# IVINS
## CITY COUNCIL
## MINUTES
## June 15, 2023

**NOTICE: This meeting was held electronically and in person. City Hall was the anchor location for the electronic meeting. You may watch the audio and video feed by going to www.ivins.com under "City Council" on the right of the home page and selecting "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 Scott, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Murphy and Council Member Anderson
**STAFF:** City Manager/Attorney Dale Coulam, Building and Zoning Administrator mike Haycock, Public Works Director/City Engineer Chuck Gillette, Director of Finance Cade Visser City Recorder Kari Jimenez.
**EXCUSED:** Council Member Mehr
**Audience:** Paul Bryson, James Barden, Sharon Gillespie, Bonnie Kline, Candy Koharcheck and others who did not sign in.

A. Acknowledgement of Quorum

**Mayor Hart** acknowledged that there was a quorum present. Council Member Mehr intended to attend via the Zoom application but was unable to connect and was excused.

B. Flag Salute

**Council Member Murphy** led the Flag Salute

C. Invocation

**Council Member Murphy** gave the Invocation

D. Disclosures

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

**2) REPORTS, PRESENTATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS**

A. Department Reports: Building Department; Public Works/Engineering; Finance

**Mike Haycock** provided an electronic report, a copy of which is available as an attachment to this agenda. He reported that they hired a replacement inspector by the name of Aaron Trammell. He is a Certified Residential Plumbing Inspector with extensive construction experience and is known for having a good personality and bedside manner. **Mayor Hart** inquired about the status of permits. **Mike Haycock** indicated the Building Department is processing some permits and is busy.
**Chuck Gillette** submitted an electronic report. A copy of the report is available as an attachment to this agenda. He reported that they finished improving the street on 685 South. The Highway 91 project is progressing and they are getting ready to pave on Kwavasa Drive where the roundabout will be. Pipe was installed on 400 East and he met with designers yesterday on the trail gap-fill project.
**Cade Visser** submitted an electronic report, a copy of which is available as an attachment to this agenda. He reported that the Treasury sent out an email indicating that they are tightening the rules on how ARPA funds can be spent but it won't affect Ivins because the City will be using those funds. Interest earnings increased again. **Council Member Anderson** inquired as to the total amount of dollars generated from impact fees other than from Black Desert. Black Desert

contributed $330,000 but he felt it was important to consider the financial contributions from other sources besides Black Desert. He acknowledged that the amount would not be close to $330,000 but impact fees paid by other projects contributes to the City's budget. Cade Visser indicated that he would need to look into that and report back.

B. Planning Commission Report

**Planning Commission Chair Robinson** reported that the Planning Commission meeting held a Public Hearings on text amendments for Development Agreements to ensure compliance with new laws. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the amendments and forwarded it onto the City Council for a Public Hearing. Another Public Hearing was held on a zoning amendment changing an area from Commercial to Light Manufacturing, which was requested by Utah Power, to accommodate expansion for Black Desert and St. George. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the zone amendment and forwarded it onto the City Council for a Public Hearing. There was a request made by Canyon Crossing to amend their Preliminary Plan for the gas station and strip mall, splitting the property in half. The purpose is to lower the rent on the units by adjusting the triple net pricing based on the gas station's impact. The Planning Commission recommended approval of that request and forwarded it onto the City Council for consideration as well. The Planning Commission continued discussion on revising the General Plan, particularly Chapter Three. In a subsequent Work Meeting, Chapter One was also finalized, and the formatting of the Plan was adjusted to ensure better flow. Recognizing conflicts between the old and new plan due to formatting changes, necessary adjustments were made, and the Planning Commission is ready to proceed with Chapters Five and Six and a new chapter was added, integrating the Financial Plan and a Five-Year forecast.

**3) CITIZEN REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS REGARDING ORDINANCES, POLICIES OR OTHER LEGISLATIVE - None**

**4) PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ITEMS**

A. Public Hearing on the Planning Commission's recommendation amending Section 15.01.109( the Subdivision Ordinance and Chapter 10 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Noticing Requirements. Ivins City-Applicant

**Dale Coulam** indicated that the subdivision ordinance currently has a section addressing noticing, while the zoning ordinance contains a more comprehensive chapter on the same topic. To simplify the process, the subdivision ordinance has been made to refer to the chapter in the zoning ordinance. As a result, public hearings and meetings will follow the guidelines outlined in the zoning ordinance chapter regarding notice requirements. The zoning ordinance previously had two (2) duplicate sections regarding land use items, with minor differences in the heading. The revised ordinance now combines these sections into a single notice of public hearings and public meetings. This includes adoption or amendments to the general plan, land use regulations, zoning text, map, and the subdivision ordinance. Public hearings cover the legislative portion, while administrative matters and processing applications for permits or subdivisions are addressed in public meetings. Public hearings are not required for administrative matters. In terms of notice requirements, instead of the previous requirement to publish notices in a newspaper, the revised ordinance suggests submitting the notices to the newspaper for posting. This eliminates the costs and time associated with meeting the newspaper publication requirements. Instead, the notices will be posted on the Utah public notice website, as well as Ivins City's own website and posted in public locations. Previously, Ivins City posted in three (3) locations. Now the legislation says the number of locations was determined based on a formula post one (1) for every 2,000 in population. Ivins City will post in five (5) locations since Ivins'

population is approximately 10,000. The new statute also makes previous courtesy notice provisions mandatory. If the ordinance specifies a distance for mailing notices to residents or posting a sign on the subject property, those provisions are now mandatory. The old ordinance listed various places that were considered affected entities, but due to changes in names and existence, it is now more practical to refer to affected entities as defined by the Land Use Development and Management Act. The reference to affected entities primarily ensures that staff provides the required notice to them. Regarding public meetings to adopt general plan or land use regulations, the process remains similar to public hearings. Ivins City will submit notices to the newspaper for posting, publish them on the Utah public notice website and the city's website, and display them in five (5) public places. There was a duplicate section, section 103 in the previous ordinance, which has now been eliminated by combining the requirements for the general plan and other land use regulations. Both categories now have the same notice requirements, and they have been merged. In the future, there may be a consideration to move the requirements for other public hearings to a separate general requirement section. Currently those requirements remain within the current chapter. For example, if there were budget-related matters, such as a truth in taxation hearing, that requires a public hearing. The notice requirements for such hearings may differ from land use-related hearings. The current revision focuses on changing the land use requirements. The primary goal of the revisions is to simplify the ordinance by eliminating duplication. The clean copy of the ordinance is now smaller and easier to read and the changes align with state law, specifically Senate Bill 43. **Mayor Hart** opened the Public Hearing.

