

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Work Session Meeting Minutes
February 28, 2017
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
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Denise Roy, Finance Director
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Drew Engemann, Battalion Chief/Fire Marshall
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director
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 Police Chief, Mike Smith.

3) Opening Remarks.

The opening remarks were given by Council Member Andersen.

4) **Approval of Meeting's Agenda.**

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

5) **Recognition of Leadership Academy Graduates.** *Presenter: Administrator Darrington.*

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, reported that this was the 5th Leadership Academy to take place. The training involves 10 employees from various departments who study leadership qualities exhibited in a group of explorers who were stranded in Antarctica in the early 1900s. The book describes the adversities they faced and their journey to survival. Participants in the Leadership Academy then study individual leadership qualities and take turns teaching the rest of the group about each respective quality. Administrator Darrington was always impressed with the results of the exercise. He presented certificates of completion to Andrew Peterson, Cindy Bean, Cody Jolley, Dave Thurston, John Clayton, Linda Hales, Lyndsey Webb, Mario Gonzalez and Tazia Asplund.

6) **To Consider Awarding Any Hour, Inc., the Blackhawk Drive Waterline Replacement Project with Additive A in the Amount of \$399,253.20.** *Presenter: Director Beaumont.*

Public Works Director, Marty Beaumont, recommended the Council award the bid for the Blackhawk Drive Waterline Replacement project off of 1500 East, to Any Hour, Inc. He noted that there were 13 bidders with only one being non-responsive. All companies submitted great bids, and Any Hour, Inc. submitted the most competitive bid, which was 10% under the City Engineer's cost estimate. Staff checked references and licensing on the company. Director Beaumont mentioned that this project is on the three-year road plan as a coordinated utility road project. It will also be a part of four pre-bid meetings which will take place on March 30th. Staff is seeking to bid all road projects as part of one large contract, which will save the City money.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved to award Any Hour, Inc., the Blackhawk Drive Waterline Replacement Project with Additive A in the amount of \$399,253.20. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

7) **Discussion on Road Funding.**

Administrator Darrington gave a historical overview of various road projects in the City and reported that he joined staff in 2010. In 2008, the City took out a bond to do a portion of the roads. Up to that point, the City's primary source of road funding came from the gas tax in the form of Class C Road monies. He described how these funds were divvied up to individual municipalities from the State of Utah. In the past, there has been about \$900,000 available for Pleasant Grove. He noted that these funds were reduced each time gas prices increased because people bought less gas. The 2008 bond payment was \$750,000 per year. When the City first bonded, several road projects were completed all at once in 2008 and 2009. Since 2010, however, less has been put toward roads because there have been less Class C Road funds available.

In 2013 during a budget retreat, the Council discussed their main priorities, which were identified as the Public Safety Building and roads. At the time, Council instructed staff to work on a funding

mechanism for roads. Former Finance Director, Dean Lundell, realized at the time that the City could collect an additional 1% on a particular franchise fee. The increase generated an additional \$195,000 in revenue for the City. The Council earmarked those funds for roads, which is where that funding has come from ever since. The City currently has \$325,000 earmarked for roads, in addition to the ongoing Class C Road funds.

In a study conducted by J-U-B Engineers in 2012, each of the City's roads was assigned a Pavement Condition Index (PCI), with a number between 0 and 100. Zero was identified as the poorest condition possible and 100 was a brand new road. The study showed that in order for the City to maintain a 70 PCI or higher on all of the City's roads, they would need to invest a minimum of \$3.8 million per year over the next 20 years.

Director Beaumont, who worked for J-U-B Engineers in 2012 when the study was conducted, stated that when they began the study, the average PCI (for roads in Pleasant Grove) was 64. However, with a budget of only \$1 million per year, they estimated that the entire road system would decrease to an average PCI of 34 to 40 after 20 years. He explained that maintenance of a road with a PCI of 70 to 100 only requires a seal coat. A PCI of 50 to 70 requires an overlay and a PCI of 25 to 50 requires a mill and overlay. Anything less would require full reconstruction. He explained that if the City allows roads to get within the 25 to 50 range where a mill and overlay are needed, projects will become more expensive.

