

**Pleasant Grove City Council Meeting Minutes**  
**Work Session**  
**February 25, 2014**  
**6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Excused: Mayor Mike Daniels

Council Members:

Dianna Andersen  
Cindy Boyd Mayor Pro Tem  
Cyd LeMone  
Jay Meacham  
Ben Stanley

Staff Present:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator  
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator  
Dean Lundell, Finance Director  
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director  
Degen Lewis, City Engineer  
Ken Young, Community Development Director  
Sheri Britsch, Arts and Culture Director  
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder  
John Goodman, Public Works Streets Superintendent  
Tina Petersen, City Attorney  
Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief

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

---

**1) CALL TO ORDER.**

Council Member Boyd served as the Mayor Tempore and called the meeting to order. It was noted that Council Members Andersen, Boyd, LeMone, Meacham and Stanley were present. Mayor Daniels was excused from the meeting.

**2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Eric Jensen.

**3) OPENING REMARKS.**

The opening remarks were given by Council Member Andersen.

#### **4) DISCUSSION ON THE LADDER TRUCK.**

Administrator Scott Darrington explained that there are some decisions that need to be made on the ladder truck before April. He stated that along with Finance Director, Dean Lundell, and Fire Chief, Marc Sanderson, they have come up with four possible options. A Power Point presentation was given. Administrator Darrington described the financial history of the truck. It was noted that the truck was purchased on May 20, 2009, for \$913,468. This was done through a lease payment of \$116,851 per year. There was a balloon payment at the end of seven years so that the City would either refinance at that time, turn the truck in for a newer one, or sell the truck to pay off the remaining balance. While the City has not yet reached the end of the seven year period, the contract states that if they decide to turn it back in, they are required to give 18 months' notice of the decision.

Chief Sanderson added that the City was in a good place financially in 2008 at the time the truck was purchased. The decision to purchase the truck on a seven-year lease was made in anticipation of replacing other equipment and to continue progressing. However, with the downturn of the economy they lost the ability to fulfill those objectives.

Administrator Darrington stated that the final balloon payment of \$320,480.22 is due on October 26, 2015. He explained that the four options proposed by staff, start with the option they most strongly recommend. The first option is to keep the truck and refinance it on September 26, 2014. The truck could be refinanced for the remaining balance, and stretched out for another seven years, or until 2021. This would also free up money within the budget due to lower payments.

Finance Director, Dean Lundell, interjected that currently the City has three ambulances that range from eight to twenty years in age. He pointed out that they could get a new truck for the ambulances and use the same boxes. Instead of paying \$220,000 for an ambulance, it would cost about \$85,000 per ambulance. They could also refurbish the older fire engine for approximately \$220,000. If the City pursued these options, they could lump all of the refinances into one package over a seven-years period with an annual payment of \$156,000. Chief Sanderson explained that they created a vehicle replacement plan five years ago, due to high usage of their vehicles. He stressed the fact that their ambulances are out-of-date and that something needs to be done. He reiterated points that Director Lundell made regarding the boxes on the ambulance, explaining that the box on the ambulance doesn't wear out. If the box is removed and placed on a new truck, a significant amount of money can be saved.

If they pursued this option they could update all three of their ambulances. Council Member LeMone asked if this was a common practice. Chief Sanderson responded that it hasn't been one in the past; however, it is becoming common due to the financial impact it has had on cities. Chief Sanderson made additional points regarding the high usage of the ambulances. He explained that they are the top maintenance expense. He stated that the oldest ambulance the City owns is also the most mechanically sound. The refurbishment process takes approximately 90 days, and if they had the oldest ambulance refurbished first, they could have it ready before the summer fire season and recuperate a significant amount of income by participating in a wild land summer program.

Chief Sanderson explained that Layton has gone through the wild land fire summer rotation for the past several years, and they've gone past the million dollar mark on recouped funds. The wild land

fire program was described as where the City provides the equipment and personnel for national or state fires, which brings in more money because they are government contracts. The wages personnel earn are recouped by the City at a daily rate on each of the apparatus, which can sometimes be as high as several hundred dollars per hour. This would be a good way to fund their own vehicle replacement program; however, they need the equipment in order to get started.

