

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
Work Session
August 12, 2014
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Mike Daniels

Council Members:

Dianna Andersen
Cyd LeMone
Ben Stanley
Jay Meacham
Cindy Boyd

Staff Present:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Dean Lundell, Finance Director
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Degen Lewis, City Engineer
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief
Corey Cluff, Fire Battalion Chief
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Lynn Walker, Public Works Director
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director

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

1) Call to Order.

Mayor Daniels called the meeting to order and noted that Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Meacham, and Stanley were present. Council Member Boyd arrived late.

2) Pledge of Allegiance.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Fire Chief Marc Sanderson.

3) **Opening Remarks.**

The opening remarks were given by Parks and Recreation Director, Deon Giles.

4) **Approval of Agenda.**

No changes were made the agenda.

5) **Open Session.**

Mayor Daniels opened the open session.

Lisa Coombs stated that she is the Chairperson for the Heritage Jubilee Festival. She announced that the event will take place on Saturday, September 13, from 3:00 to 7:00 p.m. The kick-off will commence the following day with the neighborhood competition. Event news and updates will be available on Facebook. She also noted that for every Facebook post for each person who attends, two points will be given. The event will also feature several local storytellers. All donations raised from the event will be used to repair headstones at the cemetery.

Roger Green gave his address as 665 East 200 South. He thanked the staff and elected officials for the time and effort they have put into planning for the Public Safety Building. He felt that the meeting that took place the previous Thursday went very well.

Sandy Carter explained that about two weeks ago there were issues with the water in the Manila Neighborhood, where she resides. She noted that the problem was promptly fixed. She expressed her thanks to the Public Works Department.

Jacob Sutch addressed the City's Chiefs, and expressed concerns with some of the comments that their subordinates have made online regarding the Public Safety Building. He explained that staff, elected officials, and many citizens in the community have worked very hard on this project and the bond will be even more difficult to pass if these individuals keep making negative comments. He asked the Chiefs to reign in their employees from such actions.

Police Chief, Mike Smith, responded that he was made aware of some of the comments made online. He explained that there are policies in place that they have already addressed with their employees. However, Chief Smith noted that employees have the same rights as any other citizen when they are on their own time. He assured Mr. Sutch that they will do what they can legally do to enforce the policies that are in place. Mr. Sutch stated that in his line of work, if he were to bad mouth the company or any of their contractors, he would get fired. He then relayed an incident that occurred in his neighborhood last year.

City Attorney, Tina Petersen, explained that there is a difference in the law between public and private employees, with regard to freedom of speech. The City has a certain expectation of employees, however, because this is a public matter, they have fewer tools in their toolbox when dealing with negative comments. Employees have a right to speak on a public matter. Bad mouthing your boss is a different issue. Council Member LeMone added that she attended a staff meeting during which Chief Smith distributed a three-page policy review to all of the employees who were

in attendance. She also relayed that Chief Smith strongly reiterated his expectation regarding his employees' conduct at the meeting.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the open session.

6) **Presentation of new employees.**

Chief Sanderson announced that Andrew Engemann has been working as the City's part-time Fire Captain. With recent changes to the department's organizational structure, they were able to hire Mr. Engemann on as a full-time Fire Captain. It was noted that Mr. Engemann has also been working part-time for Orem City for the past 23 years. Furthermore, the Fire Department recently hired another full-time firefighter, Shawn Sandberg. Mr. Sandberg has most recently worked part-time in Springville. He was the number one applicant out of a total of 35.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, introduced Royce Davies, the City's newest Planner. Director Young reported that he is doing very well.

Attorney Petersen announced that the Legal Department has a new part-time employee, Mikkel Davis. Mr. Davis is the City's new part-time Prosecutor. He gained experience working for Orem City and Utah County. Attorney Petersen stated that Mr. Davis has done very well in his first week of work.

