

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING & MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 N. Main, Alpine, UT
May 12, 2015

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Mayor Don Watkins.

A. Roll Call: The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Mayor Don Watkins

Council Members: Troy Stout, Will Jones, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott

Staff: Rich Nelson, Charmayne Warnock, David Church, Shane Sorensen, Jason Bond, Steve Cosper – Planning Commission Chairman

Others: Bob Antrim, Bryan Hofheins, Gale Rudolph, Chris Rudolph, Jan Braithwaite, Cheri Jackson, Alan Gillman, David Zolman, Myrna Grant, Eric Grant, Mike Russon, Jane Griener, Emily Thrap, Brian Thrap, Paul Kroff, Jessica Smuin, Steve Zolman, Brian Burr, Commissioner Bill Lee, Todd Smith, Ron Madson, Pam Madson, Michelle Smith, Steve Cosper, Dave Fotheringham, Sheldon Wimmer

B. Prayer: Roger Bennett

C. Pledge: Brian Burr

II. PUBLIC COMMENT: Gale Rudolph said she still didn't have access to the trails up Fort Canyon. There was no parking at the trailhead. She said there had been parking along that road for years.

Rich Nelson said he would let Will Jones respond. Will Jones said he would let Brian Burr respond. Mr. Burr was on the trail development committee.

Brian Burr said he had been involved with lengthy discussions with the developer of that area and was pleased to report that there was some resolution. The developer would be putting in a parking lot with restroom facilities and a nice trail system patterned somewhat after Draper City's trail system in Corner Canyon.

Gale Rudolph asked where they could park in the meantime when all that was being developed.

Will Jones said the challenge was that they were tearing up the road and it wouldn't be a good thing to have people in that area.

Ms. Rudolph said people had been able to have access from the west side of the Young property before, but there was a gate and there was nowhere to park. She asked if local people could get a permit to park.

Mayor Watkins said he appreciated her comments. The Council had spent a lot of time on the issue the previous year, but it wouldn't be resolved until the subdivision was constructed, and it would probably get worse before it got better.

Will Jones said the trails would be built with the first phase, and they would be awesome, but currently there was security in Fort Canyon trying to protect the film site.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approve the minutes of April 28, 2015

B. Bond Release - Heritage Hills, Plat C - \$122,730.65

MOTION: Troy Stout moved to approve the Consent Calendar and the minutes of April 28, 2015 as corrected. Will Jones seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Troy Stout, Will Jones, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott voted aye. Motion passed.

Mayor Watkins said the Beck zone change request had been postponed at the request of the Becks.

IV. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS: None

V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Beck Property Zone Change Request - 621 Westfield Road - Dana and Annalisa Beck: This item was postponed at the request of the property owners.

B. Oberee Annexation: The Oberee annexation petition for 190 acres (the old Pack property plus the Grant property) on the northeast corner of Alpine came before the City Council at their meeting of December 9, 2014. According to Alpine City's current Annexation Policy, the property in the Oberee annexation was included in Alpine City's Annexation Declaration area. The Council accepted the petition and process of annexation was begun. The petition was certified by the City Recorder and noticed in Daily Herald, which began the 30 day protest period. Notice of the proposed annexation was sent to all the affected entities. No protests were filed. The next step would be for the City Council to hold a public hearing on the proposed annexation, assign a zoning designation to the annexed property, and vote on it. Typically, an annexation agreement and/or development plan was negotiated during the annexation process. Since there was no annexation agreement or development plan as yet, the public hearing was postponed. In addition, there was a question about whether or not the current Council would allow the same density for the Oberee annexation that was shown in Alpine City's Annexation Policy.

The landowners then approached Utah County about possible development in the county. Since the property was included in Alpine City's Annexation Declaration Area, the County referred it back to Alpine City to see if they were going to act on it.

On March 24, 2015, the City Council and Planning Commission held a joint meeting to discuss the proposed annexation. The following motion was made and passed.

