

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
November 15, 2016
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Eric Jensen
Cyd LeMone
Ben Stanley
Lynn Walker

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Denise Roy, Finance Director
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Dave Thomas, Fire Chief
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director
Mario Gonzalez, Staff Engineer
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director

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

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Daniels called the meeting to order and noted that all Council Members were present.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Dillan Mullan.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The opening remarks were given by Niels Fugal.

4) **APPROVAL OF MEETING'S AGENDA**

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

5) **OPEN SESSION**

Mayor Daniels opened the open session.

Sandi Carter expressed a desire to resolve an issue from two weeks earlier. She spoke of information in the voter information pamphlet and her concern that it was incorrect. She stated that she tries to respect others' opinions and recognized some of the information provided was opinion and some was incorrect information. She clarified that her comments were not about peoples' right to voice their opinion, but for the facts to be stated correctly. Language in the voter pamphlet implied that the Council is not transparent or honest. She did not believe that was a fair or accurate assumption. She believes in the City Council and said she will defend their integrity and transparency. Ms. Carter asked about an article the Mayor wrote about the bond that was passed and choosing an Owner's Representative. Mayor Daniels noted that they would discuss that matter later in the meeting. Ms. Carter concluded her remarks by thanking the Mayor, Council, and Public Safety Building Committee for their service.

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

6) **CONSENT ITEMS**

- a) **City Council Minutes:
City Council Minutes for the October 4, 2016 meeting.
City Council Work Session Minutes for the October 11, 2016 meeting.
City Council Minutes for the October 18, 2016 meeting.**
- b) **To consider for approval Partial Payment No. 2 to Silver Spur Construction, LLC for the 4000 North Sewer Project.**
- c) **To consider approval of payment vouchers for (November 10, 2016).**

The consent items were reviewed and briefly discussed.

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

7) **BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

- A) TO CONSIDER THE APPROVAL OF DAVID LARSON AND DIANNA ANDERSEN AS PLEASANT GROVE/LINDON CHAMBER MEMBERS.**

Mayor Daniels explained that there has been a change in the leadership of the Chamber of Commerce. Going forward it will be a joint organization with the City of Lindon. Rather than a Pleasant Grove City employee functioning as the President, the organization will have an

independent Director. Pleasant Grove will have two voting members on the Board. Assistant City Administrator David Larson and Council Member Dianna Andersen will be considered for appointment to the Board and will be voting members. Council Member Stanley asked if new appointments will be made at the end of the year. Mayor Daniels stated that since it is late in the year, their appointments will carry over to 2017.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to appoint David Larson and Dianna Andersen as Pleasant Grove/Lindon Chamber of Commerce Board Members. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

8) PRESENTATIONS

A) NEW EMPLOYEE INTRODUCTION.

Fire Chief, Dave Thomas, introduced two new employees, Eric Nish and Ben Guerra, Chief Thomas stated that when Pleasant Grove has employment opportunities, they are fortunate to have the best applicants. As such, it is difficult to choose the best candidates out of such a qualified pool of applicants. He invited the newest employees of the Fire Department to introduce themselves to those in attendance.

Mr. Guerra stated that he is 29 years old and originally from Panama. He grew up in Provo and graduated from Utah Valley University where he attended a paramedic program. He expressed excitement to be a part of the department and serve the City.

Eric Nish reported that he is originally from Pleasant Grove but graduated in Orem. He introduced his family and noted that he served in the Army six years ago. He is dedicated and was happy to serve the community.

Chief Thomas mentioned that typically he does not hire individuals who aren't already trained paramedics. However, he made an exception with Mr. Nish because he was an exceptional candidate in all other areas. He mentioned that Mr. Nish will begin paramedic training in one month and will complete his training in less than one year.

Police Chief, Mike Smith, introduced the newly hired police officers. In response to a question from Council Member LeMone, Chief Smith stated that his department lost a total of six full-time officers and the Victims Advocate this year. He introduced Cory Russell and Steve Britton. Officer Russell comes from Duchesne County and Chief Smith stated that he is exceptionally qualified. He noted that he and Lieutenant Smith recently attended a Police Academy graduation where Officer Britton was the Valedictorian.

Officer Britton expressed was grateful to be working in Pleasant Grove and stated that he and his wife reside in Provo.

Officer Russell introduced himself and expressed gratitude for the opportunity to work in Pleasant Grove. He stated that he and his wife plan on residing permanently in the area.

Chief Smith mentioned that Lindsey Webb, Molly Andrew, and Tiana Phillips also work for the Police Department. He stated that they do a fantastic job in their respective capacities.

At the request of Council Member LeMone, Lindsey Webb introduced herself and stated that she is originally from Seattle, Washington. She was excited to live and work in Pleasant Grove.

Molly Andrews was grateful for the opportunity to serve in the Police Department as a Dispatcher.

Chief Smith expressed gratitude for such great employees and noted he will be hiring more employees soon. He briefly described the training process for newly hired personnel.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, stated that Community Development usually hires an Intern from BYU but determined that there are strong needs in the office area. An Intern's tasks could be accomplished by someone that is cross-trained to work in the front office. They could cover for vacations as well. The budgeted Intern funds were used to hire a part-time Office Assistant. There were numerous applicants but the top candidate was Shauna Taggart. Ms. Taggart introduced herself and reported that she moved to Pleasant Grove from California. She recently moved to the area to be close to family.

9) **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**A) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE (2016-25) TO VACATE A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT LOCATED ON LOT 1 PARCEL C, PLEASANT GROVE INDUSTRIAL PARK SUBDIVISION PARCEL #49:088:0015 GENERALLY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 300 WEST 200 SOUTH, PLEASANT GROVE, UTAH 84062. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington*
Continued from the November 1, 2016 Meeting.*

Administrator Darrington stated that the subject property is changing owners and as part of the title work they discovered a public utility easement on the property. In order for the purchase to be completed, the easement must be vacated. The easement was owned by various utility companies but is not used any longer. Administrator Darrington recommended vacating the easement so that the sale can be finalized.

