

**Pleasant Grove City Council Work Session Minutes  
September 14, 2010  
6:00 p.m.**

**PRESENT:**

Mayor:

Bruce W. Call

City Council Members:

Cindy Boyd

Val Danklef

Lee G. Jensen

Kim Robinson

City Recorder:

Kathy T. Kresser

Colleen A. Mulvey, Deputy City Recorder

Others:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator

Dean Lundell, Finance Director

Tina Petersen, City Attorney

Ken Young, Comm. Dev. Director

Richard Bradford, Economic Dev. Director

Deon Giles, Leis. Services Director

Lynn Walker, Public Works Director

Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief

Tom Paul, Police Chief

Degen Lewis, City Engineer

Libby Flegal, NAB Chairperson

Excused:

Jeffrey D. Wilson, City Council Member

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

---

**1. Call to Order**

Mayor Call called roll for the Council and noted that Council Members Boyd, Danklef, Jensen and Robinson were present. Council Member Wilson was excused.

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was lead by Director Bradford.

**3. Opening Remarks**

Opening Remarks were given by Director Young.

**4. Discussion on the Realignment of Center Street**

City Engineer Lewis handed out a summary on the cost for the Center Street realignment (exhibit A)

which was prepared by Horrocks Engineers. He explained that if we were to do the realignment today it would cost around nine point one million dollars and four years down the road that cost would increase to around ten point four million dollars. He said that these numbers answer the simple question of going forward with this and the kind of obligation that would be on the part of the city. Engineer Lewis said that he thinks this realignment information is something that has value for us to keep in the long range portion of our Transportation Master Plan. Down the road this may become a greater issue for the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) with their light rail and they may become the driving force behind it, but if we ignore it entirely we may end up with a result that may meet their needs but doesn't really meet our needs. This is commercial property and right now we may tell those property owners to go ahead and do what they want because this has shifted to our long range plans, but this is something that the Council in twenty years or so will have to address again.

Mayor Call stated that the reality is that the property owners need to know what to do with their property and if this is on our master plan we will need to communicate how far down the road at a minimum or a maximum that we are looking at this.

Council Member Jensen said that he feels there are two separate issues here that the Council ought to make a decision on, one is do we want to go ahead now with the nine to ten million dollar project and the second one is if we even want this on the master plan, and based on that decision it gives clear direction to the property owners and gives future Council members some idea that this long term planning has already been talked about. Engineer Lewis said that we can certainly put information to the section discussing this as to what is intended by having this in the Transportation Master Plan. Administrator Darrington agreed that we could put an annotation that this is probably twenty years out and thinks that it is something that should stay on the plan because eventually we are going to have to deal with it.

Attorney Petersen remarked that something else to address is how Community Development would treat development requests from property owners in that area if this is on the master plan and a road is shown in a certain area and someone did want to come in and build. Director Young stated that that was his question from the beginning and if we are going to leave it in the master plan or any city plan that he thinks that we need to carefully word that this is a future concept so that we can entertain any and all development proposals that want to come forward.

Director Bradford added that looking at this through the eyes of a commercial developer/realtor, anything that we say that puts a number on it will put a cloud over that site and that will limit our opportunity to develop. He feels that it would sit better with future developments if we worded it in such a way that did not put a number on it or that we put it on an indefinite delay.

Engineer Lewis said that another option is to do an environmental document that would establish a corridor and really refine this more, it still doesn't solve the funding and actual construction but you can define the corridor and it puts the city in the position where we may be committed to pick up some right of ways.

Mayor Call asked the Council how they felt about that option of defining a corridor. Council Members Boyd and Danklef said that they felt that we don't need to spend money for that. The Mayor said that it sounds like we will have to keep this on the long term master plan but to give the

property owners a sense that this is not going to happen for a number of years and added that his concern is if we don't put this in the plan, that we are just ignoring the fact that there is a need down the road for increasing the capability of the capacity of traffic onto 600 West.

Mayor Call then asked the Council what they felt. Council Members Jensen, Boyd and Danklef said that they do not want this realignment concept on the Transportation Master Plan. Mayor Call and Council Member Robinson said that they do want it on the Transportation Master Plan with commentary that it is a future concept. Council Member Jensen asked if it could be noted that this Council has had this discussion and we decided not to take action and then he questioned what the concern was with it not being on the master plan. Mayor Call stated that it just shows a lack of preparation on the part of this Council for knowing that somewhere down the road there is going to be a need for this and we ignored it. Council Member Jensen commented that he does not know that it has been proven that there is going to be a need for it. Mayor Call said that currently it has been noted that often times cars are backed up right to the intersection on Center Street, so any common sense will tell you that you are going to need more capacity down the road. The Mayor added that all master plans should be adopted with the idea of what our future needs may be, and if we ignore that he feels that it is not the responsible thing to do.