Council Member Stanley asked how many roads are currently in very poor condition. Director Beaumont explained that at the time the study was conducted in 2012, 2% to 4% were in poor condition. He estimated that those numbers were now between 6% and 7%. Each year the City drops about four PCI. Deterioration happens fast and bigger problems are created as result.

Mayor Daniels asked if any of J-U-B's numbers accounted for inflation. Director Beaumont answered in the affirmative. He recalled that \$4 million was needed consistently over the 20-year period based on an adjusted inflation number. Mayor Daniels asked if there were metrics that accounted for the increased amount of traffic over time. Director Beaumont explained that they have looked at those numbers directly; however, staff could review old transportation master plans and look at trends from the 1990s to 2012. The most critical determinant of PCI was truck traffic and heavy equipment, rather than cars. Mayor Daniels asked where the poorest roads are located throughout the City. Director Beaumont stated that roads in residential areas are in the worst condition, largely because they haven't been touched for 30 to 40 years. He mentioned that costs from 1976 to the present have more than quadrupled.

Administrator Darrington presented the following options for creating additional revenue for roads:

Property taxes: This would be considered General Fund monies that would be earmarked for roads. In order to generate \$1 million it would be necessary to charge residential users \$7.75 per month per \$250,000 valuation and Commercial users \$14.09 per month per \$250,000 valuation

Budget Reduction: In last year's budget, a line item-by-line item analysis was conducted that freed up \$130,000 earmarked for roads. In order to generate \$1 million in savings in the General Fund

budget, it equates to the elimination of roughly 10 full-time positions. This would also reduce operations by about \$285,000 per year.

Legislative Help: The State Legislature passed HB 362 in 2015, which allows the County to put forward a \$0.0025 sales tax increase to go toward transportation. Utah County voters voted down the proposition. Pleasant Grove would have received about \$374,000 in additional revenue if it had passed.

Road Fee: Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham's (LYRB) Study of the "Provo Model" evaluated several potential scenarios for Pleasant Grove. The findings of the study were as follows:

Purpose: To establish an equitable, sustainable, and transparent way to maintain existing roadways. The current funding mechanisms are Class C Road funds and the General Fund.

Land Use Categories:

- Residential
 - Single-family dwellings
 - 6,803 total units, addresses and units
 - Multi-unit
 - 3,346 total units, addresses and units
- Non-residential
 - Peak day adjusted trips
 - <2 (1,464,044 total square feet, 339 addresses, 1,464.04 units)
 - 2-4 (451,644 total square feet, 127 addresses, 451.64 units)
 - 4-20 (162,846 total square feet, 36 addresses, 162.85 units)
 - >20 (28,110 total square feet, 9 addresses, 28.11 units)
- Public Use
 - Total square feet: 1,476,989
 - 43 addresses
 - 1,476.99 units

Proportional Fee by Land Use

- Residential
 - Single-family dwellings
 - 46% of total trips
 - \$460,770 annual allocation
 - \$68 annual fee per address
 - \$5.60 monthly fee per address
 - Multi-unit
 - 14% of total trips
 - \$139,150 annual allocation
 - \$42 annual fee per address
 - \$3.50 monthly fee per address
- Non-residential
 - <2

- 8% of total trips
 - \$82,624 annual allocation
 - \$244 annual fee per address
 - \$20.30 monthly fee per address
 - 2-4
 - 9% of total trips
 - \$91,677 annual allocation
 - \$722 annual fee per address
 - \$60.20 monthly fee per address
 - 4-20
 - 8% of total trips
 - \$81,148 annual allocation
 - \$2,254 annual fee per address
 - \$187.80 monthly fee per address
 - >20
 - 5% of total trips
 - \$53,182 annual allocation
 - \$5,909 annual fee per address
 - \$492.40 monthly fee per address
- Public Use
 - 9% of total trips
 - \$91,409 annual allocation
 - \$2,126 annual fee per address
 - \$177.10 fee per address

Fee assumptions:

- Assumes a need to generate \$1.0 million in new revenues
- Single-family and multi-family fees are assumed to be assessed per unit
- Non-residential fees are assumed to be assessed per address

Example Monthly Fees:

