COUNCIL MINUTES
FEBRUARY 23, 2022

The City Council held a meeting on Wednesday, February 23, 2022, at 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 10 North Main Street, Cedar City, Utah.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Garth O. Green; Councilmembers: Terri Hartley; Craig Isom; W. Tyler Melling; Scott Phillips; Ronald Riddle.

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager Paul Bittmenn; City Attorney Tyler Romeril; City Recorder Renon Savage; Finance Director Jason Norris; City Engineer Jonathan Stathis; Police Chief Darin Adams; Fire Chief Mike Phillips; Airport Manager Nick Holt; Heritage Manager Jason Clark; City Planner Don Boudreau.


CALL TO ORDER: Pastor Pete Akin of Cedar City Foursquare gave the invocation; the pledge was led by Mike Phillips.

AGENDA ORDER APPROVAL: Mayor – we need to remove item #3 from the agenda, the item has been pulled. Councilmember Phillips moved to approve the agenda order removing item #3; second by Councilmember Hartley; vote unanimous.

ADMINISTRATION AGENDA – MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS: STAFF COMMENTS: ■ I want to express appreciation to all of you for spending the day at the retreat, it was a long day. It helped me get up to speed. We are beginning the budget time. We will try and make everyone happy. ■ Hartley – I need to be excused on March 9th, I will be out of town, if needed I can call in.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: ■ Randy Cagle – I enjoyed the Council retreat and hear the council’s ideas. Item 10 is the master plan we discussed last week. Melling – I have a conflict so I will during that and during this leave the chambers for discussion. ■ Randy – I didn’t realize it was Councilman Mellings father. I sent an email about what it is zoned in the County. Mr. Melling tried to change that years ago and there was a lot of protest and that is why it is ranch estates. We would like it to remain that. The County people don’t understand how Cedar City can affect county land. I tried to explain the master plan and how it will dictate issues. They are concerned with having medium density residential. On the master plan leave it as shown and zoned in the County and when they annex there will be a public hearing and people can voice their opinion. Hartley – when I looked at the Master Plan, I see two County parcels that are islands in the City master plan with R-2 surrounding them. I know the County has different things on their plan. The City General Plan I see medium
density all the way around other than the County islands. ▪Jerry Munson, I live on 3000, this is in the middle of everything, I don’t see a reason, there are projects down the road that are ½ acre lots that have all sold. People are coming here that want some land. I think you should think about that before you get into it. There is not water going that far other than wells on the property. There is more to it than redoing it and building, so think about it. Hartley – it is touched on the east and west medium density and the north and south rural estates. Jerry – our water system is against their boundaries. Hartley – they would have to design around that. ▪ Jason Carter – I appreciate you listening to us. I live on an acre south of this at 2650 North. I was part of the aggressive discussion in 2007, there was a room of double this many people all against the project. I don’t understand the zoning to the west. Phillips – all the brown is medium density. Jason – there are 8 acres north and the property Jerry talked about. Hartley – Flying L is island parcels of County. Jason – I think the zoning was brought in after Flying L, there are huge parcels. Hartley – the City master planned that in 2012 as R-2 development, I was not a part of that. That is why the parcels are developing that way around you. Jason – wouldn’t you like to include that in rural lots and make it one big contiguous piece of property. We know what is going on throughout the city and the valley and we moved there for a reason, I have been there since 2007. There is a lot of emotion in breaking down a piece of property. I understand everything, you can’t even buy large lots and I think it makes sense. I want him to do well, I know he has paid his taxes. We are emotional, we live there, but I also understand it is not my property. On both ends is rural lots. The brown around it is large lots with homes such as ranch type estates. Hartley – I have been looking closely at this. I am uncomfortable with it being changed because Mr. Melling has owned that property that has been master planned and it is not fair to him for that to switch. Jason – there was a reason it didn’t change in 2012. Hartley – I don’t know if it was changed in 2012, we had a master plan before that. Jason – I think there is a reason we are discussing that. Hartley – no decision has been made. Jason – it doesn’t feel like that. ▪Jane Hawkes – I live on 2575 North, the MDR Commercial is on the top of two existing single-family homes. Hartley – that is also under discussion. Phillips – if it stayed nothing would happen unless they sale the property. ▪Jeff Rushton - I live in Flying L. I want to address two things, there is a natural separation of Coal Creek with trees, it still makes the area feel rural and spread out. If you would please consider, I understand not wanting to do damage to the property owners, but please consider our stake in it also. Hartley – maybe a question we need to have asked, prior to 2012 do we know what the master plan had the property shown? The developer of Flying L chose to do R-1 lots, he was not forced to. Jonathan – I would have to research that. Jeff – that is the separation, we didn’t know there was a master plan, we bought in the county. ▪Giani Julander, Frontier Homestead State Park, we have a special exhibit sponsored by Utah Humanities and it is on water and the importance of water. We will have activities with the exhibit, it is open now, but the grand opening will be March 4th at 5:30 p.m. Mayor –I reviewed it, it is stark and blunt but very interesting. Giani – it goes through May.