Administrator Darrington said that the reality of the future planning here is if the property owners build something and then twenty years from now UTA comes through and puts the light rail tracks in the city will then be buying their property and knocking down whatever they have built there. Our options are to purchase that property now and not construct the road or to let the property owner do their thing and when the time comes in the future we will partner with them to help finance the road if they are going to want to have a commercial development there. Administrator Darrington said that it would be good to keep it on the plan so that we as staff have an idea that it is going to take care of our future needs and if any of the current property owners have issues we can tell them that there are just no plans right now to do this.

Mayor Call pointed out that when someone buys raw land and wants to develop it, one thing that is required is a vicinity map that shows how their development could ductile into future development and have enough traffic flow and not negatively impact surrounding properties. This realignment concept is similar to that, it is showing that down the road if we need to increase our capacity up 600 West and solve an issue with the railroad tracks, this is showing how it could be done.

Administrator Darrington asked if we feel that this is going to impede the current property owners if this stays in the master plan. Council Member Boyd remarked that is up to the confidence that we have in Director Young and the Community Development Department as to how this is explained to people when they come in and the caveat that this is for future planning and we don't anticipate it happening for fifteen to twenty years and at that point they make the choice to decide whether to develop there. Director Young stated that Council Member Boyd's point is basically true for anywhere throughout the city, we really can't say what is going to happen anywhere twenty years from now.

Council Member Boyd said that tonight we do not have to decide the exact plan; we just have to know whether we have ten million dollars for this and do we leave it on the master plan with an explanation. Mayor Call agreed and said that his initial canvass of the Council showed that one

wanted to leave it on with an annotation and three others that feel they are not interested in leaving this on the plan. Council Members Boyd, Robinson and Danklef now indicated that they were okay with leaving it on the Transportation Master Plan with the detailed annotation. Council Member Jensen said that he would like to see some other solutions added to the concept plan because if we are going to put something into the plan we ought to put more than one option.

Mayor Call then said that the direction to staff is to prepare an amendment to the plan that reflects tonight's discussion adding the detailed annotation with the preferred and alternate concepts.

## **5. Discussion on the Realignment of 100 East and Geneva Road**

City Engineer Lewis explained that we have the funding through Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) for the environmental study and as that was put together with the detail of the drawing that he prepared for the conceptual schedule he feels that he may have given them the impression that more thought had gone into this than it had. As they look at the two hundred and one thousand dollars in funding, they are saying that we have to consider a whole lot of different alternatives and will probably need to bump up the funding. Engineer Lewis said that what he would like to discuss tonight are some of the alternatives (exhibit B) and briefly what some of the impacts are.

Engineer Lewis next presented the alternatives: 1) The connection between the two streets right at State Street, which switches 100 East from the east side of the Purple Turtle to the west side of the Purple Turtle going down through Subway and swinging back over to Geneva Road. Engineer Lewis stated that this causes a lot of impact to the businesses there. 2) This connection is essentially the same type of curve, it comes up through Main Street and across 200 South and curves up to Center Street, it does not divide downtown and other than the Quilt shop we own all of the land. Engineer Lewis said that the Downtown Advisory Board has brought up the concern that if we take traffic off Main Street even more than it is today, that Main Street will continue to suffer and may even go downhill. 3) This connection comes straight up through Main Street and then curves over to connect with 100 East at 200 North. With this alternative the impact to the historical downtown is so great that it does not meet our needs. Council Member Boyd remarked that it destroys the downtown and it's creating more traffic and parking issues. 4) This connection is the concept of having one way streets on 100 East and Main Street. There would be smaller roadways but it has to be done twice and if we look at this option it would cost more, and this really expands the scope of the area. Engineer Lewis stated that it would be helpful if the Council could look at this and say what options they think would or would not meet the needs of the community.