Single Family House (per Unit).....	\$5.60
Apartment (per Unit).....	\$3.50
General Office (per Address).....	\$20.30
Small Retail (per Address).....	\$60.20
Medical/Dental Office (per Address).....	\$60.20
Church (per Address).....	\$177.10
School (per Address).....	\$177.10
Fast Food Restaurant (per Address).....	\$187.80
Large Retail (per Address).....	\$187.80
Convenience Store (per Address).....	\$492.40

Proportional Fee by Land Use

- Scenario 1
 - Residential
 - 60% of total trips

- \$599,960 annual allocation
 - \$59 annual fee per address
 - \$4.90 monthly fee per address
 - Commercial/Public
 - 40% of total trips
 - \$400,040 annual allocation
 - \$722 annual fee per address
 - \$60.22 monthly fee per address
- Scenario 2
 - Residential
 - 60% of total trips
 - \$599,960 annual allocation
 - \$59 annual fee per address
 - \$4.90 monthly fee per address
 - Commercial/Public (0-4 trips)
 - 27% of total trips
 - \$265,710 annual allocation
 - \$522 annual fee per address
 - \$43.50 monthly fee per address
 - Commercial/Public (4+ trips)
 - 13% of total trips
 - \$134,330 annual allocation
 - \$2,985 annual fee per address
 - \$248.80 monthly fee per address

Administrator Darrington explained that a road fee is based on trip use and has no direct correlation with property tax because taxes are calculated based on valuation rather than use.

Mayor Daniels asked how LYRB's study differs from the Provo Model. Administrator Darrington noted that the Provo Model showed commercial being broken down into four different categories.

Council Member Stanley asked how tax exempt entities would be handled. Administrator Darrington explained that Provo negotiated different prices with tax exempt entities because the properties in their city are made up of 40% of non-profit entities (Brigham Young University and the hospital are the most notable). While those entities were exempted, Provo City still negotiated alternative rates. Other cities have not exempted churches and schools. Administrator Darrington suggested that Pleasant Grove not exclude churches and schools.

Mayor Daniels asked how the City would assign a fee to citizens actually making use of the facility, which in this case would be roads. Administrator Darrington explained that the formula accounts for the idea that there are trips assigned to each household, whereas other trips are accounted for by businesses and other entities. Therefore, the formula does not double count trips. It was difficult for Mayor Daniels to assign fees based on individual usage. Administrator Darrington reassured him that this was the best, most fair assessment they could calculate.

Council Member Jensen asked staff to explain why cities have fee studies conducted. Administrator Darrington explained that data is needed to show that a fee is user based, especially

if the City is ever challenged on the matter legally. Some cities have literally enforced arbitrary numbers on utility bills but Pleasant Grove does not want to do that. Provo has not been challenged on their road fee, nor has anyone else. Therefore, a legal precedent has not been set in establishing such a fee. Implementing a road fee could be defended because the numbers are data-driven, and there is a rationale that can clearly be presented on the matter.

Administrator Darrington presented nine different scenarios for reaching \$3.8 million a year, each with various percentages for different funding mechanisms, as well as different escalation timelines. (See attached). He explained that the numbers presented were not guaranteed each year. Rather, it acts as a road map and not a mandate. He noted that the potential road funding goal was \$3.8 million per year.

Regarding Scenario 6, Council Member Andersen asked if reducing the business fee would still be true to the road fee formula calculated by LYRB. Administrator Darrington indicated that this was not necessarily the case.

Council Member Jensen suggested a 1/10 scenario, where Scenarios 8 and 9 are combined.

Council Member LeMone asked how soon a road fee would be implemented if the Council voted to move forward. Administrator Darrington explained that a road fee would be implemented in real time, as it does not have to be tied to a fiscal year budget. Finance Director, Denise Roy, stated that there would be about a one-month delay, as it would take one or two billing cycles to have it fully implemented on all of the City's utility bills.

