

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
January 23, 2007**

TIME & PLACE
OF MEETING

This regular Meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council, was scheduled for **Tuesday, January 23, 2007, at 7:00 PM;** this was preceded by a **City Council Work Session at 6:00 PM.**

The meetings were held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

Notice of the time, place and Agenda of the scheduled meetings was provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E Utah Ave, Payson, UT, and to the members of the Governing Body, on January 18, 2007; & an Amended Agenda on 1-19-07.

6:00 PM -

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA ITEMS:

ROLL CALL

Mayor: Dennis Dunn; *City Council:* Alvin L. Harward, Mary Rugg, Raymond Brown, Nelson Abbott & Mark Johnson; *Audit Firm, Jones Simkins:* Mike Kidman; *Public:* Scout Tyler Nelson, Nicole Dunaway; and the *City Recorder:* Jan Davis

AUDIT
PRESENTATION

Mike Kidman (from Jones Simkins, LLC)

(Mr. Kidman is one of the Partners at Jones Simkins, LLC, over the Government Audits)

He thanked the Council for allowing their firm to audit Elk Ridge's books and complimented the staff on being cooperative and easy to work with.

Mr. Kidman reviewed the whole audit process and a bit of the history as to where some of the current rules and regulations came from.

Review of the audit document:

Pgs 1 & 2: "Independent Auditor's Report"

This is the Auditor's signed statement declaring the City to be in compliance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and with Government Auditing Standards. They further declare, in summary, that "The combining and individual fund information, and the supplemental schedules have been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, are fairly stated, in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole."

Mr. Kidman stated that, this gives the City what is considered to be a "clean audit", with no "material weaknesses" found.

He also spoke of new accounting regulations that will tighten up the ability for the auditors to give financial advice that a CPA would offer his/her client. He elaborated that, in the future, any audit adjustments would be considered "material weakness" and would be stated as such in the audits. He would like to see what the State's reaction will be when they find these reports coming in on the smaller cities and towns across the State. They will be able to better comment at that time what precautions would be appropriate.

Pgs 3-9: "Management Discussion and Analysis"

This is a current look at the changes in the various areas of finances, from prior year to current year, written by the City (specifically, the City Recorder).

This is a relatively new item in the audit report. This analysis has been part of the public sector for a long time. It was felt that it might not be a bad idea, for governments to have the same type of analysis in less technical language.

Pgs 11 & 12: "Statement of Net Assets" & "Statement of Activities"

(Budget to Actuals) These pages are designed to demonstrate that governments cannot make it by simply charging for services, taxes are a big part of the revenue base for cities. (Elk Ridge does not have a big tax base.)

"GASB 34"

There are three perspectives shown in the financial statements:

- Budget to Actual
- Business
- Fund Focus

This makes government financial statements difficult to understand; but the people that fund bonds really love these reports because there are three different ways to analyze things.

On Page 12, focus on the line: "Change in Net Assets"; this is where we get a feeling if governmental funds or business funds are making money. (This shows the difference between beginning and ending "Net assets".)

Pg 13: “Fund Financial Statements”

Current resources (Assets) and liabilities in Governmental Funds.

In the General Fund...the Unreserved Fund Balance for 2005/2006 = \$161,286.00 (To use in current fiscal year)

Pg 15: Cont. of “Fund Financial Statements”

Shows Revenues and Expenditures in the Governmental Funds (Also shows \$161,286 at the bottom of the page). Also note the “Changes in Fund Balance from Fund to Fund:

- General Fund: decreased 39,649
- Future Improvements/Capital Projects: increased 19,744
- Non-major Funds: decreased 5,074

Pgs 14 & 16: Reconciliation of the Balance Sheet

This takes the perspective from governmental to a business point of view.

Pgs 17 & 18: Shows the “Fund Perspectives” of the Enterprise Funds

(Explanation of Enterprise Funds)

These were created to be more like a business, with charges for services providing the revenue for the Fund.

Pg 18: “Changes if Fund Net Assets”

Note the center of the page, “Operating Income (Loss)...

