

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
February 10, 2015
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Cindy Boyd
Cyd LeMone
Jay Meacham
Ben Stanley

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Dean Lundell, Finance Director
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Dave Thomas, Fire Chief
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Lynn Walker, Public Works Director
Degen Lewis, City Engineer
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder

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 all Council Members were present.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Scout Isaac Fossom.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The opening remarks were given by Council Member Meacham.

4) **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

ACTION: Council Member Boyd moved to approve the agenda as written. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

5) OPEN SESSION

Mayor Daniels opened the open session.

Frank Andersen gave his address as 793 Orchard Drive and commented on the Public Safety Building. As the City Council moves forward, whether they agree to accept the Mayor's proposal or choose some other option, he hoped they would keep in mind the ultimate goal. The decision should be based on what will best unite the community. Mr. Andersen stated that there are currently two distinct sides in this dispute and neither side will, or can, hear the other. Citizens on both sides have posted negative and hurtful comments on social media rather than speaking with each other about the issue. Mr. Andersen was in favor of the Mayor's proposal to create a separate council or committee to address the matter. He understood how it would be favorable to have representatives from both sides, each having an equal opportunity to make their opinions heard, and then come up with solutions that both parties can agree on. Mr. Anderson felt that the committee meetings should be equal in terms of representation, recorded, and posted for all to see so the parties can be accountable for their actions.

Mr. Anderson commented that this could be the most important issue in the upcoming election. If the committee was approved and formed it may not be an issue if the Public Safety Building issue is not completely resolved by the election deadline. The election could be very contentious if action isn't taken.

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

6) CONSENT ITEMS

- a) **City Council Minutes:
City Council Minutes for the January 13, 2015 Meeting.
City Council Minutes for the January 21, 2015 Meeting.**

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve the consent items. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

7) PRESENTATIONS

A) MAYOR DANIELS RECOGNIZED RICK HEILBUT FOR HIS INDUCTION INTO THE AMERICAN SOFTBALL ASSOCIATION HALL OF FAME AS AN UMPIRE.

Mr. Heilbut described the process he went through to obtain the award. Mr. Daniels thanked Mr. Heilbut for his service to the community.

B) MAYOR DANIELS RECOGNIZED JULIA WHETMAN FOR HER SERVICE TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

It was reported that Ms. Whetman served on the Planning Commission from January 2010 to January 2015, and she brought to the Commission a voice of reason. Ms. Whetman thanked the Council for their recognition.

C) REBECCA CALL, CITY COUNCIL MEMBER FROM SARATOGA SPRINGS, ADDRESSED THE EPA ISSUES FACING ALL CITIES THAT DISCHARGE TO UTAH LAKE.

Ms. Call spoke on behalf of the Utah Lake Commission. She explained that the City of Pleasant Grove is one of the few surrounding cities that does not currently belong to the Utah Lake Commission. They have, however, met with Mayor Daniels in the past to request support. Ms. Call was present with the express purpose of seeking the City's support and to explain why Pleasant Grove City should be involved. She stated that Utah Lake is an integral part of the County for many reasons, some of which do not directly affect the City since they do not have any shoreline property. She explained, however, that the Lake affects all cities in the County on some level. The reason they were requesting support was due to upcoming regulations that may affect the communities financially.

At times, the Utah Lake Commission receives unfunded mandates on the state and federal level. They have determined that when they contribute money for preventative measures, they see a savings of ten to 100 fold. The EPA has given Utah leeway to create their own standards before they enforce their own, but they require the Commission to fund it themselves. Commissioner Larry Ellertson has worked to rally the cities to agree upon and set these standards. Based on the criteria established, Pleasant Grove City will be asked to pay \$5,000 per year.

Mayor Daniels requested that Ms. Call expound on how the City would potentially be affected by the standards set by the Commission. Ms. Call explained that all of the communities in Utah County discharge water into the Lake, and there are processes to clean the water. The restrictions on those processes are getting stricter. Pleasant Grove City is not exempt from the EPA Standards of the Department of Environmental Quality just because they don't have shoreline. They need Pleasant Grove City to advocate for their residents.

In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Ms. Call explained that the contributions from the cities and other interested parties would be used to fund an Executive Director and Secretary. All other staff members are funded from outside sources. Council Member LeMone asked what the roles of these individuals would be. Ms. Call explained that the Executive Director and Secretary would administer what the Utah Lake Commission decides to do. If Pleasant Grove contributes to the Commission, they would have a seat on the board with equal say in Commission's dealings. Meetings would be held once per month.

Council Member Meacham asked if there were other districts or organizations involved in the Utah Lake Commission. It was confirmed that Central Utah, Alpine Water Quality, and a number of other state agencies are involved in the Commission. They would like to have representatives from each municipality to voice the concerns of their residents.

There was discussion about the role of the Timpanogos Special Service District (TSSD) in the issue. Mr. Ellertson stated that the Utah Lake Commission does not set standards for their storm water discharge, which are set by the State. They are, however, a contributor to the discharge into Utah Lake which is why they serve on the board. This Commission will act as an advocate in terms of storm water discharge for the area.

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, informed the Council that they could add this item to the February 24 Budget Work Session if they desire to discuss this item further. Mayor Daniels requested the item be discussed at that time. Ms. Call confirmed that the other cities not involved would be Genola, Goshen, Eagle Mountain, and Elberta. There is also a website with further information on the Commission at www.utahlake.gov.

8. ACTION ITEMS READY FOR VOTE:

- A) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2015-04) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO DECLARE VARIOUS FIRE DEPARTMENT UNIFORMS AS SURPLUS, AND DIRECT THAT THEY BE DISPOSED OF ACCORDING TO THE CITY'S POLICY FOR DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PROPERTY. *Presenter: Fire Chief, Dave Thomas.***

Fire Chief, Dave Thomas, informed the Council that a uniform change was made last year, at which time they exchanged the dark blue/gray uniforms for black. As a result, the Fire Department has been left with a number of blue uniforms that are of no use to them. There are 62 pairs of pants and 54 shirts, as well as some other leftover items. Some are well worn, while others are still in good condition. Chief Thomas hoped to surplus the extra items. Any identifiable marks and patches will be removed. Provo Fire Chief, Gary Jolly, expressed interest in some of the uniforms, but the ones that are unusable need to be disposed of properly.

In response to a question from Council Member Meacham, Chief Thomas stated that uniforms can be rather expensive, at a cost of at least \$100 per shirt or pant. He could offer the unused uniforms to Chief Jolly for a fraction of that cost.

