

KAYSVILLE CITY COUNCIL
March 18, 2021

Minutes of a regular Kaysville City Council meeting held on March 18, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers in Kaysville City Hall at 23 East Center Street, Kaysville, UT.

Council Members present: Mayor Katie Witt, Council Member John Swan Adams, Council Member Barber, Council Member Mike Blackham, Council Member Andre Lortz and Council Member Tamara Tran

Others Present: City Manager Shayne Scott, City Attorney Nic Mills, City Recorder Annemarie Plaizier, Information Systems Manager Ryan Judd, Community Development Director Lyle Gibson, Police Chief Sol Oberg, Public Works Superintendent Josh Belnap, Justin Bennett, David Black, Steve Bingham

6:30 - CITY COUNCIL Q&A AND COMMENT PERIOD REGARDING THE HERITAGE SQUARE TOWNHOMES SUBDIVISION PROPOSAL

7:00 - OPENING

Mayor Katie Witt opened the meeting.

PRESENTATIONS AND AWARDS

PROCLAMATION DECLARING MARCH 22, 2021 SOCIAL EMOTIONAL LEARNING DAY

Mayor Witt said that social emotional learning is the process through which people acquire and apply the knowledge, skill, and attitudes to develop healthy identities, manage emotion and achieve personal and collective goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain supportive relationships, and make responsible and caring decisions. Mayor Witt read a proclamation declaring March 22, 2021 as Social Emotional Learning Day and encouraged all community members to learn about and share their knowledge of the importance and impact of integrating evidence-based social emotional learning into our schools, organizations and community.

DECLARATION OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts were disclosed.

CONSENT ITEMS

Council Member Lortz made a motion to accept the following consent items:

- a. Approval of Minutes of February 18, 2021.
- b. Barnes Park Playground #1 Replacement – Parks and Recreation.
- c. Angel Street Soccer Complex Sidewalk Lighting Upgrades – Parks and Recreation.
- d. An Interlocal Cooperation Agreement for Dispatch Service with Davis County.

- e. A Resolution Accepting a Storm Water Easement from the Old Mill Village Homeowners Association.
- f. UDOT Agreement for Utility Adjustment at Green Road.

The motion was seconded by Council Member Adams.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Barber, yea
Council Member Adams, yea
Council Member Tran, yea
Council Member Lortz, yea
Council Member Blackham, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEM

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR WEBSTER FARMS NO. 4 AMENDED AT 686 SOUTH WELLINGTON DRIVE – STEVE BINGHAM

Lyle Gibson explained that this property located 686 South Wellington Drive was recently rezoned to R-1-14, which allows for lots 14,000 square feet in size or larger. At the time of rezone a concept plan was submitted showing the division of an existing lot to include one lot with the existing home on the corner and another lot facing Leola Street. The total property includes 0.65 acres of land with a 14,065 square foot lot and a 14,061 square foot lot. Each lot exceeds the 90-foot frontage requirements of the R-1-14 zone. The density, lot size, frontage, and public street improvements shown on the plat comply with applicable ordinances. All street, curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements are in place so service to this lot is a matter of running utility laterals for which an easement has been provided on the plat. The Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the preliminary plat for the Webster Farms No. 4 Subdivision as proposed.

Council Member Lortz asked if there are any other properties in this area that would be able to do a similar subdivision.

Lyle Gibson responded that there would be very few, if any, that would be able to do this. This lot is larger than most in the area and has the frontage needed to be able to split the lot.

Council Member Barber made a motion to approve the preliminary plat for Webster Farms No. 4 Amended at 686 South Wellington Drive for Steve Bingham, seconded by Council Member Tran.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Adams, yea
Council Member Tran, yea
Council Member Lortz, yea
Council Member Blackham, yea

Council Member Barber, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

AMENDMENT TO THE HERITAGE SQUARE TOWNHOMES SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Lyle Gibson explained that in a work session at the last City Council meeting, direction was given to Staff to notify residents of the request under consideration in order to give neighboring property owners a chance to provide input to the council. Notice was mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the Heritage Square development and there was opportunity for the public to provide comment before tonight's meeting. The Heritage Square property is at approximately 575 West and Mutton Hollow Road and was approved for development in 2014 and has been built as approved. The original concept was to have seven total dwellings built as single-family attached units, but due to concern with the number of units, the council at that time approved the zone and project but limited the number of units to four on this property as well as the neighboring property to the west. The property owner and original developer, Justin Bennett, is interested in reconsidering the potential to add additional units similar to the original concept.

