

Heber City Corporation
City Council Meeting
04/07/2011
7:10 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING

The Council of Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah, met in **Regular Meeting** on April 7, 2011, in the City Council Chambers located at 75 North Main Street in Heber City, Utah.

Present: Mayor David R. Phillips
Council Members Eric Straddeck
Nile Horner
Robert Patterson
Alan McDonald
Benny Mergist

Also Present: City Manager Mark K. Anderson
City Recorder Paulette Thurber
City Engineer Bart Mumford
City Planner Anthony Kohler
Chief of Police Ed Rhoades

Others Present: Larry Hartley, Paul Shelton, Jen Shelton, Wendy McKnight, Josh McKnight, Ashley Fish, Jamie Hodges, Paul Berg, RaeLyn Kohler, Kourtne Powell, Mike Thurber, Mark Smedley, Glinda Straddeck and Spencer Straddeck.

Pledge of Allegiance: Councilman Eric Straddeck

Prayer: Councilman Nile Horner

Minutes: March 19, 2011, Special Budget Meeting

Councilman Patterson moved to approve the minutes of the Special Budget meeting held March 19, 2011. Councilman McDonald made the second. No Discussion. Voting AYE: Eric Straddeck, Nile Horner, Robert Patterson, Alan McDonald and Benny Mergist.

OPEN PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments were received

CONSENT AGENDA

Wendy McKnight – Special Olympics – Request for Donation: McKnight reported that when she went to Long Beach for the international convention last year it was reported worldwide LETR funds raised was \$38,000,000 with the State of Utah raising \$170,000. She said 49 countries were represented and all fifty states. McKnight said there were 3,000,000 Special Olympic athletes worldwide.

Chief Rhoades said through McKnight's hard work, Heber was fifth in the State again this year. It was indicated that every penny raised in this area, stayed in this area.

McKnight said the Polar Plunge fund raiser had just been held and had raised \$5,000. She said an elk tag had been donated and the sale of that raised \$600. She continued the amount she had raised so far this year was over \$6,000 now and her goal was \$10,000.

Councilman Mergist moved to approve the requested \$600 donation for Special Olympics. Councilman Straddeck made the second. No discussion. Voting AYE: Eric Straddeck, Nile Horner, Robert Patterson, Alan McDonald and Benny Mergist.

Paul Berg – Marelko LC – Driveway Placement/Access onto Heber Parkway (Highway 189 / Daniels Connector) – Commercial Development located at 1355 S. Highway 189: Berg said a few months ago he learned about UDOT's plans for Highway 189 while attending a Council meeting for another issue. He said he was taking a proactive approach in relation to the Marelko property and what UDOT planned to do with the Daniel Connector Road. An overhead slide was shown of the property. Berg pointed out the portion of the Marelko property UDOT would take and explained the outcome in relation to Marelko's current and future business enterprise. He indicated he had discussed with UDOT Marelko's proposed commercial business plan for that property. It was felt the road would eventually be a Heber City road so Heber City needed to determine what access they would allow. There was discussion about accesses to the properties in the area. It was indicated the Planning Commission tabled their recommendation for access until Berg had talked to the City Council.

Councilman McDonald stated that the businesses in the area had been affected by the cement barrier in place right now. He said he was in support of giving access onto Heber Parkway.

Mayor Phillips said going back a few years there was a lot of discussion about truck routes and having limited access to maintain the integrity of a truck route. He did not think any on or off would slow down traffic because of the nature of going through commercial areas, stop lights, etc. He suggested the road probably was not going to be an autobahn. Berg said he understood the need to limit driveways; however, on this piece he thought one access was not a good idea.

Councilman Horner felt they should be made whole on the functionality of their property and agreed they had been impacted by the cement barrier in place right now on Highway 189. He felt the Council should definitely give them a right-of-way. He thought the Council should not limit them to the access they proposed but to let them have the access that worked best for the property. Councilman Straddeck asked for explanation on #2 of Berg's memo (Facilitate a local street for business access). Berg said that a proposal from the Planning Commission was a local road through the properties to provide for flow of traffic.

