

Approved

**MINUTES OF A WORK MEETING OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL, HELD ON JUNE 15, 2020 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ONLINE AS A ZOOM MEETING. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.**

**Mayor and Council Members Present:**

Mayor Brent Marshall  
Jewel Allen  
Jeff Hutchins  
Darrin Rowberry  
Krista Sparks  
Scott Stice

**Appointed Officers and Employees Present:**

Christine Webb, City Recorder  
Brett Coombs, City Attorney  
Sherrie Broadbent, Finance Director  
James Waltz, Public Works

**Citizens and Guests Present:**

Shay Stark, Aqua Engineering  
Darin Hawkes, Aqua Engineering  
Galaxy S8+  
mcasper  
Travis  
Bishop  
Andrea's iPhone  
Travis Daniels  
Mike  
Brandon

**AGENDA:**

**1. Discussion on secondary accesses.**

Councilman Stice stated the letters being sent to citizens references Grantsville City Code 17-1-6 which says, "It shall be unlawful for any person to make any improvements, changes or obstructions to city streets rights-of-way or sidewalks without the first making application to and receiving written approval from the City." He added it then talks about mailboxes being exempt and if they've made any changes, they need to fix it. He commented that we are reading that to state you cannot put cement in the park strip and asked if that was correct. James Waltz answered in regards to the meter box, they are covering the utility. He pointed out that we want people to beautify their homes and yards. He explained that the Public Works Department needs

to be able to dig five feet (5') on one side of the meter box and two feet (2') on the other side. Councilman Stice stated he does not have a problem with us making people tear out the cement around a water meter. He commented on a street next to the church where someone has a secondary access for his trailer to pull through. He reported he was looking at the Land Use Code and in 9.5.2 it says, "All parkways shall be landscaped in conformance with the provisions of this Section." Councilman Stice pointed out the City Code says you can't make any improvements but the Land Use Code says all parkways shall be landscaped. He added that the Land Use Code 6.9 says, "For each residential lot no more than two driveways."

Shay Stark stated one of the issues he has heard of is when people cut the curb, they saw cut it down, typically the curb does not have any rebar in it and it starts to break down and fall apart. So where someone has cut the curb, it becomes a maintenance issue a few years down the road. If something is poured in place that was correctly designed, you don't see the issue of it breaking up. He commented the flow side of it depends on where it is located. Each situation is unique. He has one community that is on steep slopes and they have an area where a driveway entrance that comes in and every time it rains, the water runs into the front yard because the slope is so steep. Mr. Stark reported we lose capacity with those curb depths.

Mr. Waltz pointed out the right of way belongs to the public. When they cut away the high back curb, they are essentially stealing somebody else's right of way. When people visit for holidays, they've taken away additional parking from the street because it is illegal to park in front of someone's driveway.

Councilman Stice felt there are probably several different things that conflict with each other. He stated that he was looking at this from a couple of specific issues. He commented on a couple of houses on Lookout Ridge Drive. Councilman Hutchins inquired how Mr. Coombs would interpret Land Use Code 6.9. Mr. Waltz replied that current code limits the width of a driveway to twenty-four feet (24') so that means a twelve foot (12') entrance and a twelve foot (12') exit. Councilman Hutchins said he talked with an individual who felt the City interprets the code how they want to interpret it. He agreed that homeowners pouring concrete around their meter should not be allowed. He preferred to have people park their trailers at the back of their property than on the street. Councilman Hutchins commented that he had a hard time coming down hard on a homeowner that is trying to beautify their yard when there are so many yards that people just need to mow their weeds.

Mr. Waltz stated the instances where the secondary access is onto a collector street cause safety issues. Mayor Marshall commented that when homeowners start filling in the swales, they are taking away some of the water retention. He stated Darin Hawkes with Aqua Engineering was present to explain. Mr. Hawkes explained filling in the swale reduces the overall effective volume. He added that it does depend on the size of material that you put in. If you put drain rock in, then you've got roughly twenty-five to thirty (25% - 30%) void ratios which reduces the swale volume by seventy to seventy-five (70% - 75%). He reported it displaces the water. He commented that some of the swales are designed as conveyance mechanisms and some are designed as retention or detention mechanisms. He did not think there was an immense amount of percolation because of the fine clay material near the surface.

