



Memo

Date: 11 July 2025

To:

Cc:

From: Brad Wilson, City Recorder

RE: Minutes of the 1 July 2025 City Council Regular Meeting

Please note that the following minutes await formal approval and are in draft or unapproved form.

MINUTES OF THE MIDWAY CITY COUNCIL

(Regular Meeting)

Tuesday, 1 July 2025, 6:00 p.m.
Midway Community Center, Council Chambers
160 West Main Street, Midway, Utah

Note: Notices/agendas were posted at 7-Eleven, The Market Express, the United States Post Office, the Midway City Office Building, and the Midway Community Center. Notices/agendas were provided to the Mayor, City Council, City Engineer, City Attorney, Planning Director, and The Wasatch Wave. The public notice/agenda was published on the Utah State Public Notice Website and on the City's website. A copy of the public notice/agenda is contained in the supplemental file for the meeting.

1. Call to Order; Pledge of Allegiance; Prayer and/or Inspirational Message

Mayor Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. She excused Council Member Drury.

Members Present

Celeste Johnson, Mayor
Lisa Orme, Council Member
Kevin Payne, Council Member
Craig Simons, Council Member
JC Simonsen, Council Member

Staff Present

Corbin Gordon, City Attorney
Michael Henke, City Planning Director
Wes Johnson, City Engineer
Camille Palmer, Mayor's Assistant
Katie Villani, City Planner
Brad Wilson, City Recorder

Members Excused

Jeff Drury, Council Member

Note: A copy of the meeting roll is contained in the supplemental file for the meeting.

Mayor Johnson led the Council and meeting attendees in the pledge of allegiance. Council Member Simons gave the prayer and/or inspirational message.

2. Consent Agenda

- a. Agenda for the 1 July 2025 City Council Regular Meeting
- b. Warrants
- c. Minutes of the 13 June 2025 City Council Site Tour
- d. Minutes of the 17 June 2025 City Council Regular Meeting
- e. First extension of final approval, from 15 August 2024 to 15 August 2025, for the Farmstead Off Midway Density Reduction Subdivision located at 101 West 100 South (Zoning is R-1-9).

- f. Second extension of final approval from, 15 August 2025 to 15 August 2026, for the Farmstead Off Midway Density Reduction Subdivision located at 101 West 100 South (Zoning is R-1-9).
- g. Resolution 2025-20 adopting a certified property tax rate for Midway City.
- h. Extend until 30 September 2025 a motion approving the use of Midway open space bond funds for the Lundin property located at approximately 900 West Bigler Lane.

Note: Copies of items 2a through 2h are contained in the supplemental file for the meeting.

Motion: Council Member Simons moved to approve the consent agenda items “a” through “h” as listed.

Second: Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

Discussion: Council Member Simonsen asked if the tax rate was decreasing. Brad Wilson responded that it was.

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

3. Public Comment – Comments were taken for items not on the agenda.

Resolution 2025-21 / Charitable Donation

Carl Berg asked if he would be able to speak regarding the charitable donation on the agenda. Mayor Johnson responded that he would be able to speak when the item was discussed.

4. Department Reports

Red, White, and Blue Festival

Council Member Orme reported that the Heber Valley Chamber of Commerce was helping with the Red, White, and Blue Festival. She asked everyone to support the event.

Pear Tree Llama Ranch

Mayor Johnson asked the council members’ opinions of preserving open space in the Pear Tree Llama Ranch. Council Member Orme supported preserving the open space. Council Member Simons supported it because it would connect trails and the owners worked with the Albert Kohler Dairy. Council Member Simonsen said the site tour was informative.

Katie Villani reported that the City needed to work with a neighboring landowner to obtain a small section of land for the trail.

HL&P / HVRR / Track Extension

Council Member Payne reported that the Heber Light & Power Company (HL&P) would provide property for the Heber Valley Railroad (HVRR) to extend its track and have longer trains.

HVSSD / Advisory Group / Will-Serve Letter

Mayor Johnson reported that the Heber Valley Special Service District (HVSSD) would put together an advisory group to discuss the capacity issues at its sewer treatment plant. She added that HVSSD would also consider issuing will-serve letters.

