

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
November 1, 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
Barbara Johnson, Planning/Building Tech
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Dave Thomas, Fire Chief
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator

Excused: 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 Mike Daniels called the meeting to order and reported that all Council Members were present. City Recorder, Kathy Kresser, was excused.

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Drew Armstrong.

3) OPENING REMARKS

The opening remarks were given by Molly Andrew.

4) APPROVAL OF MEETING'S AGENDA

Mayor Daniels mentioned a few changes to the agenda. Items 9A and 9B were to be continued until November 15, 2016. Items 10B and E were to be continued until November 9, 2016. An Executive Session was to be added between Items 16 and 17.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to approve the agenda with the aforementioned changes. 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.

Donna Jolley presented an article about the Illinois government being run for the benefit of its employees and shared a story about Puerto Rico's financial crisis. She expressed her worry about overspending. She stated that the City overspends on foolish things and if taxes continue to increase, citizens who are on fixed incomes will suffer. She encouraged the Council to make use of the buildings they have and spend wisely. She also made brief mention of a road that has been under construction all summer.

Mayor Daniels closed the open session.

6) CONSENT ITEMS

- a) **City Council Meeting Minutes:
No Minutes at this time.**
- b) **To Consider Approval of Payment Vouchers for (October 24, 2016)**

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 APPOINTMENT OF JAYLENE MCFARLAND, KAREN HARBOLD, AND JEANNE HOLDAWAY AS HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS.**

It was noted that none of the appointees were present. Mayor Daniels reported that the aforementioned individuals were additions to the Committee and were not replacing any members. Council Member Andersen mentioned that she interviewed the candidates and found that their backgrounds would be an asset to the Committee.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to appoint Jaylene McFarland, Karen Harbold, and Jeanne Holdaway as Historic Preservation Committee Members. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

8) **PRESENTATIONS**

A) ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF AND AGAINST THE PROPOSED BALLOT PROPOSITION THAT IS ON THE NOVEMBER 8, 2016 GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT.

City Attorney, Tina Peterson, explained that the above item was not classified as a public hearing. The statute requires a public meeting for arguments to be presented on ballot propositions. City Administrator, Scott Darrington, introduced the item and explained that the Voter Information Pamphlet was received a few weeks ago. The City is required to write an argument in favor of the bond and any resident may write an argument against it. Attorney Petersen wrote the argument for the bond and Blaine Thatcher wrote the argument against the bond. Once submitted, each group will have an opportunity to provide a rebuttal.

Attorney Petersen read the following argument FOR the bond:

The citizens of Pleasant Grove overwhelmingly recognize the need for new Public Safety Facilities. A citizen committee has spent the last year and half studying the issue and vetting options. The committee proposed solutions to the problem including a recommendation to bond for a specific amount to pay a portion of the costs of the new public safety facilities.

Through the process it has become evident that the current buildings have reached a point that additions or repairs can no longer be justified as fiscally responsible. City Council unanimously approved a resolution asking voters to authorize issuance of General Obligation Bonds to finance the construction of new public safety facilities which will house fire, police, dispatch, and a justice court.

Our fire station was built in 1949 as an addition to the old public high school. It was converted to a fire station in 1989 when the population of the City was 11,000 and we had a volunteer fire department. We now have a fulltime fire and EMS department servicing over 38,500 people. There are serious concerns with the current building as it does not meet seismic safety standards. This 75 year old structure is inadequate for day to day operations and could be destroyed in a seismic event, leaving the citizens without emergency services.

Our police station has outlived its usefulness and functionality as a police facility. It is not in compliance with current regulations for police departments that require heightened security and separation from public access. Prisoner processing and transport facilities are not secure; there is inadequate evidence storage space – evidence is being stored under stairways, in hallways and in an elevator shaft; interrogation rooms are undersized, lack ventilation and windows; the booking area is open to dispatch and puts the safety of civilian employees at risk.

Our justice court facility is drastically undersized and functionally inadequate. It seats approximately 30 people but 50 to 70 defendants are scheduled to be seen on any given day. People are forced to stand in the lobby until it's their turn. The public's safety is compromised since there is no secure way to transport prisoners, they must be walked through the foyer among

the general public. There are no conference rooms. Attorneys confer with their clients and private information must be discussed in the middle of the lobby. There is insufficient storage space for court records. There is no jury deliberation room.

The need is clear. The citizens have been heard. The amount of actual debt has been reduced through extensive cost cutting review and substantial donation commitments from private citizens and local business intended to ease the burden on taxpayers. The bond will not exceed \$9.5 million dollars and will increase the average property owner's tax \$5.02 per month. The project fulfills needs in four areas that are currently in operational failure and assures functionality both for our present needs and future growth.

Blaine Thatcher read the following argument AGAINST the bond:

As a City, we have been wrestling for years to meet argued public safety needs. It has been a difficult yet vindicating struggle as we watched the bond amounts, projected to only increase, diminish from \$19 million to \$16.9, \$14.9, \$12.67, and now \$9.5 million. We know the vast majority of citizens in Pleasant Grove want to see a solution to the needs of our public safety employees, but one that also respects the demands on family finances.