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

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved to adopt Ordinance (2016-25) to vacate a public utility easement located on Lot 1 Parcel C, Pleasant Grove Industrial Park Subdivision parcel #49:088:0015 generally located at approximately 300 West 200 South, Pleasant Grove, Utah. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley and Walker voting "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

B) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2016-26) TO AMEND CITY CODE SECTION 10-14-24-1C-2, THE GROVE COMMERCIAL SALES SUBDISTRICT, PERMITTED USES, EXPANDING THE PERMITTED USES IN ORDER TO INCLUDE USE #6377, “INDOOR CLIMATE CONTROLLED STORAGE FACILITIES”, ONLY WITHIN THE AREA WEST OF NORTH COUNTY BOULEVARD, BETWEEN STATE STREET AND CENTER STREET. (Applicant Robb Taylor) Presenter: Director Young.

Director Young presented the staff report and stated that the applicant is requesting a Code amendment regarding the inclusion of indoor climate controlled storage facilities as a permitted use with development standards within a specific area in The Grove-Commercial Sales Subdistrict. A request to amend the Code in order to include the General Warehousing and Storage use was submitted by the same applicant in the past, with the intent to develop storage units. The request was rejected as the City Council desired to keep the area free from traditional storage units in what was considered prime property for commercial sales use. Also, in the past the inclusion of used motor vehicles and automobiles was granted in the zone but with geographical boundaries defining where the specific use could be located. Use #5512, Motor Vehicles, Automobiles (used only), was permitted only in the area west of North County Boulevard between State Street and Center Street.

Currently, Shamrock Group owns the property north of Center Street facing North County Boulevard. A used car dealership is located on the parcel. The subject property is nearly landlocked and is an elongated piece of property located behind the used car dealership. The parcel was recently purchased by Shamrock Group and it was proposed that an optimal way to utilize the property would be to build a two-story indoor climate controlled storage facility.

The development of the aforementioned parcel presents challenges. The long parcel only fronts a public street at the furthestmost south edge and that corner could potentially be used for commercial sales; however, the north and back portion of the property is not viable for commercial sales as the traffic flow is restricted by the narrowness of the parcel and having a car dealership in the front. A future development is intended to have a restaurant and retail area in the southernmost part of the parcel and possibly in the northern extreme and an indoor climate control storage facility in the middle.

Multiple concerns may arise for the storage units use to be allowed in the zone such as (1) the lack of appearance or architectural appeal, and (2) the less than optimal usage of the land as single unit storage developments tend to expand to the side rather than upward. Staff recommended the following three types of development standards:

- a. Use limitation: The only variation of storage units that should be included in the area as a permitted use with development standards would be use 6377 “Indoor climate controlled storage facilities”.
- b. Geographical limitations: Use 6377 shall only be permitted within the area west of North County Boulevard, between State Street and Center Street, as shown on the attached map.

- c. Architectural Standards:
 - a. The building proposed shall be harmonious with the surrounding buildings and comply with the supplemental Site Design Standards for the zone established in City Code Provision 10-14-24-1 D.
 - b. The facility shall be multi-story and conform with the maximum building height of 65 feet.

The compliance of the architectural standards will be checked by the Design Review Board first and then by staff at the time of acquiring the building permit.

Council Member LeMone asked if the entire strip will be climate-control storage. Director Young explained that existing car sales will be maintained on the front and in the center. The northern and bottom portions will be retail or office. Only the rear area in the center will have climate-controlled storage. He mentioned that the Planning Commission reviewed the request on November 10, 2016 and recommended that the City Council approve the proposed text amendments.

Mayor Daniels confirmed with Director Young that the action was to add use #6377 to the permitted uses with the stated restrictions. The applicant, Robb Taylor, was present and available to answer questions.

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

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to adopt Ordinance (2016-26) to amend City Code Section 10-14-24-1C-2, The Grove Commercial Sales Subdistrict, Permitted Uses, expanding the permitted uses in order to include Use #6377, “Indoor Climate Controlled Storage Facilities”, only within the area west of North County Boulevard, between State Street and Center Street on behalf of applicant Robb Taylor, adopting all the findings and conclusions of the Staff Report. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken, with Council Members Andersen Jensen, LeMone, Stanley and Walker voting “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

C) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2016-27) TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 33.5 ACRES FROM A R-R (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) ZONE TO R1-20 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2150 NORTH 100 EAST. (BIG SPRINGS NEIGHBORHOOD) (Blake Jumper, Applicant) Presenter: Director Young *Continued from the November 1, 2016 Meeting.

Director Young presented the staff report and displayed an aerial photo of the subject property. He explained that there is a Master Plan to connect the roadways at some point in the future. The applicant was requesting approval of a rezone of approximately 33.5 acres on multiple properties

located at approximately 2150 North 100 East. The proposed rezone is from the existing R-R (Rural Residential) Zone to R1-20 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The rezone is in conjunction with a proposed 45-lot residential subdivision divided between two different phases.

The proposed subdivision shows a mix of different lot sizes. Some of the proposed lots were smaller than 21,780 square feet, which is what the current zone requires as the minimum square footage, which was why the re-zone was proposed. The applicant was requesting to change the zoning from one that requires a minimum lot area of .5 acres (21,780 square feet) to one that allows for 20,000 square-foot single lots.

Much of the area has historically been zoned for larger agricultural lots but over the years most of the area has been rezoned to a higher density. An application for the rezone was received on August 28, 2016.

The Pleasant Grove General Plan identifies the 33.5 acres to be part of the Very Low Density Residential land use designation. Chapter 2, page 16, of the Pleasant Grove General Plan recognizes both the R-R and the R1-20 as part of the Very Low Density Residential Land Use, which is a designation for large lots and low density estate neighborhoods with single-family homes on individual building lots. The proposed rezone meets the provisions of Pleasant Grove General Plan. Zones with smaller lot size requirements are located adjacent to the subject property. Along the south border there is a recently approved subdivision in the R1-20 zone and on the west side of 100 East there is also a strong presence of the R1-20 Zone.

