

Minutes for Western Weber Planning Commission meeting of October 12, 2021, held in the Weber County Commission Chamber, 2380 Washington Blvd. Floor 1 Ogden UT at 5:00 pm

Members Present:        Andrew Favero--Chair  
                                 Bren Edwards-- Vice Chair  
                                 Wayne Andreotti  
                                 Greg Bell  
                                 Chad Call  
                                 Jed McCormick

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call: Andrew Favero, Bren Edwards, Wayne Andreotti, Greg Bell, Chad Call, Jed McCormick

Staff Present: Rick Grover, Liam Keogh, Charlie Ewert, Felix Lleverino, Steve Burton, Tammy Aydelotte, June Nelson

**1. Minutes were approved September 21, 2021, 6-0.**

**2. Consent Items**

**2.1 DR2021-12:** Consideration and action on a design review amendment for a warehouse addition to the Kimberly Clark site located at 2010 N Rulon White Blvd, Ogden. **Presenter Steven Burton, Applicant Kenton Wall**

**Motion Made to Approve by Commissioner Bren Edwards, Second by Commissioner Wayne Andreotti. All in favor 6-0. Motion Passed.**

**Petitions, Applications, and Public Hearings:**

**3. Administrative items:**

**3.1 LVL091521** - Request for preliminary subdivision approval of Lilac Estates PRUD, consisting of 23 townhouse units and 15 storage units, with an existing building and house available to be sold as units. **Presenter Felix Lleverino, Applicant Mel Peterson**

Commissioner Bren Edwards states that he rents-leases agriculture land from the applicant and plans to continue. He does not feel that this will affect his judgement on this matter.

The applicant is requesting preliminary approval of Lilac Estates Subdivision consisting of 23 townhome units and a single family dwelling lot. The proposal includes 15 storage units that are to be used by the families who reside in the townhomes. Culinary water will be provided by Taylor West Weber Water District and sewer service will be provided by Central Weber Sewer. Lot area, frontage/width and yard regulations: The purpose and intent of a Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) is to "allow for diversification in the relationship of various uses and structures to their sites and to permit more flexibility of such sites and to encourage new and imaginative concepts in the design of neighborhood and housing projects in urbanizing areas." *Public Road Infrastructure:* The proposal includes a sidewalk along 3500 W. A condition of preliminary approval will be that the sidewalk be changed to a six foot paved pathway on the improvement plans. An interior alleyway that is 26 feet wide will provide access to the 23 townhome units. Each unit will have a one-car garage and two paved parking spaces in front of each unit. A snow storage area is shown on the landscaping plan at the north end of the project. There will also be a 26-foot wide drive that leads to the gravel parking area for storage unit staging and access Felix Lleverino would like to see 5 foot sidewalks. Commissioner Bell asks what recourse we have to work with West Haven for road plans. The developer owns other land in the area.

**Commissioner Bren Edwards makes a motion to approve with the following conditions. Commissioner Bell seconds the motion.** Staff recommends preliminary approval of Lilac Estates PRUD Subdivision consisting of 24 lots, and a 10.79-acre open space parcel. This recommendation is based on the review agency requirements and the following conditions:

1. A final will serve letter from Taylor West Weber Water will be submitted.
2. Hooper Irrigation or Weber Basin shall provide a will-serve letter verifying pressurized irrigation water services for all lots and open spaces, before Lilac Estates may return for final approval from the Planning Commission.
3. The five-foot sidewalk must be shown as a five-foot paved pathway on the improvement plans.

4. Will have a Will Serve letter from Central Weber Sewer provided prior to final.
5. Engineering will look at connectivity of 2900 South.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. The proposed PRUD conforms to the West Central Weber County General Plan.
2. The lot area, width, yard, height, and coverage regulations proposed are acceptable as shown on the submitted plat.
3. The proposal will not be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare.
4. The proposal will not deteriorate the environment of the general area to negatively impact surrounding properties and uses.