- Water Fund: 193,836 (Income)
- Sewer Fund: 3,188 (Loss)
- Non-major Fund
Storm Drain Fund: 11,206 (Income)

Mr. Kidman feels this is one of the best lines to look at to get an understanding of how the City is doing in the Enterprise Funds...noting that the City is going to place the Sewer Fund on the “watch list” due to the loss.

Pg 47: “Budget to Actuals”

This page shows Original Budget as compared to the Final Budget as compared to Actuals.

There will be less and less guidance on certain reports from the Auditors; it is their goal to train the clients to understand the financials and to become more and more independent.

The secret to the MD&A (Management Discussion and Analysis) is simply to describe the changes. Management should know what happened throughout the year.

Pgs 75, 76, 79 & 80: Reports of Internal Controls & State Compliance

The State wants to see that the auditors are reporting and “Material Weaknesses” in the City’s finances. “Material Weakness” means that there is something wrong worth reporting. They found none at this time; this does not mean that the City is perfect; it just means that they saw no “gaping holes” where things are not being done.

Compliance: Anything that is governed by laws and regulations (example: the receiving of a grant) where there is evidence of non-compliance...this should be reported; they found none of these in the audit.

“Management Letter”

No “material weaknesses”; however, there were some conditions mentioned:

1. There was one minor problem; the General Fund had a bit too much money in it (exceeding the allowed 18% for Fund Balance). This is the type of problem he would like to see, if any. Mr. Kidman feels it is better to budget closer to reality and chance over-shooting the 18% than to present a false picture of the budget.

Internal Controls:

Increase controls on developer deposits in the bonding process. Verify that the money is in proper account; (this came from an incident where a developer posted a bond into what was supposed to be an escrow account...the bank signed the documents, however the money was actually placed in another type of account. The result was that the City did not receive statements; therefore, the cash amount in that account was not included in the year-end figures, which resulted in an audit adjustment to enter this amount after the fact. Jones Simkins was notified and they issued a suggestion that the City tighten up controls verifying correct accounts.

Summary from Mr. Kidman:

The City is doing well and the Council is making good decisions; so there is no cause to be alarmed at the entry into the letter. His suggestion is to keep the good level of control through the growth of the City. The Council needs to understand what is going on with the finances of the City. The goal is to have less “book-keeping” by the auditors and just the auditing.

Audit adjustments will be viewed as “Serious Deficiencies”. There will be more comments in the Letter than have been before. Any significant audit adjustments will be viewed as a faulty control system.

If the City does not want any write-ups in the Management Letter, then small entities will be forced to seek assistance from a CPA other than the auditors to come in and check over the financial reports prior to the audit...this would be to help in eliminating any audit adjustments. Most smaller entities do not have a CPA or a Finance Dept. Mr. Kidman prefers to wait until they find out what the State’s reaction is going to be before he would recommend this.

CITY CENTER UPDATE

Alvin Harward: Two weeks ago the City Council discussed the possibility of acquiring land for a future City Center. Councilmember Harward spoke to certain land-owners who may be interested in selling land to the City. Lee Haskell said that he and his son would come up with a proposal for the 41/2 acres on the east side of Elk Ridge Drive. He also spoke to Rasmussen’s (owns about 2 acres on corner of Elk Ridge Drive & Gooseneck Drive); he wants the City to make a proposal for the land. Payson City has not arrived at a price for Hole #7 on the Golf Course.

NON-AGENDA ITEM

Mayor Dunn: The Planning Commission has been charged with re-writing the General Plan; Mountainland Assoc. of Governments (MAG) has been notified that this is being done and they have grant money available to assist the Planning Commission in this task. The Mayor is waiting to hear back from MAG. The Council will receive copies of the returned surveys regarding the citizens’ views of Elk Ridge.

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
January 23, 2007**

TIME & PLACE OF MEETING

This regular Meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council, was scheduled for **Tuesday, January 23, 2007, at 7:00 PM; this was preceded by a City Council Work Session at 6:00 PM.**

The meetings were held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

Notice of the time, place and Agenda of the scheduled meetings was provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E Utah Ave, Payson, UT, and to the members of the Governing Body, on January 18, 2007; & an Amended Agenda on 1-19-07.