Council Member Stanley requested information regarding the color change. Chief Thomas stated that there were several reasons for the change, including the desire to look less like police officers, as their uniforms are navy in color.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve Resolution (2015-04) authorizing the Mayor to declare various Fire Department uniforms as surplus, and direct that they be disposed of according to the City's policy for disposing of surplus property. Council Member Boyd seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

9. ACTION ITEMS WITH PUBLIC DISCUSSION

- A) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2015-6) PLEASANT GROVE CITY PUBLIC WORKS STANDARD SPECIFICATION MANUAL BY ADDING "APPENDIX A – STORM WATER TECHNICAL MANUAL & BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES" AND UDOT SPECIFICATIONS FOR UNTREATED BASE AND GRANULAR BORROW MATERIALS FOR ROAD REPAIR, AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. CITY WIDE. *Presenter: City Engineer, Degan Lewis.***

Engineer Lewis presented the proposal to the City Council and indicated that Appendix "A" is an update to the Public Works Standard Specification Manual. The untreated base and granular borrow material request came from Victor Johnson, the owner of Geneva Rock. Mr. Johnson brought to

staff's attention the inconsistency of the materials used for road construction throughout the state. He stated that his company makes a lot of the materials used by UDOT and would like to provide those same materials to Pleasant Grove for road construction. Mr. Johnson was requesting that the City adopt the UDOT specifications for untreated base and granular borrow materials to create more consistency throughout the area. Engineer Lewis stated that copies of the revised Appendix A the untreated base and granular borrow materials information were included in the packets for review.

Mayor Daniels asked if there was a significant price difference between the products required by UDOT and the ones the City currently requires. Engineer Lewis responded that he was not sure of the exact amounts, but in some cases it could be less expensive because the materials created for UDOT are produced in larger quantities than the ones produced for Pleasant Grove alone.

Council Member Meacham indicated that a portion of the Appendix addresses providing financial guarantees. He was concerned whether this is the correct direction to go since the City becomes liable for any unfinished work if they have contracted with an outside party. Engineer Lewis stated that this choice was at the Council's discretion. He explained why developers enter into bonds before construction is complete and how this could be helpful or harmful to the City. There was a discussion regarding the unwelcomed risks the City takes on when developers fail to finish a project, and the City takes over. Council Member Meacham did not agree with the language in the proposed ordinance about financial guarantees. Engineer Lewis stated that the language in the Storm Water Manual proposal is reflective of the language in the UDOT ordinance.

With regard to the materials used, Council Member Meacham stated that most cities use APWA specifications. He asked if the materials outlined were available to the City. Engineer Lewis assumed as much. He declared that the reason this proposal came before the Council was at the specific request of Geneva Rock, one of the largest suppliers of these materials in the State. Staff preferred to adopt another standard with adjustments than to try to create their own City specifications.

Council Member Meacham asked if they should be following APWA specifications, since they were created for cities, while UDOT specifications were created for State transportation. He felt that the APWA standards would be more applicable to their situation. In response, Engineer Lewis commented that the UDOT specifications were great and that they normally require a more high-end product. They may have higher standards than the City needs but he felt this would be worth exploring.

Council Member Meacham requested that Mr. Johnson be given time at a future meeting to present and answer questions from the Council regarding price differences and specific materials. Engineer Lewis stated that the proposal would not be a replacement to their current standards but could be used in addition to them. He reiterated that the proposal was driven by an individual company and not by staff. Council Members LeMone and Meacham agreed that they would like Mr. Johnson to expound on the items they have questions about.

With regard to the ordinance language, Council Member Meacham asked City Attorney, Tina Petersen, if it was appropriate to reference UDOT specifications rather than put the same specifications directly into the ordinance. Attorney Petersen responded that by referring to the UDOT standards, the City is agreeing to accept whatever their standards may be and accept them whenever they may change. If the Council desired to put their own specifications into the ordinance

in detail, they would have to go back and evaluate whether to change to the new specifications or not. This would not be a bad option since the Council may not agree with future changes. To add to that, Engineer Lewis indicated that there were two specifications included in the ordinance as they currently stand, which the Council can adopt and reference as part of the amendment. The ordinance refers to the UDOT specifications as they are today, not to the UDOT specifications in general. The focus is on the materials referenced rather than everything in the UDOT specifications.

Council Member LeMone asked if the City will have to do an RFP process in this situation. Mayor Daniels stated that they would not. This application pertains to the type of materials used and standards that the providers will be held to. He asked Council Member Meacham if he had concerns regarding the materials referenced, to which he responded that he would like to research the APWA standards before making a decision. Engineer Lewis stated that staff needs to explore the standards more fully, however, from the research he has done thus far, he felt that the APWA standards are not entirely appropriate to their city either. For this reason staff wanted to adopt the UDOT specifications with modifications. In time, they will be able to determine what is most applicable to Pleasant Grove City.

Mayor Daniels summarized the proposal and discussion. The proposal was to move to the UDOT specifications, primarily because the larger suppliers would be more likely to produce them in greater quantities, making them more readily available at a reasonable price. In addition, the APWA specifications would be reviewed at a later date and the ordinance possibly adjusted to be more suited to the City's needs. Engineer Lewis also added to the summary that the City could update their own specifications.

Engineer Lewis stated that the main difference with the proposed materials and what they currently use is the gradation. He saw nothing wrong with using the same gradation standards that UDOT is currently using. Again, with further research, the City can create their own specifications about proper gradation.

Mayor Daniels proposed a question to the engineers present at the meeting. He asked if there would be any risk to the citizens of the City or the developers if they switched from the current standard to the UDOT specifications. The response was no. Mayor Daniels stated that if there was not risk involved, and there was a potential financial savings, he didn't see a reason this shouldn't be adopted.

Discussion continued on whether adoption of the UDOT specifications would be an upgrade or downgrade from what they currently have. Engineer Lewis stated that one isn't necessarily better than the other, they are just different.

Council Member Meacham recommended that as they move forward, the Council consider a specification developed for cities rather than a State. He understood that the State specifications are more available, but he would like to see research into other municipalities and their specifications. With this request, Council Member Meacham was in favor of the proposal.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the public hearing.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved to adopt an Ordinance (2015-6) Pleasant Grove City Public Works Standard Specification Manual by adding “Appendix A – Storm Water Technical Manual & Best Management Practices” and UDOT specifications for untreated base and granular borrow materials for road repair, and providing for an effective date. A public hearing was held. Council Member Meacham seconded the motion.