**All Commissioners voted Aye Motion passed 6-0.**

**3.2 LVS042621** - Consideration and action on an administrative application, final approval of Phase 1 of Smart Fields Subdivision (13 lots) located at 4300 W 1400 S. **Presenter Felix Lleverino, Applicant Pat Burns, Joshua Wiscombe (Authorized Representative)**

The applicant is requesting final approval of Smart Fields Subdivision Phase 1 (13 lots) at approximately 1740 S 4300 West. The applicant is requesting to divide one vacant parcel, which amounts to 11.03 acres and create 13 new building lots. This development is considered a connectivity incentivized subdivision because the road alignment follows the Planning Division's recommendations for roadway connectivity. Commissioners asked if curb, gutter and sidewalk were included in the subdivision. Felix Lleverino answered that it was included.

**Motion made by Commissioner Andreotti to pass with the following conditions, Commissioner Bren Edwards seconded the motion.**

Staff recommends final approval of Smart Fields Subdivision Phase 1, consisting of 13 residential lots. This recommendation is based on the following conditions:

1. The final civil drawings will be approved by the County Engineer before going to the County Commission.
2. A final subdivision plat will be approved by all applicable county review agencies before going to the County Commission.
3. A monument improvement agreement will be included with the final plat.
4. All remaining subdivision improvements will be escrowed for before approval from the County Commission.
5. A subdivision improvement agreement will be included with the final plat.
6. The developer provides a final will-serve letter from Taylor West Weber Water District.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. The proposed subdivision conforms to the West Central Weber General Plan.
2. The proposed subdivision complies with the applicable County codes.
3. The subdivision conforms to zoning and subdivision ordinances.

**Motion passed 6-0**

**3.3 LVA07192021-** Consideration and action on preliminary approval of Angie's Acres Subdivision, consisting of five lots, and a concurrent alternative access request. **Presenter Tammy Aydelotte, Applicant Larry Johnson**

Commissioner Andreotti stated that he had met the owner near his home, but there was no inappropriate ex-parte conversation. An alternative access request is included with this application. This alternative access approval allows the owner to have a private access easement to access two of the five proposed lots. The owner will be required to record a covenant with the subdivision plat, where the owner agrees to dedicate to the county and improve the access easement at the time the county so requests. The applicant is requesting preliminary approval of Angie's Acres Subdivision, a single-phase subdivision consisting of five lots, in the A-2 Zone. The proposed subdivision and lot configuration are in conformance with the applicable zoning and subdivision requirements as required by the Uniform Land Use Code of Weber County (LUC). The following is a brief synopsis of the review criteria and conformance with LUC. Each of the proposed lots exceeds the minimum 40,000 square feet and 150 feet in width, as required for residential use in the A-2 zone. Two of the proposed lots do not front along a County road. LUC 108-7-31 allows for an access exception, granting access by a private right-of-way, if it is shown to be infeasible or impractical to extend a county road. Requiring a roadway through this subdivision would give a block of around 350 feet, less than the minimum required of 500 feet (LUC 106-2-3 Blocks).

Commissioner Edwards states that the north property boundary splits the distance between access for a future road. Can we add a road requirement for north side road access? Commissioner Favero agrees that 5500-5900 needs a connection. Tammy Aydelotte states that the applicant wants south facing homes. Commissioner Favero is concerned about having double access for the homes. Larry Johnson 1342 S 2500 W Syracuse is the applicant. He states that they would like South facing homes to avoid ice on driveways. Commissioners say that they want engineers to look at future connectivity. Commissioner Bell would like engineers to look at the roads so others who want to develop in the area can do so with good access and connectivity. He suggested tabling the item. Commissioner Favero agrees. Commissioner Edwards does not want to table the item, but add a condition.

**Motion: Commissioner Edwards makes the motion with the following conditions. Commissioner Andreotti seconds.**

Staff recommends preliminary approval of Angie's Acres Subdivision, consisting of five lots located at approximately 300 N 5500 W, Ogden, UT, 84401. This recommendation is subject to all review agency requirements prior to recording of the subdivision, and the following conditions:

1. A proposed final plat must be submitted prior to appearing before the Planning Commission for a recommendation for final approval.
2. Written capacity assessment for culinary and secondary water shall be submitted prior to appearing before the Planning Commission for a recommendation of final approval.
3. Engineering and Planning to look at future connection in the area and possibility of moving access to the north side to accommodate the best interest of all properties for future access.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. The proposed subdivision conforms to the Western Weber General Plan
2. The proposed subdivision complies with applicable county ordinances

**Motion passed 6-0.**

**3.4 LVA07272021:** Request for preliminary approval of Ali Farms Cluster Subdivision, a proposal consisting of 30 lots and open space parcels totaling 25.15 acres. **Presenter Tammy Aydelotte, Applicant Chris Cave (Authorized Representative)**  
9/14/2021 – Sketch Plan Endorsement received from the Planning Commission.

