

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
HELD TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 2021, AT 5:00 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY
COUNCIL CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD**

Members Present: Mayor Mike Peterson, Council Member Scott Bracken, Council Member Christine Mikell, Council Member Douglas Petersen

Staff Present: City Manager Tim Tingey, City Attorney Shane Topham, Police Chief Robby Russo, Assistant Fire Chief Riley Pilgrim, Records Culture and Human Resources Director Paula Melgar, Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, Public Works Director Matt Shipp, Administrative Services Director S. Scott Juges

Excused: Council Member Tali Bruce

1. Welcome – Mayor Peterson.

Mayor Mike Peterson called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and welcomed those present. He reported that the Cottonwood Heights City Council Meeting would take place both in-person and virtually. Council Member Tali Bruce was excused from the meeting due to illness.

2. Review of Business Meeting Agenda – Mayor Peterson.

The agenda items were reviewed and discussed.

Mayor Peterson reported that the Business Meeting would include the Pledge of Allegiance as well as an acknowledgment and recognition of retired Cottonwood Heights Police Department (“CHPD”) Sergeant Michael Fullwood. Police Chief, Robby Russo, reported that Sergeant Fullwood spent the last few years of his career in Cottonwood Heights. It was customary to award the retiree with their weapon and badge. Chief Russo reported that those items would be presented to Sergeant Fullwood on June 18, 2021, at a going-away party. Mayor Peterson clarified that it is customary to award the retiree their badge and provide them the opportunity to purchase their weapon.

The Business Meeting agenda was outlined. Administrative Services Director, Scott Juges shared a summary of the budget adjustments. He explained that in the General Fund, eight different adjustments are totaling \$39,211. They were adjustments for which the City had been reimbursed for expenditures. Each item was a dollar-for-dollar offset. The adjustments included the following:

- Public Works – scraps from old signs to be used to purchase new signs;
- Cottonwood Heights Arts Council - Salt Lake County ZAP Grant to be used for various items related to the musical;
- Police - State of Utah Highway Safety DUI Overtime Grant;
- Police - State of Utah Highway Safety Speed and Seatbelt Overtime Grant;

- Police - CCJJ Grant to be used for police training;
- Police - Bullet Proof Vest Grant;
- Police - restitution to offset vehicle damages repaired at our costs; and
- Police - event overtime reimbursed (Extra Mile, Global Endurance, On Hill Events).

Mr. Jurgens explained that the Capital Improvement Fund had an adjustment where some of the Transportation Impact Fees would be utilized to cover the Transportation Plan Update that was voted on at the February 2, 2021, City Council Meeting. Mayor Peterson had a procedural question and asked if something was liquidated that brings in revenue if that revenue would automatically be credited to a department. Mr. Jurgens clarified that there would need to be an actual adjustment, otherwise, the revenue would come in as miscellaneous revenue.

Mayor Peterson noted that another action item would take place during the Business Meeting. It was Ordinance 357-A - Approving the Rezone of 0.3-Acres of Real Property Located at 2751 East Fort Union Boulevard. Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson shared some relevant history. The Gear Room property was previously rezoned to Mixed Use. There was concern from the Planning Commission, City Council, and residents about some of the uses that were permitted within the Mixed-Use zone. After the item was approved, the City Council directed staff to analyze the land use in the area and propose a change. The current Land Use Map was the result of that City Council direction. Mr. Johnson stated that there had been no signed petition. However, when the item went through the Planning Commission process, notice was provided to every affected property and all properties within 300 feet of those affected properties. Public comments had not been unanimously supportive of eliminating the mixed-use.

Mr. Johnson explained that for this particular rezone application, staff looked at the new land use map to prepare the report. It showed RO (Residential Office) for the property and staff recommended approval based on that. The Planning Commission voted to recommend denial with a 5-to-1 vote. There were now conflicting recommendations from staff and the Planning Commission. Further discussions were had about the rezone. Mayor Peterson noted that the item would be reintroduced during the Business Meeting. Mr. Johnson commented that no public comments had been received at the Planning Commission level and there had been two supportive comments shared at the previous City Council Meeting.

The next action item was Consideration of Resolution 2021-22-Accepting Requests for Indemnification. City Attorney, Shane Topham reported that the City and eight City employees were sued last month. The Plaintiffs alleged that there was misconduct by City employees, principally the Police Department and the City Manager as it relates to the August 2, 2020, incident. Mr. Topham clarified that it pertained to a demonstration in the Mill Hollow neighborhood.

As permitted by the Governmental Immunity Act of Utah, a request for defense and indemnification was received from the City employees. The City was obligated to provide defense and indemnification for actions of City employees that occurred during the course and scope of their employment. The purpose of the resolution was to accept those requests so that the City could proceed and engage with the insurance provider.

Mayor Peterson reported that the next action item on the Business Meeting agenda was the Consideration of Resolution 2021-23-Awarding a Retiring Police Officer His Badge and Approving His Purchase of a Firearm. There was also Consideration of Resolution 2021-24-Approving a Firework Display Contract with Lantis Productions for 2021 Butlerville Days. Mayor Peterson explained that the fireworks display was something the City had done for many years, with the exception of last year due to the pandemic. City Manager, Tim Tingey explained that the cost of the display was \$12,500 and staff recommended approval.

Mayor Peterson noted that the final action item on the agenda was consideration of Resolution 2021-25-Approving Performance Contracts for 2021 Butlerville Days. Mr. Tingey explained that the resolution would approve performance contracts for Eric Dodge, Shaun Christensen, and Clayton Smalley. Staff recommended approval of the contract. Mr. Jurgens commented that he looked forward to the Butlerville Days event. It would be held outside and there would be a large venue. He noted that the carnival would not be part of the event this year. Mr. Topham added that there would be a few more performance contracts to be approved at the next City Council Meeting.

3. Staff Reports.

a. Storm Water Fee Discussion – Public Works Director, Matt Shipp.