In an effort to bridge the emotional divide, a Public Safety Building Committee was created of citizens with drastically different views. One primary goal, as stated by its chosen spokesman, was that a solution be reached "in a responsible way that would restrain to the greatest extent possible the financial burden on the citizens of our city." We are grateful for the Committee's recognition of the taxpayer and acknowledge their monumental work, resulting in the current bond number, reflecting our shared desires for public safety solutions.

While the majority of the committee strongly felt the budget could be less, they recommended to the Council a bond number and a total budget for construction costs. The success or failure of the bond now rests with the Council. As citizens of Pleasant Grove we support fiscal conservatism, reasonable solutions, full accountability, and transparent government; therefore, citizens need assurances and specifics from the Council about the money they're requesting . . . your money. The amount represents new money the City is asking for from residents at a time when major infrastructural issues remain to be addressed, including roads and water. The Council chooses to fund such needs through the citizenry; steadily raising our secondary and other water fees; proposing a new tax, called a road fee on each household and business's utility bill to raise \$1 million annually for roads. With so many expensive projects to be funded by the citizenry in the near future, will the City Council rebuild trust with the citizens and:

- 1. Commit to "a budget set at \$11 million or less for construction costs", as unanimously recommended on 8/23/16?*
- 2. Commit to work hard to reduce the costs of construction as discussed by the Committee?*
- 3. Use private donations to actually lower the amount borrowed?*
- 4. Specify a location for the buildings?*
- 5. Preserve our beloved and historic Old Recreation Center with its cultural and revenue generating functions?*

6. *Practice open and transparent finances across the city?*
7. *Be inclusive, giving citizens regular updates on the progress of the buildings and budgets?*
8. *Allow meaningful ongoing citizen input?*

To date, the Council has not addressed the concerns in writing, so we cannot recommend voting for the bond. We encourage citizens to ask these and other questions, seek hard evidence from elected officials and be confident in the answers received BEFORE you vote. Look for results, not rhetoric. It is our money they seek; it is your right to be secure in your vote.

City Attorney Petersen read the rebuttal to the argument AGAINST the Bond:

The opposition argument focuses on emotion not facts. It seeks to instill fear and mistrust rather than address the actual bond proposal. The tone is threatening rather than an objective evaluation of the merits of the bond proposal. IF the City Council will meet all of the opposition's demands THEN they would support the bond. Some demands are not even related to the project. The elected body of Pleasant Grove does not make decisions based on threats and our community should not vote based on fear and the desire to create contention.

The facts are that this proposal is based upon professional studies requested by the citizen driven Public Safety Building Committee (PSB Committee) evaluating:

- *Remodeling options*
- *Architectural and engineering costs*
- *Pricing related to various locations*
- *A thorough review of the space and functional needs of the project.*

The citizens Committee unanimously recommended the \$9.5 million dollar bond amount as being adequate to meet the public need in a fiscally responsible manner.

This proposal is the result of an open, transparent, citizen initiated recommendation from the PSB committee that took over 16 months to study the issue and propose solutions. It is the result of a spirit of cooperation, transparency, and ingenuity by the PSB Committee, the Mayor and City Council, and staff to meet a dire need in our community with fiscally responsible solutions.

This bond proposal has been developed through thorough research, and factual information. This proposal is principled, consistent, and affordable for the people of Pleasant Grove.

Mr. Thatcher read the rebuttal to the argument FOR the Bond.

The City's advocacy piece addresses the need for new public safety facilities. However, it lacks building specifics and, just as an investor requests plan specifics before writing a check, we are requesting plan specifics from the Council before voting in November. Citizens would like answers and assurances before being asked for yet another tax increase and entrusting \$9,500,000 to the Council.

- *Lindon is currently building at \$175 per square foot, and our City proposes building at \$245 per square foot.*
- *Why won't we consider a new \$3,000,000 fire station and a \$2,000,000 remodel of police and courts?*
- *What percentage property tax increase is this bond proposal? 40%?*
- *Why can other cities trim budgets and meet their needs at average construction prices?*
- *Why will the Council not commit to work hard to reduce the cost of this proposal per committee recommendation? What is the location? Over triple the space for our police and courts?*

With these and other unanswered questions, the lack of trust created by prior bond proposals, and a looming new tax to raise roads money, citizens are not ready to move ahead without necessary information. Pleasant Grove is highly indebted and already has one of the highest tax burdens in the county.

We are a modest City with modest needs. It is our right and duty to ask questions about the plan for spending our money. Why overspend? Vote no on this bond and let's work together for a modest solution to our modest needs.

Mayor Daniels opened the discussion for public comments.

Kurt Jurgens stated that he has read the proposals and rebuttals and has questions. He is currently involved in construction of a commercial building and noted that lenders require specific details before approving changes. He did not see any of that happening with the City. He noted that there are no details about the building, including its location. He commented that he is not prepared to vote for the bond while there are still so many unanswered questions.

