

**MINUTES
HARRISVILLE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
September 8, 2026
363 West Independence Blvd
Harrisville, UT 84404**

Minutes of a Harrisville City Council Work Session meeting held on September 8, 2026 at 6:00 P.M. in the Harrisville City Council Chambers, 363 West Independence Blvd., Harrisville, UT.

Present: Mayor Roger Shuman, Council Member Blair Christensen, Council Member Jason Hadley, Council Member Grover Wilhelmsen, Council Member Annette Prall.

Excused: Council Member Montgomery.

Staff: Jennie Knight, City Administrator, Jack Fogal, City Recorder,

Visitors: Sarah Wichern, Kevin Varble, Janet Varble, Jay Behunin.

1. Call to Order.

Mayor Shuman called the meeting to order.

2. Land Use Work Session.

Sarah Wichern with Jones and Associates stated she received some comments from Council Member Montgomery. She is happy to discuss those questions or address your concerns. Mayor Shuman asked to be given an overview of this ordinance. Sarah Wichern explained the state is requiring the city to adopt an ordinance addressing detached accessory dwelling units. The state provided guidelines we could consider. This ordinance defines what an accessory dwelling unit is and lot size guidelines. There is 1 accessory dwelling unit per single family residence. The property owner must live on the property in the home or accessory dwelling unit. It cannot be used for short term rentals. She reviewed what are other cities doing. She asked what is causing issues and what is working well. The biggest complaint is having an accessory dwelling unit on a property line where the people in the accessory dwelling unit could look into a neighbor's property. It is different for a barn where someone is not living. We are trying to allow latitude for residents to have accessory dwelling units without infringing on someone's privacy. Internal accessory dwelling units would not be permitted on lots under 6,000 square feet, and external accessory dwelling units would not be permitted on lots under 10,000 square feet. The state would allow you to restrict accessory dwelling units to lots under 11,000 square feet. The size of the accessory dwelling unit is limited to 10% of the property size. The accessory dwelling unit is limited 10% of the property size. For example, a 10,000 square foot lot could have a 1,000 square foot accessory dwelling unit. The proposed minimum rental period is 30 days. Sarah Wichern stated that the minimum rental period for an external accessory dwelling unit could be changed to 90 days pursuant to state statute. This ordinance would not eliminate the need for building permits. If the accessory dwelling unit is being rented, they would need to get a rental license. An accessory dwelling unit would not be allowed in a mobile home park per state code. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired whether a 2-story accessory dwelling unit would allow 1,000 square feet on the first floor and 1,000 square feet on the second floor. Sarah Wichern stated the total square footage would be based on the lot size. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired about mobile tiny homes. Sarah Wichern stated this ordinance would not address that issue. We can look at adding that to the ordinance. The design standards would

stop you from putting an RV on your property and calling it an accessory dwelling unit. Mayor Shuman stated there are RVs that look like tiny homes or mobile homes. He questioned how do we differentiate. Sarah Wichern stated we could add a section for those or just leave it to code enforcement. Council Member Prall inquired is there state law that has covered this. Sarah Wichern stated we don't really have guidance from the state on tiny homes yet. Jennie Knight stated there are state statutes that the unit must be hooked into utilities like sewer and electric. Sarah Wichern stated the ordinance as written would require the accessory dwelling unit would need to be a permanent structure. She would need to do more research before giving an opinion on mobile tiny homes and what we would need to require. Mayor Shuman stated he has seen buildings that are nice that used to be on wheels. People permanently connected to utilities and have skirting put around it. He questioned do we address this in detail or is it more general. Sarah Wichern stated the design standards must meet existing design standards. Council Member Christensen inquired could we require that if they are registered with the DMV as vehicles, it would not qualify. Sarah Wichern stated as currently written a mobile could potentially qualify if the wheels were removed and it went through the permitting process. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired why is the state pushing this ordinance. He questioned what is the purpose. Council Member Christensen stated it allows you to have your parents or children live on your property. Sarah Wichern stated we wanted to give the residents opportunity to use their property as needed while protecting their neighbors from detriment. Council Member Wilhelmsen he is concerned about the borderline. People will try to push the limit like with electric bikes. Sarah Wichern stated she feels the definition we have defines the line well. Council Member Wilhelmsen stated he is concerned with how we monitor this. What stops someone from listing the accessory dwelling unit as a short-term rental. Sarah Wichern stated that is complaint driven. We would like them all to be registered but the concern was the burden on people who are building them for the use of family. People renting them to non-family would be required to get a license. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired how do we keep track of it. What happens if someone builds an accessory Dwelling unit and sells the property 5 years down the line. Sarah Wichern stated we could track them with building permits. No matter what happens people will rent illegally if they want. It happens with single family homes currently. Mayor Shuman inquired about the size of the accessory dwelling unit in relation to the home. He questioned can it be larger than the original home. Sarah Wichern stated it must maintain the setbacks of the lot or an accessory dwelling structure setback. There are different requirements based on that. Mayor Shuman inquired if you have a multi acre property can you have multiple accessory dwelling units. Sarah Wichern stated it would still be limited to 1 accessory dwelling unit per residence. The intent is for the accessory dwelling unit to be smaller than the home on the property. Mayor Shuman questioned would the accessory dwelling unit affect the utility services for the lot. He questioned could the accessory dwelling unit affect the water rate for example. Sarah Wichern stated our minimum size would cover some additional accessory dwelling units in the city. If every home gets an accessory dwelling unit that would look different. There is a provision in the ordinance that if the utility provider rejects them due to capacity, they cannot have an accessory dwelling unit. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired is Bona Vista looking at this issue. Mayor Shuman stated they are not. Sarah Wichern stated that is why that caveat was added. Mayor Shuman inquired have we looked at the standards to see how complicated it is to put them in. As an example, what happens if half the homes in Ashlar Cove decided to have accessory dwelling units. They would go from 23 homes to 33 homes. The infrastructure would still be the same. How do we deny one resident when their neighbor has an accessory dwelling unit. Sarah Wichern stated we will probably have that issue at some point. With our current standards we can cover more density that Harrisville City has currently. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired does the ordinance allow it to be clarified more. For example, a newer home with larger infrastructure instead of an old home with smaller infrastructure. Sarah Wichern stated we do have provisions in the ordinance that if the primary dwelling is being