Chief Smith announced the names for the Police Department's new dispatchers as Mayle Johnson, Shaylee Seppe, and Andrew Nore. Additionally, the department has brought on Bo Adamson, Derrick Sillytoe, and Kevin Mallory as new Reserve Officers. Rachel Turner and Kenzie Richards were hired as new part-time employees who will work at the counter. Next, Chief Smith announced that Candice Walker accepted a full-time Dispatcher position and will also serve as a Dispatch Supervisor. Lastly, Chief Smith reported that Mikell Humes accepted a position as one of the City's full-time Police Officers. It was noted that Ms. Humes is the City's only female officer.

7) **Discussion on the Procurement Contract for the Battle Creek Microhydro Power Generation Project. Presenter: Director Lundell.**

Finance Director, Dean Lundell, explained that the Blue Energy Project has been ongoing for several years. He introduced Cory Christiansen as the engineer who has primarily worked on the project. Director Lundell stated that the City now has a matched portion which will be funded in this year's budget. It was noted that the project needs to be completed by next March.

Mr. Christiansen explained that the project initially began as research, but over time it turned into an improvement project. The project was scaled back to just a single turbine power generator at Battle Creek; however, the original research was to have been the installment of small turbines into distribution systems in several locations. Mr. Christiansen explained that pressure reducer valves, or PRVs, are placed in the distribution system for drinking water that moderate the water pressure for homes of varying elevation. Every time pressure is broken like this, energy is wasted. Currently the biggest PRV in Pleasant Grove's system is located in Battle Creek Canyon. As water flows through this particular valve, turbulence is created. This prevents the high pressure from the water coming off the mountain from causing problems in the tank. Mr. Christiansen explained that

the valve can be replaced with the turbine. All of the energy lost as turbulence will be used to generate electrical power. Mr. Christiansen noted that this single turbine will generate power for the City year-round. The power will be added to the grid, and the City will receive payment for it.

Mr. Christiansen next spoke about a program called "Net Metering" that has been established with Rocky Mountain Power. When the City has several power meters disbursed throughout the City, the company will net the amount of power being generated from that which is used. Therefore, the City will be compensated for power at the same rate it is paying.

Mr. Christiansen provided a current status on the project. He noted that the drawings to bid out the facility have already been designed and a building will be located above the concrete tanks. The pipeline runs down from the canyon and hits the existing PRV valve. The water will be diverted from that pipe into a building and into a turbine and then flow back out of the tank. The structural, architectural, and civil designs are all complete; however, a submittal from the turbine supplier is still needed in order to verify that all equipment being provided is appropriate for the project.

Mr. Christiansen stated that there are very few turbine suppliers that supply the size of equipment that is needed. Pleasant Grove's turbine is a 100kw generator, which is relatively small. Therefore, he approached Canyon Hydro, which is the company selected, as well as another company in California. Mr. Christiansen explained that while staff put together a proposal packet, they did not get very many bids for the project due to the size of the generator needed. Canyon Hydro has submitted a bid that is within budget. He recommended the City move forward in offering them the contract. If the Council decides to move forward with the bid, Canyon Hydro will have three weeks to develop their submittals. Their submittals will in turn be used to design the electrical portion of the project. Afterwards, the construction phase will begin and last approximately three to five months.

Mayor Daniels asked Mr. Christiansen how much energy the generator will create over the course of a year and how much the City currently consumes. Mr. Christiansen explained that the generator will produce approximately 10% of what the City consumes. The maximum that the generator is designed to produce is 100kw. During the runoff season when the flows are around 3,000 gallons per minute, about 80 to 85kw is generated. However, in the wintertime much less is produced.

City Administrator, Scott Darrington added that when staff initially ran the numbers, they figured that about \$30,000 would be credited back to the City's account each year. Mayor Daniels asked for an example of a building that this energy credit would effectively cover. Director Lundell stated that it would likely help offset the cost of the power for the wells. He informed Mayor Daniels that the City's power bill last year just for the wells was around \$330,000.