Jill Skoy supported finding a creative solution to meet the needs of the Public Safety Departments. She expressed concern with the wording of the official ballot which states "to pay for all or a portion of the cost". She was also concerned with what the final costs to the citizens will be. Furthermore, she noted that the ballot states that the amount of taxes is not limited to what the City may be required to levy in order to repay the debt. She requested that the bond language be clarified.

Jason Hunter noted that he served on the Public Safety Building Committee and explained that as a Committee they debated the issues for the past 16 months. Through their research, they came to the realization that the buildings are needed and the citizens' money would be used to fund the project. Mr. Hunter stated that one of the primary roles of government is the protection of its citizens and as such he argued that this was one of the best uses of government funds. He clarified that the cost was \$204 per square foot and believed that the numbers will decrease with the architectural plan. The Council and Public Safety Building Committee have committed to keeping construction costs to \$11 million or less. He encouraged everyone to vote for the bond.

Sandy Carter expressed displeasure with some of the information contained in Mr. Thatcher's argument. She commented that it was misleading and unsubstantiated. Mr. Thatcher's argument mentioned an increase of 40% to property taxes, a claim which could not be substantiated with hard data. She inquired about the cost of Lindon's facility. Mayor Daniels stated that they are spending \$209 per square foot according to the Lindon City Council minutes. Ms. Carter stated that Lindon is a much smaller city that is not building a Police Station, Fire Station, and Courts. She explained that the current buildings do not provide adequate space for public safety personnel to operate properly. Last, she was appalled by the fact that some citizens accuse the City of not being transparent when they have worked diligently to involve the public throughout the process.

Molly Andrews invited those questioning the facts to speak with her as she was also on the Public Safety Building Committee. She stated that space is an issue with the Police Department but security is an even bigger issue. The project has come a long way. The bond proposal decreased from \$19 million to approximately \$12.4 million, the facts of which were not hidden. With the addition of private donations and impact fee money, the Committee was able to reach the \$9.5 million bond amount. She mentioned that the Public Safety Building Committee Meetings can be found on YouTube.com, and anyone can listen to Jim Allred answer questions in the February 10, 2016 meeting about the expenses of remodeling. In addition, meeting minutes are available online. She expressed gratitude to the Mayor and his leadership and encouraged citizens to vote.

Christy Belt explained that the Public Safety Building Committee considered remodeling the Police Station. The cost of building new facilities was similar to remodeling. The reason the Committee did not choose that option was because the form and function of the buildings would be insufficient. She noted that the previous week she voted in favor of the bond and remarked that safety is the top priority.

Blaine Thatcher explained that everyone has different opinions. He mentioned that Lindon spent one year reducing their budget and operating costs to reduce the burden on the citizens. They began the process at \$175 per square foot and may have increased it, but Pleasant Grove started with high costs and has had to bring them down. He did not understand why the City would start high and then be constrained to an \$11 million budget. He did not know what the tax increase would be because the City has not provided that information. He had not yet heard any commitment to reduce the budget for the real construction costs.

Drew Armstrong expressed that he has worked hard to get the bond passed. The work that was done by the citizens and various professional firms was adequate. The bond election failed last year by only 3% and the proposal has gone through thorough vetting. He expressed appreciation to the Public Safety Building Committee for their time and for the private donors who are responding to this need. Mr. Armstrong explained that the reason the bond has been reduced is because of generous private donations and not because they eliminated any previous frivolities. It bothered Mr. Armstrong that inaccurate information was distributed to the public. As an example, Lindon will be spending more money per resident and building a less efficient facility. Furthermore, Lindon already has nicer Court facilities. They outsource their Dispatch and have no administrative offices for their Fire Department. He commented there is no comparison between the two cities.

Guy Fugal expressed appreciation to the Public Safety Building Committee for their time and effort. He commented that he was offended that there is still opposition to the bond. He commented that as a City it is time to move on.

Debbie Hong was in favor of the bond as the need for public safety facilities is real and will not go away. The project has been thoroughly vetted and received a unanimous recommendation from the Public Safety Building Committee.

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

Mayor Daniels acknowledged the comments made by the public and explained that the democratic process allows the freedom of expression. He offered to make himself available to discuss the issue with anyone seeking additional information and invited people to read his Facebook posts as another source. He mentioned that he posted a comparison of Lindon and Pleasant Grove and invited people to draw their own conclusion about services needed. He reaffirmed that commitments have been extended by the Council, staff, and the Public Safety Building Committee for an \$11 million construction cap. Mayor Daniels explained that there is a general recognition of the need for the facilities and he again invited anyone seeking additional information to schedule a meeting with him.

Council Member LeMone offered to meet with people about the issue as well. She mentioned that on the website there is a list of frequently asked questions and a chart showing the amount per month that the bond would be based on. There is also the stream of all the Public Safety Building Committee Meetings.

