

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT
January 15, 2019

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Roll Call: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman David Fotheringham. The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Chairman: Dave Fotheringham

Commission Members: Bryce Higbee, Alan MacDonald, Jane Griener, John Gubler, Sylvia Christiansen

Excused: John MacKay

Staff: Austin Roy, Marla Fox, Jed Muhlestein

Others: Julie Yarbrough, Doug Turner, Jan Braithwaite, Ralph Summers, Glenn Simmons, Catherine Marchant, Sherm Myers, Tom Watkins, Doni Watkins, Dustin Watkins, Tori Watkins, Brooke Bennett, Shaun Bennett, Sean Horan, Shelley Parker, David Parker, Victoria Pettey, Julie Peterson, Carolyn Baumgartner, Rachel Layton, Mark Cluff, Susan Cluff, Darryl Stallings, Marcus Sorensen, Shahbaz Janjua, Lisa Marion, Karen Quick, Bradley Barton, Tamara Barton, Michael B., Clark Williams, Lon Lott, Sue Gillespie, Jennifer Lovelady, Billie Paul, Gale Rudolph, Dale Palsson, Chase Palsson, Ashley Carter, Rick Louder, Chris Paulson, Kelly Palmer, Kristi Anterton, Bill Voss, Tom Williams, Alison Williams, Mitzi McBride, Mile McBride, Pamela Pamela, Cindy Walter, David Walter, Cathy Farr, Joey Schmutz, Dawn Bingham, Mike Davis, Jeff Call, Nate Larsen, Julianne Rowley, Kimberly Sherwin, Dave Fleming, John Williams, Crystal Hauser, Julie Matern

B. Prayer/Opening Comments: David Fotheringham

C. Pledge of Allegiance: John Gubler

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Site Plan Review – Bank of American Fork

The Bank of American Fork proposed a new building to replace the existing structure. The existing building would be demolished, and the new building would be located at the same site as the current building. The site was located within the Business Commercial Zone and the Gateway Historic District. The proposed building was approximately 4,166 square feet on a parcel approximately 0.84 acres in size. There were 21 total off-street parking stalls being proposed. The developer was seeking a recommendation of approval for the proposed site plan.

Austin Roy said the Bank asked for an exception on setbacks and parking and that was previously approved by the City Council. The setbacks were approved to be within 10 feet of the northern street and 20 feet, 10 inches off of Main Street. The east side of the property would be changed by demolishing the building in that location. Four parking spaces were approved in the setback

area within the easement. The proposal met all parking requirements; in total, the plans showed 19 regular parking stalls with two ADA parking stalls. The trees met the new guidelines. All design criteria had been met, including building height. The only thing that needed to be completed was screening the south end of the property with a solid barrier. Staff recommended approval with the condition that this screening be provided.

David Fotheringham stated that the Planning Commission had previously reviewed this application. Sylvia Christiansen noted that the Commission previously requested that the applicant move everything by about 10 feet in a particular direction. When asked if this had been done, Austin Roy explained that when this item went before the Mayor and Council, they ended up approving the application based on where the current setbacks were located. Therefore, the Council did not go with Planning Commission's recommendation on the matter.

Austin Roy stated that the property would need to meet the Gateway Historic requirements. One of the key features of these requirements was maintaining consistent architectural appearance in the downtown, Main Street area. It was important for this building to blend in with the other existing businesses. He then presented several artist renditions of the site configuration. Another key feature in this area was pitched roofs and based on the renderings, it appeared the applicant complied with this design requirement. He then presented a rendering of what the bank would look like from Main Street.

MOTION: Sylvia Christiansen recommended approval of the proposed Bank of American Fork Site Plan with the following conditions:

1. The Developer obtain a demolition and land disturbance permit prior to construction.
2. Screening be added to the parking lot on the south property line.