Joint City Council and Planning Commission Meeting / Zoning

Michael Henke reported that the City Council and Planning Commission would hold a joint meeting in August to discuss zoning. Council Member Payne indicated that he would be traveling and asked to be excused from the meeting.

- 5. Norm George Flag Lot Subdivision / Third Plat Map Amendment** (Quinn and Laura Calder, Applicants – Approximately 30 minutes) – Discuss and possibly approve a third plat map amendment of the Norm George Flag Lot Subdivision located at 146 North 300 East (Zoning is R-1-9). **Public Hearing** – Public comment must be related to this item on the agenda.

Michael Henke gave a presentation regarding the proposed amendment and reviewed the following items:

- Land use summary
- Location of the development
- Former flag lot ordinance
- Most recent plat map
- Quit claim deed
- Proposed plat map
- Vacated portions of the property
- New lot
- Setbacks
- Proposed findings

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- 300 East had been built on a portion of Quinn Calder's lot.
- The amendment would correct the issue.
- It complied with the Municipal Code.
- The Council was required to approve the amendment according to state law.

- A lot had to have frontage on both streets to be considered a corner lot.
- The Indian Summer Subdivision would not be affected by the amendment.

Note: A copy of Mr. Henke's presentation is contained in the supplemental file for the meeting.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following items:

- The request would let Mike Hopkins, who owned property just south of Mr. Calder, have a smaller setback and provide more space for development. What would the next person ask for?
- Mr. Calder was giving a lot to the City.
- Such low setbacks were not allowed in the zone.
- Mr. Hopkins wanted to add onto his house and build a five-car garage. The amendment would allow him to do that. His fence line was 22 feet from the curb and gutter of 300 East. Preferred a setback of 30 feet from the center of the road. The only way for the amendment to work was for Mr. Calder's lot to have a strip of land along his entire property. Mr. Hopkin's property was not part of the Norm George Subdivision.
- Conditions could not be put on Mr. Hopkin's property because it was not part of the request.
- Mr. Calder and Mr. Hopkins should work together to landscape the area between 300 East and Mr. Hopkin's property.

Public Hearing

Mayor Johnson opened the hearing and asked if there were any comments from the public.

Quinn Calder, Applicant

Mr. Calder reviewed the following items:

- Original plat map
- Boundary description
- Amended plat map
- Key evidence
- What he was seeking.
- Closing statement

He made the following comments:

- A lot of crazy things had happened with his property.
- 35 feet of his property was taken by the City. He did not give the City that property.
- The road was built, and the quit claim deed was recorded without the subdivision plat map being amended.
- The taking of his property was a legal issue.
- He had property rights.
- Wanted a response to his claims that evening or within 15 days.
- Wanted 300 East removed from his property or at least for the City to compensate him

for the land.

- Residents relied on the City to protect them.
- Wanted his land and wanted to sell a portion of it to Mr. Hopkins.
- Property within a recorded plat map could not be deeded away.
- Someone could quit claim anything they wanted, but that would not change a recorded plat map.

Note: A copy of a document from Mr. Calder, outlining his presentation, is contained in the supplemental file.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following items:

- Mr. Calder was asking for something different from what the staff presented.
- The Council could not do anything that night to fulfill Mr. Calder's requests.
- Conflicting requests were presented that evening.
- Only the proposed plat amendment was on the agenda that evening. That was the only action that could be taken that night.
- The intent of the quit claim deed was to transfer the property to the City.
- The request should be tabled so that Mr. Calder and Mr. Hopkins could discuss the issue. Their issues were separate.
- The City attorney could not give Mr. Calder legal advice. He could review the issue if directed by the City. The review would not happen within 15 days.

Mayor Johnson closed the public hearing.

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to continue Item #5, the Norm George Flag Lot Subdivision third plat map amendment, to a future and to be determined date with the direction that the City Attorney look at and try to resolve the issue.