6:00 PM -

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

ROLL CALL

Mayor: Dennis Dunn; *City Council*: Alvin L. Harward, Mary Rugg, Raymond Brown, Nelson Abbott & Mark Johnson; *Public*: Scout Tyler Nelson, Nicole Dunaway; and the *City Recorder*: Jan Davis

OPENING REMARKS & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Opening Remarks (prayer) were offered by Mary Rugg, after which the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Scout Tyler Nelson, for those wishing to participate.

AGENDA TIME FRAME

**MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY MARK JOHNSON TO APPROVE THE AGENDA TIME FRAME; ADJUSTING THE START TIME TO 7:25 PM
VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)**

PUBLIC FORUM

No comments at this time.

TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

Dayna Hughes, scheduled to address the City Council, was not present.

APPROVAL –
2005/2006 AUDIT

**MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYKOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY MARK JOHNSON TO
ACCEPT THE 2005/2006 FISCAL YEAR AUDIT, AS PERFORMED AND PRESENTED BY
JONES SIMKINS, LLC
VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)**

ORDINANCE –
ENTITLEMENT
TO USE LAND

(Regarding “Vesting” for Land Use)
(Memo from City Planner to Council, dated 1-23-07)
“Background

Recent discussions have occurred by the Planning Commission involving current applications and when they have vested rights, or entitlement, to existing code. Staff has found that provisions within the State Code suggest a clear method of determining vested rights. These provisions are being recommended to be added to the Elk Ridge City Code.

In essence, the new code will entitle applicants to be vested under the existing City Code at the time of the application and the payment of applicable fees. Two exceptions to this are:

1. The City finds that a compelling, countervailing public interest would be jeopardized by approving the application; or
2. Before the application is submitted, the City has formally initiated proceedings to amend its ordinances in a manner that would prohibit approval of the application as submitted.

The Planning Commission also added clarifying language that would stipulate vesting to occur when an “application is submitted for official review by the land use authority”. The effect of this would not include the vesting of rights for a concept plan which is being reviewed only by staff.

Additional provisions and verbiage related to this topic are also included in the new proposed Section 10-4-5, based upon Utah State Code.

Recommendation:

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve this proposed code amendment.”

It is the desire to not be vested at the time of “concept” application since this application can be simply a rough idea accompanied by a rough sketch of the proposed project.

After discussion, it was decided to change some of the proposed as follows:

- *Section 1 (A): Add in, after ”...a complete application...for Preliminary”*
- *Section 1 (A)(1): Replace “countervailing public interest” with “municipal or public welfare/safety issue”*
- *Section 1 (E): Replace “an issued land use permit” with “a paid and completed Preliminary Application”*
- *Section 1 (E) (1): Replace “in the land use permit” with “in the paid & completed Preliminary Application”*
& the 2nd “land use permit” with “paid & completed Preliminary Application”

Mayor Dunn: “Land use authority” is defined as the Planning Commission or the City Council. The term, “countervailing public interest” could also become “public clamor”, which the Council cannot be guided by in their decisions. Proof of this point would be found in the survey sheets returned; there are so many varied opinions, that it would be difficult to discern “public interest”.

Alvin Harward: Pointed out that when the fees are paid and the application is submitted, then they are vested...

Mayor Dunn: Feels that the word “complete” indicates that all of the required information has been submitted with the application. (This is like a building permit...if the entire application, including all of the required information, is not submitted, the Inspector will not accept the application.

It was agreed that Ken Young should review these proposed changes in the wording prior to posting the Ordinance.

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY MARY RUIGG TO APPROVE THE ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ELK RIDGE CITY CODE PROVIDING FOR THE ENTITLEMENT TO LAND USE APPLICATIONS, WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

- *Section 1 (A): Add in, after ”...a complete application...for Preliminary”*
- *Section 1 (A)(1): Replace “countervailing public interest” with “municipal or public welfare/safety issue”*
- *Section 1 (E): Replace “an issued land use permit” with “a paid and completed Preliminary Application”*
- *Section 1 (E) (1): Replace “in the land use permit” with “in the paid & completed Preliminary Application”*
& the 2nd “land use permit” with “paid & completed Preliminary Application”

**SUBJECT TO REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE WORDING BY THE CITY PLANNER
VOTE (POLL): RAYMOND BROWN-AYE, ALVIN HARWARD-AYE, MARK JOHNSON-AYE, MARY
RUGG-AYE & NELSON ABBOTT-AYE (Passes 5-0)**

RESOLUTION
GENERAL PLAN
AMENDMENT –
CIRCULATION MAP

(Memo from City Planner to Council, dated 1-23-07)

“Background

The Planning Commission recently reviewed, discussed and held a public hearing on proposed amendments to the General Plan Circulation Map as attached, including revised collector roadways in the northern section of town.

