

Pleasant Grove City Council Work Session Minutes
August 10, 2010
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Mayor:

Bruce W. Call

City Council Members:

Cindy Boyd

Val Danklef

Lee G. Jensen

Kim Robinson

Jeffrey D. Wilson

City Recorder:

Colleen A. Mulvey, Deputy City Recorder

Others:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator

Dean Lundell, Finance Director

Tina Petersen, City Attorney

Deon Giles, Leis. Services Director

Lynn Walker, Public Works Director

Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief

Mike Smith, Police Captain

Degen Lewis, City Engineer

Cory Fralick, Intern

Libby Flegal, NAB Chairperson

John Schiess, Utility Engineer

Excused:

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

Ken Young, Comm. Dev. Director

Richard Bradford, Economic Dev. Director

Tom Paul, Police Chief

The City Council Members and staff met in the City Council Chambers at 86 East 100 South, Pleasant Grove, Utah

1. Call to Order

Mayor Call called roll for the Council and noted that Council Members Boyd, Danklef, Jensen, Robinson and Wilson were present.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was lead by City Engineer Lewis.

3. Opening Remarks

Opening Remarks were given by Council Member Danklef.

4. Kena Jo Mathews presentation for Habitat for Humanity

Kena Jo Mathews, Executive Director for Habitat for Humanity of Utah County stated that their theme this year is *Be a Light in Your Community by Empowering Local Families in Need*, and their mission statement is: Habitat for Humanity of Utah County, working in partnership with God and area residents from all walks of life, strives to eliminate poverty housing and homelessness in Utah County by building and renovating houses with people in need so that there are decent neighborhoods in which every person can experience God's love, and can live and grow into all that God intends. Ms. Mathews explained that they are a Christian organization but they do not discriminate and are not associated with any religion, the principles that Habitat for Humanity was founded on were biblically based. Habitat for Humanity International was founded in 1976 by Millard and Linda Fuller, on the belief that everyone deserves a decent place to live and since that time over three hundred thousand homes have been built, helping over a million people worldwide, with over two thousand three hundred affiliates in eighty different countries. A Habitat Home is finished every twenty four minutes, that is sixty homes per day worldwide and Habitat for Humanity was just named the eighth highest home builder in the nation, with five thousand two hundred homes being built in the United States this past year.

Ms. Mathews stated that their branch in Provo is an independent affiliate and they were incorporated in 1991 by a group of individuals who were concerned about poverty housing and homelessness here in Utah County and since that time have built and renovated forty homes, the goal is to increase the number of homes built or renovated and they would like to build one in north Utah County. Administrator Darrington asked how they get the land or property to build on. Ms. Mathews said that they usually buy the land; they get money from the Utah Valley Consortium of Cities and Counties, also from tax deductible donations and obtain land or older homes and either build or renovate simple decent homes. Council Member Boyd added that Pleasant Grove is part of the Utah Valley Consortium.

Ms. Mathews said that they have a small staff, an advisory board and a board of directors which is all voluntary and eleven committees along with thousands of volunteers. They serve Utah County residents and there are requirements to qualify, one of them being that they need to be employed or have a stable income source, the homes are sold to the families, and it is not a hand out it is a hand up, so they do need to have the ability to pay for their home. The qualified families are selected on need, ability to pay and willingness to partner, each of the families have to donate three hundred and fifty to five hundred sweat equity hours into their home or other people's homes and pay a down payment and closing cost. Ms. Mathews said that they also own the Habitat ReStore in Orem which is a restore home improvement outlet that sells donated new and used building materials, appliances and furniture to the general public. Some of the other services they offer include a basic home maintenance course that is open to the public and a tool lending library which is open to any homeowner in the county. Ms. Mathews said that they are starting a new program and looking into doing some neighborhood revitalization projects which will include help with home repairs and help with exterior work to homes and they are looking for neighborhoods that they can really make a difference in. Ms. Mathews concluded by mentioning some things that people can do to give to Habitat for Humanity, like volunteering, shopping, recycling and revitalizing with them. Ms. Mathews

said that they will be getting some money in September; they have a church group out of Alpine that wants to sponsor a home and would like to build in north Utah County so they would be happy to build in Pleasant Grove.

