



CITY COUNCIL RETREAT MINUTES

Monday, August 28, 2017
Amended August 25, 2017 @ 2:20 pm*
Approved December 13, 2017

Presiding: Mayor Carmen Freeman

City Council Members Present: Jared Henderson, Nicole Martin, Craig B. Tischner, and Coralee Wessman-Moser

Staff Present: City Manager Brett Wood, Assistant City Manager Gordon Haight, City Recorder Jackie Nostrom, Director of Administration and Communication Tami Moody, Finance Director Alan Rae, Water Director Justun Edwards, Parks and Recreation Director Wendy Thomas, City Engineer Blake Thomas, Economic Development Manager Heather Upshaw, Chief Building Official Cathryn Nelson, City Planner Bryn McCarty, Communications Specialist Destiny Skinner, Scott Riding (representing Y2 Analytics), Operations Director Monte Johnson, City Attorney John Brems, and Communications Specialist Jon LaFollette.

9:00 10:00 AM - RETREAT:

1. Council Discussions

Mayor Freeman called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance. Councilmembers Craig Tischner and Nicole Martin would be joining the meeting later.

1.1. Discussion Relating to the Citizen Survey

Mayor Freeman turned the time over to Scott Riding, with Y2 Analytics, to present the results of the recent Citizen Survey.

Mr. Riding first presented the basic findings of the survey and explained that residents were generally pleased with the services offered by the City. They also believed that Herriman was a great place to live and raise a family, and they would recommend the City to others. However, one major concern among the

citizens was that the City was growing too quickly, and there was a proliferation of high-density housing. The citizens repeatedly commented that they moved to Herriman for a more rural environment.

Mr. Riding continued by reviewing the survey methodology. The sampling frame of Herriman residents consisted of a universe of registered voters taken from the voter file. In total, they sent out email invitations to the survey to 8,145 residents, with 1,215 of those bouncing back due to incorrect email addresses or high spam filter settings. The resulting deliverability rate was 85%. Of the 6,930 invitations delivered, 1,079 residents responded by completing the survey online, resulting in a response rate of approximately 15.6-percent overall. Mr. Riding then showed a map of the City and showed the geographic spread of the survey and said that it was evenly spread across district boundaries.

Mr. Riding noted that the residents' response to how much they liked living in Herriman was above the State average. On a scale of 0-100, the average response was 76. Mr. Riding reiterated that the results of the survey show the primary concern to be the pace of growth in the City.

Mr. Riding continued by explaining that the citizens were also given the opportunity to create a “budget” for Herriman City. They were asked to allocate portions of \$100 to each of the public services, which essentially ranked their priorities. Mr. Riding reported that police, parks, road maintenance, and drinking water ranked the highest. The lower ranked services were Planning and Zoning.

City Manager Brett Wood commented that these results went hand in hand with the direction the City had chosen to get out of SLVLESA and create a City Police Department. He said that it was important for the citizens to see where their tax dollars were going.

Mayor Freeman asked about the age range of the survey participants. Mr. Riding directed the City Council to page seven of the report which identified the demographics of the participants. He stated that 53-percent were female and 47-percent were male, and the age ranges were across the board.

10:30 AM

Director of Administration and Communication Tami Moody asked the City Council what section they wanted to focus on first. Ultimately, staff intended the City Council to identify key focus areas and determine how to move forward addressing those items. Director Moody explained that they wanted to put another survey in place that would gather more detailed information on the specific needs, wants, and concerns of the citizens.

Councilmember Henderson commented that there seemed to be a disconnect between the overall approval rating and the concerns about growth. 70-percent of the survey participants agreed with the City's vision, but there was a high disapproval rate with what the City was actually doing.

Mr. Riding asked the City Council what percentage of people they thought actually understood the City's vision. He stated his opinion that many people did not even know that information.

Councilmember Moser said there had recently been a heightened interest in the City's vision. They pointed out elements of the vision started within the General Plan, to which that they believed the City was or was not adhering. She believed the City Council could do a better job of communicating what the City's vision was and making sure it reflected the citizens' values.

Director Moody reported that staff had been going around the City buildings to find proper locations for pieces of art that centered on the City's mission and vision. Each department would also have the City's mission and vision statements near the entrances to those buildings. This would be a good reminder to City officials and staff, as well as the community at large.