served by a failing utility line it must be addressed before it can be approved. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired what does utilities cover. Sarah Wichern stated water, sewer, and power are the normal. Council Member Wilhelmsen stated he understands there is a provision that utility providers can deny them but can we add more to cover the city. Sarah Wichern stated she can review it to see if it would be allowed but is unsure if the state will allow it. Usually, these accessory dwelling units use such a small scale of the utilities that it has not been an issue. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired what stops someone from adding sewer to their barn which has water and power. Sarah Wichern stated you can convert a barn as an example to an accessory dwelling unit. Based on its setbacks would affect the ability to convert it. Council Member Prall inquired is the additional parking a requirement. Sarah Wichern stated the additional parking is required for an external accessory dwelling unit. By state law we cannot require additional parking for an internal accessory dwelling unit. Council Member Prall inquired it states additional beyond requirements, would it count if the home has extra parking. She questioned what would be additional. Sarah Wichern stated it depends on how much parking they have available. Council Member Prall inquired what is the number of required parking. Sarah Wichern stated the original must have two off street parking spots. Council Member Prall stated it says it needs to be unobstructed parking. Sarah Wichern clarified that the driveway could not be counted if the parking space would obstruct access to the garage. The only parking that will count in the current front yard setback is anything from the side of the house to the side of the yard. Council Member Prall stated this part of the parking ordinance about off street parking is confusing. It states they may not park or store additional vehicles unless there are two parking spaces that are not the driveway. Sarah Wichern clarified the original building would need to have a 2-car garage or 2 car parking space that does not block access. State law allows tandem parking but it is not used very often. Council Member Prall stated it appears the goal of this is to make sure there is adequate parking for the accessory dwelling unit that does not obstruct the primary residence or allow parking in the backyard. Sarah Wichern stated we don't really regulate the back yard as much but we do want to control the front yard and there is off street parking available for the home and accessory dwelling unit. Mayor Shuman inquired do they have to be parked on a hard surface. Sarah Wichern stated Planning Commission was hoping for the possibility of using gravel. The proposed ordinance would allow gravel parking. Council Member Prall stated parking can cause a headache for neighbors. This is a big concern for her. Council Member Hadley inquired what would happen if there is not cut in for the side driveway. Sarah Wichern stated we have an ordinance that regulates that already. Jennie Knight stated the curb cut can be 1 foot from the property line. Council Member Hadley stated for example his property has 8 feet between his house and the property line he would not be able to add the curb cut. Jennie Knight stated the curb cut would be allowed if the spacing is far enough from the property line. Council Member Hadley inquired about short term rentals and enforcement. Sarah Wichern stated it is difficult. It is complaint driven. The state has recently relaxed some of the restrictions and that the city could monitor short-term rental listings. Council Member Hadley inquired why not allow short term rentals. Sarah Wichern stated the purpose from the state was to add additional housing and stop the constant rotation of new people coming in and out. Jennie Knight stated it was not in the scope required by the state. We can address short term rentals in a different ordinance. Council Member Hadley stated he has heard we have ordinances on the book but we cannot enforce it. He questioned how do we enforce these rules we set. Sarah Wichern stated enforcement ultimately comes down to funding and that cities can enforce regulations to the extent they are willing to dedicate resources toward enforcement.

3. Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Wilhelmsen motioned to adjourn the meeting, second by Council Member Christensen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen,	Yes
Council Member Prall,	Yes
Council Member Christensen,	Yes
Council Member Hadley,	Yes
Council Member Montgomery,	Excused

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:56 P.M.

**MINUTES
HARRISVILLE CITY COUNCIL
September 8, 2026
363 West Independence Blvd
Harrisville, UT 84404**

Minutes of a regular Harrisville City Council meeting held on September 8, 2026, at 7:00 P.M. in the Harrisville City Council Chambers, 363 West Independence Blvd., Harrisville, UT.

Present: Mayor Roger Shuman, Council Member Blair Christensen, Council Member Jason Hadley, Council Member Grover Wilhelmsen, Council Member Annette Prall, Council Member Greg Montgomery.

Staff: Jennie Knight, City Administrator, Jack Fogal, City Recorder, Jill Hunt, City Treasurer, Brody Flint, City Attorney, Assistant Chief Nick Taylor.

Visitors: Sarah Wichern, Matt Robertson, North View Fire Chief Maxfield, Cody Peterson, Kevin Varble, Janet Varble, Jay Behunin, Joyce Stoddard, JeNeal Shaw, Lisa LaRose, Danny Hammon, Mike Delpias, Mike Devries, Lea Ross, Jorge Rivero, Cindy Owens, Jeremy Owens, Marvin Farrell, Rod Dopp, Lynnae Dopp.

1. Call to Order.

Mayor Shuman called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance.

2. Opening Ceremony.

Council Member Prall opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Public Comment

Mayor Shuman opened the public comment period.

Mike Devries shared concerns about the widening of West Harrisville Rd. His brother and dad recently met with Shannon Wixom and the team for the project. He had some questions about why the city is paying for infrastructure. If the city truly owns the property, they would not need to waste taxpayer money on it. They have requested the survey and not received it. Why do we need to waste taxpayer money on a bike lane. The sidewalks are 7 feet in the design. The

standard design is 4 feet. The irrigation head gates would sit in the sidewalk. All the resident mailboxes would be located in the sidewalk. This would create a safety hazard. This increases the burden on residents to maintain the sidewalks.

Danny Hammond works with the Young Automotive Group. He is here to discuss what they can do for the city. He used to work for a city and was in charge of a fleet. On October 1st the new state contracts will go into effect. They would love the chance to earn the city's business. The next item he would like to discuss would be collision repair. They have a local facility that can perform those repairs. They also do upfitting for public works vehicles. They can build the cab and chassis locally in Centerville. When he worked for a city, they were always required to have state contract or 3 bids. Not all state contract pricing is the same. They make their money in volume not in large markups. His team sold almost 9,000 vehicles last year.

Kevin Varble lives on North Harrisville Road. He wants to enter a formal objection to Ordinance 575. The properties on North and West Harrisville Road are agricultural. The city is trying to assert an illegal right-of-way with the West Harrisville Road widening. You are trying to push an illegal amendment without eminent domain filing and just compensation. The city is opening themselves up to legal problems. The city is entering into dangerous traffic modeling. They have yet to provide the traffic models. There are no curbs or sidewalks on North Harrisville Rd. West Harrisville Rd can handle the traffic. There are no studies being done or filed.