The Planning Commission reviewed the proposal on September 22, 2016 and unanimously recommended that the City Council approve the rezone of 33.5 acres.

Mayor Daniels mentioned that the request is directly related to agenda item 10A and asked Director Young to display the drawings for 10A. He mentioned that the applicant was concerned about the lack of a public hearing but indicated that they are not required for final plats. Rezone proposals and preliminary plats, however, require public hearings. He presented the vicinity maps showing the connecting roadway and the two plats and noted that the vicinity map shows two connecting proposals coming forward tonight. Plat A is on the south end and will have 12 lots near 100 East. The north plat will have 21 lots. There is also a larger area available for a future phase. The General Plan provides for the properties north of 1800 North to have an R1-20 Zone.

The applicant, Blake Jumper, stated that they have worked long and hard on the property as it has issues with the Murdock Canal. They have a plan for the property and will be looking to do another phase in the future after extensive geological testing has been conducted. He stated that the lots will be larger and the homebuilder will be Richmond America. The homes will range in price \$600,000 to \$1 million.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing.

Jim Wadley identified himself as one of the co-owners of the property in the middle on the north side of the development. He came to the Planning Commission in September and questioned some items on the plat. During that meeting a comment was made that rezoning would only result in a

few more lots and would not drastically change the character of the neighborhood. He explained the City Code's objectives are as follows:

- To encourage and facilitate the orderly growth and development of the City;
- To provide open space; prevent overcrowding of the land and lessen congestion on the streets;
- Secure economy and municipal expenditures;
- Facilitate adequate provision for public facilities and services; increase the security of home life and create a more favorable environment for citizens and visitors; secure safety of fire and other dangers;
- Preserve property values;
- Enhance the economic and cultural well-being of the citizens; and
- Promote a more attractive city.

Mr. Wadley asked that the reasoning behind the proposed rezone be better defined.

Mayor Daniels stated that landowners have the right to use their land. The State sets forth the rules and the City outlines the density in the area. He explained that as the population of the City grows, the owners of large tracts of land are looking for ways to sell and make a profit. The City cannot dictate what private property owners do with their land. Mr. Wadley argued that the City can make decisions regarding the rezone and asked if there is any reason to approve the request. He asked that the Council consider their vision for the north end of the City. There was continued discussion regarding how different zones transition throughout the City.

Council Member LeMone asked Director Young to respond to Mr. Wadley's inquiry in providing a reason for the proposed rezone. Director Young noted that according to the General Plan map, everything north of 1800 North is classified as very low density. They are looking to create a new classification for the northern portion to be called rural density but for now the area is very low density. The General Plan assigns certain zones through its verbiage that provide for this zoning to occur in this area. The usability difference is for large animal rights and not the size of the lots. Any rezone proposal can be called into question, and there are not always specific reasons as to why they are approved. Director Young reported that staff determined that the R1-20 zone is appropriate for the subject property as it fits within a category of housing as outlined in the General Plan. Council Member LeMone stated that the City Code should be updated to reflect this new vision for the northern portion of the City.

Mr. Wadley asked why the area was not initially zoned R1-20. City Attorney, Tina Petersen, explained that when the General Land Use Map was created the existing uses were taken into consideration. If it had been initially zoned R1-20, the existing uses would have been non-conforming. She stated that there are two steps taken when determining zoning. The first is to create the General Land Use Map, which is an overall guide for types of uses. The area in question

was determined to be appropriate for low-density residential development. She stated that Mr. Wadley's prior questions were answered as part of the adoption of the General Land Use Map. The City Council previously determined that low-density residential was appropriate. She noted that the presence of animal rights was the main difference between the current zone and the proposed rezone. She commented that Mr. Wadley's questions are appropriate and the Council should make findings in the decision process. However, she stated that he needed to understand that if the zoning was already included in the General Land Use categories, they must have very specific reasons for not rezoning the property upon request.

Mayor Daniels explained that when the City was established, it was divided into very large sections. As more people moved in or had children, the land was divided. The map represents the City providing for that orderly growth. When owners want to subdivide, they have the right to do so. If they ask for something dramatically different than what is included in the General Plan, those requests are denied.

Jan Van Orman asked the Council not to underestimate Mr. Wadley's considerations and mentioned there were over a dozen residents who attended the Planning Commission Meeting where this matter was discussed. He identified his home on the aerial map and noted that only residents within 300 feet of the project received notice of the public hearing. He expressed concerns that the owners of the middle section chose not to attend the Planning Commission Meeting due to prior negative experiences. The City needed to make greater efforts to make sure that the residents feel welcome to express their concerns.

In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Mr. Wadley stated that he wanted staff and the elected officials to discuss the reason for the rezone. Mayor Daniels explained that the purpose of tonight's meeting was to discuss the request of the applicant. He recommended Mr. Wadley meet with Administrator Darrington to figure out a proper method and forum to discuss his broader concerns on rezone requests. He mentioned that the City will soon do a General Plan rewrite.

Council Member LeMone also wanted to have a broader discussion of rezones based on the City Code.

The applicant, Blake Jumper, reported that he has been in business for 40 years and developed plots in four different states. He clarified that he did not say he was not concerned about the neighbors. He and his engineer stayed after the Planning Commission Meeting to meet with the residents and address their issues. With regard to the seven acres in the middle of the property, the only question was if there would be a fence along the south boundary. He estimated that around 90% of the comments pertained to Canyon Road and 100 East. In response, they pushed the subdivision back 10 feet to make sure that 100 East safe. The reason for development is to bring quality residents into the City and to provide a growing tax base. He echoed previous comments as stated by staff.

Niels Fugal expressed concern that there is not enough play area or open space for children. He asked that they consider the amount of open space in the development.

