

Pleasant Grove City Council Work Session Minutes
January 8, 2013
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Council Members:

Cindy Boyd
Cyd LeMone
Jay Meacham
Kim Robinson, Mayor Pro Tem

Excused:

Mayor Bruce W. Call
Council Member Lee G. Jensen

STAFF PRESENT:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Dean Lundell, Finance Director
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Ken Young, Com Dev. Director
April Harrison, Arts and Culture Director
Lynn Walker, Public Works Director
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Degen Lewis, City Engineer
Andrea Romanczyk, Transcriptionist

Planning Commission Members:

Diana Anderson
John Stevens
Amy Cardon

The City Council and staff met in the City Council Chambers at 86 East 100 South, Pleasant Grove, Utah at 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson called roll for the Council and noted that Council Members Boyd, LeMone and Meacham were present. She excused Mayor Call and Council Member Jensen.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Planning Commissioner John Stevens.

3. Opening Remarks

Opening Remarks were given by Attorney Petersen.

Director Young announced a recently opened Main Street restaurant, Cocalitos, brought samples. He welcomed them, and attendees partook of the food.

4. Discussion on Agenda Items for the January 15, 2013 City Council Meeting

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson called the meeting back to order at 6:04 p.m., noting the presence of Council Members Boyd, LeMone and Meacham.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson stated that the first item on the agenda was electing a new mayor pro tem for the year 2013, an elected official designated to take the mayor's place when he is absent or unable to attend. The mayor pro tem conducts Council and work sessions. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said she has served as such for the past year. She opened the nominations for a new mayor pro tem for 2013.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone nominated Council Member Jensen and Mayor Pro Tem Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Council Members Boyd, LeMone, and Meacham and Mayor Pro Tem Robinson voting "Aye."

Council Member LeMone mentioned that Council Member Jensen is still pretty banged up from a car accident in Sardine Canyon on December 26 and it is a miracle he survived. He is recovering at home. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson wished him a speedy recovery and stated we will let him know he is the new mayor pro tem for 2013.

- a. **Report from State Rep. Brian Greene**
- b. **To consider for adoption a Resolution (2013-01) authorizing the Mayor to sign an Interlocal Agreement for a multi-jurisdictional Mutual Aid Agreement for Sheriff and Police Services by and between Pleasant Grove City, Utah County, Orem City, Alpine City, Spanish Fork City, Santaquin City, Springville City, Payson City, Salem City, Lehi City, Eagle Mountain City, Saratoga Springs City, Lindon City, Utah Department of Corrections, Utah State Department of Natural Resources, United States Marshall, Utah Transit Authority (UTA), Utah State Department of Public Safety, and Utah State Motor Vehicle; and providing for an effective date. Presenter: Chief Smith**

Police Chief Smith said the county attorney has been working on a mutual agreement that will cover all the agencies in the county. This will save us going out and getting agreements with each agency and having a lot of little agreements in case of an emergency. There will be just one agreement that everybody will render mutual aid to each other.

- c. **To consider for approval of a site plan and final plat for The Commons Townhomes (134 townhome units) located at approx. 1650 West 100 South in the Grove Mixed Housing Subdistrict Zone. Presenter: Director Young**

Administrator Darrington said this is a site plan for the property just south of the Wright development; these are the townhomes that are going in south of the apartments (D. R. Horton).

- d. **Discussion on Strawberry Days. Presenter: Administrator Darrington**

Administrator Darrington said this will be a follow-up. There was an initial discussion in December and it has been tabled a couple of times. We will circle back and start to make some decisions.

e. Discussion on Promenade survey. Presenter: Administrator Darrington

Administrator Darrington said we have received the survey results and will go over them. We will talk about whether there are any tweaks we want to make to the Promenade.

5. Republic Services (formerly Allied Waste) to do a presentation on recycling.

This item will be moved to 1/31/13 per their request. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said we did get our notice in the Republic newsletter and it does say to have your garbage cans out by 7:00 a.m.

6. Horrock's Engineers to do a presentation on the 100 East/Geneva Road Connection.

City Administrator Darrington said he will actually be doing most of the talking here. He asked if we could come back to this item after items 7 and 8. The Council agreed.

7. To Consider Awarding the 2012 State Street Waterline Project to DB Bush Excavation. Presenter: Engineer Lewis

Engineer Lewis said this is a project we have discussed before between 2000 West and 1300 West on State Street. This provides a major trunk line loop in the system and is becoming something that we need to have in place with the Grove Commons project. Staff bid this out and received 11 bids. The recommendation is that we award to the apparent low bidder, DB Bush Excavations. Their bid was for \$119,137, which was 36 percent below the engineer's estimate. There were a total of nine bidders on the project, with an average bid of \$149,700.

Council Member Meacham mentioned that this is being driven by the State Street approvals. City Engineer Lewis said we want to get it in before the State Street projects. We do need to have it in place prior to providing the bulk of the build-out for the apartments. It is still something that needs to happen, we are just not in quite as much of a hurry and the contractor will have a little more flexibility on the start date. Council Member Meacham asked when the anticipated start date is. Engineer Lewis said we have not yet met with them about that but they are anxious, and as soon as the weather breaks.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson asked whether we have confidence in DB because of the 36 percent difference in the bid. City Engineer Lewis answered that we do; the 36 percent is under our engineer's estimate. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson pointed out that the average bid was \$149,700. City Engineer Lewis said on the second sheet is the breakdown of the bids, which have a good spread. DB was not dramatically below the others.

