

NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES

November 4, 2014

The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on November 4, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in the North Ogden City West Conference Room at 505 East 2600 North. Notice of time, place and agenda of the meeting was delivered to each member of the City Council, posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on October 31, 2014. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on January 24, 2014.

PRESENT: Brent Taylor Mayor
 Kent Bailey Council Member
 Lynn Satterthwaite Council Member
 Cheryl Stoker Council Member
 Phillip Swanson Council Member
 James Urry Council Member

STAFF PRESENT: Bryan Steele Acting City Manager
 Annette Spendlove City Recorder/HR Director
 Kevin Warren Chief of Police
 Gary Kerr Building Official
 Craig Giles Public Works Director
 Tiffany Staheli Parks & Recreation Director

VISITORS: Paul Nanny Donna Nanny
 Stephanie Valadez Brant Law

Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance.

Council Member Urry offered the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ACTIVE AGENDA

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Paul Nanny, 1329 N. 1675 E., Layton, stated that he owns property in North Ogden in a future subdivision and he thought that he had an agreement with the City regarding the installation of a water line; he has met his obligation as specified in the agreement, and that was to provide a roadway where the waterline could be installed so that it was not necessary to run the line through residential lots. He summarized the work that has taken place so far to identify the location for the waterline and complete the necessary engineering work and noted that costs of the project grew as the work continued. He stated the former City Manager asked him if he would be willing to cover any costs over the original estimate for the project and it took him a lot of effort to get five owners to agree upon the location of the waterline and paying the amount in excess of the estimate for the project. He stated that he and the other property owners finished their work in the latter part of August or first part of September and he provided a package to the

City Engineer for review and approval; as far as he knows, the City Engineer was satisfied with the work that had been completed and he felt he had met his obligation defined in the agreement. He stated that Mr. Chandler is no longer employed with the City and Mayor Taylor has gotten involved and has questioned whether this is something the City should be participating in. He stated he researched the issue to determine why the City wanted the water line installed initially and he found in the January 11, 2014 minutes that there is an obligation to provide water pressure to the area; there has been an instance in the past where the City did not loop the water system and there was not adequate flow for fire pressure. He stated it is his understanding the water pressure in The Cove is adequate and the City wanted to connect that system to the system below to provide the proper water looping; there was also a plan to install a pressure regulator valve (PRV) to allow the City to regulate more pressure for people below where his property will eventually be subdivided. He noted the project would have been advantageous to the City and residents in the area. He concluded that he is trying to find out the City's intention relative to the agreement so he knows how to proceed. He stated it would be too bad if the City decided against fulfilling its obligation in the agreement because the water line is needed to address marginal water pressures in the area.

3. DISCUSSION ON 3775 N WATERLINE PROJECT

Mayor Taylor noted that he provided the Council with a summary of the issue and it is very similar to the information provided by Mr. Nanny during his public comments. He stated Mr. Nanny and the other landowners have done nothing wrong and the water line was not their idea to begin with. He noted the agreement was made due to a set of circumstances that he does not fully agree with. He noted the Fire Marshal determined there was inadequate pressure for a subdivision at the top of 500 East unless each home was built with their own fire sprinkler system and the developer of that project moved forward undertaking that requirement. However, the sprinkler requirement was quite cumbersome and the developer was not able to sell the lots for the price he needed and, therefore, no homes have been constructed in that development. He stated he feels those types of things are the responsibility of the developer and it is not up to the City to install sewer and water infrastructure for a new subdivision; the improvements are ultimately decided to the City. He stated this is the same information that should be given to any developer when seeking to subdivide their property. He stated, however, that was not the case in Mr. Nanny's situation and the former City Manager entered into discussions regarding the possibility of looping the water line from The Cove to bring water through the south end of Mr. Nanny's and other properties. The water loop would also provide water on 500 East and solve the fire flow problem for the developer in that area as well. He noted when the City Manager talked to the property owners they talked about the manner in which the water line should be installed and the property owners have spent approximately \$7,500 on the engineering work for the project with the intent for the City to continue to pay the same amount that the original loop project would have cost, which was \$106,000, with the developer paying any amount over \$106,000 to complete the more complex water line construction to install the full water infrastructure system. He stated that when this issue was brought to his attention it was only mentioned as the loop project; neither he nor the Council have been approached about the more complex project that later took shape, which was installing the water line with the assistance of two development groups. He stated he met with Mr. Nanny and other property owners after the City Manager's departure and let them know that he had major concerns about the project based