Council Member Jensen asked about option one, if you are in the downtown area headed south what happens when you reach State Street. Engineer Lewis said that Main Street would not connect to State Street as a street, one of the advantages to this particular alignment is that the State Street right of way could be combined with some sort of development in the area which opens up developable land. Council Member Jensen asked if this would kill the traffic on Main Street. Engineer Lewis said that it kills the traffic that is just traveling through Main Street that is not headed to downtown. Mayor Call stated that that is proven, the vehicular traffic that goes through Main Street is not the type to stop and go buy something, they are on their way somewhere. Director Bradford added that there are two kinds of shopping, there is impulse shopping and destination shopping and what we

have in our downtown and the way it is developing right now, the stores are becoming more of a destination purchase than impulse buying.

Attorney Petersen said that she remembers that the alignment on option one was discussed a couple of years ago, but doesn't remember that the city ever made a decision that this was the way that they wanted to go. She thought that the whole purpose of the environmental study was to present some viable alternative options for the Council to consider and what she is hearing is that they think that option one is what we have already decided on and if we want to look at the other options it's going to cost more money. Engineer Lewis said that that is true. Administrator Darrington said that the way he understood it is that we wanted them to look at all four options, and when the funding comes through the engineer (Horrocks) says that we only really have the money to look at one option. Engineer Lewis said that he takes responsibility for the fact that that is what he presented as they prepared the estimate. Administrator Darrington asked that if there is a different concept that the city deems more important, would they let us spend the money on studying that as opposed to option number one. Engineer Lewis said that if we wanted to exclude option one, we could.

Council Member Boyd asked that now that there is a traffic light there, what effect is that going to have and do we need any of this study done at this point and what is that new light going to control. Engineer Lewis said that the new traffic light will make it easier to turn left off of 100 East on to State Street, and it only stops traffic going northbound on State Street. Engineer Lewis explained that our Transportation Master Plan says that the traffic demand for the city as a whole needs to make this connection and MAG looked at the area on a regional basis and they also see the need for a connection between Geneva Road and 100 East. Administrator Darrington added that that is the reason we got the funding from MAG because it is on their plan.

Mayor Call asked what the timing on using the MAG funds is. Engineer Lewis said that we can slow down the process, if we are looking to change the roads downtown because of the Civic Center project then that changes how things fit together.

Mayor Call stated that we need to determine this realignment so that there is better direction going forward with VCBO Architecture and the Civic Center plans. It was decided to discuss which one of the four realignment options is preferred at the next work session meeting in two weeks. Director Young said that he will plot out and present what he feels are the best options based upon our Civic Center survey results.

## **6. Civic Center Survey Results**

Director Young handed out copies of the results/summary from the Civic Center survey (exhibit C). He explained that the Council, the Department Directors and Community Development all participated in the survey and that each area was ranked and then a weight was assigned to each of the rankings and then we came up with a percentage of importance. Director Young then reviewed the summary of the combined results (the areas ranked highest): **A) Preservation:** 1) Support to preserve current City Park location = 71%, 2) Support to preserve mature trees = 62%. **B) Design and Layout:** 1) Develop newer, better buildings that are planned and designed to create a nice, cohesive community center = 90%, 2) 100 South (between Main and 100 East) should be at least partially closed to create open space and plazas = 89%, 3) Building architectural design and open

space themes should be consistent throughout the Civic Center = 88%, 4) Quality, well designed open spaces and plazas are an important part of the Civic Center = 86%, 5) Develop buildings in a way that wouldn't require lots of pedestrian traffic to cross busy streets = 83%, 6) Main priority should be creating a special place that both suits facility needs and has great gathering places = 83%, 7) An important focus of the Civic Center is to be to act as a community gathering place = 82%, 8) New Civic Center buildings should be built up (taller) rather than out (wider) to create more open spaces = 79%, 9) The Civic Center should have good connections and interaction with Main Street commercial corridor = 78%, 10) The Civic Center should be an important part of a mixed use village; blending civic uses and commercial = 76%, 11) Above ground parking structures should be located mid-block, without frontage on a through street = 76%, 12) Main priority should be the cost and financial feasibility of development options = 75%, 13) The Civic Center is part of and important to Downtown revitalization = 75%, 14) Create a nice terminus at the top of Main Street (with a park, plaza or cultural facility, etc.) = 69%, 15) Use/refurbish existing buildings as much as possible = 58%. **C) Extending Main Street:** 1) Support for extending Main Street on east side = 64%, 2) City Hall development is strongest option = 68%. **D) Best location for Fire Department – Outside of Downtown:** 1) Prefer outside of downtown = 63%, 2) Prefer downtown, not Civic Center = 61%. **E) Best use block east of City Hall:** 1) Fire and/or Police Department = 65%. **F) Best use block north of Library:** 1) New Library and/or Arts & Theater = 58%. **G) Best place to relocate the Park:** 1) Park should not be relocated = 69%. **H) Best third block for Civic Center Development:** 1) Block east of City Hall = 80%.