9) **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

A) **PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 33.5 ACRES FROM THE 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) *Continued to the November 15, 2016 City Council Meeting.**

B) **PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE 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 to the November 15, 2016 City Council Meeting.**

10) **ACTION ITEMS READY FOR A VOTE**

A) **MOTION TO DECLARE THE CITY COUNCIL'S PREFERENCE OF THE FIRE STATION LOCATION.**

Mayor Daniels commented that he took the liberty of preparing some information, this is intended to be summary in nature it is not intended to be persuasive. He then said what he attempted to do is bring together some of the points that have been discussed and some of the concerns, issues or discoveries that the committee or citizens have expressed regarding the preference or non-preference of the particular location for the fire station.

Continuing on the Mayor said that as we go through the presentation the first two items are a representation of what the architecture is along with the cost estimates. Next they will discuss the response times that were actually driven from both of the sites to various areas of the City. The concerns are more high level they are not every concern that was listed but he thinks that they capture the largest issues that the people are dealing with.

Mayor Daniels then explained the option of the site plans. Option 1 is the potential layout of what the site would look like if both police/court building and fire station were on the Downtown property. In this scenario it appears that the fire station would directly cover the majority of the Old Rec Center which is one of the concerns that has been mentioned. With Option 2 the police/courts building would be in the same place as shown on Option 1. The next picture shows the fire station on the north/west corner of the Pipe Plant. He noted that he tried to get the pictures to be the same scale so the buildings will look the same size.

Mayor Daniels then showed the initial floor plan designs that Think Architect came up with for the first and second floors of each of the buildings. The buildings do not change in size or shape no matter where they are located. This is important to know because they are trying to keep an apple to apple comparison on cost of sticks and bricks. The plans show that the square footage for the police and courts is 29,818. The street level is shown as the top picture and the upper floor plan is the bottom picture. Mayor Daniels noted that the information that they are looking at tonight is also posted on the City website.

Mayor Daniels then pointed out the floor plans for the fire station. The square footage for the fire station is 24,034 with 6 bays and the living quarters on the second floor. The bays come all the way up to the second level so there isn't room for office or living quarters over the bays.

Next the Mayor went over the detailed budgets. This lists all the estimates that the architect went through for the design of the buildings. These estimates costs are for sticks and bricks only. The police/courts estimate for the downtown site is \$7,314,876 and it stays the same with or without the fire station downtown. The fire station for downtown is \$5,332,833 which is about \$180,000 less expensive for sticks and bricks if it is built at the pipe plant. He believes that the cost is less because materials that are required in that area are not as stringent as they are at the Downtown site. The Mayor explained that these are the only estimated costs that were figured because the cost flips the other way when you start including the cost of the land. These figures show that there is about a 1 ½ % difference in cost of the 2 sites.

Response times for the Fire Department were reviewed next as it is the most critical factor when determining location. The Mayor pointed out on the map the two locations for the proposed fire station. He noted that in the top right hand table it shows the response times and number of miles driven to each of the locations and are shown in red. He said that he would guess that it is the

response time that is most critical for life and fire. He said that he had quite a few people ask him why the tests were done without lights and sirens. According to the Fire Chief, unless there is an imminent threat to loss of life or property, the Fire Department does not use lights and sirens. Council Member Stanley asked about the reasoning for choosing certain points to determine response times. Fire Chief, Dave Thomas, explained that they were looking for a representation of potential area of response.

Mayor Daniels reviewed some of the concerns and stated that if all facilities are built Downtown there is limited parking and future expansion. When you look at the site plan you can tell right away there is a limited amount of real estate on the block to be able to fit the two facilities in. Another concern is the demolition of the Old Recreation Center and the respect given to its memory. What is going to be done to memorialize the facility as opposed to disregarding the heritage that is associated with the facility? The two concerns that were mentioned are the loss of cultural heritage and memories and the loss of public and private uses whether they bring in money or not.

The Downtown location is estimated to be \$180,000 more on sticks and bricks and one of the things that was discussed to help with the space is the closure of 100 South to accommodate parking needs.

The concerns for the Fire Station at the Pipe Plant Property include the delayed response times to some areas of the City. There are circuitous routes to full East/West North/South roads and a likely congested rail crossing at 600 West and Center Street at rush hour. The residents are very concerned about the noise, traffic, and safety around this unfamiliar use of their neighborhood.

The Mayor noted that he was not at the meeting when the railroad crossing was discussed by Chief Thomas. He didn't really understand what the Chief was talking about until he watched the broad cast of the meeting. At 600 West where the railroad is during rush hour the concern is having that many vehicles coming from Center Street and turning north on 600 West or coming off of 600 West and heading to the freeway or State Street. He commented that the fire vehicles could use lights and sirens but if there is nowhere for the people to go to get out of their way it is a potential for a bottleneck and would have to be mitigated.

Mayor Daniels explained there has not been a discussion regarding the cost of improvements at 600 West and 800 North. He also mentioned that the Council has heard concerns from residents in the area regarding the change of character of the neighborhoods and cemetery and the safety of the children.

Mayor Daniels encouraged the Council to have a good discussion on the locations, as several citizens have been waiting for updates in that regard.