Council Member Boyd asked Chief Sanderson to address potential concerns that Pleasant Grove residents might have with City equipment and personnel being used to fighting wild land fires. She wanted to know how to control what equipment stays for emergencies within the City versus that used to fight wildfires. Chief Sanderson explained that currently the Fire Department has money set aside to obtain a used brush truck, which Pleasant Grove City currently doesn't have. He explained that a brush truck is a vehicle that is better equipped for traveling in the foothills. Fortunately, Pleasant Grove doesn't have very much wild land interface, which is why the City has gotten away with not having a brush truck for the past couple of years. By putting one in service this summer, money will be generated for the ambulances. Chief Sanderson explained that a tactical tender is a large water pump, and one of the most highly used pieces of equipment.

Currently the City staffs two ambulances. If there was to be a third ambulance during the summer, it would be gone all summer. During the other eight months of the year, that third ambulance is available if one of the others has maintenance issues or needs to be taken out of service for some reason. Chief Sanderson noted that most departments have a back-up ambulance. Administrator Darrington commented that if this third ambulance is used all summer, it would essentially pay for itself after a few years. Chief Sanderson stated that in the past they've billed almost \$20,000 for one week of work. If this was multiplied by 12 weeks, it could have a significant financial impact.

There was further discussion regarding the purchase of the truck. It was noted that once the truck is refinanced, it will be owned by the City. Therefore, all subsequent payments will not be through a lease agreement, and all maintenance will be the City's responsibility. It was noted that lease agreements don't cover maintenance, as those costs are typically covered under a warranty from the manufacturer. Council Member LeMone inquired as to what would happen with the truck in seven years. Chief Sanderson explained that it will be paid off and several other options will be made possible at that point. The national standard for overall useful life of the truck is 21 years. Chief Sanderson explained that after 14 years of service, trucks are moved to a backup apparatus for the remaining seven years.

There were additional comments about the financial setbacks that are preventing updates on the equipment. Administrator Darrington stated that the first option presented is appealing because it could help cure other ills within the department by freeing up financial resources. Council Member Boyd inquired as to a specific date in September of this year when refinancing would take place. Director Lundell explained that it would happen on the payment date. Council Member Boyd asked what the difference would be between the current payment and the approximated payment from the refinance. With an estimated interest rate of 3.5%, Director Lundell predicted that the payment would be \$156,000 per year. Currently the payment is \$116,000 for the truck, with an additional \$26,000 for equipment. The difference would, therefore, be between \$15,000 to \$18,000 per year, and cover the refurbishment of all other vehicles.

Chief Sanderson has completed three bids with different companies that are familiar with this refurbishment component. There is one company in particular that is the most experienced with apparatus that are of Pleasant Grove's exact same age and model. The company is based out of Las Vegas. Chief Sanderson was working on an arrangement to have the truck ready by June 1, if the Council decides to pursue this option. Council Member Boyd asked if there were any grant monies available for these projects. Chief Sanderson stated that most grants dried up about three or four years ago. Administrator Darrington added that those grants were part of a stimulus package. Chief Sanderson responded to comments made by Council Member Andersen by explaining that this first option is the only option that will generate revenue for the City. There was further discussion on the wild land fire program, and previous comments were reiterated.

The current engines that the City owns range in from the years 1988 and 1992. The ambulances are from 1992, 1994, and 2005. Council Member Boyd asked if these were standard aged trucks. Chief Sanderson replied that Orem has four new ambulances because they buy a new one every year. Therefore, they never have an ambulance that is older than four years at any given time. Refurbishment would extend the life of each of Pleasant Grove's apparatus by about seven years. There was further discussion regarding Orem's vehicles. It was noted that they buy vehicles and run them for two years. After that time, they become reserve vehicles for another couple of years before they are replaced. Chief Sanderson explained that the difference between Orem and Pleasant Grove is that Orem runs every call with one ambulance and fire engine, whereas Pleasant Grove alternates their vehicles every other call. Furthermore, 15% of Pleasant Grove's calls are just for ambulance responses, and don't require the engine or truck. Orem also has jurisdictional differences from Pleasant Grove.

