

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Work Session Meeting Minutes
April 29, 2014
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Mike Daniels

Council Members:

Dianna Andersen
Cindy Boyd
Cyd LeMone (Arrived at 6:21 p.m.)
Jay Meacham
Ben Stanley

Staff Present:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Dean Lundell, Finance Director
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Degen Lewis, City Engineer
Sheri Britsch, Arts and Culture Director
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Marcus Wager, Planning Intern
Lynn Walker, Public Works Director

Other:

Dan Torfin, DMB Investments

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, Boyd, Meacham, and Stanley were present. He noted that Council Member LeMone would arrive shortly.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

Amy Lindstrom led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3) **OPENING REMARKS.**

Parks and Recreation Director, Deon Giles, gave the opening remarks.

4) **TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL A TWO-LOT FINAL PLAT CALLED AMBERWOOD ESTATES PLAT E LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1132 EAST 740 SOUTH IN THE R1-9 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE. (SCRATCH GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOOD).** *Presenter: Intern Marcus Wager.*

Planning Intern, Marcus Wager, stated that the applicant's home sits on one of the two lots. They are working with a neighbor to redraw a boundary line to allow him to add on to his home. Changing the boundary will make the second lot 9,000 square feet and double the square footage of the applicant's lot to over 18,000 square feet. No trees will be removed from the properties. Intern Wager reported that the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the preliminary plat.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve the two-lot final plat called Amberwood Estates Plat E located at approximately 1132 East 740 South in the R1-9 (Single Family Residential) Zone. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

5) **Discussion regarding zoning restrictions on northwest quadrant of dennis baker's property.** *Presenter: Administrator Darrington.*

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, reported that last year decisions were made to restrict the zoning in the Interchange area that would require future developments be at least 50% retail. The initial decision was made last fall and the ordinance was passed in early January. The property in question, other than the hotel property, is all owned by Dennis Baker. Mr. Baker was approached by someone who is interested in developing a piece of the property as an office project. That piece of property is in the zone that requires retail development.

Mr. Baker requested that the retail requirement be removed from that piece of property. Mayor Daniels asked why that area is being limited to 50% office when the entire area was originally designated for office development. Administrator Darrington stated that the City Council has the power to remove the retail requirement but Mr. Baker only requested removing the retail requirement on the northwest quadrant and not on all of his property.

Dan Torfin from DMB Investments stated that they have been working on a concept plan for some time. When they discovered the new zoning they were concerned because the area had been planned as a corporate campus. They hoped to see the restriction removed from all of the property. Mr. Torfin believed there will be a mixture of office and retail along Pleasant Grove Boulevard even if the restriction is removed. He felt that office space will be a driver for additional retail.

They hope to continue development of the corporate campus and bring in multi-use development to maximize the area's success.

Council Member Boyd stated that they have had excellent discussions in the past with Torfin and Baker. They took a trip to Idaho to look at a similar development of Mr. Torfin's and felt that if they were to master plan the entire area, the Council would be more comfortable with Mr. Baker's request. Council Member Boyd stated that the property in Idaho is beautifully developed. If they have a similar vision for Mr. Baker's property as previously discussed, there would not likely be a problem with approval. She hoped to see a master plan for all of Mr. Baker's property.

Mr. Torfin stated that they had a master plan that included both retail and office. Many of the office tenants asked when restaurants will be developed in the area. The economy slowed the progress of the development but they would now like to begin again as soon as possible. Council Member Boyd was concerned that even if the master plan calls for retail, it will not go in if not required by the ordinance. She asked for some sort of safeguard for retail development. Mr. Torfin stated that if the City is overly restrictive, it will actually slow progress. He noted that the development of retail and office is market driven.

Administrator Darrington stated that the only guarantee the City has to hold a developer to their master plan is the zoning. Council Member Stanley asked if Mr. Baker would be amenable to different restrictions that would require more than 50% retail on some portions of his property and less than 50% on others. Mr. Torfin stated that they would like to be part of the conversation regarding restrictions. He noted that they were not involved in the conversation that put in place the current restrictions, which did not exist when they began development. They hoped to work with the City and be involved in public hearings.

Council Member LeMone asked why the City had not done a better job of informing and including Mr. Baker in the zone change. Administrator Darrington stated that when they initiated the temporary zone change, Mr. Baker was notified and he sent the City a letter expressing his opposition. He was not notified, however, when the adoption of the ordinance was made official. He felt that as a courtesy the City should have sent Mr. Baker notification of the change, although it was not required.