Councilwoman Allen asked what materials are put into the conveyance swales by people. Mr. Hawkes answered that ideally you don't put anything in a swale. He said to think of this type of swale as a curb and gutter to convey storm water from point A to point B. If it is filled in, then the flow will take the path of least resistance. Shay Stark pointed out we've recently had an example of this at Silver Fox. They had a natural storm drainage that runs through the subdivision and one of the neighbors poured a bunch of rock in it to beautify their yard. There was a storm, the water couldn't move through there, and it ended up flooding the neighbor's backyard.

Councilman Stice asked if the swales are to retain the water or to transfer the water from south to north. Mr. Stark answered that he did not know specifically on Worthington Street. He reported that swales had been used for a long time in Grantsville City. When he worked on the Transportation Master Plan in 2001, he was directed to keep them. He felt that people thought it served the purpose of retention or detention because you're mimicking the same thing that is happening along the agricultural areas anyway. The water falls onto the road and then runs into the field or the irrigation ditch. Councilman Stice pointed out that it might be designed for both retainage and transferring the water.

Councilman Stice asked if a citizen requested permission to put something in his backyard, could we calculate how big of a culvert he would need to put in to maintain the flow on Worthington Street. Mr. Waltz commented that with Presidents Park going in, it becomes a safety issue to have a driveway every 500 feet along the collector street. Councilman Stice said he would like to talk about that after discussing Worthington and the water flow. He asked if someone puts in a twenty-four inch (24") culvert behind his house, will it be able to convey the water or retain it. Mr. Stark felt that you could calculate that and try to figure it out. He pointed out that as Gary Pinkham from the Planning Commission review the plans for Presidents Park he realized that if you have a 100' lot and someone puts in a thirty-six foot (36') driveway that comes across it, it slopes into the swale. The swales in this subdivision are designed for retention and conveyance. When the thirty-six foot (36') driveway is put in, that will take up fifty percent (50%) of the capacity of the swale to act as retention or detention. Mr. Stark said you can size the pipe to move the water through, but you've lost half of that capacity. Mr. Pinkham asked the developer to resize those swales so they could factor that into it. Mr. Stark commented that if you are just trying to push the water through, then you can design a large enough culvert to allow the water to continue on, but you lose the retention.

Councilwoman Allen expressed appreciation for the discussion. She commented that if they make a decision based on this street, how many other streets will they have to look at to determine when to enforce the code? Councilman Stice answered that is why you look at them one at a time. He said if she wanted to put two driveways in at her house with a culvert, it would be a whole lot different than if anyone else does. Councilwoman Allen felt that when it is being engineered, they are mandating what people can do. Councilman Stice pointed out that his question was whether the swale is to move the water down Worthington Street or if it is to retain the water on Worthington Street. He asked if the swale is to retain the water, then how does a culvert hurt that. Mr. Waltz answered the size of the culvert should be engineered for a one-hundred year storm.

Councilman Stice stated that Councilwoman Allen had a good point as far as enforcing City code. He commented that Grantsville City code 17-1-6 is the one referenced in the letters sent to homeowners with secondary accesses and 17-2-4 (from Debbie Spilman) states it is “unlawful to lead any animal on a sidewalk,” so you can’t walk your dog on a sidewalk. Councilman Stice asked if we need to enforce that. Councilwoman Allen answered that it depends on the intent of the ordinance. Councilman Stice said another code states that it is unlawful for gates to swing out into the sidewalks. He stated that he understood that one, but asked if we enforce it. The next example he gave was 17-2-10 says “All owners or occupants of lots in the city requiring water from a main ditch for irrigation or other purposes are hereby required to dig suitable ditches, erect flumes or lay pipes and maintain the same to convey the water across the sidewalk to or from their respective lots.” Councilman Stice shared additional things from the City Code that were not enforced or did not make sense to enforce. He felt that Mr. Waltz needed direction on what the Council would like him to enforce and which they need to change.