MOTION: Troy Stout moved that the City Council make it clear that they intended to enter into a discussion with the Oberee annexation representatives. Lon Lott seconded. Ayes: 3 Nays: 0. Troy Stout, Lon Lott, Roger Bennett voted aye. Will Jones abstained. Motion passed.

The Oberee Annexation was then discussed by the Planning Commission at their meetings of April 7, 2015, April 21, 2015, and May 5, 2015. At the meeting of May 5th, the Planning Commission made the following motion:

MOTION: Judi Pickell moved to recommend to the City Council to accept the Oberee annexation petition and limit the density to sixty (60) lots maximum for the Zolman property. David Fotheringham seconded the motion. The motion passed with 4 Ayes and 3 Nays.

David Church said the City had also been recently approached by the owners of the Melby property about annexation. Unfortunately the Oberee annexation petition had been caught up in the discussion about the Melby property and they were quite different. The Melby property was not included in Alpine City Annexation Declaration Area so procedurally it was on a different track. The Oberee annexation area was included in Alpine City's expansion area, and had gone through the prescribed annexation process. He said that the landowner or owners had the right to withdraw their application anytime up until the City adopted the ordinance approving the annexation.

David Church said that state law did not require an annexation agreement prior to annexation, but Alpine City had typically required an annexation agreement so both sides knew what to expect. In the absence of an annexation agreement, Mr. Church recommended three possible approaches:

1. Have the property owners state what they proposed and what they would accept. The Council could say yes or no. If the Council agreed with the proposal, they would move forward and draw up an agreement which would be adopted at the same time the ordinance was adopted. It could be a simple agreement or a complicated agreement.
2. The City could move forward and schedule a public hearing and assign a zone to the property. The City would let the landowners know of their intentions. The landowners could then withdraw their petition or be annexed and develop according to the designated zoning.

3. They could continue how they had been going which was to try and guess what the other party wanted or would accept.

Mr. Church recommended they pursue one of the first two approaches. If the landowners knew how many lots they wanted and what they would do relative to infrastructure, the City could react to that. Or if the petitioners didn't know what they wanted, the City could set a public hearing and assign a zone. The petitioners could withdraw if they liked.

Troy Stout asked if they went forward with option two, did it have to fit the current zoning?

David Church said that if the City wanted to create a new zone, they would have to go through the process to create a new zone. However, there were enough zones in the City already to fit most anything scenario. Plus the PRD Ordinance provided flexibility in density and lot size.

Mayor Watkins invited the landowners, Steve Zolman and Myrna Grant , and their representative, Paul Kroff, to comment.

Paul Kroff said he agreed with David Church's options. He said that the landowners had sent a letter to the City dated April 2, 2015 in which they tried to be really clear about what they would expect. They had not submitted a site plan. He said they stood by their letter and were waiting for a response from the City Council.

Steve Zolman said he wanted to live in Alpine so he hoped they could come to something that was mutually agreeable. He asked the Council to remember that they were preserving a mountain in their proposal. He added that he had paid a premium for the property because the attorney said the land was already part of Alpine's Annexation Declaration Area. Second, Mr. Zolman said that there were some improvements the city would require the developers to make. They were asking for 60 lots. He said he would like to come to a mutually beneficial agreement, but didn't want it to drag on.

David Church said that for the public record, they should state what the letter said.

The letter dated April 2, 2015 requested a PRD with a zoning of CE-5 on the conservation easement area (to be private open space), and a zoning of CR-40 on the remainder. There would be a maximum of 40 lots in Phase 1 and maximum of 20 lots in Phase 2. The minimum lot size would be 20,000 square feet.

Water:

- The letter stated that, as a credit against impact fees, the applicant would install any offsite culinary water improvements necessary to service the property.
- As a credit against impact fees, the applicant would install any offsite pressurized irrigation improvements to needed to serve the property.