The Planning Commission has been in process recently with reviewing and discussing potential changes to the Circulation Map, including proposed road alignments in the southern areas of town. The Planning Commission previously forwarded map amendment recommendations to the Council on October 24th, applicable to the northern area of town.

Additional changes to the classification of existing and proposed roads are now recommended, as shown on the attached map. These other proposed changes are an effort to update the roads to match existing, approved or anticipated roadway situations.

Planning Commissioner Shawn Eliot will represent this item at the meeting.

Recommendation:

The proposed changes to the Circulation Map of the General Plan are considered necessary for planned future growth and development in town. Following the public hearing by the Planning Commission, it was recommended that the City Council approve these map changes. The City Council may approve these changes by resolution, as attached.”

Shawn Eliot: (Mr. Eliot submitted a map as an attachment to the proposed resolution.)

The proposed changes are numbered and shown by various colors and thickness of lines. Numbers 4, 5 & 6 have already been approved by the Council.

#1 (Extension of Canyon View Drive to connect to 11200 South as an “Arterial”)

(The Council has expressed concerns about this change.)

The Planning Commission felt that this proposed extension could be designed as an “arterial” class road since it will be all new road; and have this be a main road connecting to Salem (at 100 East). This would allow Loafer Canyon Rd. to drop back down to a local residential street, as it was designed to be.

Salem does not have a current transportation plan; they are working on it.

Mayor Dunn: (3 Concerns)

1. The map shows this as an existing arterial, not a proposed arterial
2. Why cut Loafer Canyon Rd. over the wash that is there?
3. There is infrastructure in the existing Loafer Canyon Rd.; would this have to be moved? (Thought of a 4th issue)
4. 11200 South will be kept as a “corridor”...Much of this property will be annexed into Salem; Elk Ridge would be running a main road through their community.

Comment:

There is a special road width standard for Loafer Canyon Road, due to existing conditions, that allows only 28’ of pavement rather than the usual 35’. This would make it more difficult to utilize this road as a “collector” type road.

Mark Johnson: He does not see any difference in having Canyon View continue to 11200 South; but to have Elk Ridge’s design end there. (Councilmember Abbott agreed.) He does not believe that Salem will tie a “collector” road to Elk Ridge through 100 East.

Shawn Eliot: Does the City want one arterial or two leading into town? Salem City has had hearings on this and has had this designated as a future connection.

Nelson Abbott: He hesitates making this part of our General Plan if we don’t know that is the direction Salem is going.

City Recorder: Salem Hills Drive (now Canyon View) was designed with a 66’ right-of-way, to be a collector road. It would be natural to extend it as such.

There is not control over what Salem does, but it could extend to 11200 South.

Mayor Dunn: The County is going to maintain ownership of 11200 South. Access roads onto 11200 South needs to be rationed to about 1200’ intervals. They want fewer intersections and safety concerns.

Could Canyon View go to Meadowlark? (Councilmember Abbott said that then we would have a smaller road connecting to a collector.)

Shawn Eliot: Approval of this one road could be postponed until Salem is checked with to see what their plans are.

*Shawn Eliot will check with Salem City.

Alvin Harward: Arterials encourage faster speeds and the backs of the houses are viewed from the road, which is unattractive. He feels that south of 11200 South, there are no arterials...it is all residential.

Shawn Eliot: There should be roads that get people out of town on arterials, with a 40 mph speed limit, rather than 25 mph. Traffic calming issues come from a lack of proper design of the roads to begin with. The arterials can be designed attractively, with fences, etc.

#3 Goosenest Drive:

(Suggestion to lower to "Major Collector")

Designated as an "arterial"; but with the residential neighborhood, the Planning Commission felt it would be better classified as a "Major Collector".