Before the vote was taken, Council Member Meacham asked Engineer Lewis if the term “granular” includes the backfill borrow included in the specification. It was concluded that even through the term “backfill” was not mentioned in the proposal, it is included in the document and is acceptable.

A voice vote was taken. Council Members Boyd, LeMone, Meacham, Andersen, and Stanley voted "Aye". The motion carried.

10) DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR THE FEBRUARY 17, 2015 MEETING.

Note: The City Council chose to discuss Item 11 before Item 10.

Mayor Daniels stated that the agenda for the next City Council meeting has been prepared. Item 8A on that agenda will be to consider approval of a request for a Class “A” off-premise beer license for the 7-Eleven Convenience Store and Fuel Station located at 715 South Main Street.

City Attorney, Tina Petersen, explained that the applicants will be purchasing the franchise for that store location. Whenever ownership changes, the new owners have to qualify for their own alcohol license from the City. More information regarding this item will be provided to the City Council members at a later date. She explained that this is normally a simple decision for the City Council, unless something unusual is discovered, which will be reported immediately.

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION – NO ACTION TAKEN.

Administrator Darrington introduced the topic of the Public Safety Building and reported that several weeks prior, there was a City Planning Retreat where the matter was discussed. The direction staff received from the elected officials at that time was to pursue an RFP for engineering services to examine four public safety buildings, namely the Fire Station, Recreation Center, The Beck Home, and the Seminary Building. The other part of that direction was to look into forming a committee to potentially address this issue for the upcoming year. Administrator Darrington stated that a few weeks ago a resident commented that the committee should consist of the City Council, and not necessarily include other residents on the committee. In response to that discussion, Mayor Daniels suggested that he and Administrator Darrington meet and identify options to present to the City Council. They found numerous ways to proceed, with pros and cons to each situation. It was noted that the RFP is straight forward, but the option of a committee needs to be discussed with the full Council.

Mayor Daniels commented on the suggestion from resident Molly Andrew a few weeks prior. She suggested that the governing body form the committee that would hear presentations on the items to be discussed regarding the Public Safety Buildings. The public would be invited to attend those meetings and be able to participate. Based on the discussions, the City Council would make the decisions. The meetings would be public, recorded, and published for all to see. Ms. Andrew stated that the Council was elected to represent the people, and having them as the committee would

streamline the process. Mayor Daniels believed there were merits to this option but had been contacted through email, phone, and Facebook, and the citizens expressed concerns with this option.

Mayor Daniels gave a history of the issues regarding the Public Safety facilities. In 2013, a decision was made by the City Council with advice from staff, and the public felt they had not been given the opportunity to voice their opinions. This ended in discussion and consternation, and the vote that year was affected by it. Again in 2014, the decision was made to restart the Public Safety discussion, and how it was guided was also derived from initiation from the Council. A Steering Committee made up primarily of representatives from City staff or the City Council. That effort resulted in defeat of the bond again. Mayor Daniels was concerned that if they start down that path again, with the City Council being the only group hearing and making decisions, it may go back to where it was in 2013, with members of the community with opinions and expertise not having a place at the table to express their views.

Mayor Daniels also had concern regarding the upcoming election, where there will be three Council seats up for decision from the public. Whatever effort is undertaken regarding the Public Safety Buildings this year, the election will be part of the discussion. In the past, they entered into these discussions with an artificial time frame, constraining the Council and public to try to hit a date, which was usually a date by which language had to be produced to be on a ballot. Invariably the research was cut short in order to reach that date. It was noted that past efforts failed.

Mayor Daniels' other concern pertained to the investigations and inquiries currently being conducted by the Lieutenant Governor. He was concerned that the heat of these three issues will not allow for a homogenous group of people to come together and develop a sense of trust.

The topic of the discussion was Mayor Daniels' proposal to create a committee that would be comprised of at least one or two members of the City Council, two residents who were strongly opposed to the bond proposed last year, two residents who were in favor of the bond, and two residents who were divided or neutral. The seventh member of the group would be the Mayor himself, who would act as Chair. The committee meetings would be public with all of the options expressed being discussed, researched, and vetted. The committee could make recommendations on what options need to be explored, but ultimately the decisions would be brought back to the City Council for approval, particularly where expenditures of funds are involved.

Mayor Daniels felt that the proposal was in the best interest of solving the problem of the Public Safety Building, while making sure the public feels satisfied that everything has been examined and all voices have been heard. The citizens need to feel confident that they are being represented on this important issue.

Council Member LeMone expressed appreciation to Mayor Daniels for the time and effort he put into coming up with this proposal. There was discussion to confirm that the proposed membership would be two residents for, two against, two neutral, one or two members from the City Council, and the Mayor. Mayor Daniels felt this would balance the makeup of the group and the strongest minds would be at the table representing all sides of the issue.

In response to a question from Council Member LeMone, Mayor Daniels explained that the role of the committee would be to be responsible for the investigative work that will take place, either by themselves or choosing to outsource and use professionals. They would then bring that information

back to the committee to be reviewed by all parties. Together the committee would evaluate each proposal and decide what they want to move forward with. The ultimate decisions would be brought back to the City Council.

Council Member Meacham asked how the exploration and research would take place, and if the Mayor would be making those assignments. Mayor Daniels replied that the committee would be responsible for identifying what work needs to be done, and which ideas need to be researched. They would either conduct this research themselves, or seek expertise from elsewhere. The results would be brought back to the committee, and the public would be invited to attend and discuss them. Council Member Meacham expressed concern that if the committee decides to hire professionals to research every decision, it could get expensive.

Administrator Darrington reminded the Council that if any decisions need to be made regarding the expenditure of funds, they would be brought back to the City Council since the Council has to authorize expenses. Mayor Daniels added that if the committee reaches a proposal that they agree on it will also be brought back before the City Council to be put on a ballot for a vote.

Mayor Daniels commented that much of the underlying problem with this subject pertains to the level of professionalism and research done to bring a final recommendation forward. If the committee truly wants to solve the problem, they will pick the best possible solution that will gain the support of the majority of citizens. It is the confidence of the people that the Council needs to consider.

Council Member Meacham questioned if they could promote the citizens to establish their own committee and bring that forward to the Council. He wanted to steer clear of committees altogether. Mayor Daniels commented that there should be someone to take on the responsibility of coming up with these options and stand behind their decisions and back the end product. Mayor Daniels repeated that the committee meetings will be public and the citizens will be invited and encouraged to participate. The goal is to have a smaller group of people that represent all sides of the issue to make sure that all of the options put forward are well vetted, and everyone feels represented.