Alan MacDonald seconded. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Bryce Higbee
 Alan MacDonald
 David Fotheringham
 Jane Griener
 John Gubler
 Sylvia Christiansen

Nays:

None

B. Public Hearing – Plat Amendment – Summit Pointe Subdivision – Six Blue Bison LLC

Austin Roy presented the staff report as well as an aerial map of the subject property. He explained that the developer, Six Blue Bison LLC, was seeking to amend the recorded plat for the Summit Pointe Subdivision. The property was located in the CR-40,000 zone, which was essentially a one-acre zone. In total, there were 32.94 acres on the subject property. The existing recorded plat was a four-lot subdivision with lots ranging in size from 3.96 acres to 12.73 acres. The proposed plat amendment was for an eight-lot subdivision with lots ranging in size from 0.95 acres to 5.44 acres, which was consistent with the zone. Access to the existing lots on the recorded plat was

through an approved, private shared driveway. The plat amendment sought to do away with the private shared driveway and proposed access to the eight-lots via a public street through an extension of Lakeview Drive (west end of Lakeview Drive). The proposed extension of Lakeview Drive would stub into the neighboring municipality of Draper.

Austin Roy reviewed the history of the property, stating that Six Blue Bison originally brought in a proposal for 15 lots, but was now amending the proposal to eight lots. This area was located in the Urban Wildland Interface which was in the fire zone. In this area, buildings had to be built with a certain material, required a certain vegetative clearance around each building, had to be sprinkled, and required a specific type of roof. Additionally, this development would be required to have two accesses. The applicant was proposing the accesses to be located off of Lakeview Drive and Draper Road. Austin Roy said all the lots met the minimum frontage requirements.

Austin Roy said the Developer owned this land along with the land on the Draper side; therefore, the property was subject to the traffic that would come from Draper. The owner planned to develop on the Draper side. The subdivision would be called the Sequoia Subdivision and would have 415 homes with a mix of single homes and townhomes. Austin Roy said a traffic study was completed and it included future traffic projections. He noted that the applicant asked Staff what intersections they wanted studied, and the applicant complied with this request. When asked if other neighborhood roads could handle the additional traffic, Austin Roy said the projection was that even with the increased traffic flow this development would cause, Alpine's roads would still remain a Service Level A. The question was asked if the projections from the traffic study included the development of Sequoia's additional 415 homes; it was noted that these projections included Summit Pointe and the Sequoia Subdivision. Austin Roy said this was all contingent upon Draper City approving a through-street. If Draper did not allow the street, Alpine would have a stub street or be a long cul-de-sac and the proposal would not meet the ordinance.

Austin Roy presented a map depicting where the eight lots would be located on the Alpine City side. On the map submitted by the applicant, it didn't show an easement for a trail and the City wanted to see that easement preserved for a future trail. He also explained that a connecting road into Draper City was not currently in Alpine's General Plan, and State Law required all new roads to comply with the General Plan. Therefore, the General Plan would need to be altered to allow this road. There was further review of the plat.

Jed Muhlestein read part of the State Code pertaining to the General Plan. State Law 10-9A-406 read: "After the Legislative body has adopted a General Plan, no street, park or other public way may be constructed or authorized as until and unless it can conform to the current General Plan."

Jed Muhlestein summarized the engineering review included in the Council packet. He explained that the streets were operating at a Level of Service A and would continue to operate at that level after development. Therefore, no improvements needed to be made to any street beyond what the developer showed on the plans. Frontage improvements like sidewalk, streets, curb and gutter were required. There was frontage along the road they were proposing and there was also frontage along Lot 2 on Hog Hollow. The plans did show sidewalk improvements in that section. Grading for the roads appeared to adhere to the ordinance which limited grading to 50 feet beyond the right-of-way. To ensure that this occurred, the Developer also showed a retaining wall. The retaining

walls appeared to meet the City's retaining wall ordinance as they were shorter than nine feet and the proposed material was redi-rock. Prior to construction, they would be required to obtain a separate building permit for the retaining walls.

Jed Muhlestein said in terms of culinary water and pressurized irrigation, the plans showed a connection of a 14-inch line for the development and a 12-inch line in Lakeview Drive. He mentioned a small section of eight-inch line in the bubble of Lakeview Drive that they would have to remove and replace with a 14-inch line as part of the proposed development. The current recorded Summit Pointe subdivision showed a one-acre restriction of outside irrigation on each of the lots. These plans did not reflect that and staff recommend that they do. Staff also recommended that any kind of landscaping above the 5,350 elevation line be limited to xeriscape or drip irrigation due to pressures in the system. It also needed to be clear that drip irrigation was considered irrigable area and counted towards the one-acre restriction. The pressurized irrigation system showed a six-inch line that would also connect to Lakeview Drive to get service. Currently, Alpine was having pressure issues in the area of Lakeview Drive. For this proposed development, staff recommended that the lines be installed but they not be put in service until offsite improvements were completed.