ACTION: Council Member Meacham moved that we award the contract for the 2012 State Street Waterline Project to D. B. Bush Excavation in the amount of \$119,137, and the motion was seconded by Council Member LeMone. It was approved unanimously, with Council Members Boyd, LeMone, Meacham, and Robinson voting "Aye."

8. To Consider Awarding the FY 2012-2013 Sewer Rehabilitation Project to Planned and Engineered Construction, Inc. (PEC) Presenter: Engineer Lewis

Engineer Lewis said this is our annual project where we put a new liner inside of the existing pipes. This is a great way to preserve and bring up the quality. It also blocks out a lot of the infiltration and lowers our treatment bill at TSSD. We received four bids and Planned and Engineered Construction was the apparent low bidder at \$172,518, which is one percent over the engineer's estimate. They are also the low bidder on the additive alternative of \$67,114. On these projects, we always ask them to bid a price for some extra work if we have the budget; this gives us a little bit of flexibility in picking up some of the extra work.

Council Member Meacham asked whether we are moving forward with the additives. Engineer Lewis said we have not really talked about that yet but we will bring him in and talk to him about it. By the time he gets here, it will be a little late this year. Our immediate needs may have changed some. Council Member Meacham asked whether the Council should approve both amounts. Engineer Lewis said they are looking for approval of the base bid and the additive items. Council Member Meacham asked whom we used last year on this. Public Works Director Walker responded it was Insituform. They were the only bidder when we first started this, but now there is some competition. Council Member Meacham asked where PEC is located, and Engineer Lewis said they were in Montana. We actually bid this with American Fork City to try to improve the situation for the contractor. The low bidders were not the same in this case, even though the work was advertised as being available at the same time. We will continue to do that with American Fork. They see the advantage in doing what we have shown a good track record with. This is their first time bidding. Council Member Meacham asked whether they are using someone else. Engineer Lewis replied they actually had a different low bidder. The same four contractors bid on both but a different contractor came out lowest in the other one. Council Member Meacham asked whether that affects mobilization costs, because PEC has a lower mobilization cost than Insituform does. Engineer Lewis said the bids were separate, so even though we advertised together, they are two separate contracts, two separate projects. It is good to have the best price, but it is not always good to have the same company. They think this is a good project that should be awarded.

Council Member Meacham said we typically budget \$200,000 per year for this. The addition goes over that \$200,000. He asked whether there was a problem with that budget-wise. Administrator Darrington said it should not be; we should be able to pull it off. Engineer Lewis said that amount ultimately defines the amount of work and we can cut the additive items amount back. Sometimes our needs change as we get in and see what the actual situation is.

ACTION: Council Member Meacham moved to award the contract for the FY 2012-2013 Sewer Rehabilitation Project to Planned and Engineered Construction in the amount of \$172,518, with the additive alternative not to exceed \$67,114, and the motion was seconded by Council Member Boyd. It was approved unanimously with Council Members Boyd, Jensen, LeMone, Meacham, and Robinson voting "Aye."

9. Horrock's Engineers to do a presentation on the 100 East/Geneva Road Connection.

Administrator Darrington said what we have today is the culmination of a project that has been out there for quite a few years, and there are still a lot of steps to be taken. He asked the Horrock's personnel to introduce themselves. Sam Jorgenson and Brian Pitts of Horrock's

Engineers are here with John Higgins, the UDOT project manager, Stephen Lord, who did the traffic modeling for the project, and Brian Dillan from the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) and Lisa Alberry-Sims from UDOT Central Environmental. City Administrator Darrington said we will explain their roles as we go along. We also invited the Planning Commission and have a few members here, as well as a few business owners that this project would affect. The purpose tonight is to go over where we are and what sort of decisions the Council needs to make. If the Council chooses, we can open it up for some feedback.

Administrator Darrington went over some of the project history. It started about 10 years ago, and it was put into the Pleasant Grove City Master Transportation Plan in 2009. At some point, it was put on the MAG Metropolitan and Transportation Plan. MAG is the regional planning group. They also help oversee federal funds and how they are distributed. When MAG is involved, generally there will be a federal component as far as the funding is concerned.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson asked whether John Schiess (of Horrock's) is out of town. Administrator Darrington said he is not. He then said about two years ago the City talked about the civic center project and how we wanted to work this connection in, considering different alternatives for connecting with 100 East and Geneva Road. One idea was the spur where we would have this connection probably take place a little more north than what is being talked about here. When we talked about those alternatives, that led to us saying we needed to get an environmental assessment (EA) done to help us understand what the best alternative would be. Particularly if federal funds are involved, there are additional requirements that might not be required otherwise. Through MAG, we obtained the funds to do this environmental assessment (roughly \$200,000). The City had a seven percent match as a part of that.