Council Member Jensen asked Mr. Jumper why landowners come to him as a developer. Mr. Jumper responded that he tries to enhance communities through quality development. He expressed admiration for the City Council and Planning Commission for the City's Master Plan. He stated that the Savage Family has a right to sell the property and make application within the Master Plan criteria. They do not want animal rights and the rezone will not change Mr. Wadley's animal rights on his property. The proposed development will bring quality residents to the area and meets the criteria set forth. He mentioned that the Parks Department also reviewed the proposal in terms of open space planned for the development.

Mayor Daniels encouraged those present to be careful in their discussion. He explained that some issues are personal preference versus owners' rights. Furthermore, some issues relate to State law and are not within the control of individual cities. As a City, they need to make sure they follow the procedures as outlined by the State and current ordinances. While he acknowledged that the General Plan needs to be discussed, he indicated that this was not the time or place. Administrator Darrington agreed that they need to have a discussion on the General Plan and stated that he would personally invite Mr. Wadley and others interested in giving input when that discussion takes place. Mayor Daniels reviewed the noticing requirements and stated that they were defined per the State's requirements.

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

Council Member Stanley asked Mr. Jumper about the concern regarding the visibility on Canyon Road and if moving the subdivision back was before or after the meeting with the Planning Commission. Mr. Jumper explained that it was both. He stated that they did not have a deceleration or acceleration lane outlined for Canyon Road in time for the Planning Commission Meeting. After meeting with the residents and hearing their concerns, it was moved back an additional 10 feet.

Council Member Stanley asked Director Young about the three different zones that fit in the very low density category of the General Plan. He mentioned that the issue regarding animal rights could be addressed in restrictive covenants or in a manner other than zoning. He explained that there is a modest increase in density that accompanies the change to an R1-20 zone. A request for a park in conjunction with the application may satisfy some concerns and used as justification for the greater density. Director Young stated that there are many ways cities handle these based on their codes. Except for the PUD zone, the City does not require a park for standard single-family residential development. The City can suggest or recommend it, but not require it. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan provides for sufficient park space. One level of service in the Parks and Trails Master Plan is that there is a park provided within one-half mile of any given area.

Council Member Stanley asked if in the process the Planning Commission sees the actual application submitted. Director Young explained that this typically does not occur. Council Member Stanley commented that there may be wisdom in requesting justification for a change. Director Young indicated that this was a broader discussion that could take place in a different meeting.

Council Member Stanley stated that while the R1-20 and RR zones are both permissible on the General Plan, they are not equivalent. The Council has the capacity to identify a preference for the lower density.

Attorney Petersen stated that Council Member Stanley's analysis was correct. If there is a reason or concern brought up by the Planning Commission indicating that the R1-20 zoning is not appropriate, the request can be denied. However, the case law is that they have the presumption of entitlement to this request. The Council can deny the request but must make very specific findings and give concrete reasons for denying it. The difference in the density is not enough. Council Member LeMone mentioned that the City Code alludes to requiring a justification. Attorney Petersen stated that the developer indicated that he is bringing in quality upper-level income that will increase the property tax base and generate revenue for the City. It is no different than what could be done except for the animal rights, which he gave as a reason for his request. Council Member LeMone commented that those two issues are not addressed in the City Code. High quality homes can be built anywhere in the City. Attorney Petersen noted that Council Member Jensen alluded to the issue earlier when asking about the R1-7 zone. Legally, the findings for a rezone identify whether the request is consistent with the General Plan and if it is in the best interest of the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens.

Council Member Andersen acknowledged that this is a difficult issue for several residents, as it was a life-altering event for many. She was concerned with remarks previously made about residents not feeling heard. Council Member Andersen also mentioned Manila Park and stated that it was not always in the best interest of an area to include a park in the subdivision as it can reduce the value of other parks. Mayor Daniels noted that this particular discussion could take place during plat approval, which is the next agenda item.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to adopt Ordinance (2016-27) to rezone approximately 33.5 acres from a R-R (Rural Residential) Zone to R1-20 (Single-Family Residential) Zone on property located at approximately 2150 North 100 East. Council Member Walker seconded the motion.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen amended his motion to include that it is consistent with the General Use Plan. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken Council Members Andersen, Jensen, Stanley and Walker voting "Aye" and Council Member LeMone voting "Nay". The motion carried 4-to-1.

10) ACTION ITEMS READY FOR A VOTE

- A) TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL A 33-LOT FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT CALLED SAVAGE STATES SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2150 NORTH 100 NORTH IN THE PROPOSED R1-20 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE. *Presenter: Director Young.***

Attorney Petersen stated that with regard to a park, the City cannot exact a park from the developer. They are paying Park Impact Fees as part of the development, which were calculated based on the demands the new growth will place on the park system. It is possible to make other arrangements

such as not paying the fees and installing a park in the development. At this point, it would be an exaction and is not legal.

Director Young explained that the two final plats have a total of 33 lots with 12 lots in Plat A and 21 lots in Plat B that are designated for new single-family dwellings. He noted that even though not all the proposed lots meet the minimum area requirement of 20,000 square feet, City Code 10-9B-14 E allows the averaging of lots to allow for a diversity in design and layout of residential subdivisions. Therefore, the proposed layout of the subdivision meets the minimum requirements set forth in the Pleasant Grove City Code.

Much of the area has historically been zoned for larger agricultural lots but over the years most of the area has been rezoned to higher density. The subject property falls within the General Plan designation of Very Low Density Residential, which allows for the R1-20 (Single-Family Residential) Zone.