CONSENT AGENDA: (1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES DATED FEBRUARY 2 & 9, 2022; (2) APPROVE BILLS DATED FEBRUARY 18, 2022; (3) APPROVE A SINGLE EVENT ALCOHOL PERMIT FOR A MARDI GRAS BEER GARDEN, FEBRUARY 26TH FROM 1 P.M. – 6 P.M. AT POLICY KINGS BREWERY, 223 NORTH 100 WEST. POLICY KINGS BREWERY; (4) APPROVE FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR
THE BLUFF AT SOUTH MOUNTAIN PHASE 1 SUBDIVISION. GO CIVIL/TYLER ROMERIL; (5) APPROVE VICINITY PLAN FOR THE DIAMONTI INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 3325 W. SR-56. PLATT & PLATT/DON BOUDREAU; (6) APPROVE A NEW HANGAR LEASE AT THE AIRPORT. CHRIS & REBECCA SAUNDERS/NICK HOLT; (7) APPROVE AIRPORT GRANT APPLICATION FOR AIP 045. NICK HOLT; (8) APPROVE AIRPORT GRANT APPLICATION FOR AIP 044. NICK HOLT: Councilmember Phillips moved to approve the consent agenda items as written above omitting item #3; second by Councilmember Hartley; vote unanimous.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONE FROM MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (MPD) TO DWELLING SINGLE-UNIT (R-2-1) FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT HIGHWAY 56 4700 WEST. GO CIVIL/TYLER ROMERIL: Dallas Buckner, Go Civil – this is the Iron West project. Phillips where on 56? Dallas – behind the SUU parcel.

Councilmember Phillips moved to approve the zone change from MPD to R-2-1 for property located at Highway 56 & 4700 West; seconded by Councilmember Isom; roll call vote as follows:

- Terri Hartley - AYE
- Craig Isom - AYE
- Tyler Melling - AYE
- Scott Phillips - AYE
- Ronald Riddle - AYE

CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING A COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE CITY’S GENERAL PLAN. RURAL COMMUNITY CONSULTANTS/ JONATHAN STATHIS: Don Boudreau – last week we entertained the comprehensive update to the general plan and there were discussions. We did not receive any detailed direction. Staff is not proposing any changes from last week.

Phillips – I read the entire text and offered suggestions to you and Mr. Hanson. I am not prepared at this time. I have looked at the general land use map. I would propose tabling this until we have time to review and address the map. I don’t know the appropriate timeline with Hartley being gone. Paul – work meetings are on the 2nd and the 16th in March. Phillips – I have not had time to discuss with citizens at large. Hartley – I know I won’t be to the next action meeting. Isom – we can grind through it the first work meeting in March and have a good idea of what changes are wanted. Hartley – I can call in to the meeting if necessary. Riddle – I want more discussion, I am not totally comfortable, I question some things maybe because of my lack of understanding.

Councilmember Phillips moved to table adopting the general plan update until March 2nd; seconded by Councilmember Hartley; roll call vote as follows:

- Terri Hartley - AYE
CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING A COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE CITY'S TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN. AVENUE CONSULTANTS/ JONATHAN STATHIS: Exhibit “A” is the proposed map. Phillips – I think Avenue Consultants have done a great job and I have looked at it closely. I have a few issues; I think it is important to keep Westview as a major corridor master planned 100-foot road. I would like 3900 West running further south, I realize it goes through SUU Farm, it may not happen, but if something happened there I would like it designated. I would also like to abandon the road through South Mountain portion. It is not because Mr. Hansen has concerns, I am not sure its purpose for us. We abandoned a road going into Old Sorrel Subdivision to the north. I don’t see how it serves the community.