Marvin Farrell has a property on West Harrisville Road. He understands there is not a discussion tonight. He sent an email to Council and the Mayor about this project. About 6 months ago there was a discussion about an 1885 right-of-way dedication. He contacted the state ombudsman but nothing was accomplished. Cody Peterson with ESI Engineering and Shannon Wixom have had discussions with him. He wants to talk about the warranty deed. If they did not sign the warranty deed, they would not receive money for their trees and fences. Along West Harrisville Road the city has approved the setbacks. Everything he can find is an 80-foot roadway. If we do an 80-foot road it will accomplish what the city needs.

Mayor Shuman closed the public comment period.

4. Consent Items

a. Quarterly Budget Audit and Financial Review.

Jill Hunt stated she provided a report in the packet. Two dates were picked at random. This audit was focused on our electronic time cards. The process ran smoothly except for some employees who failed to submit their time cards. We have implemented a new process to ensure the time cards are submitted on time. We did have an issue with URS submission but it was due to URS being down while transitioning to a new system.

b. Approval of Meeting Minutes for August 11, 2026.

Council Member Prall stated she sent Jack Fogal some grammar and spelling changes. She also requested some clarifications in the minutes regarding the budget approval discussion, where it states that she wanted her reservations noted. She stated she would like to see funds added for sidewalk repairs. Necessary sidewalk repairs should be a priority over traveling to St. George for training. She recalled a comment from Bryan Fife as well which said these sidewalks repairs are expensive and we could easily spend \$60,000 on them in one year.

Motion: Council Member Montgomery made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for August 11, 2026 with revisions, second by Council Member Wilhelmsen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen,	Yes
Council Member Prall,	Yes
Council Member Christensen,	Yes
Council Member Hadley,	Yes
Council Member Montgomery,	Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Business Items.

a. Discussion/possible action to adopt Ordinance 569; Accessory Dwelling Unit and Parking Amendments.

Sarah Wichern stated a memo was included in the packet for Council. Over the last few years, the state has required cities to adopt accessory dwelling unit ordinances. We adopted an internal accessory dwelling unit ordinance a few years ago. This ordinance would allow external accessory dwelling units. This ordinance addresses accessory dwelling units, design standards, compatibility, parking, and setbacks. Right now, residents are not allowed to build detached accessory dwelling units. We are creating an avenue for residents to build detached accessory dwelling units while trying to limit the impact to their neighbors. Council Member Montgomery stated he has three issues. The first is formatting. In 11.20 states the chapter's purpose is for providing further restrictions or requirements for certain items elsewhere in the code. Sarah Wichern stated the definitions can be moved. Council Member Montgomery stated the code does not match what is in the ordinance and exhibits. Sarah Wichern stated we can fix those. Council Member Montgomery inquired about the discussion from Planning Commission about the limit of 25% maximum of the community state law allows cities to restrict accessory dwelling units in the city. Sarah Wichern stated their discussion was more based on the lot size then limiting the number of accessory dwelling units based on area. Council Member Montgomery stated we can record a certificate with the county stating the requirements of what is allowed with the accessory dwelling unit and that it is not a duplex. He has seen this type of certificate be beneficial in the past. Sometimes we do not catch all the issues or illegal accessory dwelling units. He questioned if there was discussion about this. Sarah Wichern stated it was not discussed much. She viewed the building permit as a form of that certificate. Through the building standards we would help to limit that confusion. We can include the requirement for recording certificates if you would like. Council Member Montgomery stated a lender will not look at building permits. They will look at recorded documents. He recommends adding certificates. Sarah Wichern clarified you would like a section added about a certificate and it needs to be recorded with the county. Council Member Montgomery questioned how do we address an accessory dwelling unit in a zone where the homes are nonconforming. We have some homes in commercial zones and homes in an SAP zone which don't have standards or regulations. He questioned how those properties would be treated. Sarah Wichern stated if it is listed only for the residential properties there is a process. If they are in the commercial zone, it would not be allowed. In 11.17 it goes over what is allowed in a non-conforming use. If we use that section, it would cover this situation in the code. Council Member Montgomery inquired about the residential zones that are repealed. Sarah Wichern stated this would apply to all residential zones they would be eligible for an accessory dwelling unit. We are working on an ordinance to update those zones. Council Member Montgomery inquired would we want to allow that in these zones. If you take the Cottages at Colonial Springs for example which is an SAP zone, would we allow it with 6,000 square foot lots and town homes. Sarah Wichern stated it would be covered as residential zones. Council Member Christensen stated the lots need to be over 10,000 square feet for an external accessory dwelling unit those would not be applicable.