Roads:

- The primary point of ingress/egress would be off of Grove Drive at the sharp curve. As a credit against impact fees, the applicant would pay for required improvements at the intersection. Possible configurations were a 3-way T intersection, a roundabout, or a more gradual curve with the cooperation of adjacent property owners.
- If requested by the City, and as a credit against impact fees, the applicant would pay a pro-rata share of costs for widening Grove Drive south of the intersection.
- The second point of ingress/egress would be Oak View Lane connecting the property to Alpine Cove subdivision. This would be an emergency access only and would be improved to whatever standard requested by county, city, and neighbors.
- Phase 2 point of ingress/egress would be off of Elk Ridge Lane. The applicant would dedicate the requirement ROW for future road improvements for this access point. Road improvements would be installed if and when Phase 2 was developed.

Open Space:

- The Conservation Easement Area would be dedicated as private open space. A public trail would be dedicated through the non-developed property allowing access to the mountains and connection to northern trails. The open space and trail would preserve the hillside and allow public access through the property to the mountains.
- Property would at a minimum meet all the open space requirements outlined in Section 3.9 of the Alpine City Development Code.

The letter concluded with the following:

Development of the applicant's property has in the past been proposed, expected, and previously approved by the City. On November 20, 2007, the Alpine City Planning Commission granted preliminary approval for the Alpine Canyon Estate project with a total unit count of 79 lots (see attachment 4). On May 26, 2009, the Alpine City Council approved the City's Annexation Policy Plan & map. Exhibit C (attachment 5) of the adopted plan shows a potential of 89 lots on the Pack area (now Oberee) with a CE-5 and CR-40 zoning as currently requesting. The applicant was seeking development consistent in lot size and at a lower density than was previously approved.

Mayor Watkins acknowledged the presence of County Commission Bill Lee.

Myrna Grant said her property (59.17 acres) was located in the county next to Steve Zolman's. She was a widow and not a developer and had no development plan, but she wanted to annex into Alpine so she didn't leave an island. However, she would not feel good about having her property annexed into Alpine City if it still had the county zoning. If she were annexed, she said she had things she could give to the City but she didn't want to mention them at that time.

Paul Kroff reviewed the contents of the aforementioned letter which outlined what the landowners of the Oberee annexation wanted, and what they were willing to do.

Kimberly Bryant asked if there was a reason why the open space had to be private. Did it need to be protected?

Paul Kroff said it met the definition of open space in that it preserved the scenic view. David Church pointed out that it was not entirely private since there was a trail through it that the public could use to access the mountains. He said the previous owner had already given up the right to build structures on the land. The question for the City Council was whether they would agree to leaving it as private open space or if they wanted it to be public. Mr. Church said the landowners were not asking for any extra density based on the open space. They would already receive the proposed density based the proposed zoning without any additional open space.

Troy Stout asked how they would regulate the private open space if there was a trail running through it. David Church said that would be the landowner's responsibility.

Paul Kroff said that Mr. Zolman wanted it to be private open space because he wanted to graze livestock on it. The City would have the right annually inspecting the open space to make sure it conformed with the conditions of the conservation easement. He said he hoped the City would say thank you for preserving the hillside and providing access to the mountains.

Steve Zolman asked if anyone had read the terms of the conservation easement agreement, which were very restrictive and were written such that if the City defaulted even one time, they would no longer have access to the trail. He said the trail designated in the easement went straight up and along a ridge. A better access point would be closer to the neighborhood.

Troy Stout said he'd like to hear from the chairman of the Planning Commission and understand why the majority had a hard time coming to a vote. He asked Steve Cosper why he voted the way he did.