Mayor Daniels asked about the right-of-way to the east of the proposed development. Mr. Jumper explained that the right-of-way on the west is the Murdock Canal with a 50-foot easement and the right-of-way on the east is the Jordan River. This area is undeveloped and he cannot put roads or pipes in it. As a result, it will be an open area. He explained that he can put a road on the Provo River Aqueduct, but cannot put utilities there. They are doing limited lateral crossings for water/sewer and dry utilities such as phone lines. Before the crossings are done, they will do a more extensive geo-technical study for safety reasons. The applicant's engineer explained that the driveways cross area ranges from 12% to 17%. It flattens out before the slope from the original canal, creating nice pads for future homes. Every two lots will have a combination driveway that will cross both utilities and the Provo River. The main goal is to minimize the effects on their facilities for future maintenance.

Mayor Daniels commented that this is a steep area with a grade of greater than 12%. Mr. Jumper mentioned that there will be some grading in the area for the third phase. The geotechnical study will also indicate whether there are any issues.

Council Member LeMone identified clerical errors to be corrected.

With regard to 100 East, Mr. Jumper explained that they worked with engineers extensively on the road and took time to speak with everyone. He mentioned that they met with David Wadley to discuss his concerns about the property he owns to the north. He acknowledged the curve in the road and stated that they met with the City to create acceleration and deceleration lanes.

Mayor Daniels recalled how development has been received in his home State of Hawaii over the years and commented that as a City they need to be mindful of residents' concerns. He encouraged the developer to take time to meet with the neighbors.

Council Member LeMone asked Mr. Jumper to explain the different number of lots listed on the rezoning request versus the final plat. He stated that the rezone was for the entire parcel including the piece to the south. He noted that the Master Plan for the project is 45 lots but they are currently only asking for 33, which will be included in Phase 2.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve a 33-lot final subdivision plat called Savage States Subdivision, located at approximately 2150 North 100 North in the proposed R1-20 (Single Family Residential) Zone that now exists in the area. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Council.

Council Member LeMone asked Director Young to include the Planning Commission vote in future packets.

B) TO CONSIDER RE-APPROVAL OF A TWO-LOT SUBDIVISION PLAT CALLED LORRAINE’S PLACE LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 565 EAST 300 NORTH IN THE R1-8 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE. *Presenter: Director Young.*

Director Young presented the staff report and explained that the final plat was originally approved by the City Council on December 2, 2014. The plat was not recorded and expired last December. The applicant, Lorraine Herrera, now has the property under contract to sell and is ready to have the plat re-approved and recorded. No significant changes to the plat have been made since the original approval.

On October 16, 2014, the Board of Adjustment approved a Historical Special Exception that allowed for a 20% reduction in the flag lot stem width requirement. Section 10-15-14-G-1 requires all flag lot stems be 25 feet wide. The Historical Special Exception for the property allowed the flag lot to be reduced by up to five feet. The applicant reduced the flag lot stem width by 2.5 feet making the stem 22.5 feet wide. This Historical Special Exception was approved in part because the property serial number and main dwelling were established prior to August 20, 1985. As a result, the property is considered historical and the Historical Special Exception allows the applicant to develop her property with the same rights as her neighbors.

The applicant is requesting approval of a two-lot final subdivision called Lorraine’s Place Plat B located at 565 East 300 North in the R1-8 (Single-Family) Zone, with a General Plan designation of Medium Density Residential. The Planning Commission previously forwarded a recommendation of approval on November 13, 2014.

The proposed plat is a flag lot subdivision with a reduced flag lot stem width of 22.5 feet. Lot 1 is 8,312 square feet in size with an existing home that will remain. Lot 2 is 13,467 square feet in size with the flag lot stem occupying 11,330 square feet of the lot. Typical 10-foot public utility easements should be added to both lots and the parking spaces at the end of the flag lot stem should be marked as a separate area from the stem as the City Code prohibits parking on the stem. Both lots meet the minimum frontage, lot size and lot width for the zone. Both lots will be accessed from 300 North. After meeting the conditions listed, the proposed subdivision plat shall meet all requirements of subdivision plats in the planning and zoning code.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to reapprove a two-lot final subdivision plat called Lorraine’s Place located at approximately 565 East 300 North in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

C) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2016-047) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO DECLARE A 2015 JOHN DEERE 624K LOADER, 5 THINKCENTER M81, 17 THINKCENTER M82, 3 T420 LAPTOP, 3 T430 LAPTOP 3 THINKSTATION S30 AND 5 LENOVO M78 COMPUTERS AND DIRECTS THAT THEY BE DISPOSED OF ACCORDING TO THE CITY'S POLICY FOR DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PROPERTY. *Presenters: Director Beaumont and Administrator Darrington.*

Director Beaumont stated that the John Deere loader was spoken of briefly during the Work Session the previous week. For several years, they have had a one-year contract for the loaders. This year the State contract changed to Wheeler, so the loader will be surplussed. The City could sell it back for a \$2,000 increase from its purchase price, or sell it on the open market to possibly get more to put toward the purchase of the new loader. The City buys the equipment on the State bid list and has a contract with the dealer. They then promise to buy it back at a certain rate and then sell it used. Director Beaumont explained that the City use the equipment less than a general contractor would.

Administrator Darrington explained that there is a three to four-year rotation for the computers within the City. Once the rotation ends, they surplus them and purchase new ones. Any given year they retire a certain number of computers. When they are disposed of, the IT contractor finds its value online. He further described the process by which the City disposes of surplus property. **ACTION:** Council Member LeMone moved to adopt a Resolution (2016-047) authorizing the Mayor to declare a 2015 John Deere 624K Loader, 5 Thinkcenter M81, 17 Thinkcenter M82, 3 T420 Laptop, 3 T430 Laptop 3 Thinkstation S30 and 5 Lenovo M78 computers and directs that they be disposed of according to the City's policy for disposing of surplus property. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

A) DISCUSSION ON SCHOOL CROSSINGS. *Presenter: Mario Gonzalez, Staff Engineer.*

Council Members Andersen and LeMone commented that they have heard great things from the public about the service that Director Beaumont and Engineer Gonzalez provide the community. Engineer Gonzalez stated it was a privilege to work for the City.