Councilman Stice suggested getting back to the guy cutting down his curb. Councilman Hutchins asked if there are two issues because he has heard a couple of things. He said one was about the width of the drive and the other was the cutting of the curb. Mr. Waltz commented that right now we have driveways that are over the twenty-four feet (24’) which is what the current code allows. He reported that Mr. Coombs has been working to increase the widths of the drives to accommodate access for homeowners to park their RVs on their property. Mr. Coombs explained that is on the next Planning Commission Meeting agenda for review. Councilman Hutchins commented if we solve the span of the driveway, it may not satisfy those that have forty feet (40’). Mr. Waltz stated the meter boxes are five feet (5’) off the property line so if you give them a thirty-two foot (32’) driveway and they have a three or four car garage, and they cut the curb straight out, that is how they are cementing over their meter boxes. He explained that if they have a thirty-two foot driveway, then they will just have to dog-ear over on their property. Councilman Hutchins understood the issue with homeowners cutting the curb. He felt that if we could solve the driveway width, then we have a code regulating a two driveway maximum. Councilman Stice stated homeowners who are going to cut the curb need to call the City and discuss the location prior to doing without permission and direction on where it is best.

Councilman Hutchins commented that letters have been sent out and asked how people respond. He said he knew about the ones that have been on the agenda for the Council to consider allowing the secondary access. He asked if others are complying and removing the cement. Mr. Waltz answered he has a list of those who have repaired it and those who haven’t.

Councilman Stice went back to the Land Use Code regarding parkway landscaping. He pointed out that is 9.5 of the Land Use Code, it talks about materials prohibited in parkways. The materials listed as being prohibited are rocks, gravel, and bark, but the table it says you can put bark or mulch, but that you can’t put rocks in it. Councilman Stice felt this was another thing that needed to be looked at and fixed to make it right. He confirmed that it should be illegal to cut the curb. Councilman Hutchins agreed and asked if they should be charged a penalty. He said they can’t fix it after it’s done. Councilman Stice said they can fix it because one guy did fix it when Mr. Waltz stopped to let him know they he could not pave it. Mr. Waltz added that the man thanked him for letting him know he couldn’t do it. Councilman Stice commented that

he thought that one is too close to the stop sign and too close to the road. He felt there are other codes that supersede that one. He commented that the guy should be able to have another driveway but he cannot put it too close to the stop sign or the retainage basin.

Mr. Coombs reported our Land Use Code 6.9 is where the requirements for driveway widths can be found. Councilman Rowberry asked about circular driveways and if under our current code they each would be twelve feet (12'). Or if once it is amended to allow thirty-two feet (32') and a homeowner wants to put in a second driveway, they cannot already have a thirty-two foot driveway and put in another. Councilman Stice said let's let them have their twenty-four foot or thirty foot driveway in front of their house and then if they want to put a second one in, then it can only be twelve feet because most people have a two car garage and they have to have a place to drive their trailer to go around to the backyard.

Councilman Hutchins remarked we know the direction of the water flow so if someone has a larger cut out on the flow side of their property line, then it will go into their yard and be their problem. If they cut it out on the down the flow side, then it becomes their neighbors problem. Mr. Waltz felt that Councilman Stice's point about homeowners coming to the City to ask for permission was valid. He added that whenever you do something in your home, such as install a new water heater, you have to get a building permit. Councilman Stice suggested writing the code to say a primary driveway can only be this wide, your secondary driveway can only be this wide. Mayor Marshall added the statement "with approval." Councilman Stice asked if they are not going to cut the curb and gutter, do they still need approval. Mr. Waltz said right of way would be road to road then. He added that surface improvements is just the outside of the surface. Councilman Stice argued that if all he has in front of his house is a sidewalk with no curb and gutter or a park strip and he wants to add a second driveway, it shouldn't affect anything. Mr. Waltz responded that by definition the right of way is still outside of sidewalk to outside of sidewalk.

The Council discussed different streets in the City that do and do not have curb and gutter. Councilman Stice stated this boils down to determining if the issue is that it is against the Code or is the issue that it's causing problems. He remarked if this is causing problems, then is it affecting the flow or are the driveways too wide. Mr. Waltz answered and traffic is affected. Councilwoman Sparks pointed out a collector road is a different issue. Mr. Waltz commented that if you look at the Transportation Master Plan, Nygreen will become very busy, but right now it is in its infancy. He said if you allow secondary accesses on it, you will have Nygreen looking like Durfee Street where there is a driveway every lot.