Sarah Wichern stated we cannot regulate internal units by state code. Council Member Montgomery inquired how do we stop townhomes from having an accessory dwelling unit. Sarah Wichern stated there is a minimum of 6,000 square foot lots. Townhomes generally do not have individual lots exceeding 6,000 square feet. Council Member Montgomery stated some townhomes have multiple homes on one lot and the lot size is 8,000 square feet. Brody Flint clarified state code has preempted that by defining it as detached from the single-family home. Council Member Montgomery inquired about the thought behind both external and internal having 30 days rental minimum. Sarah Wichern stated for simplicity. Planning Commission felt 30 days was sufficient. Council Member Montgomery stated you take out the maximum lot size to home size. He questioned if we want an existing limit on home size. Sarah Wichern stated it was not a discussion item during Planning Commission. Council can add that provision if they would like. It did not seem beneficial when we were discussing. Council Member Montgomery stated he has an issue with the definition of an accessory dwelling unit where household is used instead of single-family dwelling. Sarah Wichern stated we can change that. Council Member Montgomery stated we use lot sometimes and sometimes use parcel. We should use one term consistently. Sarah Wichern stated we can change that. Council Member Montgomery inquired about the accessory dwelling unit being subordinate to the house. Sarah Wichern stated the intent was to allow an upstairs in a barn for example. We would count the livable space not the entirety of the barn. Council Member Montgomery inquired would it be better to separate 11-2-260-4.a to differentiate between internal and external accessory dwelling units. Sarah Wichern stated the standards are similar for both and either would need to meet their respective codes. Council Member Montgomery inquired what it means that it meets standards. Sarah Wichern stated this referred to building standards and she did not believe it was necessary to specify the building standards in the ordinance. Council Member Wilhelmsen stated this discussion is a one on one maybe this item should be tabled until this is clarified. Council Member Montgomery stated it needs to be passed by October 1st. Brody Flint stated he is correct. The issue would be that if someone applied before the ordinance was adopted, the City would not have a regulating ordinance in place. They could build whatever they want. Mayor Shuman inquired for an internal accessory dwelling unit do they need a separate door. Sarah Wichern stated they would not need a separate door and we cannot require it. Council Member Montgomery inquired what is the difference between an external accessory dwelling unit needing to meet family dwelling setbacks instead of a man cave as an accessory dwelling unit. Sarah Wichern stated the difference is someone living in the unit. The biggest complaint statewide is privacy. If you have an accessory structure, you will not be living in it 24 hours a day. We tried to limit the setbacks to help the neighbors maintain privacy. Council Member Montgomery inquired how is that consistent with the dwelling setback approval the city is providing. Jennie Knight stated the difference is an accessory building can be 1 foot away from the property line. Even 10 feet would give some more privacy than a 1 foot. There will be some limitations of people converting them to living spaces. For example, pole barns do not meet building code. Council Member Montgomery stated most homes would not qualify to have an external accessory dwelling unit. Sarah Wichern stated it is possible but design would need to be incorporated. You could not put windows and be right up against the property line. Council Member Hadley stated he would like the certificates to be included. Council Member Prall questioned if an accessory dwelling unit is mishandled by the first owner would the burden fall on the second owner. Council Member Montgomery stated with a demolition you would need a new loan. Council Member Prall stated that is not always true. Council Member Wilhelmsen stated sometimes we get stuck in the what ifs. We can't always regulate all the what ifs. Council Member Prall asked for clarification we are concerned about people demoing their property and bypassing the building permit process. Council Member Montgomery stated it is more for resale purposes so people know they cannot buy it and rent it as a duplex. Council Member Hadley stated there are benefits both ways. It can help protect the city. If someone does an accessory dwelling unit illegally it can help to

protect the next homeowner. Council Member Wilhelmsen stated he likes the idea. It could help the homeowner and the buyer. It would provide a record. Council Member Prall stated we would still have a record. She favors homeowners over potential homeowners. Council Member Montgomery stated in the proposed ordinance it would eliminate the ability of homeowners to shorten setbacks for an addition. Sarah Wichern stated that code is strange. We were cleaning it up and keeping the standard setback whether new or old development. You can do the accessory dwelling unit portion of this amendment then do the text change at a later date. Council Member Hadley inquired could we make it part of the motion to schedule a time to work on it. He is afraid if we just pass ordinance and say we will address it later we will not come back to it. Council Member Prall stated she feels setting another date does not solve the problem. Council Member Hadley stated he is meaning having another work session to finish this. Council Member Prall inquired does this become obsolete if we pass that deadline. Council Member Hadley stated we would pass this ordinance and circle back to those concerns. Council Member Prall inquired what are the revisions we are not comfortable passing. Council Member Hadley stated his concern is we could discuss this another hour by debating definitions.

Motion: Council Member Christensen made a motion to approve Ordinance 569; with the addition of certificates and the list of changes taken by Sarah Wichern, second by Council Member Prall.

Sarah Wichern stated Council could pass the ordinance with revisions discussed while leaving out the parking sections that still need to be updated. Brody Flint stated you have a motion and a second legally you must hold a vote on the original motion. For clarity the motion should be restated but you must vote on the original motion first.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen,	No
Council Member Prall,	Yes
Council Member Christensen,	No
Council Member Hadley,	No
Council Member Montgomery,	No

The motion failed 4-1.

Council Member Wilhelmsen clarified we are adopting Ordinance 569; Accessory Dwelling Unit and Parking with plans to revise it. Brody Flint advised you cannot make a motion about future action from Council. Sarah Wichern clarified should would change it to adoption of Ordinance 569; accessory dwelling unit and other land use amendments. Council Member Prall inquired the other land use amendments are being made to clarify language when dealing with accessory dwelling units. She inquired are we changing existing ordinances. Sarah Wichern stated there are a variety of things being changed. Some are substantial like the setback changes. Some changes are for consistency some are to match state code. Brody Flint stated as it was noticed in a way that you can pass it, you can pass the accessory dwelling unit portion, or you can pass the other revisions. Council Member Prall inquired if we do not pass the parking with the accessory dwelling unit code how do we regulate the parking for an accessory dwelling unit. Sarah Wichern stated it would revert back to the current code which does have provisions governing parking for an accessory dwelling unit. It would be beneficial to pass parking but will not be detrimental. Council Member Prall clarified if we pass the accessory dwelling unit portion, we will still be able to regulate parking due to the current code. Sarah Wichern answered affirmatively.

Motion: Council Member Wilhelmsen made a motion to adopt Ordinance 569; Land Use Amendments. Brody Flint asked a point of order clarification; your motion is to pass the ordinance as proposed. Council Member Wilhelmsen answered affirmatively. Second by Council Member Christensen.

Motion: Council Member Montgomery made a substitute motion to approve revisions to the Land Use Code regarding accessory dwelling units, including revisions to the chapters addressing definitions, land use, and special regulations; moving the provisions regarding accessory dwelling units to the appropriate land use section; placing the definition of accessory dwelling units in the external and internal accessory dwelling unit definitions section; revising the definition to more closely conform with State law; and adding a requirement to Section 11.22.260 for the City to record a certificate when an accessory dwelling unit is approved. Motion died for lack of second.

Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired why are we adding it now and not approving the ordinance now. It has been discussed already. Council Member Montgomery stated he would like this worked on and does not want us to approve things that are not relevant. Council Member Prall stated there is nothing stopping us from making amendments if we pass this ordinance in full tonight. If we pass it in full tonight, we will be in compliance with the state and we will have rules in place to regulate accessory dwelling units while we get the necessary amendments worked out. This one is on us to take our time to research and get the changes we would like made. She is in favor of passing the motion from Council Member Wilhelmsen.