Mumford said initially he had some of the same thoughts the Council Members had expressed. He wanted to give the Council some of the ideas expressed at the RPO (Rural Planning Organization) meeting. He commented that when focusing on the properties, the proposed road did not provide good access. He said that when the concept plan was presented to the RPO they pointed out this was a bypass on the south side of town and it had been agreed upon that it would be a limited access road. He said the Council passed a Resolution agreeing to limited access as did the County Council. Mumford said this was an interim piece of the bypass to the Daniel Connector. He indicated the existing properties already had access at different locations and those accesses were grandfathered. He pointed those out on the overhead. The RPO suggested if the Council really wanted this to be a future bypass they should not grant additional accesses--the Council had to honor the current accesses but did not have to grant additional ones. If the Council wanted to make this a local street, what would prevent others from coming and requesting access because of some hardship to their property and/or livelihood. Councilman Horner suggested the Council had already given access to the Boyer project. Mumford said the City extended 300 West to tie in but other than that, there were no other accesses granted. Mumford talked about the right-turn in and right-turn out for the America First parcel. Mumford said the RPO just wanted to point out that granting additional accesses was against the initial agreements. He said that UDOT was saying you decide, Heber City, if you want a local road or a bypass road. Mumford suggested if accesses were allowed now and in the future the City and UDOT wanted a bypass road with limited access, right-of-ways would have to be purchased. Councilman Horner talked about devaluing property and allowing these people to be made whole. He said the RPO or someone had better have money to make them whole if another access was not granted. Mumford said UDOT was already negotiating with Marelko for the acquisition of property and if the City granted another access that would enhance their property value and it would make a difference in the dollar amounts negotiated. Mumford talked about a conversation with Weeks (UDOT) yesterday about a different road (proposed by the Planning Commission) that would give a different access to the properties. He said Weeks wanted to work with people and felt this would be a win/win situation. Councilman Horner talked about what really made people whole and did not think an additional road would make someone whole if the original access position was taken away. RaeLyn Kohler asked if the discussion was now for two accesses instead of one. Mayor Phillips said he did not think so--the Council was trying to address all aspects of the issue and that Mumford was just relaying the discussion from the RPO

meeting. Mike Thurber said the Planning Commission felt bad for RaeLyn but the City Council, County Council and the RPO had agreed on a limited access road. He said now the Council had to determine what they wanted for the future roadways of the City and suggested it was a hard decision. He said the Planning Commission wondered if the Council wanted to keep the limited access or if they wanted commercial development on both sides of the road. He suggested that if RaeLyn was granted access then further down the road Councilman Horner could also, in fairness, be given access. Mayor Phillips indicated the truck route had changed a number of times over the years. Councilman Patterson said he was against the barrier in place now on Highway 189 and agreed with the original concept and not an additional road that only added distance to an access. He liked the idea of an access on Heber Parkway (Option 1). Councilman Mergist said by giving them access the Council was giving them back what they lost in the first place because they had two accesses before the barrier. He did not agree with Mumford that the City was enhancing their property. He said the bypass as laid out would change again in his opinion. He said UDOT had already said this would be a City street. He did not support a limited access road and said he supported moving the access further south as proposed by Berg. Councilman Straddeck wanted to make it clear that Heber City did not put in the cement median but rather UDOT put up that barrier. Councilman Horner wanted to know, since this would not happen for a few years, what they had to do to insure that another Council would not make a change to what this Council agreed to. Berg talked about an agreement with the City, UDOT and the County. Mumford said the way to proceed was an agreement with the City that would guarantee them an access when they developed in the future. Mumford said the purpose of them coming tonight was to determine limited access or not. Then what he wanted to know was if this was the way the Council was going for future requests. Four of the Council Members said Mumford was to come back every time for permission on access. Councilman Mergist said his main concern was to make this business whole. The Council said they would not necessarily give access to a new business or others. Councilman Straddeck said for the record he was against providing access. He felt two left turn accesses was a bad idea (one into the property and one onto Daniels Road). He said the City had agreed this would be a limited access area and the City should honor its agreement. He expressed concern with all the requests the Council could expect in the future based on their decision tonight.

Councilman Patterson moved to grant access to Marelko to the back of property to Heber Parkway and have an agreement between Heber City and Marelko in relation to the granted access. Councilman Horner made the second. Mayor Phillips clarified that if Mrs. Kohler decided to not develop and sell the property that property would still have access off of Heber Parkway. Councilman Horner said yes. No further discussion. Voting AYE: Nile Horner, Robert Patterson, Alan McDonald and Benny Mergist. Voting NAY: Eric Straddeck.