Justin Bennett commented that the back of the property has sat vacant for years and he would like to be able to put homes on them and feels this would be a good location for them. The residents who currently live here have liked this development and most have lived here since it was built. He would like to be able to build three more units on this property because there are many people looking for this type of housing. Building these units would also allow him to finish the landscaping. As part of this he also wants to add more parking spaces for visitors. What he is proposing is very comparable to other townhomes in the city. He has taken care of the property and the owners of these units have enjoyed living here.

David Black said that he had sent an email to the council regarding this item before tonight's meeting. This vacant area is a large space and the neighbors knew that it was likely more units would be proposed for that space. There have been many concerns expressed by the neighborhood regarding adding more units to this area because there are already so many types of these higher density homes here. Mr. Black said that he had spoken with Mr. Bennett before the meeting tonight and feels that Mr. Bennett is willing to work with the neighbors to make it work for both sides. Mr. Black said that he is concerned about Parcel A and the number of units that might potentially be proposed for that property and would like to see the limitation be left of Parcel A until the property is proposed for development.

Justin Bennett commented that he would be willing to work with the neighbors and listen to their input about this development to take it into consideration.

Council Member Barber commented that since Parcel A isn't interested in developing at this time, she would like to see the development agreement separated so that Parcel B is the only one we are considering for this.

Lyle Gibson said that the city could do a new agreement with Mr. Bennet for only his property and whatever terms we would like to include in that.

Council Member Tran commented that she would be okay with allowing two additional units on the property, but would like to see a drawing of the plans of what he would like to build.

Justin Bennett commented that they would be separate single-family dwellings, similar to what was originally proposed before being limited to only four units.

Mayor Witt asked David Black how he felt about having a discussion with Mr. Bennett about what the neighbors would like to see here.

David Black responded that he feels that they would be able to come to an agreement that would satisfy both sides. Mr. Bennett seems to be willing to listen to the residents here.

Council Member Barber suggested sending this to the Planning Commission with Mr. Bennett proposing a plat for this second phase. It would give more time for Mr. Bennett to sit down and discuss his plans with the neighborhood.

Lyle Gibson responded that a preliminary plat couldn't be approved for what is being proposed without the development agreement being approved.

Council Member Blackham stated that this neighborhood was very invested in the original proposal of this development. There was a similar development proposed on Main Street but that developer had worked with the surrounding neighbors to come to an agreement. This is a similar situation and feels that there needs to be more discussion between the citizens of this community and the developer. Council Member Blackham stated that he appreciates that Mr. Bennett is willing to work with the neighbors to some extent and doesn't want to waste his time, but there needs to be more conversation between both parties before he can vote to change the development agreement. There was a lot of time and effort that went into the original proposal and a reason the previous Council made the restrictions they did. If we allow more lots on Parcel B, we are seemingly setting a precedence for what Parcel A can build here in the future. We need to speak to those who were in opposition to this and see if anything has changed.

Mayor Witt asked about the size of Parcel A.

Lyle Gibson responded that Parcel A is a little smaller than Parcel B and likely can only build six units on the property. Mr. Gibson suggested that city Staff host a community meeting for this neighborhood to be able to speak with the developer and decide if a second phase would be appropriate.

Council Member Lortz commented that he appreciates the neighborhood engagement and feels that two more units on Mr. Bennett's property would be appropriate. However, Mr. Bennett would need to sign a separate agreement from his current one and that the stipulations for Parcel A remain. We shouldn't change the agreement when Parcel A hasn't asked for it because they haven't requested to develop it yet.

Council Member Adams asked about the history of this property and why it had to receive plat approval twice.

Justin Bennett said that he had waited too long after the original approval that it lapsed and had to be reviewed and approved again.

Council Member Adams commented that with how this was originally proposed it could seem that Mr. Bennett purposely left this area on the back vacant with the purpose of coming back to receive approval for more lots in the future.