Public Works Director, Matt Shipp reported that the engineer from Bowen Collins & Associates, Justin Dietrich, was present and would share a slideshow presentation about the Storm Water Fee Implementation with the City Council. Mr. Dietrich overviewed a slide related to the fee structure. Both the Stormwater Fee Revenue and the General Fund could be applied toward a Stormwater Fee Enterprise Fund. The Stormwater Fee Enterprise Fund would fund the following:

- Operation and Maintenance;
- Regulatory Compliance; and
- Capital Projects.

Mr. Dietrich shared the key personnel who would be responsible for operating the utility:

- Public Works Director, Matthew Shipp, P.E.
 - Oversee the stormwater utility and expenditures of the stormwater fee;
 - Follow budgets approved by the City Council.
- Stormwater Manager, Mike Mirabella
 - Act as the main point of contact for the public;
 - Manage the stormwater program.
- Senior Staff Engineer, Adam Ginsberg
 - Assist key personnel as needed.
- Stormwater Billing Specialist (New Hire)
 - Communicate with Rocky Mountain Power;
 - Organize and maintain the stormwater fee database, including tracking credits.

Mr. Dietrich reported that the Storm Water Fee Policy Manual was in draft form. It would be shared with the Council Members shortly. They would have an opportunity to review the draft and comment on it. Mr. Dietrich shared the table of contents and highlighted two specific sections consisting of the credit program and the waiver program. Mr. Dietrich overviewed the credit program:

- Credit Eligible Activities (Maximum 50% Credit)
 - Private Detention (27% Credit);
 - Private Retention (50% Credit);
 - Private 80th Percentile Storm Retention (8% Credit); and
 - Private LID Storm Treatment (7% Credit);
 - Bioswale;
 - Vegetated Strip;
 - Infiltration Trench;
 - Dry Well;
 - Infiltration Galleries; and
 - Rain Harvest and Reuse.
 - Private Conventional Storm Treatment (15% Credit); and
 - Facilities Personnel Training (10% Credit).

Mr. Dietrich explained that credits would come into play when citizens of Cottonwood Heights do things that would benefit the system and lower the overall cost to the system. The proposed maximum credit was 50%. He also overviewed the waiver program:

- Waiver Eligible Conditions
 - Hardship (100% Credit);
 - SLCO Hardship Tax Relief Program;
 - Utah Home Energy Assistance Training Program (“HEAT”);
 - Utah Food Stamp Program (“SNAP”).
 - Active-Duty (Deployed) Military (100% Credit).

Revenue issues were discussed. There were two main areas that needed to be covered. For instance, operations/maintenance/regulatory compliance requires approximately \$700,000 per year to cover expenses. Additionally, \$1 million per year was needed to address Capital Projects related to the stormwater system. As a result, the annual revenue requirement was \$1.7 million. Mr. Dietrich reported that the recommended fee per equivalent residential unit (“ERU”) is \$7.50. That would lead to approximately \$1.4 million in revenue, which would require an additional \$300,000 from the General Fund in order to meet that \$1.7 million requirement.

Mayor Peterson asked about the cost of collection. Mr. Dietrich explained that collection was included in the \$700,000 under operations and maintenance. Council Member Petersen wondered if there was an estimate for exemption numbers. Mr. Dietrich reported that the number of full ERUs would be reduced by approximately 6% and that had already been accounted for in the numbers. He clarified that the \$1.4 million in revenue already assumed the exemptions. If there

was an unusually high waiver participation rate, the revenues would be less. If there was an unusually low waiver participation rate, the revenues would be higher.

Collections were discussed further. Mr. Dietrich stated that the initial quotes from Rocky Mountain Power were \$.36 per bill per month. There was also an initial setup cost in the first year as well as minimal ongoing maintenance. Rocky Mountain Power was currently providing the same service to other cities. There would be a cost of approximately \$90,000 per year. Mr. Dietrich explained that this was much less than if the City did the billing themselves. He shared a slide that highlighted the neighboring stormwater fees. Cottonwood Heights was in the middle group, which meant it was affordable compared to many other cities in the state.

Mr. Dietrich shared the next steps with the City Council. It included the following:

- Prepare Documents:
 - Prepare adoption ordinances;
 - Finalize rate schedule (per Council direction); and
 - Finalize policy manual (with Council comments).
- Public Hearing:
 - Planned for June 15, 2021 (notice on June 4, 2021); and
 - Receive and consider public comment.
- Council Vote:
 - Tentative July 6, 2021 vote.
- Rocky Mountain Power Coordination:
 - Negotiate agreement;
 - Set up billing system; and
 - Target initial bill for October 1, 2021.

The actions for City Council Members were also outlined and included the following:

- Provide Comments on Policy Manual: Comments needed before June 9, 2021, in order to be reviewed and addressed prior to public hearing;
- June 15, 2021: Public hearing with \$7.50 as the recommended fee; and
- Vote on Rate: Tentatively scheduled for July 6, 2021.

Mayor Peterson complimented the Storm Water Fee Policy Manual. He noted that the \$7.50 recommendation was a starting point. That number could change based on public comment and Council Member comments. He also noted that the American Rescue Funds may be able to be used for stormwater. That could impact the fee discussions. Council Member Christine Mikell made note of the \$7.50 fee compared to other municipalities. Though Cottonwood Heights was currently in the middle, they were one of the few cities that did not implement a telecom tax. It would be fair to mention other areas where taxes were not implemented. Mayor Peterson agreed.

Mr. Shipp reported that the manual would be shared with Council Members that week. A few technical portions needed to be adjusted. He asked that comments on the Storm Water Fee Policy Manual be shared before June 9, 2021, so further adjustments could be made and the manual could

be redistributed. He thanked Mr. Dietrich and Bowen Collins & Associates Staff Engineer, Emily Fica, for their work on the manual.

Mayor Peterson asked Mr. Shipp to outline the process of putting together the manual. Mr. Shipp explained that there was a Staff Committee that included himself, the Stormwater Manager, Bowen Collins & Associates, Mayor Peterson, and Mr. Tingey. There had been over half a dozen meetings where many issues had been addressed. Staff brought items to the City Council over the last three meetings and various concerns had been worked through. The Storm Water Fee Policy Manual was the result of time and effort from a lot of different people.