Council Member Boyd was not in favor of the proposal and was confused about what the City Council's place would be in the process. Mayor Daniels attempted to clarify the confusion and stated that the committee will consist of a group empowered to research the project, look at all of the options, and make sure they are all on the table. If it is determined that expenses are required, they would present that request to the City Council for a decision. The Council would determine what a valid expense would be. The committee determines what options are worth exploring and presents the thoroughly researched options to the City Council for a final decision.

Council Member Boyd connected with Frank Andersen's comment from earlier that evening and agreed that there is a divide in the City that is growing. She did not see the committee uniting people, but rather keeping them divided. The citizens elected the Council to make these decisions, and everything Mayor Daniels described in his proposal are things the City Council is supposed to be doing. The Council should be representing the citizens, conducting and delegating the research, and presenting the options in public meetings. The public should also be able to give input during meetings.

Council Member Stanley was in favor of the Mayor's proposal and believed there was merit and value to having an investigative arm that can conduct the research to resolve the issue. Ideally, every option would be fully and fairly researched and presented in open and transparent meetings. One of the values of bringing somewhat polarized opinions together is that it can be an acknowledgement of the reality that there is a great division. If everyone meets together, they can hopefully come up with solutions and a proposal that will have 70 to 90% of the City behind it from the start. He remarked that there is a tremendous need to fully and fairly vet all options and he felt this was a great way to approach it.

Council Member Stanley was comfortable with the proposal, although there may be some discussion needed over the initial formation of the committee and in choosing its members. This is an approach that could, when handled correctly, bring healing to the City, which is the broadest goal of Mayor Daniels and the City Council. Council Member Stanley also commented that this decision should not be delayed in light of campaigns or other issues. A solution needs to be found for the safety of the citizens. He asked if the RFP process was being held until a decision on the committee is made. Administrator Darrington responded that the RFP had not yet been issued. Council Member Boyd suggested that they wait until they receive the results of the RFP before making a decision on the committee.

In response to a question from Council Member LeMone, Mayor Daniels confirmed that he would make his recommendations to the City Council who will vote on the names presented. Council Member Meacham gave his opinion on Mayor Daniels' proposal and sides with Council Member Boyd. He felt there was no need for a committee and if a committee were formed it would not unite the community, but keep them divided. He also expressed his desire to get the RFP process moving immediately, stating that this issue is more pressing than forming a committee.

Council Member Andersen communicated her concerns and believed it was important to figure out why the general population of the City voted "no" on the latest bond. It could have been a location issue, the fact that they didn't support a brand new building, they could have been opposed to the cost, or any other reason. The Council needs to know what the public was opposed to so they can come up with a better solution. She also stated that she wants to be a part of the committee in some way. She wants to be a part of the process and be able to comment on the options presented. The main problem with the Steering Committee was that there were a few people making the decisions, having conversations, and giving input. The meetings were not public, not recorded, and a lot of research was never presented. She did not want to be left out of the committee this time.

Mayor Daniels asked Council Member Andersen if she would feel included if she were invited to the meetings, but not sitting at the table. She replied that her preference would be to sit at the table. Mayor Daniels stated that there are many citizens that would feel the same way as Council Member Andersen. Everyone wants to be involved, but not everyone can have a seat at the table.

Council Member Boyd said that most of the residents in attendance that night will be the same people who will attend future meetings when the item is on the agenda. The group present, the Council and the public, should act as the committee. Council Member LeMone was in favor of getting started with the RFP process, and waiting until the numbers come back on the four buildings before a committee is formed. She believed that as elected officials it is the duty and obligation of the Council to be at the table for these discussions and the public should always be invited. Council Member LeMone agreed that Mayor Daniels should act as the moderator, just as a normal Council

Meeting is run. Also, this issue should not be rushed and every option weighed and analyzed, which will help the Council, staff, and the community come together to solve the Public Safety Building issue. It was important to come up with a resolution that will be agreeable to the majority of the citizens so that there will be less contention when the matter is placed on the ballot.

Mayor Daniels asked those present to show by a raise of hands if they would feel comfortable and fairly represented if the Council formed the decision-making body, taking responsibility for the research and delegating assignments, and having the public attend open meetings to express their opinions. The Council and public gave their input rather showing by a raise of hands.

Council Member LeMone clarified that the Council's decisions would be based on the public opinions expressed at the meeting. Anyone would be welcome to attend to present research or make comment.

Council Member Meacham asked if the end goal of the proposed committee would be to arrive at proper verbiage that would go on a ballot for a public vote. Mayor Daniels explained that the end goal would be to resolve the Public Safety Building concerns. It would be up to the committee to put forward a recommendation that the majority of the public would vote on.

Council Member Boyd clarified that there is a difference between a public meeting and a public hearing. In her opinion, these should not just be public meetings where the public comes and listens to the Council discuss the issue. Each meeting should be a public hearing that would be open to the public for comment and discussion. Administrator Darrington added that the public hearing is a specific format where the public is free to talk. This could be a format where things are discussed among the governing body and the meeting would be opened up to the group for their opinion on the information presented. This would be more of a dialogue form of discussion.

The Council expressed a desire to open the meeting to the public for input on the matter.

William Bridgers gave his address as 1005 East 450 South and recommended a committee of the whole format that may give the Council what they desire while maintaining control of the situation. This parliamentary procedure means that the Council would be in charge of the meeting and it is opened for public discussion. The meeting can be closed at any time by a vote of the Council, if they desire. For example, if the discussion reaches a point where a decision has to be made, they could close the Committee of the Whole and bring it back to the Council for a vote. Mr. Bridgers also suggested that the Public Safety Building issue be broken up into smaller, more manageable issues, which would insure that progress is being made.

Debbie Hong gave her address as 992 East 1100 North. She admitted that she was not in favor of a committee because she would like to come to the meetings and have the opportunity to give public comment. Ms. Hong would be more comfortable with this than relying on two people to represent her. She was tired of the fighting that has been going on because of this issue. Ms. Hong also remarked that individuals are more likely to be kind and open to other perspectives if the discussions take place face to face, rather than through social media. The community needs to have more peaceful and respectful discussions and she was sure that having more open meetings for the public will enable this to occur.