Justin Bennett responded that when he came in for the original proposal it was suggested by a staff member that he develop the property this way.

Council Member Adams thanked Mr. Black's comments and willingness to be amiable. Council Member Adams said that he would like to hear what the other neighbors in this area think as well before the agreement is officially changed.

Council Member Barber made a motion to table the Amendment to the Heritage Square Townhomes Subdivision Development Agreement until the Planning Commission could review the development under consideration and after the developer has been able to discuss this with the neighborhood. The motion was seconded by Council Member Tran.

Council Member Tran commented that when this was proposed originally it was designed this way and agreed upon. However, adding a couple more units here would be a good use of this space because the property is already fits in and it will work well in this neighborhood. Council Member Tran thanked Mr. Bennett for his willingness to reach out and discuss this with the neighborhood and hopes that both sides can come to an agreement benefitting everyone involved. Property owners have a right to develop their property the way they would like to.

Council Member Barber thanked Staff for notifying the neighbors of this proposal. It would have been wrong of the council to approve such an amendment to the development agreement without the neighbors having been notified. This is a proposal that we need to talk into consideration the history of the development because this area has had a lot of higher density housing built here and is why the neighbors feel that it's been concentrated here. Neighborhoods can benefit from high-density housing if it's done tastefully. There are other areas of the city that could benefit from this type of development.

Council Member Adams commented that when the original proposal was first presented to the Planning Commission and City Council, the neighborhood had joined to express their concerns. We can't ignore what they did and what was decided before. Council Member Adams commented that he feels that it was never Mr. Bennett's intention to only build four units on this property but rather to leave this area of the property vacant until the council changed members and it could be presented to a different body. However, because Mr. Black has been able to speak with Mr. Bennett and feels more comfortable with the proposed development since that discussion, Council Member Adams stated that he feels more comfortable with considering this proposal. There needs to be more neighborhood buy-in though and wants to see that more neighbors are comfortable with what is being proposed.

Council Member Barber added that by tabling this the council wouldn't be saying they are going to approve the proposed amendment but rather are just giving the neighbors more time to give their input.

Lyle Gibson said that there was some neighbors who reached out via email and the city could reach out to them to try to get them more involved before this is sent for review. A sign could also be posted on the property notifying the neighbors the date of review.

Mayor Witt commented that she would like to see some amical agreement be formed between the developer and the neighbors before any proposed plat is presented to the Planning Commission for approval.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Tran, yea
Council Member Lortz, yea
Council Member Blackham, yea
Council Member Barber, yea
Council Member Adams, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

A RESOLUTION APPROVING ALTERATIONS TO THE CITY'S PURCHASING POLICY

Nic Mills explained that the City Council recently noted that donating certain property might be better handled administratively. City Staff has reviewed the purchasing policy based on those observations and are proposing two alterations, along with some minor edits. Firstly, the alterations will authorize city Staff to purchase items, regardless of price, that have been approved as line items in the budgeting process. Secondly, it sets forth a valuation structure for city Staff to follow when disposing of city property.

Council Member Lortz made a motion to approve a Resolution approving alterations to the city's Purchasing Policy, seconded by Council Member Blackham.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Lortz, yea
Council Member Blackham, yea
Council Member Barber, yea
Council Member Adams, yea
Council Member Tran, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

AMENDMENT OF THE CITY'S FRANCHISE AGREEMENT

Shayne Scott explained that city staff have been discussing some modifications to the existing Franchise Agreement. These discussions have led to proposing a new Franchise Agreement to be utilized with all interested parties that desire to operate a utility service in Kaysville using City rights-of-way and other city facilities. The city currently has a franchise agreement with only one provider and would proposed, once adopted, to ensure that all present and future utilities adopt the

same agreement. After a good discussion in the council's previous meeting, along with some follow-up from Nic Mills, this agreement seems to be ready for adoption.

Council Member Barber commented that approving this agreement will help to keep everyone on a consistent agreement. It will also help assure that access to city easements and infrastructure will be beneficial to residents in helping to improve our connectivity problems. However, we need to do what we can to try to ensure that those residents who are more isolated from services will be able to be provided services and we need to consider what the best way is to do that.

Nic Mills responded that it would likely be best to incorporate some type of regulation through city ordinances rather than the franchise agreement as there will be more flexibility there. Federal regulations have limited how the telecommunications industry can be regulated.

