IVINS
CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES
August 6, 2020

***NOTICE: This meeting was held electronically, with some staff located at City Hall as the anchor location. The audio feed of the meeting is available to the public and can be accessed by going to www.ivins.com, clicking on the "Government" tab, clicking on the word "HERE" under the words City Council, and under the "City Council" tab at the top of that page.**

For approximately 5 minutes of the first part of this meeting and sporadically throughout, there were technical difficulties with the audio.

1) WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

MAYOR AND COUNCIL: The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. and announced there was a quorum present.
All present included Council Member Mehr, Council Member McDonald, Council Member Johnson and Council Member Gordhammer
STAFF: City Manager/Attorney Dale Coulam, Director of Finance Lane Mecham, Parks and Recreation Director Benny Sorensen, and Building and Zoning Administrator Mike Rodriguez and City Recorder Kari Jimenez
EXCUSED: Council Member Elliott

A. Acknowledgement of Quorum

Mayor Hart acknowledged there was a quorum present. Mayor Hart, Council Members Johnson, McDonald, Gordhammer and Mehr were present via the electronic "Zoom" platform. Council Member Elliott was excused. **Mayor Hart** requested a roll call of the City Council Members. Each City Council Member who was in attendance, acknowledged their presence.

B. Invocation

Council Member McDonald gave the Invocation

C. Disclosures

There were no disclosures or conflicts of interest with items on this meeting's agenda.

Council Member Mehr connected to the electronic "Zoom" platform at 5:40 p.m. and acknowledged he was present. He had no disclosures or conflicts of interest.

2) REPORTS, PRESENTATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

A. Department Reports: Parks and Recreation

Benny Sorensen reported that the Huntsman World Senior Games were recently cancelled and the Heritage Days Committee decided that it would be best to cancel the Heritage Days celebration, unless the City Council decides otherwise. **Mayor Hart** reported that the City will proceed with the new City Hall groundbreaking only on September 11th. **Benny Sorensen** reported that Movies-in-the-Park starts tomorrow night and will be held outside with social distancing every Friday evening in August. **Mayor Hart** referred to the City Council recently banning non-permitted amplified music or sound at Fire Lake Park and inquired as to the status of the signage for that. **Benny Sorensen** reported that the wording is up on all of the

DRAFT

signs. **Council Member Gordhammer** complimented Benny Sorensen and Sarah Nash in Parks and Rec for going above and beyond with their ideas and what they have come up with for the residents.

B. Planning Commission Report

Mike Rodriguez reported that the Planning Commission held five (5) Public Hearings at their meeting. Two of the Public Hearings were on proposed concurrent Lane Use and Zone Amendments, one was regarding a Class IV Conditional Use Permit for the new Ivins City Hall, one was regarding density allowances for multi-family housing and the most controversial public hearing related to a zone change on SITLA property for the proposed resort. That Public Hearing was continued to the next Planning Commission meeting. The two Public Hearings regarding the concurrent Lane Use and Zone Amendments move forward to the City Council for Public Hearings, as well as the discussion on density allowances for multi-family housing. The Planning Commission also approved four (4) Final Plats, a Preliminary Plan and an Amended Lot.

3) CITIZEN COMMENT & REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

A. Citizen requests to be placed on a future agenda

Dale Coulam indicated that Kim Ragan, the individual who submitted a request that was addressed at the prior City Council meeting, was present regarding that request. **Kim Ragan** stated that she resides at 340 Snow Canyon Drive and requested that a flashing speed limit sign be placed on Snow Canyon Drive because many out of state vehicles do not pay attention to the posted speed limit entering the State park. **Mayor Hart** indicated that at the prior City Council meeting, Chuck Gillette, the Public Works Director and City Engineer, commented that he had spoken with Ms. Ragan and provided her and the City Council the pros and cons of that type of sign and concluded with his recommendation against that type of sign. **Mayor Hart** stated that the State Park may be moving their booth down the road closer to the development where Ms. Ragan resides and that may help with speeding. Law enforcement is also aware of this and monitors the area. **Ron Ragan** referred to the possibility of the State Park moving the ranger station down the hill and commented that individuals will end up parking on both sides of the road and enter through the sides so they do not have to pay an entrance fee. He indicated that is going to be a mess if that station is moved down. He also requested that they consider the flashing sign to slow traffic down. **Mayor Hart** commented that discussion already took place and that this was something for law enforcement and staff to address. He clarified that it is not the ranger station that is proposed to be moving down the road. The gate is what is being considered. The Mayor and City Council agreed this would not be on a future agenda for discussion.

4) PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ITEMS - None

5) DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

A. Discuss and consider adoption of Resolution No. 2020-12R, of the City Council of Ivins City, Utah, authorizing and approving the execution and delivery of a Master Lease Agreement, by and between the City and the Municipal Building Authority of Ivins City, Utah; authorizing the execution delivery of a Ground Lease Agreement; authorizing the issuance and sale by the Authority of not more than $3,000,000 aggregate principal amount of Lease Revenue Bonds Series 2020; and related matters

Dale Coulam indicated that Jon Bronson and Mark Anderson with Zions Bank were attending via the "Zoom" platform. This is a parameters Resolution, which sets the boundaries for what

DRAFT

the bond can be. The parameters are for a bond to issue not more than $3 million dollars aggregate principal with an interest rate not to exceed 2.5% and to mature in not more than 25 years. The extra amount gives the City a cushion in case something comes up. **Jon Bronson** stated that the State of Utah's permanent Community Impact Board (CIB) already approved financing for Ivins City and have agreed to purchase the bond to finance the new City Hall, in an amount of $2.5 million dollars and they did that on July 9, 2020 and they have laid out their terms and conditions for that financing. The terms are $2.5 million dollars at 2.5% for 20 years. The plan is to close the financing by the end of September. Under the terms the State of Utah is providing to Ivins City, interest will not start accruing on the $2.5 million dollars until July 1, 2021 and the first payment is not due until July 1, 2022. The Parameters Resolution starts the ball rolling with putting notices in place for the public and sets up a Public Hearing on September 17, 2020 where the public can weigh in on how they feel about financing a new City Hall through the State. The amortization schedule is for 20 years even though the Parameters Resolution allows for a cushion for changes up until the bonds are closed with the State. This bond is a Municipal Building Authority (MBA) Lease Revenue Bond. Ivins City has already created an MBA years ago. It is an alter-ego to the State. Under Utah Code, a Building Authority that is created by a City can only do certain things. It can own, purchase, lease and finance real property. Under what's being proposed here, the MBA would be the one that enters into and issues the debt and builds the new City Hall and then on an annual basis, the MBA leases that new City Hall to Ivins City for its use. Every year the City Council will need to decide if they want to make that lease payment and continue using City Hall. Because that is on an annual appropriation basis, it does not fall under the definition of debt, although it is the City's obligation. The City could walk-away anytime from that lease but there are obviously consequences to that. The building itself acts as collateral for the financing. The Parameters Resolution lays out the beginning steps for the legal action. In the City's application to the CIB, the City has agreed to finance the remaining amount of the new City Hall building in the estimated amount of $1.689 million dollars, which will need to be provided before the bonds are closed at the end of September, which is a requirement of the closing. Another requirement of the closing is that construction be bid out in accordance with Utah Code prior to the bond closing. **Council Member Mehr** commented that this has been explained well and it was appreciated. **Mark Anderson** commented that if the bids come in higher than expected, the City can go back to the CIB without having to go through another Parameters Resolution. **Council Member Mehr** indicated that his concern was that the City was going to stick with what the Council agreed to, $2.5 million dollars, but Lane Mecham and Jon Bronson have explained this well. He inquired if the City Council will have another chance to discuss this. **Jon Bronson** clarified that this will come back to the City Council for the final Bond Resolution. **Mayor Hart** stated that the bid process is ongoing and the City Council will likely have the bid information in hand by the next City Council meeting. **Council Member Gordhammer** inquired if what the City is doing is extending the parameters from $2.5 million dollars to $3 million dollars to give the City a buffer, and then hold a Public Hearing where the City Council vote again and this is just creating the buffer. **Jon Bronson** clarified that this is creating a buffer and there is another meeting finalizing the Bond Resolution that the City Council would need to adopt.