Mark Smedley – Report on Issues surrounding Municipal Police Officers Providing Contractual Services: Mark Smedley greeted the Council and referred to the Executive

Summary he had written. Smedley reviewed the layout of that with each concern being addressed with a summary recommendation on pages 15 and 16. Councilman Straddeck felt it was well put together and concise. He thanked Smedley for the work he put into the document. He only had one question on page 15 #1 in relation to security work. Smedley said it would be peace officer work. Straddeck said he was satisfied with that explanation.

Councilman Horner indicated he did not get the document until Tuesday night and not Friday like the rest of the Council. However, he had read it a number of times. In fairness to the Council, he had a lot of questions. Mayor Phillips asked how the Council wanted to proceed. Councilman McDonald wanted to go over the document item by item as he also had questions.

Councilman McDonald questioned Smedley about Section 11-13-203.5 of the Utah Code and specifically the language “if there is an agreement...”. He said there were two different sides—law enforcement and security. Smedley said he would recommend in the future, if Heber City wanted to provide law enforcement services to have an agreement in place. Councilman Horner did not want to talk about “in the future”, but rather right now. He wanted to find out and discuss the facts of right now. He wanted to know if there was an agreement in place for the time being discussed. Smedley said he did not think there was a formal written agreement in place between Thomas the Train and the Heber City Police. Councilman McDonald wanted to know if there should be a blanket agreement in place or if each event should have a separate one. Smedley said that the safest procedure would be to have an agreement in place for each event even though that would not be the most convenient. He said there were various agreement formats—Memorandum of Understanding, Interlocal Agreement, or a letter. Councilman Horner asked if there was a policy in place that provides for an agreement to be signed. Smedley said he did not know if there was a policy in place that said it had to be done, but there are secondary agreements in place that were not used. Councilman Horner said that to him that meant policy was not followed. Smedley said there was a document in place that had been used in other circumstances, but had not been used in this case. Smedley said the law does not specifically say a written agreement had to be in place but that often agreements are oral. He said many cities enter into oral/verbal agreements. Chief Rhoades asked if the law specifically stated there had to be an agreement. Smedley said the law did not specifically say an agreement had to be in place but 11.13.203.5 implied protection was there if you want cart blanche and no problem protection from immunity is anticipated that an agreement would be in place. Chief Rhoades felt that said the City claimed liability if there was an Interlocal Agreement in place. He said it did not say that it was illegal if there wasn't an agreement in place. Smedley agreed. Councilman McDonald said the talk was in relation to law enforcement services and not security. Discussion about law enforcement versus security. Smedley said there had to be a clear demarcation and explanation that should distinguish police protection and not security--because of recent legislation it had to be more defined. Smedley said with a written agreement there was no question that the City was completely protected. He continued that a verbal agreement could be entered into and it would be

legal but one didn't get the complete protection of the governmental immunity clause. Councilman McDonald questioned who approved the verbal agreements—Council, Chief of Police or City Manager. Smedley said his understanding was any agent of the City.

Mayor Phillips suggested that “in the future” be saved for another meeting and concentrate on discussion on what information the Council actually wanted. He asked what that was. Councilman McDonald said his concerns were based on an agreement being in place or not being in place because some years there was an agreement in place and some years it was just done without an agreement.

Councilman Horner said that he wanted to understand from Smedley's document/findings what wrong doing took place and he believed there was a few wrong doings and he wanted to answer Pride's allegations. He thought the City was put in a great liability circumstance. He felt it was straight forward that the officers provided security services. They were doing what they were told. He suggested Anderson was aware there could be potential problems because of his meeting with Pride Security in 2009. Anderson said the discussion with Pride Security at that time was that they did not want the City to solicit security. Councilman Horner said he believed the City did solicit, the officers provided the services and in turn paid directly by the train. He continued the officers used police cars, computers, uniforms, police guns, etc., and he wanted to know the implications. He thought Smedley had spelled out the implications in his report and the City should not have been involved with it. Smedley said on page eight he went over specifically the allegations/concerns of Pride Security. Smedley said the allegation to solicit was not discussed when Pride presented their case to the Council. Smedley said the officers were paid directly for the last instance and that should not be done--they should be paid through the City.