(4, 5 & 6: already approved)

#7 New N/S Road (Goosenest to 11200 South)

It was proposed to designate this as a "New Minor Collector"...in spite of the rumors; Mr. Cloward will not be having a "gated community".

#8 (N Loafer Drive)...This has been long-standing road in town: lower to a local road.

#9 (Hudson Ln) It is proposed to tie into Canyon View Drive.

#10: (Elk Ridge Drive) Gladstan to Hillside Dr – Raise to Major Collector; and continue main movement behind High Sierra Dr.

High Sierra is a "local" street...it is proposed to have a main road south of High Sierra.

The potential for development is "big enough" that the Planning Commission feels both roads would better serve the area south of town. High Sierra does tie into the area, but the slope is steep and there would be problems.

(Councilmember Johnson commented that there would be a substantial cut and the slope would also have to be dealt with if a road were to be located south of High Sierra.)

The City Engineer reviewed this proposed road and felt it could be done.

The one property owner, though he would not like to have a road on his property; he would prefer having a road south of High Sierra rather than widen High Sierra to be used as a major collector road.

Financing: Perhaps road impact fees could help pay for the road. The main motivation to consider this proposed road was the possible development of 500 acres in that area; and having multiple accesses to that area, as well as preserving High Sierra as a residential street.

It is a plan. There could also be a tie-in to Loafer Canyon Rd. and through Payson Canyon.

(Mayor Dunn stated that Payson City would prefer to leave that area as is and possibly consider a camp ground in the Four-Bay area...so, a road through that canyon is not likely.)

Payson can be contacted as well for information as to their plans.

#11: (Salem Hills to High Sierra) Raise to Major Collector.

#12: S. Mountain Rd (High Sierra to Loafer Canyon) Raise to and make new Major Collector, secondary to connection to Loafer Cyn Rd. The most feasible place to connect to Loafer Canyon would be by the gate to the Loafer Recreation area.

Mayor Dunn: Voiced 3 concerns:

- The location of the proposed road would encroach on the property belonging to Loafer Canyon Recreation Association members
- The road would go through one person's house
- The water tank would be in the way

(Mr. Eliot responded that exact location could be altered.)

#13: Canyon View Drive (Salem Hills to S. Mountain Rd) Raise to and make new Minor Collector. Canyon View, above Gunderson's property might be the best location to connect a road.

#14: Nebo Canyon Rd (New Minor Collector connecting to Payson City)

This could be tabled until we have more information from Payson City.

After further discussion, it was decided to table numbers 1(Canyon View), 2 (Loafer Canyon) & 14 (Nebo Canyon Rd)...#14 because it is not known what Payson plans for Payson Canyon.

Alvin Harward: Karl Shuler and his proposed development will need the access of another road behind (south of) High Sierra Drive.

Shawn Eliot: The City can allow development to occur with access from High Sierra for the time being; then further development would have to wait for another access to the area.

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY ALVIN HARWARD TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF ELK RIDGE, UTAH, AMENDING THE CIRCULATION MAP OF THE ELK RIDGE CITY GENERAL PLAN; WITH THE STIPULATION NUMBERS 1, 2 & 14 ARE TABLED UNTIL SHAWN ELIOT RESERCHES INFORMATION AND PROPOSED ROAD SYSTEMS FOR SALEM AND PAYSON CITIES; HE WILL BRING THAT INFORMATION BACK TO THE CITY COUNCIL AND DECISIONS WILL BE MADE ON THESE OTHER PROPOSED ROADS

VOTE: YES (5)

NO (0)

SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING – STREET NAME CHANGE

N. Loafer Drive:
MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY MARY RUGG TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A PROPOSED STREET NAME CHANGE (N. LOAFER DRIVE); TO BE HELD ON FEBRUARY 27, 2007, AT 6:15 PM
VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)