The EA began in August 2011. The purpose of the project is to improve the mobility and system linkage for north-south arterial travel in Pleasant Grove. There is a lot of traffic along 100 East and it is not all Pleasant Grove residents. It is a major road for moving traffic from points south to Highland, Cedar Hills, American Fork Canyon, Alpine, and other areas. Our purpose was to reduce traffic on local streets in the project area—when 100 East gets overloaded, people tend to move to local streets that really are not built for that type of traffic—and then providing traffic operations at the arterial intersection with State Street within the project area with level of service E or better for projected 2014 traffic volumes. That means that when we are moving traffic through certain intersections, if we have too much traffic it is rated A through F, and if we do not tackle this problem sometime by 2040, we will have a level of service D at that intersection.

We have admitted all along this project is somewhat visionary; it is something that needs to be dealt with at some time. The question is timing. Administrator Darrington pointed out on the handout the existing traffic volumes (at the bottom) and the 2040 projections if we were to do nothing about it. The alternatives being considered are north of State Street. We had Horrock's look at that, particularly if federal funding is used or we are affecting historical structures. As we go through the EA, there is going to be a recommendation from the FHA regarding significant impacts. Impacts on historic structures are likely to come back as a significant impact, which would mean we would not be able to use federal funds. Engineer Lewis clarified the north and south alternatives; they are north and south of the preferred alternative within the study area. Administrator Darrington had mentioned we had excluded the downtown area from the study

area, so Horrock's would not necessarily have looked in great detail north of 200 South. These are the alternatives looked at as we did the study and the problems identified.

Administrator Darrington appreciated the clarification; when he says "points north" or "points south," he is referring to the preferred alternative, which right now is the connection off of 100 East. Council Member Meacham asked whether the document looked at those alternatives that the City had considered. Mr. Dillan said they did not describe in detail any other alternative other than the one shown on the map, because they knew what the outcome would be and they were limited by 200 South and Alpine Drive (that was the direction they were given for the study area). They did not analyze actual impacts or count historic structures. A quick review revealed that making a connection north of the preferred alternative would hit numerous historic structures. With the federal funding, they had to look for an alternative that would not do that. Council Member Boyd asked about the south. Mr. Dillan said it was the same there.

Administrator Darrington said that at points south there were historic structures, as well as potential low-income minority populations that this road would go through. In some ways, we had to choose an alternative; we could not have every single alternative studied with the funds available. The alternative chosen was the one that seemed most likely to be the one with no significant impacts. Mr. Dillan said they had their architectural historian look briefly, and south of the care center were one to two homes eligible for the National Historic Register. (They do not have to be on the register for a significant impact to occur but rather just be eligible for listing.) Administrator Darrington said there will always be some kind of impact on someone, so they are trying to find a way to obtain federal funding as part of the solution. The key elements of the preferred alternative are that it meets our purpose and needs and avoids impacts on historic resources. There are still some impacts, however; it could require relocation of seven business and three residences. It modifies access to some of the businesses. The details will be more evident as we get into the design phase as to how we can tweak this to create the least impacts. Right now it is just a picture on a map; we can draw some conclusions from this but not all conclusions.

Part of the process is that in December we invited the local businesses in the area to meet with Horrock's on a one-on-one basis so they could have their questions answered as far as the project and how it is going to affect them as best we know right now. They can explain their points of view tonight. We had an open house in December, and one of the things that came out of that was the FHA saying that if this project is going to receive a finding of no significant impacts (FONSI), they would need a resolution from the City Council saying that they support the project. We will not take action tonight, but part of the discussion we need to have tonight is whether we are in support of the preferred alternative. If not, they would still like a resolution to state that so they can start making some decisions as to how they will handle this EA. They will not issue a decision until we have a resolution.

Council Member Meacham asked how much we are talking about "tweaking" this. Administrator Darrington said if the Council comes with a resolution of support, FHA will take that into account as they make their decision as to whether it will be a FONSI, which in essence says that step is completed and we can move to the next step. There will still be approvals necessary to obtain federal funding. Alternatively, they can push it to an EIS, which is a more in-depth environmental that costs between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000, and we want to avoid that. An EIS will tell us pretty much what the EA tells us, and the FHA really does not want to go that route,

either. They want to either issue a FONSI or say there are significant impacts. If the Council says it is in support of this decision up to this point, FHA will likely give a FONSI, and then the project continues to advance. That means proceeding to design, acquiring right-of-way, and construction. Those three things are trigger points for us. Even though the Council passes the resolution and we receive the FONSI, when we enter into the design phase, it is still up to us. We do not have to start the design phase tomorrow; if we need to put that off we have that ability, as well. This does not commit us to the next three phases.

Administrator Darrington said there is some money available to us now through MAG for design. We can do that at our discretion. He did not know whether there was a deadline to use that money. Council Member Boyd asked whether there was a required match on that, and he said there was a seven percent match, the same as on the EA. Design will be \$200,000-\$300,000. If we do a resolution of nonsupport, the FHA will likely come back with a finding of no significant no-build. They still could give us a finding of no significant impact with a build option, which would mean that the project can continue to move forward, but they have told us it is unlikely that if we issue a resolution of nonsupport, in essence that kills the project. A FONSI no-build means that the project cannot be advanced with federal funds. We just found out a couple of days ago that if they have a FONSI no-build, then UDOT cannot use federal funds in the future, the county cannot use federal funds, and federal funds in perpetuity will likely not be able to be used on this project. Council Member Boyd asked whether that was only in that area. Administrator Darrington responded only on this project; it does not affect other projects that we might get funding for. That causes staff some concern because all along they thought that if our City decided we do not want to pursue the federal funding, UDOT could go after it and do it on their own. This pretty much says that if we say no, then UDOT and the county cannot get it. Alternatively, if we do a resolution of nonsupport, federal highways could kick it to an EIS and take it to the next level themselves. We really do not want to go there because it will cost a lot of additional money and will probably not reveal anything new.

