

Minutes
Town of Hideout
Town Council Special Meeting - Continued Public Hearing
June 24, 2021

The Town Council of Hideout, Wasatch County, Utah met in Regular Meeting and Continued Public Hearing on June 24, 2021, at 6:00 PM electronically via Zoom due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Regular Meeting and Continued Public Hearing

I. Call To Order

1. Mayor Rubin's June 7, 2021, No Anchor Site Determination Letter

Mayor Rubin called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and explained that due to the Public Health Order, no anchor site was available for the meeting. Mayor Rubin thanked the residents of the Town of Hideout for the impressive turnout during the recent referendum election. He reported there was a seventy-five percent (75%) turnout rate of registered voters. He expressed his gratitude toward members of the community for their participation. Mayor Rubin also thanked Staff for their hard work.

II. Roll Call

Present: Mayor Phil Rubin
Council Member Chris Baier
Council Member Jerry Dwinell
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Bob Nadelberg
Council Member Ralph Severini

Staff Present: Town Attorney Polly McLean
Town Attorney Cameron Platt
Town Administrator Jan McCosh
Town Planner Thomas Eddington
Town Engineer Ryan Taylor
Town Engineer Dillon Bliler
Public Works Supervisor Kent Cuillard
Town Clerk Alicia Fairbourne

Others Present: Brian Cooper, James Magleby, Craig Jenson, Jeff Bawol, Wade Budge, Glen Gabler, Brian Reeve, Jeff Turner, John Leone, Mike Stewart, Jack Walkenhorst, Carol Tomas, Nate Brockbank, and others who may not have logged into Zoom using their full or proper name, or who dialed in using only a phone number.

III. Public Hearing Items

1. Continued Public Hearing, Discussion, and Possible Action on the Final Approval of Shoreline Phase 2A Amended Final Plat

Mayor Rubin reported the item was for a public hearing, discussion, and possible approval of the Shoreline Phase 2A Amended Final Plat. Town Planner Thomas Eddington noted the Town Council had heard some of the information already and had the opportunity to do a site visit. He explained that Phase 2A Amended was essentially the removal of Lots 2 through 16 on Upside Drive, which were uphill lots. The proposal was to move those lots to Phase 3 of the development, where they will be downhill lots. Mr. Eddington stated Phase 2 would have forty-seven (47) total lots, which was down from the sixty-two (62) lots which were originally part of the phase. While this would reduce the number of units, nothing else would change. The fifteen (15) lots would be moved because of the subdivision boundary.

Council Member Dwinell noted the style would change from uphill to downhill and wondered if that would impact the building envelopes. Glen Gabler explained the lots would match the downhill building type which was part of Phase 2. However, one unit was lost due to the change from uphill to downhill. Council Member Nadelberg asked if the fourplex that was being removed would revert to open space. Mr. Gabler explained nothing was being removed but the fourplex would become a triplex. There would need to be slightly larger units due to the topography of the downhill versus the uphill and the fourth unit would not fit as a result.

Mayor Rubin shared a drawing from the packet to illustrate the proposed amendments. Council Member Baier asked about the permanent secondary access for Phase 2. Town Engineer Ryan Taylor explained there was no permanent secondary access for Phase 2 as it would be included in Phase 3 of the development. It was noted there was secondary access which Lakeview Estates would include at the bottom of Phase 2 and there would also be a connection between Shoreline and Lakeview in Phase 3. Mayor Rubin pointed out there was an emergency access road below Phase 2 which was already in place. It was upgraded in the Spring and was passible in an emergency. Council Member Baier expressed concerns about that emergency access road in Winter. Mayor Rubin stated the road would need to be cleared during the winter months to be useable.

Council Member Baier asked about the number of units. Mr. Eddington reminded Council Members there were forty-seven (47) proposed units, but not all of them had been built. Council Member Baier believed thirty-one (31) units was the number of units where the Town stopped issuing Building Permits if there was not a secondary access road in place. Council Member Dwinell noted in the packet, there was a letter from Wasatch County Fire Protection Special Service District (“Wasatch County Fire”) to state there could not be approval without a secondary access. Mr. Taylor explained the secondary access was addressed for Phase 3 as a connection to Lakeview, which was bonded and currently under construction. Both of the subdivisions would be completed concurrently and the road would be in place.

The Council discussed the possibility of adding language to state the Lakeview road needed to be at a certain stage of construction before additional building permits would be issued. Mr. Taylor explained as long as construction continues, there would be sufficient access. However, the Council could add language related to the Lakeview road, if desired. Mayor Rubin believed that type of language would be added into the Phase 3 Final Plat rather than the Phase 2A Amended Final Plat.

Council Member Baier did not want to see any more occupied units until there was useable secondary access. Council Member Dwinell suggested tying the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (C/O) to the completion of the secondary access. Language could be drafted to state no C/O's would be issued for units in Phase 3, including the transferred units until the road was deemed usable by the Town Engineer. Council Member Baier supported the suggestion. Council Member Haselton wondered if there needed to be Wasatch County Fire approval. Council Member Baier explained their approval was not required.

Council Member Severini asked if anything had changed since the last meeting as it related to Phase 2A. Mr. Eddington reported Phase 2A Amended was essentially the same as it had been. There were no infrastructure changes or numeric changes proposed. Mayor Rubin clarified Phase 2 would be reduced in size because Phase 2A was being removed. The Wasatch County Fire letter only applied to Phase 3. He believed the Town Council had agreed Phase 3 needed to have full secondary access before occupancy. The current discussions were about whether the Town Council was in support of the reduced size of Phase 2. He reminded the Council Members that Phase 2 was currently permitted to build.

Mr. Eddington suggested possible language for a Condition of Approval to add to the Ordinance:

- The secondary access road between Shoreline Phase 3 and Lakeview Estates should be complete to accommodate access to and from Shoreline Phase 2 Amended and Phase 3, prior to the award of any Certificates of Occupancy beyond the initial thirty (30) units.