Council Member Stanley mentioned that he asked staff about the number of residences, schools, and crossings within a one-mile radius of the two proposed sites and they hadn't had that fully researched at that time but is hoping that he can get those answers soon. Some of the factors and criteria that has been outlined would apply to both sites. He remarked that both locations are residential locations that is why he asked staff for that information. Administrator Darrington

explained that they do not have that information tonight although he said he would email those numbers later.

Council Member Andersen described the purpose of the discussion and mentioned a few items she discovered about each location. First, the MAG Transportation Plan has outlined projects over the next 40 years and will include light rail on the track at 600 West. The intersection at 600 West and Center Street is failing now. She said that she was very moved by the comments that Chief Thomas made about that intersection and then you add trucks and light rail to the equation. The comment about build-out, the goal of the Committee was to plan ahead for growth. She stressed that response times are the most important consideration to make when deciding on the best location. She spoke about her experiences moving to Pleasant Grove and establishing roots in the community.

Next Council Member Andersen remarked that she read the first volume of the Pleasant Grove history and she understands the value of the Old Fort Area. She couldn't remember if it was Beth Olson or Mildred Sutch that stated that Pleasant Grove is one of the only communities left in Utah Valley that has kept their safe place in the Old Fort spot. She loves that the Old Fort which was a safe place will now house our police and our fire. She noted that the Old Recreation Center has had minimal maintenance over the years which hasn't kept the building up to standards. The Bowen and Collins report states that it will take 2 million dollars to bring it up to code. She stated that she has enjoyed that building her children have played ball there, but she doesn't know if it is fiscally responsible to own and manage an aging event center.

Council Member Jensen explained that he based his information on facts and his position on the issue came down to the health and safety of the citizens. He presented graphs and population demographics to the Council. Chief Thomas provided him with the number of calls the department received during the years 2014, 2015 and 2016. In reviewing a map of 800 North he noted that 70% to 75% of the calls came from the south and southeast sides of the City. Population demographics show that the southern side of the City contains 207 apartments, 630 commercial buildings, 706 churches and schools, 1,992 high-density residential, 3,900 residential and 17 unknown, for a total of 7,500 buildings and out of that 7,500 6,200 represent residents to which the Fire Department must respond. The number of buildings located north of 800 North was also reviewed and there is a total of 4,129 of that 3,700 is residents the other 344 is commercial, churches and schools. It was noted that these neighborhoods are more rural.

Director Beaumont clarified some of the fore mentioned figures. The County labels the type of use on a parcel of ground so when you say that there are 1,800 churches and schools that number is the number of parcels that are owned by exempt classifications not necessarily that there are that many schools or churches in that area.

In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Council Member Jensen clarified that the numbers represented residential parcels, not calls. He directed Mayor Daniels to another map that showed the number of calls from each area. With regard to access, travel duration, and the directness of roads around the Pipe Plant property, Council Member Jensen observed the bottlenecks on 600 West are dangers posed to firefighters that cause response time delays. These are things that need to be looked at and the conditions that they are trying to put the firemen into.

Council Member Walker commented that he has listened carefully and believes the public would want his vote to represent their thoughts. As he has researched each location and listened to public feedback, 3-to-1 people want the Fire Station Downtown. He also stressed that safety and response times were the highest priorities when deciding on the right location. Last, he stated that it was time for the City to pass the bond and move forward and start planning. You may get into the downtown site and find out some new facts as you look at the positioning of the buildings and there might be a change.

Council Member Stanley agreed that they need to analyze the public's preferences. He reported that he has received more comments through the City's website in favor of the Pipe Plant property, as well as from members of the Public Safety Building Committee and he has personally received more comments in favor of the Pipe Plant location to the Downtown location. To him that is a factor but he doesn't believe that the information that he has is statically a significant sample size. He heavily weighs the comments from the Fire Chief and Public Safety professionals who make these decisions every day.

Council Member Stanley stated that the data that is not available yet needs to be analyzed. He wanted to know what was in the one-mile radius and determine if school crossings and churches would have an impact on the concerns of safety, the concerns of children playing, concerns of children crossing the street that reflects in terms of where they are really going to be the safest. Furthermore, while it was less costly at the Pipe Plant property, there were other costs at both locations that had not been quantified. He was concerned about the parking constraints with the Downtown site. There are 2 acres at the Pipe Plant that they have talked about using, there are 1.05 acres at the downtown site for the exact same structure of the fire station so they do lose a lot of additional space for a more generous turning radius and other things that would be a benefit at the Pipe Plant.

Ultimately he thinks that the discussion that is the most important is a recommendation from one of his heroes on the PSB Committee, Jan Van Orman, he suggested a few weeks ago that what they really need to do is talk about the vision for the future of the City and what the goal is. He is concerned about the loss of people downtown that the Old Rec currently provides, the dances, the boutiques and activities bring a lot of people downtown which is beneficial to the downtown businesses. He also mention that he is worried about the impact on Strawberry Days, City social events are the things that matter to the citizens and how that will change and he is not convinced that there has been proper discussion on these issues.