Council Member Petersen asked about the parameters for the American Rescue Funds. Mr. Tingey reported that there was a certain amount of time to use the funds. He believed they needed to be used by 2024. Staff did not know the full parameters yet, but the funds were allowed to be spent on stormwater. It would be permitted for capital costs rather than operational costs. The final determination regarding the funds would be available in the next few weeks.

b. 2021-2022 Budget Discussion – City Manager, Tim Tingey and Finance and Administrative Services Director, Scott Jurges.

Mr. Tingey reported that the budget process began in January 2021. Since then, there had been numerous meetings with department heads as well as Work Session discussions with the City Council. The Tentative Budget had already been adopted. Staff would highlight some of the differences between the Tentative Budget and the current budget.

Mr. Jurges noted that certain items were incorporated into the budget draft since the Tentative Budget was adopted on May 4, 2021. One item was the addition of \$400,000 in revenue from the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). That money would be paid directly to the City from UDOT in January. It would come into the General Fund and then be transferred to the Capital Projects Fund to cover various project costs. Mr. Jurges explained that the money would not be earmarked for a particular project, but there would be a reconciliation to ensure that monies transferred into the Capital Projects Fund for a specific purpose would go towards that purpose.

There were also a number of changes related to the General Fund, which were as follows:

- House Bill (“H.B.”) 129 was approved at the past Legislative Session related to General Fund balance limitations. Those had been increased from 25% to 35% as the maximum allowable amount. Cottonwood Heights projected ending Fund Balance was just over 25%. That 25% would equal approximately \$5,547,000 in the Fund Balance. The City was required to keep a minimum of 5% and then an additional 1% based on City Ordinance;
- The long-term disability, short-term disability, and basic minimum life costs had been updated after a new bid reduced those costs by \$19,721 in employee compensation;
- There was \$6,700 included that would go towards a match for the Utah State Historic Preservation Grant;

- There was \$21,000 included to update Tasers to turn on body cameras when activated. That cost would be one-third of the total and it would be phased in over a three-year time period in order to add that into service; and
- The fire cost was updated to match the current budget projection of \$117,272.

There were also a number of changes related to the Capital Projects Fund, which were as follows:

- After the discussions at the previous City Council Meeting, \$50,000 had been added to the 50/50 Sidewalk program;
- \$150,000 had been added in grant revenue from the Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant. It would be used to offset costs associated with the Ferguson Canyon Park Project; and
- \$173,500 had been added to fund engineering and property acquisition related to the 1700 East Sidewalk Project. Additional funds would be needed to complete the project.

Mr. Tingey discussed the 1700 East Sidewalk Project. He reported that City Council asked staff to look at phasing options. The first phase was included in the budget and included engineering and property acquisition. The next budget year would include a request for the remaining portion of the funds to complete the project. Mayor Peterson noted that there were a lot of sidewalk needs throughout the City. However, this one had been on the priority list for a long time. The school district identified it as a safe walking route for Ridgecrest Elementary.

Council Member Mikell asked about the total cost over two years. Mr. Jurgens explained that if the property needed to be purchased, it would be approximately \$425,000. The engineering would involve a survey of the property as well as the description. Once that information is obtained, the City would be able to approach the homeowners and talk to them about the property itself. At that point, there would be a better idea of the exact square footage needed.

Council Member Mikell noted that Danish Road had also been on the priority list for a number of years. She wondered how it was decided that 1700 East would go first. Mr. Shipp explained that the process included direction from the City Council. He added that 1700 East had a fairly straight alignment and would not require changes to the road alignment. On the other hand, Danish Road was more involved and would likely be more expensive. Council Member Mikell felt that \$425,000 was a large amount of money for the project. It was noted that the number was an estimate and it could change in the future.

Council Member Scott Bracken stated that there had been a sidewalk project along Bengal Boulevard where the property was completely donated by the homeowners. That had significantly reduced the cost. Mr. Jurgens explained that the amount included for property acquisition was \$135,000 but the actual number could be less than that.

Mayor Peterson discussed the process. He reported that there is a retreat once a year where Council Members would prioritize funding expectations. The 1700 East Sidewalk Project had not been included on that funding list. While the City Council has the right to augment the list, Mayor Peterson understood the concerns raised by Council Member Mikell. He wondered what approach the Council would like to take in regards to the item.

Council Member Mikell wanted to know what the property costs would be before starting on engineering. Mr. Shipp explained that nothing could be built unless the property was owned. The process would begin with preliminary engineering and surveying. Council Member Bracken suggested that only a certain portion of engineering be done until there are discussions with the individual homeowners. Once there are approvals or agreements in place, the engineering could be completed. Mr. Jurgas noted that once there was a better idea of where the property lines would be, discussions with homeowners could begin. Further discussions were had about the 1700 East Sidewalk project. Mr. Jurgas explained that the project could be done in smaller phases. Engineering work could be done first. Staff could come back to the City Council after that was done and after preliminary conversations had taken place with homeowners.

Mayor Peterson asked for more information on the Ferguson Canyon overflow. He wondered whether there was full funding to finish the parking lot, restroom, and fencing. Mr. Jurgas confirmed this. There was money set aside for the parking area and that part of the project was moving forward. The funding proposed in the budget adjustment related to the completion of park improvements. Mr. Jurgas confirmed that fencing for the off-leash area and walkways were included in the funding for the park. Mayor Peterson noted that it would be beneficial to see a full budget for the project as there were many different parts. Mr. Tingey commented that he could include that in future communication with Council Members. An update would be shared with the City Council in the next few weeks related to the actual design of the park.

Certain assumptions would require additional attention before the final adoption of the budget:

- \$350,000 had been included as a placeholder for the Solar Grant for City Hall. This would need to be trued up once the final information was received; and
- The final certified tax rate and property tax revenue would need to be added in. When those figures were received from the county on June 10, 2021, they would be added to the budget. Those numbers would give the City the final new growth numbers for the year.