**James Barden** resides at 359 South Chia. Under F on the proposal, it states a 300-foot notice but some of the fields are bigger than 300 feet. He suggests 600 feet to get the whole neighborhood to know and also suggests putting a three-to-five-foot sign on the property so it can be read from the street or from 100 yards away and that'll tell everybody exactly what's going on in their neighborhood. **Mayor Hart** inquired if there were any other comments, or if there was anyone on the Zoom applicant that wished to make a comment. **Cade Visser** stated that there was no one on Zoom requesting to make a comment. There being no further comments, **Mayor Hart** closed the Public Hearing.

B. Discuss and consider approval of Ordinance No. 2023-09, an Ordinance of Ivins City, Utah, amending Section 15.01.109(1) of the Subdivision Ordinance and Chapter 10 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Noticing Requirements

**Council Member Scott** indicated that he had also wondered about the 300-foot distance for notice. After conducting some research, he found that some cities notice within 100 feet or only adjacent properties. He expressed that 300 feet might be too lenient and suggested alternative ways of giving notice, such as advertising in the newsletter and on the website, allowing interested individuals to sign up for an email list to receive updates on proposed changes. **Dale Coulam** clarified Ivins City sends out an email list maintained by the City Recorder Kari Jimenez, for individuals who want to receive notice of upcoming agendas. **Council Member Scott** referred to signage and expressed concerns about the subjective language used in the ordinance regarding the size of the sign. He researched other cities and learned that different cities have different requirements, such as a minimum size of 28 by 44 inches in Denver, 2 feet by 2 feet in a City in California, and 3 by 4 feet in a Florida city. He proposed specifying the size of the sign in the ordinance and mentioned that several cities required a yellow or gold background for the sign to draw more attention. **Mayor Hart** commented that a white background draws attention in Ivins City. **Council Member Scott** requested that the City state a

minimum sign size. **Mayor Hart** inquired what Mr. Barden's recommended sign size was. **James Barden** stated a size of 3 by 4 feet. **Mayor Hart** suggested cutting a 4 by 8 sheet of plywood into three (3) signs measuring 32 by 48 inches, or into two (2) signs measuring 4 by 4 feet and inquired about the source of the signs. **Dale Coulam** indicated that Ivins City has them made through an external source, the building department keeps them in stock and they are made of durable metal. **Mayor Hart** inquired what the size of the current signs used in Ivins City is? **Mike Haycock** stated that they are the same size as real estate sign that fits in the real estate frames. **Council Member Scott** clarified that they are around 18 inches by 24 inches. **Mike Haycock** indicated that the signs are frequently seen and utilized, because a number of flyers are placed in them and they need to be refilled every three (3) to four (4) days, indicating their visibility to the public. **Council Member Anderson** commented that one thing to consider is the practicality of installing larger signs. If the signs become too big, a new process involving posts or concrete would be required, which may not be cost-effective or durable in windy conditions. Some cities are using cheap signs with steel posts that don't last long due to wind damage. He emphasized the need to find a balance between size and practicality. If larger signs are considered, using banners might be a more suitable option than cumbersome plywood because banners can be more easily installed and replaced. **Council Member Scott** agreed with the need to make signs as visible as possible and suggested that size, color, and other factors be taken into account. He also proposed the idea of requiring one sign per street frontage for properties that face multiple streets, enhancing visibility from different directions. They also need to specify when the signs should be posted and recommended a timeframe of at least 14 days prior to a public hearing, to provide a clearer and consistent notice period. **Council Member Johnson** stated that the ordinance references a timeframe of 10 calendar days. **Dale Coulam** indicated that all land use public hearings require 10 days notice. **Council Member Murphy** stated that with the cost of postage, the City does not need to double the mailings because that would cost the City quite a bit. Adjust the sign size and she felt that 300 feet was plenty for notification. It has worked all this time and there have not been a lot of complaints of people not knowing or not getting notices because a lot of people don't even read their mail. **Council Member Anderson** reiterated the effectiveness of the current signs, explaining that people are aware of them and frequently take the flyers, which indicates that the signs are being seen. **Council Member Johnson** supported the idea of specifying a measurement for the sign, stating that it would be beneficial to have a standardized size. She agreed with Council Member Murphy's point about the potential costs of doubling mailings and favored adjusting the sign size instead. **Mayor Hart** concurred, highlighting that a three (3) by four (4) foot sign would be noticeable and that the signs are typically placed close to the street, allowing for easy reading. **Council Member Murphy** inquired as to logistics and costs associated with installing larger signs. **Mike Haycock** indicated that it could be figured out. **Council Member Johnson** stated that using the current sign would be acceptable as long as the measurement is clearly stated. **Mayor Hart** indicated that a standard real estate sign is typically 18 by 24 inches and doubling each dimension would make it significantly more visible. **Council Member Johnson** supported the idea of stating the size of the current sign to ensure clarity for future reference. **Dale Coulam** suggested stating the current size as a minimum requirement, allowing for the exploration of larger sign options for larger zone changes in the future. **Council Member Scott** indicated that it was important to effectively notify the public about land use and zone changes, particularly those with a significant impact. The 300 foot requirement may not be sufficient. He proposed using larger signs that would be impossible to miss while walking or

driving through the City. **Council Member Anderson** suggested that they could have one sign for every 300 feet or 200 feet for larger zone changes, ensuring that the signs adequately cover the affected area. **Council Member Scott** stated that he came across a City where there was one (1) sign per five (5) acres and suggested that as an alternative option. **Mayor Hart** indicated that regardless of the sign size or publication methods, there will always be individuals who claim they were unaware of the changes. He emphasized the need to find a balance between sign size, clutter regulations, and effective communication. He suggested that if the parcel size exceeds five (5) acres, signs could be posted on each street frontage, and the sign size could be doubled to ensure better visibility and notification of a larger number of people. The **City Council** agreed.

**MOTION: Council Member Scott moved to approve Ordinance No. 2023-09, an Ordinance of Ivins City, Utah, amending Section 15.01.109(1) of the Subdivision Ordinance and Chapter 10 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Noticing Requirements, as amended, with the addition that signs will be placed on each street frontage; for parcels under 5 acres signs will be a minimum of 18x24 inches; over 5 acres will be 32 to 36 inches x 48 inches**
**SECOND: Council Member Johnson**
**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

Roll call vote. All Council Members who were present voted in favor.