Councilman Stice commented that when reading the Code that we have, it says a guy can have two driveways, it says you can put cement in the park strip as long as it is not more than twenty-five percent (25%) of it. He did not see how someone putting in a second driveway with cement is violating our Code other than if you cut the curb. Mr. Coombs added the designation of the street such as whether or not it is a collector street. Councilman Stice suggested not addressing the collector streets and instead talk about Lookout and call it not a collector street. Mr. Stark said Lookout was a prime example because the home on the corner has an issue with a driveway being too close to the intersection. However, a few houses in, does not have the issues. He

asked where does our Code define that because where you see an issue, somebody else might not. Councilman Stice said he bet if you go through our Code, you can find ten things wrong with what the guy did, but you could probably find ten reasons why he could do what he did. It just depends on where and how deep you look. Councilman Hutchins commented that they had identified issues and talked about solutions. He asked Mr. Coombs what other communities are doing or if this is a common situation and what his advice was. Mr. Coombs answered any time you have multiple ordinances or laws that conflict, we try to resolve the conflict by reading both of them and see if there is a way to find a resolution. Sometimes you cannot, in those situations you say you cannot do anything about it because the law needs to be changed. Or you take the ordinance that was passed latest in time and follow it and make a change to the oldest law. He commented that while drafting the driveway width code, he saw one that was sixteen pages long just dealing with driveways in their city. Mr. Coombs felt there would be several instances where our Code is in conflict with some other area of the Code or the Land Use Code. He said the only way to resolve that is what he just described or to have the City Council take on the task of cleaning it up. He reported that other cities have put together a working group and working their way through it. Councilman Stice felt we could tweak 17-1-6 to say you cannot put cement around a water meter ten feet out, but you can put gravel, lime fines, or mulch in there. He added that we should put something in there that says if you want to cut the curb, you have to get permission from the City because it is the City's curb.

Councilman Stice felt they should be able to modify the Code to allow secondary driveway but make it clear that the resident cannot cut the curb because it is not their curb; they have to get permission. Mayor Marshall asked if Councilman Stice would like them to come in to address that. Councilman Stice did not think that everyone who wishes to cut their curb should have to come to City Council. He believed that between Public Works and the Building Inspectors, they should be able to say it will work or that it is too close to a fire hydrant, an intersection, etc. Mr. Hawkes asked if the City requires a permit for flat work because they would have to declare they are putting in a driveway on the application for a permit. Mr. Stark explained that Clinton City requires residents to get approval for a fence or a tuff shed. They have a simple application and they are mainly requiring it to provide information in simple terms the general requirements and the sections of code governing the situation.

Mayor Marshall asked Councilman Stice to rewrite Title 17 of the Code. Councilman Stice agreed. He asked what to do about the homeowners that have received letters that this might apply to.

Mr. Waltz commented that if the gentleman who appeared before the Council at the recent City Council Meeting was allowed to keep his secondary access, they will have twelve other homes that are going to follow suit. Councilman Stice stated the problem he had with that one is that he saw someone else do that and thought he could do it as well. He commented that the three people that did it on the west side of Worthington claimed the Building Inspector said it was okay so there might be some doubt. Mr. Waltz said with Nygreen being an arterial, he advised the Council to not allow it to continue on down the street.

Councilman Stice inquired why Worthington is a collector street. Mr. Stark provided everyone present with a Street Master Plan. He explained that in 2001 Grantsville put together a Street Master Plan. At the time, there were a couple of planning processes going on in Tooele County. One was WFRC and UDOT were doing a study which was ultimately tied with the Mid-Valley Highway. Tooele County was also in the middle of a transportation study. Mr. Stark reported the information he gave the Council was his combination of the two studies based on the pertinent data he was looking at. He pointed out the Mid-Valley Highway was shown and it loops along the Depot fence to connect with Mormon Trail Road. And Mormon Trail Road swung around the bench and connected to Burmester Road. He reported those were some of the outside parameters they had to consider at the time. He said as they were looking at the City they considered AASHTO standards. And at that time AASHTO defined a rural collector street as traffic of 400 vehicles per day on the street. Mr. Starks stated he was generalizing it and there several other factors that went into it. He explained that as they were looking at the City, Worthington Street ended before South Street. Worthington Street south of South Street was a dirt road and South Street and Nygreen were dirt roads. He said the only large subdivisions the City had on the south end were South Willow Estates and Anderson Ranch and other than those there was hardly anything out there. Mr. Stark reported you bring the residential streets into a collector street and the collector has limited access and it has width designation for a center turn lane. So as the City grows, if a collector street gets to the point that there is a lot of traffic on it and it begins to slow down at intersections, we can put the center turn lane in. Councilman Stice asked if the thickness of the asphalt is any different on a collector than a local street. Mr. Stark answered not in what he had shown. Mr. Stark stated they knew they potentially had the road coming in along the D.O.D. property. The discussion at that time did not include the Deseret Peak Annexation and there was no development out to the west. The west side was Soil Conservation; that is where Wells Crossing and Northstar Ranch are now. At the time Mr. Stark was told that area would never be developed. Because of that, they did carry Nygreen across but were not so worried about carrying South Street across. There was no expectation that the density of development would be such that it would be necessary. The thought process was to get traffic to SR-112 so residents could go to Tooele or get to SR-138 and there would be connections at both ends of town. They asked which right of ways were the least developed because the ones that were developed were done so to a narrower width. In order to make them collector streets, they would have had to take property from people to make it happen and the City did not want to go that way. Mr. Stark commented this plan was done in 2001 and the growth projections back then are nowhere near where the City is at right now. We are way beyond the 2025 growth projection made on this. He stated that is part of the reason we need a new Transportation Plan. He reported the City paid \$5,000 for the current one. They did not do any modeling; they basically tried to use common sense and some basic principles to come up with the plan. He add the City is in a different situation with a lot of growth and pockets of higher traffic.