Motion: Council Member Wilhelmsen made a motion to adopt Ordinance 569; Land Use Amendments, second by Council Member Christensen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen,	Yes
Council Member Prall,	Yes
Council Member Christensen,	Yes
Council Member Hadley,	Yes
Council Member Montgomery,	No

The motion passed 4-1.

b. Right of Way Width for West Harrisville Road Discussion.

Mayor Shuman stated this item came up due to discussion about width of the proposed road. We wanted to have a discussion about the right-of-way width and the design standards. The design standards currently planned to match the 80-foot right-of-way. Council Member Montgomery stated his concern when he came into office in January is there has been confusion and miscommunication about this project. State law allows a partial street vacation. We would need to notice a public hearing and determine if there is a good cause to make a right-of-way width adjustment. Council Member Montgomery stated if the City were to vacate a portion of the right-of-way, it would not necessarily affect an easement for public utilities. This is strictly a discussion on the right-of-way for roadways. He looked at our standards and the Wasatch Front Regional Council's plans. They list the road as a collector. In the Harrisville General Plan, we have it mapped as a 66–80-foot right-of-way. In our General Plan we have it listed as a minor arterial. A minor arterial needs to be 84 feet. There are so many conflicting issues with this project. We should get this to 80 feet to meet our standards. There is so much

confusion going on. We need to set it by ordinance what the standard is. This used to be a state road then a county road and now a city road. We need to discuss the vacations. Let's settle it by having a public hearing and an ordinance to establish the right-of-way at 80 feet. Council Member Prall inquired about the comments about the payment to owners for trees and sprinklers. Mayor Shuman stated there is a right-of-way on the road. Some say 99 feet and some say 80 feet. If a landowner puts in a fence within that right-of-way area, we technically do not have to pay them for it. It is standard practice to pay for those removals. There will also be a slope from the road into some driveways. We are paying for construction easements to match that slope into their driveway. Council Member Prall inquired if we change the roadway width, we would not need to pay homeowners for that impact. Cody Peterson with ESI Engineering stated we would need to proceed regardless due to the slope of the yards. Mayor Shuman stated the impact is such that the slope will need to be addressed regardless of 99 feet or 80 feet. The 99 feet is in question but the road is being designed to 80 feet. Council Member Prall inquired are all homeowners being offered a settlement as part of this process. Mayor Shuman stated the ones that are impacted. Council Member Prall stated the documents are not a land transfer. Cody Peterson stated we are saying we already own the land. We are asking them to provide temporary construction easements, paying them for trees and fences that are disturbed in the right-of-way, and signing the deed cleaning up the property line issues. Council Member Prall inquired the benefit is less property and a lower tax bill. Cody Peterson stated it is one benefit. Matt Robertson stated we have worked with UDOT and the warranty deed is not necessary to continue with the project. Cody Peterson stated if property owners do not sign the warranty deed, they could still receive a construction easement and compensation for items disturbed during the construction process. Matt Robertson stated due to this funding coming from the federal government we must follow the process setup with UDOT. Council Member Prall inquired what happens if the property owner signs that paper, do they forfeit the ability to take legal recourse. Cody Peterson stated he believes they would. Council Member Prall stated it is a difficult decision for the homeowner to give up the property or fight the road. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired how vague are the easements. He questioned will utilities still be able to run into the property. Cody Peterson stated if you move to the 80-foot right-of-way there are some utilities outside of the right-of-way like power poles. That would need to be a discussion with those utility providers. Council Member Montgomery stated as he reads state law the utility companies still have a right to the easement. If we vacate the right-of-way, we are forfeiting our right to put in public infrastructure such as roads or sidewalk. Council Member Prall inquired with the access would it limit trees or other items. Council Member Montgomery stated it could affect it. Council Member Prall inquired if we reduce it to 80 feet would we no longer have access to complete the road. Brody Flint stated we are discussing different things. If we follow with Council Member Montgomery's plan, we shrink our right-of-way and give the property owners land. The city is no longer able to use that 19 feet for any improvement ever unless we pay for it later on. Council Member Prall inquired would the utility companies still have access. Brody Flint stated not necessarily. If there needs to be other utility improvements, we may not have the ability to do that if we vacate the right-of-way. Council Member Christensen inquired if we keep the 99 feet, we would not build on it currently but if needed in the future it could be used. We are currently building on 80 feet not utilizing the full 99 feet. Brody Flint answered affirmatively. Council Member Prall stated so this is not about the current project it is about future use. Brody Flint stated currently there is a 99-foot right-of-way, there are some property owners who disagree. There is nothing that prohibits the property owner from trying to clear it up at any point even prior to this. What Council Member Montgomery is suggesting to change the right-of-way from 99 feet to 80 feet. We would give that 19 feet to the respective property owners. Council Member Prall inquired what is forcing us to do that now. Brody Flint stated nothing is. Council Member Prall inquired did this come up because we were asking property owners to give up property. Brody Flint clarified no this came up because Council