Mr. Taylor liked the language but felt it would be better suited to the Phase 3 discussions. Mr. Gabler clarified Phase 2 includes 2A, 2B, and 2C. The amendment was for 2A only. Units were being taken out of 2A and being moved to Phase 3. He further explained parts of 2A would remain. Council Member Haselton asked about the number of units. Mr. Eddington reported there were forty-seven (47) total units for Phase 2. Council Member Baier reiterated her concerns about secondary access. She noted they were looking at forty-seven (47) units which could be built and occupied without a stipulation that permanent secondary access would be in place for evacuations and emergency vehicles. Mr. Taylor noted that Phase 2 would have more than thirty (30) units, however the current discussion was related to moving fifteen (15) lots from Phase 2A to Phase 3. Discussions were had about occupancy. Mr. Taylor explained the Building Permits were already issued for Phase 2A and he could not speak to the number of C/O's which had been issued.

Town Attorney Polly McLean believed Lakeview would be built but there was always a chance that it would not be. An appropriate Condition of Approval would state there needed to be secondary access that met Fire Code requirements; there needed to be year-round access which could be plowed; and the access road needed to meet the approval of the Town Engineer. This would provide the ability for the development to move forward if something happened with the Lakeview subdivision. The Council wondered if it would be possible to place a cap on C/O's until the secondary access was in place. Ms. McLean explained the secondary access was already in place. Mayor Rubin reported the secondary access road had been improved in the Spring. The road base had been put down.

Mr. Taylor confirmed the secondary access road was improved in the Spring. The road was sufficient for Phase 2, but the condition for Phase 3 would include the connection through Lakeview. The connection was currently under construction and the intention was to have both Shoreline Phase 3 and Lakeview completed by the Fall, which would make the interconnections complete and drivable

before Winter. He agreed with the Condition of Approval suggested by Ms. McLean. Mr. Gabler explained he was present for the meetings with Wasatch County Fire. Phase 2 was stipulated based on the emergency access road, which had been improved. He was not sure why there continued to be conversations about Phase 2 since the requirement had already been satisfied with the emergency access road. When Lakeview was in, there would be permanent access in Phase 3 and permanent access in Phase 2. He reiterated secondary access was satisfied for Phase 2.

Council Member Baier stated it was the responsibility of the Council to ask these types of questions in a public forum. Additionally, she noted the Council Members had not been involved in the same conversations as the developer and Staff. She wanted to ensure that all questions related to access were adequately addressed before the Town Council moved the discussions forward.

Mr. Gabler informed the Council he would be willing to commit to clearing the road if Lakeview was not completely ready by Winter. This would ensure the emergency secondary access remained drivable. Council Member Severini suggested adding that to the Ordinance so it was a formal commitment. Mr. Eddington stated he could draft appropriate language. Mayor Rubin asked if there were two Ordinances. Mr. Eddington explained that everything for Phase 2A Amended and Phase 3 were included in the same Ordinance.

Ms. McLean noted the Ordinance could be amended and made into two separate Ordinances. The facts related to Phase 2A could be pulled out and added to a separate Ordinance if desired. However, it would be the Council's decision. The Ordinance could remain as-is, with amendments, or there could be two separate Ordinances ready for a vote before the end of the Town Council Meeting. Ms. McLean informed Council the public hearings could be combined and the vote could take place after the discussions on Phase 3. She did not know if the applicant would want to amend Phase 2A if there were issues with the approval of Phase 3. The discussions moved onto Shoreline Phase 3.

2. Continued Public Hearing, Discussion, and Possible Action on the Final Approval of Shoreline Phase 3 Final Plat

Mayor Rubin reported the item was a public hearing, discussion, and possible approval of the Shoreline Phase 3 Final Plat. Mr. Eddington reviewed the Staff Report and stated that the fifteen (15) units from Phase 2A would be moved to Phase 3. Phase 3 would have sixty-two (62) units instead of forty-seven (47). Mr. Taylor discussed road widths. At the last Town Council Meeting on the subject, road widths were one of the more difficult issues. He believed a conclusion had been reached. In the current application, the developer submitted three different options, which included the following:

- Option 1: 28-feet, plus curb and gutter, allowing for twenty-six (26)-feet for asphalt and pan;
- Option 2: twenty-six (26)-feet of asphalt, with a reduced high back curb and gutter; and
- Option 3: twenty-six (26)-feet of asphalt with native grass swales on either side (no formal curb and gutter)

The formal curb and gutter had been a previous discussion point. There had been discussions about whether the curb and gutter could count as part of the drivable surface or if it was part of the snow storage and stormwater. Option 3 included twenty-six (26) feet of asphalt with native grass swales on either side. It would meet the intent of the Ordinance. The Town Engineers recommended Option

3. Council Member Dwinell asked how deterioration would be prevented on the edge of the road. Mr. Taylor explained there were a number of possibilities. It would depend on how the grass swale was built. For instance, there could be grass and topsoil, however, there would likely be a fair amount of deterioration over time. A strip of road base could be added to hold back the asphalt and act as a shoulder. Or there could be concrete ribbons. He hoped to hear more about the specifics from the developers.

Council Member Dwinell was not sure he was comfortable with Option 3. Given that grass does not exist in the Town in any sizable fashion and that there would be a certain amount of water consumption necessary to keep the grass swales alive, he was not certain that it was a viable option. Mr. Gabler preferred Options 1 or 2 with the curb and gutter. He explained Option 1 would have twenty-six (26) feet of drivable surface. It also met the Wasatch County Fire Code and International Fire Code. He wanted to hear more about which option the Council Members would prefer.

Council Member Severini noted he looked at other town road requirements. It seemed in other areas the options would meet the general requirements. He asked about the reduced high back curb and gutter listed in Option 2 and wanted to know the width of the reduction. Mr. Gabler explained it had been reduced to one foot on each side. Mr. Gabler discussed issues with expanding the road to thirty-one (31) feet overall. He stated it would restrict the units. The development would lose units, the ability to jog the buildings back and forth, and the ability to have longer driveways. The proposed road widths would allow for better variation of streetscape and meet the intent of the International Fire Code.

Legal Counsel for the Developer, Wade Budge, felt Council Member Severini brought up a good point about other cities. He shared a brief presentation related to other areas. During the last Town Council Meeting, there were a lot of comments related to snow, so he looked at communities which had a lot of snow. A study had been commissioned. Mr. Budge shared several examples, including Empire Street, which was twenty-four (24) feet. The Shoreline Phase 3 proposal would have larger road widths than that. Additional examples were shown. Mr. Budge explained what Council was proposing was larger than what the Developer had done in any other Phase. He stated Option 1 provided twenty-six (26) feet of usable surface, was consistent with State Code, and wider than the Council would see in sister communities.