C. Public Hearing on the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding removal of STRO (Short-Term Rental Overlay) zoning district on Crossings at Red Desert. Located at approximately 800 South Main. VE Management and Investment Co-Owner. Ivins City-Applicant

**Mike Haycock** reported that this is the property located at approximately 800 South Main near Highway 91. The property currently has a STRO (Short-Term Rental Overlay) zoning district in place but the owners of the property have expressed their willingness to remove the STRO zoning overlay to clarify the permitted uses of the property. **Dale Coulam** clarified that the owners have a development agreement in place, and as part of that agreement, they have agreed not to use the property for short-term rentals. There are actually two (2) parcels owned by this same owner, one of which is adjacent to Highway 91 and will not be affected by the proposed change. The other parcel, situated between Main Street and 800 South, has been approved for a multifamily project that also had a short-term rental overlay but the owners have consented to removing the short-term rental overlay from this parcel **Mayor Hart** opened the Public Hearing and inquired if there was anyone on the Zoom application that wished to make a comment. **Cade Visser** clarified that there were no one requesting to make a comment. There being no comments, **Mayor Hart** closed the Public Hearing.

D. Discuss and consider approval of Ordinance No. 2023-10, an Ordinance of Ivins City, Utah, approving a Zoning Map Amendment to remove the Short Term Rental Overlay on property now known as The Crossings at Red Desert, located at approximately 800 South Main

**Council Member Anderson** inquired if the property to the west and the property of the south of this property will still stay as a short-term rental district. **Dale Coulam** stated that is correct.

**MOTION: Council Member Murphy moved to approve Ordinance No. 2023-10, an Ordinance of Ivins City, Utah, approving a Zoning Map Amendment to remove the Short**

**Term Rental Overlay on property now known as The Crossings at Red Desert, located at approximately 800 South Main**
**SECOND: Council Member Anderson**
**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

Roll call vote. All Council Members who were present voted in favor.

E. Public Hearing to discuss proposed salaries for elected officials and salary ranges for statutory officers and department heads

**Dale Coulam** reported that State law requires that a Public Hearing be held when determining salaries of elected officials and statutory officers. Department heads are also included in this process. Salary ranges are determined based on market-based surveys conducted by an independent company called TechNet, which the City has been using since around 2006 or 2007. Previously, cities would send out their own surveys, but it was often challenging to obtain accurate and timely information. TechNet surveys all cities in the State, providing comprehensive salary and salary range data. Initially, the Council set parameters for the survey, excluding St. George and focused on cities with populations under 30,000. The range now includes St. George, unless it is an outlier, to ensure a competitive understanding of where Ivins City stands. This is particularly important for positions like Public Safety, as neighboring cities actively recruit officers. The survey serves as a useful tool for addressing employee concerns about fair treatment and potential opportunities in other cities within Washington County. Human Resources can refer to the market survey to compare salaries and discuss options with employees. In most cases, employees find that they are being treated fairly based on the survey data. The purpose of using market-based salary ranges and TechNet is to ensure fair compensation and provide transparent information for decision-making. **Mayor Hart** commented that this has worked well. He opened the Public Hearing and inquired if there was anyone who wanted to comment through the Zoom application. **Cade Visser** confirmed that there was no one on Zoom who wanted to comment. There being no comments in person or via the Zoom application, **Mayor Hart** closed the Public Hearing.

F. Discuss and consider approval of Ordinance No. 2023-12, an Ordinance of Ivins City, Utah, approving salaries of Elected Officials and salary ranges for Statutory Officers and Department Heads

**Council Member Anderson** referred to the salary ranges and inquired whether they include benefits? **Dale Coulam** clarified that in the past, the Utah website required benefits to be included, leading to inaccuracies in salary comparisons. To address this, the City has relied on TechNet for market-based surveys, which focuses on pure salary figures without benefits. Newcomers to a position typically start at the lower end, while experienced and tenured employees fall within the higher end. **Council Member Murphy** indicated that it is important to adjust salary ranges to account for employee longevity and to attract new talent. Ranges that do not vary can hinder employee retention and limit career progression. **Council Member Anderson** acknowledged the challenges of competing with government salaries and inquired what the percentage of the benefit package was in relation to the salary so that he could understand the overall cost to the City. **Council Member**

**Murphy** stated that benefit costs vary depending on factors, like the number of individuals covered, whether it is a single coverage, employee plus spouse coverage or a family plan of more than two people. **Council Member Anderson** drew a comparison to how other entities disclose wages, where the reported figure often includes the value of the benefit package. He inquired as to Ivins City's benefit package in relation to salaries? **Dale Coulam** indicated that the cost of the benefits package varies in terms of a percentage, and he was unsure of the average percentage. **Council Member Anderson** asked about the difference in benefits between a single person and someone with a family of eight (8). **Council Member Murphy** clarified that at the County level, there is a fixed package cost for a family, regardless of the family size. **Council Member Anderson** stated this his understanding was that would mean that married individuals with a family receive a better benefit. **Council Member Murphy** clarified they actually pay more for their own coverage, while the County's cost remains the same. **Mayor Hart** inquired about the cost of the benefits package. **Cade Visser** explained that it ranges from $15,000 to $30,000, depending on the employee, including health insurance. The cost varies due to different rates with the Utah Retirement System and on an employee's length of service. **Council Member Anderson** asked about vacation time or paid time off. **Cade Visser** explained that it varies, based on the employee's hourly rate. The number of vacation days is determined by their length of service. **Dale Coulam** added that all employees receive the same sick leave, but the number of vacation days depends on their tenure. He has worked for the City for almost 20 years and is at the maximum number of vacation days. **Council Member Anderson** inquired if the salary is based on a 40-hour workweek, as he often receives questions about these things. **Dale Coulam** indicated that it is based off of 40 hours, although exempt positions like the City Manager, City Attorney, Director of Finance, Building and Zoning Administrator, Public Safety Director, City Recorder and similar, do not receive overtime pay regardless of the extra hours worked. **Mayor Hart** inquired if there were any questions regarding salaries for Elected Officials and whether everyone agreed with the proposed ranges. **Council Member Scott** stated that when he was initially presented with the salary ranges, there was no explanation provided but upon investigation, he found the City's methodology to be professional, relying on an independent third-party source that calculates the low, midpoint, and high ranges, without subjectivity or manipulation of numbers and appreciated that the data was provided by a third-party vendor. **Mayor Hart** commented that an analysis is conducted annually to position employees within the salary range, considering performance and experience. **Dale Coulam** indicated that was correct and normally a merit-based system is used but with recent significant inflation, that has led to cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) to preserve employees' purchasing power. **Mayor Hart** did not hear any objections and suggested that the City Council move forward with this.