Council Member Andersen asked if this same type of project could also take place at Grove Creek, and generate even more revenue. Mr. Christiansen explained that the reason this job makes sense financially, is because the City is only paying for half. It would be ideal to do some more of this work in other areas and as technology becomes less expensive there may be additional possibilities that the City can examine. At this point, however, any kind of expansion beyond Battle Creek is cost prohibitive.

Mayor Daniels wanted to know over what period of time the City will recoup the costs associated with the project. Director Lundell explained that the total cost of the project is around \$660,000, and the payback will take approximately 11 years. Council Member Meacham inquired as to how the Department of Energy determined the project amount of \$660,000. Director Lundell explained that the original congressional earmark was for \$1 million. However, the project was redefined as a "Demonstration Project" because the City is demonstrating that this new technology is feasible. This project redefinition caused for a change in the overall federal award amount.

Council Member Meacham remarked that there are likely many more communities that have similar conditions as Pleasant Grove. He asked if any of those other communities are pursuing similar projects. Mr. Christiansen explained that Water Pro in Draper has a 700kw turbine. Park City also designed a new water plant, which included space for a turbine vent. They have not, however, installed the turbines due to budget issues. There was continued discussion on other areas in Utah that have considered turbines in the past.

Council Member Andersen asked who will maintain the facility. Administrator Darrington explained that City staff will oversee it. Council Member Boyd remarked that she thought she'd never live to see the day that this project would actually take off. She thanked the team for their effort to get the project off the ground. She stated that this project will greatly benefit the City and provide a large revenue source. Attorney Petersen described the next steps the Council needs to take on the matter.

8) Discussion on Jay Robinson property.

Administrator Darrington reported that he spoke with the agent for the property, Mark Ryan, several times. The property is located directly to the west of the new Walmart Neighborhood Market. Currently there is a piece of the property that is not a part of the high density residential overlay. Administrator Darrington explained that recently a proposal was submitted for a senior housing project on that property; however, the Council was not interested in the proposal. Mr. Ryan approached staff for feedback on what the Council will allow on the subject property, which is currently zoned Commercial Sales.

Mayor Daniels clarified that the subject property is the long and skinny parcel on State Street. Secondary road and utility access into the property are also not well-defined at this point. Administrator Darrington explained that there are problems with sewer connecting to the area. However, road access could be made off of State Street. In previous discussions the suggestion was made to wait until Stan Smith's frontage can be incorporated on North County Boulevard, which would make the subject property commercially viable. That process, however, could take many years.

City Engineer, Degen Lewis, explained that sewer access would need to be made with 2000 West, because there is not a line running through State Street. There is, however, a 10 to 12-inch main water line running off of State Street and a storm drain slough runs along the west side of the property.

Mr. Mark Ryan presented an aerial photo of the subject property, and identified an existing home on .75-acre that was built in the mid-1800s. He explained that the long, deep piece of property was

brought to the City at one time to be part of the overlay that was to be approved for multi-family housing. The developer, however, didn't end up purchasing the property, so it was removed from the overlay. Mr. Ryan explained that for the past two years he has approached staff about putting the property back into the overlay. However, no progress has been made, primarily because staff doesn't have any control over the situation.

Mr. Ryan suggested that retail be allowed at the front of the property. He requested that the Council also consider allowing the same density to exist on the subject property as is found on the Wright development. One issue is that there isn't any access on the lower portion of the property and onto North County Boulevard. Mr. Ryan stated that he knows a developer who would be able to develop the area as senior housing if it were approved. Alternatively, apartments or townhouses would also be a good option for the property.

Mr. Ryan asked if the City would allow for a long road with a cul-de-sac so that a fire truck could turnaround on the property. Mayor Daniels asked if the subject property has a buyer yet. Mr. Ryan responded that it has not been purchased. Council Member Boyd suggested that if the boundary line were removed from of 2000 West, it could be a great commercial area. The two property owners could work together to master plan the property.

