

MINUTES  
**HOUSE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Thursday, January 30, 2025

**TIME:** 1:30 P.M.

**PLACE:** Room EW05

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Ehardt, Vice Chairman Cornilles, Representatives Erickson, Skaug, Weber, Alfieri, Cheatum, Hawkins, Healey, Price, Cayler, Rasor, Wheeler, Berch, Church

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** None

**GUESTS:** The sign-in sheet will be retained in the committee secretary's office; following the end of session the sign-in sheet will be filed with the minutes in the Legislative Library.

**Chairman Ehardt** called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Church** made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2025 meeting. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**RS 32028:** **Rep. Ehlers** presented **RS 32028**, which provides an additional option for dissolution of recreational districts. In order to make a taxable district, it requires a petition initiative with 20% of the signatures of qualified voters, followed by a ballot vote with the majority of voters in the district's boundaries to be in favor. The current dissolution process for recreational districts is the same procedure. This proposed legislation makes the dissolution process easier by allowing either the petition initiative or having a majority of the board of directors approve the dissolution. It will still require a ballot vote with the majority of voters to be in favor of dissolution.

**MOTION:** **Rep Skaug** made a motion to introduce **RS 32028**. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**RS 32077:** **Rep. Price** presented **RS 32077**, which clarifies actions taken on consent calendar and consent agenda by requiring, if there is more than one action item, unanimous consent to pass it. Consent calendars and consent agendas are non-confrontational and routine items which are listed as one lump item on the calendar or agenda. This makes it easier to pass the items without having to vote on each individually. Currently, if controversial items are added to consent calendars or consent agendas, there is no means to pull items from them in order to vote on separately.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Wheeler** made a motion to introduce **RS 32077**. He requested for more specific examples of items which would have been pulled out of a consent calendar or agenda if this legislation was in place.

When answering questions, **Rep. Price** clarified **RS 32077** does not address or change how a council member can remove an item from a consent calendar or agenda. This proposed legislation states the items originally in a lump item on a consent calendar or agenda would be voted on separately, which could allow for an item to be addressed for removal. **Rep. Church** requested for testimony from board and city council members when there is a bill hearing for **RS 32077** in order to better understand how this legislation could affect how they handle consent calendars and consent agendas when the vote is not unanimous.

**VOTE ON  
MOTION:** **Chairman Ehardt** called for the vote on the motion to introduce **RS 32077**. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**RS 32006:** **Rep. Shirts** presented **RS 32006**, which establishes a singular definition on agricultural building and structures across all local jurisdictions. This definition is based on the International Building Code, and would define agricultural buildings as those which house or store agricultural commodities or equipment used during agricultural production. These do not include processing, human habitation, or retail facilities or facilities open to the public.

When answering questions, **Rep. Shirts** clarified the intention of **RS 32006** is to provide consistency. In certain situations, there has been confusion on what constitutes an agricultural building, as well as instances where individuals try to make agricultural buildings into industrial or commercial buildings for permitting fees. The proposed legislation will also not require counties to issue permits for agricultural buildings, nor change their current authority to issues these permits.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Weber** made a motion to introduce **RS 32006**. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**RS 32108:** **Rep. Fuhriman** presented **RS 32108**, which allows cities to transfer properties to a non-profit organizations. Currently, cities can transfer properties to taxing districts or agencies through negotiations. If it is to any other organization, cities are required to sell the property through an auction process. Throughout the state, cities have entered into lease agreements with non-profits, with the leases varying in length of time and are commonly low. With cities being responsible for the maintenance and liability of these properties, they can become financially burdensome. This will allow a city to transfer a property being leased to a non-profit without requiring to go through the auction process. This would avoid a non-profit from being unable to afford the property, as well as provide cities more flexibility.

When answering questions, **Rep. Fuhriman** stated he reached out to multiple cities on how **RS 32108** could affect them. Each was different, with some having leases with non-profits the proposed legislation would be highly beneficial. He clarified the process requires a public hearing, and transferring a property requires a majority of the city council and be deemed in the best interest of the city.

**ORIGINAL MOTION:** **Rep. Wheeler** made a motion to introduce **RS 32108**.

**Rep. Berch** spoke **in support** of the motion. He wanted addressed at a full hearing whether cities could be sued for transferring property instead of making them available for purchase. In answering questions, **Rep. Fuhriman** clarified this proposed legislation does not restrict cities as to what non-profit organizations this would apply to, and there is no current restriction on cities as to what kinds of non-profits they can enter into a lease agreement with.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** **Rep. Price** made a substitute motion to return **RS 32108** to the sponsor.

Speaking to the motion, **Rep. Price** stated there should be guardrails in place regarding what types of non-profits this would apply to. She gave an example where in her community the city transferred a property without the support from the public. **Rep. Fuhriman** addressed her concerns, stating the cities he talked to did not have leases with political non-profits.

**Rep. Berch** spoke **in support** of the original motion, stating he wanted **Rep. Fuhriman** to speak more on the legislation and with more detail addressing the questions and concerns from the committee at a full hearing.

**Rep. Alfieri** spoke **in support** of the substitute motion, stating how there are non-profits which claim to be nonpartisan but act as political organizations, and wanted more guardrails and definitions in **RS 32108** to address these concerns.

**ROLL CALL  
VOTE ON  
SUBSTITUTE  
MOTION:**

**Chairman Ehardt** requested a roll call vote on the substitute motion to return **RS 32108** to the sponsor. **Motion carried by a vote of 8 AYE and 6 NAY and 1 Absent/Excused. Voting in favor** of the motion: **Reps. Ehardt, Cornilles, Alfieri, Hawkins, Healey, Price, Cayler, and Rasor. Voting in opposition** of the motion: **Reps. Erickson, Weber, Cheatum, Wheeler, Berch, and Church. Rep. Skaug was Absent/Excused.**

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 2:06 PM.

---

Representative Ehardt  
Chair

---

Elijah Phipps  
Secretary