Engineer Gonzalez explained that there are three areas, in particular, that have been brought to staff's attention. He recently met with two of UDOT's traffic and safety personnel, as well as a consultant who deals with traffic issues. The intersections in question are (1) 200 South (adjacent to Pleasant Grove High School); (2) 100 East, near John Hancock Charter School and Central Elementary School; and (3) 3300 North 1450 West, near Lincoln Academy Charter School.

Engineer Gonzalez mentioned that the school zone around the high school does not have a reduced speed limit as it has not been deemed necessary. Staff suggested an option of having signage that

is more visible for students who are crossing. He presented Google images of the school zone in question, as well as its surrounding areas. He stated that a lot of drivers exceed the posted speed limit, thus putting students at risk. Other consultants have suggested installing a rectangular rapid flashing beacon, which costs \$10,000 per sign. They are solar powered, which accounts for the majority of the cost. Engineer Gonzalez suggested that two flashing beacons be installed at the high school site and explained that they have wireless connections and work in tandem with one another. The flashing beacons will face west.

Council Member Andersen stated there needs to be three distinct lanes and suggested that staff discuss the matter with the Alpine School District. She was concerned with whether traffic would be able to move through the roundabout near the school if flashing beacons are installed. Director Beaumont clarified that flashing beacons are not stop lights; rather, they are warning systems for drivers indicating that a pedestrian is trying to cross. Council Member LeMone was surprised there hasn't already been an accident in the area because of the speeding that takes place in the area. She liked the proposed solution.

Council Member Andersen expressed concern regarding the crosswalk at 600 East (located one block west of Pleasant Grove High School) noting that it is poorly lit. She stated that there were steady streams of pedestrians during the 15-minute drop off/pick up times on weekdays.

Mayor Daniels asked if there were other cities or school districts elsewhere that had successfully resolved similar problems. Engineer Gonzalez mentioned that every public school within a district is required to have a neighborhood access plan that channels students to safe locations throughout school zones where there is a known crossing. The school district publishes the plan on their website and through other channels of communication to both students and parents.

Council Member Stanley asked if the financial impact of implementing a neighborhood access plan was the burden of the City or the school district. Engineer Gonzalez stated that most of the local jurisdictions pay to implement this plan. Director Beaumont added that municipalities are required by State Law to provide safe access routes. It is also the City's responsibility to provide a crossing guard, crosswalks, and signage. Council Member Stanley asked who evaluates the adequacy of the City's existing provisions. Director Beaumont explained that a UDOT Engineer is tasked with evaluating whether cities are in compliance with State Law.

Council Member Andersen asked if there was any grant funding available. Director Beaumont answered in the affirmative but stated that the process is very competitive. The City applied for two different grants this year and both requests were denied. The State seeks to fund projects where they can accomplish work for the least amount of money.

Engineer Gonzalez proceeded to discuss the crossing at 100 East, near John Hancock Charter School and Central Elementary School. He stated that while the intersection has a flashing stop sign, it is not legally a school crosswalk. Images of the intersection were presented for Council review. Council Member Jensen mentioned that he lived in this neighborhood and identified where children cross to get to school. As a neighborhood, they have tried to work with the State to get a crosswalk; however, the State indicated that a crosswalk wouldn't work in the area because of its proximity to a stoplight. Engineer Gonzalez explained that in his correspondence with the State,

they have indicated a willingness to leave the decision up to the local jurisdictions. However, this is a high traffic area and as such they should refer to UDOT's SNAP plan for the area. He noted that the SNAP plan routes all students to Center Street, which is the safest point because of the traffic light. The challenge is that students will find the shortest route, regardless of whether it is the safest route as outlined in the SNAP plan. Engineer Gonzalez stated that there has been some discussion about putting in a normal pedestrian crosswalk without labeling it as a school zone crosswalk.

Director Beaumont mentioned that in today's Directors Meeting there was discussion of the intersection at 1800 North 100 East. He mentioned that there was a crossing guard and a reduced speed for that particular school zone. He agreed with Engineer Gonzalez's assessment that this is a difficult spot due to the high of volume and speed of traffic crossing 100 East. Staff's recommendation was to direct all school pedestrian traffic to the safest spot rather than introduce another location where children could possibly get hurt. The safest crossing is at the intersection even though it is inconvenient.

Council Member Andersen asked if there was education at the schools regarding UDOT's SNAP plan. Council Member LeMone answered in the affirmative. Engineer Gonzalez added that SNAP training is a requirement for State funding. He mentioned UDOT's Walking School Bus app, which connects parents to each other so they can coordinate efforts in getting children to school safely.

Staff and the elected officials then discussed the Lincoln Academy Charter School. Engineer Gonzalez stated that charter schools are not required to have a SNAP plan because they are considered a commuter school. Traffic and pedestrian studies have been conducted in the area, through which the concern was raised that students cross 3300 North from the south because it is not stop controlled. Furthermore, the average speed limit is 35 MPH even though signage specifies a speed of 25 MPH. As new development occurs, additional discussion will be needed to determine the safest location for students to cross and how to best accommodate their needs. The north is fully built out in terms of street improvements but the south lacks pedestrian ramps and a sidewalk. Additionally, there is also a drainage ditch. Engineer Gonzalez stated that staff plans on meeting with the school district in the near future to further discuss school crossings. They will relay information to the Council as it becomes available.

Council Member LeMone asked if there was money in the budget for the rapid flashing beacon at the high school. Director Beaumont answered in the negative and said the City would need to find a funding source as soon as possible. Administrator Darrington stated that the Council could either approve a budget amendment now or wait until January to work the expense into the budget for the new fiscal year. Council Member LeMone suggested staff approach the Alpine School District to see if they would be willing to help pay the cost. It was noted that the Council can discuss the project at the Budget Retreat in January.

B) DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION ON THE NEXT STEPS FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES.

Note: There was a break at 8:37 p.m.