Greg Warburton gave his address as 779 East Center Street. He agreed with the comments given by Ms. Hong. In the past, it was difficult for smaller committees to communicate their findings and research to the entire City. Mr. Warburton witnessed this at the Blue Ribbon Committee meetings, and was disgusted that the information was not disbursed to the public. A lot of time and money went into the work of the Blue Ribbon Committee and that research was never presented. Mr. Warburton wanted to see the City come together and communicate, particularly if the public has more opportunities to participate. He stated that he fully believes that the elected officials should be able to vote on the issue.

Eileen Billings gave her address of 1245 North 380 East and stated that she has not seen any progress with this issue even though it has been in the interest of the City for a long time. Recently, Ms. Billings attended a meeting at the Fire Station and gave her views on the issue. She was booed by her own neighbors to such an extent that she had to leave. She likened this situation to the Biblical parable of the man who was given a talent by the master, and buried it. The City doesn't seem to be moving forward and she believed the community will flounder if they are not making progress. Ms. Billings reminded those present that the City is not entirely safe and they need a proper police station for their public safety. She felt it was a very important issue but that a committee will just keep them going in circles.

Lindsey Swayze gave her address as 1141 North 300 East and remarked that she remains undecided on the issue of the Public Safety Buildings. She explained that part of the problem is that the Council has made it clear how they felt in the last elections, and she believed they were siding with the minority. Ms. Swayze thought there was a lot of mistrust between the public and the City Council. If the Council will listen to the majority who were not in favor of the bond option, they will feel more properly represented. Ms. Swayze was unconvinced that a committee is the solution to the problem but she did not think the Council will get the support they need if they just take the lead on making these important decisions. She pointed out that this is what happened in the past, and it did not work. The best solution would be to find common ground between those on both sides of the issue and those who are undecided so that all sides are fairly represented and confident in the final decisions.

Jack Freeman who resides at 450 East 100 North, was pleased with what was happening and the fact that the public is able to express their concerns and be heard. He also likes that the Council has a desire to be impartial. Mr. Freeman reminded the Council that they were elected to represent all the Pleasant Grove citizens, regardless of their own personal opinions. Mr. Freeman also informed the Council that the majority of the citizens did not vote on the bond issue. He had spoken with his fellow citizens and they expressed that they did not feel the need to vote because they had already voted for the Council Members that they felt would represent them. Mr. Freeman agreed with what Mr. Warburton expressed in that he wants to fully support the elected officials and respects them.

With regard to the formation of a committee, he felt that the attempts to create and use committees in the past two years have not been successful. He was in favor of the Council acting as the committee. Mr. Freeman listed three items he would like the Council to focus on when taking on this issue. First, they should be impartial and be the representatives they were elected to be. Secondly, if the Council needs to conduct research, they should go to the public and professionals for assistance, and delegate if necessary. Third, they should bring options back for a vote.

Mr. Freeman shared information he found when speaking with his fellow citizens about the most recent vote. He discovered that approximately 20% of the population voted for the bond, 20% voted against it, and about 60% did not vote at all. Mr. Freeman again requested that the Council leave their personal agendas out of the discussions and decisions, which may help the citizens change their mental attitude toward the Council.

Brad Dailey gave his address as 221 East 1100 North and indicated that he is relatively new to the community and neutral in terms of the Public Safety Building issue. He applauded the Council for how they are addressing the situation. He explained that he has served on Councils before, and understands the pressure they are under. Mr. Dailey shared a story from his childhood growing up on a farm where he and his brothers would cut off the tails of their dogs so they wouldn't get in the way. He explained that if you want to create a mean dog, cut a little bit of the tail off at a time. He feels that that is what has been done in Pleasant Grove, and it's created kind of a mean city.

Mr. Dailey commented on Council Member Meacham's particular attention regarding the road issue discussed earlier and stated that it was because he was concerned about the infrastructure. The Public Safety Buildings are part of the City's infrastructure and deserve to receive concern and attention. He requested that the Council think of the issue in that way and consider the best solution for the City. Mr. Dailey stated that the Council needs to "cut the tail off" because it's going to hurt no matter what.

Stan Williams gave his address as 175 South 1300 East and stated that until now he had not expressed his opinion on social media but has heard and seen enough of it to cause him embarrassment. He expressed appreciation to Mayor Daniels for approaching the discussion calmly. Mr. Williams admitted that he voted against the bond. He wanted to vote in favor of it, but in the end the cost was too high. Mr. Williams recalled being approached by different Council Members seeking his vote, with a promise that they would represent the citizens. That seemed to have fallen by the wayside once they were elected. He wanted a representative who will listen to his concerns and make decisions that are in his best interest. Mr. Williams was in favor of Mayor Daniel's proposal for a committee where there is an open discussion.

Carl Cooney who resides at 2115 North 1800 West, agreed with Mr. Williams. Throughout the process he has felt like he was working against the City Council and was afraid that will continue and create an even deeper divide among the citizens. Mr. Cooney agreed that all of the citizens should be involved and vote on the issues. They also need to feel confident that the Council is listening to them and representing them fairly. Like Mr. Williams, Mr. Cooney wanted to vote for a new Public Safety Building because it is needed. He was sure there was a smarter way of going about it than what was proposed. He also expressed appreciation to the Mayor for being a calming influence in the discussion.

Drew Armstrong gave his address as 995 East Center Street. He agreed with the remarks given by Ms. Swayze, and Mr. Cooney to some degree. He remarked that the committees in the past have not worked and preferred there not be another. Mr. Armstrong stated that he voted for the present City Council Members and trusts them to represent him as a citizen. He liked the idea of a Committee of the Whole where the public has a voice and all ideas are discussed. Mr. Armstrong requested that the City Council take responsibility for making ensuring that all of the options are well researched and presented. He would feel more confident if the presentations came from the City Council and then put out for a vote of the public.

Diane Moss gave her address as 391 East 200 South and expressed her desire to move ahead with the matter. She insisted that the Council look at the facts rather than the opinions of individuals. When looking at the facts, Ms. Moss came to the conclusion that the Council was mostly in favor of the bond, which changed how she felt about having a committee. She now thinks a committee may be the best option for the City and could streamline the process of resolving the issue.

Blaine Thatcher who resides at 120 North 1400 East, submitted that the format of the City Council Meeting was a great way to gauge public opinion on issues they will be voting on. He considered it an attempt to gain a new perspective on public opinion, but did not believe it would be a good format to research and analyze data. A committee would be a better approach for that purpose. Mr. Thatcher stated that although many are of the opinion that a committee would not bring unity to the community, he believed it was the best opportunity to heal. He hoped that those who are selected to represent all sides of the issue will come to the table with open minds and a willingness to compromise to produce a recommendation for a solid solution. He voiced support for Mayor Daniel's proposal.