on the fact that this is something that the City has never been involved in in the past. He noted the City Engineer agreed and had the same concerns about using private taxpayer dollars to participate in a private development. He stated the impetus being the project is not a taxpayer responsibility to begin with and that was the fire flow issues; if a subdivision lacks adequate pressure for fire flow, it is the developer's responsibility to install adequate pipes or wait until neighboring subdivisions are developed with adequate infrastructure to connect to. He noted there are many properties in the City that are undevelopable due to the cost to connect to utility infrastructure and the City has never participated in a project to facilitate private residential development by installing such infrastructure. He reiterated the participation that the City had been committed to by the former City Manager was not legitimate and he feels it would set a bad precedent for the City to become involved in such a project especially when other developers have been required to install their own infrastructure. He emphasized that this project was not the idea of Mr. Nanny or the property owners and he is not trying to cast any dispersion upon them; nonetheless, \$106,000 of tax dollars should not be spent on the project and could be used for much better uses in the City, such as the drilling of a new well. He concluded the Fire Marshal has since removed the fire flow finding from the 500 East subdivision and the need for the water loop project no longer exists. He stated the group of developers for the 3775 North subdivision have paid for engineering work for their development and they were encouraged to do so by a member of City staff; they have incurred expenses and spent a lot of time and the decision now is how the City will proceed. He clarified that the City Council originally approved a budget of \$106,000 for the water loop project, but never had any discussions about participating in the more complex project for the development and he summarized the options before the Council at this time: first is to continue with the project and make an agreement with the developers; second is to not continue with the project and compensate the developers for their engineering costs as a good faith effort; third is to do nothing; or fourth is to assist in financing the installation of the lines to ultimately be paid back by way of a payback agreement. He noted the City Attorney has recommended against entering into the payback agreement, but he is comfortable with the City reimbursing the property owners for the engineering costs they have spent on the project. He noted he does not feel the City should participate in the project, which only serves to solve a private development problem.

Council Member Satterthwaite stated that it sounds to him like the City made a mistake. Council Member Bailey noted that in the past the City has performed other water line looping projects where there was inadequate water flow. Mayor Taylor stated that is correct, but he is not aware of another project that is similar to the project at hand. There was a brief general discussion regarding the purpose of past looping projects, with Council Member Satterthwaite noting he is hesitant to set a precedent relative to this type of situation. Council Member Stoker agreed and noted she does not feel the residents would appreciate the City spending taxpayer dollars to fund a private development. She agreed the City has made a mistake and she does not feel the Council should agree to take on the project in any shape or form. Council Member Bailey agreed and noted the discussion should only center on whether the Council is comfortable paying the engineering costs that were incurred because of misdirection by City staff. Council Member Swanson stated he feels the City should pay for the engineering costs. Mayor Taylor agreed because he does not feel the property owners would have come together and paid for the engineering work without some incentive from the City. Mr. Nanny stated that is correct. He added the subdivision will not be able to proceed until other properties are subdivided and utility

connections are more readily available. A discussion regarding various developments in the area of the subject property ensued with input from Mr. Nanny and Brant Law. Mayor Taylor concluded this is a very difficult situation.

Council Member Urry stated he understands the ethical reason for the City to pay for the engineering fees, but on the other hand he looks at the money as an investment for the property owners. He stated he has made investments in the past where he lost more than \$7,500 based on advice from someone else and no one ever made him whole. Mr. Nanny stated that he thought he had an agreement with the City; if that agreement had not been in place he would not have spent \$7,500 for engineering services. He stated in talking to the City Manager he thought he was talking with someone who had control and decision making authority. Mayor Taylor added that the City Engineer also sent an email to Mr. Nanny's engineer, after being directed by the City Manager, indicating that the City was committed to the project. He noted the City Attorney that is not legally binding because the Council is the only body that can making binding decisions for the City, but there were written commitments from City staff that led Mr. Nanny and the other property owners to undertake the engineering costs. There was a general discussion regarding procedural issues in the City that prohibit City staff from making binding decisions, with Mayor Taylor noting it is necessary for the Council to adopt policies or make procedural changes to ensure similar situations do not occur in the future. Council Member Urry stated that the Council should have received all information regarding the project before a decision was made; there was a breakdown in communication between the City Manager and the City Council and the City Manager may have misrepresented the scope and intent of the project.