Councilman McDonald read from 58.63.301 State Code which dictated who should be licensed and who was exempt. Discussion about licenses and State Code. Councilman McDonald felt this issue all came down to licensure—that someone had to have a contract security license. Councilman Straddeck said it couldn't be read any other way...you are exempt from needing a license as peace officers employed by or licensed as a contract security company. Discussion about the word “employed” and also security services / law enforcement services. Smedley referred to 58.63.304 which read “a police officer employed by or licensed as a contract security company”...so a police officer could work for a contract security company under their licensure. Smedley referred to the next paragraph which read “officers may exercise peace officer authority only as specifically authorized by law as law enforcement officers or special function officers. Smedley referred to his memo and the definition of Special Function Officers. “...defined as individuals who are sworn and certified peace officers performing specialized investigations, service of legal process, security functions, or specialized ordinance, rule, or regulatory functions. Smedley said the law conflicted and that was another reason to have a contract.

Discussion about whether the officers were on duty. Smedley suggested that could be determined based on the schedule/roster. Councilman McDonald said the officers were not paid by the City so they were not on duty. Council Horner read from 53-13-105 (2) as outlined on page nine of Smedley's memo. Councilman McDonald suggested because the officers were wearing blue the City was liable. Smedley said he agreed it was bad policy and it would create liability for the City and for the officers if the officers went down and were wearing blue and did not have a written agreement. He continued, though, that in fairness to the officers, it was not an intentional thing. Councilman Horner said in fairness to the officers they assumed it was fine because the Chief of Police and Anderson, who should know the law, told them it was okay. Smedley said the law had changed and that was why DOPL had come in and made explanations. Councilman Horner said it should stop and it should have stopped with Mark Anderson when Rose and Sandoval approached Anderson. Anderson said his recollection of the discussion with Rose and Sandoval was about solicitation and he had told them it was not appropriate for the police officers to solicit business. He said there was no conversation from them that the police officers could not legally function as security officers. The conversation was they did not want the police department soliciting business as a police department. Councilman Horner asked if Pride Security could provide law enforcement services. The answer was no. So he reasoned how could there be any idea that they were competing with anything other than security. Councilman Straddeck said that was easy. Security couldn't provide peace officer functions--peace officers had higher credentials. A person functioning as a peace officers could function at a higher level and do more functions. Councilman Horner said Pride came to Anderson expressing concern with the Police Department competing with Pride Security. He continued that Pride couldn't provide law enforcement. So the only way they could feel threatened was in competition of providing security services. Councilman Straddeck said it only meant the police officers were over qualified. Councilman Straddeck compared a bid for computer work with two people with one having more qualifications of the other but still able to complete. Councilman Horner said do we hold ourselves to a lower standard that ignorance is okay just because we didn't understand the law. He said it was Anderson's job as City Manager to understand the law especially when someone comes in and voices a concern saying the City should not compete and the City went ahead and competed. In 2010 Anderson should have followed policy and looked into the books that police officers, as now recommended by the City Attorney, could not be paid privately. Mayor Phillips indicated police officers could be paid privately if working privately. Mayor Phillips asked Councilman Horner if this was about Pride Security or Mark Anderson. Councilman Horner said it was about Pride Security and what the City Manager had allowed and the Mayor had enabled. Smedley reviewed that the matter was on solicitation and that his findings had not found any solicitation after that direction was given by Anderson. Councilman Horner read item 3 on page 10 of the executive summary. Councilman Horner suggested that the Chief of Police expressing disappointment to Craig Lacey was actually solicitation. Councilman Patterson strongly disagreed and said expressing disappointment was not solicitation. Smedley indicated Rose went to Anderson and said he did not want Heber City soliciting for work. Mayor

Phillips added that Rose didn't want the City officers doing the work for the train. Smedley indicated cities could decide on their own policy but doing that work was not illegal and Perry Rose did not set policy for Heber City. Councilman Horner then asked who set policy for Heber City. He said it should not be Mayor Phillips nor Mark Anderson but the Council and since the Council didn't do it, and speaking as a business owner, it was competing with the private sector and there were no ifs, ands, or buts about it, and it was wrong. He continued that Pride's allegations were true. Mayor Phillips felt, because Rose had complained to Councilman Horner directly, Horner was not seeing both sides of the issue and not being open minded. Councilman Horner then said he was not totally saying they broke the law but what they did was wrong and there was misappropriation of funds.