Mr. Tingey reported that an update would be shared with the City Council at the next meeting about liability insurance. There would be some increases and staff was currently evaluating that with the insurance provider. That adjustment would need to be made to the tentative budget as well as the others already outlined during the Work Session. Discussions were had about compensated absences. Mayor Peterson felt that item should be better understood.

Council Member Mikell reported that the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee had a number of funding requests. Certain things on that list were being funded, such as the Ferguson Canyon Overflow lot. She wondered if there could be a small increase to the budget to include one of the smaller projects requested by the Committee. For instance, a pollinator garden or signs that included QR codes. Mayor Peterson wondered if the Committee had a priority list. Council Member Mikell noted that first on the list was the Ferguson Canyon Overflow lot.

Further discussions were had about potential projects. Council Member Bracken liked some of the ideas but wanted to hear more from the actual Committee. Council Member Mikell clarified

that the list was originally intended for grant requests. It was meant to help Mr. Johnson and his team determine which grants the Committee may be interested in pursuing.

Mayor Peterson commented that the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee had been very proactive. He noted that if there is a smaller project the Council supported, the Committee could potentially present to the City Council or a budget adjustment could be made. Council Member Mikell was comfortable with that idea. She would pass the information to the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee. Mr. Tingey reminded Council Members that there will be a public comment period during the Business Meeting and a public hearing on June 15, 2021, related to the budget.

c. **Community Renewable Energy Program (HB 411) Governance Agreement – Community and Economic Associate Planner and Sustainability Analyst, Samantha DeSeelhorst.**

Community and Economic Associate Planner and Sustainability Analyst, Samantha DeSeelhorst shared an updated related to the Solar Grant. She expected to hear back about the application the following week. If the full request amount (80% of the project) was awarded, the amount to be paid by the City would be approximately \$100,000. The line item in the budget for \$350,000 would be more than needed, assuming the full grant was awarded. However, it was possible that only partial funding would be awarded. In that case, there would need to be a discussion with the City Council about how to proceed. Ms. DeSeelhorst added that if full funding was awarded, the return on investment would be between four and ten years. She was optimistic that the City had a strong application and would provide information to the Council as it became available.

Ms. DeSeelhorst shared a slideshow presentation related to the Community Renewable Energy Program. Background information was overviewed. Ms. DeSeelhorst explained that the Community Renewable Energy Program is also frequently referred to as HB-411. It originated from legislation that was passed during the 2019 Utah Legislative Session. The program would create a way for communities to achieve net-100% renewable energy via partnerships with Rocky Mountain Power. Ms. DeSeelhorst reported that the Renewable Electricity Resolution had been signed at the end of 2019. The next step was to sign the Governance Agreement. The process steps for the Community Renewable Energy Program were as follows:

- Sign Governance Agreement;
- Sign Technical Agreement;
- Submit Application to Rocky Mountain Power;
- Public Service Commission Reviews;
- Pass Ordinances;
- Send Opt-Out Notices; and
- Program Begins.

Ms. DeSeelhorst explained that this would be a long process. She shared an overview of the Governance Agreement purpose, process, and participation requirements as follows:

- Purpose:
 - Single agreement to address cost-sharing, voting, initialization of ratemaking study, and other administrative elements. It would create one unified structure.
- Process:
 - Staff and legal representatives from the eligible communities collaborated to write the Governance Agreement, which was now being distributed for signatures. A handful of eligible communities had already signed, including Cottonwood Heights partner cities, Millcreek and Holladay.
- Participation:
 - For continued participation in the Community Renewable Energy Program, communities should plan to sign the Governance Agreement by July 31, 2021.

Ms. DeSeelhorst discussed some of the costs. Since the program was the first of its kind, there would be several initial costs associated with the program setup. Those costs would need to be covered by participating communities to ensure that they were not shifted to other Rocky Mountain Power customers. The program costs could be broken down into two categories:

- Non-Noticing Costs:
 - Community Expert: Legal and technical consultants who perform analysis and negotiate program details with Rocky Mountain Power on behalf of the participating communities;
 - Rocky Mountain Power Application Fee: The cost of Rocky Mountain Power's time to negotiate program details and engage with the Utah Public Service Commission during the program review;
 - OCS-DPU Expert: Individuals contracted by the Office of Consumer Services and/or the Department of Public Utilities to review the program details.
- Noticing Costs:
 - The individual cost for each community to mail two opt-out notices to each Rocky Mountain Power customer within their jurisdiction.

Ms. DeSeelhorst reported that the estimated non-noticing total for all participating communities was \$700,000. The noticing costs would be unique to each community. For example, the total estimated costs in Cottonwood Heights were as follows:

- Non-Noticing Costs: \$21,884.21; and
- Noticing Costs: \$11,497.77

The total estimated costs for Cottonwood Heights would be \$33,381.98. Ms. DeSeelhorst explained that the non-noticing total could be split over two fiscal years. For instance, \$10,942.11 would be due July 31, 2021, and an additional \$10,942.11 would be due July 31, 2022.

Ms. DeSeelhorst posed some frequently asked questions as well as the answers to those questions:

- What will happen to the costs for Cottonwood Heights if some communities decide to stop participating?

- Ms. DeSeelhorst reported that there were 22 eligible Utah communities. If some of those communities decided not to sign the Governance Agreement, the costs would not increase. The \$33,381.98 for Cottonwood Heights would be stabilized thanks to certain communities acting as a financial backstop and agreeing to pay more to stabilize the costs for remaining participants.
- What will the rate for participating customers be?
 - The reason the Governance Agreement needed to be signed before the rate-making process was initialized because there needed to be money to pay for the rate-making expert. There also needed to be a more accurate sample size to indicate who would be participating. This would allow the rate to be designed accurately.
- What is the opt-out process?
 - Ms. DeSeelhorst explained that opt-out mailers would be delivered to every Rocky Mountain Power customer before the program began. It would include details about how to opt out of the program. That process would be managed through Rocky Mountain Power.
- Can customers opt back in after opting out?
 - Individual customers could opt back in at a later date. However, communities could not opt back in. If Cottonwood Heights decided not to sign the Governance Agreement, the City would be ineligible for the program.
- Will customer rates increase if participants opt-out?
 - Ms. DeSeelhorst noted that the question would be addressed further during the rate-making process. She did not anticipate that the rate fluctuation would be any more intense than the current electricity rates. There would be a focus on an incremental resource procurement process.