SUBDIVISION BONDING – DISCUSSION

Mayor Dunn: After consideration, the Mayor felt the Council should discuss the possibility of loosening up the ways in which developers provide bonding for their subdivision improvements. Example: With the large amount of money required for the bond for Elk Ridge Meadows, Phase 2, they have a Construction Loan and are releasing the funds as the invoices come in, so the developers do not have to pay interest on the entire amount at once (over 4 million dollars for the whole Phase).
 The City's Code allows for, 1) Letter of Credit 2) Performance Bond or 3) Escrow account. It really does not matter how the developer chooses to bond for the 100% of the construction part of the development, as long as it is through a reputable institution (bank, insurance company, etc). It is the 20% Durability Retainer that the City has to have access to in case of default for whatever reason; and the 6% Engineering Inspection Bond, as well.
 *After discussion, it was decided to have David Church draft the wording and choices available...perhaps the wording could be a bit more "generic" in nature for the 100%. After the wording is drafted in a sample document, then the Planning Commission could make the necessary changes in Code and the Guarantees.
 On demand draws must be available in the arrangements with the banks/institutions.
 *The Mayor to contact David Church.

CPA/FINANCIAL OFFICER

Curtis Roberts (formerly with Jones Simkins) has tendered his resignation and has gone with another company as the comptroller. He has offered to contract with the City in the capacity of a CPA rather than an auditor and to assist in the financials; to get them ready for the audit. The City was warned a few years ago that regulations may tighten up to the point of needing outside assistance to eliminate the audit adjustments. That time is now upon us, as noted by the Audit discussion. Mr. Kidman (Jones Simkins) felt the City should wait to act until after it is determined what the State's reaction will be this spring.
 Mr. Kidman also stated that the regulations could lead to having this type of assistance.
 *After discussion, it was decided to have Mr. Roberts give the City a proposal with estimates for an annual review, a semi-annual review or (eventually) a quarterly review.
 Perhaps an annual review (about \$5,000-\$6,000) would be the place to begin.

ORDINANCE – ELECTED OFFICIALS/EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION

In May, 2006, the Council voted (with the Tentative Budget for 2006/2007) to increase the stipend for the position of Mayor to \$1,000/month, based on 80 hours per month or more; if the hours worked are less in any given month, then the wage would drop back down to \$500.
 The Mayor brought out the point that wages for City Councilmembers and the Mayor are also based on 75% attendance over a 6 month period of time.

- Raymond Brown: Suggested other changes:
- COLA (He feels this should be at 3%; where did the City get 4.1%? (From the CPA last Spring...his advice was that by the fall, it would be at about 4.1%)
 - Bonuses (He agrees that bonuses should be paid; but he feels they should be funded at 3% of gross annual salaries, with 0 - 5% established on a performance criteria. He does not feel it should be 3% across the board.
 - Per Diem: He suggested going from \$25 day to \$29: \$6 for breakfast, \$8 for lunch & \$15 for dinner...less any meals provided for by the conference.

The Council agreed with the last two of the suggested changes on bonuses and per diem.
MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY NELSON ABBOTT TO APPROVE A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE COMPENSATION OF ELECTED AND STATUTORY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF ELK RIDGE CITY; WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

1. **Change Effective Date for the amended salary for the position of Mayor to January 1, 2007**
2. **Bonuses: to be funded at 3% of the gross annual wages; with 0% - 5% (cap); with performance based criteria**
3. **Per Diem: change the total amount from \$25/day to \$29/day; broken down (\$6 – Breakfast, \$8 – Lunch & \$15 – Dinner); Less meals provided with the cost of the Conference**

VOTE (POLL): NELSON ABBOTT-AYE, MARY RUGG-AYE, ALVIN HARWARD-AYE, MARK JOHNSON-AYE, RAYMOND BROWN-AYE
Passes 5-0

EXPENDITURES: *General: None.*

MINUTES

1. City Council Minutes of 12-12-06:

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY NELSON ABBOTT TO APPROVE THE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF 1-12-06, WITH CHANGES:

- **Page 3: Frandsen Driveway: change “12%; on” to 12%; one side...”**
- **Page 6: Expenditures: Snowplow...Mayor Dunn said “it was discovered...” rather than Raymond Brown**

VOTE: YES (5)

NO (0)

2. City Council Minutes of 1-9-07:

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY ALVIN HARWARD TO APPROVE THE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF 1-9-07, AS PRESENTED

VOTE: YES (5)

NO (0)

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:40 PM, Mayor Dunn adjourned the Council Meeting.

City Recorder