He would love to hear, if comments from the public are continued, about peoples vision and what can be done to replace the foot traffic to the downtown businesses. What is going to bring people downtown in the way that the boutique has and what will be the future of the boutiques, is the City going to lose them forever?

There have been individual anecdotal concerns from a number of people, there have been a number of people come in and say that the exit out of the fire station if it is put on 200 South instead of 100 East will be a concern for them because it comes out right at their house. He has heard specific individual concerns about noise and safety and is anxious to see the numbers on churches, cross walks for schools within the one mile radius. He is anxious to have a really thorough conversation

about the vision. He said that Council Member Andersen has already articulated about the safety of the Old Fort and it is a vision. He said that he is worried about parking and the traffic that the downtown businesses have lost.

Council Member Andersen addressed the concern regarding events and explained that they could be accommodated with large tents. Alternatively, carpet can be rolled out at the Rec Center, which is how Provo houses events. Pricing for events is the same at the Recreation Center and parking can be accommodated on the west side. Furthermore, at Stone Gate there is ample parking across the street and at the event center. She stressed that the revenue that is produced by the Old Rec Center is not sufficient to maintain it. The City is not doing maintenance on the building because there is a budgetary restraint. She feels that the event portion can be accommodated. The downtown feeling will be enhanced, the University Place (UP) has a beautiful park area with pavilions. You can still have events in the park, for Strawberry Days the fireman can pull out on 100 East, no headlights in the house.

Council Member LeMone mentioned that she grew up in Pleasant Grove with the Old Recreation Center culture her entire life. She was in favor of the Downtown location based on the health and safety of the community, fiscal responsibility, and honoring the City's heritage in a more respectful way than a dilapidated building.

Mayor Daniels reminded the Council that nothing will happen on November 9 or January 1. He does not know how long it will take before construction begins as they will still need to go through the design and engineering process. The more effort put into the planning phase, the less likely mistakes will occur that will result in project increases. He also noted that they won't borrow the money until there is a need to borrow the money. The decision that is being made tonight is to let the public know what this Council is thinking as to what the primary location would be for these facilities. He then noted what Council Member Walker stated, that when architects and the engineers start looking under the ground they could find something that could change the mind of the Council on the site. Council Member Andersen agreed, they might start digging and there might be Indian ruins or there might be waste, you just don't know.

Mayor Daniels remarked that the public has asked the Council to state an opinion tonight, to make a decision so that they can go to the ballot box knowing what it is the Council is thinking so that it is not a mystery. His request is that the Council take a vote in favor of one of these two locations as the primary location and announce that so the public can do what they need to do.

Council Member Stanley commented that while he was indifferent to the location, he was concerned because there are still unanswered questions to his satisfaction. He said that he is worried about the ambiguity of location, and the more that they talk about the post vote the more concern he has that people will feel that there is still significant revisions that may happen to the plans to get to a point, he has had people, who he deeply respects, suggest that the plans should be redesigned to accommodate everything Downtown. He said that he isn't ready to express a preference but it is far past time but feels like there are too many questions that haven't been answered on the future of Strawberry Days, on the nature of our need for foot traffic and the vision of our downtown that we should have had. Furthermore, while events can be accommodated elsewhere, the owners of boutiques have requested to stay Downtown. He remarked that it is not

his position to make a statement of preference because they have not had critical data and discussion yet.

Council Member Jensen addressed some of Council Member Stanley's concerns. Some of the website comments were submitted without names so he did not consider them and he does not believe the Public Safety Building Committee Members requested a certain site. Mayor Daniels confirmed that the votes of the Public Safety Building Committee were inconclusive. The concern on schools, he thinks that that was heard at the meeting in September from residents on that issue and the crossings at 600 West. Council Member Jensen stated that the cost of the land at the Pipe Plant property will be more expensive. He did not consider the issue of parking to be as important as the health and safety of the citizens; however, there is sufficient space for parking at the Downtown location next to the Administration building and next to the Beck home and closing 100 South down.

Council Member Jensen noted that the vision of the downtown has already been discussed with the Downtown 2020 plan which the Council has been criticized for having. He loves the walkability of downtown, he has been to the boutiques and has watched as people come to the boutique, they get out of their car and walk into the boutique and then they leave. It doesn't push people to the downtown businesses. Furthermore, Council Member Jensen echoed previous remarks made pertaining to the relocation of events to accommodate them as a result of a new facility Downtown.

Council Member LeMone asked Council Member Stanley what he was referring to when he said that foot traffic would be lost. She explained that she asked for a list of activities from Parks and Recreation Director, Deon Giles. The only City-run activities that take place at the Old Rec Center are a junior high dance and basketball practices. The rest are private events. She commented that she attends every boutique and all bring in their own food, so the foot traffic to Downtown businesses is minimal. Council Member Stanley stated he would have liked to have seen a study on that to quantify those numbers and it would be nice to know.

Mayor Daniels asked if there were any other considerations that haven't already been brought up. Council Member Andersen noted that the Old Rec Center has a lot of memories for a lot of people and at some point the Council is going to have to come up with 3 million dollars to renovate it or come up with a beautiful way to pay tribute and honor it and she thinks that that can be a joyful City celebration.