Mr. Stark explained we cannot deny a person access to their property. If there is not another street for them to access their property from, we have to allow them to access their property. He cited an example he ran into with this type of situation a few years ago in Wendover. Councilman Stice expressed appreciation for Mr. Stark's knowledge on this.

Mayor Marshall commented that Worthington Street is the only north and south connection on the east side of the City, so even if you have to have a wiggle in the road, you still want to try to keep that corridor there and available. He stated whether the Depot fence line ever has a road constructed along it or not, it will be many years out. He felt the City should try to preserve the north/south corridor because Nygreen is years out to connect to SR-112. Councilwoman Sparks asked how that will affect Presidents Park. Mr. Stark answered the traffic study for Presidents Park recommended that it is time for Durfee Street to have a left hand turn lane onto Worthington coming from the east. He reported that a section of Durfee Street is now (with this project) going to be acting as a collector street. At some point, if we continue to get that higher density growth, we will see the same thing happen with Worthington. He felt that Nygreen extending to SR-112 will help with that. He has proposed an amendment to the General Plan because of the annexation on the east side of the City and the fact that the Mid-Valley Highway will tie into Sheep Lane that Sheep Lane needs to become an arterial to handle the traffic. He is also proposing the Lamb Lane be a collector street. Mr. Coombs stated the biggest change needed for Presidents Park Subdivision will be an allowance for the road and the width for the collector road.

Councilman Stice commented that between Mr. Waltz, Mr. Stark, and Mr. Hawkes he was convinced that Mr. McCarty will need to take his culvert out. Councilwoman Allen asked if there are other situations along Worthington Street where homeowners are going to request a variance to allow for a secondary access. Mr. Waltz answered if that one stays, then yes, there will be more.

Mr. Coombs asked if the Council would like the amended ordinance to require homeowners to apply for approval for a secondary access on a collector street. Councilman Stice answered that there will be no new secondary accesses to a collector street. He pointed out that if the City is allowing access from the front, then they can put in two driveways and drive around their house.

## **2. Discussion of secondary water.**

Mayor Marshall reminded everyone that the Irrigation Company has cut the allotment of irrigation water available to residents to use to water their yards. He reported there has already been advertisements on Facebook for services with a water tie in from culinary to secondary. He explained we discovered a cross connection a week or two ago. He said that area of town is probably the only area where the water pressure exceeds that of the Irrigation Company. He stated they had pumped nearly a half a million gallons of water into the irrigation system through the culinary water system. Mayor Marshall explained that you have to have an air gap between the secondary and the culinary so that you don't contaminate one to the other. He said that the real problem we have is that we have subdivisions that water their lawns with secondary water. If they run out of secondary water, they are going to start watering their lawns or gardens, etc. with culinary water. The issue then becomes that they have not paid an outdoor water acquisition fee. Mayor Marshall explained it may be necessary to enact the outdoor watering fee on all subdivisions. This will allow the City to pay for the acquisition of more water. It is an impact fee.

Councilman Hutchins explained that irrigation water is based on weather and there are about 10,000 shares. He stated that means that if we have a wet year, you will get more water because it is available. He pointed out there are no more shares, so as people are moving in, they have to buy or lease the available shares. The Council discussed the water requirements for new subdivisions.