Mayor Daniels led the discussion by stating that as a business owner, he must rely on the construction expertise of others. He explained that an Owner's Representative is a person who has background and experience in the management of large scale construction projects, such as that of the Public Safety Facility. An Owner's Representative works for the people who are going to own the building rather than the people selling the service. They make sure the project is on time, within the budget, and retains all of the functionality that was originally intended.

Mayor Daniels stated that several qualified individuals have expressed an interest in performing this function and asked the Council if they would like to proceed in finding a qualified candidate to fill this position. He suggested they conduct their search by way of an official job description that would be published via standard media outlets. He described his vision for a committee to also be formed that would be comprised of a few select staff members who have the authority to execute decisions and retain contracts. Those individuals may include the City Administrator, the Police and Fire Chiefs, the Judge, and possibly Director Beaumont (who has an engineering background), among others. Staff would work with the Owner's Representative to take care of the day-to-day aspects of selecting an architect and reviewing design plans. The Owner's Representative would need to be an expert in their field so that the public can be confident that their tax dollars are being used as efficiently as possible.

Mayor Daniels expressed appreciation for the trust built over the last several years that lead to a 63% majority vote in passing this year's bond. He wanted to build upon that trust and help execute the commitments that have been made. He expressed his intent for making this a transparent process. Forming a committee of qualified individuals, led by an Owner's Representative, would not displace the role of the Council but would allow them to move forward and maximize efficiency.

Mayor Daniels explained that the Owner's Representative would be selected through the standard job application process. Administrative staff would write a job description and publish it on the City's website and the applicants would have an opportunity to present their qualifications. Mayor Daniels had spoken with several people who expressed an interest in filling this role. Some are even interested in offering their services free of charge as a way of giving back to the community. However, there are others who would not be able to volunteer their time. As a Council they need to define in the scope of work, time commitment, and an appropriate compensation.

Administrator Darrington stated that he has spoken with the City's Financial Advisor and they are now authorized to borrow up to \$9.5 million for the project. He explained that the City sells the bonds all at the same time. They set the number they are borrowing, sell them, and the money is subsequently deposited into the bank. The funds remain in the bank and are withdrawn as construction needs arise. If the City wanted to borrow \$7 million to start, they would have to go through another issuance later to obtain the full \$9.5 million. The risk involved with going that route is the possibility of changing interest rates. Administrator Darrington mentioned that in the last few weeks interest rates have increased. They are still low; however, they could continue to climb. Currently, the City is scheduled to enter into a Parameters Resolution, which indicates that the Council authorizes staff and the City's Financial Advisor to go through the process of borrowing the money. After the resolution is adopted, the City will obtain a bond rating that is

determined by the City's overall financial situation. GO bonds get the lowest rating because they have received the full backing of the citizens. Administrator Darrington briefly described the process by which a City rating is obtained and said it could be around mid-to-late February before the funds become available. He recommended the Council move forward immediately.

The expenses leading up to bond funding can be covered by Police and Fire Impact fee monies. In the unlikely event that the funds are expended in their entirety, the City would then have the option of spending General Fund money, which would be reimbursed once the bond proceeds are received. While staff does not anticipate the need to borrow from the General Fund, the option will be included in the resolution. Administrator Darrington stated that impact fee money will be used first because the funds have an expiration date and this is the only project they can be used for.

In response to a question raised by Council Member Stanley as to whether there was a mechanism in place to sell back the unused portion of the funds, Administrator Darrington answered in the negative. He noted that the City would need to use the funds. Once they sell the bonds there is a 10-year callback feature and they do not have the ability to repurchase them. He explained that when the school district bonds for large amounts they draw out in increments over time. However, to do this the City would have to go through a second issuance and obtain another bond rating, which requires time and financial resources. Administrator Darrington reiterated that the biggest risk in going this route is the potential increase in interest rates. Mayor Daniels asked Administrator Darrington if he could determine what the cost of issuance might be if they decided to take only half of the money now and the other half later. Administrator Darrington stated that he would have the requested information available for the Council at a later date.

Council Member Andersen asked if the City begins accruing interest once the funds are deposited in the bank. Administrator Darrington answered in the affirmative. There are, however, regulations such as they cannot hold funds for an extended period of time in order to collect arbitrage income from the interest rates. Finance Director, Denise Roy, added that the money will be in an interest-bearing account, which will reflect the State's rates (which are currently less than 1%). Council Member Andersen asked how the architect will be paid. It was noted that the architect will submit a monthly bill for work done within that period.

Administrator Darrington explained that once the funding becomes available, the City's next step is to determine which process to use. They can submit a design bid, which is the traditional way. In this scenario, the City hires an architect to design everything up to the construction documents. The City subsequently puts the construction out to bid to a General Contractor. The second option is an architect-led design build. In this instance, the architect and general contractor come on right away, and together work through the design and construction process. Administrator Darrington mentioned that Heber City recently constructed a public safety facility and he inquired of their staff what route they pursued. He discovered that they pursued an architect-led design build. They stated that the process allowed them to solve problems before they occurred.

Mayor Daniels asked if there was an option for the architect to work for the contractor. Administrator Darrington was unaware of such a scenario. There was brief discussion regarding the process by which the new Recreation Center was built. Administrator Darrington mentioned

that Heber City hired their architect first and the architect assisted with the process by hiring the General Contractor. He discussed the timeline of the RFP and anticipated they would begin the interview process by January. The design will take at least six months, which means that under the best circumstances they will break ground by next summer at the earliest. He emphasized that this timeline is still tentative and will not be solidified until the architect is selected.

The Owner's Representative will interface with the architect and contractor. Heber City organized an internal committee comprised of their Police Chief and City Engineer and called all the shots. Any significant decisions came before the Council for prior review; however, for the most part the committee was given a budget and a mandate to stay within budget while constructing a facility that meets the City's needs. The architect also plays a major role in guiding the City through the design process.