Administrator Darrington stated that while the wild land fire program could certainly generate extra money, he didn't feel comfortable counting on it because there may not even be much of a fire season. He wanted a decision based on what is best for the City. Chief Sanderson added that Engine 72 is only worth about \$3,000 to \$4,000 in scrap metal, therefore, he hoped that refurbishment will increase the value and help fill in the \$16,000 gap. Council Member Boyd asked how soon this item will be put onto the agenda for a vote. Director Lundell explained that it would be added to next year's budget, but wouldn't be acted upon until September.

Council Member Andersen asked Director Lundell which option he would support, if this wasn't being considered as a public safety matter and just as a fleet. Director Lundell replied that the primary reason staff would support the first option is because it helps the City address other issues for which there currently is no funding. Chief Sanderson added that the message will need to be communicated to Pleasant Grove residents that a significant amount of money was saved through refurbishment of their existing vehicles, as opposed to the purchase of all new vehicles. He explained that once these vehicles have been refurbished, they will look brand new.

Council Member LeMone acknowledged all of the work that the Fire Department does on their own. They find ways to cut corners and made financially wise decisions for their department. This idea was considered another move in that direction. She found it embarrassing that the City still has apparatuses that are over 20 years old. Council Member Stanley asked Chief Sanderson to walk him through the refurbishment process. Chief Sanderson explained that everything is updated; the box is removed and refurbished and then placed on a brand new truck frame. Council Member Boyd asked staff to go ahead and put this project in the budget. If any other questions come up they

should be directed to Director Lundell, Administrator Darrington, or Chief Sanderson. The Council voiced their overall support for the project.

5) **PARKS AND OPEN SPACE:**

Council Member Boyd suggested prioritizing certain discussion items based on time frames for various project accomplishments. Administrator Darrington added that while the Council can discuss the Pipe Plant project, it is a big decision item and it would be better if Mayor Daniels was present for those decisions.

a) **Pipe Plant Property Master Plan.**

A meeting with City Engineer-Degen Lewis, Public Works Director-Lynn Walker, Public Works Superintendent John Goodman, Administrator Darrington, Director Lundell, and Mr. John Scheiss took place earlier this week. During the meeting, they started working on the Capital Facilities Plan and what to do with the upcoming rates for the year. They also quickly honed in on the City's storm drain budget, and what options they have for that property. With the combination of unspent bond proceeds, impact fees, and capital money, the City currently has just over \$2 million in that particular account. Staff recommended moving forward on building and landscaping the basins, with the objective of having a park within the next 12 months. Building and landscaping the basins would cost approximately \$1 million to \$1.5 million to complete; however, this would not include the piping that needs to be upgraded in the storm drain water from 1100 North to the pipe plant. It would be ideal if this part of the project could fit in the budget. As a result, decisions need to be made on what can and cannot be done.

The property would need to be cleared prior to further construction. The Public Works Department has some storage on the subject property now, and decisions also need to be made regarding cemetery parks, public works facilities, and other buildings. These decisions will help determine what specific costs will be involved. Administrator Darrington explained that while staff would like to proceed with this process, they would like to have input from the Mayor and City Council before moving forward. It was also noted that the basins can be built now with existing funds if there aren't any rate increases.

Staff feels that building the basins should be the first priority. If the Council feels differently, the existing funds could be used for property purchases or upgrades. Another point to consider was that if the City builds a park, they will also need to construct a parking lot. This would need to be done with recreation funds and not storm drain funds. Currently the Parks and Recreation Department has approximately \$1 million in funds from impact fees, which provides the option of building a parking lot for the park. Administrator Darrington clarified that impact fees collected for parks is specifically for the construction of new parks, and not maintenance. The time line for using those funds is within six years. Engineer Lewis added that a foot print size for the detention basin would need to be determined.