Director Young stated that what he would like to do is take this information and combine it with the proposed layouts and see how we can combine the two into something that makes sense for us.

Both Council Member Boyd and Director Giles commented that their answers to the survey questions may change depending on what realignment decisions are made.

Council Member Danklef commented that 100 East is a state road and how involved is the state or UDOT going to be in making the realignment decision. Engineer Lewis said that UDOT has not really addressed this issue to the city's satisfaction, 100 East is simply a low priority to the state/UDOT, it is a busy road but it is nothing compared to most of what they deal with. Administrator Darrington said that as we study this whether it is the state or the county, they need to be in this process on the ground level with us so that there are no surprises.

## **7. Discussion on Utility Rate Study**

Administrator Darrington said that we talked about this a couple of weeks ago and discussed the needs that are driving us to change our rates, one of them being that our secondary water is not generating enough revenue to cover the debt service, number two is the increased treatment costs from TSSD and number three is future capital projects that need to be done in the next five years, particularly the storm drains which is our largest concern with a three and a half million dollar project that needs to be done within the next two years. Administrator Darrington handed out a Rate Proposal sheet (exhibit D) in which the plan has been created to smooth out the increase over the next four years. He said that ideally we would like the Council to adopt a four year rate so that people will know what to expect and we will know that we can count on these as we start to bond or as we get ourselves financially right where we need to be.

Finance Director Lundell said that in meeting with Director Walker and Utility Engineer Schiess we discussed the capital projects and did talk about delaying some of these increases, but the rate study shows where we are and where we should be and if we do gradually bump those rates over a few years, we discussed what that does to our master plan and capital facilities plan. Director Lundell said that after we looked at it we moved a couple of projects back a year or two and everything will probably work okay with the exception of the storm drain because there are a couple of storm drain projects coming up that are really not optional. There is the Lindon Hollow project with Lindon and Orem that we are moving ahead with, the other large project is the piping of the Battle Creek and Grove Creek areas with the canal enclosure. Director Lundell explained that the Rate Proposal sheet is broken down into three parts: the Rate Proposal, the Dollar Increase, and the Percentage Increase, and these numbers are based on an average rate and we need to do the dollar increase to the storm drain now to deal with the capital projects that are coming up. He said that as long as we can have some flexibility in the capital projects that we will be okay and that we will be able to meet the capital facility plan that we have now based on these rates.

Council Member Jensen pointed out that the proposal shows five years and are we being asked to only approve the first four years. Director Lundell said “yes,” that between now and then we would like to get some kind of systematic method or formula of how much we look at adjusting rates a little bit every year so we are not going ten years and then having to make a large increase. Administrator Darrington said that to be fair to the public and because we cannot predict the future, this is what we consider the worst case scenario, for instance if we get a million dollars from the state to help with the storm drain project, these rates even though they get adopted now, we can always go lower through the years and we will evaluate that each year to see if we can reduce them. These proposed rates are with a really flat impact fee structure and this is assuming that we are not going to get any additional monies through the state or federal government for any of the projects.

Mayor Call said that he appreciates the smoothing aspect that they have done with these rates and when we look at this, that every year we will do sort of a rolling assessment so that we are always looking at four to five years into the future. Director Lundell said that that is correct and that we want to get to the point where we get everything on a five year rolling budget.

Council Member Danklef asked when it is suggested that these rates change. Director Lundell said that they are suggesting that everything but the secondary water would go into effect as soon as possible, the secondary water will not go into effect until next April.

Administrator Darrington said that this has already been noticed as a public hearing and is on the agenda for next week. The question that we have to figure out is that if this is adopted next week will it be enough time to get it into the system before the next bills go out, so it is possible that it may not be until November. Administrator Darrington said that the other aspect is relaying this to the community so that they understand why we are doing this, we will have a separate paper that explains each fund and why the rates are going up, we will post this on the website, it will be in the newsletter and as part of the utility bill. Administrator Darrington acknowledged that there will be some concerned residents and we will explain this as best we can. Mayor Call said that we did have some residents with recycling that were caught by surprise because they pay their utility bills online and is there a way that we can contact them. Administrator Darrington said that there should be a way to

contact them, if they are doing this online then we should have an email address on them and we can look into that and we will explore all of the avenues to try to get this word out.