Melling – a little south of there, there is a planned interchange where #218 is and it seems UDOT may move it to the west a little to line up with Westview Drive. If that is the case I want to make sure on our master plan that the frontage road on the north side of the interchange connects to Providence Center Drive, that will be the main access. Hartley – I agree, it needs to come from Hwy 91 or to South Mountain and I don’t know if it interferes with the RDO. Melling – the other element to that, the green line is wider than the yellow. Providence Center line should extend to South Mountain, should the yellow line also be green into Providence Center Drive. Jonathan - yellow is 55 and green is 75-foot road. Melling – you will want a clear access to get to Providence Center Drive. Paul - you want to connect it all the way to Old Highway 91. Melling – yes, if they move the interchange westward.

Paul – does the council want to designate Westview Drive as the preferred place for a new interchange. You can make those recommendations, UDOT may look at it. Phillips – if you refer to the general land use map, that area is designated to be commercial, that makes more sense with the interchange. It is a better place than where it is now shown. Mayor – I don’t think they want to use the fly over for the interchange. Phillips – UDOT said they would look at the Westview location. Riddle – Westview is designated 100-foot road but is not yet? Yes. How do we deal with that when we want a 100’ but your building is in the way? Hartley – for several years the Engineering Department has been buying the right-of-way, they are not done. Phillips – you saw the model; you saw the projected growth to the southern area. Melling – we will have a bottle neck unless we make sure it connects. Phillips – my recommendation is to look at the Westview Drive as the interchange and Old Highway 91 to Providence Center Drive and eliminating 161 over the top. Melling – it extends western of the dotted purple line and the road vacated connects to Westview to the north.

Paul – the feedback is to keep Westview 100 feet wide to the north and south. Extend 3900 South through the SUU Farm and master plan to connect into Westview Drive. Abandon road connecting South Mountain Drive into Iron Horse. Designate Westview and I-15 as the
preferred location of the new southern interchange and connect Westview to Providence Center Drive.

Jonathan – the reason for the offset on Providence Center Drive is because of the topography, there will need to be a jog west and that is why the dotted line at the intersection. Do you want it all green and to South Mountain Drive? yes.

Melling – do you think it is ok to make this vote or do we need to run it through the models? Jonathan – I talked with Thomas, he ran the model eliminating the dotted purple line and didn’t see any negative impacts. The dotted line along Cross Hollow Hills, there is already lots shown there, it would need to be 55’ instead of 66’. Melling – I am ok with making it a 55’ foot road, it is an inconvenient way to get to Cross Hollows Drive. Mayor – there are some lots on the 66-foot road. Jonathan – those are in the County. There is a proposal to eliminate a master planned road. When it came through the Council discussed keeping it a through street at Industrial Road, east of MTI, by the old Coleman Plant. Paul – you refused to remove it but let them move it to go north. We would leave it a city street. Melling – can we leave it on there and override it when it comes through. Paul – can I suggest a foot note to keep it, but not at a 55’ road.

Tom Jett – what is the purpose of the road adjacent to the freeway? Hartley – that goes to the Animal Shelter. Tom – what are they planning to do? Phillips – we want to keep the road as a pass-through street, but not a 66’ wide street. Tom the other is the dirt road behind Fort Cedar, and it will go through the City road department? Paul – it is a master plan.

Jonathan – the Fort Cedar Blvd. to the north, that intersection is offset from where they want to bring the city street through. By Engineering Standards streets need to be aligned for safety. The curves don’t meet city standards, it is too tight. Phillips – it needs to meet City Standards. Melling – you lose some area; they will have to figure that to make it conform. Until we have a final plat keep it on the master plan to have it extend to Industrial Road. Paul – as long as it is in the adopted plan the Engineers can go to the developer with the information. Melling – we had those discussions with the developer when they came in.