Administrator Darrington remarked that if the development is market driven there may never be retail on certain parts of the property. Council Member Boyd stated that if they want retail they need to have a plan in mind of how to make it happen. A market driven development may turn out to be office only. She felt it was short sighted of the City to not make a plan to maximize the retail space. McDonald's expressed interest in developing the property a few years earlier. Council Member LeMone asked if any other businesses had expressed an interest. Administrator Darrington stated that there were none to his knowledge. It was noted that the portion of the property with the best access has generated the most interest. Mr. Torfin stated that McDonald's has since purchased another parcel.

Council Member Boyd asked Mr. Torfin if he felt there was something that he, the City, and Mr. Baker could come up with together that will work for everyone. Mr. Torfin felt they could and was willing to sit down with the City to review the master plan. They were comfortable formalizing the plan with agreements as long as there is some flexibility as development occurs. Council

Member Boyd agreed that portions of the property will be difficult for retail due to frontage and road issues. Council Member Andersen agreed and saw no problem changing the zoning for what they are requesting as long as they meet again to discuss retail. Administrator Darrington stated that the reason the City Council initially created the zoning was to protect the City's interests and allow for further discussion with the developer of the property.

City Attorney, Tina Petersen, asked how much of the lower parcel would be used in this project. Mr. Torfin stated that the contract would be for the entire 9.64-acre piece. There have been two preliminary offers from developers but they could still lose the contract if the 50/50 requirement remains in place.

Administrator Darrington stated that a development agreement may be a good option to grant the applicant's request and ensure that the developer has a retail requirement. Council Member Boyd asked if it is possible to zone in a manner that would allow for a café or restaurant in an office building. Attorney Petersen believed it would be allowed as long as the use is permitted in the zone.

Mayor Daniels remarked that this particular request is not a Dennis Baker project. A third party expressed a desire to purchase 9.64 acres from Mr. Baker. Because the zoning ordinance changed from office to 50/50, they are ready to walk away from the deal. DMB Investments does not have any input or authority on what or how it will be developed. This request is a transaction to move the land from DMB to a third party who will need to come before the City and make a request for an office building. Mr. Torfin agreed and stated that much of the landscaping is already done. Mayor Daniels asked if DMB had built design standards into the contract requirements. He remarked that Mr. Baker's projects are always built to the very highest standards. Mr. Torfin did not believe any design requirements had been built into the contract.

Mayor Daniels commented that as development continues the vision for the area will be met. He felt that drawing up development agreements at this time may be premature based on other issues that are still being sorted out. He stated that the area could eventually become part of a greater whole. Demand is driven by what development is put in place. He felt that even if the restrictions are removed there is still a greater chance of having a master developer working on the area and driving what takes place there. Mayor Daniels then suggested that staff work with Mr. Torfin to determine the zoning in order to remove it from the two parcels in question.

Council Member Meacham felt there needs to be more discussion with DMB Investments on their commitment for the remainder of the project. Council Member Boyd commented that she feels that Mr. Baker and Mr. Torfin has the same vision as the Council does for that area and will be willing to have that conversation for the betterment of that corner.

Council Member Andersen asked if there is an urgency to work out the zoning for the parcel on the corner. Mr. Torfin stated that there are exciting plans for the area. They are currently in discussions with a group that could bring great things to the City. He thought it would be unfortunate to delay a development simply because of the 50/50 zoning.

Council Member LeMone stated that a development agreement may help the City feel at ease about changing the ordinance. She thought the City needed some sort of protection to ensure that both

parties get what they want. Mr. Torfin remarked that one of the parcels is already planned for five corporate buildings while other parcels have not been finalized. The Council felt that some sort of understanding or agreement with Mr. Baker would be important if they agreed to change the zoning requirements.

Mayor Daniels indicated that they are discussing lifting the 50/50 requirement on two parcels only. The City would still be protected on the other pieces. The way the ordinance is written, the other areas could be 100% retail and no less than 50% retail. Mayor Daniels asked if there was a reason to reduce the retail requirement.

Council Member Stanley stated that the thinking was that a mandatory 50% or greater retail would offset some of the lost guaranteed retail in the other parcels. Council Member Boyd remarked that it is important to look at the big picture. She felt it was possible to make the changes Mr. Baker would like while ensuring that the City has a safety net for the rest of the developable area. She stated that it would not take a lot of time to make the changes and draft an agreement.