MOTION: Council Member McDonald moved to approve Resolution No. 2020-12R, of the City Council of Ivins City, Utah, authorizing and approving the execution and delivery of a

DRAFT

Master Lease Agreement, by and between the City and the Municipal Building Authority of Ivins City, Utah; authorizing the execution delivery of a Ground Lease Agreement; authorizing the issuance and sale by the Authority of not more than $3,000,000 aggregate principal amount of Lease Revenue Bonds Series 2020; and related matters
SECOND: Council Member Johnson
VOTE: The motion carried.

Council Member Mehr	AYE
Council Member McDonald	AYE
Council Member Johnson	AYE
Council Member Gordhammer	AYE
Council Member Elliott	ABSENT

Mayor Hart requested a roll call vote. All Council Members that were in attendance via the Zoom meeting platform, voted in favor.

B. Discuss and consider approval of Resolution No. 2020-13R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah approving: (a) the proposed 10-year Residential Waste Collection Agreement between the Washington County Special Service District No. 1 and Republic Services, and (b) the proposed Solid Waste Collection Agreement between Washington County Special Service District No. 1 and the City of Ivins, pertaining to billing and collection for solid waste services and related matters

Dale Coulam commented that Attorney Fay Reber was present in the City Council Chambers. **Attorney Fay Reber** reported that the District is coming to the end of a 10 year contract throughout the County, along with an additional 10 year contract coming to an end for billing and collections. Each time they come to the end of these contracts, they debate whether or not to put this out to bid, buy the equipment and operate it themselves, or just tweak the agreements. The District decided that it was in the best interest of the County to extend the agreements and go to each City and Town to give them the opportunity to weigh in on the agreements. The District is asking each community to approve the Resolution. The recycling program will continue and each community will decide how they want to handle the recycling program as it relates to an opt-out program that is open from September 1 through November 30 of this year. Ivins City has mandated for the last 5 years that every resident utilize the recycling program and Ivins City could continue to do that but the other communities in Washington County are allowing their residents to opt-out of the recycling program. **Mayor Hart** commented that there are anticipated increases in the cost for recycling and that is part of the rational for allowing residents to opt-out of the program. **Council Member McDonald** indicated that in February, 2021, the cost will go up several dollars per month. One of the concerns that he had about the opt-out program is that there are currently no administrative fees associated with the program but if the City proceed with the opt-out option, the City is going to have to state who is in the program and who is out and inquired if the City needs to assess an administrative fee to monitor and track that or just continue with all residents opted-in and no opt-out option. The District is spending $70,000 to $75,000 dollars just in advertising for the opt-out program. He would like the recycling program to grow because it has a positive effect all around for the landfill but it is more expensive to recycle than it is to bury. With the other communities in the County providing for an opt-out, he did not see how Ivins City could not provide the opt-out option. **Council Member Mehr** inquired if there were issues with Republic Services and the way things were managed. **Council Member McDonald** stated that there were some minor issues between the District and Republic Services but the new contracts address all

DRAFT

of those issues. **Council Member Mehr** referred to the billing and annual increase language in paragraph 6(C) and inquired if that language is consistent with the previous agreement. **Fay Reber** indicated that it was. **Council Member Mehr** inquired who the control board is made up of. **Fay Reber** stated that each of the Cities and Towns have a representative on the board, with the exception of the City of St. George. Their entire City Council is on that board, along with the County Commissioners, for a total of a 22 member board. **Council Member Mehr** inquired if those members could be voted out of office. **Fay Reber** indicated yes. **Mayor Hart** inquired if Ivins City has an opt-out program, if the blue can is removed from the address of the non-participating resident. **Fay Reber** stated yes and indicated that after November 30th the District will know who is in the recycling program and who is out of the program and then the excess blue containers will be picked up.