Mayor Call stated that they do terrific work in a very professional way and thanked Ms. Mathews for her presentation.

5. Discussion on the Utah Lake Commission membership

Administrator Darrington said that we have paid our membership for this commission this year and the question that came up is if we need yearly to review whether this membership is something that we want to continue. Administrator Darrington stated that he is not that familiar with the Utah Lake Commission so he will have to defer to the Council members who sat on the commission and Director Giles who also has some experience with them.

Director Giles stated that he has been involved with them from the start and when they established the commission he was assigned to the Technical Committee so he has not been attending the board meetings. Director Giles said that the Technical Committee is involved with the whole aspect of the lake such as transportation, storm drainage, water, etc. The Technical Committee is a good group and there are a lot of networking opportunities that help us and keep us informed, the dues that we pay allow us a vote and we were one of the first cities without a shoreline to become member. Administrator Darrington asked if we could still be a part of the Technical Committee if we are not a paying member. Director Giles said that we could but that we would not have a vote. Administrator Darrington said that our contribution was about four thousand seven hundred dollars for the year. Council Member Jensen stated that that amount varies. Attorney Petersen asked how they assessed the fee if it varies. Council Member Jensen said that he believes it's off the budget.

Council Member Jensen remarked that as a representative when you attend the commission meetings you are part of the discussion but that in all of the time that he went he never really saw any issue that came up that directly impacted Pleasant Grove. Council Member Jensen said that from that standpoint he feels that the membership is of very limited value other than the association with other members who are mostly all Mayors.

Council Member Wilson stated that he agrees with Council Member Jensen, most of what is discussed does not affect us.

Mayor Call asked if we anticipated there ever being a situation where we wished we would have been able to vote. Director Walker commented that it would be anything to do with storm drainage. Director Giles said that we would want to be able to vote on any future transportation, road or trail connector projects. Mayor Call asked if there is a situation where our vote would make some kind of a difference. Council Member Jensen said that there are thirty to forty voting entities, so the influence would be on the discussion side; most of the items talked about were things that are being funded privately, such as the bridge, or through grants. Council Member Jensen said that from his perspective that the value of being on this committee would be for the information discussed and the opportunity to associate with the other members primarily the Mayors.

Director Giles said that on the Technical Committee they discuss the basics of everything such as recreation and where we spend the money so it serves the greater need of the whole community. Attorney Petersen asked Director Giles if he voted on that committee. Director Giles said that he does but that his committee is a recommending body and that he is not sure that he would lose his vote on that committee or not if we were not a paying member, but that he feels it is important that we be able to voice our opinion. Council Member Wilson added that the voting members do rely on and listen to the recommendations of the Technical Committee.

Mayor Call stated that from his standpoint in this county, geographically we are always going to be in a minority with those who don't border the lake and if there ever is any kind of a weird, divisive issue where the people that are on the lake want to push something through, they are going to be able to regardless whether we have the vote or not.

Administrator Darrington said that we can stop paying for the membership and if we feel that we are missing out on something then we can always rejoin. Mayor Call recommended that we take a hard look and evaluate this membership for next year and look into if we bow out, can we get back in. Director Giles said that he would look through our agreement to make sure that we are not going to miss out on anything.

Mayor Call asked if there was any other discussion, there was none.