Administrator Darrington asked if the City Council felt like the other parcels should be more than 50/50. If they are satisfied with 50/50, the zoning would not need to be changed and the restriction could be lifted on the requested parcels allowing for Mr. Torfin's project to proceed.

Council Member Andersen asked about the process for lifting the requirement. Attorney Petersen stated that it would involve an ordinance change. The most efficient way to accomplish it would be to remove the two parcels from the map. It would have to go through the Planning Commission but should move along fairly quickly. Council Member Boyd supported lifting the requirement on those parcels but wanted to know what protections the City has on the others.

Mayor Daniels stated that the City cannot prevent others from making a similar request in the future, but the Council has the power to deny the requests. The Council felt that the two parcels being discussed would be best suited as office space.

Council Member Boyd wanted more than just the zoning as protection for the City. Mayor Daniels expressed concern that if the restrictions are overly restrictive larger developers, who could do more and bring more to the City than the current applicant, will simply walk away rather than deal with the strict zoning. He felt that waiting to create a development agreement with a developer who wants to build on the 100 acres instead of five or nine would potentially be a better alternative.

Council Member Andersen noted that it was important that the community and developers realize that the Council is open to discussion. Council Member LeMone thought it was important for staff to encourage developers with questions to attend Council Meetings. She asked that staff keep Mr. Baker and others who are affected in the loop as discussions occur and progress is made.

Administrator Darrington stated that as he and staff prepare to sit down with Mr. Torfin they need to know what the Council wants them to discuss. They need to know if the zoning is adequate or if a development agreement is desired. Mayor Daniels clarified that four of the Council Members are comfortable moving forward with the removal of the 50/50 requirement on the two properties in question. He asked staff to move forward and rescind the requirement.

6) Discussion on accessory apartments.

Administrator Darrington stated that there are certain ordinances that restrict accessory apartments. Residents and others have requested that the restrictions be reconsidered. A model ordinance was created by a committee roughly five years earlier that was presented to the City in 2010. The City Council ultimately rejected it. Currently the City is opting not to enforce the ordinance. Last week the Council decided to review the model ordinance and make a decision on how to proceed.

Council Member Stanley asked what legal process would be required. Attorney Petersen indicated that there is no requirement other than that the local ordinance requires a public hearing for changes to be made to the zoning code. Administrator Darrington stated that the intent was to conduct all of the research and prepare the ordinance to present to the public at the public hearing.

Council Member LeMone wanted to establish a committee similar to what was created for the Public Safety Building as a way to get citizen input. She suggested they also review other cities' ordinances and requirements. After conducting the research they can present an ordinance to the City Council. She hoped a decision could be made by the end of the year. This would allow for a final product that is very transparent. The City is engaged in several important issues currently and creating a committee is a way to move forward without overwhelming the community.

Council Member Meacham asked what percentage of homes with accessory apartments is fully legal in cities where those apartments are allowed. This could have an impact on the City's infrastructure, particularly in the Transportation Master Plan. Council Member Andersen stated that she spoke with Orem City regarding their registration process and stated that their application is completely free. There is a permit fee, however, if the homeowner chooses to make updates or changes to their apartment. Since the moratorium in Orem was lifted, 10 applicants have come forward. There is only enforcement if there is a complaint. Council Member Andersen agreed with Council Member LeMone's suggestion and thought the model ordinance would give the committee a place to start.

Council Member LeMone reported that during the last public hearing, the City learned that the public wants off-street parking, a small number of tenants, and for the accessory apartment to be owner occupied. The citizen committee can refresh the research that has already been conducted.

Mayor Daniels reported that he spoke with members of staff about whether they can take on the extra work load in addition to the Public Safety Building. They thought it would depend how much work is delegated to the citizen committee. Administrator Darrington felt that by having the committee help in the process, staff can adequately address the issue.

Council Member Meacham requested that the committee involve a diverse group of people. Administrator Darrington stated that they will accept names from the Council or other citizens to consider to serve on the committee. Council Member Meacham stated that historically the City has been divided on the issue and it will be important for the committee to represent both sides.

7) Discussion on budget.

Finance Director, Dean Lundell, stated that the budget needs to be tentatively adopted by the following week. He reported that there is a 13% health insurance increase. There were discussions about how to reduce it. One option is to increase the plan deductible. It was reported that the traditional plan has a \$500 individual and \$1,000 family deductible, which will be increased to \$750 and \$1,500. The HSA plan will also increase. Employees will pay an additional \$6 per month.