Kristi Belt gave her address as 266 East 1640 North. She admitted that if she was not selected to be on the proposed committee, she would be a little upset, as a lot of other citizens would. She commented that she elected the Council to represent her. Ms. Belt stated that it would be good to have a sub-committee do the research on the issues and then bring it forward so that the public can be part of the proceedings and hear all of the information. She also thought it would be wise to hire professionals outside the City who are unbiased. Ultimately, the City Council was elected to represent the citizens and should act as the committee. Their main responsibility is public safety.

Bill West gave his address as 48 North 1400 East. He presented a popular quote to the Council and public that insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. He saw the City heading down that path. He admitted that there are trust issues between the City Council and the citizens because they do not consider the Council Members to be impartial. If the Council wants to fix that, the committee is the best option. The goal of a committee is to have all sides of the issue come together and make sacrifices for the greater good. Mr. West was in favor of the Mayor's proposal.

Molly Andrew who resides at 1177 Nathaniel Avenue, considered committees to be the definition of insanity. She voiced her support for the City's public safety officials and understands that they need a safe place to work.

Eric Jensen gave his address as 120 North Main Street and stated that he has not had any concerns about trusting the Members of the City Council. If he ever had an issue, he always felt comfortable approaching them. In the past there had been recommendations from committees that the City Council has not followed. He trusted that they made correct decisions in favor of the community as a whole. Mr. Jensen thought the City Council should act as the committee and have the meetings open to the citizens for comment. He hoped the community would be more open-minded to trust the Council to represent them.

Amy Lindstrom gave her address as 1160 East 100 North and stated that they have had too many committees in the past two years and they haven't been successful. The neighborhood meetings were good and she felt like they listened to her concerns, but the vote was still no. Ms. Lindstrom

did not see the need for the situation to be resolved this year, but stated that there has to be some forward movement. The police and firemen are tired of being the center of contention and getting negative feedback from the community.

Ms. Lindstrom was unsure why the Council received criticism from the community for supporting the bond. In her mind, if the City Council felt it was a good solution, the citizens should have trusted and supported it. The Council should have chosen a plan that they knew most of the community would support. Ms. Lindstrom stated that it is the job of the City Council to explore every option and do the necessary research. She supported a meeting similar to the retreat that recently took place, where all of the opinions could be heard and the setting seems less formal. She understood that the final decision would be made by the City Council.

Jacob Sutch gave his address as 291 South 300 East and stated that he is in full support of the Mayor's proposal for a committee. He could not see a fair decision being made in the current format, which the Council seems to lean toward. There seemed to be a disconnect between what the City Council is thinking and how the citizens feel about the issue. The Council proceeded with the bond even though it wasn't what the public wanted. He recalled a suggestion made to hold off on any decision. The Council moved forward anyway which is what caused the distrust. Mr. Sutch admitted that he does not trust the Council to represent him. He requested that the City move forward with what is best for and reflects the wishes of the community.

Frank Andersen who resides at 796 Orchard Drive, told the Council that those who addressed them who were in favor of the Mayor's proposal were those who voted against the bond. They did not feel that their side had a seat at the table, which was why Mayor Daniels' proposal resonated with them. Everyone who spoke that evening was correct in saying that the Council is who they elected to represent them and they should feel fairly represented. Mr. Andersen stated that it is impossible to represent everyone. A committee would be tasked with the responsibility of finding common ground between the parties and present information to the community to be discussed. Mr. Andersen stated that with a committee you would have people at the table who are invested in working toward a common solution. He felt this was something the Council could not do. Mr. Anderson reiterated what the Mayor asked in a previous issue when he asked if it was hurting anybody. He asked the Council to consider if there could be any harm in forming a committee and trying it out.

Rick Hardman gave his address as 838 Apple Grove Lane, and stated that the trust issue needs to be dealt with. He felt that could be done through transparency and making sure everyone's voice is heard. He did not see that happening quickly or easily, but needs to be done.

Mike Petersen who resides at 1223 Fort Drive, reiterated that the public has continually used the words trust, transparency, and integrity, which he viewed as nice words for "liar". Mr. Petersen stated that neither side of the issue is willing to move because they don't trust each other. That being said, he felt that bringing the two sides together in a committee will not improve the divide. He requested that the Council use the Committee of the Whole to get the information they are seeking.

Roger Green gave his address as 665 East 200 South and expressed his disappointment that MOCA was not receiving more praise for their work. As for the committee, he was not entirely convinced that was the way to go since it was what the Council was supposed to do.

Carl Kuni wanted to have his mind changed. He was willing to change for the better of the community.

Mr. Thatcher spoke to the Council again and expressed surprise at the number of people who are opposed to the Mayor's proposal. He saw it as their best chance to come together.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the public session, and requested a five-minute break.

The hearing continued at 8:58 p.m.

Mayor Daniels expressed his appreciation for the civility of the meeting and felt they made a lot of progress together as a group. He reminded the Council that his role is to guide and mediate the meeting, not to make decisions. He requested feedback from the Council.

Council Member Stanley reported that he received an email from a concerned citizen who was in favor of committees. Along with the email he sent an eighty-five-page report from the Municipal Research and Service Center, from which Council Member Stanley read the following seven benefits of having a citizen advisory committee:

1. Provide assistance to the legislative body when formulating public policy and help transform public policy decisions into action.
2. Address issues of interest or conduct background work on technical or politically sensitive issues.
3. Serve as a way to build public consensus on controversial issues before elected officials make a decision.
4. Give a community a forum for discussion in greater depth than is possible with a legislative body.
5. Provide a more thorough review of complex and significant matters than a part-time council may be able to offer.
6. Provide expertise without expending budgetary money.
7. Assist in the resolution of conflicts.

Council Member Stanley expressed his support for these points. Pleasant Grove citizens are divided, and they currently have a situation where no compromise is taking place, and thus no progress. He still was in support of the Mayor's proposal to form a committee.

Council Member Andersen stated that there were a few words used in the public comment that she didn't feel represent her views on the issue. For example, it was expressed that the Council seeks to have control. Council Member Andersen likes to receive information and then be able to process that information for herself. She didn't feel this makes her controlling. There is a difference

between wanting to be consistently involved and controlling the situation. She wanted to be a part of the decisions made on the matter.