Administrator Darrington said we would like to move forward and have a City resolution, whether in support or nonsupport, some time in February. FHA will issue their decision likely sometime in March. If it is a FONSI, it will be valid for three years, and then if conditions or resources change, they will re-evaluate. At the end of three years, they will take a look, and if there are no significant changes, it is likely we can in essence get an extension of the FONSI. If there are some significant changes to the area, it will probably need to be revisited in some manner. The design is already partially funded; MAG has already allocated funds. On the MAG plan, there is no money pretty much for the next five years for the right-of-way in this project. If we were to use federal funds, it is likely this project would be built sometime between 2018 and 2020. If federal funds are not used, the project can start at any time.

Council Member Meacham said a few years ago UDOT did not support this but now they do. He asked UDOT how strongly they do support it. Project Manager Higgins said it is not a high priority at this time for UDOT. He thinks in the future it will become a priority. Administrator Darrington said he thinks we understand that State Street is a state road. This has been something that has been largely staff-driven, as far as keeping this on the radar and keeping the project in the sight of the Council. Geneva Road is a state road; 100 East currently is a state road and could be a county road before all is said and done. We really do not own any of the roads that are involved here, but in some ways we own the traffic. As we have talked about this, we had a really good discussion about whether we should put in the matching funds to do the

environmental assessment, but the Council at that time directed that we at least do the EA, first of all to figure out what the preferred alternative was, and then just to set us up for whatever the next round is. Staff has recognized this as a need and the Council has discussed it a couple of times and made decisions to advance this. It really rests with the Council if we take this any further. He does not want it perceived that staff is falling on their sword, saying we absolutely have to have this. We think this is something we will need at some time. The whole reason we have gone through this EA is to keep the ability to get federal funding alive.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said as far as the federal funding, if it cannot be built in the next five years, if we were to approve and move it forward, would the business owners have a clear-cut idea of when it would come to fruition? She knows uncertainty is of concern to them. Engineer Lewis said staff feels fairly comfortable that the funds would be available sometime between 2018 and 2020. They cannot say that with certainty because things can always happen to change, but on MAG's plan it is a phase 1. City Engineer Lewis said it will be between today and 2020. MAG's plan is "fiscally constrained"; they do not put things into the plan that they do not anticipate being able to get funding for in the future. With that, we can see it being funded by 2020. Right now, this project is not anywhere on the statewide transportation approval plan—there is no funding for it allocated for the next five years.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson asked how it would change if the ownership changed. Administrator Darrington said the only thing that would change is who is going to pay for the project, the county or the state. The state will still, we assume, be involved in some manner because they have Geneva. The county will be involved in some manner because of 100 East. We are going to be involved in some manner as the group that is driving the project. He did not think it would change anything as far as the amount of federal funding; it might just change who helps pay for it.

Council Member Meacham said he assumed the analysis was done when North County Blvd. was not open or when it was under construction. He asked whether we feel confident in the numbers, not having that roadway open and assuming it will take some of the traffic off 100 East. Mr. Lord responded we are confident because it is really about future projections rather than what is on the ground today. We are talking about this area becoming so congested that it is a problem in 2040. That modeling includes North County Blvd., background levels of traffic, and new development in certain areas.

Council Member Meacham asked when we will see the "High T" intersection on 100 East/State Street failing. Mr. Lord said that was always intended as a temporary fix to the problem, knowing that eventually these two roads are going to have to be connected in order for those two intersections to function together. What we did not do was analyze any interim use between today and 2040. What we really know is that in 2040 those two intersections will not function, but as far as giving a year when that is going to happen, we do not know.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said she is not an engineer, but she could never have imagined the light at 100 East 20 years ago. Dave Told said there are about three hours a day right now when he cannot get out of his driveway.

Council Member Boyd said one thing that comes to mind when we are projecting 2040, why are we saying we are going to build it in 2020? Administrator Darrington said the main reason is because it is on the MAG plan to be funded by then. Council Member Boyd asked whether we

are pre-empting the real need for it? Everything that she reads is projecting that the need is going to be in 2040. Engineer Lewis said we usually look 30 years out. An environmental document does not normally step through every year and try to determine where the breakdown is. MAG has a lot of projects that they see a need for in the future. We have a number of projects in our transportation master plan that assume the City is completely developed. When we get to that point cannot be exactly predicted. When we look at that, we really cannot wait until 2040 and say, now we have to build it. We are trying to take chunks of it at a time, moving toward that goal of build-out. MAG's plan gets re-evaluated every couple of years, the UDOT gets re-evaluated on an annual basis, and you look at how things change. It could shift. Putting this at 2018-2020 is putting it at the outer end of phase 1. This study has brought up information that MAG did not have. This helps us see that there is not an overwhelming need for the project today, so perhaps it will get shifted in MAG's plan. Right now, however, MAG has it in a plan where they say by 2020 we will be able to afford to build the following projects, and this project is one of those.