Council Member Boyd asked if we had our Facebook or Twitter accounts up yet. Administrator Darrington said that they are not set up yet. He said that we are prepared to answer any questions and if people have questions have them call either him or Director Lundell at City Hall.

Mayor Call asked if there were any other questions or comments, there were none.

**8. Discussion of items for the upcoming September 21, 2010 City Council meeting:**

- a. **Public Hearing to consider for adoption an Ordinance (2010-14) to amend Title 10 Chapter 3 Subsection 2, “Administrative Code Enforcement” and renumbering sequential subsections to provide an administrative code enforcement procedure to handle zoning and land use code violations through a civil process; establishing an appeal procedure and providing for an effective date, at the request of Pleasant Grove City Staff (CITYWIDE IMPACT)**
- b. **Public Hearing to consider for adoption an Ordinance (2010-15) to amend Title 10 Chapter 6 Subsection 2, “Definitions” of the Pleasant Grove City Municipal Code by adding definitions for “Caretaker,” “Personal Care Provider,” “Accessory Apartments,” and amending the definition for “Family,” and “Fence;” and also amending Title 10 Chapter 9A Subsection 1, “Purpose” of the R-R ) Rural Residential zone and Title 10 Chapter 9B Subsection 1, “Purpose” of the R1 (Single-Family Residential) zones, declaring the Accessory Apartments are prohibited; however, providing an exemption for Caretakers and Personal Care Providers in Subsection 2 of each zone, at the request of Pleasant Grove City Staff (CITYWIDE IMPACT)**

Council Member Jensen asked why the definitions for “Family” and “Fence” were added. Attorney Petersen said that those are two small amendments that Planner Allen asked be added to this ordinance because they were things he wanted to amend anyway. Director Young said that we had already worked on the fencing ordinance and as we were finalizing the accessory apartment ordinance we realized that we needed to change these definitions and since this ordinance is dealing with definitions we added it here.

- c. **Public Hearing to consider for adoption an Ordinance (2010-16) amending Title 10 Chapter 15 Subsection 38, “Fencing” of the Pleasant Grove Municipal Code for the purpose of allowing hedges and other landscaping to be exempt from being considered fencing material, however maintaining regulations based on its impact as screening material and requiring a five foot (5’) separation for a second fence only when the same owner requesting the second fence has an existing property line fence; and adopting new regulations for the maintenance and on-conforming fencing standards and providing for an effective date, at the request of Pleasant Grove City Staff (CITYWIDE IMPACT)**

Director Young said that this is a housekeeping item, the issue was brought forward about hedges

along the property line where they were not actually following the property line, and according to our ordinance a hedge is considered a fence. There are problems about where they could build a fence adjacent to the hedge and a lot of issues regarding that so this ordinance will help clarify and regulate that.

- d. **Public Hearing to consider for adoption a Resolution (2010-049) amending Title 8 Chapter 1, “Water Works,” Subsection 5-D “Water Service Charges,” Chapter 4C “Timpanogos Special Service District,” Subsection 12 “Fees,” Chapter 5 “Storm Water Utility,” Subsection 4 “Storm Water Utility Fee,” and Chapter 9 “City Pressurized Irrigation System,” Subsection 2 “User Fees,” by increasing the utility rate fee to adequately support each utility (CITYWIDE IMPACT)**
- e. **To consider for adoption a Resolution (2010-50) authorizing the Mayor to sign a boundary line agreement between June C. Monson and Jess H. Monson, trustees of the June C. Monson Marital and Family Trust and Pleasant Grove City for property located at approximately 100 North and 900 East, and providing for an effective date (MONKEY TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD)**
- f. **To consider for adoption a Resolution (2010-51) authorizing the Mayor to sign a deed for Pleasant Grove City to combine five parcels into one single piece of property, for property located at approximately 100 North 900 East, Monson Water Tank site and providing for an effective date (MONKEY TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD)**
- g. **To consider Chad Fullmer’s request for final plat approval of a one lot subdivision called Murphy Meadows Plat B, vacating Lots 3 & 4 of Murphy Meadows Subdivision Plat A, located at approximately 1215 West 2420 North, in the R1-20 (Single Family Residential 20,000 sq ft lot area) zone (NORTH FIELD NEIGHBORHOOD)**

Director Young said that items “g” and “h” are both plats and that he is requesting that we move them up on the agenda before the public hearings.