Councilmember Moser commented that the survey results outlined the top five areas where the City was doing well, as well as the bottom five areas where improvement was needed. She said it was important to recognize successes as well as critiques.

Director Moody said she had gone through the survey results over the weekend and created a document showing the top and bottom results. She showed that document on the projector and said she would email a copy of it to the City Council Members. The positive outcomes of the survey included the following:

- Quality of life rating of 76 on a scale of 0-100
- Positive remarks about the community, small town feel, parks and trails, and open space.
- Satisfied with the services they receive for their tax dollars.
- Top budget priorities- police, parks, and road maintenance.
- 79-percent were likely to recommend Herriman as a good place to live, and 85-percent think it's a good place to raise a family

Constructive criticisms included:

- High density
- Pace of growth and fear of overpopulation
- Traffic infrastructure
- Secondary water services
- Planning and Zoning Services.

Councilmember Moser said that Lehi was a rapidly growing city as well. She asked if staff had done any comparisons between the Lehi and Herriman. Mr. Riding said Herriman was growing at a much faster rate than almost any other city in the State.

The City Council discussed what defined high density. Mr. Riding commented that this was not specifically asked in the survey, but it would be a good question on a follow up survey. Councilmember Moser said a number of residents had quantified town homes and apartments as being high density. She said products the City deemed as medium density were still considered high density to the residents. She felt it was important to know what the citizens considered to be high density. Mr. Riding said the City had the ability to conduct a follow up survey specifically for density. He said that the first survey had created a pool of residents who would be willing to take more City surveys in the future.

Mayor Freeman asked if the survey included a space for residents to express themselves beyond a multiple-choice option. Mr. Riding said an open box for comments had been included at the end of the survey. Those comments were all included in the report. Aside from some redaction of personal information, the comments were unaltered. Councilmember Moser said she believed that the statistics of those comments were accurately reported, but it was important for the City Council to reach beyond those comments as well.

Councilmember Moser suggested the City Council table the high-density part of the conversation because the matter would be addressed later. It seemed that many of the issues in the survey were education-based. One of the elements of growth and overpopulation was the effect on schools. She believed the City could do a lot to collaborate with the Jordan School District to distribute information the public regarding the process of adding new schools. There seemed to be a fear that the existing schools would become overcrowded with every new subdivision, and it takes time for new schools to be built. The document could include ideas of actions the City could implement to mitigate these concerns.

Councilmember Henderson commented that people don't understand there was a disconnect between the City and the School District. For example, the School District would not build a school before a subdivision goes in; rather, they always responded to growth. Councilmember Moser felt that Herriman had a great relationship with the Jordan School District, and creating a document that they could share jointly with the public should be reasonable.

Assistant City Manager Gordon Haight said it sounded like the City Council wanted to go through a communication and education process, and then resurvey to see if the City was effectively providing information to the citizens. Resurveying before the education piece would probably provide results similar to what was just presented. He said the City's relation to the School District was complicated. The City bonded with the District for the new high school that was currently being built, even though the District already owned other property in Daybreak. Each school came in per a bond of the District, not per the City's direction. That information needed to be communicated to the public.

Councilmember Moser added that the document should answer questions such as: responsibilities of the City versus the School District, how far in advance the two entities communicate with each other, and so on. Councilmember Henderson agreed and stated the School District had to respond to the City's actions.

Councilmember Moser said they also needed to clarify that the City was not permitted to collect impact fees for education per State legislature. She added that the document should also include information on what residents could do to support the School District to ensure that there were adequate facilities for their children. There was subsequent discussion on how this information would be presented to the public, including the City newsletter and media outlets, and setting up a booth at "back to school night".

Mayor Freeman suggested that the City better communicate the process of development, regardless of density. The City cannot put a moratorium on growth and development completely, because property owners had the right to develop their properties.

Councilmember Moser commented that the survey showed that the residents wanted more commercial development in the City, but it didn't specifically ask what they wanted to see. She said it might be helpful to resurvey in order to determine what the residents wanted in the City; however, this may set unrealistic expectations.

The City Council discussed development and a comment was made that they could not fully control what businesses came into the City. It was suggested that they try to get residents more involved in City meetings because there were a lot of educational opportunities available to them there. The Council discussed the link between commercial development, higher density housing and increased traffic.