**MOTION: Council Member Scott moved to approve Ordinance No. 2023-12, an Ordinance of Ivins City, Utah, approving salaries of Elected Officials and salary ranges for Statutory Officers and Department Heads**

**SECOND: Council Member Johnson**

**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

Roll call vote. All Council Members who were present voted in favor.

**5) DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS**

A. Discuss and consider approval of purchase of body worn cameras

**Police Chief Flowers** stated that the use of body cameras has become mandatory for the Santa Clara Ivins Police Department (SCIPD) and is no longer a choice. SCIPD was one of the early adopters of body-worn cameras, but legislation has made their usage obligatory. Two bids were evaluated, and after testing and conversations with the vendors, the preferred choice was Axon. The decision was based on Axon's superior battery system, cost-effectiveness, and compatibility with SCIPD's needs. He emphasized the financial aspect of the program and discussed the importance of considering upfront costs versus installment payments. Axon's proposal included regular updates and addressed concerns raised during discussions with Dale Coulam. Additionally, the program resolves the issue of storage capability, which has become a significant demand due to the need for accessing and retrieving information. **Mayor Hart** inquired about the upgrade to the current cameras used by SCIPD. **Chief Flowers** indicated that the new cameras are an upgrade as the existing ones are wearing out due to constant usage. The battery life of the current cameras lasts only a few hours. The previous practice of storing information in-house is no longer feasible for evidentiary reasons. The new bid mainly covers the essential camera and storage system, as additional features can be costly. The new cameras are smaller, less bulky, and offer some automatic functionalities. **Council Member Anderson** referred to storage and inquired if the company would handle that. **Chief Flowers** clarified that the bid includes storage services and allows the County Attorney to access footage directly from the vendor's website. This arrangement simplifies the retrieval process, saves manpower and time, and increases trust in the stored information.

**MOTION: Council Member Murphy moved to approve the purchase of body worn cameras through Axon**

**SECOND: Council Member Anderson**

**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

**Mayor Hart** requested that agenda item 5)C be brought forward to this point in the agenda, indicating that if the Council decides not to prioritize phase two (2) of Highway 91, it would result in the cancellation of the associated grant for the path and bike land along Highway 91.

**MOTION: Council Member Anderson moved to suspend the rules and bring agenda item 5)C to this point in the agenda**

**SECOND: Council Member Murphy**

**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

C. Continued discussion regarding project prioritization

**Chuck Gillette** distributed the prioritization list and provided a presentation on Fiscal Year '24 Project prioritization. He acknowledged receiving assistance from Council Member Scott while preparing the list and using some of his language to describe certain categories. He mentioned that Council Member Scott had suggested additional categories that were not included in his own list. He proceeded to discuss the four categories that he would address, while informing the Council about Council Member Scott's categories that were not incorporated. The first category, as defined by Council Member Scott, was critical/safety, which encompassed projects aimed at resolving safety issues or meeting legal, regulatory, or mandated requirements to avoid legal action, fines, penalties, or potential liability for the city. Chuck assigned a weight of three (3) to this category, considering its importance. The second category focused on maintenance, encompassing projects necessary for preserving critical components in a state of good repair. While not mandatory, neglecting these projects would result in a decline in the current level of service and potentially lead to higher future replacement costs. He assigned a weight of two (2) to this category. The third category pertained to improvement or betterment, involving projects that aimed to enhance the current level of service and contribute to the city's overall improvement. This category received a weight assignment of one (1). The fourth category, growth capacity, consisted of projects that provided additional capacity to prevent a loss of level of service. Typically, such projects were funded by impact fees, but in this case, they were not constrained by those requirements. Chuck assigned a weight of five (5) to these projects. However, he acknowledged that in a different analysis, this weight might not be categorized as low. He explained that Council Member Scott had proposed two additional categories: Life cycle, which involved saving money instead of spending it immediately, and efficiency, which encompassed projects that resulted in cost savings in the long run. However, he decided not to include these categories as they were not specific projects under consideration. Chuck proceeded to discuss the projects that received scores in the critical/safety category, explaining that any project lacking safety benefits received a score of zero (0) and was not included in the list. The first project he considered the most important safety project was the widening of the shoulders on Old Highway 91 and the addition of a bike lane from Kwavasa Drive to the Shivwits boundary, which he scored at nine (9). The second project was the Puerto Dr. Sidewalk Improvements, which received a score of six (6) due to the potential safety risks associated with increased traffic. The third project involved Center Street Landscape Islands, which contributed to safety by separating traffic lanes, and received a score of two (2). The fourth project was the Kayenta Parkway/Kwavasa Drive roundabout, which addressed safety issues related to site distance problems, receiving a score of two (2). The fifth project, Snow Canyon Parkway from Saint George to Red Mountain Spa, was primarily a maintenance project, but since fixing the road's rutting issues could prevent accidents, it received a score of one (1). He acknowledged that it did not deserve a zero score, despite being primarily a maintenance project. As an addition, he proposed a trail project specifying a trail from Kwavasa Drive from 200 North to Kayenta Parkway. Although this project had low traffic volume, it had a safety element due to pedestrians walking on the road. He assigned it a safety score of one (1). He moved on to four (4) maintenance projects. Notably, projects could fall into multiple categories. The First maintenance Project Snow Canyon Parkway from St. George to Red Mountain Spa was listed in the critical/safety category. He suggested an alternative approach for this project, estimating a cost of approximately $200,000 to fill in the ruts using methods like a scratch coat, micro surface seal, or Cape seal, instead of a full overlay, which would cost $500,000. **Mayor Hart** inquired about the effectiveness of this approach. **Chuck Gillette** stated that it could extend the road's

usability by approximately 20 years, postponing the need for a complete overlay. **Council Member Scott** commented on the possibility of accessing State Park funds for this project. **Chuck Gillette** stated that a state statute allowed such funds to be used for roads connecting to State Parks. He noted that the route in question was eligible for a 50% grant, and although the funds would be reimbursed four (4) years later, it was a viable option for Ivins City. He also mentioned that Snow Canyon Drive could be eligible for similar funds in the case of a significant rehabilitation project. He scored this at eight (8). The Second Maintenance Project is Canyon Cliff subdivision, another maintenance project. He proposed a lower-cost option, estimating the cost at $100,000, involving a cape seal to extend the road's lifespan. **Mayor Hart** inquired about the deteriorated state of the road. **Chuck Gillette** stated that the roads in that neighborhood were inadequately constructed. With a cape seal treatment and subsequent slurry seals in 7 to 8 years, the road's life could be extended by another 20 years before requiring a full rehabilitation. **Mayor Hart** questioned if that road was the one east of the Red Mountain market. **Chuck Gillette** stated yes. He scored that at five (5).