Several questions were posed to the Cottonwood Heights City Council:

- Do you wish to sign the Governance Agreement?
- Do you wish to budget for the outlined costs? (Line item currently included)
- Who would you like to designate as a Board Member and Alternate for the Governance Cooperation that would be formed through the agreement?

Ms. DeSeelhorst explained that the Board Member selected must be an elected official but the alternate could be an elected official, appointed official, or a member of staff. The Governance Agreement must be signed by July 31, 2021. The Board Member positions could be designated after the fact through a letter. Ms. DeSeelhorst reported that some communities had opted to designate members in their resolution when they signed. Others had opted to sign the Governance Agreement and the associated resolution and then designate the members afterward.

Council Member Bracken wondered how often the Governance Cooperation planned to meet. Ms. DeSeelhorst believed that once the transition was made into a formal Board Meeting, it would be on a monthly basis. Mayor Peterson asked if the alternate was a voting member. Ms. DeSeelhorst confirmed this. If a Board Member was unable to attend, the alternate could fulfill any obligations.

Council Member Mikell asked about the opt-in time for customers. Ms. DeSeelhorst explained that if the City Council chose to sign the Governance Agreement, there would be a technical agreement, application review with several agencies and each municipality would need to pass a local ordinance to implement the new renewable rate. That that point, Rocky Mountain Power would send the opt-out noticed. They were required to be sent out no sooner than 60 days before the program was set to begin. Council Member Mikell asked about the consultant. Ms. DeSeelhorst reported that the consultant would be funded through the dues paid with the Governance Agreement.

Council Member Mikell wanted more information about the backstop issue. She wondered what would happen if 80% of residents opted in and then Rocky Mountain Power moved forward on their own and had 70% of their power be renewable. Residents could potentially choose the 70% over the 100% and opt-out of the program. Ms. DeSeelhorst commented that the consultant would be able to look into those types of details. She noted that many communities wanted a consultant who would assist with projections multiple years into the future.

Mr. Tingey reported that the item would be brought back to the City Council again. \$35,000 was included in the budget. That was slightly more than the \$33,381.98 needed and provided a buffer. Ms. DeSeelhorst stated that there was a broad cross-section in both size and geographic location represented in the 22 eligible Utah communities. A number of communities had already signed the Governance Agreement. Mayor Peterson thanked Ms. DeSeelhorst for her presentation.

d. Gravel Pit Discussion – Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson.

Mr. Johnson shared an update on the Northern Gravel Pit Development. He reported that the formal paid application for the gravel pit was submitted in August 2019. From January 2020 through May 2020, the project underwent Architectural Review Commission (“ARC”) review and received unanimous approval. The ARC would act as the approval body for architecture and landscaping designs at every phase moving forward.

From July 2020 through October 2020, the Planning Commission held six meetings with public hearings. The vast majority of the comments received were from residents of Holladay City and the Canyon Cove subdivision and were largely related to traffic concerns. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the gravel pit development by a vote of 5-1. From December 2020 to the present, the development had been discussed on and off by City Council.

Mr. Johnson shared renderings from the developer. The renderings included an accurate scale of the buildings on the site. He noted that the architecture, design, and colors were placeholders and would be refined during ARC review. The images were intended to show the visual massing of the site. Mr. Johnson pointed out the condominium building and reported that it would be 13 stories. The next tallest proposed building was 7 stories and was multi-family residential.

The rendering also showed an accurate representation of the proposed intersection alignment. Staff felt it would resolve the majority of the concerns heard by Holladay residents. There would be a stop-controlled intersection for any vehicle that left the project site. Other traffic patterns

would continue to function as they did currently for the Holladay residents to the north. Mr. Johnson overviewed other elements of the proposed design, including the mixed-use office and retail as well as the retail pads. The center of the site would include an open plaza area.

Mr. Johnson noted that the rendering did not show the temporary secondary egress through the south of the site. It would share the same intersection as the current ski shop. That secondary egress would be required until the southern gravel pit developed and a permanent intersection connected into the project area. Renderings from different distances and angles were shared. Mr. Johnson explained that in the PDD area, building height measurements were based on the elevation of Wasatch Boulevard.

Council Member Mikell asked about the renderings. Mr. Johnson reported that the renderings had been done by Beecher Walker Architects. They were an experienced firm that had handled a lot of large projects in Utah. Council Member Petersen noted that the large processing tanks on the site currently were 85 feet or approximately 6 stories. The condominium would be double that height. Mr. Johnson stated that the condominium building was proposed to be 13 stories in total or approximately 142 feet. He noted that several stories were tucked into the hillside and would be incorporated into the topography of the site.

Council Member Mikell wondered why the developers had not chosen to place the shorter tower closer to the residences rather than the condominium. Mr. Johnson explained that it had to do with certain site constraints. Fault hazards had been identified through the site and that created certain limitations about where each structure could be engineered and safely constructed. He added that the unit count had been based on the developers' assessed need and return on investment. The condominium building had 99 units for sale and the apartment had 325 rental units. 64 of those rental units would be affordable housing units.

Discussions were had about building massing. Mr. Johnson explained that the PDD had additional density and building height in exchange for certain amenities that could not be achieved within standard zoning. He shared several examples:

- Mixed Residential Housing:
 - For-purchase, high-end condominiums;
 - Market-rate rental units;
 - Deed-restricted affordable rental units.
- Trail and Trailhead at Location Identified in Bonneville Shoreline Trail Master Plan:
 - Hillside trail alignment that would connect to future Bonneville Shoreline Trail through the area.
- New Public Road with Wide Sidewalks and Bicycle Lanes:
 - These would connect to the future southern development.
- Pedestrian Plazas and Courtyards Open to Public:
 - Approximately 25% landscape and open space, excluding hillside areas.