The Council debated the options available to them for addressing the issue, with a focus on whether the results of the engineering work will be valuable to Mr. Nanny and the other property owners in the future, with Council Member Bailey proposing that the City reimburse the property owners 50 percent of the engineering costs that have been spent as a result of advice or a commitment from a City employee. Council Member Swanson stated he is comfortable with that proposal. Council Members Stoker and Urry objected to the recommendation and Mayor Taylor concluded it would be most appropriate to gather more information about the issue and add an action item to the next business meeting agenda for the Council to take a formal action. He thanked the Council and property owners for their input this evening.

The Council then had a brief discussion regarding the potential procedural changes that should be made to ensure that situations like this do not occur in the future. Council Member Bailey noted that he appreciates the way Mayor Taylor had dealt with issues such as this one in a very frank and direct manner. Council Member Urry agreed and noted this is an example of why the Council needs to do their homework regarding each budget they are asked to consider. Council Member Bailey agreed, but noted it is also important for the Council to be able to trust those employees that are responsible for the day-to-day operations of the City. There was also a brief discussion regarding other projects that have been approved in the City in poor judgment, with Mayor Taylor noting the most important thing to him is that taxpayers understand they will not be 'on the hook' to help developer make a profit.

2. DISCUSSION ON EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION

Acting City Manager Bryan Steele reviewed a chart identifying the fiscal impact of providing a certain percentage increase to employees in a given year. He used the example of a three-percent increase and noted that would have a fiscal impact of \$102,000 per year. Mayor Taylor noted he and Mr. Steele are not expecting the Council to make any decisions regarding compensation tonight and this discussion is just meant as an intro to salary discussions for the upcoming budget cycle. Council Member Bailey inquired as to the employee benefits that are tied directly to salary. Mr. Steele stated they include FICA, URS, and the 401K match provided by the City. There was a brief discussion regarding retirement contribution rates, with Mr. Steele noting there are tier one, tier two, and public safety employee categories with the Utah Retirement System and he reviewed the contribution percentages made for each employment category. Mr. Steele then reviewed the available fund balances in the City budget and noted that sales tax revenues are up five percent over the amount budgeted. Council Member Bailey inquired as to the current fund balance percentage. Mr. Steele answered it is 17 percent of general fund revenues.

A memo from Mayor Taylor summarized several ideas or suggestions for improving employee compensation policies or benefit packages. Staff and all Department Heads have participated in meetings to discuss these issues.

Bottom Line Up Front (BLUF): We have had three good discussions with our Department Heads about salaries and employee compensation. Everyone has provided input and thoughts. We have sifted through a variety of concepts and ideas together, and have 4 primary options for addressing the salaries. The options are not necessarily mutually-exclusive, and some can be done in cooperation with one another. Ultimately the staff and I will recommend that we implement the “second half” of the already-programmed salary increases now instead of new salary increases and adjustments for reasons explained below. We also recommend taking a longer-term look at the best salary incentive program for our employees moving forward, as part of the next budget process.

Format for Work Session: We will be presenting all of the ideas below for discussion, as well as welcoming any ideas from the Council. All Dept. Heads will be present and will offer their advice and input. Throughout the meeting, we will be looking for your guidance about what to do with salaries in the near-term, and also what concepts you want us to refine further and bring to you during the budget process next year for a more comprehensive approach to salaries, employee benefits, morale, etc.

Primary Options for Addressing Salary Needs

1. Develop New Salary Recommendations Based on an Updated Salary Survey

Concept: Develop a new list of salary recommendations for each employee in each department. We started with this concept first, but realized without an updated salary survey, we were kind of making it up as we went along. To really be effective and objective this process needs to be underpinned by a recent and relevant salary survey, and the data used by the original committee is now more than 2 years old. Annette has begun the process of doing a new salary survey, but this will take 1-2 months to finish. Our Dept. Heads feel it will be better to conduct a new salary survey and use that periodically to adjust salaries as a more long-term solution.