**Council Member Anderson** inquired about the allocation of the $500,000 budget for the Puerto project. **Chuck Gillette** stated that the estimate was derived from two public meetings held with the residents of Puerto Drive. During the first meeting, feedback was gathered, and in the second meeting, a proposal was presented based on that feedback. The proposed solution includes extending the sidewalk on the east side of the road where there currently isn't any sidewalk, extending it all the way down to the corner. **Council Member Anderson** inquired if Ivins City has the necessary right-of-way to proceed with the proposed sidewalk extension on Puerto Drive. **Chuck Gillette** stated that Ivins City does have the right-of-way on the west side of the road, allowing them to extend the sidewalk behind the existing curb. This extension would continue until approximately 300 South, where a transition would occur from the existing curb to moving it outward. This transition is necessary to address potential conflicts that could arise if the extension followed the existing curb line. Additionally, improvements to the handicap ramps would be made. At the intersection of Mesa Vista and Puerto Drive, there were plans to create a bump-out feature. He clarified that the term "bump-out" may not be the most accurate, as there is a bike lane present. To enhance safety, a landscape island would be placed between the bike lane and the travel lane for a short distance through that intersection. On the opposite side, the bike lane would remain close to the travel lane, but the landscape strip would be bumped out for a short distance. The purpose of these modifications is to narrow the intersection, prompting cars to yield and reduce their speed. **Council Member Anderson** indicated there is an alternative approach that is used in Las Vegas, where a curb line was installed to address a similar issue without extensive sidewalk and curb modifications. By placing a curb line between the path and the bike lane, parking was eliminated, creating a dedicated path for pedestrians. He believed this approach could be effective and cost-effective. **Chuck Gillette** indicated that such an approach would be less costly and that it could be a viable option and suggested further exploration of alternative solutions. While the current proposal is a priority, he emphasized the importance of discussing other options as well. There is some intention to arrange a meeting for additional discussions on the council's funding preferences. **Council Member Anderson** questioned if there have been any accidents on Puerto Drive. **Chuck Gillette** indicated that there have been some accidents, but they have all been minor non-injury accidents. **Council Member Anderson** expressed his desire for the police to conduct a survey similar to the one conducted for accidents on Highway 91. He believed it was important to apply consistent philosophies throughout the city when making decisions based on accidents and allocating funds. **Mayor**

**Hart** commented that the parking strip is important to many residents, and in the past, Ivins City considered the option of curbing off the strip so that the sidewalk would essentially be on the asphalt. However, that option was not deemed feasible due to residents using the road for parking. **Council Member Anderson** commented that a curb would keep the cars out there. **Chuck Gillette** stated there would still need to be cutouts for driveways. **Council Member Anderson** commented that when he is driving down the south end of Puerto, he has noticed trucks parked on the side of the road, extending into the roadway because the road width is insufficient for both parking and vehicles. **Mayor Hart** indicated he would like to bring the residents of Puerto in for more discussion to ensure that everyone understands the proposed changes and to address any potential concerns. He mentioned the presence of new homes and the need to consider their impacts as well. The goal is to avoid complaints and ensure that the right course of action is taken. **Chuck Gillette** stated the Third project is focused on rehabilitating 400 South from Puerto Drive to Cordero Dr. The road is deteriorating due to the presence of clays in the subbase. While there are no potholes yet, it still requires full rehabilitation. However, he suggested postponing this project until SITLA (School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration) develops, which might occur in fiscal year '25. He believes it should not be prioritized at the moment. The fourth project involves the replacement of the 400 East Concrete Waterway. He scored it low because addressing it now wouldn't significantly benefit Ivins City. Although it's not a safety concern, maintenance crews occasionally need to cut out concrete and make repairs. While it is troublesome, it's not urgent enough to prioritize and allocate a large sum of money to it. It's a manageable issue that can be dealt with for the time being, which is why it's on the list but not considered a priority. He moved on to discuss improvement and betterment projects. He mentioned three (3) potential underground power line projects, including Center Street, which is an arterial road similar to Highway 91. Although they all have value, he scored them equally. He also suggested the idea of adding more pickleball courts, although Parks is not under his department's jurisdiction. Nonetheless, the Council requested prioritization, and he provided them with one. He then mentioned the growth/capacity projects, which should ideally be funded through impact fees. However, he didn't delve into them since they are not currently being seriously considered by the council. Referring to the next slide of his presentation, he presented his top four projects based on his prioritization, as requested by the Council. Project number one (1), Old Highway 91, scored highly as a safety project, particularly with the multiplier. Project number two (2), Snow Canyon Parkway from Saint George to Red Mountain Spa, scored high as both a maintenance and safety project. Regarding Snow Canyon Parkway, he recommended not undertaking it next year but rather applying for funds for state parks in January and including it in the budget for fiscal year '25. Project number three (3), Puerto, scored very close to Snow Canyon Parkway. Gillette expressed the opinion that if Snow Canyon Parkway is addressed, Puerto could be scheduled for fiscal year '25 as well. Lastly, project number four (4) is the Canyon Cliff subdivision, which he suggested could also be postponed until fiscal year '25. **Mayor Hart** indicated that some of the projects discussed require actual engineering work and the creation of plans. He highlighted the importance of the council making decisions during this discussion in order to initiate the process and move forward with completing the projects. Acknowledging the need for action and decision-making, the council's input is crucial to progress with the projects.