6. Discussion on bike lane implementation/on-street parking

City Engineer Lewis stated that there is real interest from the biking community for dedicated bike lanes and then handed out an overview with maps (Exhibit A). Engineer Lewis explained that in the Transportation Master Plan most collector roads are intended to have bike lanes on them, so in order to implement this we need a three lane road. Roads that are designated as three lane collectors where parking will need to be restricted in order to provide bike lanes are: 1100 North, 2600 North, 1300 West, 100 East and 700 South. Currently only 2000 West, 1100 North and 1300 West are proposed for bike lane implementation, the remaining streets lack sufficient continuous pavement widths or will require significant costs to restripe. Engineer Lewis pointed out that 2000 West is a five lane road with planned bike lanes where parking is not currently provided for and Pleasant Grove Boulevard is not shown as having bike lanes on the map, but it has the same lane arrangement as 2000 West once it is complete and bike lanes could be provided on both by simply marking the shoulder as a bike lane. Engineer Lewis next explained that two lane collectors which are all collectors east of 100 East, with the exception of the portion of 200 South in front of the High School, should be able to be striped for bike lanes and on-street parking. Collector streets are intended to move a higher volume of traffic at a higher rate of speed and because of this, new development is arranged so that lots do not front on a collector street. However, there are sections of both streets where existing homes face the street and the nearest cross street for on-street parking is some distance away so there is an obvious impact to these residents.

Engineer Lewis said that there is a good portion of the community that would like to ride their bike and do ride their bike regularly, who would like to see an accommodating space on our busier roads that gives them a little bit more breathing room as they travel these roads.

Mayor Call said that when you stripe for a bike lane, it is pretty obvious and you really don't have to put up no parking signs. Engineer Lewis said that the manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices says that marking a bike lane is done by the on-street markings; the signs in that case are supplemental to the street markings. The Mayor asked if we would then go and paint the curbs red. Engineer Lewis said that he does not think that we would need to. Attorney Petersen asked how people would know that if the curbs were not red. Engineer Lewis stated that obviously there would be the regular bike symbol and that he thinks that it is primarily a function of education and there is going to be some confusion for awhile and it will require an enforcement aspect in order to make it work. Engineer Lewis said that we may need more signs and bike symbols in some areas to help establish these bike lanes, but there will be a transition period to have people understand where they can no longer park on the road because the City has decided to make them travel lanes. Council Member Boyd added that the education comes with the people that live there. Mayor Call stated that if we went forward with this then we would need to have a well laid out campaign for information to the residents on those streets.

Chief Sanderson commented that when you ride on a street that is marked, it is crystal clear that it is a bike path and for the occasional car that is parked in the bike path, you just ride around it. Engineer Lewis said that in regards to lanes and trails that are meant to be used by bicyclists and pedestrians, for people who are commuting or exercising on their bikes they do not want to use a facility like that because the pedestrians and other users interfere with the way they want to use it. These users want to be on the street and they have the same legal rights as a vehicle and the right to the entire lane and that point is hard to get across.

Council Member Boyd recommended also adding bike lanes for 900 West. Engineer Lewis said that we would have to do some improvements to some of the shoulders in order to have a marked bike lane but that we can certainly look into what it would take to include it.

Council Member Robinson said that she thinks the suggested bike lanes are a good idea and that we should slowly transition these areas. Engineer Lewis said that one advantage to implementing this gradually is that it will only be some neighborhoods at a time rather than the whole city all at once. He added that we have got this in the master plan and feels that the biking community is going to be happy to see the City go in this direction and obviously there will be others who will be unhappy with these changes.

Mayor Call asked if there are going to be any issues if Engineer Lewis lays out a plan of action.

Council Member Jensen said that he has a concern with safety and how this is going to be phased in, also that to him it does no good to put in bicycle lanes that go nowhere, they dead end and there is no connectivity and he wants to make sure that whatever is being planned now, there is a connectivity without gaps in between. Mayor Call said that a bicyclist is going to get somewhere no matter what, whether there is a bike lane there or not, so as we are not going to get to do this bike plan all at once because we do not have the resources, there is value to phasing in this project. Council Member Jensen said that he wasn't thinking of the bicyclists, he was thinking of the residents in the sense of not being able to park on certain blocks of the street and then being able to park on certain parts and the concern is that if we roll this out we will get more push back from the citizens if it doesn't make any kind of sense. Council Member Jensen then asked if the bike lanes would be open year round and

are we accomplishing anything by having bike safe zones only on some streets? Mayor Call asked to clarify that what he is saying is that until we can do everything we don't do anything? Council Member Jensen said that what he is asking is, "do we really need them if we can't provide a complete service because we are not providing anything if it's a partial service?" Mayor Call stated that he feels that we are providing something even with the partial plan and in our master plan there are bicycle lanes on all of these roads. This is kind of like the sidewalks; we can't do them all at once so we do them as we can until we have a whole city full of sidewalks. Chief Sanderson added that any area that he can ride his bike in a bike lane is safety that is being provided by offering it, whether it's one block or two blocks or ten miles, it is a safety aspect that needs to be addressed.