This is a request for preliminary approval of Ali Farms Cluster Subdivision, consisting of 30 lots, and public roadways throughout this proposed subdivision. This plan includes open space parcels to the west of the proposed lot layout. The total project area amounts to 25.15-acres. The open space area encompasses an area of 11.26 acres. The applicant is proposing to preserve 50.6 percent open space, meeting the required minimum open space preservation of 50 percent for the A-1 and A- 2 Zones, for requested bonus density, as outlined in LUC §108-3-5. The following is a brief synopsis of the review and criteria and conformance with LUC. The developer shall install Each of the proposed lots exceeds the minimum area and width for a cluster subdivision. Lot sizes range from 13,505-18,595 square feet. Lot widths range from 70-95 feet. The applicant is proposing 66' wide publicly dedicated right-of-ways throughout this development. Sidewalks on both sides of the roadways are proposed. Sidewalks shall be stubbed to all lot boundaries where the proposed roadways shall be stubbed. An open space plan has been submitted with this application. The developer has indicated that the open space will continue to be used for agricultural purposes, and owned and maintained by an HOA. Commissioner Bell asks if the road is wide enough to permit agricultural equipment enough room to access safely. Commissioner Edwards said that there is enough room for agriculture equipment.

**Motion: Commissioner Bells makes a motion with the following conditions. Commissioner Edwards seconds the motion.**

Staff recommends preliminary approval of Ali Farms Subdivision, consisting of 30 lots located at approximately 750 S 4700 West, Ogden, UT, 84401. This recommendation is subject to all review agency requirements prior to recording of the subdivision, and the following conditions:

1. A will serve letter from Hooper Irrigation is required prior to a recommendation of final approval.
2. A final will serve letter from Taylor West Weber is required prior to a recommendation of final approval.
3. A street tree plan is required prior to a recommendation of final approval.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. The proposed subdivision conforms to the Western Weber General Plan
2. The proposed subdivision complies with applicable county ordinances

**Motion passes 6-0**

**Planning Director Grover goes over the rules for a Public Hearing.**

**Petitions, Applications, and Public Hearings:**

**4. Legislative Items:**

**4.1 ZMA 2020-01** To hold a public hearing, and consider and take action on file ZMA2020-01, an application to rezone approximately 242 acres, located t approximately 2875 W. 2600 N. from the A-1 zone to the C-1, R-2, R-3, R-1-10, RE-15, and Master Planned Development (MPD) Overlay Zones. The rezone application is accompanied by file and GPA2020-01, an application to amend the unincorporated area's general plan to facilitate the proposed master planned development. **Presenter Charles Ewert, Applicant JDC Ranch Properties, Jay V. Christensen, Nilson Homes Agent: Bryan Bayle**

Commissioner Edwards will time 3 minutes for each speaker from the public.