**Chuck Gillette** agreed with Mayor Hart's point, mentioning that even projects like Old Highway 91 and Puerto Drive may not begin until fiscal year '25 due to the need for engineering work. However, he noted that they could potentially start the process in fiscal year '24. **Mayor**

**Hart** added that although they have general ideas about the projects, there are no concrete plans ready for bidding at this point. The discussion highlighted the need for further planning and engineering before the projects can move forward. **Council Member Anderson** commented that he had Rocky Mountain Power provide an estimate of around $650,000 for putting the power lines underground. He has already submitted an order to get a more exact price. He explained that if the road were to be expanded to five lanes and it became a safety issue, Rocky Mountain Power would have to participate in dropping the lines underground. Tom Heaton, who manages this part of the city, suggested getting a work order to determine if it is indeed a safety issue and to determine the extent of participation required from Rocky Mountain Power. He emphasized the importance of considering these factors and ensuring that the power infrastructure on that side doesn't increase. **Mayor Hart** inquired to the council for their thoughts. **Council Member Anderson** indicated he appreciated Chuck Gillette's opinion but believes that perspective can be subjective depending on how one looks at the situation. He mentioned reaching out to traffic safety engineers to gather more information and opinions on the matter, as Chuck Gillette admitted he is not a traffic safety engineer. When he talks to people, they express concerns about having only one lane of traffic from Santa Clara to 600 West on Snow Canyon Parkway, especially considering the increasing traffic volume. He emphasized that it's not just about safety but also about the use and convenience of the road for the city's residents. He believes that the people who use that road have the same rights as those using Snow Canyon Parkway. He proposed considering factors beyond just safety and seeking an engineer's opinion to determine if the project truly warrants a high priority. Regarding the second project. He mentioned that even with a budget of $1,000,000, they may not be able to accomplish everything they want but can still make significant progress. **Mayor Hart** disagreed with Council Member Anderson and indicated the presentation that was given to the County showed that Ivins City would be contributing $2 million to that project. That's why Ivins City got the million dollars from the County. He gave serious consideration to the five (5) lanes and concluded that putting five (5) lanes through that short section would not be safe. To say the five (5) lanes is comparable to Snow Canyon Parkway is not true. Snow Canyon Parkway is five (5) lanes for miles. Highway 91 in this area is a .3 mile section were they are widening from one lane each direction, to two lanes each direction. The point he was trying to make last meeting was a driver will have to speed up and drive faster than the speed limit to get past somebody in that shorter distance. **Council Member Anderson** disagreed. **Mayor Hart** invited Police Chief Flowers to provide his professional opinion and explain the basis for his conclusions. **Police Chief Flowers** indicated he based his analysis on historical data, including traffic accidents and speed surveys conducted in the area. He found that traffic volume is increasing, with approximately 58,000 vehicles passing through the section in question over a four-week period. The average speed of traffic was found to be between 40 and 50 miles per hour, with about 47% of vehicles falling within that range. He noted that most accidents occur at intersections rather than on the road itself. He examined the road design, which includes two single-lane roundabouts and turning lanes. In his view, the short distance between the roundabouts creates a situation where drivers might speed up and change lanes frequently, similar to how drivers approach yellow lights. He believed that this behavior could lead to unnecessary risks and burden for drivers. He also considered the challenges of left turns in multiple lanes, pointing out the difficulty of making left turns on Sunset Avenue. From a safety and traffic flow perspective, his opinion that maintaining one lane in each direction with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour is in the best interest of the motoring public. He emphasized that the current two-lane configuration, with

well-designed turning lanes, meets the needs of the area. While he acknowledged that future development may warrant reassessment, he saw no advantage in implementing a passing lane of less than half a mile. **Council Member Anderson** sought clarification on the specific area where the lanes would be expanded in the future. **Police Chief Flowers** clarified that he provided his opinion on the section between 400 West and Kwavasa. **Mayor Hart** clarified that the passing lane would potentially be situated between the roundabouts at 400 and 600 West. **Police Chief Flowers** expressed personal unease in giving his opinion on these matters but shared his preference for a two-lane road with dedicated bicycle lanes or paths, considering the recreational nature of the area and the presence of cyclists. He believed that inviting passing with short distances between roundabouts would encourage speeding. It's always good to get expert opinions. The opinion of the SCI police department is a two-lane road between those two roundabouts. **Council Member Anderson** expressed his dissatisfaction with the Transportation Master Plan and accused the Mayor of not allowing him to speak freely. **Mayor Hart** clarified that the plan was updated recently and stated that he personally drives on the road in question almost every day. **Council Member Anderson** questioned the efficiency of allowing the slowest car to determine the speed for all drivers and expressed concerns about the impact on property owners and residents along the road. **Mayor Hart** indicated the City's significant financial commitment to the project, with over $14 million allocated, a quarter of which comes from the City's own funds. **Council Member Anderson** questioned the specific figures mentioned by the Mayor, and the discussion became heated. **Mayor Hart** attempted to shift the focus to the rest of the Council, calling for their opinions on how to allocate the funds and prioritize the various projects. He acknowledged that different Council Members might have different perspectives, and he wanted to hear their thoughts on which projects should proceed and receive engineering work. The conversation reached an impasse, with tensions running high between Council Member Anderson and Mayor Hart. The Mayor sought input from the other Council Members to move the discussion forward.

**Council Member Anderson** stated that Council Member Mehr messaged him and requested this item be moved to the next Council Meeting so he could be present. **Council Member Murphy** indicated she had reservations about the repeated disruption caused by road construction, drawing from her experience in Chicago where streets were often ripped up without completing the necessary work. She questioned the logic of tearing up the streets now and potentially having to do it again in the future. She acknowledged that she wasn't well-versed in engineering matters but felt that it didn't make sense to proceed with the current plan. **Council Member Johnson** indicated she was in support of Chuck’s prioritization of projects and suggested sticking with the priorities that he explained. She mentioned that even Council Member Anderson had expressed agreement with Chuck's recommendations. She believed that the Council should support Chuck's expertise and the objective approach he had taken in prioritizing the projects. **Council Member Scott** indicated he had spent time with Chuck, providing input and ideas, and commended him for his well-done work. He mentioned that there was a five-year capital plan with a long list of projects, but the current discussion was focused on the top priorities. He was in complete support for the first four items on the list and suggested leaving any extra money in the capital projects budget for now. He highlighted the urgent need for a new ambulance for the Fire Department, which currently had one with 153,000 miles and an extended waiting period for a replacement. **Mayor Hart** sought further comments from the Council, acknowledging Council Member Anderson's strongly advocation for widening Old Highway 91 to five lanes because it was a high priority for him and the people he