Mayor Daniels said that on the matter of Downtown for both facilities or Downtown for police, courts and dispatch and then Pipe Plant for fire and EMS or if you don't know or don't want to say at this time. Who is in favor of having all 3 facilities in the Downtown? Council Members Andersen, Walker, LeMone and Jensen agreed. Council Member Stanley remarked that he is neither in favor or opposed.

Mayor Daniels then asked who was in favor of having police/courts Downtown and fire and EMS at the Pipe Plant. Council Member Andersen noted that she loves that that is still a possibility and loves that if there is something that they are digging into or finding that there is a second choice. Council Member Walker agrees. Council Member LeMone stated that she thinks that it is not

viable but the Council owes it to the citizens before they vote on Tuesday to know where the location is. Council Member Jensen stated Downtown but if it is not viable then Pipe Plant. Council Member Stanley remarked that he is neither in favor or opposed and wishing that he had answers to the questions that were asked.

Mayor Daniels stated that for the purpose of identifying the location for the bond it will be advertised to the public that the majority of the Council is in favor of having both facilities in the Downtown location as has been suggested. No one has expressed a primary preference for having them split between the Downtown and the Pipe Plant but that will be a second option if necessary.

B) CONTINUED ITEM: TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2016-043) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AN INTERLOCAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN PLEASANT GROVE, UTAH COUNTY AND CEDAR HILLS REGARDING CANYON ROAD (100 EAST); AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. PRESENTER: ADMINISTRATOR DARRINGTON *Continued from the October 18, 2016 meeting. *Continued to the November 9, 2016 City Council Meeting.

C) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2016-044) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH IVORY HOMES FOR THE AVALON HILLS PLAT A SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 900 SOUTH LOADER AVENUE, FOR THE STORM DRAIN PIPING SYSTEM; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. Presenter: Director Beaumont.

Attorney Petersen mentioned to the Mayor and Council that there are a number of items that still need to be resolved with the Development Agreement and plat signing. The motion was to be a conditional motion.

Director Young introduced the plat that the Development Agreement is associated with. The applicant is requesting approval of a 34-lot final subdivision on property located at approximately 889 East 900 South in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. An application for the final plat was received on April 29, 2016.

The proposed subdivision is to be located on approximately 5.43 acres. The final plat consists of 31 subdivided lots destined for new single-family dwellings and two lots, Lot 1 and 2, with existing dwelling structures to remain. The existing structure on the west side will be removed. By creating this subdivision, the existing Lot 1 had to adjust its size by reducing its acreage and moving the rear property line closer to the existing structure. Since the property already had an existing dwelling, the existing dwelling on Lot 1 shall comply with the yard requirements for the zone. The minimum required rear yard setback is 20 feet for new proposed subdivisions.

All lots meet the 9,000 square foot minimum lot size required in the R1-9 Zone. Measurements of the lots on the plat submitted by the applicant show that all lots contain a building area that exceeds the 800 square foot minimum required building footprint in the R1-9 Zone and can accommodate a home meeting the minimum building requirements.

Engineering as well as other agencies have reviewed the proposed subdivision and found it to be acceptable and in compliance with City standards. The roads show connectivity according to the Vicinity Plan adopted by the City.

Director Beaumont mentioned there are two conditions that need to be included with approval of the plat. He described the need for the Development Agreement with respect to off-site storm water work needing to be done. The storm water needs to be rerouted to accommodate the new development. The City is participating in the design and paving for the work. The Planning Commission reviewed and approved the preliminary plat under the name of the Brandow Subdivision, on June 23, 2016. Staff recommended approval of the proposed final plat subject to the following conditions:

1. A letter from Chuck and Luanna Stam giving their approval to be included in the subdivision and their approval of the piping of the north union canal along the frontage of Loader Avenue
2. A signed development agreement for off-site storm drainage.
3. All final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Director Beaumont explained that there is a benefit to getting the water to the upper main line and they felt they should agree to do the design and paving. The piping will be done by the contractor currently working on 1000 South. He received the amount for the work on the lower portion; however, it has not been approved by Ivory Homes, which is why the Development Agreement needs to be conditional. There was review of an aerial map of the subject property as well as brief discussion regarding utilities in the area.

In addition to the condition of finalizing the agreement for off-site work, Director Beaumont explained that the other agreement pertains to the subdivision. Three of the parcels currently have homes on them and are required to be part of the plat. A formal written agreement is required for the lot to be included and the ditch piped on the front of the property.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to adopt a Resolution (2016-044) authorizing the Mayor to enter into a Development Agreement with Ivory Homes for the Avalon Hills Plat A Subdivision located at approximately 900 South Loader Avenue, for the storm drain piping system; and providing for an effective date, adopting the findings and conclusions of the staff reports and the conditions as articulated. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken Council Members Jensen, LeMone, Andersen, Stanley and Walker voting "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

D) TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL A 34-LOT SUBDIVISION PLAT CALLED AVALON HILLS SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 889 EAST 900 SOUTH IN THE R1-9 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE. *Presenter: Director Young.*

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve a 34-lot subdivision plat called Avalon Hills Subdivision, located at approximately 889 East 900 South in the R1-9 (Single Family-

Residential) Zone.