Member Montgomery asked to have this discussion. Council Member Prall stated so if we were not doing this project this would not be an issue today. Council Member Hadley stated the issue is we are already close to the front porch of some homes at 80 feet. If we go to 99 feet, we would be on their front porch. This will give the owners property rights to protect their homes. Mayor Shuman stated there are professional surveys that show 80 feet and some that show 99 feet. Matt Robertson stated the 80-foot rights-of-way are more recent and were made to the existing improvements. Documents on record at the county show all properties on the road have a 99-foot right-of-way in 1973. There has been no documentation showing the right-of-way width was vacated or changed. The confusion comes from a proposed UDOT project in the 1960s which would have utilized 80 feet for the project. The project was abandoned in 1969. It did not vacate the 99-foot right-of-way. Mayor Shuman inquired how many of the 16 homes show the 99-foot right-of-way. Matt Robertson stated 10 have current legal descriptions that agree with the 99 feet. Some have legal descriptions that show 80 feet and some show ownership to center of the road but they can be researched to show it was 99 feet before more recent surveys. Mayor Shuman inquired where would Council like to go with this item. Council Member Montgomery stated he would like to set a public hearing to set the right-of-way width. Brody Flint stated you can hold a public hearing if the plan is to vacate city property. We need a direction or plan. Council Member Prall clarified we need a plan of action then hold a public hearing. Brody Flint stated you can do a townhall to receive input but you need to set some direction for a public hearing about the specific item. Council Member Hadley asked we can hold a townhall to get public input if it is noticed. Brody Flint stated you are correct. You can hold a special meeting if 3 of you agree. Council Member Prall inquired would we need a plan of action to hold a townhall. Brody Flint stated we could not make a decision at the townhall but you would not need a definitive plan to hold one. Matt Robertson stated you could do this but it would change the right-of-way documents for this project and construction easements. It could have a big impact on this project. This would have a big impact on the project being able to move forward. We are not changing the roadway design we are building to 80 feet. Council Member Christensen stated we own the land to 99 feet but are building to 80 feet. To clarify we would be giving up land. Brody Flint stated you are giving the property owner land. Why it matters is UDOT's right-of-way team have to redo every right-of-way to comply with their and federal standards. If this is done currently it could mess up the project and it may not happen. Council Member Montgomery stated if we approved a reduction of the right-of-way, it would be from center line. He questioned if we change the right-of-way is the project done from centerline. Cody stated the double yellow sits 1-2 feet north of the center line. It is not a perfect 40 feet on either side. Council Member Prall inquired if we choose not to vacate the property and homeowners do not sign the documents what happens with the project. Cody Peterson stated we would not be able to get on their property to tie in their driveways to fix the slope. Matt Robertson stated we would go through the condemnation process to get access to tie in their driveway. The matter would go before a judge for a decision. Council Member Prall inquired have we reached out to the residents and spoken to them about their options. Matt Robertson stated Shannon Wixom has been contacting the residents and meeting with them. Council Member Prall, Montgomery, and Hadley requested that a townhall be held. Jennie Knight inquired about a date for the townhall. Council requested the townhall be scheduled for September 22.

c. North View Fire Station 23 Presentation.

Chief Maxfield with North View Fire District presented on Station 23. He explained he spent 25 years with the West Valley Fire Department. His area of expertise was resource analysis. That was the first thing he dove into when he became chief. He looked at where the departments call outs were located. Our highest concentration area is around station 21 in North Ogden and along the Highway 89 corridor. They looked at how long it takes to get to a call. The goal is to

arrive at an emergency call within 4 minutes. He looked at a computer model to see what areas they struggled to get to in that time frame. The worst areas are along Highway 89 in the south towards Wal-Mart and in the North East part of North Ogden. They identified 3 potential locations for future stations. He tried to look at future planning and zoning and future infrastructure projects. There have been talks for a fire station in Harrisville since 1981 when they joined the fire district. Station 23 in Harrisville looks like the most prudent location. Initially they were going to have a combined building with the police department to save tax payer money. The more we went through the design process the more sense it made to separate the buildings. The lot their building is going on has been subdivided, appraised and utilities have been stubbed. He does not want the District's station to be ostentatious. He wants the building to be strong, trustworthy, and frugal. The building will have 3 bays, 7 bedrooms, and a fitness area separate from living quarters. The plan would be to share the fitness area with the police department. We designed the facility to match with the new public works and public safety building. The benefit to the community is faster response times. Right now, 80% of our calls are handled by station 21 and 20% are handled by Station 22. We have received an increase of 281 calls in the first half of 2026. Our models project Station 23 will handle about 30% of the calls, Station 21 will handle 50%, and Station 22 will handle 20%. We are looking at early summer of 2027 for ground breaking. They are hopeful the station will have its grand opening in January or February of 2029. Council Member Montgomery inquired are the red dots on the map still going to be red with this station. Chief Maxfield stated those would not. They were included on the map to show the historical data. We do need Harrisville to decide if they would like to participate in the shared space. It would be approximately \$350,000 for the shared space. If you do not want to participate let him know so they can reduce the size. Council Member Prall inquired if the increased call density could be due to an aging population. Chief Maxfield stated that could be a factor but is not sure if that is the overall cause.

d. Council Meeting Frequency Discussion.

Council Member Wilhelmsen stated he was trying to look at some options due to our long meetings. He was unsure if we need to have a second meeting. He does not think it is the answer but we can look at it. Could we do more work sessions if we know some items will have a lot of discussion. He does not feel we are doing justice to our citizens with these long meetings. He stated Council's effectiveness decreases during late meetings. He questioned how we can streamline these meetings. Council Member Montgomery inquired why his comments could not be sent out before. He asked Jack Fogal to explain why. Jack Fogal stated your comments are discussion points for Council. The purpose of the Open and Public Meetings Act is to ensure that discussion are held during public meetings rather than through email. Council Member Montgomery stated we could do work sessions. Council Member Prall stated a work session or a second meeting could help. Mayor Shuman stated he has spoken to other Mayors and they feel work sessions are a benefit. Council Member Hadley stated it would be good to get the documentation sooner. Sometimes he gets the amendments at the last minute. He spends his time in the evenings researching but work has been busy. He came with a lot of the questions that were answered during the discussion. He could have answered some of the questions on his own if the information was provided sooner. Council Member Wilhelmsen stated we do need to be respectful of staff's time. He questioned what if we swap Planning Commission for Council. He questioned would holding the meeting on Wednesday be beneficial. It would be a benefit to Planning Commission and may benefit Council. He wants to have an effective discussion while still being able to go home at a decent hour. Council Member Hadley stated he does not feel more time in a meeting will be beneficial. We have all been part of meetings where adding extra time does not make the meeting better. He needs more preparation time to answer questions. Mayor Shuman stated he would propose that we add a work session so we start at 6 PM instead of 7 PM. He has been part of making the agenda and

it gets hard because you cannot cut people off from applying for Council. He meets with Jennie on Tuesdays and it can be difficult to set the agenda. He did like the work session discussion today. If we can streamline the meeting it would be a benefit to the public. Council Member Montgomery inquired if we can vote on the consent items as a whole. If we have enough background information, can we vote on them on bulk. Council Member Wilhelmsen stated he did enjoy the comments from Jill Hunt. He appreciates hearing about the audit and seeing where we need to improve. Sometimes we need to go down rabbit holes but it is not always appropriate for the agenda as a whole. Council Member Prall inquired is there an alternative like emailing the presenter. Mayor Shuman stated we need to be careful about having that discussion outside of the public meeting. If we do a work session we can get some of that discussion done before the meeting. Council Member Montgomery questioned can we adjust items to allow the shorter items to be in the front of the agenda. Jennie Knight stated it is beneficial if you email your questions to staff, we can come prepared to answer them. We try to allow the contractors to be first to be respectful of their time. Council agreed to hold work sessions before Council Meetings.

e. Rules of Procedure Discussion.