Council Member Blackham suggested that section 1.4 in the Franchise Agreement be revised to make it clear that franchisees cannot sublet. In addition, in section 8.1 it mentions that the franchisee will show evidence of adequate general liability and questioned if that was clear enough and what would be considered as adequate. In Article 9 it discusses the franchisee being able to work within the city's right-of-way trench unless they obtain a permit but currently the city doesn't allow anyone in our trenches and this is saying they would have to be. Is this okay to keep in here? Section 9.3 discusses aerial installation and there are times when we may have to request a franchisee to bury poles or electrical services and this section doesn't have any requirements for them at this point. We need to make sure they understand that it may be their responsibility to participate in relocating poles.

Council Member Lortz responded that in the Pole Attachment Agreement it discusses franchisees having to relocate new poles, including for underground lines.

Council Member Blackham suggested putting in a specified timeline that the franchisees would have to move the lines.

Shayne Scott added that the idea of the franchisees being in the same trench as the city's is to try to help limit the number of cuts and excavations made so to do the work at the same time of installation, but agreed that it is confusing and the language needs to be altered.

Council Member Lortz said that he would like to see the insurance indemnifications between these agreements be conformed to each other.

Council Member Adams made a motion to approve the amendment of the city's Franchise Agreement with the condition that section 9.1 be amended to remove "same trench", and that we pursue an ordinance for this type of use.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Blackham, yea
Council Member Barber, yea
Council Member Adams, yea
Council Member Tran, yea
Council Member Lortz, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

POLE ATTACHMENT AGREEMENT

Shayne Scott explained that this agreement has been part of the discussions alongside the franchise agreement as franchisees may ask for the use of city poles for specific phone/internet providers. These discussions have led Staff to propose a new Pole Attachment Agreement to be utilized with all interested parties that desire to utilize City poles to serve area residences and businesses. Part of this process will also be proposing a Pole Attachment Fee to be added to the Consolidated Fee Schedule, which is adopted annual by the City Council. The Power Department Superintendent, Gary Hatch, has reviewed the pole attachment agreement and has made suggestions that have been presented to the Council.

Council Member Adams said that he would be in favor of moving this to an action item as long as Mr. Hatch were to have the final say on the agreement's approval.

Council Member Blackham commented that he had spoken with the Superintendent early on and was told that he was able to sit down with Council Member Lortz and go through the document thoroughly. Mr. Hatch had indicated that he felt comfortable with the agreement, as long as the proposed changes were included.

Council Member Barber said that in Section 1.F. it mentions that equipment will be installed in a reasonable time limit and asked if the language needed to be more specific.

Council Member Lortz responded that part of the problem with being more specific in this situation is that we won't know how many poles they will need to attach to until the pole attachment agreement is submitted for approval. The Power Commission will be reviewing a proposed rate for a pole attachment and at that time will also discuss a time frame based on the number of pole attachments. They will have a set time to complete it or their approval will lapse.

Council Member Lortz made a motion to approve the Pole Attachment Agreement with the modifications as submitted by the Power Department. The motion was seconded by Council Member Blackham.

Council Member Tran thanked all who have been involved in this process and contributing their expertise towards this. It is appreciated to be able to ask questions and get understanding on this.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Barber, yea
Council Member Adams, yea
Council Member Tran, yea
Council Member Lortz, yea
Council Member Blackham, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

CITY MANAGER AGREEMENT

Nic Mills explained that this Agreement is between Kaysville City and Shayne Scott to continue to serve as City Manager for the city. The City Manager position is the only person who operates under a contract employment basis. It is a standard industry-wide agreement and lays out his responsibilities with his employment. This is the third contract in almost five years between the City and Mr. Scott. The last agreement has an expiration date of June 2021. If ratified, this agreement would start March 1, 2021 and would supersede all previous agreements. This agreement was first introduced at the City Council Retreat on January 23, 2021 and after being reviewed by Nic Mills it is being presented to the Council for approval.