Councilman McDonald said there was a state law broken because no one had licenses. Mayor Phillips felt that was a serious charge and then asked Smedley to go back and check if a state law was broken based on licensure. Councilman McDonald read from the State Code he had printed out and said no one was licensed to do the security. Councilman McDonald said he was totally for the officers having outside work and wished the City could pay them more money. Smedley reviewed from page 9 of his Summary. Mayor Phillips said the Council had never set any policy and Councilman Horner was implying wrong doing when there was not a policy in place. Councilman Horner felt just because there was not a policy in place made it okay.

Councilman Straddeck said it did not matter a hill of beans what Councilman Horner thought or what he, Councilman Straddeck, thought. What he wanted to know was what Councilman Horner wanted to do. Councilman Horner said he wanted the Council to understand the liability placed on the City, the perception of wrong doing, and that their necks were put out there and this kind of behavior needed to stop and the City Manager had a chance to stop it and should have stopped it and just because it hadn't happened in the past it had been brought up and now it did happen again so he wanted the Council to understand and he thought there should be a reprimand as Pride wanted so that the Council's necks weren't out there to be sued or that this liability did not happen and that the punishment needed to fit the crime. Mayor Phillips asked what the crime was. Councilman Horner said the Councils' necks were out there and the policy was not followed. The recommendations of Smedley were not adhered to. He did not want misappropriation of funds to happen again. Anytime an employee used equipment paid for with the tax dollars and got personal gain from that, it was a misappropriation of funds. Councilman Straddeck said if he understood what Councilman Horner was saying was he wanted the Council to understand the seriousness of the allegations, make sure it didn't happen again, and supply reprimands. Councilman Straddeck said he thought all of the Council had a great understanding, particularly from Councilman Horner's point of view, and thought he was misguided. He did not think there was going to be any more understanding by going over the issues more and going around in circles. He said the Council knew there had to be changes going forward, he felt everyone was in agreement with that. So the Council was left with the proposal of reprimanding

those Councilman Horner believed were in the wrong. Councilman Horner did not think Councilman Straddeck's understanding was the same as his and felt the Council needed to come together and have an open mind like he did. Councilman Straddeck said he understood and did not come to the same consensus as Councilman Horner. Councilman McDonald reviewed page 3 of Smedley's memo about City property should not be used unless for a public purpose. (last paragraph on page 3) He thought City property had been used and the City should be reimbursed.

Councilman Straddeck said he knew that he could not make Councilman Horner understand anything because his mind was already made up and he did not want to waste anymore time. It was going to come down to what to censure or not to censure. Mayor Phillips said he felt that Councilman Horner formed an opinion after talking with Rose and Sandoval that Mark Anderson did something grievous before getting both sides of the story. Mayor Phillips suggested there needed to be a policy in place before Councilman Horner accused someone of breaking the policy. Argument about whether there was a policy in place or not. Councilman Horner argued the case against competing with the private sector. Mayor Phillips said he was of the opinion we lived in America and the train could hire who they wanted to hire. He felt bad that the amount of work done by the City Attorney was disregarded by Councilman Horner who felt there was liability when the City Attorney said there was not. He suggested the Council had to make a policy before accusing someone of breaking the policy.

Councilman Horner asked about the roster that Smedley had referred to earlier. Smedley said he did not know the answer to that and that question would have to be asked of the Chief because he did not know if there was a roster or not. Mayor Phillips said the police were doing what they had done for 20 years. Councilman Horner said that did not make it right. Mayor Phillips said the Council needed to look forward instead of backwards. Councilman Horner just wanted the Council to be aware of the issues. Mayor Phillips said he thought the point Councilman Horner was trying to make was the point he wanted to make because it is what he believed and that was that our City police should work on the clock for Heber City and should never get involved outside the job. Councilman Horner said he was okay with the officers working outside the Heber City job but that Mark Anderson and Chief Rhoades should have known the law and they allowed the officers to work without a contract and placed the City at risk.