MOTION: Council Member McDonald moved to approve Resolution No. 2020-13R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah approving: (a) the proposed 10-year Residential Waste Collection Agreement between the Washington County Special Service District No. 1 and Republic Services, and (b) the proposed Solid Waste Collection Agreement between Washington County Special Service District No. 1 and the City of Ivins, pertaining to billing and collection for solid waste services and related matters
SECOND: Council Member Johnson
VOTE: The motion carried.

Council Member Mehr	AYE
Council Member McDonald	AYE
Council Member Johnson	AYE
Council Member Gordhammer	AYE
Council Member Elliott	ABSENT

Mayor Hart requested a roll call vote. All Council Members that were in attendance via the Zoom meeting platform, voted in favor.

C. Continued discussion and consideration to approve Resolution No. 2020-09R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah, supporting the Utah Leads Together Plan

Mayor Hart indicated that he recently signed a proclamation in support of wearing masks and acknowledging that wearing masks makes a difference and Council Member Gordhammer has presented this Resolution to the City Council for consideration. **Council Member Gordhammer** stated that the reason she brought this forward was because in hearing reports around the state. people seem to be indicating a disconnect between what Governor Herbert is saying and what they were hearing at the local level. This was her attempt to say that if Ivins wants to be consistent with what the State of Utah was issuing with the Utah Leads Together Plan, that this speaks together with one voice. At the prior City Council meeting the Council Members wanted to see what Washington County brought forward. She was curious as to what other Council members feel if what the Mayor signed was adequate or if the Council should move forward with a Resolution. She indicated that Governor Herbert has given cities and town the authority to put forth a mask mandate on their own, but she was not advocating for that. **Mayor Hart** congratulated Council Member Gordhammer and felt that this Resolution was a very simple statement, not politically charged in any way and simply acknowledging that the office of the Governor have provided guidelines and requirements, based on the understanding of how to work with the virus. He would personally be pleased to sign it but would like to know what the Council would authorize him to do. **Council Member McDonald** referred to the

DRAFT

Proclamation that the Mayor signed and indicated that within a few minutes of the Mayor signing that, he received a call asking him if he was in support of that and he had to clarify that the proclamation was signed personally but that is not necessarily seen that way because it says "Mayor of Ivins, Chris Hart" and is deceptive in that regard. He personally wished that the City Council could have discussed the Proclamation first before it was signed because it has the appearance that the City Council all agreed upon the proclamation. At the last City Council meeting he had stated that he was not necessarily in favor of this Resolution. Individuals know what is best for their own health and he thought that by making a statement like this, people will feel like they are being forced into having to be a certain way out in public and he received a letter from a concerned resident regarding that. **Council Member McDonald** was not saying that the virus was not real and was not affecting people's lives, but felt that the numbers are elevated and exaggerated so he struggled to believe a majority of reports. He was not in favor of the Proclamation or this Resolution and wanted people to decide individually for whatever is best for their personal health. **Mayor Hart** stated that they are entitled to decide for themselves but they are deciding for other people who they are coming into contact with. **Council Member McDonald** indicated that if people are going out, they are putting themselves at risk. **Council Member Johnson** stated that she had similar view as to what Council Member McDonald said. One of the "WHEREAS" paragraphs she took particular issue with and that was that all elected leaders should be communicating consistent public health recommendations. In her opinion, she did not believe that is the case because the purpose in having local leaders is to give them different perspectives and directions for what's best for their communities. She recently traveled to Salt Lake County and to Utah County and the differences between the two were unbelievable but what they were doing worked for each county. It's important that the Council do what is best for the City where they live and not necessarily have to agree with the same choices that are made in Salt Lake County or Salt Lake City. She also agreed that when they sign something like this Resolution, it gives the appearance that they are expecting that to happen and she is not in that direction and would not support it. **Council Member Mehr** commented that the Utah leads Together Plan is Governor Herbert's comprehensive taskforce plan to help mitigate any economic consequences of the pandemic and anything the City can do to help our economy, helps our families and encouraging people to be healthy is a good thing. The plan is comprehensive but at the end of the day, he was not a big fan of Resolutions to begin with, but indicated that they are non-binding and he appreciated Council Member Gordhammer wanting to have this Resolution to show support. He personally felt like the Council was doing a good job working together. It may seem like a good thing to sign this today but it feels like they'd be signing a blank check based on information that they have today. He suggested that they not move forward and sign the Resolution, but keep it a standing agenda item.