Council Member Blackham said that his comments are not directed at Mr. Scott himself but to the contracted position. This contract being presented does not have an end date, but because it's a contract Council Member Blackham said that he feels that it needs to not be left open-ended. However, this contract should end on an odd year so that it cannot be tied to the elections. There is also included in this proposed agreement the ability for the city manager to work from home one day a week. Council Member Blackham stated that he feels that the city manager position is a very public position and therefore needs to be accessible to the public and department heads. Interaction needs to be as in-person as possible. There are times things come up and the city manager will need to take time off. However, the city manager is the leader for the city and needs to be in the office and available as much as possible. It makes a difference for our employees to see the city manager around. It helps the morale of the employees and is good for our citizens. As someone who might be seeking to have a position as a city manager, they need to realize that they are at the frontline of the city and their position will be one where you will be in-person. Council Member Blackham stated that he's not a fan of contracts for employees, but because this has been in place previously we need to honor what previous councils have done.

Council Member Tran asked about Section 2.F and how long a written approval from the Mayor would last.

Nic Mills responded that it would last for the specified time or until revoked.

Council Member Tran said that she feels that the city should be available and at the city building, but should also be allotted some flexibility. Council Member Tran asked about Section 3.B where it discusses the timeframe for a severance package and said she would like to see the maximum time be reduced from twelve months. In Section 3C it says the Manager should not be removed during the first 180 days following any change in membership of the City Council or Mayor. Council Member Tran said that while she can understand why this was put into the contract so a newly elected council cannot take advantage of the Manager's position, but there needs to be more consideration here for the city. Under 3H it mentions that the city can terminate the contract through written notice 180 days prior to the termination date. Council Member Tran said she feels that is too long. Council Member Tran said that she would like it clarified in the document that the City Manager could not use 240 hours of vacation time at once.

Council Member Barber said that we want to be able to attract a variety of people and some might be more used to working in different types of work environments. We have become more of a modern workforce who work from home, especially as of late. Council Member Barber said she agrees that the city manager needs to be present, allowing them to work from home one day a week

doesn't seem to be creating a problem and she would be in support of allowing it. Council Member Barber said that she would like to see that severance only exceed six months at most. It seems the overall feeling that the city manager would be taking this job knowing it's a risk and we need to have a good severance policy to try to keep good employees.

Mayor Witt asked about typical severance timelines for this position.

Shayne Scott responded that 6 months is a standard minimum, with twelve months being above average. The intent was to try to push for longevity in the organization. The longer a city manager worked, the longer his severance would be.

Nic Mills commented that this is an incentive to try to attract quality applicants in the event that we need to hire a new city manager. It helps to incentivize people to stay long-term as well.

Council Member Blackham said that the contract says that the manager could be terminated at any time without obligation to the pay of severance package, but then later states that the city can terminate the contract without cause and giving the Manager written notice of termination at least 180 days prior to the termination date. Council Member Blackham suggested the language be changed to make it clearer when the Manager would and would not get severance.

Council Member Lortz said that he is not opposed to allowing the city manager to work from home 1 day a week, but suggested that the verbiage be changed to say "up to one day a week" rather than saying "at least one day a week". Council Member Lortz also suggested that the cell phone privileges reflect what other employees receive.

Mayor Witt said that the contract mentions that the city manager could live up to 30 miles outside of the city and she feels that is too far away and would like to see that it stipulate that the city manager live within the county or within 10-15 miles. Mayor Witt also stated that the contract requires that the mayor review and evaluate the performance of the Manager annually. Mayor Witt said she would like to make it clear that the evaluation is done through an evaluation by the council as well and reviewed at the budget retreat which will be compiled into an evaluation report.

Council Member Tran said that she wouldn't be opposed to setting an end date on this contract so it comes due every two years and will be reviewed at that time, but to change the end date so as it does not end on an election year to avoid any potential influence on an election year. This is one of the jobs of the city council and therefore we should be reviewing it every two years.

Council Member Lortz made a motion to approve the City Manager Agreement with the following modifications as discussed:

1. This term would for 3-years and would expire July 1, 2024.
2. In Section 3F, the telecommute option be reworded to say "up to 1 day".
3. The cell phone policy mirror the benefit given to other city employees.
4. The city manager would be required to live within Davis County.
5. In Section 3H, the 180-day clause would explicitly state that it would be without severance.
6. Vacation time be capped at 240 hours and would require approval of the mayor as to the use of the vacation time.