Mayor Daniels asked Director Young what is required when providing access for commercial development. Director Young stated that they look for secondary access points. Mayor Daniels referred to Council Member Boyd's suggestion to commercially develop the property on North County Boulevard. He asked if there would be a requirement for the developer to provide some form of access to the parcel located behind them. Director Young explained that when a parcel has other street access, an additional access is not necessarily required. It is, however, beneficial to get a cross connection between developments whenever possible. It was noted that for the purposes of good planning, a strong recommendation can be made to provide secondary access into the property.

Director Young suggested that the City make revisions to the General Plan and Ordinance that require a master plan for the area. Council Member Boyd agreed that this is the direction that the City needs to go. She referenced larger developments in the State and pointed out that they were master planned by several property owners. Mr. Ryan expressed frustration with the correspondence he has had with the City on this matter for the past couple of years. Mr. Ryan stressed that he needs help from the City to develop the property.

Mayor Daniels asked staff what needs to be done to move forward. Administrator Darrington replied that any potential actions taken on the subject property are contingent on the surrounding properties. While the frontage could be developed, the rest of the property cannot be developed on its own, due to the lack of access.

Fire Battalion Chief, Corey Cluff, explained that road access is not the only factor that needs to be considered when remaining compliant with the Fire Code. He explained that building height guidelines and occupancy classifications also need to be made. It is of equal importance to consider how an apparatus would access the property as well as how people would evacuate in the event of an emergency. Chief Cluff explained that what he will normally do with the Development Review Committee is to look at all possible options and apply different codes and needs to the development.

Mayor Daniels asked the Council where they are with amending the City ordinances or codes to allow for stronger requirements, or alternatively allow for a different kind of development. Council Member Boyd remarked that as a Council they owe it to all of the property owners in the area to establish requirements within the ordinance that allow for more cohesive planning. She stated that now that the City has hired a full-time Planner, now would be an appropriate time to assess the ordinance requirements.

Director Young explained that cohesive planning in this area will also require the cooperation of all of the existing property owners, in that they will need to have a shared vision of what and how to move forward with a plan. He stated that because the property owners do not have a shared vision of what to do with the land, it will be challenging to achieve an overall master plan. Council Member Boyd stressed the importance of involving Stan Smith more in developing a concept plan, and in pinpointing a timeline for his property.

Council Member Stanley stated that he would like to help Mr. Ryan, even if a consensus among the property owners cannot be reached. He also felt that the first step to take would be to have a meeting with all of the property owners with the Planning Commission in an effort to figure out a direction that can be taken. Council Member Meacham agreed that it would make sense to provide access from North County Boulevard, as previously suggested. Council Members Andersen and LeMone agreed with that assessment. Mayor Daniels summarized the discussion by stating that staff needs to get together with all of the property owners in the area and see what kind of cooperative master planning can be arranged. If this is not possible, the Council needs to know immediately in order to provide guidance to Mr. Ryan regarding the Robinson property. A time frame of two weeks to hold a meeting with the property owners was set so that the process can move forward expeditiously.

Administrator Darrington stated that it is Mr. Ryan's job to work with Mr. Smith. He asked the Mayor and Council if it was their responsibility to maximize the value of the property by changing City ordinances so that all of the access issues are addressed. Although he wished to be helpful, he felt that the City should be cautious in how they proceed. He explained that the City does not want to overextend itself to the point that every time a developer runs into a problem they expect the City to solve it for them. Administrator Darrington pointed out that if Mr. Smith chooses not to develop his property, the City doesn't have the responsibility to force the issue.

Mayor Daniels clarified that the next step is to entertain a meeting between all parties, and if a Master Plan Agreement can't be reached, the City no longer has the ability to move forward. Attorney Petersen felt this would be the case, with the exception of possibly exercising eminent domain on the two roads that are already in the City's Master Plan. Attorney Petersen pointed out that the subject property can be developed as it is now under the zoning code; it just can't be developed in the way Mr. Ryan and the property owner want it to be. She agreed with Administrator Darrington that it is not the City's responsibility to make changes to maximize the value of one's property. However, it is the City's responsibility to make good planning decisions.