MOTION: Council Member Gordhammer moved to approve Resolution No. 2020-09R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah, supporting the Utah Leads Together Plan
SECOND: Council Member Mehr
VOTE: The motion failed

Council Member Gordhammer	AYE
Council Member Mehr	NAY
Council Member McDonald	NAY
Council Member Johnson	NAY
Council Member Elliott	ABSENT

DRAFT

Mayor Hart requested a roll call vote. Council Members Johnson, McDonald, Gordhammer and Mehr were present via the electronic "Zoom" platform. Council Member Gordhammer voted in favor and Council Members Johnson, McDonald and Mehr voted in opposition. Council Member Elliott was excused. The motion failed for lack of a majority vote.

D. Continued discussion and consideration regarding criteria for CARES funding distribution

Dale Coulam indicated that he did some research throughout the State and initially brought criteria to the City Council that was Uintah County's criteria and also what Salt Lake County was proposing to do. Utah County has come out with criteria that is similar to Uintah County. What is before the Council is primarily based on the structure of Utah County's criteria and it is now up to the City Council to come up with and establish the criteria. Cedar City and Iron County have discussed criteria close to what is before the City Council. Other cities and counties are still in the process of developing their own criteria and some are turning the program over to their Chamber of Commerce or their County to administer. Developing the criteria is a policy decision for the City Council to make. It is going to take time get the program rolled out and by the time it is rolled out, the City will have the second distribution. Once the criteria is established, the City will prepare an application that is available on Ivins website and could provide the information through social media avenues. He appreciated Council Member Mehr's suggestion of requiring a business to provide proof of what the funds were spent on. **Council Member Mehr** inquired how many businesses with business licenses are in Ivins. **Lane Mecham** stated that is hard to determine because a person in Ivins can run a business by Ivins recognizing another municipality's business license. Not all businesses are required to have a business license in Ivins. **Dale Coulam** clarified that there are over 100, including those in the Coyote Gulch Village, home occupation businesses, builders, contractors and similar. **Mayor Hart** indicated that Council Member Elliott was not present but had concern for individuals being able to use some of this money, although the funds have primarily been used as a means to support commercial entities but the Council could possibly consider a percentage, a specified amount or chose not to consider that. He spoke with the President of the Chamber of Commerce and they have administered a loan program designed to make loans available for businesses and have a mechanism in place to do that and evaluate the applications but there would be a fee to administer that. **Dale Coulam** clarified that that fee would be CARES Act eligible.

Mayor Hart referred to the Municipal Building Authority (MBA) meeting scheduled for 7:00 p.m. tonight and commented that due to logistics, the Council would finish this meeting before going into the MBA meeting, which meant that the MBA meeting would not start on time.

Council Member Mehr commented that he has been involved in this process and was thinking of Tuacahn. They could use every penny of these funds and still not have enough but on the other hand, for a sole proprietor, receiving $5000 as an example, would be amazing for them. The question they need to ask is, is the City trying to stretch the money to touch as many businesses as possible or is the City looking at it differently like how much revenue a business brings into the City and how many employees they have? He didn't have the answer to that but it is something the Council should think about. **Mayor Hart** stated that there is a third distribution that is supposed to occur of approximately $270,000, for a total of just over $800,000 and suggested that it might be foolish to require multiple applications. **Dale Coulam** clarified that they were not totally confident on the third distribution of funds, but were for the first and second distribution of funds. **Council Member Mehr** suggested that just one application be required. **Mayor Hart** inquired if the Council wanted to address whether or not individuals should be included receiving these funds. **Dale Coulam** indicated that if there's a particular