Council Member Boyd explained that if the City Council voices support for this project in this meeting, staff needs to collect and report back to the Council on specific numbers. A discussion of all other options and the direction of Public Works would also need to occur. Administrator Darrington stated that other potential options have also been uploaded to Dropbox for further

review. The basins need to remain where they are, but all else can be negotiated. Council Member Boyd felt that because the extra money was bonded for the pipe plant, it would be rational to continue with those plans. Administrator Darrington replied that there are some reserves for the storm drain as well.

Council Member Meacham mentioned the option of having a tiered detention basin, and asked if it would be possible to have underground storage as well. Engineer Lewis replied that this would be more costly, and stated that it would be inappropriate to charge the storm drain fund to put storage underground so that parks have more room for activities. It was estimated to cost about \$5 million to put the storage capacity for the pipe line underground, however, the City can approach Mr. Scheiss for a more accurate figure. Superintendent Goodman added that filthy water is stored in the underground tanks, making maintenance a nightmare.

Director Giles suggested that if Public Works isn't moved to the subject area and it becomes all green space, the majority of non basin property could be used for fields. Council Member Andersen added that the fields on the west side of the pipe plant could be tiered for draining purposes, and still allow for play. Engineer Lewis replied that if a major storm occurred, there would still be water in the full pond area for a couple of days because its designed to be released very slowly. Even with an upper-tiered pond that drains first, it will still take a long time for the field to become playable again. Additional drainage may be needed to speed up the process. Council Member Andersen stated that from a soccer perspective, she knows that playing on a wet field will ruin it. She felt that if drainage ran into the lowest field, then the higher field could still be made playable more quickly. Engineer Lewis explained that a tier is created to better control water. It was also noted that it is possible to create a tier without going underground.

Administrator Darrington added that whatever room has been reserved for cemetery space can be landscaped and used for the next five or six years before it needs to be used for cemetery purposes. Any other decisions should be made when Mayor Daniels can also review the options and provide input. Engineer Lewis reviewed some numbers, noting that in 2002 Pleasant Grove spent \$1.25 million to build a five-million gallon tank. In today's dollar that would be approximately \$1.875 million, or about \$.37 per gallon. In translation, it would cost about \$4.18 million to build a 13-million gallon underground tank. There was further discussion regarding underground options. Council Member Stanley mentioned that he has taken the tour with Mayor Daniels and Director Walker, and felt that it'd be a good option even though it would be expensive.

Council Member Andersen wants to see regulation sized fields, as opposed to smaller fields. She felt that there won't be a cheaper option when determining a location for public works. Public Works can be unobtrusively built in a nice place, and land isn't going to get any cheaper. As of now, there isn't any funding available to purchase land anywhere else, and they're currently located on three acres. Council Member Andersen also felt that a tank wouldn't be necessary if the land is tiered. She reiterated points previously made about not being able to play on wet fields, and noted that it's only necessary to have about four inches of sod dried out in order to play. She stated that this isn't a \$5million problem. Director Giles stressed the importance of maintaining the City's competitive leagues. He suggested putting turf on the entire southeast side of the property and playing on it year round, which would be a fraction of the cost. However, this would require relocating Public Works. Council Member Andersen suggested placing parking lots near every field, which will make carrying coolers and transporting family members a much easier process.

She also requested that a bathroom be located nearby. Council Member Andersen was in favor of moving Public Works to the pipe plant property.

Council Member Meacham was also in favor of moving Public Works. Administrator Darrington added that parking lots and bathrooms will come out of Parks and Recreation impact fees rather than Storm Drain funding. Engineer Lewis explained that a location needs to be determined for the detention irrigation reservoir, which is being paid for by the secondary water system. Council Member Boyd concluded the discussion by reminding staff to collect and report back numbers so that this item can be put on an agenda and reviewed again in another meeting.

**b) Shannon Fields.**

Currently Shannon Fields has two softball fields, and there is enough land to add two more. Due to the City giving the school district their old softball field as part of the doTerra incentive package, staff proposed constructing the additional fields in that area. Park impact fees could pay for one of them; however, the other field would be a replacement of a current field, and would not be eligible for park impact fees.