Council Member Danklef stated that he is concerned with telling residents that they can't park in front of their homes. Engineer Lewis explained that some sections like on 1100 North there is not enough room for on-street parking and a bike lane because of the center turn lane, something has to be sacrificed or we have to widen the road. There is fifty feet of asphalt, the turn lane standard is twelve feet, and the travel lane standard is eleven feet, bike lanes are four feet and you would need seven to eight feet for parking. Council Member Danklef asked if it might be better for 1100 North to put only two lanes, a bike lane and also allowing parking. Engineer Lewis said that with the volume of traffic and the speed on 1100 North, that he recommends not doing bike lanes rather than giving up the turn lane.

Council Member Robinson said that you can look at what Park City has done, they have bike trails throughout the city and in the smaller old part they have still accommodated the bicyclists with bike lanes, there are times that cars park over them but people are well aware that that city accommodates bikes. Engineer Lewis said that there is also parking in the bike lane and not doing enforcement. Council Member Robinson said that she likes that idea. Engineer Lewis said that it is not as much commitment to the bike lane if you are not actually going to keep it clear, you can mark it with what is called a share-row so that there is something that reminds people that there are bicyclists also using the shared road. Police Captain Smith stated that you need to decide what stance you are going to take and stand by it because you will have the homeowners that are going to be upset that they can't park anymore and as soon as you put those lines on the road you are going to have bicyclists that feel entitled because that is their lane now.

Mayor Call recommended that now that we have all given this input that we ask Engineer Lewis to come up with a recommended plan of action, something concrete that we can further discuss. Engineer Lewis asked for a little more clarification on the plan of action. The Mayor said that it should be along the lines of information, dates that we will begin a mailing campaign to residents showing the specific areas of each road that will be striped; on what day we will begin the striping and information regarding on-street parking.

7. Discussion on utilities in the Manila area

Administrator Darrington said that because he hasn't been with the City that long, that he is not sure of all of the history with this area and that he is aware of certain aspects and that this issue is sensitive for a lot of people particularly for those who live in this area. Administrator Darrington said that he wants to be objective as to what our options are and then handed out a summary of possible options (Exhibit B). He explained that this list is not all inclusive and if there are better options or other ways

in which we can do this then we can discuss those as well. Administrator Darrington explained that he has also included some numbers attached with these options as to the cost of putting sewer and secondary water in this area and as we review them keep an open mind and try not to get sticker shock and just automatically look at this and say that it isn't possible. We do not have to do it all at once, certain areas we might not even need to put sewer in and there might be alternatives to putting in secondary water, and we just need to have the discussion. Administrator Darrington said that he wants everyone to be clear that this is the starting point of the discussion on what we want to do for this area.

Administrator Darrington also explained that Manila water is an ongoing issue that we are trying to work out, we have met with Cedar Hills recently to compare our notes as to what we want to do with the Manila Water Board and that he wants that to be a separate issue from the infrastructure item for the time being. He said that he does not want us to feel like we have to get the Manila water figured out first before we can address these because they can run parallel paths at this point.

Administrator Darrington explained that the information on the handout lists three possible options, and information that Utility Engineer John Schiess put together on the numbers of what it would cost us to make sure that every single resident in the Manila area has sewer and secondary water and to break it down by cost for each road, also included are maps of current sewer and secondary lines and where we would need put new lines in. Administrator Darrington said that he would like to go over all of the options first and then we can have the discussion. Mayor Call indicated that that would be fine.