Council Member Andersen asked if the funds would go into an enterprise fund, given that the money was being collected via a utility bill. Furthermore, she asked if enterprise funds were unable to receive General Fund money. City Attorney, Tina Petersen, explained that the funds would not go into an enterprise fund. A special revenue fund would be created instead. Special revenue funds are similar to enterprise funds, but do not have the same restrictions. Council Member Andersen asked if special revenue funds are limited to maintenance, or if they can be used for new builds and reconstructions. Administrator Darrington stated that a road fee would be designated specifically for roads and would not be used for curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

Director Beaumont referred to an earlier discussion about inflation. He noted that J-U-B's 2012 study was based on 108 miles of road. As Pleasant Grove continues to grow, new roads will need to be taken into consideration. While \$3.8 million is needed per year based on today's calculations, those costs could change if additional roads are constructed. It was noted that roads cost about \$21,000 per year per mile.

Mayor Daniels explained that J-U-B's study showed that the City has fallen short in investing the amount needed each year into maintaining roads properly. He referenced a recent news article which indicated that cities have primarily relied on the State Gas Tax for maintenance money to maintain roads. He discussed impact fees and noted that cities are not allowed to use impact fees on roads. He stressed the need to address this issue to prevent falling further behind. He explained that there may be people who will not be happy about how much it will cost. Regardless of where the \$3.8 million is assigned in the budget, the money has to come from somewhere. He recommended that the Council involve the public throughout the decision making process.

Council Member LeMone suggested the Council vote on a scenario prior to soliciting public input. She requested that the item be placed back on the agenda within the next month. Last year, there was positive feedback on the road fee, and the City must start moving forward as quickly as possible.

Administrator Darrington was also in favor of the Council voting on a scenario before opening the matter up to the public, as it would better guide the discussion. Council Member Andersen agreed, but suggested two or three scenarios be debated instead of just one. Council Member Andersen also noted that there are some road projects that will cost an exorbitant amount of money to fix, such as 1100 North. It would take four years of saving everything just to do that road and no other projects. She wondered if there was a way to do a small bond, the funds of which would specifically be used for such projects. A property tax could be implemented to pay for that debt service.

Council Member LeMone agreed but was not in favor of property tax. She instead preferred the road fee method. Council Member Andersen preferred not to pay for a small bond using road fee money. Administrator Darrington stated that staff could run the numbers against different revenue sources and present their findings to the Council.

Director Beaumont explained that it was important to remember that if more funding becomes available, they will by default have other options for tackling larger projects. Currently, with such little funding available, it's not possible to allocate all of the available funding toward one specific project.

There was some discussion as to whether a special assessment area (SAA) could be formed in order to pay for larger, more specific road projects. Attorney Petersen explained that SAAs are created in neighborhoods that have a specific need. A neighborhood needs a certain number of signatures from residents who are in favor of the SAA in order to pay for the improvements specific to their area. In an SAA, the City pays for the cost of the project up front, but the property owners are then assessed a fee to pay the City back over time.

Mayor Daniels commented that they need to gauge where the public is on this issue, and how they want to go about paying for the various road needs throughout the City. Based on prior experiences, he thought it was best to engage the public early in the process. Council Member Andersen agreed, and stated that it is important to know what citizens are willing to spend. The neighborhood chairs have shown a willingness to attend meetings every other week to represent their neighborhoods on the matter. If residents express a lack of willingness to pay for the roads, the City can quit worrying about the issue.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, mentioned a survey that his department recently conducted. One of the questions asked residents to address what they were willing to pay for roads. He suggested they do another survey that is specific to roads. Council Member LeMone stated that they could conduct a survey in addition to public hearings. Administrator Darrington noted that preliminary numbers had previously been introduced to the public. He also liked the idea of conducting a survey in addition to holding public hearings.

Council Member Stanley preferred Scenario 7 and commented that they need to reach \$3.8 million sooner rather than later so that the City's roads don't continue to deteriorate. He opined that a hybrid solution was the best approach, as it would involve the most compromise on all sides. The other scenarios did not show the same spirit of shared sacrifice. On several occasions, the public has expressed that they do not support bonding for roads during City Council Meetings. He recommended that the Council look closely at utility fees and budget reductions. Council Member Stanley did not think it is as simple as raising taxes and/or fees or making budget cuts. He indicated that there are other ways to pay for these needs, such as raising user fees to subsidize fewer services, finding ways to make more money for the Fox Hollow Golf Course, and making the Recreation Center more accessible without so many subsidies. He explained that there are ways to ask for money from people who are tied to specific uses, which is more attractive than large tax increases. He recommended they discuss all of these scenarios. If roads are the City's highest priority, they should be the first funded at the beginning of the budget season. They have never articulated what it would look like if the City fully funded roads before funding anything else. He stressed that the Council needs to be able to say to the public that they've done their due diligence on the matter. Thousands of people across the community have expressed a willingness to do their part, and as such, Council Member Stanley felt the matter should be voted on by way of a ballot.