Director Lundell reported that they are proposing a 2% pay increase for employees as previously discussed. There will be a 3% increase for the IT Consultant. The Technology Budget proposes to keep certain software updated on the City servers. The Recreation Center will fund new equipment and programs that will be paid off in three years. There will also be new staff consisting of a full-time Planner and a full-time Paralegal. Both positions are already partially funded.

Director Lundell explained that equity adjustments list all positions after the base salary for full-time employees. Funds have been allotted to replace 11 police radios at a cost of \$19,000. The City is considering three-year leases on new police cars to be purchased through Ken Garff Auto. Administrator Darrington stated that the City currently has a five-year lease for vehicles. Chief Smith requested that the City revert to a lease with a shorter term and expressed concern about repair costs associated longer leases. The shorter lease will cost approximately \$1,000 more per car for each of the 24 vehicles.

Mayor Daniels stated that this is something the public will ask about. He asked for more specifics about why they are choosing to move from a five-year to three-year lease when there is an added cost. The main reason had to do with warranty coverage and maintenance expenses. It was noted that the cost to fix a police car is far more than a typical vehicle. Chief Smith planned to address the Council in the next few weeks to explain why this decision was made.

Council Member Boyd asked if a final decision was made about new employees. Administrator Darrington stated that proposed positions have been added to the budget but are subject to Council approval.

Mayor Daniels stated that there were previous discussions about wage adjustments and getting all employees to at least the minimum step within their position pay range. Director Lundell stated that that issue was accounted for in the budget. Administrator Darrington indicated and that the change will be implemented by July. Council Member Boyd asked about the full-time Planner position. Administrator Darrington responded that in previous years the City employed a full-time Planner and office person in addition to the current employees filling those roles. In 2011, two employees were laid off to help balance the budget and because there was no demand due to lack of development in the community. There is, however, now enough development to justify a full-time Planner again. This position could potentially involve an Intern being transitioned to full-time.

Director Lundell reported that a basic roads plan has been drafted and stated that road maintenance funding is an issue in cities everywhere. Various cities have tried different tactics to improve their roads but it is always a challenge. American Fork City tried without success to pass a GO Bond. Provo City created a Transportation Fund that involves a fee that goes directly toward road maintenance. They spent a year conducting research before implementing the fee.

The main discussion around the country for road maintenance centers on a Gas Tax. The funds received from a Gas Tax are based on the number of gallons used. As cars become more gas efficient and people drive less, a Gas Tax becomes less of a long-term revenue source. The gas tax is determined on a state level. It was noted that the current gas tax allocates 30% to the cities.

Director Lundell reported that other funding options are GO bonds, property taxes, or road maintenance fees. After searching for other cities or states that have a road maintenance fee he was surprised to find that there are not as many as anticipated. This type of fee is dictated by cities rather than on the state level.

Road maintenance issues were discussed. Director Lundell stated that one challenge with roads is that when a large subdivision comes into a community, they bring beautiful new roads but also more maintenance for the City, which increases costs. In response to a question raised by Council Member Andersen, Director Lundell stated that the City's first road bond will expire in 2018. Administrator Darrington clarified that the City is using Class C monies to pay the bond rather than general obligation property tax.

Director Lundell felt that the main question was to determine how much the City will need to perform maintenance and updates. Additional research is needed to determine the dollar amount the City will need. Provo City determined that they will need \$4 million per year. They do not plan to build new roads but simply to maintain existing ones.

Administrator Darrington indicated that they know that \$2 million per year will not be enough for the City to keep up with its needs, but may be a good place to start. The actual cost might be closer to \$10 million per year to repair and maintain the roads. Currently, Pleasant Grove City receives roughly \$975,000 per year in Class C monies. An additional \$200,000 from energy taxes and a debt service payment of \$750,000 are all allocated to roads. After 2018, the City will have \$1.175 million to put toward maintenance.

Director Lundell stated that 46% of Provo's fee is paid by residential customers. Pleasant Grove would likely be closer to 65% if they do something similar. If the City wants the additional \$2 million as well as pay the debt service, the cost will be \$13.03 per month for residents. If the City waits until 2018 when the debt service has been paid, the rate for residents will be \$6.80. A great deal of research is needed to determine how much is really needed for roads. It was noted that the fees will appear on citizens' utility bills.