represents. **Council Member Anderson** emphasized that Council Member Mehr had requested to be present for the discussion and prioritization, as it had been a topic in every meeting. He wanted Council Member Mehr to have a chance to participate in the decision-making process. **Mayor Hart** clarified that passing the budget did not impact the prioritization discussion, as the budget had certain assumptions about the projects but could be adjusted later if needed. **Dale Coulam** confirmed that the budget would be passed as amended, including phase two and Puerto, based on the instructions from the previous meeting. **Cade Visser** clarified the budget has certain assumptions on projects to be used. That doesn't mean that Ivins City is locking in, and it must be spent, but there's certain assumptions that were Puerto and phase two are in fiscal year 24. Now, as Chuck mentioned, that might not happen, it might start in fiscal year 24. If that is the way the budget gets approved. This discussion per Dale, I'm pretty sure it could continue, but there's certain assumptions that must be made when passing the budget. **Council Member Anderson** indicated the development and engineering timeline of the highway 91 project wouldn't be developed or engineered by June of the following year 2024. **Mayor Hart** asked Chuck to clarify certain points brought up by Dale Coulam. Specifically, he wanted to address the misconception that the project involved tearing up and redoing the road when it transitioned from two to five lanes. **Chuck Gillette** explained that the process mainly involved adding asphalt to the sides of the existing road. **Council Member Murphy** clarified her previous statement, noting that she was referring to the inconvenience and impact on residents who have to live near a major construction project. **Council Member Anderson** indicated that the fifth lane on the road had already been built to the required grade, and only the road base and pavement needed to be added to complete it. He emphasized that finishing the project was not only about safety but also about allowing people to enjoy their lives. Currently, the additional lane is left as 12 feet of dirt on both sides. **Mayor Hart** raised concerns about the concentration of high-density housing near the 400 West roundabout and the potential safety issues if the roundabout were to become a two-lane roundabout instead of a one-lane roundabout. **Chuck Gillette** confirmed that a two-lane roundabout would be less safe. **Council Member Anderson** questioned the plan for the future and asked what the city intended to do. **Mayor Hart** explained that the master plan states in 10 to 20 years, the extra lanes would be added. **Council Member Anderson** expressed skepticism about the master plan, pointing out errors in the projected traffic volume of 35,000 cars per day on highway 91. **Chuck Gillette** defended the master plan, stating that finding an error in one line didn't render the entire plan garbage. **Council Member Anderson** clarified that his criticism was specifically directed at the portion of the plan related to highway 91. **Chuck Gillette** questioned Council Member Anderson if he believed the two lanes would be sufficient for the next 10 years. **Council Member Anderson** stated in California with five lanes, you can sit in traffic for 10 hours. **Chuck Gillette** to Council Member Anderson you agreed that the two lanes will work for the next 10 years. **Council Member Anderson** stated from a capacity standpoint if people want to sit in traffic for several minutes. **Chuck Gillette** stated that’s all he wanted to clarify. **Mayor Hart** indicated he was inclined to request that the Council moves forward But the Council could move it to the next meeting and adopt the budget within an amended form. **Council Member Johnson** commented that the two projects listed in the budget remained priority projects and their priorities would not change, regardless of the decision on the number of lanes. She suggested accepting the budget as it is and continuing the discussion on other priorities when Council Member Mehr is present. She also sought clarification on the plan for the dirt lanes if the decision was made not to pursue a five-lane configuration. **Chuck Gillette** clarified that gravel

shoulders would be added to the road if it remained a three-lane configuration. However, if the decision was made to go with five lanes, they would have to finish the three-lane project first and then come back at a later time to expand it to five lanes. **Council Member Anderson** expressed the desire to have the road finished and landscaped for the benefit of the residents and drivers, rather than constantly undergoing construction. **Chuck Gillette** indicated he had a conflict and would not be able to attend the next City Council meeting on June 29th.

**MOTION: Council Member Murphy moved to continue this agenda item to the July 20th City Council meeting**

**SECOND: Council Member Johnson**

**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

**Council Member Anderson** inquired about having a discussion regarding the inclusion of a roundabout in the budget that was not directly related to the prioritization discussion that developer Jon Graf had been asking about it. **Chuck Gillette** explained that the recommendation from TRC was not to amend the master plan, but if the Council wanted to proceed with the amendment, a motion would be needed. **Council Member Anderson** suggested putting the roundabout discussion as a separate item on the agenda for the next Council meeting on June 29th to allow for a focused discussion. **Mayor Hart** acknowledged the request and confirmed that Council Member Anderson would like to have a separate discussion about amending the Transportation Master Plan to move the roundabout. **Council Member Johnson** questioned if the discussion should happen without Chuck. **Dale Coulam** stated that amending the Transportation Master Plan should start with a study and public hearings before the Planning Commission, before reaching the City Council for a public hearing. **Mayor Hart** clarified that the intention was to have a discussion to determine if initiating the process for amending the plan was necessary. **Chuck Gillette** indicated that Tom Jorgenson could convey their sentiments on the matter during the meeting on June 29th.

B. *Discuss and consider approval of Interlocal Agreement between Washington County, Utah, and Ivins City for TRT Funding to assist in the improvement and construction of Old Highway 91 Multi-Use Path and Bike Lane

**Mayor Hart** inquired about the deadline for signing and returning the agreement to Washington County. **Chuck Gillette** indicated that the County is flexible with the timeline and will discuss it at their next meeting, which aligns with Ivins City's schedule. He mentioned that once the agreement is signed, it will be put on the County's agenda for approval. **Council Member Johnson** questioned the relation of this agenda item to the top priority projects previously approved. **Mayor Hart** clarified that while the approved budget signifies a commitment to the top priority projects, the question regarding Old Highway 91 is separate. It pertains to the availability of funds for the project. **Council Member Anderson** inquired about the financial commitment of Ivins City to this project. **Mayor Hart** commented that there was presentation where Ivins City requested $3 million for Phase Two of the project. **Council Member Anderson** questioned the impact of this agreement on the 2025 budget and expressed the need for funds for engineering since the project won't be designed by 2024. **Chuck Gillette** explained

that this project was not Federally funded, unlike the other highway project. He estimated that the engineering phase could be completed within four to six months.

**MOTION: Council Member Scott moved to approve an Interlocal Agreement between Washington County, Utah, and Ivins City for TRT Funding to assist in the improvement and construction of Old Highway 91 Multi-Use Path and Bike Lane**
**SECOND: Council Member Johnson**
**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | NAY |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

D. Discuss and consider approval of Resolution No. 2023-09R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah, approving the Certified Property Tax Rate for Calendar Year 2023

**Cade Visser** reported on the tax rate for the upcoming years. The tax rate for the current year is 0.000901%, which is a decrease from last year's rate of 0.000921%. The decrease in the tax rate is due to new growth in the area. This topic has been discussed over the past few months. The expected revenue for the current year is just under $2.1 million. The property tax revenue for the previous year was $1.9 million.