9) Discussion on allowing hotels/motels in the Grove Commercial Sales District.

Mr. Ryan stated that there are several partners planning on building a hotel in the Grove Commercial Sales District. Administrator Darrington informed the Council that staff determined

that a hotel/motel is not a permitted use in that zone. They were, however, unable to determine why they were not permitted, and recommended that they be added as a permitted use in the Grove Commercial Sales District. The matter will first need to go to the Planning Commission and then will come before the Council for final approval.

Council Member Stanley expressed support for the proposed change and asked how the sales tax revenue will differ from other commercial developments. Staff did not know the answer off-hand; however, Director Lundell was under the impression that the tax revenue would be better than that of a standard commercial development. It was also noted that the City could adopt a transient room tax. Council Member Boyd asked Director Young to outline the boundaries for the Grove Commercial Sales District. Director Young explained that the District wraps around State Street from 1300 West to 2000 West. Additionally, it goes down along the corridor where Evermore is located, as well as a small portion of Pleasant Grove Boulevard.

10) Discussion on the 4000 North sewer proposal. Presenter: Administrator Darrington.

Administrator Darrington distributed the original proposal sent to Cedar Hills approximately two years ago. He noted that if the principles in the letter still apply staff will prepare an updated letter to be signed by the Mayor.

Administrator Darrington reviewed each line item in the proposal. The first was that Cedar Hills grant Pleasant Grove residents the ability to hook onto the Cedar Hills sewer line in 4000 North in Pleasant Grove. The number of hook-ons (current and future) will be determined by the zoning that is allowed along the street. The second item relates to the time period. The proposal suggests a perpetual agreement, or 99 years, if perpetuity isn't a legally viable option. Third, Administrator Darrington reviewed the cost estimate for the sewer line, which two years ago was estimated at \$328,812, with Pleasant Grove paying for half. The agreement will stipulate the legal language similar to Pleasant Grove City "leasing" the line from Cedar Hills.

Attorney Petersen expressed concern with the idea of leasing the line from Cedar Hills, and felt that it puts the City in a weaker legal situation later on down the road. She preferred that the matter be approached with an interlocal agreement instead, which would entail the City buying into the line. Administrator Darrington stated that he will remove that language from the proposal, which will also effect the line regarding perpetuity.

Administrator Darrington continued reviewing the proposal and explained that the fourth item states that Cedar Hills will receive impact fees and hook-on fees from Pleasant Grove residents that connect to the line. These fees will be paid to Pleasant Grove City and passed on to Cedar Hills. The fifth item states that Pleasant Grove homeowners will be responsible for their lateral, which about three years ago was estimated to be around \$7,000 to \$10,000. The sixth line item explains that Pleasant Grove residents will be charged the same sewer rates as all other Pleasant Grove residents, which will be billed by the City. Pleasant Grove will then reimburse Cedar Hills their sewer cost at Cedar Hills rates. These rates will cover any treatment charges and future capital replacement charges. Cedar Hills will not be allowed to charge Pleasant Grove City any rate different than the normal Cedar Hills rate for the majority of their residents.

Administrator Darrington explained that if Pleasant Grove has joint ownership, they will share the joint pipe replacement and future maintenance costs, which will be addressed as item seven in the proposal. Council Member Meacham asked about the size of the line. It was noted that it is an eight-inch pipe. Currently, Cedar Hills has three connections to the line and there aren't any more of their residents that border it. Pleasant Grove would add about 24 residents. There was then discussion relative to a similar situation that Pleasant Grove had with Lindon, as well as a historical review of discussions with Cedar Hills.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the last two proposed line items. The eighth item states that the agreement cannot be terminated unless both parties agree to terminate it. Lastly, Pleasant Grove residents will be able to hook-on to the sewer line at their convenience. Administrator Darrington stated that if the Council agrees to the items as they have been discussed, he will draft a revised proposal and send it off to Cedar Hills immediately.