Councilmember Isom moved to adopt the comprehensive update to the City’s Transportation Master Plan keeping Westview 100-feet and north south. Extend 3900 South through the SUU Farm and master plan to connect into Westview Drive. Abandon road connecting South Mountain Drive into Iron Horse. Designate Westview and I-15 as the preferred location of the new southern interchange and connect Westview to Providence Center Drive and changing the road to 55’ instead of 66’ along Cross Hollow Road, and a foot note for the road from Industrial to 400 North to keep a north/south road open; seconded by Councilmember Hartley; roll call vote as follows:

Terri Hartley - AYE
Craig Isom - AYE
Tyler Melling - AYE
Scott Phillips - AYE
Ronald Riddle - AYE
CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING A COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE CITY’S ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN, AVENUE
CONSULTANTS/JONATHAN STATHIS: Jonathan – it was presented last week. My recommendation is to adopt this as an overlay to the trails master plan so the trails around the edge of town are preserved. Melling – do we need to make any adjustments based on the changes to the transportation master plan? Can we approve it if the transportation plan removed roads then the paths also be removed? Tyler – that is clear.

Councilmember Melling moved to adopt the comprehensive update to the City’s Active Transportation Master Plan with amendments to the Transportation Plan removed roads the trails be adjusted accordingly and that it be an overlay to the existing City Trails Master Plan; seconded by Councilmember Phillips; roll call vote as follows:

- Terri Hartley - AYE
- Craig Isom - AYE
- Tyler Melling - AYE
- Scott Phillips - AYE
- Ronald Riddle - AYE

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 38 OF THE CITY’S ORDINANCES REGARDING DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT DESIGN AND INSTALLATION STANDARDS. SUNRISE ENGINEERING/JONATHAN STATHIS: Phillips – I know you didn’t hear from us over the week. My concern is the overall volume of the change to our detention. First you can see what the volume and cost does for developments, but I am concerned what it does aesthetically. We have a few and they are not well taken care of. Whose responsibility is it to take care of it. I know on retention in the ordinance it is the private owners responsibility. Jonathan – in City Standards, it must serve 160 acres for the city to own and maintain. Otherwise, it is on the private property owner or the homeowners association. Phillips – do we have recourse if they don’t? Jonathan – it is a code enforcement issue. Phillips – I have concerns about the cost it will bring to development and what it will look like.

Melling – I am worried about the cost but looking at the cost per acre impact I think we were looking at $300 to $500 per lot, and for lifetime flood insurance that is pretty good. There seems that the current standard does not capture it. We need to look at depths instead of larger basins that are 3 feet deep depending on the property and place safeguards for children. For a child 3’ is as dangerous as 6’. Weeds reduces visibility, but our standard needs revision. As written, do we have options on depth? Jonathan – retention is 3’, detention does not have a maximum, but there is a maximum on retention. Paul – we set that, it is not a State or Federal mandate. Jonathan – looking at other cities, the 3’ is typical. Mr. Watson brought up the idea of more fencing for a deterrent and for safety. Going deeper you get more recharge in the aquifer. When originally written the intent was the 3’ was for safety.

Phillips – we are proposing a change in Section 38-3-4D-1 is it a different name. Jonathan – a different name and additional requirements in the report. More in depth, it was patterned off St. George City. Phillips – will we have the opportunity to make sure the various
engineers and developers know the requirements? Jonathan – yes, it would be in the Engineering Standards. Jonathan – we can look at a 50-year storm versus 100-year if you want. Tyler – you should make a decision on engineering, not cost to the developer, when the flood comes, and they come to council and say the independent engineering study said this and you didn’t do it, it concerns me. One other suggestion, if you approve this tonight, in the motion we adopted what it is telling us to do in the engineering standards already, so make it that the standards conform with the change.