Mr. Johnson made note of the height concerns expressed by the City Council. He reported that the height for PDD projects at the gravel pit was based on the impact to Wasatch Boulevard. This

was a sliding scale. For instance, the closer to Wasatch Boulevard, the shorter a building would need to be. The scale varied from 60 feet maximum height (when closer to Wasatch Boulevard) and 300 feet in height (when 500 feet or further from Wasatch Boulevard). The height of the condominium project was 145 feet above the average grade of Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Johnson explained that there was a minimum height of 25 feet within the zone. There was an intention to build a denser project than seen in other areas of Cottonwood Heights.

Mayor Peterson asked about the tallest height of a building in Cottonwood Corporate. Mr. Johnson explained that it was between 85 and 95 feet. However, he noted that the gravel pit development was envisioned differently than an office park. The condominium building was more than 500 feet back from Wasatch Boulevard and was 45% of the allowed height in the PDD. Mr. Johnson read some policy language related to the PDD Ordinance and the Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan:

- PDD Ordinance:
 - Development within the PDD should be designed to...encourage a mixture of uses, including complementary high-density multi-family residential and loft units.
- Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan:
 - The preferred scenario identified the potential for high-density, mixed-use urban development at the gravel pit, with the recommendation to limit commercial redevelopment elsewhere in the Wasatch Boulevard area;
 - The preferred scenario preserves and enhances the scenic and natural qualities along the corridor by concentrating new development in the gravel pit;
 - The preferred scenario identifies potential land uses and locations for new development or redevelopment along the corridor by:
 - Focusing development in the gravel pit, which balances preservation, moving people, transportation, recreation, scenery, and canyon access;
 - Acknowledging the potential for a high amount of development in a way that balances corridor goals.
 - High-density, mixed-use development in the gravel pit;
 - Shape a canyon-oriented, walkable urban activity center at the gravel pit;
 - The idea of an intense, walkable, mixed-use place also oriented to both canyon access and on-site recreation was popular with the public and was one of the highest-scoring concepts in the team evaluation.

Mr. Johnson shared an estimated financial analysis. It was created with a tool from Zions Bank that analyzed growth in the City. The additional market value was a total of \$116.8 million with \$82.78 million taxable value-added. The population growth would be an estimated 1,029 and there would be the creation of 735 new jobs. Council Member Mikell noted with almost 2,000 additional people coming in and out of the development, there could be issues with traffic. Mr. Johnson reported that Holladay City Staff was supportive of the proposed intersection alignment. Council Member Mikell wanted to hear from the Holladay City Council and Holladay Mayor.

Council Members discussed the previous conversations with Holladay City. It was noted that the alignment had not been supported. Mr. Tingey explained that there had been a change in the road configuration since those discussions. Mr. Johnson reported that he received an email on April

19, 2021, from Holladay City that expressed support. He added that the gravel pit development was fully within Cottonwood Heights jurisdiction. However, Cottonwood Heights wanted to be good community partners and address concerns identified by the City of Holladay.

Mayor Peterson believed there were a few outstanding areas that needed to be addressed. Those concerns related to building height, Sensitive Lands Evaluation & Development Standards (“SLEDS”) compliance, costs to City services, and ensuring that the City was on the same page as Holladay. Mr. Johnson noted that additional details or discussions could take place with Council Members as needed. Staff was ready to put the gravel pit development into a final package.

4. Review of Calendars and Upcoming Events.

a. July 19-24, 2021 – Butlerville Days.

The item was not discussed further.

5. Possible Closed Meeting to Discuss Litigation, Property Acquisition, and/or the Character and Professional Competence or Physical or Mental Health of an Individual.

There was no Closed Meeting.

6. Adjourn City Council Work Session.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Work Session adjourned at 7:11 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS MEETING
HELD TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 2021, AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY
COUNCIL CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD**

Members Present: Mayor Mike Peterson, Council Member Scott Bracken, Council Member Christine Mikell, Council Member Douglas Petersen

Staff Present: City Manager Tim Tingey, City Attorney Shane Topham, Police Chief Robby Russo, Assistant Fire Chief Riley Pilgrim, Records Culture and Human Resources Director Paula Melgar, Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, Public Works Director Matt Shipp, Administrative Services Director S. Scott Jurgens

Excused: Council Member Tali Bruce

1.0 WELCOME

Mayor Mike Peterson called the meeting to order at 7:17 p.m. and welcomed those present. He noted that this was the first in-person Cottonwood Heights City Council Meeting in many months and the Council Members were glad to be back. The meeting was also accessible virtually.

2.0 PLEDGE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Pledge was led by City Manager, Tim Tingey.

3.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

3.1 Recognition of CHPD Sergeant Michael Fullwood's Service by Chief Robby Russo.

Police Chief, Robby Russo reported that Cottonwood Heights Police Department Sergeant Michael Fullwood had come from West Jordan five or six years ago. He had been a great addition to the Police Department and represented the City well. Sergeant Fullwood had decided to retire.

4.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS

Mayor Peterson opened the citizen comment period.

Tim Hallbeck commented on the fireworks contract. He noted that certain areas of the City are quite dry and he planned to put a "No Fireworks Sign Please," in his neighborhood. He did not know what the policy for that was for the rest of the City. He shared jokes with the Council. Mayor Peterson explained that Cottonwood Heights previously tried to ban fireworks in the community but the State overrode that decision. The City worked closely with Unified Fire Authority ("UFA") representatives to protect any at-risk areas.

Dennis Iversen shared comments related to short-term rentals. He noted that the definition of a short-term rental has been discussed at the May 4, 2021, City Council Meeting. It was proposed that Cottonwood Heights eliminate the vague 3-to-30-day definition and adopt the State definition. He wondered if that had been done. Mayor Peterson explained that the language change had not happened yet, but made note of the reminder. Mr. Iversen also commented on the penalties for illegal short-term rentals. He believed the fine should be \$1,000 rather than “up to” \$1,000 as the penalties are often quite low. Mr. Iversen noted that advertising a short-term rental in a restricted area does not constitute a violation. He expressed concerns about that. He wondered why advertising for a short-term rental in an area where short-term rentals are not permitted is allowed. Mayor Peterson thanked Mr. Iversen for his comments. He reported that Mr. Tingey would reach out and share information related to his questions and concerns.