Jed Muhlestein said sewer would be installed in the main roadway of the development and would connect to the existing system in 600 North. This would provide gravity sewer for the development. The storm drain would be similar by collecting water along the roadway, bringing it to a low point in the road, and directing it down to the bottom east side of the development. The plan showed a culvert under Lakeview Drive where it crossed open space.

The storm drain had seen some changes from the first time the Planning Commission reviewed this proposal. The storm drain report included with the application showed that the detention pond was sized for a 10-year storm and that did not meet City ordinance; it needed to be sized for a 100-year storm. Staff recommended that this be corrected prior to any kind of project approval.

Since the subject property was located in a protected, sensitive land area, a Geological Hazard Report was required for reviewing slope stability, debris flow, flooding, etc.

Jed Muhlestein said he read the reports and there were a few important items that he learned from the reports. In terms of slope stability of the site, the Geologic Hazard Report specifically said that any slope cuts greater than 3 to 1 on or near the site needed to be evaluated. The detention pond in the plans showed a 2 to 1 cut for 80 feet up the hillside and that was not evaluated. This would need to be evaluated in the re-design of the pond and included as part of their resubmission. Additionally, the Geologic Hazard Report mentioned debris flows, and unfortunately Alpine City was well aware of debris flows due to a recent incident. The Geologic Hazard Report mentioned that debris flows should be accounted for within their storm drain analysis. The storm drain detention pond should be sized for whatever potential debris flows came off that hillside.

A bond would be required prior to plat recordation. Additionally, they would need to meet the City's water policy, and a land disturbance permit would be required prior to construction to ensure that a storm water pollution prevention plan would be followed according to State law. There were also several red lines on the plat and plans that needed to be addressed.

The Fire Department submitted a review letter which was included in the Council packet. Jed Muhlestein reviewed that letter, which mentioned the following:

- The property was located within the Urban Wildland area, which needed to be mentioned on both the plat and plans.
- Lot 4's buildable area was a long distance from its frontage (about 400 feet). The developer was required to design a driveway access for the Fire Department to the buildable area of that road. They were also required to show how this home would be protected with fire. Furthermore, the Fire Chief said they stubbed out a fire lane and a hydrant for Lot 4. This road needed to be an all-weather access road capable of sustaining weight limits of fire apparatuses required by International Fire Code, which means it could not be a dirt road.
- It was assumed the proposed westerly end on the plans would make a connection to a road in Draper City. In order to approve these lots, a road connection was required due to the length of the road with relationship to the existing length of Lakeview Drive.

Jed Muhlestein clarified that on the pressurized irrigation system, Alpine had plans in place for alleviating pressures in the City. Staff was working on the approval of the ridge at Alpine, and they were going to be installing variable speed pumps at the mouth of Fork Canyon so as to push more water into the high pressure zone system. Staff was also looking at a potential new well to be placed in the high zone that would provide both water and pressure for the area. These installations would need to be done before the lines in the subdivision would be charged with water. Until that point, they would be doing all of their watering—both indoor and outdoor—with culinary.

Alan MacDonald said he didn't think the Planning Commission could consider what the Fire Chief had said if he was basing his review off of a connection to Draper City. It was noted that a public hearing would take place in Draper the following night regarding this issue.

Mayor Troy Stout said Alpine's Master Plan did not connect to Draper City and the City did not intend to connect to Draper City. Alpine had a couple of stub streets into Highland that still had not been connected. He said the City Council all signed an agreement.

David Fotheringham opened the Public Hearing.

Julie Yarbrough, 782 Lupine Drive in Alpine, said she and her neighbors opposed the Summit Pointe development as proposed: specifically, any potential road connecting to Alpine through to Draper. She asked everyone in the audience who opposed this item to please stand; approximately 20 people stood. She said she enjoyed the small town feel and dreaded the traffic coming down the roads through Alpine. The streets were not designed to be connector roads and there was already too much traffic on Main Street. She asked that the Council not alter the City significantly. Citizens purchased homes in Alpine assuming this was a bedroom community. She said Blue Bison's plan disregarded Alpine's General Plan and the interests of Alpine's citizens. The developer was only interested in money and it wasn't right for them to do this at the detriment of Alpine residents.