Brody Flint stated he has been working on this for a while. He has some drafts he has been preparing. He spoke about the Open and Public Meetings Act. Council Members can ask staff to answer questions but cannot direct staff. You need to be careful it is a gray area. Sending the questions to Council might not necessarily violate the Open and Public Meetings Act but discussion from those questions would. If you sent it to staff it can be made part of the record. Council Member Prall inquired can we send a partial packet and agenda or does it need to be done together. Brody Flint stated it needs to be done together as much as possible. Doing it piecemeal would cause issues. Our rules of procedure need some updates. One item he found is in if someone wants to abstain from a vote. If someone does abstain is it a no or a yes or does it go to the Mayor as a tie. Council Member Christensen stated he was voted in by the citizens and feels they should not abstain from a vote unless there is a conflict of interest. Brody Flint stated this would cover voluntarily abstaining not conflict of interest. Council Member Prall inquired how do we differentiate between those two. Brody Flint stated you can contact him and discuss it with him. Council Member Prall inquired what happens if it happens in the meeting and you are not here. Brody Flint stated if I am here, you can ask for a recess and discuss it with him. If he is not here you would have to make that decision. He would recommend erring on the side of abstaining over the conflict. Council Member Montgomery inquired about presenting the conflict to Council and Council can decide if it is or not. Brody Flint stated he does not advise doing that. Ultimately the decision is on you not the Council. If Council says you are fine but you are challenged the consequences, are yours not Council's. Council Member Montgomery recommended if someone abstains it should go to the Mayor. Brody Flint inquired do you want to allow someone to abstain for non-conflict interest reasons. Council Member Hadley stated he does not believe you should be able to abstain. Brody Flint stated he feels it should not be allowed. Council Member Prall inquired how do we know if we are allowed or not. She questioned do we have consequences either way. She inquired could we add language allowing us to declare the conflict. Brody Flint stated the language is already in place for that. Council Member Prall clarified what happens if I declare a conflict and at a later date it is decided there was not a conflict. Brody Flint stated it is your conflict to declare. Council Member Prall inquired would we be in trouble if we don't vote due to a perceived conflict. Brody Flint stated there is not really a guideline to saying you have a conflict or not. If you feel it is a conflict you would declare that and abstain. The scrutiny tends to be more on the side of failure to declare a conflict. Council agreed that Council Members should be required to vote unless they have a conflict of interest.

f. Discussion/possible action to adopt Resolution 26-24; Special Event Permit.

Jennie Knight explained this is a continuance from last month. She had reached out to the Trust, which handles the City's insurance. They reviewed the policy and liked it. We did change some of the language requiring a mass gathering permit if there will be over 500 people. We also identified some excluded activities. This list calls out some examples but it is not all-inclusive. We cannot plan for everything someone could ask for. This relates to city property as well. Any of these events are not covered with our insurance. Council Member Prall inquired it states motor vehicle events would that cover events such as car shows. Jennie Knight explained our insurance would cover car shows where the vehicles are not moving but would not cover moving vehicles. Council Member Montgomery inquired about the little train at an event a few years ago. Jennie Knight stated because the train would be moving, it would not be covered by the City's insurance. The Trust suggested limits for liability insurance would be \$2,000,000 combined single limit for personal injury and property damage. We did add language to the permit that states application for the permit does not guarantee approval. Council Member Montgomery inquired about the neighborhood traditional 4th of July Parade on North Harrisville Rd and the insurance requirement. Jennie Knight stated our insurance will not cover it. Council Member Hadley inquired about weddings at a church house or a school event. He questioned what if someone has a wedding in their backyard. Will they be required to file a permit and get the \$2,000,000 insurance. Jennie Knight stated the distinction will be use of city resources. If they close a road they would need to follow our guidelines. Council Member Hadley inquired can we clarify the language. Jennie Knight answered we can add whatever language you would like. Council Member Hadley inquired about a church meeting with over 200 people. Brody Flint answered churches are protected and we could not require a permit. Council Member Hadley inquired does any event with more than 200 people need a permit. Council Member Prall clarified you can have a wedding without a permit if you are not utilizing city resources. Council Member Hadley stated the ordinance states any event with more than 200 people. He questioned could we add language that exempts church buildings, school property, and private property that does not require city resources. Jennie Knight answered we can add that language. Council Member Hadley stated he has had to get a rider on his insurance to pay for a policy when doing photography at the state capitol. It can be difficult for people to get the \$2,000,000 policy. Council Member Prall stated she has done some research and a normal person can purchase a single-day event policy. Council Member Hadley stated he has been to weddings with 500 people. Brody Flint stated there is no penalty for not getting a permit. This policy does not have an enforcement provision. We can't go out and give them a ticket. Council Member Hadley stated what stops the police from going and giving them a ticket. Brody Flint stated any law that does not have an enforcement provision cannot be enforced. As it is currently written, it cannot be enforced. Council Member Hadley inquired can the public enforce this in a different way. Can we make this clearer to not tie up police resources. Council Member Montgomery inquired about the parade. There is no enforcement but the city is setting a rule you need to follow. This is not a parade the city sponsors. Council Member Prall inquired are there any events you think should have a permit. Council Member Montgomery stated closure of streets. Council Member Hadley stated large events on city property. Council Member Prall summarized an event with road closures or an event on city property would require a permit. Council Member Montgomery inquired about the parade and if a permit would be required. He questioned who would cover the insurance for this event. Council Member Prall stated they would need to get a permit and insurance. There have been fatalities in parades nearby. Jennie Knight inquired do you want to require a household notification or a flyer for an event. Council agreed a flyer would be sufficient. Jennie Knight inquired do we want to include signature blocks from the department heads. Brody Flint advised we should have department heads sign off on the permit especially public safety. Council agreed to have signature blocks