2. Implement Planned “Second Half” of Salary Increases Sooner

Concept: Implement the second portion of the already-programmed salary increases sooner. Upon further review, this option is our top recommendation. These salary increases are already programmed and planned. The Dept. Heads like that there is no possibility of internal politics or intra-department competition, because these salary increases are already set and were determined against an objective standard (the original Compensation Committee report). Therefore, it makes sense to do the second half of the previously recommended salary amounts sooner and we would like to ask you to consider implementing these salary increase on January 1, 2015. The impact to the budget will be about \$125,000 (\$96,000 General Fund, \$29,000 from Enterprise Funds).

3. Develop a Career Progression Plan

Concept: Create a plan for career progression through our departments, so that employees who reach certain career milestones can be rewarded with salary increases. This is especially important for our departments where employees can stay in the same position for long periods of time. Their only possibility for raises right now, is either the Council to approve money for raises or for a COLA to be passed by the City Council. Our Dept. Heads would like to see a program that incentivizes employee performance and educational achievement. Here is an example of how such a career progression program could work (these are just example numbers—not a real proposal):

Position: Utility Worker I

2.5% raise for earning the Water II or Sewer II certificates

2.5% raise for earning Water III certificate

2% raise for completing a Bachelor’s Degree

2.5% longevity raise after 5 years of service

The basic idea would be to offer a career and salary progression opportunity for employees who will be in their positions for some time. Often our employees end up staying in the same position while waiting a promotion opportunity, and currently the only way for them to get a salary increase is for the Council to pass salary increases or COLA. This type of program would give these employees some more ownership in their own career and would give them an opportunity to earn salary increases through their own good performance and effort. The increases would last until they earned a promotion, after which they would be placed on the salary range of that new position and the previous increases would no longer apply. They could then earn the new increases associated with their new position to boost their new salary.

Our Dept. Heads like this type of program a lot, and we would like to bring a more formal plan before the Council that addresses this option or Option #4 below as part of the budget process early next year.

4. Develop a Program for Performance-Based Evaluations & Merit Raises

Concept: Make a pool of funds available to each department during the budget process for merit raises to deserving employees.

Currently we do not have a formal program for merit raises. In the past this has simply been based on the budget and what the Council approved. Then the program was implemented in different departments as per the Dept. Head. As the economy improves, the Dept. Heads would like to see us be able to get back to offering merit raises. This gave the Dept. Heads the opportunity to review their employees’ performance, and incentivize the performance and reward those with positive reviews.

Obviously if we implemented something like #3 above, we would not need to focus as much on #4. But merit raises should be part of our program whenever fiscally possible.

Employee Morale/Recognition Ideas

These are some ideas we have discussed as ways to recognize our employees and build high morale. Some ideas from Councilmembers and some from our Dept. Heads. They are in no particular order.

1. Employee Compliment Program: A program where citizens are encouraged to report on positive employee interactions. The employee and the citizen would receive a small incentive, such as movie tickets.
2. Employee Suggestion Program: A program wherein employees who give suggestions for improving efficiency, saving money, etc. receive a small incentive (such as a gift card).
3. Introduce Employees to City Council: Regularly introduce employees to the City Council during meetings. Perhaps when they are first hired, and upon receiving promotions or other career milestones.
4. Employee Spotlight in Newsletter: Spotlight an employee in the newsletter periodically to put a face on our public employees.
5. Lagoon Day (or similar): The city used to offer a lagoon day or similar social/fun event for employees and their families.
6. End of Year Bonus: The city used to offer a Christmas Bonus to employees

Other Employee Benefit Ideas

These are other ideas we brainstormed for helping to improve working conditions and employee morale. These ideas are in no particular order, and will be topics for discussion during the Work Session. We would like to get guidance of which ideas the Council would be willing to consider, and we will develop them further.

1. 401k contribution: The City used to match up to 6% employee contributions. This was discontinued a few years ago.
2. Alternate Work Schedules: Other cities use alternate work schedules as a “no-cost” employee benefit. Our Dept. Heads believe that we could maintain proper coverage while offering 10 or 9 hour workdays (with an associated day off every week or every other week, respectively).
3. Contributions to HSA accounts: The City could contribute to these accounts as a benefit for employees who use them. We did a “one-time” contribution to these accounts when we launched the HSA as an option, but there is not a plan for contributing to them going forward.
4. Education Benefits: The City could introduce a program to assist with trade school or college tuition, in exchange for a contract to stay working with the city for a set period of time after graduation. We have done this in the past, based on Council approval, but there is not really a formal program in place.