Even though the overall project would require funding from two different funding accounts, staff recommended constructing both fields at the same time in order to be more cost effective. Administrator Darrington explained that this is a project that they'd like to move forward with this year. Director Giles added that it would be ideal if they were playable by next spring. Administrator Darrington estimated that the project would cost between \$200,000 to \$400,000 to complete both fields, but he would research specific numbers and present them to the Council at a future meeting. The fields would not be playable this season, so the City would work out an agreement with the school district to use their field in the interim. The school district has verbally communicated to the City that they can continue to use the fields, and so it would be a matter of obtaining a written agreement. Council Member Andersen asked if construction would impact parking for Strawberry Days. Director Giles explained that they will arrange for parking in that area for the week of the event.

**c) Bike Park.**

Director Giles explained that this was one of the most supported ideas out of the Trails Master Plan. The last Insurance Summit Meeting was nearly all about bike parks. One of the biggest suggestions was to have a professional contractor and designer for the park. They can oversee the construction and it can be built with volunteers, as long as it is designed by a professional and meets specific standards. The estimated cost to have someone design onsite is approximately \$30,000. Council Member LeMone asked for a rough breakdown of expenses. Director Giles explained that it would cost \$8,000 to \$10,000 to design and approximately \$30,000 to \$50,000 to oversee the rest of the project. Other estimated figures include \$20,000 to \$30,000 for restrooms with one pavilion each and a high end estimate of \$50,000 for utilities. Council Member LeMone requested that more specific numbers be collected and reported back to the Council. Administrator Darrington stated that a full budget will be compiled. Council Member LeMone asked if there were any grant monies available that could be used for the project. Director Giles replied that they can look into that option. He stated that they will also need to make sure that there aren't any issues with Public Works regarding restricted spring areas.

Director Giles expressed his support for the project, noting that it would draw a lot of people to the City. Council Member LeMone suggested breaking the project down into phases in order to move on something more quickly. Director Giles stated that he was advised to keep the park closed until it is ready to be opened completely. Administrator Darrington added that the funds should be available to construct the park all at once. He reminded the Council that this project can be entirely funded by park impact fees. Council Member Andersen asked if there were any corporate sponsors that could also get involved. Director Giles explained that most sponsors are tied in with the Intermountain Bike Association (IMBA). In other words, most sponsors give money to IMBA, and then IMBA disburses the funds through grants to other projects and groups. He concluded by explaining that there are some grants for which they could apply after they've come up with a design.

**d) Grove Open Space.**

Administrator Darrington alluded to previous discussions regarding the Grove open space. He explained that the open space could either be landscaped, a nature park, ball fields, or any number of other things.

The Grove open space consists of land from the interchange all the way up to State Street. Various Council Members expressed their opinions on what to do with the open space. Council Member Boyd stated that she doesn't want to give up on the standard that they already have for the open space. Council Member Andersen asked what the projected population for the area is. Director Ken Young didn't have a specific projection just for the Grove. Council Member LeMone felt that the entire area should be retail. Council Member Andersen asked if the gardens presented by Evermore will be free to the public. It was noted that the gardens were to be part of the paid area. Council Member Boyd added that doTerra is also planning a lot of gardens and trails. She explained that she doesn't want to loosen up the City's expectation of developers that come to Pleasant Grove and what they want them to provide in the Grove open space.

Attorney Petersen asked if the Council wanted staff to pursue the purchase of property for a City Park as part of preserving open space in that Grove area. Director Young explained that there is a significant difference between 30% of an apartment complex as opposed to a five-acre City Park. There was further discussion identifying land availability. Council Member Boyd explained that there are multi-family and Wal-Mart developments that began in the southwest corner in a detention basin. It was noted that just because the Evermore Theme Park is in the area doesn't mean that kids are going to have somewhere to go and play. She strongly felt that there should be some remaining open space. Director Giles also felt there would be benefits to having an additional leisure park in the area. He didn't feel that would be a good location for a large sports center; however, it would be beneficial to have a park where nearby business employees could go to eat their lunches during the day. It was determined that a significant amount of property would not be needed to provide this amenity. Director Young added that the Master Plan includes trails in the area, some of which are already under construction with the townhomes and apartments. There was further discussion on a possible park location.