on the permit for department heads. Council Member Prall inquired we want to change the wording to state on city property or in the event of road closures. Council Member Hadley stated he would like to add the exemption of houses of worship, school facilities, private property where no road closures or city services are utilized. Council Member Prall inquired are there any other property beside city property that we do want to require a permit for. Jennie Knight explained we do have these events as listed requiring a permit fun run, walks, parades, festivals, public gathering, celebrations, outdoor concerts, any event requiring a mass gathering permit. Council Member Prall inquired do we want to provide a more specific definition for a celebration. Council Member Hadley stated if we include the exemption discussed earlier of houses of worship, school facilities, private property where no road closures or city services are utilized it would provide the needed clarity. This would exempt events like a trunk or treat at a church. Council Member Prall inquired are schools part of this decision, don't they have their own rules to follow. Brody Flint stated schools have their own rules to follow and do not have to follow our permitting process typically. Council Member Prall inquired on the permit it states it must be turned in within 60 days; would it be better to change it to at least. Jennie Knight stated the recommendation is between 45-60 days. We should change it to state 45 days before the event. Council Member Prall clarified that the permit would need to be filed 45 days before the event. Jennie Knight recommended not establishing 60 days as the maximum submission deadline. She explained that the City is already receiving inquiries about events several months in advance and that allowing applications to be submitted earlier would provide additional time for review. She recommended changing the language to establish a minimum submission deadline of 45 days before the event.

Motion: Council Member Hadley made a motion to adopt Resolution 26-24, Special Event Policy/Permit, with the revisions and guidance discussed by the Council, including clarifying that a permit is required for events utilizing City property or requiring a road closure or City services; exempting houses of worship, school facilities, and private property where no road closure or City services are utilized; adding department head signature blocks to the permit; requiring a flyer for household notification when applicable; and revising the application deadline to require submission at least 45 days prior to the event, second by Council Member Wilhelmsen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen,	Yes
Council Member Prall,	Yes
Council Member Christensen,	Yes
Council Member Hadley,	Yes
Council Member Montgomery,	No

The motion passed 4-1.

- 6. Closed Executive Session – A Closed Executive Session for the purposes described under UCA § 52-4-205(1)(c); strategy session to discuss pending or reasonable imminent litigation and UCA § 52-4-205(1)(d); strategy sessions to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, including any form of a water right or water shares, or to discuss a proposed development agreement, project proposal, or financing proposal related to the development of land owned by the state or a political subdivision, if public discussion would: (i) disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration; or (ii) prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms.**

Motion: Council Member Hadley motioned to enter a Closed Executive Session for the purposes described UCA § 52-4-205(1)(c); strategy session to discuss pending or reasonable imminent litigation and UCA § 52-4-205(1)(d); strategy sessions to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, including any form of a water right or water shares, or to discuss a proposed development agreement, project proposal, or financing proposal related to the development of land owned by the state or a political subdivision, if public discussion would: (i) disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration; or (ii) prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms, second by Council Member Montgomery .

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen,	Yes
Council Member Prall,	Yes
Council Member Christensen,	Yes
Council Member Hadley,	Yes
Council Member Montgomery,	Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Council Member Prall motioned to adjourn a Closed Executive Session for the purposes described UCA § 52-4-205(1)(c); strategy session to discuss pending or reasonable imminent litigation and UCA § 52-4-205(1)(d); strategy sessions to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, including any form of a water right or water shares, or to discuss a proposed development agreement, project proposal, or financing proposal related to the development of land owned by the state or a political subdivision, if public discussion would: (i) disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration; or (ii) prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms, second by Council Member Wilhelmsen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen,	Yes
Council Member Prall,	Yes
Council Member Christensen,	Yes
Council Member Hadley,	Yes
Council Member Montgomery,	Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

7. Mayor/Council Follow-up

Assistant Chief Taylor explained we have a new School Resource Officer who is doing a great job. We had our Night Out Against Crime. Mayor Shuman inquired who participated in the event. Assistant Chief Taylor stated that the Harrisville Police Department, Weber County Sheriff's Office, North Ogden Police Department, North View Fire District, Pleasant View Police Department, Weber FOP, and other agencies participated.

Jennie Knight explained the Utah League of Cities and Towns conference registration opens this week. Early bird registration is available through the end of September. Please let staff know if you would like to attend.

Council Member Montgomery inquired if we participate in license plate readers. Assistant Chief Taylor stated we do not have any. We have an MOU in place with Ogden which we can use if needed but we do not have any. Council Member Montgomery inquired about Flock Cameras in the city. Assistant Chief Taylor stated we do not have any. We have applied for a grant for Flock Cameras. When reviewing the grant application, they will do a study looking at blind areas on Flock Maps and assign funds to fill those blind spots. The City may be able to obtain a camera through the grant. Council Member Montgomery inquired about inspections and the 3-day rule. There are some misunderstandings of how the community does inspections. Jennie Knight stated we have not had any issues with our building inspector. We contract through a third party; they have multiple inspectors. Council Member Montgomery explained there is a push to eliminate property tax and a push to allow 5,000 square foot lots regardless of zones. He inquired whether the City could set up meetings between Council and its legislative representatives. Jennie Knight stated we have in the past. Brody Flint stated if you contact the representatives, they usually value your opinion because you are a Council Member. They may come speak in a meeting to you.

Council Member Wilhelmsen reminded Council last month they discussed allowing the orchestra to use the cabin for rehearsal. They are working on creating a 501(c)(3). Council Member Hadley explained the North Ogden Band utilizes their city facilities but they are a part of the city and not a separate organization. Council Member Prall inquired would it be a conflict if we voted and are a member of the orchestra. Brody Flint stated unless you are making a lot of money from the orchestra it would not be a conflict.

Council Member Hadley stated he has been meeting with representatives from Pleasant View and North Ogden regarding the possibility of creating a joint economic office. The thought process would be that we would advertise as a Tri-City economic team. The benefit is we would be 60,000 residents instead of separate entities trying to go alone. Farr West has also expressed interest in joining as well. This could be a great opportunity for our cities. We are close to the point of setting up an interlocal agreement to move forward. Council Member Montgomery stated it is a good idea. We have more power as a region and not an individual city. Council Member Wilhelmsen agreed it would be a good idea.

8. Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Hadley motioned to adjourn the meeting, second by Council Member Wilhelmsen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen,	Yes
Council Member Prall,	Yes
Council Member Christensen,	Yes
Council Member Hadley,	Yes
Council Member Montgomery,	Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 P.M.

ATTEST:


Jack Fogal
City Recorder

Approved this 13th day of October, 2026




Roger Shuman
Mayor