Glen Simmons, 693 West Lakeview Drive, said he and his neighbors opposed this subdivision. He saw no need to sacrifice the quality of the area to benefit someone from a neighboring City. He did not want to see someone from another city profit at the expense of Alpine citizens. He added that he would like to see Lakeview Drive fixed soon.

Crystal Hauser, 184 West Fairview Circle, said she opposed this development because the schools were already overcrowded. To illustrate this point, she explained that her 8th grade daughter was unable to get into basic general education classes at her junior high because there were too many students.

Sherman Myers, 554 Lakeview Drive, opposed the road connection to Draper. If the General Plan needed to be amended then it should be on the ballot for the citizens to decide, similar to what happened in Cottonwood Heights. He did not want to see construction trucks through his neighborhood. He said if this project did get approved, the City needed to have traffic calming devices on all roads leading down from the proposed development.

Toms Williams, 453 Matterhorn Drive, said he noticed a lot of red flags in the traffic study. He said it did not treat all roads the same. He encouraged the City to review the study thoroughly, as it did not take into consideration roads with steep grades. He said these were 25 MPH roads; he was opposed to this plan and the impact it would have on Alpine.

Marcus Sorensen, 721 Lakeview Drive, presented data from some research he had conducted on this issue. He said Blue Bison was relying on an easement to get to their lots. Easement roads were minor roads and not collector roads. He presented a map to show where the roads would be located and which routes would be faster. Google and Apple maps were always going to take a driver through the shortest way to a particular location.

Ashley Carter, 502 North Matterhorn Drive, said she was concerned that Alpine would have to foot the bill for roads and schools. She implored the Commission not to wait for Draper to build that road right up against Alpine.

Billie Paul, 11 South Matterhorn Drive, said 20 years ago a construction truck slammed into her car and almost killed her and her son. She did not want to see more construction equipment coming down Alpine roads.

Julianne Rowley, 390 South Ponderosa Drive, said she moved from Seattle for the quiet and beautiful mountains. Utah was ruining its mountains and she was opposed to construction. She said she was an Alpine school teacher and the schools were already full; she said she wondered where these children would go to school. She wanted to keep Alpine quiet and beautiful.

Dale Palsson, 322 North Matterhorn Drive, asked the Commission to consider 'what was in it for Alpine.' He said Draper would receive all the revenue from taxes and impact fees whereas Alpine would be stuck with all of the expenses.

Darryl Stallings, 651 West Lakeview Drive, stated that Alpine was quiet. For this reason, he chose to retire here. The Master Plan was in place to keep Alpine small and quiet, and this development

would change that. He opposed the road connection into Draper, and agreed Alpine would not get any value from this project.

Tom Watkins, 734 North Summit Way, said this was a no-brainer. It was difficult to get up Summit when snow was present and he believed that this was not considered in the traffic study.

David Walter, 313 East 280 South, asked if the developer knew that there would have to be a General Plan amendment. He said it felt like a pre-emptive strike to get the plat approved without first amending the General Plan.

David Fotheringham closed the Public Hearing.

Paul (no last name given), Developer's Engineer, said he read the report and agreed with all the engineering requirements. They could accommodate the 100-year storm requirement. They could have the 2 to 1 cut slopes evaluated by a geotechnical engineer. Additionally, they would probably redesign the pond to upsize it anyway, which would also address debris overflow into Lots 1 and 2. He mentioned that the current Draper density was 1.03 lots per acre. A plan of 430 lots per acre as submitted to Draper but did not have any traction with its city officials. He said developers tend to go for the highest density possible. He noted that the current approved density in Draper allowed for 115 homes. He pointed out that Lakeview Drive currently did not comply with Alpine's ordinance and this project would help bring that road into compliance. He said the Developer could mitigate the route construction workers used.

When asked if Lot 1 accessed 600 North, the Developer's Engineer answered affirmatively. There was further review of an aerial map of the subject property. It was stated that Parcel A was too high for it to be serviced by the current infrastructure.