Mayor Daniels countered that statement by asking Council Member Andersen if other people in the community might feel exactly the way she does and want to be involved. His proposal was to have committee meetings held in public and to allow public input. Council Member Boyd declared that they have that format now with the City Council. She did not feel that anything needs to be reconstructed. Council Member Anderson stated that the committee meetings should not be like Council Meetings, they should involve discussion around a table similar to the recent retreat. Council Member Andersen asked what the difference would be between having a committee and keeping it with the Council as long as everyone has the ability to give input.

Mayor Daniels stated that although they still have not investigated why the majority voted against the bond, they know that there are strong leaders who voted both for and against. Bringing those individuals together could result in a recommendation that the majority would vote for. Council Member Boyd commented that a committee could create a closed feeling to the public, which is not what they want.

Mayor Daniels compared the divided situation with the nation's history where opposing sides came together to create an independent nation. The solution took a lot of compromise and many years to conclude, but great things resulted. Mayor Daniels was trying to advise the Council of the dangers of approaching this issue for the third time when the majority of citizens have told the council that they are not in favor of the way it was done. A new approach is needed and he proposed a solution patterned after an old way that is probably their best chance for success. He gave an analogy of a doctor being unable to perform surgery on himself. If surgery needs to be done, he will seek the help of another doctor.

Mayor Daniels would like to see the entire community fully accept a recommendation at the end of the process and feel satisfied that they were heard and that it is the best solution for the community. He asked the Council to try something they may not be comfortable with in the best interest of the City.

Council Member Meacham responded to the Mayor by claiming that these words were similar to the ones he used last year when approaching the matter. They tried committees and non-committees and nothing progressed. He was personally not convinced which path they should take, other than the way they go needs to involve everyone and be completely transparent. Mayor Daniels agreed and adding that all parties need to be heard and feel represented.

Council Member LeMone presented a few proposals based on what had been said. The first was to comprise a committee that would go through an RFP process to find a third-party person to create a plan for the Public Safety Buildings, with input from the public. The second was after a committee is formed as described, the Mayor would recommend names of individuals to give it a trial run for 90 days to six months. If the committee isn't working, the Council should feel free to disband it and think of another option. Council Member LeMone suggested that the names be selected at random from those who want to be involved. That would ensure that the public could not accuse the Council of having an agenda with whomever they select.

Council Member Anderson was willing to try anything as long as they eventually find out the reasons for the vote against the bond.

Council Member LeMone asked why the proposed committee would only have seven members and how the individuals would be found. Mayor Daniels stated that he would recommend individuals he believed could do the job well and the City Council could approve of the recommendations. He was concerned that without designated people who would feel responsible and accountable for being at all of the meetings, the Council will not succeed. Mayor Daniels would also be in charge of finding parties who are impartial to the situation to be on the committee.

Council Member Boyd was concerned about making decisions about the committee at that time, since the structural studies should be completed first. Mayor Daniels stated that the RFP process can move forward independent of the formation of the committee and it would be a piece of information that would add to the knowledge of the committee concerning the status of the current facilities. With that information they can come up with options to renovate or rebuild. Council Member Boyd asked about the timeframe for the RFP. Administrator Darrington informed the Council that they would be written by the end of the week. He and the Mayor felt that the potential committee would want to be involved in the RFP process so they put that on hold.

Council Member Boyd expressed frustration at the status of the RFP and felt they had already decided to move forward with them at the end of the retreat. Mayor Daniels claimed responsibility for the delay.

Council Member LeMone asked how the committee would be involved in the RFP process. Administrator Darrington stated that there was criticism with regard to MOCA being brought in by the City since the residents viewed them as puppets for the City. By having the committee involved in the RFP process, they would not run into the same accusations. Council Member Meacham commented that the selection of an engineering firm to handle the RFP would not be left up to the committee, but the final decision would be made by the Council.

Council Member Andersen expressed her opinion about the committee. She stated that there is a notion that once a decision is made about the committee or any other decision, it is set in stone and unchangeable. She agreed that if a committee is formed and does not work it can be changed. There is nothing wrong with trying new things.

Council Members Meacham and Boyd expressed concern about who will decide if the committee isn't working. Mayor Daniels stated that if the committee comes back to the Council and can only report on how much they hate the ideas of the other group and no compromise can be made, he would determine that it isn't working. If, however, the committee comes up with viable options, the Council should continue to let them negotiate. Mayor Daniels confirmed that the meetings will always be open to public input.

Council Member Stanley was optimistic that they can have unanimity on the committee and compromise. He was in full support of the proposal. Council Member Boyd declared that she did not support the proposal.

Mayor Daniels asked the Council their opinion on the proposal presented. Council Members LeMone, Boyd, and Meacham were against the proposal. Council Members Andersen and Stanley were in favor. The consensus was 3-to-2 against the proposal.

Mayor Daniels stated that there was another potential proposal from Council Member LeMone, where the committee members would be randomly selected to avoid being accused of having an agenda.

Council Member Stanley stated there was value in having the Mayor make the selections, because he would recommend individuals who are truly influential in their respective areas. He would like to see the strongest, most articulate, and most vocal individuals serve on the committee. A random selection would not guarantee that. Council Member LeMone retorted that the random selection would remove any accusations of the Mayor having a personal agenda.

Mayor Daniels confirmed that Council Member LeMone's proposal was to have the members chosen at random. There would be an ability to admit that the committee wasn't working and was willing to try something else if needed. The Mayor would still act as a mediator.

Council Member Meacham asked if the Council was in favor of a committee or not. Council Member LeMone responded that her proposal is a compromise. Mayor Daniels reminded Council Member Meacham that there was a current proposal on the table, which he could decide against.

Council Member Stanley urged the Council to reconsider the portion regarding the selection of the committee members. He did not feel there was a risk of accusation and the Mayor has made it clear that his agenda is to heal the City.

Mayor Daniels asked for the opinion of the Council regarding Council Member LeMone's proposal. Council Member Meacham, Stanley, and Boyd were against the proposal. Council Members Andersen and LeMone were in favor. The decision was 3-2 against the proposal.

Council Members Meacham and Boyd both wanted to know if the rest of the Council was for a committee or no committee. In response, Mayor Daniels asked who would be responsible for conducting the research and making decisions if there were no committee. Council Member Boyd declared that the City Council would be the responsible body and the meeting would be open to public discussion. She still felt the RFP was a more pressing issue.

Mayor Daniels attempted to clarify Council Member Boyd's proposal by asking if she would like the City Council to be the committee. She responded that she wanted the City Council to act as City Council Members in a legislative capacity with the Mayor directing and bringing matters up that will help them move forward on the Public Safety Building issue and present information to the public meetings to be heard. The public meetings would be transparent and open to the public for comment.