Steve Cospers said he voted in favor of the landowner's proposal for the Oberee annexation. After three or four meetings of discussion on the Oberee annexation, they tried to strike a balance. They understood there were still issues that needed to be discussed. A maximum of 60 lots was considered a starting point. Perhaps more of the land should be zoned CE-5. The water study showed that small lots used less water even though there were more homes. He said the study was helpful. There had been a lot of citizen input saying that Alpine was out of water. That wasn't necessarily the case. The pressurized irrigation water was limited but not the culinary water. Mr. Cospers said he thought the reason for the 4 to 3 vote was because some of the Planning Commission didn't like the idea of 60 lots. One member had a problem with the open space being private rather than public. Another one thought it had gone through too quickly and it needed more study. He said people wanted to lessen the density as development moved farther north. The Planning Commission recommended a maximum of 60 lots but that was not the final number. It could be less. With the zoning and PRD it was not clear. Lot sizes could change in a PRD. He said he'd love to see a CE-5 zoning but that was not practical. There was still a lot of work to be done.

Kimberly Bryant said there were no other half-acre lots in that area.

David Church explained that the zoning of CR-40 described one home per acre, but in a PRD the lots sizes could be smaller and the homes clustered so that part of the area was open space. It didn't necessarily mean the Oberee development would be done as a PRD. If the conservation easement area was zoned CE-5 and the rest was CR-40 and there was no open space, the density would be one home per acre.

Steve Cospers said no one on the Planning Commission was opposed to the annexation. It was the 60 lots that caused some objections.

Mayor Watkins asked Shane Sorensen what the density would be on the Oberee property if it was all zoned CE-5? Shane Sorensen said if the conservation easement was included, it would be about 14 lots. If it was excluded, it would be about 10 lots.

Paul Kroff showed the following chart showing a comparison of the density in nearby developments compared to the Oberee property.

Neighborhood	Homes per Acre
Alpine Cove	0.74
Heritage Hills	0.68
Box Elder South	1.43
Oberee (60 lots)	0.47

Mr. Kroff reviewed the chart. Alpine Cove had a density of 0.74 home per acre. They were not preserving any mountain or open space. Heritage Hills had a density of 0.68 homes per acre. They had open space. Box Elder South was the most dense development with 1.43 homes per acre. It had less open space than Heritage Hills. The proposed Oberee development would be the least dense of all the areas with a density of 0.47 homes per acre. They were aiming for 60 lots. There would be 40 lots in Phase 1 and 20 lots in Phase 2.

Kimberly Bryant asked how many acres of open space were in Heritage Hills and Three Falls. Shane Sorensen estimated there were about 30 acres. Three Falls had 811 acres and over 450 acres of public open space.

Troy Stout said the City wouldn't be getting any benefits from the Oberee development. They already had the trail through the land in the conservation easement.

Steve Zolman said that under the current conservation easement, it would be very inconvenient for the City to access the trail. The City would be responsible to protect the trail and keep the livestock away from it. Plus, the trail could not be constructed until Three Falls was constructed and the trails in Three Falls completed to make a connection.

Kimberly Bryant said there were a lot of trails that ran past livestock and it wasn't a problem. She said she felt strongly about private and public open space. There were times when private open space was warranted. If they were going to trade private open space for extra density, it needed to be beneficial to the community.

Troy Stout said the numbers were confusing and asked Shane Sorensen to explain it. Shane Sorensen said that if they looked at the conservation easement area and assumed it was zoned CE-5, it would be developed as a PRD so the lots would be smaller. As a PRD with a maximum bonus, they would get four additional lots.

Troy Stout said that his point was that he didn't like 60 lots, but he didn't know that he wanted to limit them to 14 or 10 lots.

David Church said that they could pass a motion that said the zone on the conservation easement would be CE-5 and the remainder would be zoned CR-40 with a development agreement that said "X" number of lots were the most they could get.

Lon Lott said they needed to consider other issues that would be of value to the City such as widening Grove Drive and preserving the hillside.

Troy Stout asked if the community really wanted Grove Drive widened? Mr. Lott said that since he'd occupied his Council seat, he heard people screaming that it was so unsafe and people in Box Elder had to negotiate it every day, but it was in the County and the City couldn't do anything about it. Now was he hearing that people wanted it to remain the same?

Don Watkins said that what he'd heard that night was the developers would pay their pro rate share. Was that 5% or 50%?