Director Moody reported that staff had already tried to educate the public about development through the newsletter, website, social media pages, and by offering online classes; however, the online classes were not well attended. She asked the City Council for more suggestions.

Councilmember Moser recommended that they conduct a three or four-month long informational campaign for each issue identified in the survey. After the campaign, they could resurvey that issue and see what kind of progress was made. She believed that focusing on a single issue for a longer period of time may be more effective than what they had been doing before. It was also suggested that staff make a presentation during a future City Council meeting. Many of the City Council meetings were well attended, so they would be able to reach a fair number of residents this way.

Councilmember Henderson liked the idea of an informational campaign. He also suggested they provide information about traffic and roads similar to the information for the School District. Not all of the roads or public transportation was controlled by the City, and there had to be a lot of collaboration with Utah Department of Transportation, the County, and other cities.

Director Moody suggested that the Councilmembers and staff all provide the same links, videos, and information when questioned by residents for the sake of remaining consistent. The City Council requested a compiled list of these links.

Councilmember Moser suggested that they set aside some time during City Council meetings to allow residents to ask questions or make comments about the campaign information. There was a discussion regarding this option, as not all of the City Councilmembers or staff were comfortable opening up the meeting completely. It was decided that staff would take time during the meetings to make informational presentations about the subject topic. The topics that needed to be addressed were the new police district tax, property tax, traffic, public transportation, and economic development, and the school district.

11:18 AM - The City Council took a short break.

Councilmember Tischner and Councilmember Martin arrived.

Upon request, Director Mood briefly reviewed the results of the survey and gave a brief synopsis of the City Council's discussions thus far. She said that the important matter they gathered from the start of the

meetings was they wanted to ensure that the community had information and knowledge of the City's mission and vision, and that the City was actually working toward those goals. If that was not happening, the City needed to have a discussion about potential changes. Staff would continue to push the mission and vision statement through several different channels, including attaching them to these minutes. Director Moody then stated that the City Council would like to focus information campaigns for the police service change from SLVLESA to a City department, the school district, economic development, and traffic and transportation.

Councilmember Martin suggested that economic development be addressed before the police department. She said the City was knee-deep in economic development, as were the surrounding cities, and the matter should be addressed quickly.

Mayor Freeman was curious to know if the people who took the survey were engaged in the community. He suggested that this be a question on a follow up survey. Director Moody said the survey pool was an accurate representation of the demographic of the City, and she questioned why the information would be important. Mayor Freeman said it would be helpful to know if the City needed to change their method of communication if none or few of the participants were involved in City meetings.

Councilmember Martin asked how they would be measuring the success of the informational campaigns. Director Moody explained that they would conduct more surveys at the end of each campaign, and the survey pool would be the same. Councilmember Martin suggested making the campaigns a requirement for the neighbourhood facilitators, as they were the forerunners of their neighbourhoods.

The City Council further discussed the option of opening a portion of the meeting to the public. Councilmember Moser said she had envisioned a five-minute presentation from staff addressing one of the topics, and the City Council could address questions that had been submitted before the meeting. She was not anticipating a give-and-take period. After continued discussion, Director Moody said staff could push for questions through the usual avenues and base their presentation off those questions. If another question or concern comes up during the meeting that was addressed in the presentation, then they could take the question at that time.

Councilmember Martin suggested a section of the City website or an entirely different website be dedicated to correcting false information, as well as rumours that were spread throughout the City and on social media. It would be easier for residents to find the information they needed without having to search the entire website. It was reported that staff had been doing something like that on the "hot topics" page. There was continued discussion on this issue.

The suggestion was made that the City Council provide a way to take public comment via telephone during the public comment portions of the meeting. They had many residents who watched the meeting live online, and it would be beneficial to provide a way for them to call in with comments. It was stated that Salt Lake City had been doing this and it had been very successful. The City Councilmembers agreed to the suggestion.

1:05 PM

1.2. Discussion of an ordinance approving an amendment to the 2025 General Plan *(Continued from August 9, 2017, August 18, 2017 and August 23rd City Council meetings)*

Mayor Freeman first reported that the canvassing meeting would be held the following night at 5:00 pm. Part of that discussion would be a resolution to begin the process of forming a Service District. Mayor Freeman wanted to be sure that they had City Council consensus of the resolution, because two of the City Councilmembers would not be present that night. It was confirmed that all were in favor. Mayor Freeman then turned the time over to Assistant City Manager Haight to begin the discussion on the ordinance amendment to adopt the 2025 General Plan.