The Council indicated that Scenario 9 was the closest to reaching \$3.8 million, rather than Scenario 7 as Council Member Stanley had suggested. Mayor Daniels explained that once the City reaches \$3.8 million, they could look at how to split of what you can repurpose from resources that we currently are collecting vs. what new resources that you need in order to make up the \$3.8 million. He remarked that the City is not going to solve the problem unless the main goal is to reach \$3.8 million.

Mayor Daniels explained that both sides of an argument can be right and wrong. It is narrow-minded to think that one individual has all of the answers and is correct. There are 36,000 people in the City and the majority take the time to get involved and vote they speak for everyone. If the Council takes the time to present the overall problem to the public, they will obtain feedback and reach the most unified consensus on which direction to take. Mayor Daniels stated that there currently is not a \$3.8 million solution on the table, although it is most needed. Administrator Darrington stated that if the City were to carve out \$1 million from the current budget in order to get to the \$3.8 million, staff needs to know where to make the cuts.

Council Member Andersen indicated that several residents contacted her instead of Council Member Stanley. They have contacted her and asked that the City not insult them by requesting \$5.00/month in order to pay for the roads but to fund the total amount of needed. Furthermore, those same residents voted for the Recreation Center, the pool, the library, and a host of other services that they do not want to see cut. She wanted to be an advocate for the people who are calling her, because they moved to Pleasant Grove to specifically enjoy the current services being provided.

Council Member Jensen discussed level of service, and what it means to the community. He stated that last year the department heads made significant one-time cuts, which generated \$130,000. While some think that our budget has fluff in it, the cuts were significant to citizens and staff with

regard to how it affected the level of service provided through those respective departments. He figures that there is about \$2 million in administrative fees, if that is cut then the City has to make up \$2 million in administrative fees somewhere. Those dollars represent about 20 people, and \$2 million is close to 14% of the City's budget. A \$2 million budget cut impacts the service level in every single department, which was voted on by the public. Furthermore, Council Member Jensen stated that when he hears that the City isn't spending money on roads, it is simply not true. Every member of the Council is doing their best to represent the needs and interests of the community.

Mayor Daniels clarified that \$2 million represents 20 full-time employees and approximately \$500,000 in operating costs from the General Fund. 20 full-time employees is about 20% of the work force and \$500,000 of operations which means across the board you are going to have services falling off. Mayor Daniels asked the Council if that is something they are willing to do are you looking at that drastic of a cut.

Council Member Stanley explained that there is always the possibility of creating additional fees, taxes, or other means to fund things that would hypothetically be lost if roads were funded before anything else. If this means losing important services, the City could instead impose a fee to preserve those City services and employees. He explained that funding roads was not the end of the process or budget analysis.

Mayor Daniels asked the Council to define how much of the \$3.8 million is going to come from the General Fund and how much is going to come from an alternative funding source, such as a fee or tax. Council Member Stanley reiterated that the entire \$3.8 million could come from the General Fund, after which the citizenry could vote on the services they do not want to see diminished. Mayor Daniels asked the rest of the Council to weigh in on this strategy.

Council Member LeMone stated that they should allow the public to decide between fully funding \$3.8 million per year immediately, or via escalated amounts over time in one of the scenarios presented by Administrator Darrington. She stressed that there are other needs in the City to take into consideration, and it would not be reasonable to cut all programs all at once just to fund one specific need. She commented that she has lived in Pleasant Grove her entire life and participated in these programs and benefitted from the City's services. The General Fund is already contributing \$325,000 and she was not in favor of allocating more than \$25,000 in additional funds from the General Fund toward roads. Therefore, the Council should ask the public how they want to pay the remaining amount.