Troy Stout said they were saying they'd fix it in lieu of impact fees. He saw that as a trade, not a benefit.

Paul Kroff said a study would need to be done. If no improvements were needed, did the City want it done anyway?

Lon Lott said there was a recommendation from staff that it be widened even if it wasn't recommended.

Paul Kroff said widening Grove Drive would be a big expense for 60 lots. Other existing lots in that area would also benefit from the improvement. He said Oberee would expect to pay their share of the improvement but not absorb all of the cost.

There was a question about impact fees versus the cost of improvements. David Church said impact fees were based on the Capital Facilities Plan. There were some roads where it would be appropriate to use impact fees, but Grove Drive was not one of those roads because it was in the County. If they did annex that area, they would recalculate the impact fees and determine what share was the responsibility of the City and what would be the share of the developer.

Kimberly Bryant asked if they had done that with other annexations.

David Church said they had done it with every one of them - Willow Canyon, Heritage Hills. There had been a negotiated agreement. Typically the developer took care of their onsite development. Grove Drive was mostly offsite. When the Alpine Canyon Estates (Roberts) annexation was under consideration, the City had approved an annexation agreement that allowed 79 lots on the condition that the developer improve Grove Drive and provide a second access. He said it was the same property they were currently looking at, but it was prior to the conservation easement.

Troy Stout said they had requested 60 lots. He asked if they would consider a lower density. Mr. Kroff said they might if they could get some relief on the offsite improvements.

Lon Lott said there was a recommendation from staff stating that the offsite improvements were going to be beneficial to the City, such as the water line in the upper water zone.

Don Watkins asked if they had prices, benefits, and cost savings to the City.

Shane Sorensen said they didn't have any numbers yet. However, there was a culinary water loop line below the Grove tank. On the PI system there was also a looped line and a pump on the Assy property that the City owned where they had to pump water to a low pressure zone. It would be beneficial to the high zone to have water pumped because they didn't have any wells there. There were also the Grove Drive improvements.

Troy Stout asked if they had a ballpark figure on the cost of the improving the hard corner of Grove Drive. Shane Sorensen said it was tough because there was no planning. They had a sketch of a roundabout that might fit. It would depend on whether or not the Christensen property was involved.

Paul Kroff said the feedback from the residents was that they wanted a 3-way stop, which would be the most affordable.

Michelle Smith said she lived in Box Elder subdivision. She believed it was Patterson who had added a little bit of room to the road up there and it had helped the situation.

Troy Stout said they were talking about density versus improvements. Density was permanent. He was trying to calculate if they could prevent the density and make the improvements with City money. He was leaning toward lower density and having the City take on the cost of the improvements. Shane Sorensen said it had cost the City 2 million dollars to widen Westfield Road.

Kimberly Bryant said she wanted to do what benefited the community. Troy Stout said the community had said the most important thing was protecting the hillsides. He would like to do both, protect the hillsides and accommodate growth.

Brian Burr asked if the Grove Drive would become city property if they annexed the area. The answer was yes. Mr. Burr said they should have the county participate in improving Grove Drive because they had property beyond it. It would benefit them as well.

Will Jones said he had a conflict of interest on the Oberee annexation and recused himself from the vote.

Troy Stout indicated he would like to make a motion. He said he wasn't in favor of 60 lots but wasn't certain how to get there based on the zoning.

David Church asked if he could suggest some language that might help move it along. He suggested there be a motion that the City Council set a public hearing on the proposed annexation of the property for a certain date with a zone of CR-40, and instruct staff prior to the public hearing to negotiate a development agreement that limited the landowners of the Oberee annexation property to no more than X lots, and if an agreement between the landowners and the City Council could be reached prior to the date of the public hearing, the annexation could be done. If it couldn't be reached, the Council would indicate that they would not vote on the annexation. In that way they could move the discussion toward an end. He said the Council would also want to indicate what zone they would give the Grant property. If the Grants didn't like the zoning, they could withdraw and the whole thing would collapse.