Assistant City Manager Haight said staff had three goals for this discussion: for the City Council to agree upon a General Plan map; outline what kind of public process they would like staff to move forward with; and to select a date for action to be taken. Assistant City Manager Haight presented the current General Plan and pointed out a few areas that did not conform to the plan and had other issues as well.

When discussing the SLR property, Mayor Freeman explained that the City had put together a CDA and bonded for about \$36 million. With that money, they installed infrastructure for all of the facilities for that proposed project. The way the City was going to get the money back for that investment was from tax increment, and that required the property to be developed commercially. However, if the property didn't develop, and every year that it remained undeveloped, the City was losing revenue. Mayor Freeman said this was a critical issue for Herriman City. Assistant City Manager Haight added that SLR was now asking for the property to remain residential, although the General Plan designation for the property was Light Industrial. Councilmember Martin commented that the developer was now asking the City to help them financially, but they were unwilling to help the City financially. There was some discussion on this issue.

City Planner Bryn McCarty then presented a comparison between the current and proposed General Plans. She presented several drafts of the General Plan map and explained how the density would change with each iteration. There was a discussion primarily surrounding the Adalynn and Dansie properties.

Councilmember Tischner asked if the other Councilmembers were comfortable with the proposed plan for the Dansie property. Councilmember Martin was comfortable with the low-density map because that was what the City Council had asked for; she said this proposal was reasonable.

Councilmember Moser felt that the developer needed to maintain more agricultural uses on the property. She argued the City would be restricting future property owners by taking away any option for agriculture. Councilmember Tischner countered by stating it would also create an opportunity for residents that did not want to move into an area where their neighbours had horses. The plan offered low density without the large animal rights. Councilmember Moser said there was enough acreage in the area for a horse community contained into one area, and there would still be plenty of room for residential lots. Councilmember Tischner disagreed.

Mayor Freeman indicated that he was not in favor of agricultural uses for the property. Low density would afford for people to still have chickens and other small animals, but it would restrict large animals.

Councilmember Henderson referred back to the results of the resident survey regarding the vision of Herriman City. The General Plan referenced agricultural uses time and again, and he felt that including agriculture was part of the feel of Herriman. He could not, in good conscience, agree with the plan as proposed. He suggested a combination of agricultural and residential uses.

Councilmember Moser commented that many residents considered agricultural uses as something that made Herriman unique. Part of the vision statement was to preserve the feel of Herriman City. Councilmember Henderson agreed. He suggested that they keep 10-percent of the land as agriculture.

Councilmember Martin reiterated that she was perfectly comfortable with the low-density community, which also included a school site and plenty of open space. To say that the City was not getting anything from this development was disingenuous. She argued that the “community feel” of Herriman was subjective, and it wasn’t fair to define that as agricultural uses. She thought that the City was creating and preserving the “community feel” with everything that they do. Councilmember Henderson disagreed and said the General Plan specifically addressed the issue of preserving agricultural uses. He reiterated his suggestion of having a combination of uses on the property.

Councilmember Moser commented that the City already dictated a lot of what property owners could and could not develop, including building size, design, and colors. She saw no reason why they could not ask for agricultural uses on the property. She emphasized that they wouldn’t force the property owner to include agriculture, but they should make sure that option was available.

Councilmember Martin said, as they look to preserve agriculture in the community, one of her hopes was to be able to work with property developers on the future annexation and their continuing ideas to have a Utah State University agricultural campus in the City. She commented that they had considered including some estate lots, which would do well in preserving some more agriculture in the City. Councilmember Moser said that the Utah State campus was a good plan, but plans change. The City needed to establish their vision now rather than counting their chickens before they hatch.

Councilmember Martin reported that there had been extensive discussions on the Utah State campus and it was the goal of the City to attain that type of facility. Staff had already put in significant hours and conversations were still underway. Assistant City Manager Haight commented that the negotiations were going very well. Utah State had stipulated that the property owners enter into a development agreement with Anthem.