This project was first proposed to Weber County early in 2020. The proposal was placed on hold by the applicant pending negotiations with adjacent cities. The applicant is now requesting that the project continue to be processed by the County. When the Planning Commission is acting as a recommending body to the County Commission, it is acting in a legislative capacity and has wide discretion. Examples of legislative actions are general plan, zoning map, and land use code amendments. Legislative actions require that the Planning Commission give a recommendation to the County Commission. For this circumstance, criteria for recommendations in a legislative matter require compatibility with the general plan and existing ordinances. This application a request to rezone approximately 242 acres from the A1 and A-2 zones to the C-2 zone. The application is accompanied by a request to modify the general plan for the area to match the rezone request. The purpose of the rezone is to master plan the property. The applicant desires to provide commercial, residential, and parks, trails, open space, and other community amenities within the project. The subject property is located in an unincorporated island, sandwiched between Plain City and Farr West City. As a point of policy, the county typically prefers significant development activities to occur within incorporated cities. For whatever reason, the applicant and adjoining cities have not been able to come to a negotiated agreement regarding the development. As such, the applicant is requesting that the county process the application to vest the development under county laws, after which the applicant has agreed to work with Plain City to annex, in accordance with their general plan. Staff have determined that the applicant's proposal meets best planning practices for master planned development. The proposal is well thought out and considers the development context beyond the project borders. These practices typical include provisions for street connectivity, walkability via trails and pedestrian connections, a mixture of residential opportunities, as well as a mixture of supporting commercial opportunities. The project also offers a fair share of open space preservation, green area, and recreational corridors and amenities. Many of the open space, recreation, and trails proposed will be open to the general public. Given these considerations, staff supports the proposal as offered by the applicant. However, an important consideration for the project is how well it fits into the existing community. The proposal is denser than most development in both Plain City and Farr West, and there are residents in both cities that have voiced their concern over how the density will affect their quality of life. After reviewing the general plan for Plain City, and discussing the proposal with members of the County Commission, the final recommendation for the proposal is to cut the applicant's requested density by approximately 50 percent, and require some of the higher density lots and uses to be located in the interior of the development in a manner that is not as visually impactful to surrounding landowners. In effect, this practice is to hide the density in the interior of the development. In this report, you will find an analysis of the applicant's proposal, which is accompanied by staff's review and final recommendation. The staff recommendation at the end of the report is intended to be used by the planning commission as a guide to make a planning commission recommendation to the county commission. Staff is recommending approval of the proposal with a reduction to density, and slight modifications to proposed infrastructure.

Planner Charlie Ewert states that this area is an island between two cities-Farr West and Plain City. Both have denied annexation. In the original plan, density was on the high side. Developers have decreased that density. They are proposing having 725 units with larger lots on the outside area of the development and smaller lots in the center of the development. Streets are well laid out with good connectivity and good trail connections. The public is concerned about the infrastructure. Applicant will work with UDOT after the rezone for infrastructure. This is just a rezone. We can offer rezone with conditions if needed. County Commissioners have the final say. Plain City shows east west connectivity. Farr West has changed its road plan. -1900 West connectivity will help alleviate congestion. Applicant proposes working with cities master plans. We would like to see more xeriscaping in park strips. Developer does not want duplexes and is willing to put that in writing.

Commissioner Favero asks about some changes on a new map. Charlie Ewert states that both plans limit density to 700 + lots. Commissioner Bell states that we need to look at housing for all stages of life. Developer wants to put smaller housing in the center so as to not detract from larger lots. Staff is not advocating for either city to annex this property, but thinks that it will be annexed by one of the cities in the future.

Developer, Bryan Bayles, 1656 Equestrian Parkway, Kaysville, states that he has been working with property owners. We want a project that we can be proud of. We are doing other projects in the area, but we see this as one big project. We want to add amenities and affordability. This is a convenient location. Bona Vista Water is in the area and we are also looking to Pineview or Mountain View for secondary water. Sewer is in the area. Drainage is in the area and studies have been done. There is a high water table that must be considered. Phase 1 and 2 are already in progress. This is a 10-12 year project. We would also like to talk to and incorporate the school district and churches in the area. Charlie Ewert has added lots of conditions.

**Commissioner Edwards makes a motion to open the public hearing. Commissioner McCormick seconds. All vote in favor 6-0.**



Jon Beesley, 2348 N 4350 W Plain City. I am the Mayor of Plain City. Who benefits from this development? Plain City and Farr West have denied this project. County should not change the zone for this development. I hope that you will all listen to the residents and deny the rezone.

Rebecca Cannon, 3439 W 2350 N, Plain City. We try to have plans for reasonable growth. Based on higher density, you will swamp the schools. The School District is trying to bond now for money for new schools. Plain City does have a plan for higher density housing. Braden Sander, 2727 Prairie Circle, Farr West. There are a lot of unknowns. We don't want to force this development on the cities. We should have the annexation conversation first. This is not fair to the communities, schools and traffic concerns. 2700 N is a problem. To vote for this is irresponsible.

Jared Maw, 4000 W 2200 N, Plain City. I am on the Planning Commission for Plain City. When this project came through the city, it was denied because it was too dense. It does not fit our General Plan. We should decide when to annex before you rezone.

Monica Hanks, 2732 N 3375 W, Plain City. I will be able to see this from my yard. We agreed on larger lot sizes for our community. It is a bad precedent for developers to come to the County when denied by the City.