DRAFT

provision that concerns them in the proposed program, they could point that out and discuss it. **Council Member Gordhammer** referred to the number of employees and inquired if that was the right yard stick to be using and commented that there could be a situation where an organization does not have a lot of employees but has had significant losses. That should be the top criteria. **Lane Mecham** commented that according to the Department of Workforce Services, Tuacahn Center for the Arts has an employee range of 250-499 so the proposed 140 employee limit could prohibit Tuacahn from applying for these funds. **Mayor Hart** inquired if the City needs to have employee limits in place at all because if a loss has to be demonstrated, he inquired why there would need to be an employee limit. **Council Member Mehr** stated that it is likely that every business has been impacted in some way and suggested that if an application is submitted and it is demonstrated that they had an impact, that each applicant receive $2500 and inquired if there was a for every applicant to receive a little something if they demonstrate they have a loss. **Mayor Hart** indicated that receiving the funds should be merit or need based. **Council Member Mehr** suggested that it should be based on need. **Mayor Hart** stated that in the construction world, the volume of business in residential construction has increased and the volume in commercial construction has decreased but he would be surprised to see anyone in the construction business indicating that they have suffered a loss. **Council Member Gordhammer** felt that the City should put a program together that helps the businesses that have been impacted and inquired if the City considers sales tax that the businesses pay to Ivins and should that be used in the? **Mayor Hart** indicated that Tuacahn provides very little sales tax to Ivins City because it functions as a 501(C)(3) non-profit organization. Overall, Ivins City does not receive large amounts of sales tax from businesses in the City. **Lane Mecham** clarified that Ivins City only receives a total amount from the State for sales tax and does not receive individual information as to where specifically the sales tax comes from. According to Workforce Services, there are 127 businesses listed in Ivins and some are construction related like plumbers, electricians and similar. **Council Member Mehr** referred to individuals receiving these funds and stated that he felt like these funds are for businesses and with the Government protections and other faith based options for support, this particular grant program was designed to support businesses, which then supports families. **Mayor Hart** inquired what the purpose of the CARES Act funding is. **Dale Coulam** stated that the first purpose is to reimburse municipalities for direct costs and the second purpose is for businesses. Regarding distribution to individuals, he commented that the government already sent out stimulus funds for everyone, even if they did not suffer a loss. **Mayor Hart** inquired if the Council should focus on whether or not they are going to include individuals receiving these funds. He had not seen or found any communities that are focusing on individual applications and inquired if that was because that is harder to defend. **Dale Coulam** indicated that it would be bigger can of worms and more difficult to establish what the losses are. **Council Member Gordhammer** commented that regarding individuals, it was recently reported that the State opened the rental aid program for Utahns receiving jobless benefits and the criteria seemed significantly different. **Mayor Hart** referred to unemployment discussions and commented that employers are having a hard time getting their employees back because the employees are receiving more money from the government than they would be if they were working. He was not trying to discount in anyway individuals struggling but there are really significant safety nets locally and in the State for individuals. **Council Member McDonald** stated that he has been trying to hire people for two (2) months and until there was a threat of losing unemployment, applicants would not respond. **Council Member Gordhammer** indicated that from a priority perspective, the City

DRAFT

should develop a program for business purposes and if there is still some money set aside after distributing the funds, they could then talk about individuals receiving these funds but that the initial priority is to address businesses in the Ivins City community. The **Mayor and City Council** agreed to focus on businesses and then look at individuals if and when there is a third distribution. **Council Member Mehr** referred to eligibility and inquired why there is a requirement for the business to be a business in Ivins for a year versus January 1, 2020 because their business would be impacted whether they started January 1, 2020 or in March the year prior. He inquired if that was so the business could demonstrate a loss? **Mayor Hart** stated that was correct and the City would not want a business that started its business in August, 2020, applying for these funds. **Council Member Mehr** suggested that the full-time employees number should be removed because if that requirement is there, it automatically excludes some businesses. **Mayor Hart** inquired how the Council felt about the application limits and if there needs to be anything there. The City Council agreed that a limit did not need to be there because applicants have to justify their losses and it does not mean they are going to get what they applied for, they are illustrating the losses and asking for whatever measure of compensation they think they're entitled to with Ivins help. As an example, if the City only had $100,000 go out on the majority of applications, wouldn't the City want to support Tuacahn to the extent the City can with the rest of the funds? He spoke with a Tuacahn representative and Tuacahn's losses exceed $2.5 million dollars and whatever Ivins City would be able to provide would be a drop in the bucket of what would be needed to survive but the County is looking at Tuacahn and wanting to help as well. In looking at businesses in Ivins, they have big businesses and really small businesses. He felt that the City should help the bigger businesses with these funds as well. The City Council agreed. **Council Member Mehr** inquired if a business meets the criteria, if the City could then distribute funds at the City's discretion based on the applications. **Lane Mecham** commented that until the City knows what the applications look like, the City could make an objective assessment. **Council Member Mehr** stated that is why he suggested that if an applicant demonstrate a loss, they should receive something and also acknowledge other businesses that have larger losses. **Mayor Hart** indicated that he had similar thoughts of an amount of $1,000 so maybe they say something of "up to $2500" depending on the number of applicants. The City Council agreed. **Dale Coulam** suggested that the Council allow him, Lane and Dennis to refine the eligibility requirements, put together the application for them to approve and refine both at the next meeting. The City Council agreed.