Council Member Dwinell appreciated the examples but wanted to know if they had looked at cities in Wasatch County. Mr. Budge explained they had not. He stated Wasatch County Fire expressed a preference that there be two additional feet of pavement surface. However, the fact was there was sufficient surface as determined by the State Code and the International Fire Code. He hoped a decision could be made regarding road widths so they did not need to continue to have the road discussions every time a future plat was brought to the Council.

Council Member Dwinell noted Wasatch County Fire made its position clear. Additionally, an Ordinance was crafted last year which codified the requirements. He was uncertain how to balance the changes based on health and safety with the proposal. Mr. Budge stated the new code was codified after Shoreline was approved and he did not believe the Ordinance would apply to the development. He added the health and safety exception in the Development Agreement was very narrow. It was different than many other Development Agreements. However, they did not want to just do the twenty-three (23) feet which were done previously. They wanted to provide more width and be responsive to the concerns. Ultimately, what they were proposing was something that met the requirements.

Mr. Gabler read from the Wasatch County Fire letter which was included in the packet:

- *Roads must include a minimum of twenty-six (26) feet unobstructed width for their entirety*

He did not understand comments which seemed to indicate that Option 1 did not comply with what Wasatch County Fire was asking. It had twenty-six (26) feet of unobstructed width for the entirety. The International Fire Code, which was referenced on the Wasatch County Fire District's website, stated fire access roads could be asphalt, concrete, or other approved driving surface. Mr. Taylor referenced 10.08.14.1 of the Town Code, in which the road standards were broken down into two sections. He reported for the Town Council to permit Options 1 or 2, an exception would need to be granted. Mr. Gabler believed Option 1 was far better than Option 3. Further discussions were had about 10.08.14.1 of the Town Code.

Council Member Baier wondered if mountable curb and gutter was considered a drivable surface. Mr. Taylor explained that when the new road standards were adopted in 2020, Wasatch County Fire stated it was not. They did not consider the concrete curb and gutter to be a drivable surface. As a result, Options 1 and 2 did not comply with the requirements. Mr. Gabler pointed out Option 2 proposed twenty-six (26) feet of asphalt. He also clarified Wasatch County Fire never said the concrete pan, which was in line with the asphalt, could not be included in the twenty-six (26) feet. There was twenty-six (26) feet of flat and drivable surface in the proposed options.

Council Member Baier discussed Option 1 and stated it appeared to meet the requirements of the Wasatch County Fire Code, which was twenty-six (26) feet of drivable surface. Council Member Dwinell also felt Option 1 met the general intent of the drivable surface and felt it would be suitable to grant an exception. It was also possible the Town Council may want to revisit the Ordinance in the future to ensure that the language is consistent with the intent.

Council Member Severini asked about the grading which started from the center of the road and then sloped down to either end at two percent (2%). He wondered if the pan would be consistent with that slope for the mountable outriggers to take advantage of it. It was noted the purpose of the slope was to push water runoff to the side of the road. In terms of the mountable outriggers, Mr. Gabler reported the Fire Department put down large pads and the stabilizer was placed on top of those pads. The pads simply needed to be on solid ground. He informed the Council the pan on each side is eighteen (18) inches and a countable mountable area. The carrying capacity of the concrete pan was higher than the edge of asphalt. Mr. Gabler reiterated they did not want to do Option 3 as there was nothing to stabilize the outside edge of asphalt. It was not the safest option and Option 1 was much safer.

Mr. Taylor reported he had gone over Options 1 and 2 with the Fire Chief and Fire Marshal, who were unable to attend the Town Council Meeting. They felt the options did not meet what had been set in the Town Code or the International Fire Code. As a result, Wasatch County Fire did not have a positive recommendation for Option 1 or Option 2. They did not meet the Town Code which was adopted in 2020, but if the Council wanted to grant an exception, that would be permissible. Mr. Taylor suggested if the Council wanted to grant such an exception, they should list as many reasons as possible to explain why the exception was granted.

Council Member Dwinell agreed there needed to be consistency and was likely to side with Wasatch County Fire. Mayor Rubin reminded the Council Members the developers were granted the authority to build the subdivision prior to the current administration. That authority was also granted under

the prior Code. He believed the developers had made an effort to work with the Town of Hideout. Mayor Rubin was not opposed to the Option 1 solution. While he recognized it was not ideal, it was much closer to what the Council wanted. He was not against supporting an exception. Council Member Haselton believed an exception would set a precedent for other developments in town. Mayor Rubin noted that the reason for the exception would be the development was grandfathered in under the prior Code.

Ms. McLean explained this was ultimately the decision of the Town Council, as Wasatch County Fire could only issue a recommendation. The development was vested under the 2009 Town Code, but an exception could be made for health and safety issues. Staff's position was there were health and safety issues. Council Member Severini asked for additional details about the Wasatch County Fire concerns. Mr. Taylor explained Wasatch County Fire supported Option 3 because it met the intent of the Code. The concern with Option 1 was during the winter, ice and snow would melt, refreeze, and accumulate in the gutter, which would make it impossible to put outriggers on anything other than firm asphalt surface during the winter months. Mr. Taylor stated Wasatch County Fire wanted twenty-six (26) feet of unobstructed asphalt, plus the shoulder, curb, and gutter or storm drain. They had historically not considered the shoulder, curb, and gutter, or storm drain to be a drivable surface.

Mr. Gabler shared the official letter from Wasatch County Fire, which was provided two years ago. He wondered if Wasatch County Fire had since changed their position. He re-read the language related to the unobstructed road width. Mr. Taylor explained their opinion was the curb and gutter was obstructed during certain times of the year. In 2020, the Town Council worked closely with Wasatch County Fire to come up with a minimum road standard which would be safe. 10.08.14.1 of the Town Code referenced twenty-six (26) feet, plus the curb and gutter. Mr. Gabler had a difficult time understanding why Option 3 would be preferable to Wasatch County Fire. If they were concerned about snow and ice in the gutter, the grass swales included in Option 3 would be muddy and snowy. He felt Option 1 was much better. Mr. Gabler added that the third option was more affordable to install but would not make for a well-designed community. He shared other road width examples from the Town of Hideout for reference.