After further deliberation, it was concluded that a scenario was needed in which \$3.8 million was obtained sooner rather than later, with zero additional funds coming from the General Fund. The shortfall could be collected in either a road fee or property tax increases. Council Members LeMone, Andersen, Jensen, and Walker were in favor of this conclusion, whereas Council Member Stanley was not. Council Member Stanley stressed that the City should consider fully funding the roads from the General Fund and then asking the citizens what services they are willing to save after the cuts are made.

Mayor Daniels advised staff to re-run Scenario #9 with an escalator, and start off with the General Fund's current contribution of \$325,000. The shortfall would then drop into a road fee, and the end goal would be \$3.8 million by 2019. Council Member LeMone requested that multiple timelines be presented to the public for their review and consideration.

Council Member Andersen was concerned about implementing a flat commercial fee, as proposed in LYRB's fee study. She explained that it would be difficult to achieve equitability because all businesses are different. Council Member Stanley agreed. Mayor Daniels and Council Member Andersen both identified a need to recuse themselves from that particular discussion when the time comes, as they are both business owners in Pleasant Grove.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the updated scenarios that will be available for further review, as requested by the Council. Council Member LeMone also asked Council Member Stanley to present his ideas in writing, to which he agreed to have ready by the next Council meeting.

Council Member Stanley commented to the public that are here and to those watching at home. It has been wisely observed that highest office in the land is the office of the citizen, and if you would like to see roads funded first, if you would like see an approach that forces the City to have priorities that match the priorities of the public, the overwhelming evidence that he has seen is that ¾ of the City, if not more, believe the Council should put roads as the highest priority and should fund it first. There are mechanisms like initiatives and referendums that will be the ones that will drive your City to get to the results that you would like to see in moving our City forward in positive and good ways.

Council Member LeMone asked Council Member Stanley if there is a date that the Council can get this ideas in writing. Council Member Stanley replied that he would be happy to present the Council with that information next week.

8) Review and Discussion on the March 7, 2017 City Council Meeting Agenda.

Staff briefly reviewed the agenda items for the aforementioned meeting.

9) Neighborhood, Staff, Council and Mayor Business.

Members of staff provided various updates on their respective departments. Director Young reported that he would present the results of the General Plan survey during the meeting on March 14th. There were 675 responses to the survey. Several participants indicated that they were in favor of funding roads. Assistant to the City Administrator, David Larson, announced the upcoming Chamber lunch the following Thursday where Dave Crenshaw, author of *The Myth of Multitasking*, will be the keynote speaker. Parks and Recreation Director, Deon Giles, reported that he will be out of town next week attending the Cemetery and Parks Conference.

Council Member Andersen wanted to discuss the issue of being creative in making Fox Hollow more lucrative. She personally has helped Fox Hollow increase their revenue by \$40,000 to \$50,000 annually by bringing in golf tournaments. This is an accomplishment she takes great pride in. When accusations are made that imply anything to the contrary, she takes it personally.

Council Member Jensen reported that the Jimmer Fredett Foundation is moving forward.

Council Member Stanley stressed that roads are a serious problem in the City, and he has always advocated for a hybrid solution. He was opposed to a one-sided, extreme approach on the matter.

Council Member LeMone stated that everyone is trying to solve the road issue, including members of the public. She expressed to Council Member Stanley that whenever he addresses the issue, it comes across as if he is the only one who is working toward solving the issue. However, everyone is working hard, including department heads who are cutting funding in their budgets. Everyone was trying to come up with hybrid solutions, and it is disappointing to hear Council Member Stanley express that he feels like he is the only one working toward a solution. Council Member Stanley commented that if that has been the case, it has been a miscommunication. Council Member LeMone concluded that they needed to resolve problems as a team.

10) CLOSED MEETING TO DISCUSS THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE, OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL (UCA 52-4-205 (1)(a))

ACTION: At 8:43 Council Member LeMone moved to go into a closed meeting to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual. Council Member Walker seconded. Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley and Walker voted “Aye.”

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

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

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

ACTION: At 9:43 Council Member Walker moved to come out of the closed meeting and go back into regular Council meeting and adjourn. Council Member LeMone seconded. Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley and Walker voted “Aye.”

11) Adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

The minutes of February 28, 2017 City Council meeting were approved by the City Council on March 21, 2017.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder, MMC

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