Councilmember Moser said the City had an opportunity right now to retain agricultural uses in this area without having to rely on what did or did not happen in the future. She would like to see 25-percent of the property remain agricultural, which would be about 100 acres. Councilmember Henderson was open to a discussion with the property owner on the matter.

Mayor Freeman reiterated that the property owner did not want any agriculture on this property. Councilmember Henderson commented that low density agricultural zoning required 10-percent of the lots to be half an acre in size to accommodate larger animals. Low density residential would be roughly the same density, but there were no requirements for larger lots. Councilmember Tischner said that the A-.25 zoning hadn't been adopted yet, so this conversation about density was just a speculation.

Mayor Freeman said if the City Council required that the property include agricultural uses, they wouldn't see a development agreement on this until after the first of the year. It would take at least two months for the application to go through staff and the Planning Commission and then back to the City Council for approval. The property owner wanted to start developing as soon as possible.

Councilmember Henderson again stated he would be willing to negotiate with the property owner on agricultural uses. He believed that asking for 100 acres was reasonable. Preserving agriculture was part of Herriman's identity. He said they needed to change the wording of the General Plan if they weren't willing to preserve agriculture.

Councilmember Martin said she was comfortable with the low-density plan. Councilmember Tischner was also in favor of the low-density residential plan, which would provide opportunities for people to live somewhere without the potential for neighbours maintaining horses. Councilmember Moser said there were certain agricultural zones that were set aside for large animals, but almost every other residential neighbourhood in the City was residential. There were plenty of other areas where residents could move which didn't have animal rights. Councilmember Tischner said this plan would provide large lots without animal rights, and they did not have very many of those neighbourhoods in Herriman.

Councilmember Moser commented the residents would move to this location knowing that there were potential agricultural uses and large animals. She questioned whether the City Council supported the General Plan or not. She explained that if 100 acres were zoned agricultural, that would provide for maybe 20 lots that would be half-acre lots with animal rights. Councilmember Tischner again stated that the ordinance for the A-.25 zone hadn't been adopted, so all of their arguments were speculations. Councilmember Henderson stated the City Council all agreed in principal that this was what they wanted for the low density agricultural zone. Councilmember Tischner said he wasn't disagreeing with it now, he was just cautioning on guaranteeing it before the zoning even came before them for approval.

Mayor Freeman was not in favor of agricultural uses on the property. He believed that they could still maintain the feel of Herriman without requiring agriculture in the area. There were many residents in the City that had no interest in agriculture at all. He was not comfortable forcing a land owner to have agricultural uses when there may not even be a demand for it. Councilmember Henderson said that it would be beneficial to give people an area where they could choose whether to have large animals or not. He said not providing agricultural zoning would take that opportunity away from everyone.

Councilmember Moser stated that the City already dictated a lot of what people could and could not develop. Mayor Freeman argued that it was impractical to compare required design elements to a 400-acre

development. The City Council continued to discuss potential agricultural uses on the subject property and throughout the City. There was also continued review of the General Plan draft maps.

Councilmember Tischner suggested allowing a public comment period during a City Council meeting so that the residents could share what they wanted to see on these pieces of property. Councilmember Moser recommended that they present the current General Plan map as well as the final draft that the City Council decides on.

Regarding the Adalynn property, Councilmember Moser said she did not like the medium-density clusters because it was not at all what the residents would support. The City Council heard two hours of public comments that were entirely opposed to medium density. Councilmember Martin said she was in favor of having medium-density clusters around the transportation corridor. Ideally, cities should be placing higher densities as a buffer between transit and existing single-family homes. She noted that they weren't even considering high density housing. Medium density developments supported commercial businesses, and most people did not want a single family home next to transit and commercial development.

Councilmember Henderson mentioned that the current plan had a higher overall density than the first draft that was presented. He questioned the need to include medium density at all. Councilmember Martin said that they also needed to consider affordability. She had recently heard two separate presentations talking about Utah being in the midst of a severe housing shortage. Land prices had increased drastically in recent years. A large portion of the population simply could not afford single family homes. Having some element of medium density ensured that they had quality products that were affordable to a lot of families. Councilmember Martin stated that density did not necessarily equate to crime and a lowering of the community, but it simply acknowledged that this was a different housing market than five, ten, or even twenty years ago. She wanted Herriman to be a multi-generational community. Councilmember Henderson argued that Herriman City already had enough medium density, and many residents felt the same way. He believed that they needed more single-family homes. Councilmember Martin reiterated that it was wise to have medium density clusters next to the transit corridor. She spoke of the benefits of building small communities with amenities. She was in favour of a mixed-use concept with a variety of housing options available.