Administrator Darrington began with option number one, the **Cedar Hills Boundary Adjustment**, he said that he believes that this options has been looked at in the past, this is the option where Cedar Hills lets the residents hook on right away but part of the interlocal agreement is that when they sell their property or pass away, that property will boundary adjust into Cedar Hills and they become Cedar Hills residents. So eventually, in a hundred years from now, everything north of canal will be Cedar Hills, no longer Pleasant Grove. The pros to this are that it eventually cleans up the boundary line and current Pleasant Grove residents would be able to get immediate access to services. The cons are that it shrinks our city limits and it forces people that have lived in Pleasant Grove for years into Cedar Hills, also there are possible legal issues on various properties such as creating islands or peninsulas. Option number two, the **Buy into Cedar Hills Infrastructure**, because Cedar Hills already has sewer and secondary water in a lot of these areas we would offer to buy into their system, we would pay a portion of their capital cost on this infrastructure and then whoever hooks on Cedar Hills will reap the benefit of the monthly rate. The pros to this are that it would be less costly to Pleasant Grove instead of having to put in our own infrastructure and the current Pleasant Grove residents would get immediate access to services. The cons are that Cedar Hills has not shown an interest to this type of proposal and Pleasant Grove residents are still hooked onto Cedar Hills' services. Option number three is that **Pleasant Grove puts in our own Infrastructure** and that in a lot of ways takes care of the problem because it is now our infrastructure and our residents are hooked on to our services. The pros are that this takes care of the issue once and for all and all Pleasant Grove residents are treated equally. The cons are that this is the most expensive option and it creates two sets of pipes in the streets and is that the most efficient way to use government money.

Mayor Call asked how many homes that this is affecting. Administrator Darrington said that currently

it is fifty homes that are affected on the sewer; these homes are probably all on septic tanks right now and about eighty five homes are affected on the secondary water. Council Member Jensen asked how many it would affect when we are built out. Council Member Boyd said that at build out it would add about sixteen more homes. Engineer Lewis pointed out that the future use of any property there would depend on what we do with zoning. Council Member Jensen said that if we open this up we might as well open it all the way and if we are going to bring in sewer then we ought to be looking at the total cost of doing it and not just a piece here or there, we should look at the actual cost in the relationship to the number of hook ups.

Mayor Call expressed that if we were to do all of these sewer improvements now, there are pieces of property that could be developed and others could hook into these lines and in effect the impact fees cover those costs and then we just have more monthly revenue from the utility. When we are talking about an area like this the developer bears the brunt of the cost of bringing sewer to that area, so it is no real added cost to the City to develop a big area like this if we are stubbed to a certain point. Engineer Lewis stated that that is a condition that you typically place on people, it's the property owner who wants to develop and they have to adhere to the conditions that the City has set. Mayor Call said that his point is if we decide we are going to do this and put all of our own sewer lines in we don't really need to consider that there is going to be additional costs and some of these costs could be defrayed as adjacent areas get developed.

Mayor Call then asked the Council for their thoughts on the various options and expressed that he wished that we had a better relationship with Cedar Hills and if we had a solution that involved some of the infrastructure of Cedar Hills there is no guarantee that years down the road another elected body there might decide to change the rules on us. Administrator Darrington added that the caveat to that would be if we bought into their infrastructure part of the agreement would be if their future Council changes it, they have to refund us all of the money that we put into it.

Administrator Darrington asked the Council if they felt that option one was a viable option. The Council indicated that it was not. Administrator Darrington added that when he talks with Cedar Hills this is the option that they bring up. Council Member Danklef said that possible issues on this option are that those who are not hooked up to sewer and are on septic tanks, that may be a health concern, also there are some people who have already paid for their connection and if we are not going to do anything we ought to have an obligation to give them their money back. Council Member Boyd said that a lot of us prepaid for our hooks ups when the City said that they were bringing the sewer in and we could prepay and no matter when we hook up to sewer our cost was taken care of.