Mayor Daniels stated that the best case scenario would be for the City to have permission to levy a tax on gasoline since that is the best indicator as to who is driving. Mayor Daniels stated that more than any other issue, the residents feel that fixing the roads is one of the most important to address. He suggested another citizen committee be formed to assist in the process. Director Lundell stated that the first thing the Council and staff need to do is determine how much money is required each year to fix and maintain the roads. Once that number is determined the City can ask residents how quickly they want to see the roads repaired, which will help determine the cost.

Council Member LeMone asked if it is possible to use the Class C reserve account to repair major roads immediately in an effort to show residents that the City is serious. Administrator Darrington stated that they recently created a 10-year road plan that is currently being executed. Public Works

Director, Lynn Walker, stated that the main roads are not the biggest problem and smaller roads need the most work. Council Member LeMone reported that a citizen group may be able to help determine the level of service the community would like to see. Council Member Andersen did not think the general citizenry understands what is involved in fixing roads and the time and money involved. A citizen committee could help educate the public on that issue.

Mayor Daniels stated that the road issue will not go away and the roads will continue to deteriorate. The Council and staff need to create a plan that involves a study and discussion with the public to explain the current condition of the roads and determine how quickly the community wants them repaired. The public needs to understand the options and costs. Administrator Darrington stated that additional research needs to be conducted before the citizen committee is formed. July 1, 2015, was set as the date to impose the plan and work to create a timeline.

Council Member Stanley preferred that the citizenry vote on issues that will substantially increase taxes. Administrator Darrington indicated that it will be up to the Council to put the fee issue to a vote. Council Member Andersen thought all would agree that the roads need work. She felt it was only a matter of determining the level of service they are willing to pay for.

Mayor Daniels stated that when the Council Members are asked about roads they can say that the initial discussion was held and they have analyzed the research conducted regarding what other cities are doing, what states supreme courts have upheld laws created for similar issues, and the details of Provo's recently approved road project. They can share information about the current bond and work to determine the exact dollar amount needed for Pleasant Grove.

Council Member Meacham asked if the projects on the 10-year road plan are being actively worked on. Director Walker indicated that they were.

Director Lundell stated that several utility rate increases were included in the budget. TSSD is raising their rates, which means that the sewer increase will be roughly \$1.65 per month, per household. The water surcharge is \$1.25 over 12 months but can also be charged only during the heaviest water months, which will make the increase higher over a shorter period of time. Director Lundell proposed increasing the culinary water charge by \$1.56 due to capital projects. It was possible to delay increasing the rate for another year but there are large projects coming up in the next few years that total roughly \$1.6 million. Raising the fee now will help the City accumulate money and potentially avoid the need to borrow later. It would also not be difficult to get a small loan to finance the project. It was noted that the garbage utility will also increase by \$0.83.

Director Lundell stated that with the proposed utility increases, the total cost per month per household is \$6.74. Mayor Daniels stated that if the City can get ahead of the curve they can pay for upcoming projects and avoid paying interest, which ultimately leaves more money for other projects.

Council Member LeMone stated that there will always need to be an increase to stay on top of upcoming projects. This is one way the City can plan for upcoming projects without having to impose large rate increases all at once. The public frequently asks the City to plan ahead and minimize debt. The culinary water increase is one way to accomplish that. Director Lundell

remarked that anything that is not increased this year will have to be increased at a higher rate next year.

Administrator Darrington reported that a public hearing is held as part of the budget approval process. When rate increases occur, the City notifies the public of the public hearing. Council Member Boyd asked that additional verbiage be added to the public hearing notice to ensure that residents are aware of the increases as well as the public hearing. She asked if it would be possible for the City to pay for the water from Orem this year, which would reduce the utility increase by \$1.25 per household. Administrator Darrington stated that the City did that last year and cannot do it again.

Mayor Daniels stated that the utility rate increase will take effect July 1 and the public hearing will be conducted the first Tuesday in June. The City can advertise the public hearing over the next few weeks and the Council can come back and discuss what they learned from the public. The public safety discussions will take place in August and the GO bond will be voted on in November.

In response to a question raised by Council Member Stanley, it was reported that the average utility bill is \$110, which means what is proposed represents a 5% increase. Director Lundell stated that there are specific reasons why each fee is being increased. While there is a consequence for not raising the fees now, it would be possible to reduce some of the fee increases. Mayor Daniels explained that the proposed increase helps the City plan for a day when they are reducing debt and paying cash. The City Council and citizens have recognized that planning for the future is very important.