11) Discussion on agenda items for the August 19, 2014 City Council Meeting.

Administrator Darrington explained that the size of the bond for the Public Safety Building will be determined in next week's meeting. He noted that it will be the first item on the agenda. Administrator Darrington presented a spreadsheet of the current estimated costs for the project. He brought the Council's attention specifically to the estimated cost for the entire project, which is 14,969,186.

The City presented to the public a cash contribution from the General Fund of \$1.3 million. This money will be used to pay a portion of the owners' costs. The \$1.3 million contribution will also comprise Public Safety Impact Fees, as well as the sale of four different properties. Currently we are only selling one of them, the other 3 we are keeping and reimbursing the Public Safety Impact Fee fund out of the General Fund. Administrator Darrington spoke about premium bonding and noted that it will not change the burden on the citizenry. The par amount of the bonds is set at \$12.6 million, which will be the amount represented on the ballot.

Director Lundell added further explanation by stating that the amount the taxpayer will pay and the amount that the City will pay for the annual payment will be the same regardless of the premium bond amount. He also explained that the reason premium bonds can be issued now is because there are people who are interested in buying them. This can, however, fluctuate based on market conditions. It was noted that last year the language of the bond amount was \$16.9 million with a life period of 23 years. The bond for this year was presented to the public as having a life period of 20 years. There was continued discussion on the matter.

Mayor Daniels explained that there is time between now, when the vote takes place, and when the project gets to point of having soft costs. He inquired as to whether or not there are costs that can be anticipated from a General Fund perspective that could be saved toward some of those soft costs. Administrator Darrington explained that each year the City has roughly \$300,000 in fund balance which wasn't spent during the budget year. If some of those funds were earmarked, the General Fund contribution could potentially be bumped from \$1.3 million to \$1.6 million. He clarified that these funds would come from additional revenues, rather than the reserve funds. However, at this point a specific figure cannot be estimated. Council Member Boyd asked how this would affect the rest of the City and department directors. Administrator Darrington acknowledged that the City has

needs other than the Public Safety Building project. Overall, he advised against committing additional General Fund revenues to the project.

Mayor Daniels commented that after looking at owner costs, he felt it would be beneficial to get estimates for different large expenses. Administrator Darrington pointed out that the three largest owner costs are Technology (\$679,126), FF&E (\$565,939), and Communications (\$169,782.) He stated that if the City could find a way to save money in each of these categories, it would be ideal. Staff was still working out prices in the communications category and would have those numbers available at next week's meeting. Administrator Darrington noted that the City can obtain State grants for needed dispatch equipment, however they are not guaranteed.

Chief Smith explained that the Motorola equipment that the Police Department currently uses is extremely outdated, to the point that some of the system has broken altogether. The representatives have to look around for used equipment, because none of it can be fixed any longer. Chief Smith stated that the equipment currently on the market is astronomically priced. He anticipated that in 18 months the price of new equipment will drop. Additionally, the phone contract with Century Link is for five years, and the City is currently in the third year. Therefore, the contract will need to be renewed at about the same time the new facility will be built. In conclusion, Chief Smith reported that he was working on a grant for some of these needs.

Council Member Boyd remarked that for the City to build a beautiful, multi-million dollar facility, and then not provide all of the necessary technology, would be very short-sided. Chief Smith added that as the next generation advances, the Police Department is looking to provide the opportunity for citizens to text a 911 call to the City's Dispatch Center. He stressed the importance of moving in the same direction as society.