Council Member Jensen asked about the status of the enterprise fund for sewer with respect to covering this cost now. Administrator Darrington said that we are finishing up on our rate study and in our work session on the 31st we are going to have an in depth discussion on the enterprise fund so the short answer is that there is really no money to do this. Administrator Darrington said that we would have to bond or we could pay as we go if we did it in phases but that might not be the most cost effective, so the easier way to do this might be to bond with the understanding that you are sharing the cost with whole city to put this in. Council Member Jensen asked if this does go in would it be mandatory for those who could hook into it, to hook into it. Administrator Darrington said that it's mandatory, if there is a sewer line within three hundred feet they have to hook into it. Engineer Schiess stated that the current stance has been that if you have a septic system that is operating

correctly that you are not forced to hook on until that system fails. Utah County will not allow new septic systems so if you are within three hundred feet, you have to connect. Engineer Schiess added that the decision is up to the Council if they decide to force them to connect otherwise it wouldn't occur unless their system fails. Council Member Jensen then asked what it costs to hook up to the sewer. Engineer Lewis said that it costs around eight to ten thousand dollars.

Mayor Call said that there is an issue here, by law if your septic system fails and you are within three hundred feet of a sewer line; even if its Cedar Hills' sewer line you have to connect. Attorney Petersen stated that that is the issue, currently we don't have pipes in the ground so they have no option but to go to Cedar Hills so that is part of the discussion that you need to have that in the short term you won't have a lot of people hook on right away but over time you are going to have a lot of people that at least have the option to remain in Pleasant Grove. Council Member Boyd said that she thinks that this goes back to the fact that when we annexed into Pleasant Grove the annexation states that the city we annex into will provide the services for us.

Mayor Call pointed out Cedar Hills' policy on this, if you are not in Cedar Hills and you utilize their services you start off by paying double fees and after several months if you are still not annexed into Cedar Hills you pay four times as much and ultimately it tops out as eight times as much. Council Member Robinson asked if their new administration was wavering any. Administrator Darrington said that there have been some initial discussions about an interlocal agreement but that it is kind of hard for us to go forward with negotiations with them until our Council says what our position is and what we want to push for. Mayor Call said to answer Council Robinson's question, the current elected official body has not communicated a different stance on that. Administrator Darrington added that their stance in the long run is the boundary adjustment (option one), anything other than that that we have proposed to them, they are not interested in. Council Member Danklef asked if there was any other agency that can help arbitrate between these parties. Council Member Boyd said that we have already done that with the County. Administrator Darrington remarked that short of us putting in our own infrastructure we just have very little leverage with Cedar Hills.

Mayor Call stated that he thinks the first thing we should do is to talk with these residents and let them know that we are considering putting in the system and if we put it in what their cost would be and take the temperature there first. He said that he would like to see us calculate the average cost to the resident and communicate with all fifty of these residents and find out what their level of commitment is if they know how much this will cost them. Council Member Boyd said that there are several empty lots that are in foreclosure and it might do well to speak to the banks because they may very well want to contribute to the cost to make that land saleable.

Mayor Call asked the Council if they felt option two was worthwhile, to buy into Cedar Hills' infrastructure. Council Member Boyd asked that when we talk about buying into their infrastructure does that mean that we are going to offer to buy the infrastructure on 4000 North? Administrator Darrington said that that could be part of it; it would probably be more of a lease that would be leasing their infrastructure for our citizens. Administrator Darrington added that this would be a lot of financial incentive for them but if this is more political and not financial then we would find out really quickly that their answer is "no." Council Member Boyd said that before this becomes an option that her concern would be who owns the sewer on 4000 North because if it is Cedar Hills that owns it then you won't get anybody to hook up to it. Administrator Darrington said that 4000 North could be

a possible part of this negotiation that would be something that the City purchases. Attorney Petersen said that it sounds like option number two might work for the secondary water system but does not sound like it would work for the sewer system mostly because there is only that one street that we can even propose and they have already told us they wouldn't sell it to us. Council Member Boyd commented that all of the people who live on that road have said that even if a service agreement comes in that they are not going to hook up to it if its owned by Cedar Hills. Administrator Darrington stated that we would have to approach all the residents of Pleasant Grove and say that we want them to spend around two and a half million dollars a year whereas we could try to get the same thing accomplished with this option for one million dollars, then as a City we have to look at this option if it is financially viable. He added that he does understand that there are some feelings of mistrust or disinterest, but as a City we have to at least explore options out there. Mayor Call said that for the sewer option we then need to get a figure on the cost for hooking up and then figure out a game plan for contacting each resident affected and get a feel for the temperature. Administrator Darrington said that we will probably do a survey to have something in writing where these residents can say if they are in favor of this option or not.