- h. **To consider Ryan Thompson’s request for final plat approval of a five lot subdivision plat including three Flag Lots to be called Cook Property Subdivision, located at approximately 400 West 400 North, in the R1-8 (Single Family Residential 8,000 sq ft lot area) zone (LITTLE DENMARK NEIGHBORHOOD)**

Mayor Call asked if there were any other questions on next week’s agenda.

Chief Sanderson stated that on the Council meeting following the Heritage Festival we recognize the Firefighters who won the completion held during the festival and asked if he could have a few minutes to do that. Mayor Call asked Recorder Kresser to place that on next week’s agenda.

## **9. Mayor, City Council and Staff Business**

- Engineer Lewis explained that we have a commitment with our conditional use permit to not allow parking on the south side of 3300 North and with the site plan approval for Quail Run

Charter School, the residents of Creekside were concerned about their ability to get in and out of their neighborhood while school lets in and out. The idea of having a left turn was proposed (exhibit E), since we don't allow parking on the south side of the road there is room to do three narrower lanes for traffic with a left turn lane and still have space for parking on the north side of the road in that development. Engineer Lewis said that in order to do the three lanes he recommends that we remove the gate piers and island and pave it over. He said that we have reviewed the minutes from the various meetings on Creekside and the purchase agreement for the park and pond area and we don't find any commitment by the city to keep this island. Administrator Darrington stated that the developer who initially put this in might have some heartburn that we are going to pull this out. Mayor Call asked Administrator Darrington to call the property owner. Administrator Darrington indicated that he would and that his preference is to have the staff handle this.

Engineer Lewis reported that the traffic signal on State Street and 100 East is coming along, the striping is done and it looks like it may be operational by the end of the week.

- Director Walker stated that the striping on 1100 North will be done within the next two weeks.

Administrator Darrington asked when we will be shutting down the secondary water system for the year. Director Walker said that they are taking the water out of the canal two weeks earlier this year so it will start to shut down on the first of October but most people will have water until the 15<sup>th</sup>.

- Council Member Boyd expressed a thank you to everyone who helped with the Heritage Festival. Mayor Call asked if she had any numbers on attendance. Council Member Boyd said that the numbers during the day were equal to past festivals but that the afternoon and evening were slower probably because of the LDS church's regional conference meetings. The numbers were down for the Kiwanis barbeque cook-off, so we are looking to have the barbeque throughout the day, selling sandwiches and meals and not having the dinner at night.
- Mayor Call mentioned that he received a letter from the Robinson's on the decision of the Planning Commission about their bungalow and asked Director Young if he knew anything about it. Director Young said that they and their neighbor (Taylor) are both in the Downtown Village Commercial zone and a commercial zone does allow operations to be built up to the property line. What was approved was a conditional use for a commercial garage to be built on the lot and the Robinson's bungalow is pretty close to that property. Director Young stated that he appreciates the concern but because it is in that commercial zone, that provision allows for them to build the auto maintenance shop. Engineer Lewis said that they will be doing auto detailing and minor maintenance like oil changes and Mr. Taylor was told that he needs to screen his operations from the street. Mayor Call asked if painting is part of what can be done with an auto detailing operation. Director Young said that there would not be any major painting it would be pin striping and things like that.

Council Member Boyd asked about the sidewalk in front of that area because she has met with a resident who is concerned about the sidewalk there at Thornberry and are there any

provisions done as far as improving it along there. Engineer Lewis said that the ordinance requirement is that if you are missing the street improvements then you are to install them, we haven't required residents yet to replace city improvements that have deteriorated.

Mayor Call said that the Utah Valley Exchange organization every year selects to honor a Fire Fighter and a Police Officer who have gone above and beyond their duty. The Mayor asked that Chief Sanderson and Chief Paul take a look at the information and put some thought into it and make some recommendations.

#### **10. Executive Session**

Executive Session to discuss the purchase, exchange or lease of real property (UCA 52-4-205(1)(d)).

Administrator Darrington stated that we will not need to hold this executive session tonight.

**ACTION:** At 7:51 p.m. Council Member Jensen moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Robinson seconded and the motion passed unanimously with Council Members Boyd, Danklef, Jensen and Robinson voting "Aye."

#### **11. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

This certifies that the Work Session Minutes of September 14, 2010 are a true, full and correct copy as approved by the City Council on October 19, 2010

---

Colleen A Mulvey, Deputy City Recorder

*(Exhibits are in the Work Session Minutes binders in the Recorder's office)*