Council Member Haselton asked for more information about the curb and gutter design. Mr. Gabler explained it was the same curb and gutter GCD had done in all of their developments. There was two-point-five (2.5) feet of concrete, eighteen (18) inches of pan, and twelve (12) inches of modified curb. Council Member Nadelberg believed the real issue was the fact that some of the road width would be lost due to snow and ice during certain times of the year. He believed instead of looking at the road materials, it should be made clear how much width Wasatch County Fire was concerned about losing due to snow and ice accumulation. He wanted to understand the projected loss which needed to be accounted for. Mr. Gabler pointed out there was no wording in the Town Code or International Fire Code related to that scenario. None of the Codes considered what might be lost.

Mayor Rubin explained part of the Public Works effort included pushing the snow back to clear the area to the curb. This was normal practice after a significant snowfall. Mr. Gabler noted with a solid concrete curb it would be possible to drive perpendicular to the curb and clear all of the snow because there was a solid concrete curb holding the edge of the asphalt. Council Member Severini wondered if it would be possible to remove the pan in Option 1 and put asphalt there instead. He wanted to know if that would comply with the desires of Wasatch County Fire. There was discussion regarding the suggestion. Mr. Taylor explained it would not counter the Wasatch County Fire concerns. Replacing the curb with asphalt was not consistent with what Wasatch County Fire believed

complied with the Code. They wanted to see a storm drain system outside of the twenty-six (26) foot unobstructed width. He noted there was no real value to Option 2 and Options 1 or 3 would be preferable.

Mr. Gabler reiterated if the road became wider, the development would lose the ability to jog the buildings and vary setbacks on the streetscape. There would also be a loss of landscaped areas and the Town would be responsible to service more asphalt in the future. Council Member Nadelberg commented he would be uncomfortable voting against something that the Fire Marshal recommended. Mr. Gabler referenced the Deer Waters development, which was north of the Shoreline development. Everything on that side was twenty-seven (27) feet curb-to-curb. There was also a rock wall six (6) inches off the back of the curb. He wanted to make sure all of the future landscaped walls were four (4) to five (5) feet back from the curb to ensure there was plenty of room for snow removal.

Mayor Rubin asked the Town Council to discuss other aspects of Phase 3 and revisit the road width discussion later in the meeting. Mr. Eddington further reviewed the Staff Report. He noted there had been some questions related to open space at the last meeting. The project was vested under the 2009 Town Code and the 2010 Master Development Agreement (“MDA”) and did not need to meet the current open space requirements. Mr. Eddington reported the proposal did meet the requirements of the 2009 Town Code and 2010 MDA. He compared the proposal to the current Code. Based on the current Code, as a forty-seven (47)-unit subdivision, there would be a requirement for 1.41 acres of public open space or about fourteen percent (14%) of the subdivision area. If the proposal was viewed through the current Code requirements, there would be three (3) to five (5) percent. While the proposal would not meet the current Code requirements, it did not need to, since it met the 2009 Town Code and 2010 MDA requirements.

Mr. Eddington explained the applicant expanded the trail proposal significantly. There was a solid east-west trail along the north side as well as a trail that utilized the Public Utility easement, which was recommended in the Parks, Open Space, and Trails Plan, which was incorporated into the proposed plans. Mr. Eddington noted there had been discussions during the last meeting regarding access to the State Park lands. He asked if the developer would consider working with the Town to coordinate possible trail connections to State Park lands by dedicating a ten-foot (10’) by ten-foot (10’) area. Mr. Gabler was more than willing to work with the Town to facilitate whatever was necessary to create a legal connection from the Shoreline property to the public trails. The Council stressed the importance of legal and approved trail access.

Mr. Gabler shared the Landscape Plan with Council Members. Mr. Eddington stated Staff would work with Mr. Gabler and present the information to the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee, noting it would be beneficial to receive their input on the final design. Mr. Gabler overviewed the Landscape Plan and stated Phase 3 alone had more than two hundred thirty (230) trees proposed and fifteen hundred (1,500) shrubs and plants.

Mr. Eddington discussed density. He explained that there were fifty (50) Equivalent Residential Units (“ERU”) for Phase 1, forty-seven (47) for Phase 2, and sixty-two (62) for Phase 3. There would be one hundred fifty-nine (159) ERU’s in total. The applicant was not proposing any units over five thousand (5,000) square feet, which was in compliance with the 2009 Town Code and 2010 MDA. He noted there were no density issues with what was proposed for Phase 3. Mr. Eddington discussed future amenities. The swimming pool, Community Meeting Room, and amphitheater were all part of a subsequent phase. However, he reminded the Council Members the future amenities were not

part of the current considerations. The Council was only looking at Phase 2A Amended and Phase 3.

The grading and stormwater requirements were overviewed. Mr. Eddington stated there were recommendations in the Staff Report related to working with the Town Planner and Town Engineer to finalize some of the grading requirements. Mr. Taylor added there was a Condition of Approval listed specifying an updated Grading Plan may be needed, depending on whether the Town Council approved the exception of the road width. Mr. Taylor also wanted to see information related to the trails on the final Grading Plan. For instance, the trail under the power line would be built across some steep slopes. It was important to make sure it was buildable and would not create unstable slopes.

Mr. Taylor shared a comment related to street names. He explained there was a concern that the connection between Shoreline Phase 3 and Lakeview changed from Deep Water Drive to Lagoon Drive, which was not best practice. He noted the Council could approve the proposed name change or direct Staff to work with the owners to try to come up with one continuous road name. Council Member Dwinell felt it was important to stipulate the road name needs to be continuous. Mr. Gabler was fine with that.

Mr. Eddington discussed Item 10 on the Staff Report. He explained the proposal specified there were three distinct building elevations. Mr. Gabler reported there were eight (8) different elevations. Additionally, he would approach the Design Review Committee with two different color schemes. This would create sixteen (16) different possibilities and allow the development to have more variation.

The Staff recommendations were overviewed. Mr. Eddington stated the recommendation for Phase 2A Amended was to approve it as proposed and conditioned in the Staff Report. He reminded the Council Phase 2A Amended would remove fifteen (15) of the units and move them into Phase 3. Mr. Eddington reported approval was recommended for Phase 3, but it seemed there were still discussions to be had related to road width and the best option. He felt that those discussions should continue before the Council voted on the item. Mayor Rubin suggested the Council hear public comments before continuing the road width discussions.

At 8:19 p.m., Mayor Rubin opened the public hearing. He reported there had been a question posed in the Zoom chat box during the discussions related to the size of the curb and gutter. Mayor Rubin clarified the proposed curb and gutter was the standard size seen throughout the Town of Hideout.