Mayor Taylor reviewed his memo. There was a brief discussion regarding the difference between merit pay increases and cost of living adjustments (COLAs). Council Member Swanson stated he feels that some of the suggestions mirror pay policies used in the private sector. He added that for pay progression he would like that employees be required to contribute a certain number of years or some sort of commitment to the City if they receive a training opportunity that makes them more valuable to the City or another city. Mayor Taylor noted the City pays for certain opportunities and there may not be a legal problem with requiring some sort of

commitment from an employee who leaves after receiving certain training. Council Member Swanson stated he would be interested in considering a non-compete clause for employees where an employee would not be able to work for another city for a certain period of time after severing their relationship with North Ogden City. Mayor Taylor stated he can ask City Attorney Call to research that option. There was a general discussion about a career progression plan, with a continued focus on requiring employees to commit to work for the City for a certain period of time after receiving training that contributed to a certification. Council Member Swanson suggested that pay increases for certifications not be given to employees for up to six months after receiving a certification to ensure that they can apply the newly gained knowledge to their job. Public Works Director Giles stated he would be comfortable with that.

Police Chief Warren stated he is hesitant to implement a non-compete clause or require an officer to make a commitment to the City after receiving a new certification because officers must already spend a significant amount of money to become POST certified in order to be considered for hire by a police department. He added that when his officers receive certain certifications qualifying them to move from one range to another within the pay scale, he would like for them to receive the entry pay of the new range or a five percent increase, whichever is higher. He stated his focus is on attracting and keeping quality officers. The Council discussed the ability to implement different pay progression policies for each department. City Recorder Spendlove stated that is an option, but she wants to ensure that when the Council decides to give merit increases the same percentage amount should be available to each department and the Department Head will decide how to divide the percentages among their employees. She stated there should never be a circumstance where one department gets money for merit raises while others do not.

Council Member Urry stated that it is his understanding that there are two departments in the City that are ‘hemorrhaging’ because they continue to lose employees and he thought those departments were going to recommend a solution for addressing compensation issues for their departments. He stated that he did not think this was going to be a salary discussion for all employees, but a discussion specific to those departments to stop the problem. Building Official Kerr stated he feels the biggest issue is employee morale and if the morale in the City were better, many employees that have received job offers from other entities would have chosen to stay rather than leave. Mayor Taylor stated that one thing that contributes to the low morale is that many employees know that if they left their employment with the City, the person hired to replace them would start out making more money than them due to the way the City’s pay scales are structured. He stated employees know that the City has conducted a salary survey to determine appropriate salary scales, but they have not been implemented. He noted his recommendation is that the funding set aside to move all employees to their entry level wage at a minimum be spent now and employees receive the appropriate pay now; the cost to implement that would be \$62,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year. He stated the action would raise morale and the next step could be to consider a career progression plan in conjunction with the development of the next fiscal year budget.

Council Member Bailey asked Mayor Taylor if he is proposing funding for merit increases and career progression increases each year. Council Member Swanson asked what would happen in a year where an employee is eligible for a merit raise and a career progression raise. There was a

general discussion regarding employee compensation funding, with Mayor Taylor indicating more discussion is necessary and the most important thing to him at this point in time is that each employee be brought to at least the entry level wage in their scale. Council Member Satterthwaite stated that he wants North Ogden City to be known as an employer that pays their employees fairly and has created a system where people want to stay and be a part of. Chief Warren stated that right now the opposite is true; the City has trained its employees to be the stars for other agencies because it has refused to compensate employees fairly. He stated he feels a significant salary survey needs to be conducted and the results implemented within the next six months. He noted the pay increase being recommended right now will help the morale in his department, but it will not solve all the problems. There was a brief discussion regarding the criteria used for the City's last salary survey, after which Council Member Bailey shared his three main concerns regarding the City's compensation plan: first is that there is little opportunity for growth in North Ogden because there are so few positions and higher paid positions do not open very frequently; second is that turnover is essential for an organization the size of North Ogden and it is not possible to keep everyone all the time; third is that it is necessary to set aside a block of funding to operate the City's departments and carefully consider all proposed pay increases to avoid inflating the operating budget to an unreasonable level that is no longer in the market. He stated he recognizes the need to make structural changes in order to retain employees and the low morale in the City is not based solely upon compensation; it is important to address all issues contributing to low morale rather than thinking that money will solve every problems.