Scott Johnson, Traffic Engineer, explained the scope of the traffic study and what they looked for when conducting them. They evaluated the traffic impact of the development on a typical day at three peak times. Additionally, they collected daily traffic data, which was not something they did for every traffic study but felt was necessary for this one. The question was asked if there were different qualifications in traffic studies for residential roads versus public collector roads, or were roads evaluated the same. Mr. Johnson said there were different calculations based on the type of intersection (for example, signaled versus not signaled) and not what area of town it was in. Once the existing Service Level threshold was established, they also projected into a future planning year. In this case, the Mountainland Association of Governments had a horizon year of 2024. As part of the study, they projected growth for the future into 2024. While delays would increase slightly, Alpine would maintain a Service Level A on its roads. As part of these estimates, they used the industry standard database compiled by the Institute of Transportation Engineers to estimate the number of trips caused by the proposed development. They did this using an independent variable, and in residential areas, the most accurate independent variable was the number of homes in the area. Mr. Johnson further explained how Service Level for projected growth was determined based on the data available.

A member of the audience briefly spoke about the challenges posed by winter weather in the areas being discussed.

Another member of the audience stated that there were mechanisms that could be put in place that would limit the routes that trucks could take in this area.

Sylvia Christiansen said some of Alpine’s land use goals were to preserve the quality of life and the existing atmosphere of the City, as well as to preserve and protect critical areas.

Jane Griener said when people moved to Alpine, it was possible that they looked at the Master Plan and based their decision on buying a home on that plan. The point of the Master Plan was to allow people to invest in property and make decisions on which lot they wanted to buy. She said she looked at collector roads when she bought her house. She said the State had a law that changes could not be made without it being in the Master Plan. There were real reasons for having a master plan, and that was to protect the citizens of the City. She supported the master plan and said the Planning Commission had to follow it by law in order to plan. She said it was helpful to hear the citizens’ input on these matters and to know what their concerns were. She appreciated everyone showing up.

Alan Macdonald agreed. He said the City had no plans to amend the General Plan, a statement that had been reinforced by the Mayor.

John Gubler said he moved from Draper because he felt like Draper “sold its soul” just to make money. His biggest concerns pertained to the road connection. He said he would move again if this project was approved.

Bryce Higbee asked if the Commission needed to list the findings in order to make a motion.

MOTION: Jane Griener moved to recommend that the proposed Plat Amendment – Summit Pointe Subdivision be denied based on the following:

1. Alpine City’s General Plan does not show a connection to Draper
2. Only 1 access currently exists
3. Does not meet the Wildland Interface Ordinance
4. Detention Basin doesn’t satisfy the 100 year flood event requirement
5. Potential flooding of Lot 1 and Falcon Ridge Lot 2 needs to be addressed
6. Developer address the issues mentioned in the Geological Hazard Report regarding slope stability and debris flow

Sylvia Christiansen seconded the motion. There was discussion between the Planning Commissioners regarding the above-listed conditions, and the motion was amended as written. Alan MacDonald seconded the amended motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Bryce Higbee
Alan MacDonald
David Fotheringham

Nays:

None

Jane Griener
John Gubler
Sylvia Christiansen

C. Public Hearing – Amendment to Article 3.1.11 & 3.9.6 – Dwelling Clusters & Development Clusters

Staff was proposing an amendment regarding development clusters/ dwelling clusters, which sought to define and clarify these sections of code.

Austin Roy said Staff proposed a definition which stated: *A group of three or more lots whose Buildable Areas are located no more than 2 times the minimum distance of the closest two Buildable Areas, with a maximum distance of 100 feet for the furthest Buildable Area within the Dwelling Cluster.*

Jed Muhlestein said typically in a one-acre development each lot usually had 200 feet of frontage. There was further discussion on the proposed language as read by Austin Roy. Austin Roy then reviewed the old language versus the new language and explained the reasons behind the proposed changes. He noted that there was another amendment to this same ordinance being proposed on tonight's agenda, pertaining to private driveways. One of the proposed amendments addressed length limits on private driveways.

David Fotheringham opened the Public Hearing.

Will Jones stated that the Wadsworth Meadows project may come in with one-acre lots and he wanted to know how this ordinance would affect that development. He was concerned that this was a form of a taking.