Councilman Stice asked if we should require developers to bring culinary water for outdoor use and not allow them to use irrigation. Mayor Marshall stated there needed to be some kind of balance. He said the City cannot do anything with what has already happened, it would have to be from here forward. He said if a developer provides irrigation water for the subdivision, that is fine, but there also needs to be something for the outdoor watering impact fee to help cover the cost. Mr. Coombs reported that we can require any developer to pay for our ground water whether they are going to use the irrigation water or not. He explained the City can say that we understand they want to provide irrigation to your development but as a City we have to be ready and willing to provide that water to each of the lots in your subdivision. If they choose not to use the secondary water or it runs out, there is still a way to water. He pointed out that it is the same thing as you see with electrical companies and when people put solar panels on their homes. The electrical company is still going to charge you because they have to run the lines to your house and maintain the service.

Councilwoman Allen expressed concern about collecting the impact fee and then not being able to find the water. Mayor Marshall explained those funds would be put in a restricted account. Councilman Rowberry commented those funds could be used for future water storage tanks, wells, and infrastructure. Councilwoman Sparks commented it says the landscape watering requirement and asked how we know how they plan to landscape when they're building a home. Mayor Marshall answered that you don't and that is why you take the square footage of that lot less the square footage of the home. Councilwoman Sparks asked if she xeriscapes her yard, why is she paying for outdoor water. Mr. Coombs answered it is because the City has to be ready and willing if they change to put it all in grass. Councilman Rowberry stated Northstar Ranch is on culinary water and they have to have so much grass in by a certain date, but there is not enough pressure to operate the sprinkler system. He asked if we should be looking at ways to encourage xeriscapes and/or water reducing type of subdivisions. Mayor Marshall answered yes, we should. He added that we are looking at the water issue at Northstar Ranch. He reported that we have encouraged the HOAs to put in their provisions that there is xeriscape. Councilman Rowberry felt that most new homeowners would not be opposed to paying the fee if they know the City using the funds for water.

Councilman Stice asked if the City puts a backflow at the water meter. Mr. Waltz answered that was on the next agenda for the City Council to approve. He stated that by December 31<sup>st</sup> of this year we have to have a cross connection control program in place by law. He explained we have three certified cross connection control administrators on staff. Councilman Stice asked if going forward we can tell the new subdivisions that you have to have it. Mr. Waltz answered that we have an educational flyer that we have created and it will be going out in the Mayor's Newsletter. Mayor Marshall added that it was also sent out by the Irrigation Company. Mr. Coombs stated this was an ordinance we already had on the books, we are updating it. It can be

Approved

found in Section 7-3 of the Code. Councilwoman Allen commented that Dave Teggin has asked about ordinances to support their efforts on xeriscaping. She asked how the City discovered the cross connection case and if there was a spike in usage. Mayor Marshall answered yes. He explained we have to turn in a report every year on the amount of water that we pump and how much of it has been utilized.

### **3. Discussion of CARES funding.**

Mayor Marshall explained the CARES funding is federal funding coming to the cities. He asked the Council to consider whether we should take the money or not. Sherrie Broadbent reported our first allotment is a little over \$300,000 if we decide to accept it. The total amount will add up to over one million dollars. She pointed out it can only be used for COVID-19 related expenses. It cannot be used for budget shortfalls. She reviewed some of the ways it can be used and asked for direction. Mrs. Broadbent stated we do not want to waste money because we will all pay for it with our taxes. Councilman Stice asked if there is a matching amount we will need. Mayor Marshall answered no, there is not. Mrs. Broadbent reiterated that it has to be dedicated to COVID. She stated the risk you run is if you spend the money and they come back and say that it did not qualify and you would have to pay it back. Councilwoman Allen asked what would happen if you accept the money but do not spend it all. Mrs. Broadbent answered that you would have to give it back. Mayor Marshall added that you have to track your expenses. The Council was in agreement that we should accept the CARES funding.

Councilman Rowberry stated he was told there was something on Facebook saying that the government was giving all cities who cancel their 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebrations extra funding. Mayor Marshall reported we have not been offered any funding to cancel the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. Mr. Coombs pointed out there was a proposal from the County Health Department to get a mental health counsellor for our elderly population. He explained that is also something we can consider for these funds.

### **4. Adjourn.**

**Motion:** Councilwoman Allen made a motion to adjourn. Councilwoman Sparks seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.