Troy Stout asked what would take precedence - the zoning or the development agreement. David Church said the development agreement took precedence. It was the same thing they had done with the Willow Canyon annexation.

MOTION: Troy Stout moved to approve a zoning designation of CE-5 for the land in the conservation easement and CR-40,000 for the remainder of the Oberee property and CR-40,000 for the Grant property, and instruct staff to negotiate a development agreement to allow no more than 31 lots on the Oberee property. To further clarify, Mr. Stout stated that in the space where 60 lots were proposed, the number of lots would be reduced to 31 lots. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 2 Nays: 2. Troy Stout and Kimberly Bryant voted aye. Roger Bennett and Lon Lott voted nay. Will Jones abstained. Since it was a tie vote, Mayor Watkins voted, and he voted aye. Motion passed.

Paul Kroff said that the number Mr. Stout put out there would not work with the cost of the offsite improvements.

Steve Zolman said maybe he should go back to what was approved in 2007 where they got 79 lots and paid for all the improvements. Mr. Church said they probably wouldn't be able to afford to do that even today. And he wasn't sure Mr. Zolman would get the votes for 79 lots.

Mayor Watkins said that what he understood from the City Attorney was that if 31 lots passed, they would negotiate a development agreement if everyone was willing.

Lon Lott said he thought 31 lots was too low. Roger Bennett agreed. Mr Lott said he felt that should make a good faith offer and make a reasonable offer on the number of lots so they could do some offsite improvements.

Troy Stout said he did make the motion in good faith.

C. Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2015-2016

PUBLIC HEARING – TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016

Mayor Watkins opened the Public Hearing on the Budget. There were no comments. The Public Hearing was closed.

City Finance Officer Alice Winberg introduced the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2015-2016. She said she appreciated the opportunity to meet individually with some of the Council members earlier and review the budget with them.

Rich Nelson reminded the Council that this was not the Final Budget. They would accept the Tentative Budget by motion with the understanding that changes may still be made. The Final Budget had to be adopted by June 23, 2015.

Will Jones asked about funding for the Youth Council. Alice Winberg said the Youth Council would be earning some of their own revenue. Any overage would be met by the City. They had allocated \$3800 to the Youth Council. Kimberly Bryant said she felt they should have more since the Youth Council was four times bigger than it used to be. They didn't want the leaders paying for some of the activities out of their own pockets.

MOTION: Will Jones moved to allocate \$5,000 to the Youth Council. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Will Jones, Roger Bennett, Troy Stout, Lon Lott, Kimberly Bryant voted aye. Motion passed.

Alice Winberg said the proposed budget included capital improvements and one new fulltime employee. It also included the equipment that needed to be replaced. There was no proposed increase in property taxes.

Rich Nelson said they had included a 3% salary increase in the budget but only .07% of that would be a cost of living increase. It was not a 3% increase across the board.

Alice Winberg said they may not give all that out. They didn't last year.

Kimberly Bryant thanked Alice for all the work she had done on the budget.

Alice Winberg said the Budget was available on the City website. Notice of the public hearing had been published in the Daily Herald and noticed on the utility bills.

Shane Sorensen reviewed the equipment replacement schedule, vehicle replacement schedule, waterline replacement projects, and street projects.

Rich Nelson listed other improvements that were included in the budget including a salt shed, Moyle Park improvements, new windows in the Moyle Park house and plaster work, soffit and fascia.

Shane Sorensen said restroom for Moyle Park would be here in late May. They might have to bring in water from 770 North.

Rich Nelson said the improvement in Lambert Park including \$80,000 for fencing. The Bowery roof need to be fixed. The bell tower in City Hall needed to be fixed.

Mr. Nelson said there would be \$1 rate increase for culinary water which would continue. They were hoping to receive some increases in the B&C Road Fund. There would need to be budget opening for the current year to include money for the Dispatch Building and the remodel of City Hall. Pickle ball courts and tennis courts in Burgess Park would also be included in the budget opening.