Council Member Urry stated that employees need to be aware of the amount of money that the City contributes to employees' retirement packages and other benefits. Mayor Taylor stated that employees are aware of those things and are appreciative of them, but it is still important to compensate them fairly based on the market. Council Member Stoker added that the Council asked the Department Heads to work together to create a proposal for an improved compensation plan; they have done that and their recommendation is reasonable and yet the Council is arguing with them. She acknowledged it will not be possible to approve every recommendation made regarding compensation and it will not be possible to retain every employee, but she wants to get to a point where people are not leaving the City because they are underappreciated or underpaid or no chance for advancement. She stated she feels the second half of the pay raise should be implemented now and she would be supportive of additional increases in the crucial areas of the City. She stated she is in favor of discussing the other options listed in the memo during future budget meetings. The Council discussed Council Member Stoker's proposal with the Department Heads, with a focus on pay compression within the pay scales due to the fact that employees have not been allowed to move through their wage scale.

Council Member Bailey asked if there is some flexibility associated with the second portion of the pay increase approved at the beginning of the budget year. Mr. Giles stated that his employees are expecting the same amount that he received at the first of the fiscal year and it would be difficult to change that at this point in time.

The Council concluded to implement the second half of pay increases now and have more detailed discussions regarding the many compensation issues in upcoming meetings and throughout the budget process.

Parks and Recreation Director Staheli asked that the Council also give consideration to increasing the pay ranges for her part time and seasonal employees because she cannot attract good employees at the current pay. She stated she has been forced to hire SOS or temporary employees to get the work done in her department.

Council Member Urry suggested the City hire a consultant that is a professional at doing the work at developing salary scale recommendations. Council Member Stoker stated the City can conduct a salary survey and each Department Head is an expert at knowing what they need in their own department. Council Member Bailey agreed the City has the expertise in house. He noted that one of his concerns was that the City tasked a committee with a certain task and they did something different and created a level of expectations that was far higher than the City could ever achieve financially. He stated the Department Heads and employees should have been trusted to provide information about their actual needs. Council Member Swanson agreed. Council Member Urry stated that he has asked for a spreadsheet that includes all employees in all departments and the amount of money that each Department Head feels those employees should be paid accompanied with a proposal regarding how to achieve that pay. Council Member Satterthwaite stated the discussion needs to be more than about a spreadsheet; there must be criteria defined that an employee must meet in order to get to a certain point in their pay scale.

Council Member Swanson stated he would like to have a factual comparison of the wages for seasonal or temporary employees compared to the cost the City pays for SOS employees.

Chief Warren then asked if the Council has given any thought to re-implementing the three percent 401K matching contribution for employees. This led Mayor Taylor to review various employee morale programs that have been referenced in his memo. Council Member Bailey asked how many employees are taking advantage of the option to have a 401K account, to which Mr. Steele answered approximately 90 percent. Mayor Taylor noted the three percent match would be less expensive than a three percent wage increase. He then focused on the option for an adjusted work schedule for City employees, with the Council concluding they are comfortable with alternate work schedules at the discretion of Department Heads as long as each department has coverage five days per week. Council Member Bailey stated he would like to discuss each benefit option in more depth during the upcoming budget discussion meetings.

The Department Heads thanked the Council for paying attention to the compensation issues in the City. The Council concluded to take formal action on the second half of the employee pay increases at the November 18 meeting so raises can be implemented in the next pay period after the meeting. Mayor Taylor stated he may send an administrative memo to all employees with a summary of the outcome of this meeting given that all employees were very interested in the meeting.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

5. COUNCIL/MAYOR/STAFF COMMENTS

Council Member Bailey motioned to go into a closed meeting to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Bailey	aye
Council Member Satterthwaite	aye
Council Member Stoker	aye
Council Member Swanson	aye
Council Member Urry	aye

The motion passed unanimously.

The closed session began at 9:30 p.m.

The regular meeting reconvened at 9:59 p.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Bailey motioned to adjourn. Council Member Stoker seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Bailey	aye
Council Member Satterthwaite	aye
Council Member Stoker	aye
Council Member Swanson	aye
Council Member Urry	aye

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:01 p.m.

Brent Taylor, Mayor

S. Annette Spendlove, MMC
City Recorder

Date Approved