Attorney Petersen explained that the motion needs to include a condition that the illegally subdivided lot will be included in the plat and that the property owners will submit a written confirmation expressing a willingness to be part of the plat.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley amended his motion to include the condition as articulated by the City Attorney. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

E) TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL A TWO-LOT SUBDIVISION PLAT CALLED LARSEN ACRES PLAT D, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 112 EAST 1280 NORTH IN THE R-R (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) ZONE. Presenter: Director Young
**Continued to the November 9, 2016 City Council Meeting.*

F) PLEASANT GROVE CITY PARTICIPATION IN THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Administrator Darrington explained that there was an in-depth discussion three weeks ago on the level of participation the City would have with the Pleasant Grove Chamber of Commerce. In the past, the City provided a full-time funded employee, who at first was the Assistant to City Administrator, David Larson. Assistant Larson spent half his time at the Chamber of Commerce and the remainder conducting other City business. At one point, all of Assistant Larson's time was moved to another area of the City and James Dixon was hired part-time to provide that service. As a City employee, Mr. Dixon's primary function was to handle the Chamber of Commerce. He left for another job and the Council must decide how to fund the position and hire another City employee or work with Lindon to combine the two Chambers into one joint entity.

One option was to pool their resources and give discretion to the Chamber to hire someone. Pleasant Grove's financial commitment in the past has been \$18,000 for personnel and \$2,000 as a community partner in the Chamber. The recommendation from staff three weeks ago was to stay with the \$18,000 paid to the Chamber and continue giving the \$2,000 contribution. The Chamber could then combine the salary with Lindon's contribution and hire a Director. There have also been discussions about combining resources with American Fork as well.

This funds are already budgeted so they are not seeking a budget amendment; however, the Council needs to decide how to spend the money that is currently available for the position. Council Member Stanley mentioned that in previous discussions he suggested that Pleasant Grove have twice the representation on the Board, since they will be paying twice as much as Lindon. Council Member Stanley noted that there was some initial resistance to this suggestion. Administrator Darrington stated that this language could be included in the proposal.

Council Member LeMone asked Council Member Stanley to clarify what he meant by resistance to the aforementioned suggestion. Council Member Stanley explained that there was concern about the disparity between the two cities' contributions. Mayor Daniels confirmed that Pleasant Grove will get two seats on the Board of the joint Chamber of Commerce.

There was further discussion regarding representation on the Board. Administrator Darrington clarified that currently the Board does not have Council representation and most representation is from business owners. Administrator Darrington stated that they could appoint two Council Members to serve on the Board who would have voting power. Council Member Stanley mentioned that the City's representation does not necessarily have to be Council Members but could be people they designate for that role. Administrator Darrington explained that Council Members are simply liaisons to the Board. He also explained that Lindon was not interested in contributing to the Chamber if it was run by a Pleasant Grove City employee. Lindon would be willing to contribute financially to the position if the Board were to hire its Director. It was noted that the position and funding would be reviewed on an annual basis.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved to participate financially in the Chamber of Commerce in the amount of \$18,000, plus a \$2,000 contribution and two voting Board Members. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

There were no further discussion items.

12) REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE NOVEMBER 9, 2016 CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

The agenda for the aforementioned meeting was briefly discussed. It was noted that next week's meeting will take place on Wednesday night, rather than Tuesday night due to the Election.

13) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS

Staff provided brief updates pertaining to their respective departments. Director Beaumont stated that the construction season is coming to a close and gave brief project updates. Fire Chief Thomas mentioned that they are doing their fall fitness test and he invited the Council to join. Director Britsch reported that the second round of bids for the elevator came in too high. They are hoping for favorable results to come in next Friday.

14) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Council Member Jensen challenged others to participate in No-Shave November and donate \$50 to a good cause. Council Member Stanley mentioned that he has spoken with Nathan Ivy and Mr. Graves about a road issue. He invited colleagues on the Council to discuss Cedar Hills' approach on the matter.

15) SIGNING OF PLATS

There were none.

16) REVIEW CALENDAR

There were no additional calendar items for review.

Mayor Daniels expressed appreciation to the public for their representation tonight. He also expressed appreciation to the Council for reaching a decision on the location. He then called for a motion to go into a closed meeting.

17) **CLOSED MEETING TO DISCUSS PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION UCA 52-4-201 (C)**

ACTION: 8:25 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn into a Closed Meeting to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

ACTION: At 9:09 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to come out of the Closed Meeting and go back into City Council meeting. Council Member Jensen seconded. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Mayor Daniels called for a motion to adjourn.

18) **ADJOURN**

ACTION: At 9:12 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn. Council Member Jensen seconded. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

The minutes of the November 1, 2016 City Council meeting were approved by the City Council on November 29, 2016.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder, MMC

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