fee. The combined structure was recommended by Staff.

By consensus, the City Council approved the combined fee structure of all of west Farmington.

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (Agenda Item #14)**

It was decided by consensus that the applicants for the Board of Adjustment post would be interviewed on Tuesday, March 4, at 5:30 P.M. prior to other meetings.

**REVIEW OF DRAFT WORDING FOR REPLACEMENT CANNON PLAQUE (Agenda Item #15)**

The packet included several drafts of wording for the plaque to be placed on the new cannon monument. By consensus, the Council directed that the wording be brief.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

**Shepard Lane Site Distance Improved**

Mr. Hale reported that the relocation of the Oakridge Golf Club fence had made a marked improvement for the safety of traffic along that road.

**Tree Removal Request**

Mr. Haugen suggested removing volunteer growing pines on Main Street between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> North in order to preserve the sidewalk nearby.

**Land Use on Burke Lane**

Mr. Haugen reported several citizen's opinion that the Bourne property should not be used for residential development.

**Potholes on Clark Lane**

Ms. Holmes reported large pot holes on Clark Lane west of the railroad tracks on the south side of the asphalt.

**Fund-Raising Conference**

Ms. Holmes reported there would be a conference regarding grants, fund-raising, etc., to be held March 9 through 12. She offered to attend if the Council felt it would be of help.

**Fiber Optics Meeting**

Mr. Johnson reported there would be a meeting of the committee reviewing fiber optics

options for the City. The meeting would be held during the week of February 24<sup>th</sup> to gain further information regarding the technology.

**Signals on Main/Shepard and Main/Burke and 1075 West**

Mr. Forbush stated that signals for the Main/Shepard and Main/Burke intersections were under consideration by the Utah Department of Transportation. Discussions will also be undertaken to resolve safety problems at 1075 West.

**CLOSED SESSION**

Larry Haugen moved to adjourn to closed session to discuss competency of individuals as permitted by law. Susan Holmes seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

A motion was made by Larry Haugen to go back into open session. The motion was seconded by Bob Hasenyager and carried unanimously.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, upon motion of David Hale with a second by Ed Johnson, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

---

Margy Lomax, City Recorder  
Farmington City