Joel Hansen – as a developer, I agree with Tyler, I am not looking for a cheap way out, I want to make sure we have the drainage that saves us and the City as much as possible. One thing we did talk about a few weeks ago, if the master plan drainage study on South Mountain, I have a large drainage channel I have to put in, what is the impact on that drainage channel as it is written today, 10’ wide 6’ deep. If we change it to this, what does it change to? I do not debate it needs to be built the right way based on engineering standards, I would just like to understand the mathematics of it. The other thing I am cautious of is the fence around stuff like that. I have an issue with safety. You go to Phoenix they have a major canal running through the city with no fence and there is a bike path and walking trail around it, you have to pay attention to what you are doing. Warning signs, yes, but to fence it is a detraction from what it is aesthetically and over burdensome to make it a regulation. Most kids like to climb fences. As I build the drainage wash, an open wash through South Mountain to the west, as a rip rap I want the walking trail along the side of it. I don’t want a fence when it has water once every 750 days. Error on the side of caution that people need to take some responsibility for themselves. Try and make the community and an amenity to be there with a walking trail. A chain link fence is ugly.

Melling – the detention ponds retain a large volume for a long time, how does the update affect existing drainage canals and channels? How does that impact the process of a development? Jonathan – if the development is in process, we can’t change it. Sunrise is still working on the storm drain master plan and that would change projects not vested. Melling – this would not change channels until we adopt the storm drain master plan. Correct.

Phillips - how are RDO’s vested? Tyler – the Council said they do not vest in City Master Plans.

Councilmember Isom moved to approve amending Chapter 38 regarding drainage improvement design & installation standards; seconded by Councilmember Melling; roll call vote as follows:

- Terri Hartley - AYE
- Craig Isom - AYE
- Tyler Melling - AYE
- Scott Phillips - NAY
- Ronald Riddle - AYE

Hartley – is the fence requirement in there or not? Yes, minimum 41”.
A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CITY PERSONNEL POLICY. NATASHA HIRSCH: Paul – this is for the police department (PD) only, when you hire an employee they have a 6 month probation, if not performing we can part ways without specified cause or long hearings, after that they vest with due process and if you discipline you have to have cause and hearings to defend themselves. The PD starts a person, sends them to POST and by the time they get back and on the road, they don’t have time to observe. Their 6-month probation will be when they come back and are in field training.

Councilmember Isom moved to approve the resolution amending the personnel policy; seconded by Councilmember Hartley; vote as follows:

AYE: ____5____
NAY: ____0____
ABSTAINED:0____

A RESOLUTION FOR THE REVISION TO THE 2021-2022 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET. JASON NORRIS: Hartley – we did get the proposal from Willowsticks, if we do the revision does that approve the Willowsticks, I haven’t had a chance to review it? Jason – it puts funding in place, but you would still have to contract and award the contract, this is the funding mechanism. Paul – the purchasing policy has provisions when we don’t have to bid, but any contract will come back because of the dollar amount. Melling – there was mention of a grant or two we received; I assume we will amend again. Jason – we will do another one at the end of the fiscal year.

Councilmember Melling moved to approve the resolution revising the 2021-2022 FY budget; seconded by Councilmember Phillips; vote as follows:

AYE: ____5____
NAY: ____0____
ABSTAINED:0____

CONSIDER INCLUDING ADS HP STORM DRAIN PIPE AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO CONCRETE STORM DRAIN PIPES. JONATHAN STATHIS: Jonathan – one issue we have been seeing is difficulty in obtaining concrete pipe with lead times. I invited representatives of ADS pipes.