Second: Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

Discussion: Council Member Simons said that staff had presented a proposal, Mr. Calder presented a different proposal, and the motion was different from Mr. Hopkin's request to allow him and Mr. Calder to meet and then come back to the Council. Council Member Payne responded that the motion continued the item so another application would not have to be submitted.

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

6. Ordinance 2025-18 / Underground Parking Structures (Paul Berg, Berg Engineering – Approximately 30 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or adopt Ordinance

2025-18 amending Section 16.13.390 (Off-Street Parking and Loading) of the Midway City Municipal Code to allow underground parking structures. Recommended by the Midway City Planning Commission. **Public Hearing** – Public comment must be related to this item on the agenda.

Michael Henke gave a presentation regarding the request and reviewed the following items:

- Current code
- Planning commission discussion
- Applicant's proposed code
- Alternative code proposed by staff
- Planning commission recommendation
- General Plan

Mr. Henke reviewed the following proposal from the applicant:

- Parking structures would be allowed as a Conditional Use.
- A parking structure was defined as a building designed for car parking and where there was more than one floor or level on which parking took place. It was essentially an indoor, stacked parking lot.

Mr. Henke reviewed the following proposal from staff:

A parking structure was defined as a building designed for car parking and where there was more than one floor or level on which parking took place. It was essentially an indoor, stacked parking lot. Parking Structures were not allowed except if all the following requirements were met:

1. Only one layer of parking was visible.
2. Any lower parking levels (surface parking area to the roof) were completely below natural grade and such lower parking level(s) would not be visible from adjacent streets, neighboring properties, or within the development.
3. Berms would not be used to create a visual barrier for lower parking levels or to create a new "natural grade".
4. Access ramps to below natural grade parking would not have direct access from Main Street, Center Street, River Road or from roads fronting the Town Square which included the following:
 - a. 100 North (100 West to 200 West),
 - b. 100 West (Main Street to 100 North), and
 - c. 200 West (Main Street to 200 North).
5. Access ramps to below natural grade parking would not exceed 10% unless they were covered or heated.
6. Below natural grade parking lots with more than 150 parking stalls below natural grade would have two accesses.

7. At grade parking would comply with other surface level parking requirements.
8. Amenities could be installed above the below natural grade level parking and could include landscaping, sports facilities, and parking.
9. Any area gained by creating below natural grade parking could not be used to create more building area. Any area gained would be used for landscaping, sports facilities (roofless), or parking.
10. Below-natural grade parking was allowed under designated open space if the design of the structure allowed the open space to be visually indistinguishable from open space areas that did not have parking below.
11. At the time of the building permit, below grade parking lots would provide lighting, ventilation, storm water runoff, groundwater and all applicable codes.

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- The applicant's proposal would make parking structures a conditional use.
- Did not want larger buildings because of parking structures.
- The request did not require a master plan amendment.
- Recommended a restriction against buildings above parking.

Note: A copy of Mr. Henke's presentation is contained in the supplemental file for the meeting.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following items:

- What did number one mean? This should be clarified.
- Could a structure be built above parking?
- Parking structures conveyed an urban feel.
- Only one level of parking should be allowed above grade.
- Subterranean and multi-level parking was a tool for urban high-density development.
- The Municipal Code should preserve existing houses on Main Street.
- More parking was needed along Main Street.
- Subterranean parking allowed for more commercial density. It was a more efficient use of space.
- More time was needed to process the proposal.
- The proposal for the entire development should be presented with any request for layered parking.
- The staff's proposed language should be refined.
- Recommended against staff's proposal that any area gained could not be used for more building area.
- Staff's phrasing for visible parking should be adjusted.

Paul Berg, Berg Engineering Resource Group and representing the applicants, made the following comments:

- Talked Michael Henke through the revisions.