Mayor Call then moved on to the secondary water options and asked if there was the same amount of passion to the option to participate in offsetting some of Cedar Hills' infrastructure costs. Council Member Boyd said that she really doesn't know if that would be something we want to ask on the survey because if you are paying something to Cedar Hills then they have control. Council Member Jensen said that when he looks at the cost for this it doesn't make sense, because you are talking about roughly thirty five people and spending about thirty thousand dollars per resident in order to allow them not to spend one hundred and eighty dollars a year for secondary water when we already have a solution which is to use culinary water. Council Member Jensen asked if it even makes fiscal sense to spend that kind of money in order to put them on secondary water, what's the return on investment. Council Member Boyd stated that she agrees and that it is something that we need to ask these residents because there is not that much concern now that there has been an equalization on the rates. Administrator Darrington stated that that rate equalization is a temporary solution and that financially it is not what pencils out in the long run, we need to do some more analysis on it to see the long term cost to the City before we can say what our long term plan is because if we are going to have a separate water rate for those people that don't have access to secondary then the rest of the city is in a way subsidizing that. Council Member Jensen said that they should be subsidizing it, that no matter where you live in the city you should have equal access to some form of a water usage for secondary, that is the whole point of having a community that we all join as a community and bear the cost for everybody in the city otherwise every time you build something such as a school then the only people who pay for that new school would be the people who are going to be served by it. Council Member Jensen then said that he would need more information into why we would treat the people on that part of the city differently than we treat the other residents of the city. Administrator Darrington said that he does not disagree with Council Member Jensen but that we do need to crunch the numbers to see how much money we are losing every year in water before we make decisions.

Mayor Call said that to wrap up this discussion what he has heard is that in three weeks we will have the water rate study done and we will have the numbers on the temporary water payment structure in Manila for people watering their lawns and if that was made permanent what effect that is going to have and how much that is going to increase everybody's rate. Mayor Call commented that as we've looked at this, it just doesn't make sense financially to build a secondary water system above the

canal. Council Member Boyd said that we have gone through this before and the residents in that area are grateful and it has been a successful temporary solution, and if we have to change the rates citywide then it will affect those above the canal. Engineer Lewis added that if we stick to a long term culinary situation there then we could look at metering both sources, because with the culinary water it's going to be a lot more critical. He said that the secondary system provided so much per acre to the homeowner and we could stand a little bit of fluctuation in the secondary water but with the culinary it is going to be more critical to know that someone is being an excessive user. Mayor Call stated that that is a good point.

Mayor Call then said that this has been a fruitful discussion and that we will have some more of our questions answered by the survey.

8. Discussion of items for the upcoming August 17, 2010 City Council meeting:

a. To consider awarding the Business Extra Mile Award to Test Out and Kate's Quilting Block

Administrator Darrington said that we will need to have an executive session next week regarding our discussion with the Manila Water Board.

Mayor Call asked if there were any questions on next week's agenda, there were none.

9. Mayor, City Council and Staff Business

- Attorney Petersen reported that the Prosecutors Training Conference that she attended last week was very fruitful and that she has some good ideas for enhanced prosecution for some of the more serious crimes that we see.
- Administrator Darrington mentioned that our intern Cory Fralick is currently working on a couple of projects for us, he is creating a photo directory of the all the city employees and also putting together an internal employee survey to get their general feel about working for Pleasant Grove.

Administrator Darrington said that he met with Dennis Baker last week and had a discussion on what the Council's vision is on the zoning in the Grove and Interchange area. They are looking at another possible site for the fast food restaurant but they would also eventually like to come and present to the Council what they feel are the benefits to getting any sort of commercial or retail development going out there to kind of jump start the area and get things going. Administrator Darrington said that some of their ideas do have some viability to them and others we may be a little skeptical of but they want to get to the decision makers and show it to you, they feel like they are losing a lot of flexibility because this is something that has always been allowed since they've owned this property and now we are saying "no" to them.