John Leone commented there needed to be a happy medium as it relates to the road width discussions. He understood the concerns on both sides but felt a compromise was necessary. Mr. Leone also felt a representative for Wasatch County Fire should be at the meeting. His main concern was if the roads were durable and would last. Mr. Leone thanked Mayor Rubin for answering his question related to the curb and gutter size. Mr. Taylor shared additional information related to the proposed curb and gutter as well as the snow and ice concerns. Mr. Leone wondered if a precedent would be set for future builders if Phase 2A Amended and Phase 3 were to move forward. Mayor Rubin explained anything new would need to comply with current Code. Anything with preexisting authorizations was vested under the prior Code. He added there were different MDA's for different developments. There were a limited number of things which could be changed about a prior approval. However, health and safety concerns could lead to changes in some instances such as this one.

Mr. Gabler was willing to offer an updated Option 1 for the Council to consider. It would add one additional foot to the road width, which would equal twenty-nine (29) feet overall. He felt this option could satisfy the concerns.

Nate Brockbank did not like the landscaping at Deer Waters and Shoreline but appreciated the extra trees and bushes which were proposed for the next phases of Shoreline. Mr. Brockbank noted there was a power line Mr. Gabler had run down the property line. He was surprised there was not an Ordinance to state overhead power was not preferred, which led to the views of his lots having a view of a power line rather than the reservoir. Mr. Brockbank stated the bid to bury the power line was \$200,000. He hoped something could be worked out with Mr. Gabler because he did not think the power line placement was ethical or fair. Mr. Taylor explained this was a vested Code issue. The new Town Code spoke to those kinds of issues but the vested Code did not state anything specifically. Mr. Gabler was happy to discuss the issue with Mr. Brockbank the following week.

Carol Tomas asked for more information on performance bonds. Mayor Rubin reported the Town of Hideout did not allow vertical construction without a performance bond in place. However, they did allow earth moving. There was a risk that a developer could leave partway through the earth moving and there would be a mess for the Town to clean up. Mr. Taylor explained there was a 10% cash bond as part of the Construction Permit. If a developer were to abandon a project mid-way through construction, that bond would provide funds to stabilize the area. Ms. Tomas noted there had been a commitment in which the lots in front of her home would not be more than one story. Mayor Rubin asked that she provide her contact information so the Town Planner could discuss the Code on height restrictions and the approved topography associated with the area at a later date.

Jeff Turner noted Wasatch County Fire said they needed twenty-six (26) feet of road width. Mr. Gabler had gone above and beyond and had now proposed twenty-nine (29) feet. While Mr. Taylor stated there had been conversations with Wasatch County Fire, no one from Wasatch County Fire had bothered to attend the meeting and as a result, those conversations were hearsay. Staff preferred Option 3, but he did not feel it would work in the Town of Hideout. The intention of the proposal was to make the development look classy. Mr. Turner believed the Town Council should approve the development. Council Member Baier explained that the Council relied heavily on Staff. She did not doubt Mr. Taylor had spoken to Wasatch County Fire. While representatives were sometimes able to attend Town Council Meetings, she understood that Wasatch County Fire was very busy. She was grateful that Mr. Taylor was able to relay the facts of those conversations. The Council intended to strike the right balance between aesthetics and safety. Council Member Dwinell and Mayor Rubin expressed appreciation for Staff.

There being no further public comments, Mayor Rubin closed public input at 8:46 p.m.

Council Member Baier was pleased about the twenty-nine (29)-foot offer from Mr. Gabler for Phase 3. She wondered if he would be willing to have a thirty-one (31)-foot road width for the future Shoreline phases. Mr. Gabler stated they would be willing to commit to twenty-nine (29) feet for the rest of the Shoreline development. Council Member Baier noted power lines were mentioned during public input. Most residents do not want to see power lines. Mr. Gabler explained there were two types of power lines through Shoreline including transmission and distribution lines. Some distribution lines had been moved. Several years ago, when he spoke to Rocky Mountain Power about the possibility of burying the lines, they were unwilling to do so. However, he could approach them again.

There was discussion regarding the potential to bury power lines. Mr. Taylor noted the issue which Mr. Brockbank brought up had more to do with aesthetics than safety. Council Member Baier stated power lines could be the source of wildfires. For safety and aesthetic purposes, it would be beneficial to bury the lines. Mr. Gabler clarified the distribution lines were moved by Rocky Mountain Power. The poles had tipped slightly but were stood back up vertically. Council Member Severini wondered if a plan could be put in place to maximize the viewshed. Mr. Taylor explained the intent of the new Town Code was to ensure power lines would be underground in all future development. Mayor Rubin commented Staff could look into a potential Pole Master Plan to improve the viewshed.

Council continued the discussion related to road widths. Council Member Dwinell was pleased Mr. Gabler had offered another foot of road width, but he was concerned the Council decision would set a precedent. While an exception could be offered, he did not want to set a precedent by doing so. Additionally, if the current Code was not specific enough or needed to be changed, the Council would likely need to look at it again. Council Member Dwinell understood different Fire Districts had different interpretations, but Wasatch County Fire was clear about what they wanted.

Council Member Haselton asked if it was possible to have the road be twenty-six (26) feet which would allow the storm drain to occupy the remaining three (3) feet. Mayor Rubin pointed out Option 3 did that. He believed it created more issues than Option 1 with the additional one (1) foot. Mr. Gabler explained the updated Option 1 would add an extra foot of asphalt but keep the same curb and gutter design. He believed that was fair.

Council Member Severini asked if Option 3 was still the preferred Staff option. Mr. Taylor reported based on earlier discussions, Option 3 was how Staff had prepared the Staff Report. Option 3 met the Town Code and the intent of separating the stormwater and snow storage from the road. The ultimate decision would be up to the Town Council. Council Member Dwinell was not a fan of Option 3. He wanted to understand why Option 3 would be preferred by Staff. It was noted the setback was not as impacted as much with Option 3. Council Member Haselton wondered how Option 3 was more of a benefit than Option 1. Mr. Taylor did not know that it was necessarily more beneficial. There were two styles of road including a more formal urban style with curb and gutter and a more rural style without curb and gutter. The Town had both. Council Member Haselton was torn on an appropriate road width.