- The above ground parking should be allowed at approximately natural grade. Some flexibility was needed.
- Wanted to provide parking alternatives and the ability to hide parking.
- The proposal would be a tool to make Main Street look good.
- Parking should not be used to control growth.
- All cities wanted additional commercial development.
- Architectural standards, etc., not the proposal, would give the City a nice Main Street.
- Pickle ball courts would replace some of the above ground parking in Southill.
- The commercial building square footage in Southill would remain the same.
- The applicant was considering more underground parking on the west side of Southill.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following additional items:

- The Council did not want a main street like Heber City's.
- More density hindered the City's ability to retain the Resort Tax.
- The City had the lowest property tax rate of any City in Utah.
- Parking should be behind commercial buildings.
- Parking was not beautiful.
- People liked the current feel of Midway.
- A city could have too much commercial development.
- Underground parking should not have one lane access.
- Did any of the proposals provide a thorough enough review and oversight?
- Engineering specifications should be required with a request for a parking structure.
- Approval should not be granted until a definition of open space was provided for commercial development.
- Should there be a universal definition of open space in the Municipal Code?
- It was smart to have open space over underground parking.
- Zermatt Resort could benefit from underground parking.
- Underground parking was forward thinking. It would help with the City's parking problem and would not change the use of the property.

Public Hearing

Mayor Johnson opened the hearing and asked if there were any comments from the public. She closed the hearing when no public comment was offered.

Motion: Council Member Simons moved to continue Ordinance 2025-18 with the input from Council including the following items:

- Item one of the staff's proposal would say "at grade".
- Items nine and ten would be reviewed.
- The addition of a twelfth item.
- And anything else from staff's notes.

Discussion: Michael Henke indicated that the changes could not be made in time for the next council meeting. Paul Berg indicated that could hurt the applicant's construction schedule.

Mayor Johnson asked if the proposed change should be just for Southill. Michael Henke

responded that the proposal was specific enough that it would only apply to Southill.

Mr. Berg indicated that the item could be continued for a month if plans could be submitted sooner. The Council agreed.

Second: Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Motion: Without objection, Mayor Johnson recessed the meeting at 8:16 p.m. She reconvened the meeting at 8:28 p.m.

- 7. Ordinance 2025-21 / Lot Sizes** (Michael Henke, Planning Director – Approximately 45 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or adopt Ordinance 2025-20 amending Title 16 (Land Use) of the Midway City Municipal Code regarding lot sizes. Recommended by the Midway City Planning Commission. **Public Hearing** – Public comment must be related to this item on the agenda.

Michael Henke gave a presentation regarding the proposed ordinance and reviewed the following items:

- Proposed Municipal Code Section 16.16.120
- Proposed Municipal Code Section 16.17.040
- Small scale subdivisions by zone.
- Density and open space
- Examples
- Impact
- Items of discussion
- Possible findings

Mr. Henke also made the following comments:

- Open space was built into density reduction and rural preservation subdivisions.
- The proposal would not affect already recorded developments.
- The R-1-7 and R-1-9 zones were exempted.
- The size of houses could be limited with setbacks. Sizes could also be limited by a cap on volume and building envelopes.
- Was always discussing setbacks with landowners or potential landowners.
- Subdivisions limited by street frontage would not be affected.

Note: A copy of Mr. Henke's presentation is contained in the supplemental file for the meeting.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following items:

- The proposal would hurt the families that wanted to subdivide their property so their children could build houses and stay in Midway.
- Its negatives outweighed its benefits.
- It would create larger lots but with larger houses and not as much open space.
- Open space should be fought for in larger developments.
- Open space should be required instead of larger lots.
- The proposal would create open area without needing an HOA.
- The current code gave a benefit to developers.
- The current code or the proposed code would not create affordable housing.
- Was language needed requiring a minimum of 15% open space?
- The cut off point for the proposal was six acres or ten acres in the RA-1-43 zone.

Public Hearing

Mayor Johnson opened the hearing and asked if there were any comments from the public.

Paul Berg

Mr. Berg made the following comments:

- Had a history with open space in Midway.
- Helped create open space tools with Mayor Bill Probst.
- Work with Bob Mathis, a former planner, to create 15% open space with clustering.
- Density and open space were different.
- If the City wanted less density then it should change its density regulations.
- The City should look at how to create open space.
- The 15% open space requirement should remain.
- The minimums could be reduced.
- Most HOAs worked successfully.
- Agricultural land was better than just open space because it reduced maintenance costs.
- Large lots were not necessarily to create open space or a rural feel. Instead, the City should just create open space. This would give the City more control.
- Requiring a percentage of open space upfront avoided having to overregulate lots.