- Chief Sanderson mentioned the recent publicity for the Unified Fire Authority's new Dive and Rescue Team in Herriman; they are proactively scuba certifying their Firefighters because of a

drowning they had in one of their reservoirs. Chief Sanderson explained that we had an incident two years ago where we had a dog walk across the pond and fall in the ice and we responded but stood helplessly with really no ability to go get it. After that incident we did all of the research, allocated the money and purchased all of the ice rescue equipment, we did the training and brought everybody up to speed with the Ice/Water Rescue Certification level, we have continued that this year with another one hundred hours of Ice/Water Rescue training and we are in the process of researching whether or not there is a benefit to having scuba diving as one of our Firefighter certifications. Chief Sanderson said that there are fifteen of us in the department who have earned those scuba diving certifications on our own, but whether or not we need to purchase the equipment for the department is what we are looking at and that he will keep the Council up to date with how that comes about.

- Captain Smith mentioned that in Salem City they have had a huge issues with their ponds, they got to the point that they had so many incidents that their officers started to carry scuba gear.
- Director Walker reminded everyone about the City Employee Summer Party tomorrow at the Veteran's Memorial Park starting at 6:00 p.m.
- Deputy Recorder Mulvey said that this Thursday, the 12th, we will be hosting the meeting for the Central Utah Records Association at 10:30 a.m. Deputy Recorder Mulvey then thanked Council Member Robinson for being the presenter at this meeting on the topic of Stress Management and invited the Mayor, Council and staff to attend as well.
- Council Member Danklef reported that this year the Fox Hollow Golf Course went on secondary water from American Fork City, the initial estimate that they gave for the cost of that was in excess of one hundred fifty thousand dollars and they are working out a temporary solution but the Mayors of the three cities involved will need to figure out how to compensate water rights to the golf course for the watering.
- Council Member Robinson reminded everyone about the City Golf Tournament at Fox Hollow on the 26th at 2:00 p.m.
- Mayor Call mentioned the ribbon cutting for Accelerated Payment Technologies and asked Council Member Danklef to report on it. Council Member Danklef said that they are new to Pleasant Grove, they relocated from California and in talking with the CEO he had nothing but excellent remarks to make about the City, how easy we were to work with and how smooth their transition went and that he would be happy to endorse us to any other company that is contemplating Pleasant Grove versus another city.

Mayor Call then asked where we stood on the accessory apartment ordinance. Administrator Darrington said that it will be part of our discussion in our joint meeting with the Planning Commission on August 24th.

The Mayor asked about the issue with the fence on the property at Costume Craze. Attorney Petersen said that the last she had heard was that it had been resolved, the position was that

the falling rock/wall was a nuisance but the condition of the fence was more of a civil issue and the two property owners needed to work that out. Mayor Call said that he wonders if this was resolved to Costume Crazes' satisfaction. Attorney Petersen said that she would be happy to call and follow up with them. The Mayor said that that would be good for them to hear from a city staff member.

Mayor Call next mentioned the property on 200 South, a green house on the north west corner of Main Street that looks as if it might be abandoned. Attorney Petersen said that it is her understanding that our Code Enforcement person checked it and has been on it, the problem is that the property owner on record with the County is a company and we sent them a letter but they didn't respond, we did research further into another contact person and sent a letter last week and we are waiting for a response. Attorney Petersen said that if we don't get a response then we will just go clean it up and then lien the property.

ACTION: At 8:37 p.m. Council Member Wilson moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Jensen seconded and the motion passed unanimously with Council Members Boyd, Danklef, Jensen, Robinson and Wilson voting "Aye."

10. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

This certifies that the Work Session
Minutes of August 10, 2010 are a true,
full and correct copy as approved
by the City Council on September 7, 2010

Colleen A Mulvey, Deputy City Recorder

(Exhibits are in the Work Session Minutes binders in the Recorder's office)