Administrator Darrington suggested purchasing property for a possible future park location. Another option was for a developer to purchase it. Council Member Boyd asked if they could label



it as a future park location. Attorney Petersen explained that it cannot be reserved as park until the City owns the land. Director Giles suggested approaching Mr. Stan Smith about donating a couple of acres for a small park. Council Member Boyd supported the idea and suggested that they initiate that conversation with him. Administrator Darrington agreed that approaching Mr. Smith would be a viable option. Director Young mentioned that Mr. Smith's brother, James Smith owns the property to the south as well. Administrator Darrington volunteered to make initial contact with the Smiths on the matter. Council Member Andersen added that another valuable contact would be Mr. Dale Warburton. Prior to approaching the Smiths, the proposed park will be mapped out.

**e) Wetlands Park.**

Director Young explained that the Master Plan includes a boardwalk across the wetlands. Director Giles added that the property to the north also needs to be included. A trail will go through the condominiums to the nearby pond area. It was confirmed that the planning for the wetlands requires approval from the Corps of Engineers.

An aerial map of the property was reviewed. Director Giles referred to the northern property, noting that it is owned by the City. Director Giles mentioned that they will need to work with Mr. John Scheiss on that property for storm drainage; however, it can also be used as open space and for educational purposes. Council Member Boyd suggested working with doTerra whose property is close to the City's, about placement of a trail to connect the two properties. There was further discussion on the matter. Council Member LeMone asked if impact fees could be used to construct the boardwalk. Staff responded in the affirmative. It was also noted that the location of the boardwalks has not yet been determined.

Engineer Lewis identified a parcel on the map for which the City does not yet have title. He stated that he will submit a letter to the current owner. He also identified an irrigation channel in the area, as there is a significant elevation change from the north to south. It would be ideal to store some storm drainage in this area; however, staff would first need to discuss that option with the Corps of Engineers. Engineer Lewis was not optimistic that it would be an acceptable location for storing storm drainage.

Director Giles briefly referred back to the Smith property to the north, and noted that Public Works conducts all of their washout there; therefore, relocation would be necessary in order for development to occur.

Administrator Darrington stated that staff will make a sketch of where the boardwalks will go, and present the concept to the Council for approval prior to hiring someone to design them. Council Member Boyd added that Mr. Dan Torphin would be a valuable resource in making a sketch, due to his many years of experience in wetlands. Council Member Meacham asked if the playground area was intended for youth or adults. Director Giles replied that busses could be parked on 220 South, and grade school classes could come to the boardwalk for educational purposes. Director Young added that this could also serve as an adjacent open space for the residents in the nearby senior housing community. Council Member Boyd noted that the senior housing community donated some of their landscaping in order to kick start this project.

Director Young explained that in the Master Plan, the Mahogany wetlands area is located on 1300 West, above State Street, and south of Mahogany Elementary School. Director Giles stated that the original plan was to push Garden Drive through the property in order to connect to Strawberry Point. At that time, staff had about seven different community partners who were interested in helping with the project, which would have connected Mahogany Elementary with the City Park and the wetlands. However, the gentleman who owned the property was asking too much for it to be a viable option. Administrator Darrington concluded that the Mahogany wetlands are designated in the plan as a potential wetland park in the future, and, therefore, it needs to remain in the planning stages.

**f) Memorial Grove.**

Director Giles explained that the cemetery east of the Memorial Garden has quite a bit of space. Families often want to plant a tree or shrub, however, City Ordinance doesn't allow for that in the cemetery due to maintenance. Staff had looked at continuing a sidewalk through the eastern property and making the area more of a grove. They have also considered putting in niches or a scatter garden. In future development the pipe plant property could present other options for additional niches.