Council Member LeMone stated that this is not how the citizens will view that decision. It will end up the same way it has before, with the citizens accusing the City Council of not listening to them, and making their own decisions. The only solution was to compromise.

Attorney Petersen reminded the City Council of the procedure of bringing one proposal to the table at a time, which would be decided on. The same proposal cannot be brought to the table again, a

new proposal must be made. Mayor Daniels clarified that Council Member Boyd's proposal was to have no committee but let the City Council serve as the legislative body and direct the research with input from the public, and decisions to be made by the City Council.

Council Member LeMone felt unprepared to express her opinion on the proposal. Mayor Daniels asked if the Council would prefer to table it until a later meeting. Council Members LeMone and Boyd wanted to wait. Council Members Stanley, Andersen, and Meacham wanted to resolve the matter tonight. The consensus was 3-to-2 in favor of resolution.

Mayor Daniels asked for an opinion on Council Member Boyd's proposal for no committee. Council Members Andersen, Stanley, and LeMone were against. Council Members Meacham and Boyd were in favor. The outcome was 3-to-2 against the proposal.

Mayor Daniels declared that it was clear that the Council had been divided on every proposal made. He asked for further compromise and a different proposal. In response, there was a discussion regarding the committee members being selected at random. It was decided that the Mayor could provide names for each category, for, against, and neutral, and the Council could randomly select from those names. Council Member LeMone wanted it to be known that she felt uncomfortable discussing individual names in a public meeting. Council Member Andersen stated that there could be a more creative solution and suggested that it might be better to readdress the issue at a later date.

Mayor Daniels asked the Council again if the issue should be resolved tonight or tabled. Council Members Meacham, Andersen, Stanley, and LeMone wanted to resolve the issue tonight. Council Member Boyd abstained.

Council Member Andersen proposed that individuals interested in serving on the committee submit their names along with a resume or essay. There would be many qualified, intelligent, and influential residents who would put their names up for selection. She also recommended that the number be increased so that there would be three members for, three against, and three who are neutral.

Mayor Daniels clarified that Council Member Andersen was proposing the names be selected at random from a pool of names and that there be three from each side of the argument rather than two. He asked for the opinions of the Council. Council Members LeMone, Andersen, and Meacham were in favor. Council Members Boyd and Stanley were against. The decision was 3-to-2 in favor of the proposal.

Mayor Daniels concluded that a committee would be formed, the Mayor would provide several names for each category and the members would be selected at random from the list. This would take place in public and be recorded.

12) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS

Administrator Darrington informed the Council that he sent an email to each of them regarding the new process for parties interested in serving on committees. They created an application to be filled out by the interested parties and then interviewed by Mayor Daniels. If the interview is favorable, the Mayor will make a recommendation to the Council and they will have an opportunity to voice

their opinion on the individual. There will then be an Executive Session to discuss concerns. Administrator Darrington stated that if no applications are received they will still have the freedom to ask people to serve, but they will still have to go through the new process.

Chief Thomas reminded the Council that a volunteer program with the Fire Department was discussed several weeks ago. That program is ready to be launched and they will begin to see advertisements in their recruitment efforts.

Council Member Meacham commented on the report provided by Chief Thomas regarding the fire responses from the past month. There were 27 responses, which included more than just fire responses. Chief Thomas confirmed that the responses are divided between EMS and strictly fire related calls. Council Member Meacham noted that although the response times are quick, there is a large time difference between the medical response times, and fire response times. Chief Thomas was unsure of the reasons for this. More research would be done to find the answer to that question.

Library and Arts Director, Sheri Britsch, presented the Council with updates on grants received. With the money received from grants and donations to digitize old newspapers, the total came to \$1,981.00. With regard to the elevator application, Ms. Britsch stated that she has an interview scheduled for March. She also thanked Chief Thomas for the presentation he made to staff about optimism.

Finance Director, Dean Lundell, commented that this was the first Council Meeting since they refinanced the bonds. These were sold about a week and a half ago and the timing seemed to work out well. The interest rate they received was under 2.5%, with the overall savings on the net present value being about \$1.1 million or about \$80,000 per year.

Administrator Darrington gave the Council the option to postpone the Executive Session until after the Mayor returns in a few weeks, stating that the issues to be discussed weren't pressing. Council Member Boyd requested the Executive Session continue as planned.

Engineer Lewis informed the Council that UTA will be changing the schedule for the downtown bus to every 15 minutes during peak hours. This had not been officially changed as of yet but was in progress.

13) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS.

Council Member Andersen reminded the Council that the Pleasant Grove wrestling State Tournament would begin the following day. She requested to ride on the fire truck that would go down 200 South. Chief Thomas informed the Council that they received complaints from a few citizens, requesting that the Fire Department not participate in the event. The Council and staff discussed a compromise of having the trucks be involved, but not sound the sirens.

Council Member Stanley sent an email to the Council Members regarding an event on Tuesday, February 17 in the Gold Room at the Capitol Building to honor Jose Valdez, which he would be attending. Because of this, he would be late to the Council Meeting on that date. He suggested the discussion items be postponed so that he can be present. It was decided that the item would remain on the agenda.

Mayor Daniels confirmed that he would be out of town until after March 2, 2015.

14) **SIGNING OF PLATS**

Lorraine's Place "A", Locust Ave "B" and Maple Grove "A" plats were signed

15) **REVIEW CALENDAR**

There were no further calendar items to review.

16) **EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE, OR PHYSICAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL. (UCA 52-4-205 (1) (a))**

Mayor Daniels called for a motion to go into executive session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical health of an individual.

ACTION: At 10:19 p.m. Council Member LeMone moved to exit the City Council Meeting for a brief break, and then go into the Executive Session. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Council took a 10 minute break before going into executive session.

ACTION: At 10:26 p.m. the Council went into executive session.

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Cindy Boyd
Cyd LeMone
Jay Meacham
Ben Stanley

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Tina Petersen, City Attorney

Mayor Daniels asked for a motion to come out of executive session and go back into regular session.

ACTION: At 10:46 p.m. Council Member Andersen moved to come out of executive session and go back into regular session. Council Member Stanley seconded. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Council directed Staff to reevaluate the Public Works Directors job description to see if it meets the vision of the City's professionalism and when the time comes to post the job notice the Council would like to open the job up for all recruitment.

The Mayor then called for a motion to adjourn.

17) **ADJOURN**

ACTION: At 10:48 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Minutes of February 10, 2015 were approved by the City Council on March 10, 2015.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

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