Mr. Tingey entered into the record one public comment and provided some additional updates. He reported that *Maggie and Steve Fowler* had additional questions related to short-term rentals. That written comment would be forwarded to Council Members. Mr. Tingey addressed the language change mentioned by Mr. Iversen. He explained that he had been working with City Attorney, Shane Topham to prepare an ordinance that would address some of the concerns related to short-term rentals. It would be presented at a future City Council Meeting for discussion and consideration. Additionally, they had contacted the Utah League of Cities and Towns (“ULCT”) about short-term rental concerns. The ULCT agreed to include the item in discussion meetings with some of the land use committees they had in place.

There were no further comments. Mayor Peterson closed the citizen comment period.

5.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

5.1 Proposed Budget Amendment for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 – Introduction by Finance and Administrative Services Director, Scott Jurges.

Administrative Services Director, Scott Jurges reported that the proposed budget adjustment was predominantly within the General Fund. The total adjustments proposed in the General Fund were \$39,211 of added expenditures and \$39,211 of added revenues. Each item was a dollar-for-dollar offset. The adjustments included the following:

- Public Works – scraps from old signs to be used to purchase new signs;
- Cottonwood Heights Arts Council - Salt Lake County ZAP Grant to be used for various items related to the musical;
- Police - State of Utah Highway Safety DUI Overtime Grant;
- Police - State of Utah Highway Safety Speed and Seatbelt Overtime Grant;
- Police - CCJJ Grant to be used for police training;
- Police - Bullet Proof Vest Grant;
- Police - restitution to offset vehicle damages repaired at our costs; and
- Police - event OT reimbursed (Extra Mile, Global Endurance, On Hill Events).

Mr. Jurges explained that the Capital Improvement Fund had an adjustment where some of the Transportation Impact Fees would be utilized to cover the Transportation Plan Update that was voted on at the February 2, 2021, City Council Meeting. The total expense was \$39,700. There was no revenue offset because those funds were collected in prior periods.

Mayor Peterson opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

5.2 Proposed Adoption of City's Budget for Fiscal Year 2021-2022 – Introduction by Finance and Administrative Services Director, Scott Jurges.

Mr. Jurges noted that certain items had been incorporated into the budget draft since the tentative budget was adopted on May 4, 2021. One item was the addition of \$400,000 in revenue from the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). That money would be paid directly to the City from UDOT in January. It would come into the General Fund and then be transferred to the Capital Projects Fund to cover various project costs. There were also a number of changes related to the General Fund, which were as follows:

- House Bill (“HB”) 129 was approved at the past Legislative Session related to General Fund balance limitations. Those had been increased from 25% to 35% as the maximum allowable. Cottonwood Heights projected ending Fund Balance was just over 25%;
- The long-term disability, short-term disability, and basic minimum life costs had been updated after a new bid reduced those costs by \$19,721 in employee compensation;
- There was \$6,700 included that would go towards a match for the Utah State Historic Preservation Grant;
- There was \$21,000 included to update Tasers to turn on body cameras when activated;
- The fire cost was updated to match the current budget projection of \$117,272.

There were also a number of changes related to the Capital Projects Fund, which were as follows:

- After the discussions at the previous City Council Meeting, \$50,000 had been added to the 50/50 Sidewalk program;
- \$150,000 had been added in grant revenue from the Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant. It would be used to offset costs associated with the Ferguson Canyon Park Project; and
- \$173,500 had been added to fund engineering and property acquisition related to the 1700 East Sidewalk Project. Additional funds would be needed to complete the project.

Certain assumptions would require additional attention before the final adoption of the budget:

- \$350,000 had been included as a placeholder for the Solar Grant for City Hall. This would need to be trued up once the final information was received; and
- The final certified tax rate and property tax revenue would need to be added in. When those figures were received from the county on June 10, 2021, they would be added to the budget. Those numbers would give the City the final new growth numbers for the year.

Mr. Jurges explained that anything could be adjusted before the adoption of the budget. Items could also be adjusted after the adoption of the budget as long as appropriate steps were followed. He reported that in two weeks, the City would be able to move forward and adopt the budget. Mayor Peterson asked about the average amount of underspent funds. Mr. Jurges stated that the General Fund Expenditures totaled \$18,461,587 and there was typically between 3% to 5% in underspent funds. He noted that the City was conscious that funds were spent with a need and purpose. This was reviewed on a regular basis.

The Fund Summaries, Restrictions, and Transfers chart was shared with Council Members. Mr. Jurges noted that the chart listed different funds, including the new Stormwater Fund. The summary showed the projected beginning balance, revenue, expenditures, transfers in or out, projected ending balance, and any change in Fund Balance. It also included fund balance restrictions and unrestricted fund balance numbers. Mr. Jurges overviewed the information on the chart. He noted that there was more detailed information in the tentative budget that included the classification of revenues and expenditures. The tentative budget was available to the public.

Mr. Jurges discussed sales tax revenue. \$7.2 million was the projected sales tax revenue for the current year. The actual budget was set at \$5,750,000. In the prior fiscal year, the money received was \$6,719,000. Mr. Jurges explained that in a non-pandemic year, the estimate would have likely been in the \$6 million range. However, there had been a lot of unknowns with the pandemic and the number had been reduced to \$5,750,000 in order to be conservative. It looked like the actuals would be in the \$7.2 million range. Mr. Jurges noted that it was better to be conservative with the numbers than have to make cuts in order to balance the budget.

Mayor Peterson reported that two Council Members were assigned to a Benefits and Compensation Committee. Additionally, two Council Members met with Staff and asked questions related to the budget. He noted that it was a long process. Council Member Douglas Petersen commented that the conservative approach to the numbers made sense. Mayor Peterson agreed and felt that the budget looked good. He also commented that the City was in a sound financial state.

Mayor Peterson opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

6.0 ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Consideration of Ordinance 356 Approving an Amendment to the 2020-2021 Budget.