Mayor Johnson closed the hearing when no further public comment was offered.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following additional items:

- Open space included density, setbacks, etc.
- Could there be an HOA or entity that administered various pieces of open space throughout the City?
- The City should have an arsenal of tools to preserve open space.
- Families should be able to provide building lots for their children.

- The Council should not create more work for staff.
- The current code was not that broken.
- The City could restrict the percentage of a lot that could be built upon.
- Limiting the volume of house was a better way to create open area in a lot.
- The Code did not allow developers to carve off six-acre parcels to avoid the open space requirement.

Motion: Council Member Orme moved to deny Ordinance 2025-21 regarding lot size and leave the Code as it was currently.

Second: The motion died for the lack of a second.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following additional items:

- The Planning Commission was considering increasing the open space requirement to 25%.
- The proposal should be considered again after the City Council and Planning Commission's joint meeting.
- Clustering could also be used to create open space.

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to table the item for further discussion until after the combined meeting with the Planning Commission regarding zoning.

Second: Council Member Simonsen seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Nay
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

8. Resolution 2025-21 / Charitable Donation (Corbin Gordon, City Attorney – Approximately 10 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or approve Resolution 2025-21 acknowledging the value of a charitable donation of land, by Honua Development, LLC and Tyson Miller, for a trail in Midway City.

Corbin Gordon gave a presentation regarding the proposed donation and reviewed the location of the donation. Mr. Gordon also made the following comments:

- The trail was in the City's trails plan.
- There was no plan to develop the associated property for maybe ten years.
- Tyson Miller, one of the property owners, was willing to donate the land for the trail if it could be a tax right-off.

- Mr. Miller had the property appraised.
- Requested that the Council approve the appraised value for the IRS then the property would be deeded to the City.

Note: A copy of Mr. Gordon's presentation is contained in the supplemental file for the meeting.

Michael Henke made the following comments:

- The property around the trail would eventually be developed. Hopefully open space in the development would be next to the trail.
- It was possible that the developer might want to move the trail when the property was developed.
- The City had miles of trails but only one section that had fencing that created a tunnel feel.
- The City should accept the donation because it was free and would help complete the City's trails plan.
- The City would allow a future developer to count the trail as open space.
- The City would decide when the trail would be built.
- Resident's wanted trails.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following items:

- Could the trail be behind lots and have a tunnel feel with fences on both sides?
- Usually, the City and community knew what a trail would be like when it was built with the development.
- Could the City require that a future development have open space next to the trail? The City did not have any leverage to require that.
- The City would have to amend its code to prohibit fencing along trails. Setbacks could be required for privacy fencing along trails.
- The City usually waited for a property to be developed for a trail to be built.
- The trail could be gravel.
- The owners wanted to deed the property instead of granting an easement to prevent liability.
- The owners or developers would have to build the trail and not receive a right-off if they waited for it to develop.
- A developer would only need to make sure the trail went from point A to point B. The City could not necessarily dictate the route.
- The owner might withdraw the donation if the City prohibited fencing along the trail.

Carl Berg, who lived next to the proposed donation, made the following comments:

- Not all gifts were good.
- The City's typical trail easement was 20 feet. Why was the gift for only 12 feet?
- Loved trails.
- The trail on the donated property would be ten feet from his house. He had a patio on that side of his house.
- The trail would set bad precedence by being ten feet from a house.
- Usually trails were built before the surrounding houses.
- Lived in his house for more than a decade.