Mayor Freeman stated that there was 770 acres of land between the Adalynn and Dansie properties. The medium density proposed would be 76 acres of that amount, which was only nine-percent of the total property. The rest would either be low density, single family, or commercial. He did not feel that nine-percent was too much to ask for. Councilmember Moser said many residents had commented on the number of town homes in the City, and they didn't want to see anymore. There were hundreds of town homes along the Mountain View Corridor, and there were plenty of opportunities for people who were looking for a town home. She emphasized the need for larger, single-family lots.

The City Council then discussed the first draft of the proposed General Plan amendment. They made suggestions on where the density could be adjusted. There was also a brief discussion regarding the potential senior housing component, and they all agreed that a restricted use would be more appropriate than a suggested use.

Mayor Freeman referenced another property and talked about how that fit into the 900 acres available for development. He had spoken to the property owner on many occasions and the property owner was very persistent. Mayor Freeman felt the City would have to take a tough stand to maintain their vision. The property owner had indicated that he would not bring any of his property into the City if the General Plan did not allow him to develop as he wanted. He felt that the residents needed to know that there was more at stake than just 270 acres of land.

Councilmember Tischner said 900 acres of development would drastically impact schools and traffic. He suggested the City Council determine a density range for the developer to work with, which would allow him to have some flexibility. They should also strive for a development agreement to include the annexation of the rest of the owner's property.

Councilmember Martin suggested that they talk about what they expected from the 900 acres, and from that discussion they could determine a density range. She again referenced the Utah State University campus with an agricultural focus, and the developer's interest in including agricultural estate lots in the development. There was also discussion about including a manufacturing business park, which would create another job market for Herriman residents. Councilmember Martin reported that the State was trying to figure out how Utah was going to manage doubling the population by 2050, and they had discussed a potential legislative fix that specifically looked at land use and City Planning. There would be incentives for those who planned higher densities near transit and provided affordable housing, and funding could be taken away from cities that did not follow this requirement. She asked how Herriman was going to manage the growth they knew was inevitable.

Referencing the first draft of the General Plan map, the City Council discussed an appropriate density range for the subject property. Councilmember Henderson was in favour of the density range of the existing General Plan map, which was 673-1,090. The developer was asking for quite a bit more than that, so it would show good faith to raise the density a little higher than that amount. After continued discussion and some alterations to the general plan map, they agreed upon a range of 737-1,252.

3:03 PM - The City Council took a short break.

City Planner McCarty presented the final draft of the General Plan map that would be presented to the residents.

Councilmember Henderson and Councilmember Moser still felt that more agricultural uses should be included in the map. Councilmember Tischner and Councilmember Martin were comfortable with the proposed map, and Mayor Freeman stated that he was not in favor of more agriculture for this property. Councilmember Moser said that she could not, in good conscience, support a plan that included town homes and medium-density clusters.

City Planner McCarty asked the City Council how they wanted to proceed. Councilmember Tischner said that they should keep the draft without agricultural because the A-.25 zoning hadn't been adopted yet. Even if that ordinance were to pass, changes were probably going to be made from what they discussed last

time. City Planner McCarty commented that by making 40 acres agricultural the density would be increased by about ten units.

The Council determined to present this draft to the public during a City Council meeting and allow for public comment.

1.3. City Manager Updates

City Manager Wood commended staff for their work on the General Plan update. He then reported that the new City Council and Mayor would be sworn in on January 2, 2018, at 6:00 PM.

The City Council then discussed the possible dates for the Budget Retreat. City Manager Wood said the Retreat should take place in January to allow time for staff to prepare the final budget by March. Some of the City Councilmembers felt that the Retreat should be held in February to allow time for the new City Councilmembers to get settled in.

There was a brief discussion about parking at the City building.

Councilmember Tischner moved to adjourn the City Council Retreat. Councilmember Wessman-Moser seconded the motion and all voted aye.

I, Jackie Nostrom, City Recorder for Herriman City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on August 28, 2017. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Herriman City Council Meeting.



Jackie Nostrom, MMC
City Recorder