An aerial view of the property was reviewed and described. Council Member Boyd mentioned the idea of a rose garden for burial of remains, and then having a plaque to honor the deceased. Director Giles replied that a scatter garden would serve a similar purpose. Council Member LeMone inquired as to how many families seek these kinds of options. Director Giles stated that many families make these inquiries. It was clarified that families cannot plant trees in the cemetery, unless it is within a designated spot, and those locations are very limited. Director Giles explained that for further tree planting, staff would develop a specific landscape design and a selection of tree species to choose from for interested families. Council Member Boyd felt that this would be a very compatible option for the Veterans' Memorial as well.

Director Giles stated that the City needs to look at building niches, as there have been several cremated remains coming in for burial. He doesn't feel that this will ever replace traditional burial, but it is becoming more common. Administrator Darrington stated that they'll create a conceptual plan for the items discussed, and will report back to the Council. Council Member Meacham asked for clarification on why the east side of the cemetery is being reserved. Director Giles explained that burials can't be done there because of the foundation and existing utilities from previous homes that existed when the City purchased the property. The City had that area landscaped to beautify it for the time being.

**g) Shooting Range.**

Council Member Stanley mentioned that he also had this item added to the agenda for the budget retreat. He has discussed with other staff the possibility of using some property that the City owns on the bench of the mountain for a shooting range. Council Member Stanley felt there would be value in having a range in Pleasant Grove, and it could even be used for police officer training. Currently police officers have to make a lengthy drive to shoot on a good range, and both public and private partnerships could assist in building one in the community.

Council Member Stanley added that there wouldn't be a lot of structural requirements and finances involved for the project. Some of the concerns that he considered were liability and/or noise issues. Council Member Stanley reported that he solicited input from the public on those issues, and was inundated with enthusiastic responses from residents who live in the area who were in favor of having a range there. Several individuals replied that people shoot in that particular area anyway, and having a range would help put them in a designated location. He suggested sketching the project out with the others so that some specific numbers can be estimated.

Attorney Petersen asked if there was a specific property that Council Member Stanley had in mind. The question was referred to Director Giles. Director Giles stated that they had originally considered the property north of Kiwanis, however, had decided that would be a poor location due to the nearby trails. He explained that averting safety issues with trail users would be the biggest challenge in identifying a suitable piece of property. The amount of land needed would be determined by what they would want to facilitate, whether it be pistols, rifles, or archery. Orem's shooting range was given as an example and it was noted that their shooting range is only for the Police Department and is not open to the public. There was further discussion about other nearby ranges. Director Lundell asked if it would need to be staffed as a public facility. Superintendent Goodman referred to the Lee Kay Center in Salt Lake, and explained that it requires workers to maintain safety. He also noted that it is publicly owned and operated.

There was further discussion regarding location. Director Giles reiterated that the "G" mountain would need to be off limits due to the nearby trails. He and suggested the Nymer property as a possible location. Council Member LeMone asked about fire concerns. Chief Sanderson added that every year the west mountain has fires due to people shooting illegally. This would be a maintenance issue that would need to be addressed. There was further discussion on Orem's shooting range. Administrator Darrington suggested that staff look at potential locations to see what is available, and then determine if there is a piece of City owned property that could be used or if land needs to be purchased.

There was overall support from staff and Council Members for Council Member Stanley's proposal to build a shooting range. All agreed that it would be used frequently. Council Member Meacham added that the location should be conducive to a shooting range and include natural barriers. The suggestion was also made to possibly build an indoor range for pistol shooting. Engineer Lewis commented that he will contact the Nymer family to talk about the shooting range.

6) **DISCUSSION ON AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE MARCH 4, 2014 CITY COUNCIL MEETING.**

Director Young reviewed the business items listed on the March 4<sup>th</sup> Regular meeting agenda.

- A. **Public Hearing** to consider for adoption an Ordinance (2014-7) amending Section 10-11E-2-1 of the Pleasant Grove City Code adding permitted uses to the Downtown Village (DV) zone for properties that are located within 150 feet of State Street. *Presenter: Director Young*

The first item is a rezone request for properties fronting State Street in the Downtown Village zone. Rezoning had taken place on the west side of the rail road track, and the discussion for the March 4th meeting will be for the east side instead. A list of permitted uses on properties within a

proximity to State Street of 150 feet was developed. The list of permitted uses would allow businesses to enjoy all of the same uses as the C-S zone, which is otherwise on State Street, but they would also be held to the same standards as the Downtown Village zone.