**MOTION: Council Member Scott moved to approve Resolution No. 2023-09R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah, approving the Certified Property Tax Rate for Calendar Year 2023**
**SECOND: Council Member Anderson**
**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

Roll call vote. All Council Members who were present voted in favor.

E. Discuss and consider approval of Resolution No. 2023-10R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah, adopting the Final Budgets for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024

**Cade Visser** stated that the Animal Shelter has had a lot of expenditures recently dealing with county calls. To accommodate these expenses, an increase of $10,000 was proposed in their budget but it will be offset by billing the County's Sheriff's Office, resulting in increased revenues of $10,000 as well. This amendment ensures that the current fiscal year's budget is not exceeded, and no changes have been made to the General Fund. **Mayor Hart** clarified that the motion would be to adopt the resolution as amended. **Cade Visser** gave a recap of the projected financial position at the end of fiscal year 2024. It is estimated that the General Fund reserve will reach approximately $3.5 million, marking an increase of around half a million. The capital projects reserve is expected to have $1 million, the water cash reserve including impact fees is projected to be approximately $6 million, and the sewer and storm drain cash reserve including impact fees is estimated at $1.5 million. The major capital projects included in the budget, which comprise of Phase one and Phase two of Highway 91, Puerto Drive improvements, the purchase of BLM land for the Public Works Yard and Regional Park, Tuacahn Water tank repairs, and the

Tuacahn Wash Sewer project. The total cost for these projects is $8.1 million. **Council Member Scott** indicated that the projected amount in the General Fund reserve is close to the maximum allowed. **Cade Visser** clarified it would be around 32-33% of total revenues, just below the maximum of 35%. He referred to a non-budget question Council Member Anderson raised earlier, and stated that impact fees were $90,000 in May, that were unrelated to Black Desert Resort.

**MOTION: Council Member Johnson moved to approve Resolution No. 2023-10R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah, adopting the Final Budgets for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024, as amended**

**SECOND: Council Member Scott**

**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

**Dale Coulam** point of order - the Resolution need to be clarified to approve the estimate to complete budgets for fiscal year ending June 30, 2023, and the budgets for fiscal year ending June 30, 2024. Council Member Johnson re-stated the Motion.

**MOTION: Council Member Johnson moved to approve Resolution No. 2023-10R, a Resolution of Ivins City, Utah, approving the Estimate to Complete Budgets for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2023 and the Budgets for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024 and adopting the budgets as the Final Budgets for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2023 and Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024, as amended**

**SECOND: Council Member Scott**

**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

Roll call vote. All Council Members who were present voted in favor.

F. Continued discussion regarding Ordinance No. 2023-05, an Ordinance of Ivins City, Utah, amending Section 7.12.102 of the Ivins City Code regarding the Discharge of Firearms

Draft Ordinance

**Dale Coulam** stated that the updated version of the ordinance based on the previous discussion and Minutes from the last City Council meeting. He mentioned that Fred in Ivins Building Department had found a document called the "Indoor Firing Range Design Operations and Maintenance Criteria" dated April 2012. It seemed more applicable to commercial indoor ranges than private ones and is over a decade old. He emphasized that the requirement of having structural, mechanical, and acoustical engineers involved in the design process would ensure compliance with current standards. **Mayor Hart** agreed. **Council Member Anderson** indicated that this was another item Council Member Mehr asked to be continued so he could be in attendance for the discussion if there's no rush on it. **Dale Coulam** clarified that there was no urgency.

**MOTION: Council Member Anderson moved to continue the discussion regarding Ordinance No. 2023-05, an Ordinance of Ivins City, Utah, amending Section 7.12.102 of the Ivins City Code regarding the Discharge of Firearms**
**SECOND: Council Member Murphy**
**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

**6) CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes for June 1, 2023

**MOTION: Council Member Murphy moved to approve the Consent Agenda**
**SECOND: Council Member Johnson**
**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

**7) CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

**8) REPORTS**

A. Council

No reports

B. Mayor

**Mayor Hart** reported receiving a text from Patrick Manning with Black Desert Resort, sharing a message Kent Byland, a Land Planner for Entrada. Kent played golf at Pebble Beach while wearing a Black Desert Resort hat and he received numerous inquiries about Black Desert being the new Tom Weiskopf golf course in Utah. Some individuals specifically mentioned Ivins. There is a press conference scheduled for June 30th at 12 o'clock at Black Desert and the Council is invited to attend. Tom Weiskopf was a renowned professional golfer and designed the golf course at Black Desert. The PGA and LPGA have signed contracts for five (5) years and beyond, to hold events at Black Desert due to Weiskopf's exceptional work. He proposed the idea of adopting a Proclamation stating that every week there is an LPGA or PGA event at Black Desert, that week would be recognized as Tom Weiskopf Week in Ivins. He believed it would be a positive gesture and suggested presenting a copy of the proclamation to Tom Weiskopf's wife. **Council Member Johnson** sought clarification on whether Tom Weiskopf Week would be recognized every week that they play. **Mayor Hart** clarified that it would only apply to the weeks when there was a week-long tournament taking place in Ivins. It would involve wearing Ivins shirts and acknowledging it as Tom Weiskopf Week. **Council Member Scott** raised a question about the existence of other dedicated weeks in the year and how they would interact with Tom Weiskopf Week. **Mayor Hart** clarified that the purpose of Tom Weiskopf Week was to add charm and create a positive public relations and a gratitude standpoint. It is a remarkable achievement for Ivins to have secured the PGA and LPGA tournaments. He encouraged the Council Members to attend the next press conference for further announcements.

C. City Manager/Attorney Dale Coulam

**Dale Coulam** reported that nine (9) candidates have filed for the upcoming election, which means there will be a Primary election. He mentioned that the election dates have changed, as recently announced by the Legislature. The new Primary date is September 5, and the General election will take place on November 21.

D. Items to be placed on future agendas

Request by Council Member Anderson to discuss including a roundabout that developer Jon Graf has been asking about at the entrance of his RV Resort and Highway 91.

**9) CLOSED MEETING**

**10) ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Council Member Anderson moved to adjourn**

**SECOND: Council Member Johnson**

**VOTE: The motion carried.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Council Member Scott | AYE |
| Council Member Johnson | AYE |
| Council Member Murphy | AYE |
| Council Member Anderson | AYE |
| Council Member Mehr | ABSENT |

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Respectfully,

Kari Jimenez
Ivins City Recorder