Council Member Boyd said she just recalls that when we were first discussing this, UDOT was not in favor of doing it at all. We pretty much had to talk them into even looking at it and doing some type of study. At that point, they even came back then and said there is no need. It seems like we keep doing studies looking for the right answer. Engineer Lewis said this has been going on for about 10 years, and as time has gone on new needs have been identified. Council Member Boyd said that every step we get to then commits us to the next step or we will lose federal money. Engineer Lewis said that is where he wanted to go. The State Street project has resulted in this being pushed again with UDOT. UDOT came in and did a really quick origin/destination study. They said traffic going northbound on Geneva Road wants to go north on 100 East; how does it get through own. They came back and said they did not see it as a really big issue right now and were not going to consider it as a part of the State Street project. That has been some of the frustration. This connection was kind of a side thing and not really looked at directly. During this process is when UDOT said they could see that when we get to 2040, the department will have an issue to deal with. At that point, they saw that they needed to have it on their radar. They are still not saying when it needs to be dealt with. The reason we are trying to be visionary and look forward is that we have some property owners in the area who are saying they can see how it can affect us and asking for guidance on how this situation might be solved. They want to be able to make plans for it. Again, it is not something we anticipate building in a couple of months or even a couple of years, but some of the property owners can now, with this, say they know that at some point in time this will happen. They will probably not want to build a new building in the middle of the right-of-way, but can expect that if they build elsewhere, the project will miss it.

John Higgins said he can speak a little bit to the history because there have been three other major actions by UDOT in the past 10 years in this area: the Geneva Road improvement, the bridge on State Street over the railroad, and the State Street widening program. Each time, he remembers Frank Mills, past City Administrator, approaching UDOT to ask whether we were also going to consider this connection, but each time it was just barely outside of the project area. It was not his feeling that UDOT was ever saying we did not need it; it was more that UDOT was saying they were not going to look at it as part of that project. Pleasant Grove and staff continued to see a need for it and continued to look for opportunities to get it studied, and that is where this study came about for a standalone project. It has been talked about for a number of years on the staff level. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson opened the discussion for public comments.

Dustin Sweeten, owner of Powerhouse Motor Sports at 25 West State, said he has met many times with Horrock's and has come to the open house. He is not directly affected; the project is not taking any of his property. He thinks there are some problems with traffic and we addressed this about three years ago. All the business owners at the time met and identified preferred alternatives at that time, which were all to revitalize downtown. He believes if this project goes through it will be a death warrant for those businesses downtown. The alternatives that were looked at were going through the park or areas through there and having a walkable downtown. When they say "preferred alternative," he thinks it is preferred because it is the only way they can get federal funding. He does not think it is necessarily the best alternative, but the City probably does not have the funding to do it otherwise, so it is either do it this way or do not do it. He said there are a few business owners for it but most of them are probably against it. Anytime there is a disruption of business, it hurts. When the State Street bridge project was going on, business dropped 30-40 percent in 2008, and then another 40 percent during the bridge project. His business is just barely starting to come back up. Another construction project of that size will hurt most of the businesses in that area and some will not survive, even if they are not directly affected by the construction. He said he has served as chairman of the planning commission in Lindon and does understand what is involved in planning and the need for this type of thing. He does believe there is a need for a connection in some manner, but he does not know that this is the best one. He believes a vote of confidence in this alternative will lead the City down that road and it will be difficult to get off it. He said he has generated over \$1,000,000 in tax revenue in the past eight years; \$150,000-\$175,000 came to Pleasant Grove City directly. They said they would always be behind us, but sometimes in the past few years it has felt that that has not been the case. Businesses are the ones that generate income for the City. Every residence that goes in costs the City money. The Council needs to take a look at what it does to the businesses. He found with the bridge project that they were very nice when they came in, but when they actually did the project that went away. They were dealing with contractors shutting down their access two or three times a day; sometimes customers could not even get into their location. A lot of businesses are going to be dealing with that if this happens. He spent a lot of money to have a business at the corner of Geneva Road and State Street, two of the busiest roads in Utah County other than I-15, and if this project is built it will take him off the corner.

Clark Evans, owner of the Purple Turtle for 45 years, agrees completely with what Mr. Sweeten just said. They thought there would be an alternative that was suggested a long time ago that they felt was better. He understands that federal funding is affected by historical properties. He would like to know what a historical property is. His business was also affected by construction and he still has not recovered from that. He has two concerns with this project. (1) During the construction he will not survive and (2) After the construction, there is no parking or access; if he cannot get to that intersection he is dead. He feels that he is between a rock and a hard place. He is also concerned that this project only goes a block on 100 East, and that is going to have to be done at some point with impacts to all of the same businesses. They are going to feel the impacts for years. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson mentioned that his business was as much a historical landmark as some of the homes in the area. Mr. Evans said his building is not historical because it has been altered. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said he is a part of Pleasant Grove history, whether or not he is on the registry. He said that if the project goes ahead, if he is to stay in Pleasant Grove, he will have to relocate. He needs the traffic, a lot of cars every day.