Administrator Darrington suggested the job description be written up as an RFP, indicating that applicants should list their fee in addition to their qualifications for the position. The City can either opt to bring aboard the Owner's Representative or Architect first, or hire the Architect and Contractor first. Administrator Darrington's preference was to hire the Architect in conjunction with the Owner's Representative. The Architect, Owner's Representative, and committee could then work through the process of selecting a Contractor.

There was next discussion on the Old Recreation Center, a subject over which Administrator Darrington advised the Council to be sensitive. It was noted that the last Junior Jazz practice will take place the end of February. Staff's recommendation was to not schedule any events at the facility from that point forward (March 1, 2017). All other events, including boutiques and dances, can be scheduled up until that date. Administrator Darrington stated that the facility will not necessarily be demolished on March 1, but they need the flexibility between then and Strawberry Days in June. He emphasized that as a City they need to come up with a way to honor the building between now and then. Several ideas were brainstormed and recommendations would be presented to the Council. Mayor Daniels suggested that staff be assigned to oversee the memorialization of the building.

There was discussion on how to proceed. Council Member LeMone suggested they draft the job description for the Owner's Representative immediately. She would like this individual to be involved in the hiring of the Architect since they will be working closely. She suggested the committee be involved in hiring the Owner's Representative.

Council Member Stanley felt this was a transparent approach. He asked about the Architect-led option and if there were any downsides to this approach. Mayor Daniels relayed a time his business built a facility in Hawaii and had a Contractor lead the project. The Contractor managed to complete the project for 25% less than the estimated budget. Later, they did another project that was Architect-led and had an opposite experience. Mayor Daniels stressed the need for having controls in place to expend funds efficiently.

Council Member LeMone preferred to hire an Owner's Representative first so they can assist in the hiring of the Architect and Contractor. Administrator Darrington commented that they would not likely fill the position until December, which would push the process back slightly. Council

Member LeMone stressed the importance of getting the project done correctly. Staff and the Council agreed that hiring an expert to manage the project would save a significant amount of money for the City in the long run. Council Member Stanley suggested that they move forward to put out an RFP for the Architect. He stated it will be important to bring on an Owner's Representative who has a level of independence and commitment to the taxpayer, as well as experience in construction. He mentioned that he has been approached by several people who would be willing to fulfill this role at no charge. After further discussion, the Council agreed that the first step needed to be bringing on an Owner's Representative.

Mayor Daniels asked the Council what they felt would be reasonable compensation for the position. Administrator Darrington suggested they allow applicants to set their own fee. Council Member Walker commented that this would be the best money the City will spend on the project. Staff noted that they would advertise the position via the City's website. In response to a question from Council Member Andersen, Mayor Daniels indicated that the cost of the position would be included in price of the project. He added that having a local professional would lend credibility to the project. The meetings throughout the design phase would be as open as possible. Mayor Daniels stated that decisions need to be made by a smaller group of experts. The Council unanimously directed staff to advertise for position as soon as possible.

12) **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE NOVEMBER 22, 2016 CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA**

Mayor Daniels briefly discussed 100 East and relayed his correspondence with other elected officials on the matter. He felt the item should be placed on the agenda again for further Council consideration. Council Member LeMone noted that Cedar Hills City Councilwoman, Jenney Rees, was present. She invited Ms. Rees to provide updates from Cedar Hills's side of the matter.

Ms. Rees informed the Council that the Cedar Hills City Council rejected the County's offer. Mayor Gygi met with Commissioner Ivy and Commissioner Lee who both indicated that they would be willing to take the \$9.5 million to fix the road as it was discussed. After it is fixed they would approach the two cities to discuss future ownership. This scenario was what Cedar Hills hoped would be accomplished, without requiring the cities to enter into an agreement with the County. Ms. Rees stated that Pleasant Grove is larger than Cedar Hills so the financial implications of entering into the agreement are much greater. They would like to meet with the Pleasant Grove City Council to discuss maintenance needs. Together with the Pleasant Grove City Council, they would also like to meet with the County Commissioners in January to discuss the best way to proceed. Mayor Daniels stated that they were willing to have conversations with Cedar Hills. They would not, however, want to be left with a small amount of money and a patch job when there could be a proper job done that could last for 20 to 30 years. Ms. Rees reiterated the need for the two Councils to meet. The Council was amenable to having a discussion. Council Member Stanley expressed a willingness to move in the same direction as Cedar Hills.

With regard to the November 22 City Council Meeting, Mayor Daniels stated that the main purpose of tonight's meeting was to canvass the results of the election.

13) **NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS**

Staff provided brief updates relative to their respective departments. Director Beaumont mentioned that 4000 North will be paved the following day. Fire Chief, Dave Thomas, reported that they deployed two units to the Mountain View this morning in light of the latest incident. He was unable to confirm any details. Library and Arts Director, Sheri Britsch, thanked everyone for their help with the Veterans' Day program, which was very successful. Council Member LeMone suggested that the Veterans' Day Program be held later in the day in future years so that more people can attend. Administrator Darrington reported that he met with the School District's Facilities Committee earlier in the day regarding tax incentive proposals. Staff would like to have both entities reach an agreement by early December.

14) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Council Member Walker announced that Pat Ellington passed away this past week.

Council Member Jensen shared his observations of the Public Safety responders at Mountain View earlier in the day. He also highlighted the local talent of author Leslie Zimmerman, who recently wrote and published a book called "Dream Big". Council Member Stanley invited everyone to attend the final Finance Academy session the following evening. He also announced an upcoming event at Aroma Tools where Ray Croma will be a guest speaker. Council Member Stanley informed those present that Former Pleasant Grove Mayor, Cornell Haynie, also passed away this week.

15) SIGNING OF PLATS

There were no plats signed.

16) REVIEW CALENDAR

It was reported that the Christmas Tree Lighting will be held on November 28 at 6:00 p.m.

17) ADJOURN

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:12 p.m.

The minutes of November 15, 2016 City Council Meeting were approved by the City Council on December 6, 2016

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

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