Mayor Daniels posed the question of why bonds are for 20 years when the equipment will become obsolete within the next five years. He felt this was an important issue that needs to be addressed. Council Member Boyd referenced a common scenario in which people take out a 30-year home mortgage that includes appliances that become outdated. She felt it would be difficult to determine that which is dispensable. Administrator Darrington added that the \$1.3 million cash contribution will pay for part of the hard construction costs. Council Member Boyd asked if that amount could be line itemed for the public's reference. Administrator Darrington confirmed that it could.

Council Member Stanley expressed concern with financing items that have a five-year shelf life over a 20-year period. He stated that while he wants the public to have this facility, he felt that the City needs to approach the project with realistic numbers that can be paid within a reasonable time frame. He stressed the importance of pursuing the right kind of philosophy when dealing with debt. Council Member Stanley was of the opinion that there are certain soft costs that can be reduced, however, he was not in favor of changing any of the hard cost estimates. He then referenced several types of comments that were made during a recent meeting on the matter. His impression was that the bond will not pass unless the amount is reduced from \$12.6 million to \$9 million or \$10 million.

Administrator Darrington explained that staff met with members of the Blue Ribbon Committee last Thursday and they recommended cuts to bring the bond amount down to between \$9 million and \$10 million. Those suggestions were forwarded to David Hart for consideration. Mr. Hart responded that without significantly changing the square footage or durability of the building, there

is no way to complete the project for that price. Administrator Darrington and Mr. Jones both commented that the figures presented are about as low as they can go. Council Member Stanley suggested that rather than making cuts, a different funding source for some of the expenses with a shorter shelf-life be identified. There was further discussion pertaining to the matter. Council Member Stanley made reference to Springville's approach to a similar project.

Council Member Meacham commented that the longer the City waits, the more expensive it will become. Furthermore, if the bond amount is set too low, they run the risk of running out of money prior to finishing the project. Chief Sanderson was of the opinion that if the building can't be built correctly, it shouldn't be built at all.

Council Member LeMone was concerned with the proposal to bring the cost down by \$3 million when there aren't any facts or figures to back up the assumption that people will be more likely to vote for such a revised bond amount. Staff and elected officials spent 850 hours over the course of four months gathering solid facts and figures, which is exactly what the public asked for from the City. She stated that the City hired MOCA for a reason, which was to accurately determine percentages and estimates. Council Member LeMone felt it would be a gamble to cut owner costs, and that it would not be a fiscally responsible action to take. She noted that she was part of the process last year and this year and was of the opinion that the numbers presented cannot be reduced any further. In conclusion, Council Member LeMone stated that as a City, Pleasant Grove has a habit of building for the present and not for the future. As a resident, she was willing to pay extra to build a more durable facility.

Council Member Andersen remarked that she has enjoyed the process this year and working with MOCA and visiting with various members of the community. She felt the City has taken a completely factual approach to the project and that the citizens and committee members have been extremely impressed with the City's efforts. Council Member Andersen explained that she gets very nervous when there is talk of gambling with other department funds. She refuses to pursue a decision that could potentially jeopardize the functionality of another department. She prefers to communicate to the public that the set bond amount will not be exceeded, rather than take a gamble on whether or not there will be sufficient funding to have every necessity covered.

Council Member Stanley reiterated his previous points about finding alternative funding sources in order to bond less, rather than make cuts to the project. Council Member LeMone asked where he plans on finding \$3 million elsewhere. He suggested making operational cuts to the Police, Fire, and the Legal Departments who will be occupying the building. Council Member LeMone asked for input from the chiefs on the matter. Chief Smith responded that the Police Department is already struggling to keep their head above water. He had no idea where they would be able to make those suggested cuts. He stressed that cutting money from his operational budget would directly affect their level of service level in a drastic way. He explained that they have scrimped, saved, and held fundraisers to maintain the level of funding that is absolutely essential to the success of the department.