City Engineer, Degen Lewis, suggested the citizens know why the rates have increased and specify which rates have not been increased. He explained that the City has not raised sewer rates due to the life of the sewer system being extended, which keeps rates low. Administrator Darrington stated that a letter would be included in the utility bills and in the City newsletter with an itemized explanation of the increases.

Administrator Darrington reported that last time capital projects were discussed the Council asked staff to prioritize them. They created a priority list consisting of projects that have to be addressed immediately, projects that can be delayed, and projects that can be pushed back one year. There is \$418,000 available with Priority 1 projects totaling \$352,677. Priority 2 projects will then be analyzed.

Administrator Darrington recommended the City work on completing Shannon Fields but recognized that they may need to use some impact fee money, which will leave additional funds in the General Fund. There could also be additional funds as a result of the sale of Battle Creek. It was noted that staff has worked to reduce costs on capital projects wherever possible.

Director Giles stated that swimming pool updates at the Recreation Center need to be done this year. These updates will significantly extend the life of the pool and the pumps. The slide will also be repaired.

Administrator Darrington stated that the department heads worked together to prioritize the list. Mayor Daniels asked if some Priority 2 items could be accomplished this year. It was reported that the department heads have not discussed the matter but can work on prioritizing the projects.

The Mayor and Council thanked Director Lundell for his excellent work on the budget. Administrator Darrington stated that the issues discussed tonight will be in budget form next week and available for review by the public. He stated that after tonight's discussion the budget will be set. He invited anyone with questions to raise them now. Council Member LeMone asked about the condition of the City Hall roof and if it really needs to be Priority 1. Director Giles responded that it is leaking significantly. She asked if public opinion would be negative with respect to fixing a roof since they are working toward a new Public Safety Building. Director Giles felt it would not be a problem since the City will continue to use the building even after the new Public Safety Building is completed.

Council Member LeMone asked about the electrical upgrades proposed for the Library. Arts and Culture Director, Sheri Britsch, remarked that currently she has to flip the breakers to get the lights to turn on. An electrician provided an estimate for several items including adding a light switch to turn on the power. She commented that it would be nice to not have to flip the breakers but not nearly as important as adding outlets under the tables and along the wall for computers. The new carpet will be placed only on the main floor of the Library. She stated that the Library will likely be closed for a few days to paint, carpet, and perform the electrical work. Council Member Andersen had a potential corporate sponsor to complete the children's area of the Library and asked to discuss it with Director Britsch.

Administrator Darrington stated that the Priority 1 list totals roughly \$200,000. There was a chance that some items on that list could be completed as well. He reported that the last date to legally pass the budget is June 17, which is also Strawberry Days. He asked if the Council would prefer to adopt the budget on June 10 rather than meet during Strawberry Days. A public hearing also needs to be held prior to the final vote on the budget. The Council agreed to hold the public hearing on June 10 and meet briefly on June 17.

Administrator Darrington stated that there have been previous discussions about how to increase the wages of part-time fire fighters. The cost will be roughly \$35,000. Fire Chief, Marc Sanderson, stated that the intent was to implement a plan so that over the next five to six years there will be funds available to pay those costs. It is not currently funded or included in the budget, but it is something to consider. Mayor Daniels recommended it be added to the budget.

8) **DISCUSSION ON AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE MAY 6, 2014 CITY COUNCIL MEETING.**

Administrator Darrington commented that there is long list of agenda items for the May 6 meeting. Staff recommended reaching out to Director Young to determine if there are any questions.

9) **EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY (UCA 52-4-205 (1)(d)), THE SALE OF REAL PROPERTY (UCA 52-4-205(e)) AND PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION. (UCA 52-4-205 1 (c))**

Mayor Daniels asked for a motion to go into executive session to discuss the purchase, exchange, lease of real property, the sale of real property and pending or reasonably imminent litigation.

ACTION: At 9:50 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to go into executive session to discuss the purchase, exchange, lease of real property, the sale of real property and reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Andersen seconded and the motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

PRESENT:

Mayor: Mike Daniels

Council Members:

Dianna Andersen

Cindy Boyd

Cyd LeMone

Jay Meacham

Ben Stanley

Staff Present:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator

Tina Petersen, City Attorney

Degen Lewis, City Engineer

Kathy Kresser, City Recorder

At

10) ADJOURN.

ACTION: At 10:45 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn to come out of executive session and adjourn. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion, and the motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 10: 45 p.m.

This certifies that the City Council Minutes of April 29, 2014 are a true, full and correct copy as approved by the City Council on June 3, 2014.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

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