MOTION: Council Member Mehr moved to continue
SECOND: Council Member Gordhammer
VOTE: The motion carried.

Council Member Mehr	AYE
Council Member McDonald	AYE
Council Member Johnson	AYE
Council Member Gordhammer	AYE
Council Member Elliott	ABSENT

Mayor Hart requested a roll call vote. All Council Members that were in attendance via the Zoom meeting platform, voted in favor.

E. Continued discussion regarding updates on Ivins new City Hall

Mayor Hart reported that the contractor has a deadline of next week to receive bid information and the architects have put out questions to improve the accuracy of the bids. It is anticipated

DRAFT

that by the end of the month, they will have a better picture of the bids. He reported that he signed a Letter of Support for a Rocky Mountain Power grant application for a solar package that is worth approximately $100,000. There were concerns about panels showing up on the roof but City Engineer Tom Jorgensen brought up the idea of placing solar on a shade structure for parking canopies and there are companies who specialize in that. If the City is okay with him exploring the cost of that, he will look into that idea. The City Council was okay with him exploring the cost of a couple of solar shade structures. **Council Member Mehr** referred to the company Tesla making solar tiles that look like roof tiles and inquired if that was an option. **Mayor Hart** indicated that there are mixed reviews on those and they only work on a pitched roof but on the shade structure, the solar panels are the shade. **Council Member Mehr** appreciated consideration for the neighbors who live around where the new City Hall will be built.

F. Continued discussion regarding issues, policies and/or procedures related to coronavirus (COVID-19)

Mayor Hart commented that there has been good news reported regarding the virus but schools in Washington County will be opening in the next couple of weeks so they will see how that goes as it relates to the virus.

6) CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes for July 16, 2020

Council Member Gordhammer commented that it would be helpful to see the Table of Uses marked up from the Minutes discussion. She will go through the Minutes and compare them to the Table of Uses.

MOTION: Council Member Mehr moved to approve the Consent Agenda
SECOND: Council Member McDonald
VOTE: The motion carried.

Council Member Mehr	AYE
Council Member McDonald	AYE
Council Member Johnson	AYE
Council Member Gordhammer	AYE
Council Member Elliott	ABSENT

Mayor Hart requested a roll call vote. All Council Members that were in attendance via the Zoom meeting platform, voted in favor.

7) CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

8) REPORTS

A. Council

There were no reports

B. Mayor

C. City Manager/Attorney Dale Coulam

No report

D. Items to be placed on future agendas

9) CLOSED MEETING

10) ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT

MOTION: Council Member Mehr moved to adjourn
SECOND: Council Member McDonald
VOTE: The motion carried.

Council Member Mehr	AYE
Council Member McDonald	AYE
Council Member Johnson	AYE
Council Member Gordhammer	AYE
Council Member Elliott	ABSENT

Mayor Hart requested a roll call vote. All Council Members that were in attendance via the Zoom meeting platform, voted in favor.
The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully,

Kari Jimenez
Ivins City Recorder

DRAFT