Eric Jones, 2435 N 3425 W, Plain City. Please deny this application. Both cities have turned this down. There is no money to improve 2700 N. UDOT has plans to move roads. Planning Commission should protect what is already there. I moved here to be away from the growth.

Crystal Sander, 2727 Prairie Circle, Farr West. We moved here to get away from 5600 in Roy. The road in our area is dangerous. It is not good to add more traffic to 2700 N. There is already so much traffic. Please deny.

Curtis Kennedy, 2151 W 2700 N. I live on 2700 N. I can't back out of my driveway.

Lisa Cox, 2041 N 3900 W, Plain City. There is too much growth. Please listen and don't approve.

Ken Phippen, 3372 N 2575 W There is sewer capacity to treat sewage at the plant, but not the pipes. You will have to go through someone's yard.

Tara Savage, 2850 W We just had a sewer system flood. This is too much.

Dustin Skeen, 2466 N 4100 W, Plain City. I serve on the Plain City Planning Commission. This does fall into Plain City's Pioneering Boundary. We would like to annex this into Plain City, but the density is just too high. Everyone is against the 700 number. I would like to see a work meeting for this to find the best solution.

Kendra Palmer, 2734 N 2675 W. What is the difference between townhomes and duplexes? Farr West does not allow this zoning.

Commissioners asked if there were any other speakers. There were none.

**Motion was made by Wayne Andreotti to close the Public Hearing, It was seconded by Greg Bell. All voted in favor 6-0.**

Commissioner Edwards says that he hears about cramming this plan down to the cities. There has been a process, it is being vetted. Schools should have similar numbers with this plan. 2700 is a mess. UDOT is the one who should work on that road. It is a collector road. Are we going to stop all development? Commissioner Bell asked how this proposal is different from what the cities were presented. Charlie Ewert said that the original plan to the county is on the web site. Commissioner Edwards stated that they built a larger sewer line in the area. We usually work out this in the subdivision plat. Developer can only plan the sewer after the subdivision plat. Commissioner Andreotti stated that storm water plan and streets is the next step. Commissioner Bell asks who will maintain the roads. Charlie Ewert stated that there is some discretion. The developer did a master plan for all acres. Commissioner Call asked how long this has been going on. Charlie Ewert said 18-19 months. Why was a deal not made with other cities? They could not agree. Commissioner Andreotti said that if the developer is willing to meet zoning standards, sooner or later, this development is going to happen. It should go along with the cities. Commissioner Bell stated it is critically important that to grant a rezone, we should not casually give out development rights. We need to consider the neighbors. I am not comfortable unless we meet the zoning of the cities. Commissioner Favero likes that there is a master plan. The development offers a good plan. With growth, comes improvements. We need affordable housing for families. This checks a lot of boxes for down the road. Commissioner Edwards says that this is a 10-12 year plan. People will pay their fair share for the road development. Commissioner Favero states that this is no subdivision plan, only rezone. There are a lot of boxes to check. That does not mean that everything will be as planned. We can't make decisions based on future possibilities. Commissioner Bell says that we should look at the concerns of the cities. We should consider input from other communities. We should consider what we have heard tonight. Commissioner Edwards says that there are certain things that the developer must do before moving forward with development agreement. Charlie Ewert said that if the development is approved, we want to do the zoning right the first time. The development agreement can ensure that important things are included.

The developer states that schools, sewer and water will all be a problem no matter who develops in this area. This plan is different from what Plain City saw. Communities need affordable housing. Traffic will be addressed through a traffic study.

Commissioner Bell said that the feedback today is that the community doesn't like this.

**Motion: Commissioner Bell moves to deny application and send back to work with cities. Commissioner Andreotti seconded for a vote. Commissioner Bell voted yes. All other commissioners voted no. Motion did not pass 1-5.**

**Motion made by Commissioner Edwards to vote for a positive recommendation for the rezone with the staff recommendation and conditions and findings. Commissioner McCormick seconded the motion.**

If the Planning Commission supports the proposed general plan amendment, then staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the County Commission for the general plan amendment, File #GPA2020-01, and the rezone, File #ZMA 2020-01 with the following requirements to be executed by means of a development agreement:

1. The development agreement should contain a requirement for the applicant to not protest an annexation from an adjacent city.
2. The development agreement should limit the number of attached patio homes and fourplex townhomes to no more than 100 total units.
3. The development agreement should limit the total number of housing units to no more than 725 units.
4. The project layout should be changed to reflect the street connectivity of Figure 4 herein.
5. The development agreement should omit the street design standards of Page 8 of the applicant's proposal and defer to Plain City's adopted street design standards.
6. In the development agreement, the project zoning (Page 7 of the proposal) is changed as provided by Figure 3B.
7. Trails should be constructed in accordance with the standards in the Plain City General Plan, or as otherwise adopted by Plain City standards. More specifically:
  - a. The trail along 2700/2600 North Street should be constructed as a Class 2 or Class 3 Trail, as listed on page 19 of the Plain City General Plan. The trail should be at least 10 feet wide and paved, with at least a 10 foot landscape buffer between the trail and the street. The trail shall be constructed from the existing sidewalk in Farr West City and extend westward to the existing Plain City boundary, including a bridge or other mutually agreeable crossing of the canal that runs along the existing Plain City Boundary.
  - b. The trail that runs north/south along the power line corridor, and the trail that runs east/west through the middle of the project (through the park area) should be constructed as a Class 1 Trail, as listed on page 19 of the Plain City General Plan. Both should be at least 10 feet wide and paved with at least five feet landscaped area between the trail and a paralleling street.
  - c. All other trails should be at least a Class 3 paved trail, as listed on page 19 of the Plain City General Plan
  - d. Any trail that connects between lots or parcels, including those stubbing to the exterior boundary of the subject property, should have a landscaped trail corridor that is at least 20 feet wide.
8. The parks and open space areas should be as provided in the proposal, and phased in a proportionate amount as the project is phased.
9. All park strips and trail corridors should be planted with and irrigated for drought tolerant (water wise) vegetation. No turf grass. Parks have limited turf grass on areas for sports/play fields.
10. Trees, no less than 2" caliper, should be planted along trails and in park strips at a distance no greater than the tree species typical canopy width. The species should follow Plain City's adopted tree species list.
11. The HOA should be professionally managed. Until the area is annexed into a city, the HOA management company should be responsible for managing all open space areas, park strips, landscaping, and common area, and provide street snow removal.
12. The project should follow the architecture design contained in the applicant's proposal.
13. That all other agency concerns should be accounted for as may be necessary in the development agreement.
14. That the West Central Weber County General Plan should be amended to include the entire unincorporated island, and should be designed and/or annotated to encourage development that will stimulate incorporated into an adjoining city, and provide general support for the adjoining city's general plan.

This recommendation may come with the following findings:

1. With the proposed amendment to the West Central Weber County General Plan, the proposed rezone complies with the general plan. The proposed amendment corresponds with the objectives of the Plain City General Plan
2. With the exception to zoning, the proposal complies with the Plain City General Plan.
3. The proposal offers public recreation, shopping, jobs, and has the potential to offer a mixture of housing options, all cornerstones of sustainable community planning principles.
4. The impacts of the development on adjacent landowners is proposed to be appropriately minimized by buffering similar land uses, and screening higher density housing from view by locating it in the middle of the project.
5. The development is not detrimental to the overall health, safety, and welfare of the community.

**Motion passed 5-1 with Commission Bell voting against the rezone.**

**5. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda: No Comments**

**6. Remarks from Planning Commissioners:** Commissioner Bell asks about feedback from a recent survey and open house in Western Weber area. Charlie Ewert stated that there was not a lot different from the survey. There will be a meeting with consultants soon. People realize that growth is inevitable. No one scenario will be the perfect solution. We will have at least 3 scenarios to look over. Others would like to voice their opinion. Planning department asks that the Commissioners be at the next meeting to help answer questions. We are planning a meeting at Uinta Highlands. Commissioner Andreotti says that he wishes that cluster subdivisions would go away. The only person to save agricultural and farming is the farmer. Commissioner Edwards believes that this development will be an asset to the community in the future.

**7. Planning Director Report:** Thank you for the deliberations and handling of the public comments. We can remove public comment if you want or move it to another part of the meeting. The Commissioners say that they would like to keep public comment.

**8. Remarks from Legal Counsel:** I can echo Director Grover about the handling of the public meeting.

Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Bell. Seconded by Commissioner McCormick. All voted to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,  
*June Nelson*  
Lead Office Specialist