Jeff Lindstrom said he own Professional Heating. A project that wounds the earlier speakers kills him. He is right in the configuration where it will be completely taken out, which is good and

bad. It gives him the opportunity to start anew, but the other businesses are left to survive. He has been involved with the City on a minor basis for at least 15 years on this project. They built their original building in the late 1990s and there was talk about this then. When he bought the building they did a major remodel and the City was hesitant to give him a building permit (about 10 years ago). At first they really balked because they said they did not want him to remodel the old building if they were going to have to buy it back from him. He has been preparing mentally for this eventually and planned his life accordingly. He planned to move because that is the direction he has been led by the City. In that sense, he does support this expansion because that is what he has been planning on. The people it is going to hurt are good friends. He said that when the stop light went in, that was supposed to cure a lot of the 100 East backup. It actually doubled it, making it worse. Now everyone that avoided that intersection uses it, and the new North County Road has made it a little less but not significantly. During rush hour, the only way they get out of their business is a right turn; left turns are absolutely impossible going north. If he does not have anyone parked in front of the office he can sneak down the parking lane, go through Clark's parking lot, and get out. Other than that he is inaccessible for three hours a day. If the Council approves this and there is right-of-way acquisition in five years, he has no idea what it will be like then. Long-term he is comfortable with the direction the City goes because he has planned for it. He is more concerned about the short term, is there a more-immediate solution to deal with the way it is now.

Dave Told said he owns the Subway building and is directly impacted. The road will go through his building. He is okay with the project to move forward—he thinks there is a need—as long as everyone is compensated fairly and all the business owners are involved in the design. His businesses, along with his tenants, were very much affected by the last intersection construction project. He is shocked and pleasantly surprised that the center median has not affected them worse than he thought it would for that side of the road. It has affected the north side of the road worse than the south side. This intersection would definitely help traffic flow, and he is one of the ones that City Engineer Lewis talked about who has a direction he wants to develop and keep going forward. He built the drive-through and did the wall for Subway out of a block that they can take down because they do not know if they are going to stay or not. They will eventually move their business and do more retail there. He would like direction so he can move forward. There is definitely a need and whatever the City does, it needs to do something. He goes over to the Professional Heating lot and you cannot get in or get out of there, as well as his place, to turn left when you are coming out to go south onto the road at times in the afternoon. You have to turn right and go around the block. It is getting worse. Everyone talks about 2040, when he does not know what is going to happen in five years. Council Member LeMone asked him whether he is in favor of the alternative or saying he would like to be involved in another alternative. Mr. Told responded that for the preferred plan, businesses definitely need to have input. He knows UDOT does not care when it gets to a point; he is with Mr. Sweeten—they tell you something and then a contractor comes in and does something else. He can deal with stuff as long as the end result is positive, and if they get the business owners involved in accesses, he knows Allreds had to fight for their access. Access is going to be a big thing. It will affect him a lot. It is going to be hard to go out both ways. He is in favor of this plan.

Paul Jarvis, general counsel for Utah Capital Credit Union, seconded the concept that the business owners need to be involved in the design phase, as well as expressed his concern that the loss of business in that area affects the businesses that are standing. UCCU has hundreds of cars that pass through that drive-through every day. Part of their concern is they do not want to

become a through-way for traffic. They have talked to Horrock's a little bit about that. He appreciates that they have invited them into their office and considered those things, but primarily access in and left turn out access on State Street are their primary concerns. Beyond that is the impact on neighboring businesses affects them.

There being no other comments from the public, Mayor Pro Tem Robinson closed the public hearing portion of the session.

Council Member LeMone asked for confirmation that we are not making any decisions tonight. City Administrator Darrington said we are not. He said he thinks there should be discussion among the Council as to where we feel we should go, but regardless there will be a resolution in support or nonsupport, or we will need to do it some time in February. Staff wants to get a feel as to what to draft as far as that is concerned. Council Member LeMone said she would definitely like to have the Mayor and Council Member Jensen here for a more in-depth discussion. She said the open-house meeting was very informative for her because she has not been here as long. She also agrees with Mr. Sweeten that there may be a better alternative and more of a balance we can come to satisfy business owners and keep some of the history of Pleasant Grove, even if it means not getting the federal funding. She does not like it stopping where it does right now because we have been talking about revitalizing Main Street for the past 50 years. She does not know if this is going to be the plan that will do that. Maybe it will never be revitalized and we will have to be satisfied with what it is, but she does not know if looking at other alternatives will hurt. It might cost us some money but it might be worth it in the long run to see what options we have available that will benefit both Main Street and current business owners and residents. She feels really strongly about the businesses that have been her for 45 years, such as the Purple Turtle. After the open house, there was quite an uproar on Facebook about it, and just seeing some of the comments, she knows not everyone is educated about what is going on, but some of the comments are valid. She needs to keep that in consideration when making this decision and discussing this. She does not know if this is the best alternative for everyone involved.

Council Member Boyd said the thing that scares her the most about it is that something we as a Council and staff are doing every day and are very aware of is bringing business into the City, and we just heard two of them say that they will relocate if we do this. We have had Sammy's relocate just recently. She said she thinks we cannot afford to make decisions that lose the businesses we have. We have invested in a lot of businesses in our City, and it is time we put them as a priority. It has been frustrating for Mr. Lindstrom and Mr. Told because it has been a discussion for many, many years, and we just kept saying let's try this, let's look at this. We looked at UDOT. They are saying no, that is not a go. We do not feel good about it. Then we do a little engineering and just keep going down this path of trying to make something work that she does not feel we should be trying to make work, or maybe not at this time. Our downtown is important to us. If this project goes in and cuts off downtown we may as we just lock up the doors and tell them all to go home. It is frustrating to her where we have gotten with this and we need to step back and look at our priorities. Are we going to lose businesses through this or kill or downtown?