The motion was seconded by Council Member Tran.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Adams, yea
Council Member Tran, yea
Council Member Lortz, yea
Council Member Blackham, nay
Council Member Barber, yea

The motion passed with a vote of four to one.

WORK ITEMS

DISCUSSION ON A FIBER LEASE AGREEMENT & DISCUSSION ON FIBER CONDUIT LEASE RATES

Shayne Scott explained that the City installed a fiber ring in various locations throughout the city in 2017. This ring connected several power substations and other city facilities and provided fiber connectivity for automated reporting, monitoring and other management of these facilities. At the time of installation, conduit and dark fiber were also installed for future city use as well as any other unknown future use that would benefit the City and our residents. An existing local company has recently approached Staff and proposed to lease fiber from the City. Because this lease would benefit not only the city financially but also would potentially increase connectivity in the city for residents and businesses, Staff is proposing an agreement to be entered into with any public or private organization that can meet the expectations and obligations of the agreement. Also included in tonight's discussion are the proposed rates to be associated with this lease. Once adopted these rates would live in the Consolidated Fee Schedule to be reviewed by the council annual and adjusted from time to time as the council sees fit.

Council Member Tran said she would like to see the incentives involving the refunding of money to the lessee be removed from the agreement.

Ryan Judd commented that he appreciate the dialogue they'd been able to have with the council members since the previous council meeting where they first started this discussion. Since then they believe it would be best to create a separate interlocal agreement with Central Davis Sewer District in order for them to be able to lease fiber from us.

Council Member Adams asked about adding a cap for the number of strands that a lessee can lease.

Ryan Judd responded that the city doesn't anticipate many organizations wanting to lease fiber from us. However, they have included in this agreement that the city will still have the ability to say how much fiber one agency can lease.

Council Member Lortz added that this agreement is a commitment for ten years from the lessee, and they will also need to have an approved franchise agreement with the city.

Council Member Blackham commented that this is an important piece of the city's infrastructure but we don't have the ability to operate or maintain it for others. The city needs to have obtain a

contract through a request for proposal from other contracts so that they can be the ones to maintain the system. The city needs to be removed from any physical operation of maintaining this fiber ring. Council Member Blackham commented that he feels there are a lot of loopholes in this agreement which require the city to be involved in the operation and maintenance and it would be better to hand that over to a vendor to do on behalf of the City.

Ryan Judd commented that this lease agreement says that the work could be done by the city or an approved contractor. This gives the city more options.

Council Member Blackham said that a vendor might want to alter this agreement depending on what services they are willing to provide.

Council Member Lortz said that he feels that the way this agreement is written provides flexibility for the city or vendor to do the maintenance and repair work and doesn't feel that a vendor would need to amend it.

Council Member Blackham said that if we had a contract with a company to operate and maintain the fiber lines, if there were a problem then the lessee would call the contractor and not have to call the city. They would be responsible to repair the lines and not the city.

Council Member Barber commented that the city has had this fiber ring for about fifteen years and there has only been a couple of incidents where damage was done to the lines. It will be a rarity that we will have problems with the fiber lines.

Council Member Tran said that we need to be up-front about our expectations of our lessees

Council Member Barber suggested having a low-income option available.

Council Member Blackham responded that the city can't dictate how these lessee's make their money.

Council Member Barber made a motion to table the discussion on a Fiber Lease Agreement and the discussion on the Fiber Conduit Lease Rates until their next meeting, seconded by Council Member Tran.

Council Member Lortz commented that the Power Commission will be meeting the first week of April and will be discussing the pole attachment agreement and associated rates. Once they have vetted that out they will present their recommendations to the Council.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Tran, yea
Council Member Lortz, yea
Council Member Blackham, yea
Council Member Barber, yea
Council Member Adams, yea

The motion passed unanimously.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Nothing was brought under this item.

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS

Council Member Barber mentioned that the Parks and Recreation Department would be holding the annual city Easter Egg Hunt on April 3, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. at Barnes Park. In addition, there are a lot of upcoming sports and events coming up and encouraged everyone to check out the city website for more information.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Barber made a motion to adjourn the City Council meeting at 9:50 p.m., seconded by Council Member Adams and passed unanimously.