- A. Public Hearing to consider for adoption an Ordinance (2014-8) rezoning approx. 0.45 acres from R1-20 (Single Family Residential) to R1-15 (Single Family Residential) zone on property located at approx. 1240 North 460 East. (BIG SPRINGS NEIGHBORHOOD) *Presenter: Director Young*
- B. To consider for approval a 1-lot Final Plat called Atwood Estates located at approx. 1240 North 460 East in the R1-15 (Single Family Residential) zone. (BIG SPRINGS NEIGHBORHOOD) *Presenter: Director Young*

Agenda items "B" and "C" are related; item "B" is a rezone so that a proposed lot can be created. A 20,000 square-foot lot at Atwood Estates is currently in place; however, an access road needs to be extended in order for the property to be developed. The access road cuts into the 20,000 square feet, which prevents them from meeting the minimum size in the R-1-20 zone. However, the General Plan designation for the area provides for R-1-12 and R-1-15 zones. Staff recommended the applicant request a rezone to R-1-15, which is slightly less than 20,000 square feet.

- C. To consider for approval a 2-lot Final Plat called Orchard Grove Plat "B" located at approx. 350 East 420 South in the R1-8 (Single Family Residential) zone. (STRING TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD) *Presenter: Director Young*

Director Young reviewed agenda item "D" and stated that a couple of years earlier, the Orchard Grove subdivision was created and is now mostly developed. There is now just a small piece left that the applicant would like to divide into two lots.

- D. To consider the request of Rick Stapp for a 4-lot Final Plat called Heritage Grove Plat A located at approx. 900 West 2800 North in RR (Rural Residential) zone. (MANILA NEIGHBORHOOD) *Presenter: Engineer Lewis*

Agenda item "E" is for a four-lot final plat called Heritage Grove Plat A that is located north of the Stonegate Center on 900 West. There have been some storm drainage issues in the area, and most of those issues should be resolved at this point. Engineer Lewis added that when neighbors came before the Planning Commission to speak about the amount of debris and water on the property, staff went back and carefully reviewed the area again. Currently, there is a storm drain line and curb inlets going in. There is also an open area that serves as a detention basin. Engineer Lewis explained that every home built there will have a foundation drain. Council Member Boyd expressed concern with the ability to build homes on the property due to issues with water retention. Attorney Petersen advised staff to review the plat and stated that if the land was deemed unbuildable a notation should have been made. There was further discussion on the matter.

- E. To consider for adoption a Resolution (2014-05) authorizing the Mayor to sign an Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between Pleasant Grove City and the cities of Provo, Orem, American Fork, Springville, Spanish Fork, Lehi, Payson, Lindon, Highland, Alpine, Mapleton, Salem, Cedar Hills, Eagle Mountain and Utah County for NPDES Phase II Storm Water Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practice Compliance; and providing for an effective date. *Presenter: Attorney Petersen*

Attorney Petersen reviewed agenda item "F", which was to authorize Mayor Daniels to sign an Interlocal Cooperative Agreement with several surrounding cities for NPDES Phase II Storm Water Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practice Compliance, and provide for an effective date. She explained that this is for a renewal of the agreement, which has been in place for several years. The new storm water requirements that came in several years ago require cities to have a public education component. The agreement with partnering cities allows for a collaboration of funding and outreach.

It was noted that the Majestic Meadows Plat D was signed. Assistant David Larsen added that votes for Team Member of the Year are due by the following Friday. Council Member Stanley announced the event of "Heroes Behind the Badge" which was to take place the following Friday evening. Arts and Culture Director, Sheri Britsch, made a few announcements regarding the library, and noted that the book sale went well.

**ACTION:** Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion, and the motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

7) **ADJOURN.**

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

This certifies that the City Council  
Minutes of February 25, 2014 are a true,  
-full and correct copy as approved by  
the City Council on March 18, 2014.

---

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

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