MOTION: Lon Lott moved to accept the Tentative Budget for fiscal year 2015-2016 as proposed. Will Jones seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Lon Lott, Will Jones, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Troy Stout voted aye. Motion passed.

The Council next discussed the request for a new employee for City Hall. The Council questioned if extra help was needed for Shane Sorensen in the Public Works building since Ron Devey and Jay Healey had both left.

Shane Sorensen said their responsibilities had been absorbed by the remaining workers, primarily himself, Landon Wallace and Greg Kmetzch. They were making it work but they were stretched.

Will Jones said he thought the new employee should spend four hours working in the Public Works building as an assistant for that department and four hours at City Hall.

Shane Sorensen said he wasn't asking for help but they could probably use the help. With all the meetings they had, they could use someone to answer the phone.

Rich Nelson said there was plenty for work at City Hall for another full-time employee. He would move Marla Fox to the building department and make her a part-time deputy recorder. Charmayne Warnock could be a fulltime recorder. They were swamped with GRAMA requests and with all the lawsuits, he didn't see that changing. He added that there was also enough money for a part-time employee in City Shops along with a fulltime employee at City Hall.

MOTION: Troy Stout moved to accept the addition of a fulltime employee in City Hall and half-time employee for Shane Sorensen at City Shops. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Lon Lott, Will Jones, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Troy Stout voted aye. Motion passed.

D. Inspection Services Contract Recommendation: Alpine City had published notices for a Request for Proposal (RFP) to provide services for the Alpine City Building Department for plan check reviews and building inspections. Three firms had responded which met the required qualifications. They were Epic Engineering, Forsgren Engineering, and Sunrise Engineering. After comparing the three proposals, Rich Nelson said staff recommended staying with Sunrise Engineering. He also recommended that Rich Nelson, Charmayne Warnock (building department coordinator) and Will Jones sit down with Sunrise and negotiate the contract.

MOTION: Kimberly Bryant moved to approve Sunrise Engineering as the provider for building inspection service and plan review, and further recommend that the Council authorize the Rich Nelson, Charmayne Warnock, and Will Jones to negotiate the contract with Sunrise Engineering. Troy Stout seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Lon Lott, Will Jones, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Troy Stout voted aye. Motion passed.

E. Independent Audit Services: Alpine City had published notices for a Request for Proposal for independent audit services. They had received proposals from Greg Ogden, Pinnock & Robbins, Kedding & Chris, and Larson. Rich Nelson said that after reviewing the proposals, it was pretty clear that Greg Ogden, the CPA the City had been using, was the most cost effective. In addition, he recommended it would make sense to stay with someone who knew the City.

MOTION: Will Jones moved to approve Greg Ogden, CPA as Alpine City's auditor, and further recommend that the City Administrator be assigned to negotiate the contract with Greg Ogden. Troy Stout seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Lon Lott, Will Jones, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Troy Stout voted aye. Motion passed.

VI. STAFF REPORTS: None.**VII. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION:**

Mayor Watkins said the first night the food trucks had been in Alpine was fantastic. They had sold out of food. However, he'd received a call from Brian Burr whose son owned a food truck business and would like to participate in Alpine's food truck night, but he'd been told no by Clayton Johnson who was the food truck owner the City had authorized to manage it. He said it was heartbreaking that people from the community weren't allowed to participate in it. He asked Rich Nelson to contact Mr. Johnson and say "Thank you" but please respect the residents of Alpine who had a food truck business and wanted to participate, and tell him they didn't want to have the same trucks every weeks.

VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION: Troy Stout moved to go to closed meeting to discuss property acquisition and lawsuits. Lon Lott seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Troy Stout, Lon Lott, Will Jones, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant voted aye. Motion passed.

The Council went into closed session at 9:49 pm.

They returned to open meeting at 10:11 pm.

MOTION: Will Jones moved to adjourn. Lon Lott seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Will Jones, Lon Lott, Troy Stout, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant voted aye. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:11 pm.