MOTION: Council Member Mikell moved to APPROVE Ordinance 356 Approving an Amendment to the 2020-2021 Budget. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Mikell-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Petersen-Aye, Mayor Mike Peterson-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6.2 Consideration of Ordinance 357-A Approving the Rezone of 0.3-Acres of Real Property Located at 2751 East Fort Union Boulevard from R-1-8 (Residential Single-Family) to RO (Residential Office) and Amending the Zoning Map.
OR
Consideration of Ordinance 357-D Denying the Rezone of 0.3-Acres of Real Property Located at 2751 East Fort Union Boulevard from R-1-8 (Residential Single-Family) to RO (Residential Office).

Council Member Mikell noted that the rezone request was within Council Member Bruce's district. She wondered if it should be tabled until the next City Council Meeting. Mayor Peterson was ready to move ahead with a few conditions. He felt the application was fairly straightforward. Council Member Petersen wondered whether Council Member Bruce had spoken to anyone about the application. Mr. Tingey explained that there had been some questions via email but she had not indicated any preference. Mayor Peterson did not want Council Member Bruce to miss the opportunity to share or ask questions. He was not opposed to tabling the item to the next meeting if it allowed her to be present.

Council Member Bracken was ready to move forward with conditions. Mr. Johnson explained that if the City Council had a desire to impose zoning conditions, he would need to consult with the applicant to determine whether he would be willing to modify his application. Council Member Bracken suggested that the conditional uses listed under A be removed. Mr. Johnson stated that he would meet with the applicant to see whether he would agree to a condition that would exclude medical, optical, and dental offices as potential future uses on the site. Council Member Mikell wondered whether L would be removed as well. Mr. Johnson noted that they were very similar. Mayor Peterson asked Mr. Johnson to communicate with Council Members individually to determine whether there were any additional areas of concern.

Discussions were had about the rationale for removing A and L. Council Member Bracken noted that there were a lot of those types of RO (Residential Office) uses on Highland Drive. He felt it worked there but would not work as well that far east. Mayor Peterson added that the frequency of vehicle trips and parking were other issues to consider as well.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to CONTINUE Ordinance 357-D until the June 15, 2021, City Council Business Meeting. The motion was seconded by Council Member Mikell. Vote on motion: Council Member Mikell-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Petersen-Aye, Mayor Mike Peterson-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6.3 Consideration of Resolution 2021-22 Accepting Requests for Indemnification.

Mr. Topham reported that eight City employees had been named as defendants in a recently filed lawsuit concerning the City's response to the protest in the Mill Hollow neighborhood on August 2, 2020. Those City employees had filed with the City requests for indemnification, pursuant to the Governmental Immunity Act of Utah. The City was required to accept those requests and provide defense and indemnity to the City employees to the extent that the subject acts or omissions occurred including during the performance of employee duties, within the scope

of employment by the City or under color of authority. The resolution would accept the requests for defense and indemnification, subject to a reservation of rights.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to APPROVE Resolution 2021-22 accepting requests for indemnification. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Mikell-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Petersen-Aye, Mayor Mike Peterson-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6.4 Consideration of Resolution 2021-23 Awarding a Retiring Police Officer His Badge and Approving His Purchase of a Firearm.

Chief Russo noted that the item was related to Sergeant Fullwood, who had been working with the Cottonwood Heights Police Department for several years. He asked that the City Council recognize his service by awarding his badge and approving his purchase of a firearm.

MOTION: Council Member Mikell moved to APPROVE Resolution 2021-23 awarding a retiring police officer his badge and approving his purchase of a firearm. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Mikell-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Petersen-Aye, Mayor Mike Peterson-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6.5 Consideration of Resolution 2021-24 Approving a Firework Display Contract with Lantis Productions for 2021 Butlerville Days.

Mr. Tingey explained that the item was to approve a contract for a professional firework display for the 2021 Butlerville Days. The cost was \$12,500 in two installments. Mayor Peterson noted that it was a well-planned display that would also be supervised by the local Fire Department. Council Member Mikell asked about the fire support. Assistant Fire Chief, Riley Pilgrim reported that the UFA prevention team would come out and look at the site. They would not sign off on the permit unless all safety requirements were met. The team would also work directly with the fireworks company. Assistant Fire Chief Pilgrim noted that there would be an engine on location during the firework display and there would be a sweep of the area afterward. The area where the display was authorized was a low-risk location to any type of vegetation and open space.

It was noted that Assistant Chief Pilgrim would present a report at the next City Council Meeting. Council Member Mikell asked that the report also include some of the hillside protection that Cottonwood Heights residents could consider. Assistant Chief Pilgrim noted that it was never too soon to prepare for wildfire season. He reported that information would be included in the newsletter and he could also talk about the basic steps homeowners could take. In addition, he would highlight steps that the City was taking to address wildfire concerns.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to APPROVE Resolution 2021-24 approving a Fireworks Display Contract with Lantis Productions for 2021 Butlerville Days. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Mikell-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Petersen-Aye, Mayor Mike Peterson-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6.6 Consideration of Resolution 2021-25 Approving Performance Contracts for 2021 Butlerville Days.

Mr. Tingey reported that the performance contracts were for the 2021 Butlerville Days event. Additional performance contracts would be presented at a future City Council Meeting.

MOTION: Council Member Petersen moved to APPROVE Resolution 2021-25 approving Performance Contracts for 2021 Butlerville Days. The motion was seconded by Council Member Bracken. Vote on motion: Council Member Mikell-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Petersen-Aye, Mayor Mike Peterson-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

7.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

7.1 Approval of the City Council Work Session and Business Meeting Minutes for May 18, 2021.

MOTION: Council Member Petersen moved to APPROVE the City Council Work Session and Business Meeting Minutes for May 18, 2021. The motion was seconded by Council Member Mikell. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

8.0 ADJOURN CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS MEETING.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to adjourn the City Council Business Meeting. The motion was seconded by Council Member Mikell. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights City Council Work and Business Meetings held Tuesday, June 1, 2021.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: June 15, 2021