Council Member Meacham said he sees a need for it. He is not as positive about other alternatives. He agrees that there is a definite impact on the downtown businesses, whether it is five or ten years down the road.

Council Member Robinson said we are between a rock and a hard place. She knows six of the 12 Kelly kids worked at the Purple Turtle. It is part of our community. Someone will be affected one way or the other. It takes a lot of courage to think in terms of long-range goals. The opening of North County Blvd. was one of Senator Valentine's goals 25 years ago. There were hundreds of easements that had to be obtained in order to see that come to fruition, but now, as she drives up North County Blvd, it gives her a sense that people are looking to that future. The year 2040 will be upon us before we know. She has to consider the bigger picture and businesses on either side that will be impacted. She does not think these decisions are necessarily an effort to discourage business in Pleasant Grove. We embrace it and the partnership, but she also thinks that with business there is either act or react, and one business partner, Pro Digital, was frustrated enough with the process the last time this came up for discussion that they moved. She knows government moves slowly and that is her biggest frustration—having great goals and not knowing if anything will have been accomplished when her term is up. Federal funding may not be a big deal to some communities, but in Pleasant Grove she would hate to see us eliminate that potential funding completely by doing a nonresolution. If the discussion moves forward, she knows it is hard for a business to make plans.

Council Member Meacham asked if we could have a definition of historical properties. Mr. Dallin said he would provide the definition. City Attorney Petersen said they have a definition in code that may not be exactly what the Council would use. Administrator Darrington said that going forward we would set this for discussion at the January 31, 2013 work session and hope the full Council and mayor would be here. He thinks there is some additional information he can come up with to help shape the decision so everyone is fully knowledgeable of what we know today. After the discussion, we can do a resolution the first or third Tuesday in February. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said we encourage businesses and citizens to give input because no Council member has yet made a decision. Council Member Meacham said we invited the planning commission to be here if they had any comments.

Commissioner Anderson said she agrees with Council Member Robinson that it takes a lot of courage and planning to be able to make tough decisions now for the future, but she does not yet have a position one way or another. She said she lives on 300 East (at 100 South), so it is an ancillary road. When she first moved in 21 years ago, there was very little traffic. We do have to know that 20 years can make a big difference. If you sit on her porch at 8:00 a.m. you will see a lot of traffic. She believes that there is a way to have the road so that it impacts the fewest amount of people. She also believes that right now there is property on State Street that would be available if we were thinking now about compensating people who are going to lose access. Right now is the time to think about how we will compensate them best, as opposed to reacting when traffic is out of control. The light on State Street and 100 South results in traffic backing up to Center Street at 8:00 a.m. on 300 East. Traffic is stopped from State Street to Center Street at that time, and then it goes the other direction.

Commissioner Stevens said his feeling is that there probably has to be something done but there is also the conflicting thing of downtown. We do not want to lose businesses. What are our alternatives? He thinks the downtown has to have a voice in how this works or at least give some input. If the Purple Turtle happens to relocate, you have this big island right there between those things; are you going to put a park there? No one else is going to build anything there. Mr. Evans said he does not see that property being worthy anything, and the thing that concerns him most is that they are saying they are going to do this without even helping him in any way, shape, or

form. He is not even listed as being relocated. It makes no sense. He said those are his concerns, the effect on downtown.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said we will continue to discuss this on January 29 and that will be an opportunity to hear more input. She thanked everyone for participating and again expressed appreciation for all our business partners.

10. Follow-Up Discussion on Multi-Family Housing (no public comments will be taken)

After a five-minute break, the meeting was reconvened at 7:39 p.m. for a limited discussion. Administrator Darrington introduced the subject by saying this was started at the second meeting in December. We have received some feedback on how we want to handle our multi-family. Director Young has put these changes together with the different code topics, what we currently have, and the proposed changes based on feedback from the Council.

Director Young said we did not get too far but had more of a general discussion as to what the document was all about. We did talk about the first page but did not get too much further into that. Depending on what the Council wants to do, Director Young said he could run them through the document and simplify it; there is a lot of verbiage on these pages. As Administrator Darrington mentioned, it is broken down into existing and proposed, as well as Grove zone and CS-2 zone when we are in different categories. On the first page, the categories are permitted uses and project design. We look at both of those zones and what they say about those two areas. By and large, what we are doing here is trying to make the Grove zone and the CS-2 zone capability for multi-family be the same—the same requirements across the board in both zones because currently they are not the same. There are a lot more requirements in the Grove zone than in CS-2. There are a few variances between the two and we are trying to bring them together. The CS-2 zone is commercial but it allows for multi-family to be in that zone up to 45 percent of the overall project area. In other words, 55 percent of the land area must be commercial and the remaining can be built by conditional use permit as multiple family.