Council Member Dwinell asked if it would be possible to make an exception for the setback rather than the road width. Mr. Taylor explained this had been discussed with the applicant. Mr. Budge appreciated the creative suggestion but noted the setbacks were an Ordinance. The appropriate process would involve seeking a variance. He reported a variance was a very different process and five (5) criteria needed to be met, which were set by State Code. Mr. Gabler added he would not want to have eighteen (18) or fifteen (15)-foot driveways.

Council Member Baier thanked Messrs. Eddington and Taylor for their work as well as Mr. Gabler for being willing to entertain different options. With the twenty-nine (29)-foot proposal offered by Mr. Gabler, the exact Wasatch Fire Code standards might not be met but the development would be much closer. This was a level of compromise she had not expected. She felt there had been good conversations with the developer. As a Council, it was important to consider the give and take. She was concerned about setting a precedent and it was important to find a way to make an exception without doing so. Council Member Dwinell agreed but was not sure how the Council could avoid setting a precedent. Mayor Rubin believed it was a matter of legal opinion. The development was vested under the old Code and it was under a different MDA. If the Council chose to adopt the

twenty-nine (29)-foot option, it would be wider than almost anything on the uphill side of Town or anything in the pre-existing Town.

Mayor Rubin agreed with Mr. Gabler about the driveway lengths. Shortened driveways were more likely to cause interference with the flow of traffic than the occasional event where there was snow and ice in an emergency. Council Member Dwinell also preferred the longer driveways but had been trying to come up with some creative solutions. Mr. Eddington explained that if the Council wanted to make an exception for the development it would be important to include some of the reasons in the Ordinance.

Council Member Severini felt there had been a good compromise made with the offer for the additional foot of road width. He believed that added more value to the Option 1 proposal. Option 3 would likely cost the Town more in the long run due to repairs and maintenance. Council Member Severini discussed the issue of precedent and noted that there was a lack of additional input from Wasatch County Fire. He would prefer to hear more about the reasons behind their recommendation. Council Member Severini was willing to compromise but did not want to have the same conversations for each phase of the development. He wondered if the developer would be willing to meet the current Town Code requirements for the future phases.

Mr. Taylor noted some good points had been raised related to the Town Code. It may be appropriate to grant an exception for Phase 3 and then agree to revisit the Town Code in the future. Council Member Dwinell outlined the developments which were approved prior to the 2020 Town Code, including Deer Springs, Deer Waters and Lakeview Estates, in which all had agreed to include thirty-one (31)-foot road widths. Only Shoreline could claim a precedent was set. If the Council could receive a commitment from the developer for thirty-one (31)-foot road widths for the future phases, there would be no issue of precedent.

Council Member Nadelberg believed the streets in the Shoreline development were too narrow. He felt it was a safety hazard and the overall level of safety was non-negotiable. He could not approve the narrower streets and did not feel comfortable going against the Wasatch County Fire recommendation.

Council Member Severini wondered if Mr. Gabler would be willing to make a determination on road widths for future phases. Mr. Gabler explained since they did not know what future phases would look like, it was difficult to make a commitment to thirty-one (31)-foot road widths. However, he was willing to commit to at least twenty-nine (29) feet on all future phases. Mayor Rubin was unable to vote on the matter but considered this to be a solid step forward and a good compromise. Council Member Baier agreed. She wanted to see the Council move forward with Phase 3 and the twenty-nine (29)-foot road widths knowing that the future phases would not be less than twenty-nine (29) feet. The updated version of Option 1 made the most sense.

Council Member Severini liked that direction but hoped Mr. Gabler would be willing to work with Messrs. Eddington and Taylor to get as close to thirty-one (31) feet as possible in future phases while the Town looked at the Town Code to consider modifications. Mr. Gabler stated that they could make the commitment to not do less than twenty-nine (29) feet on all future roads. He would be willing to look at the roads further as long as the Council could look at possibly amending the Town Code. Council Member Severini felt that was fair. Council Member Dwinell believed the intention was to strive to meet the new Town Code wherever possible. He was on the same page as Council Member Baier given the commitments Mr. Gabler had made. There was discussion about potential

language to add to the Conclusions of Law section of the Ordinance. For instance, future phases would not be less than twenty-nine (29) feet and where possible, could be increased. Town Council would also agree to look at the Town Code.

Mr. Eddington reported he made amendments to the Ordinance during the Council Member discussions. He explained the Ordinance remained the same as in the packet except for the changes made, which were highlighted in yellow. The changes were overviewed:

- Language related to Phase 2 had been clarified to state: Phase 2A Amended;
- The Findings of Fact section noted the applicant proposed a twenty-nine (29)-foot road, with twenty-four (24) feet of asphalt, plus five (5) feet of mountable curb;
- Option 3, which had twenty-six (26) feet of asphalt with swales and the related conditions had been removed
- The Conditions of Approval section stated streets would be constructed to twenty-nine (29) feet, with twenty-four (24) feet of asphalt and five (5) feet of mountable curb. This was based on the unique circumstances outlined:
 - Topography and density in Phase 3;
 - The time the applicant had dedicated to the project, which involved a substantial amount of effort related to the layout;
 - The applicant had agreed to roads not less than twenty-nine (29) feet and would look into additional opportunities to meet the 2020 Town Code
- Clarifications were made related to the proposed architecture and variation;
- The developer agreed to dedicate a 10x10 area to connect to State Park lands for possible future trail connections;
- The applicant would work with the adjacent developer and Rocky Mountain Power to explore whether it was possible to relocate the previously placed utility poles underground; and
- There was language related to the emergency access road requirement. If the connection with Lakeview did not occur, the developer would commit to snow plowing the emergency access road if the connection with Lakeview was not asphalted by the fall.

Ms. McLean suggested adding language to specify the intent of the Council was the approval would not set a precedent for future phases related to road widths less than twenty-nine (29) feet. Discussions were had about the best language for a condition specifying that no C/O's would be assigned in Phase 3 until the permanent road is in place or there is a suitable emergency access road.

Council Member Baier noted the Council had not discussed what would happen to the emergency access road once the permanent secondary access road was available. She wondered if it would be restored to become a trail. Mayor Rubin explained it could become a trail but it needed to be something emergency vehicles could drive on, in case the other roads are blocked. This had already been agreed to in prior approvals. He added Wasatch County Fire requested in the event of an

emergency, the emergency access road not be restored in a way which would prevent a vehicle from using the road. Suitable language was discussed. Mayor Rubin explained, stating the emergency access road could be converted to a trail – accessible by emergency and utility vehicles – would be appropriate.