- The City Council should protect its residents.
- Expected houses but not trails next to him.
- This area of the City had more trails than any other area in the City.
- Mr. Miller said that he wanted to build two houses on the property. This could create an 800-foot long tunnel feel along the trail.
- The more the donation was discussed the fewer rights he would have.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following additional items:

- Carl Berg chose to build his house close to the property line.
- Carl Berg had a private lot for many years.
- It was difficult to accept a gift and then ask the giver to accept restrictions. The City should at least ask.
- The setback on the property with the proposed donation was ten feet. This meant 20 feet between Carl Berg's house and a house on the property. The trail would create more space.
- Mr. Henke and Carl Berg met with Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller wanted the trail on the boundary so that the property could still be used for agriculture. He refused that it be in any other location, including further from Carl Berg's property.
- Carl Berg should have some privacy.
- The City could landscape along the trail to provide privacy.
- The Homestead Trail was as close to some properties.
- The gift should not be accepted unless the City knew how the property would be developed.
- What would the perception be if the City refused the gift.
- The trail would be built for free when the property developed.
- Mr. Miller was not asked to attend the meeting. He should be invited.
- If Carl Berg had not been to the meeting, then the Council would have approved the donation. The Council did care and listened to residents.
- The staff work on the donation was appreciated.
- There was not a deadline to accept the donation.
- Should the Code be changed just for this section of trail?
- The City should again ask Mr. Miller for flexibility in the route of the trail.

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to continue the item to allow staff, and anyone else who wanted to be part of the conversations, to see if any movement could be made to address the negative impacts on the adjacent property owners.

Discussion: Council Member Simonsen wanted a 20-foot easement for the trail.

Council Member Payne asked Carl Berg what minimum setback he wanted. Carl Berg asked that it be more than ten feet away.

Corbin Gordon noted that the owners did spend time and money to get an appraisal and legal description. Council Member Payne noted that the appraisal was from 2022.

Council Member Simons noted that the proposed resolution was just to accept the value.

Second: Council Member Simonsen seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Motion: Council Member Payne moved to continue the meeting to consider the next item on the agenda.

Second: Council Member Simonsen seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

- 9. Ordinance 2025-19 / Parking Agreements** (Katie Villani, City Planner – Approximately 10 minutes) – Discuss and Possibly deny, continue, or adopt Ordinance 2025-19 amending Section 16.13.390 (Off-Street Parking and Loading) of the Midway City Municipal Code regarding parking agreements between Midway City and businesses. Recommended by the Midway City Planning Commission. **Public Hearing** – Public comment must be related to this item on the agenda.

Public Hearing

Mayor Johnson opened the hearing and asked if there were any comments from the public. She closed the hearing when no public comment was offered.

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to continue the item to the next available meeting.

Second: Council Member Payne seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye

Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

Motion: Council Member Simonsen moved to continue the meeting to consider the next item on the agenda.

Second: Council Member Orme seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

10. Ordinance 2025-20 / Poultry (Katie Villani, City Planner – Approximately 10 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or adopt Ordinance 2025-20 amending Title 16 (Land Use) of the Midway City Municipal Code regarding poultry. Recommended by the Midway City Planning Commission. **Public Hearing** – Public comment must be related to this item on the agenda.

Public Hearing

Mayor Johnson opened the hearing and asked if there were any comments from the public. She closed the hearing when no public comment was offered.

Motion: Council Member Orme moved to continue the item.

Second: Council Member Simonsen seconded the motion.

Discussion: None

Vote: The motion was approved with the Council voting as follows:

Council Member Drury	Excused from the Meeting
Council Member Orme	Aye
Council Member Payne	Aye
Council Member Simons	Aye
Council Member Simonsen	Aye

11. Ordinance 2025-15 / Committee Member Term Limits (Katie Villani, City Planner – Approximately 10 minutes) – Discuss and possibly deny, continue, or adopt Ordinance 2025-15 removing term limits for members of some or all committees established by Midway City.

The item was not considered.

12. Commission and Committee Members / Appointment Process (Brad Wilson, City Recorder – Approximately 20 minutes) – Discuss the process for appointing members to commissions and boards established by Midway City.

The item was not considered.

13. Contract Change Orders / Discussion (Brad Wilson, City Recorder – Approximately 20 minutes) – Discuss restrictions on change orders to contracts entered into by Midway City.

The item was not considered.

14. Closed Meeting (As needed)

A closed meeting was not held.

15. Adjournment

Motion: Council Member Orme moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Payne seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Celeste Johnson, Mayor

Brad Wilson, Recorder