Chief Sanderson stated that he can provide very specific line items to his department's operational budget. For example, last year he was given a vehicle maintenance budget of \$40,000, and they ended up needing to spend \$62,000. Therefore, he had to take \$22,000 from other budgets. At the end of the year he was over budget. This was not due to irresponsible spending; rather, they simply

do not have enough money to operate the Fire Department for 12 months. Chief Sanderson acknowledged Director Lundell for his expertise in budget planning, which allows for his department to function. Lastly, he stated that there isn't even \$10,000 he can cut from his operational budget without eliminating an entire service.

The Council continued to deliberate several points made throughout the discussion. Mayor Daniels felt that the bond will hinge on the attitudes of staff and elected officials and how they approach the public for permission to use their money. If the majority of the public can see that they are constantly looking for ways to reduce costs without compromising quality and functionality, the confidence of the public will favor approval of the bond. He emphasized that the manner in which the Council represents their spending and to whom the funds belong, will be very critical. Mayor Daniels expressed his confidence in the bond amount of \$12.6 million, and stated that it is an appropriate number. Furthermore, his confidence will increase as the City moves forward with the project and seeks to identify ways in which to save money. Last, Mayor Daniels stressed the importance of working together to be fiscally responsible. He remarked that any and all negativity could potentially damage any chance of the City moving forward.

Item "B" on next week's agenda relates to modifications to the title of the Cultural Arts Department and the Director's titles, as well as adding provisions for the Public Works Department. Item "C" will be for a conditional approval for a 20-lot final plat known as Pleasant Heights. City Engineer, Degen Lewis, provided an overview of the applicant's current status. Item "D" will be consideration of approval for a request from Andrea Bishop for a two-lot final plat called Canyon Brook Plat B. Director Young explained that this process has been going on for some time, as it also entailed a rezone. The Board of Adjustment also recently granted a variance approval.

Item "E" will be to consider approval for a request from Larry Lindstrom for a two-lot final plat called Grove Crest Villas A Subdivision. Director Young noted that the site plan was approved by the Planning Commission last month. The property will be divided with senior housing on the back portion of the property and commercial at the front. Item "G" will be a Resolution to amend the Pleasant Grove City's Construction Standard Specifications Manual for the purpose of updating construction drawings and civil requirements for improvements, as well as other minor updates. Engineer Lewis reported that this item isn't quite ready, so it will be moved to another date.

Item "H" and "I" both relate to the surplus property located at Battle Creek Park that will be transferred over to the Alpine School District. The last item on next week's agenda will be for the Resolution adopting the Policy and Procedure Manual for the Pleasant Grove City Cemetery.

12) Neighborhood and Staff business.

Mayor Daniels asked NAB Chairperson, Libby Flegal, if any of the other neighborhood chairs would be interested in participating in the work relating to the Public Safety Building, specifically in communicating information to the neighborhoods. Ms. Flegal responded optimistically. Mayor Daniels explained that the City will coordinate with her group.

Administrator Darrington reported that he heard from doTerra earlier in the day and they would like to provide a tour for City staff and elected officials. They proposed that the tour take place on

August 26, 2014, at 4:00 p.m. They were tentatively looking to schedule the ribbon cutting for September 24, 2014.

Engineer Lewis explained that few months ago the City purchased three lots on which to construct a new water tank. He presented a model of what the site will look like. Mayor Daniels asked about an anticipated time frame on the project. Engineer Lewis replied that it has yet to be determined. Capital funding has not been allocated for the construction, and approximately \$700,000 to \$800,000 will be needed for the project.

13) Mayor and Council Business.

Council Member Andersen proposed that the staff and elected officials convene for a mini-retreat to discuss the Public Safety Building. Administrator Darrington suggested this matter be added to a Work Session Agenda. He agreed to look at the calendar and propose some dates.

Mayor Daniels announced that he will be out of the office for the rest of the week.

14) Signing of Plats.

There were no plats to sign.

15) Review Calendar.

There were no calendar items to review.

16) Adjourn.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:24 p.m.

Approved by the City Council on September 2, 2014

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

(Exhibits are in the City Council Minutes binders in the Recorder's office.)