Anderson said probably 15 years ago Kevin Young worked with Jim Smedley to develop an outside employment agreement. He said from his perspective on the issue at hand he agreed there should have been a secondary employment agreement in place. He continued that Mark Smedley had articulated the areas the City was deficient in and had now pointed out the weaknesses in relation to the issues. He said he wished this had been handled differently but he did not think he had done anything wrong--in his mind there was nothing criminal done and funds were not misappropriated. He encouraged the Council to take the recommendations of the City Attorney and create a policy that addressed all the legal issues. He continued that if the Council needed to

go into Closed Session to censure himself and the Chief because they felt he and Chief had done something so grievous, then that should be done. However, the Utah County Attorney had studied this and said there was nothing to investigate or prosecute. Mayor Phillips felt that everyone was in agreement about a contract being in place. Discussion about police personnel, as well as other departments, taking vehicles home after work. Discussion about the advantage of having a police presence, either in uniform or by using the City vehicles, at different events. Councilman Horner said there was another thing that should be looked into and that was the bid process. He said Pride Security did not get a chance to bid on the job and if the train really was a governmental agency, there should have been a bid process. Mayor Phillips indicated the City did not bid to provide the services. Councilman Horner said that was exactly what he was saying. Discussion about reprimands.

Councilman Straddeck moved to move on to the next topic. Mayor Phillips said he wanted Smedley to follow up on licensure. Smedley reviewed what exactly Councilman McDonald was suggesting and what Mayor Phillips wanted him to do. Councilman McDonald wanted to know about reimbursement. Smedley referred to his memo on page 3 and public purpose. In his opinion the train was a quasi governmental agency. So this was one governmental agency requesting work from another governmental agency. The City Council determines what is a good public purpose--good for the valley and brings revenue to the valley. He talked about the spirit in which this was done (one governmental agency working for another) He pointed out, too, that the Utah County Attorney investigated this and found there was no misappropriation of funds. Councilman Horner talked about Smedley's response on page 5 (first answer on the page midway through the paragraph) in relation to a perception of City representation. He felt that was the issue and the problem was with administration because they allowed the officers to do the work.

Chief Rhoades said the officers were in uniform and paid individually as a lot of agencies do. He said this did not go out to bid but that was not a City issue but rather a train issue. Between 2002 and 2009 there had been a contract. He said he thought a contract had been signed because he had assigned that to another individual; however, it had not happened. He said there was a policy in the Police Department. He said if there was any violation at all it was that a contract was not signed. They did contact the officers individually. He had no contact with Craig Lacey prior to the contact he had with him prior to the event he had with him in 2009. He said all he did was tell Lacey he was disappointed and that was all—he did not solicit. He said it was later that Lacey called and said he wanted more than security but a police presence. Not until this year was there a law passed about contracts. It was passed this legislative session because of this very issue. No one solicited--the train invited us to come--no laws were broken. After Lacey contacted the Chief he reviewed it with Anderson and the Chief called DOPL and they said they did not need a license. He said Mark Anderson specifically asked him about solicitation and he told Anderson they did not solicit. He continued the only policy that was broken was the Police

Policy about a contract. He said he was sorry Councilman Horner felt the way he did about him but that all the recommendations made by Smedley were made after the fact. He suggested they were recommendations, not rules or laws and they were made after the fact.

Approval of 2011 Citywide Road Improvement Engineering Contract: Mayor Phillips asked if Mumford was asking for approval of the agreement with Horrocks Engineering. Councilman McDonald said he did not have a problem with the Agreement but wanted a hold harmless clause so they couldn't come back on the City with liability issues. Mumford said Horrocks had Engineers Errors and Omissions Insurance so if there was any liability it would go back to their insurance company and that was stated in the Engineering Contract.

Councilman Horner wanted to know why we needed to hire Horrocks to do this and not do it in house. Mumford said he did not have the resources to look at the scope of work. All those services require a number of people with expertise and he definitely did not have the time. Anderson said there were 2400 hours of work in the project which was more than a year of Mumford's time. Councilman Horner apologized and said he had only received the packet on Tuesday so he had not had time to review the Scope of Work.

Councilman Straddeck moved to approve the 2011 Citywide Road Improvement Engineering Contract with Horrocks Engineers. Councilman Patterson made the second. Voting AYE: Eric Straddeck, Nile Horner, Robert Patterson, Alan McDonald and Benny Mergist.

Discussion – 2011-2012 Fiscal Year Budget: No Discussion.

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Heber City Council for April 7, 2011, adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Paulette Thurber, City Recorder