Bill Aller, Engineer and Projects Manager for ADS Pipe – I am part of the field engineer I work in support of our territory managers with agencies and consultants to help design our systems correctly. Service life of the pipe it is typical 75 years, we do have independent testing from other agencies such as Florida DOT, Brackish Environments, they have determined a service life of 100 years. Brackish environments would include salt water. They install pipe along the Atlantic Ocean and observed it and determined that a life of 100 years is appropriate for the life of the pipe. It is also in a sanitary form, the reason is the ph ranges 1 ½ to 14 which means you can fill the pipe with sulfuric acid and it won’t react to it,
it will not corrode. So, if you look at stormwater and typical soils, the pipe has no reaction to that. Paul – how about strength, we now use reinforced concrete. Bill – two animals doing the same task. We are trying to convey stormwater. Reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) and polypropylene pipe as well as polyethylene pipe, we can accomplish the same loading as RCP pipe, and we do that with the interaction to the backfill. RCP is a rigid pipe that sheds loads differently than thermoplastic pipe that is flexible. In most cases RCP will require a 1-foot minimum cover and we do also, this reduces the load on top of the pipe and it also and sheds it into the backfill around it. He showed a video, 43” pipe 6’ long, unsupported piece of pipe, we are putting 14,000 lbs. per square foot on the pipe. When you look at 40,000 axle load, the pipe is supported. We are not rigid, but we can handle the load. We put the teeth of the bucket on the pipe, 3” per tooth, 18 square inches. You can see no protrusion through the pipe. As he lifts up there are dents and then it pops back round. We took a 24” pipe and put a monster excavator on it and we took the pipe and buried it and put an excavator on it and there was no affect. Once installed class I is premium backfill, no compaction, to 99 percent it is better, it provides more support. 2 or 3 classifications they are less and less structural, but not perform to that height of cover. HS 25 loading is about max you see here. Jonathan – we do HS 20. Bill – with a class 3 backfill which is minimum backfill and the pipe performed. We are approved by the FAA, and we will be putting it under a taxiway. Phillips – what is installation like? Bill – easy, we have a UDOT job in Davis County where they reduced the equipment size enough by using this and put the base in there is no need to dig for a bell and they saved a lot of money. Once competition is introduced the cost comes down. The installation is cheaper. Isom – is a 6’ pipe normal? Bill – no, 20’. Phillips – what is the supply like? Bill – 2 to 2.5 weeks out, we are national. UDOT wanted 45,000 feet of advantage and I was able to pull it in nationally in a week. Mayor – what is the product? Bill - It is polypropylene. He showed another accordion video. It is lined with a smooth interior; this was done in American Fork.

Mayor – how much more than N12? Ty - Pricing is 10-12% more than standard stocked. Mayor – over 24”. Ty - it starts at 12 inch and goes to 60 inches. Mayor – what is our proposal? Jonathan – greater than 48”. Mayor has Toquerville adopted this? Ty – they are an is HP only spec., Hurricane uses this and the black N12, St. George uses N12, Washington N12, Ivins is HP only, Richfield N12. Orem, American Fork, Logan we are in all their specs and approved by Utah APWA and UDOT specs and contractors like the HP better. it is gasketed, option of dual, we can use it in sanitary sewer line and the spicket has two gaskets. Two lines in Clark County 20” sewer line. Mayor – we supplied it through the Golf Course. Ty - We are not the only ones that make it, others use polypropylene, but we are local, we have a plant in Salt Lake. During the summer do you do any cross linking like HTPE?

Mayor – it is a process that strengthens it. Do they adapt, N12 to this product with an adapter? Ty – Yes, with an adapter. Mayor - you can do it under the roads and then go to N12 further down? Yes. Nobody inventories in Cedar City, but they do in St. George, Scholzen Products, Ferguson and Mountain Land you can probably get 1,000 feet. I am an excavator with a contracting license. There is a place for every product, RCP is a great product, there are places for everything, your product has not allowed it. I don’t want to just be an option because of availability, I want you to know it will perform well.
Jonathan – in the City standards we allow ADS and N12 up to 24 inch. The N12 is a different product, it is the black HDPE. Above 24” it is proposed to keep reinforced concrete pipe and add the HP also. Mayor – installation will be less than 15%. The difference is N12, it goes to 60”. Jonathan – concrete comes in 8’ lengths, this would come in 20’ lengths and much lighter. Mayor – can N12, 30 inches be in the city, Jonathan – no, concrete. Hartley – you feel comfortable, and don’t feel this is just a supply issue? Jonathan – yes, and I have also talked with Jeff Hunter, and he was impressed, he went to the presentation. Mayor – I support this.

Councilmember Phillips moved to approve including ADS HP Storm Drain Pipe as an alternative to concrete storm drain pipes over 24”; seconded by Councilmember Melling; roll call vote as follows:

- Terri Hartley - AYE
- Craig Isom - AYE
- Tyler Melling - AYE
- Scott Phillips - AYE
- Ronald Riddle - AYE

**ADJOURN:** Councilmember Isom moved to adjourn at 7:15 p.m.; second by Councilmember Hartley; vote unanimous.

_Signed_  
Renon Savage, MMC  
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CITY COUNCIL – FEBRUARY 23, 2022