Jed Muhlestein pulled up the Development Code where it stated that it was up to the City's sole discretion if a development was a PRD. Alan MacDonald said the developer first came to the City asking for the development to be a PRD. Bryce Higbee said a developer could still build; however, there were regulations on where they could build, and a PRD was usually developer driven.

David Fotheringham closed the Public Hearing.

David Fotheringham said the Commission needed to ask the City's Attorney if a PRD was required in the Sensitive Lands. If it was mandated, then they needed to know if this new ordinance could be considered as a taking. After further deliberation, the Planning Commission determined that the best course of action was to table the issue to allow for additional review.

D. Public Hearing – Amendment to Article 3.1.11 Flag Lots, Private Driveways, & Shared Driveways

Staff was proposing additional definitions for flag lots, private driveways, and shared driveways to the development code in order to regulate these types of uses within the City. Austin Roy explained that the language proposed by staff was adapted from what surrounding cities had adopted. Staff's intent was to ensure that the language wasn't too restrictive, particularly for unique pieces of land that were more difficult to develop.

Austin Roy said the new proposed definition for a flag Lot was: *A lot with fewer frontages in the front part of the lot (flag pole) than required for the zone within which it is located, and the rear portion of the lot (flag) is wider than the front portion. Also, any lot whose lot width at any point in the flag portion of the lot is less than 50 percent of the flag pole portion of the lot.*

Austin Roy said the new proposed definition for a private driveway was: *Vehicular access point to an individual lot from a public street whose specifications meet those defined in Buildable Area.*

Austin Roy said the new proposed definition for a shared driveway was: *A Private Driveway shared by two or more lots.* One of the reasons why this new definition was proposed was to ensure that there weren't any shared driveways in the mountains, scarring up the hillsides. In general, Austin Roy said he preferred to have "black and white" language in the City's ordinances.

In Section 3.03.100 Special Provisions, it would have this language:

Flag Lots, Flag Lots as outlined in definition are prohibited in the CE-5 Zone

Private Driveways, Shall be no longer than 150 feet.

Shared Driveway, The installation of a shared access is prohibited.

Jed Muhlestein said he felt like in areas such as Three Falls where they wanted to protect the hillsides, it might be better to have shared driveways that were still less than 150 feet, and then split off into the individual homes. Alan MacDonald said if there was a good reason for this, property owners could still come in and request a variance. Jed Muhlestein said it would be very hard to obtain a variance. Alan MacDonald agreed that variances should not be easily granted; but if developers could show a good reason for a variance, then there should still be a process in place for it. Jed Muhlestein said it was important for them as a City to draw the line in the sand and determine what they were and were not comfortable with. The comment was made that shared driveways created safety issues due to having multiple access points off of a driveway, which was exactly what they were trying to avoid. Jed Muhlestein stated that the width of the driveways could also be changed. The question was whether or not the City wanted to allow private driveways in the lower elevations to take people up to a higher elevation and build. The General Plan indicated that this was not desirable for the City.

David Fotheringham opened the Public Hearing.

Will Jones asked how someone like the Anson's would be able to build on their property. He said this action would cause more of an issue. He was concerned that the City would be forcing land owners to add a full-blown road that would scar up the hillside, which was exactly what they were trying to avoid. He suggested making slope the issue. Based on the proposed ordinance changes, the City was taking the ability of a land owner to put one home on their property and instead forcing them to develop a subdivision.

The Planning Commission had a discussion based on the concerns raised by Mr. Jones. The Planning Commission decided to table this issue for further review.

David Fotheringham closed the Public Hearing.

IV. Communications

David Fotheringham would like to see all basketball courts in Alpine lined for pickle ball. Alan MacDonald would like more maintenance at Burgess Park.

Sylvia Christiansen asked if anyone else was getting calls about a property on Main Street. Jed Muhlestein said Lonny Layton was interested in putting in a car dealership on Main Street. The City's ordinance currently said commercial sales were permitted in that area; however, there were certain restrictions. An ordinance change would be required for the type of car lot suggested by Mr. Layton.

V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: December 4, 2018

MOTION: John Gubler moved to approve the minutes for December 4, 2018, with the change made by Bryce Higbee. Jane Griener seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Bryce Higbee
 Alan MacDonald
 David Fotheringham
 Jane Griener
 John Gubler
 Sylvia Christiansen

Nays:

None

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 pm.