Mayor Rubin thanked Staff for their hard work and Mr. Gabler for his willingness to compromise. Council Member Nadelberg wanted to confirm voting in favor of the Ordinance, as revised, would allow there to be a one-time exception to reduce the road width recommended by Wasatch County Fire. Mayor Rubin confirmed this and asked for a motion from the Council.

Motion: Council Member Dwinell moved to adopt an Ordinance to approve the Shoreline Phase 2A Amended and Phase 3 Subdivisions, located in Hideout, Utah, as modified. Council Member Severini made the second. Voting Yea: Council Members Baier, Dwinell, Haselton, and Severini. Voting Nay: Council Member Nadelberg. Motion passed 4-1.

3. Continued Public Hearing and Review of the Fraud Risk Assessment Questionnaire and Discuss Ways to Improve Controls for the Town of Hideout.

Town Administrator Jan McCosh reported the above item was related to the Fraud Risk Assessment Questionnaire. It was a new requirement from the State to reduce risk in financial operations. She identified the biggest issues with the assistance of Town Treasurer, Wes Bingham, which related to the separation of duties. Ms. McCosh explained during the COVID-19 pandemic, when everyone was working from home, the separation of duties shifted. The Town was fortunate enough to add another Staff Member and would be able to move forward with a better separation of duties.

Mayor Rubin informed the Council the State issued guidelines and the Fraud Risk Assessment Questionnaire. He overviewed the questionnaire and explained points were awarded based on the answers. Mr. Bingham and Ms. McCosh determined that the Town of Hideout currently has 270 points. One of the issues was that the Town is weak on written policy. He stated in 2019, the Council was asked to commit to the Ethical Behavior Practices, but it had not been done in 2020 due to Staff turnover. However, as long as all Council Members were willing to respond to the document before June 30, 2021, the Town would gain an additional 20 points. Doing so would move the Town of Hideout from 270 points to 290 points, which would give the Town a moderate rating. Mayor Rubin believed it was possible to address the gaps and move into a low-risk category fairly quickly.

Council Member Dwinell asked what the score was previously for the Town of Hideout. Mayor Rubin explained this was a new format. Ideally, the Town wanted to be in the low-risk category. Council Member Baier felt the goal should be to move into the low-risk category. She asked about a potential timeline to handle the written policies. Ms. McCosh explained she and the Mayor had a meeting set for Friday to address some of the issues. Additionally, a new Staff Member had recently started, which would allow the Town to further separate duties and create policies. Mayor Rubin believed before the Fraud Risk Assessment Questionnaire was due the following year, all of the necessary policies would be in place. Council Member Baier suggested a quarterly report to highlight what had been accomplished and what still needed to be done. Mayor Rubin was in support of the idea.

Mayor Rubin opened the public hearing at 10:10 p.m. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed at 10:11 p.m.

IV. Public Input - Floor Open to Any Attendee to Speak on Items Not Listed on the Agenda

At 10:12 p.m., Mayor Rubin opened the public input portion of the meeting. He reported there had been several emails submitted from residents. Two constituents had commented on Shoreline Road. One was a walk-in comment and another was an email. It was noted that speeding was still an issue on Shoreline Road. Mayor Rubin explained there had been Sheriff Department presence and speed signs were posted. He noted the Town could look into a temporary or removable speed bump as well as additional speed signs. Mayor Rubin reported an email was received in support of the Dark Skies Ordinance. He believed Mr. Eddington would provide an update on that Ordinance at the July 8, 2021, Town Council Meeting. Another email was received to voice concerns about the power lines by Shoreline. If there were still concerns after inspection, Mr. Taylor would contact Rocky Mountain Power.

Council Member Baier stated there were occasions where she wanted to respond to some of the questions in the shared email mailbox. However, she did not have permission to do so. Mayor Rubin explained that Staff usually answered the emails to ensure the responses were consistent. Council Member Baier asked anyone from the public who wanted to hear from a specific Council Member remember to send the email to the specific Council Member's email address.

Brian Reever shared comments related to the emergency access road which was discussed during the Shoreline development portion of the meeting. It sounded like the emergency access road would remain even after the secondary access was connected. Mayor Rubin confirmed this but clarified it would be fenced on both ends. It was a requirement of Wasatch County Fire. Mr. Reever noted this was a surprise because many were expecting the emergency access road would become a ten (10)-foot trail rather than remain a twenty-six (26)-foot emergency access road. Mayor Rubin explained when the plat was approved by the Town Council, it was included in the approvals. He did not know it needed to remain the full twenty-six (26) feet and asked Mr. Taylor to look into this further.

There was no further public input. The public input portion of the meeting was closed at 10:24 p.m.

V. Agenda Items

1. Discussion and Possible Approval of an Adjustment for Planning Fees and Water Rate Increase.

Mr. Eddington overviewed the adjustments for Planning Fees. Over the last year, some changes had been made and application fees were created to include overage costs. He shared the Planning Fees chart with Council and highlighted the Concept Review as an example. The current fee was \$2,000 which was divided between Planning, Engineering, and the Town. Mr. Eddington explained the approach was challenging because there was not always enough and then the Town needed to collect the money. As a result, the proposed adjustment would see some changes made to the fees. For instance, the Concept Review would shift from \$2,000 to a \$1,000 application fee and a \$2,500 escrow fee with one Planning Commission Meeting. At the bottom of the Planning Fees chart, there was information about the costs associated with extra meetings. Mr. Eddington reported an analysis was done on neighboring communities and the proposal was in line with other areas.

Council Member Dwinell wondered if there was a system in place in terms of accounting. Ms. McCosh reported the Town was in the process of making refinements to the accounting system to accurately reflect the changes in billing. Fine-tuning was still taking place. Mayor Rubin explained

the system had the functionality, but needed to be set up appropriately to manage the changes. Discussions were had about the escrow fees. Mayor Rubin stated if there were any funds left after approval, the remaining funds would be returned to the applicant.

Ms. McCosh discussed the changes related to the Water Service Rates. She explained Jordanelle Special Service District (“JSSD”) increased its water rates the previous year. However, the Budget Committee decided not to pass that increase on to residents at that time due to the uncertainty of the COVID-19 pandemic. There was another increase this year. As a result, the proposed fee increase was a two-year increase, as it would account for the previous year increase as well. Council Member Dwinell wondered if the rates listed were the direct JSSD rates or if there was some overhead added. Ms. McCosh reported the rates listed were from JSSD. However, the sewer rate had a small administration fee.

Mayor Rubin was concerned about having enough to take care of maintenance for the system. Ms. McCosh believed the Council would need to plan on that type of increase the following year. There needed to be further study about what the costs would be. Mayor Rubin stated the current proposal was to increase the rates but it was important to recognize the rates may need to be revisited in the future. Council Member Baier wanted to know what would happen if the Resolution was not adopted during the current Town Council Meeting. Mayor Rubin stated money was lost each month. He would rather the Resolution be adopted and looked at again rather than the Town continue to lose money. Ms. McCosh reported there would be an announcement on the next bill if the Resolution was approved. The new rates would become effective as of August 1, 2021.

Motion: Council Member Haselton moved to approve a Resolution Adopting Fee Schedules and Policies for Planning, Subdivision, Sign Code, Water Impact Fees, and Water Service Use and Other Fees. Council Member Nadelberg made the second. Voting Yea: Council Members Baier, Dwinell, Haselton, Nadelberg and Severini. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Discussion and Consideration of an Ordinance Amending Hideout Code Title 6, Chapter 8 Fireworks & Ignition Sources.

Ms. McLean reported at the last Town Council Meeting, there was discussion about fireworks and ignition sources. She had since suggested some adjustments be made to the language. Town Attorney, Cameron Platt, had also been working on the proposed language and looked into different restrictions across the State. Ms. McLean believed the language could be simplified, and shared a proposed update for Title 6, Chapter 8. She explained the Town of Hideout was considered a high-risk area. The proposed changes would remove the negligence standard and state the following:

- No open flames, except campfires built within facilities provided for them in improved campgrounds, picnic areas, or permanently improved places of habitation

Ms. McLean stated the language would allow residents to have an open flame near their home. Mayor Rubin did not believe it was wise to have open flames in a backyard fire pit. It was an ember source and the embers could be picked up by the wind which could lead to fires in dry areas. The only way to prevent that was not to allow open flames outside. Ms. McLean offered to rework the language and bring the Ordinance back to the Council for review at a future meeting.

3. Discussion and Consideration of an Ordinance Providing for Municipal Restriction of Fireworks and Ignition Sources within all Portions of the Town of Hideout and Adoption of a Map of the Restricted Area.

Ms. McLean reported the State Code allowed for the ban of fireworks, but the Town needed to explain the decision. The packet contained a letter from Wasatch County Fire regarding Full Fire Restrictions. It included all of the restrictions imposed by the State of Utah under the Stage 2 Fire Restrictions. Ms. McLean explained the letter stated the Town of Hideout was a high fire risk. Section 1 of the Ordinance allowed for fireworks to be banned year-round. Section 2 of the Ordinance included the following language:

- No cutting, welding, or grinding metal in areas of dry vegetation, unless the areas where the work is being done is thoroughly wetted down and the areas are kept wet throughout the process;
- No operating a motorcycle, chainsaw, ATV, or other small internal combustion engine without an approved and working spark arrestor; and
- Building, maintaining, attending, or using any fire campfire or stove fire is prohibited until November 15, 2021. This included charcoal grills and barbecues, coal and wood-burning stoves, and tent stoves and included use at homes and in developed camping and picnic grounds

Mayor Rubin asked what the difference was between Title 6, Chapter 8, and the proposed Ordinance. Ms. McLean explained the Ordinance was an annual Ordinance required by State Code. It would allow the Town to ban fireworks due to dangerous conditions. It needed to be passed for the July holidays. Council Member Haselton asked about enforcement at Ross Creek on the July 4th weekend. Mayor Rubin reported the ban the County put in place would cover that area. However, Staff could reach out to Jordanelle State Park to find out what their enforcement plan was.

Council Member Baier asked about enforcement in the Town of Hideout. Mayor Rubin noted they did not have the resources to patrol throughout the night. Residents could call the Sheriff's Department, if necessary. Alternatively, residents could capture proof of a violation on a cell phone or write down the date, time, and person responsible to file a complaint the following day. The Council noted there were signs posted throughout the Town to let residents know about the restrictions.

Motion: Council Member Baier moved to adopt an Ordinance providing for the municipal restriction of fireworks and ignition sources within all portions of the Town of Hideout. Council Member Haselton made the second. Voting Yea: Council Members Baier, Dwinell, Haselton, Nadelberg and Severini. None opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Discussion and Determination of June 29, 2021, Board of Canvassers Meeting held In-Person or Via Zoom Conference Call.

Town Clerk, Alicia Fairbourne asked the Council Members to discuss whether they would prefer to hold the Board of Canvassers Meeting in-person or via Zoom. There was nothing stated explicitly in the law requiring the proclamation to be signed the same day. It could be signed the next day. Council Member Baier preferred a Zoom meeting. She wondered if the Council would need to come

to Town Hall to sign the proclamation. Ms. Fairbourne explained Staff would coordinate a time for the Council Members to sign. It was determined that the meeting would be held via Zoom.

I. Closed Executive Session - Discussion of Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation, Personnel Matters and/or Sale or Acquisition of Real Property, as Needed.

There being no further public business, Ms. McLean reported that she had a brief update to share with Council Members and Mayor Rubin asked for a motion to close the public portion of the meeting in order to hold a closed Executive Session.

Motion: Council Member Nadelberg moved to close the public portion of the meeting and move into a Closed Executive Session for discussion of pending or reasonably imminent litigation, personnel matters, and/or the sale or acquisition of real property. Council Member Haselton made the second. Voting Aye: Council Members Baier, Dwinell, Haselton, Nadelberg and Severini. None opposed.

At 11:08 p.m., the public session was closed and the meeting moved into a Closed Executive Session.

After a short recess, the Closed Executive Session convened at 11:13 p.m.

Present: Mayor Phil Rubin
Council Member Chris Baier
Council Member Jerry Dwinell
Council Member Carol Haselton
Council Member Bob Nadelberg
Council Member Ralph Severini

Staff Present: Town Attorney Polly McLean

VI. Meeting Adjournment

At 11:35 p.m., Mayor Rubin asked for a motion to move into public session and adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Council Member Nadelberg moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Haselton made the second. Voting Yea: Council Members Baier, Dwinell, Haselton, Nadelberg and Severini. None opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 p.m.




Alicia Fairbourne, Town Clerk