Administrator Darrington asked who was here the last time we talked about this. Everyone present was at that last meeting. Director Young said he can go down through each category and show what staff is proposing. He listed some of the overall changes that are trying to meet some of the objectives we have talked about recently that will be applicable to both of these. First, a maximum height of three stories for any building, but we will only allow townhomes that are ground to sky (same unit to the top of the building), not three stories of stacked condominium or apartments. They can be attached side-by-side but not on top or below. Council Member Boyd asked whether it would be a garage on the first level. Director Young said it could be. Second, any project of at least 10 acres will need to have an integrated housing mix plan like a village with all different types of housing integrated, not five acres of townhomes and five acres of apartments. If it is at least 10 acres, it must be integrated (e.g., a townhome next to a twin home next to a single-family home). Council Member LeMone asked how we are defining integrated. Director Young said we can get more definite on that but it currently specifies a mix within the same area, that is, different types of units together on the same street or frontage. We can have an example of that. In the Grove zone, we currently have a requirement of at least two types of housing per project, but the proposal is that we go to three types so we have, for example, a condo, a townhome, and a twin home or single-family.

The maximum density is proposed to be at 12 residential units per acre (page 2). This is in regard to mixed use above commercial or just strictly a residential-type area. There will be no bonus density; that will be eliminated. Currently, there is an opportunity to go up to 18 with a high-density residential overlay, but the overlay is being eliminated. Engineer Lewis said this is the same in the CS-2 zone, even if there is a maximum density there currently of 24 units. Director Young confirmed that CS-2 will allow 24 per acre, or if it is within 200 feet of a public street, 18 units, but this will bring that down to 12 units, as well. Council Member Meacham asked whether in our old requirements, did we allow additional density if they were on top of commercial and whether this addressed that. Director Young said it allowed 24 units per acre if it was above commercial and that will go away (number 4). Council Member Boyd said basically there will be no way to get around that limit. Director Young confirmed that that is the case.

Director Young said we are changing the CS-2 zone to match the parking requirements of the Grove zone—two and a half parking spaces per unit. CS-2 currently requires two and one-quarter, so both will go to two and one-half. It will also take emphasis away from the joint use of parking facilities or shared parking. We are adding a requirement that at least one parking space per unit shall be an attached garage, and no carports shall be permitted in front of buildings. The carports shall be required to have similar materials, including roof lines. Administrator Darrington said on the joint parking, the old wording said joint use is desirable and encouraged, and in some ways that was used against us and we are taking it out. He asked whether in concept we are going to be okay then without joint parking words; do we need to define that better? What was proposed with the Wright development project seems a little hokey. Director Young said he thinks there was just a little bit of verbiage that was missing in the code that allowed us to go a little bit astray at first, but we do have the “up to 40 percent may be approved, no conflict in operating hours, no further than 500 feet.” The 500 feet was not just of the project but of the buildings that are directly associated with that parking need. That is perhaps the verbiage we need to add in.

City Attorney Petersen said she had also noted in the Council’s discussion that we were going to make sure to use it only for true mixed-use projects. One of the criticisms of the proposed joint use was that it really was not a true mixed-use development; they were using their retail component, which was not part of the residential component, to try to get their shared parking. We had talked about adding some language that would make the shared parking only for true mixed-use.

Council Member Boyd asked if there was some kind of percentage as to how many of each of the three prototypes/designs, if we need to be that specific. Director Young read the verbiage staff is suggesting: “At least three prototypes. One type shall include single-family or two-family homes. Lowest-density housing shall comprise the highest percentage of land area and the highest-density type shall comprise the lowest percentage.” Council Member Boyd said that was what we had talked about. Also, regarding the trails, maybe some of the parking could be forfeited for bicycle parking. Director Young said he did not know that we want to forfeit any of the parking, but certainly we want to have bicycle parking. There is a requirement for bicycle parking currently. Council Member Boyd said we might want to have that bicycle parking inside, or inside businesses. Maybe that was what it was—they could forfeit a couple of parking stalls if they provided bicycle storage indoors. Director Young said that might be something we need to look at in another section of the code. Right here we are talking specifically multi-family.

Administrator Darrington reminded the Council that we have the minimum two and a half parking space per unit, which we have had developers tell us, is pretty onerous. If we are comfortable with it, that is fine and we can stick with the 2.5. Council Member Boyd asked if the 2.5 on number 8, five percent for bicycles can be part of the total ... Administrator Darrington said he thinks what this has is bicycle racks in the amount of five percent of the total automobile spaces, so that if they are required to have 100 parking spaces for their vehicles, then they have to provide five spaces for bicycles. There is not a trade-off there. The CS-2 zone currently has 2.25 parking spaces per unit. Council Member Boyd said it is 2.5 for one zone, the Grove zone. Engineer Lewis said the CS-2 zone has 2.25. Director Young said we have not had a lot of experience or anything really at all with the 2.25 yet. We have had a lot of experience with 2.15, which is where most of our developments were built. He does not know if we are comfortable in saying we want to try 2.25 or 2.3. Attorney Petersen said what we have built under our current standard before we changed it obviously was not enough. We have parking issues in all of our multi-family developments in terms of parking on the public roads. Some of them have narrower streets and they are trying to park on those streets. People who come to visit have to circle three or four times sometimes to find a visitor parking space that is open. It was not enough—that was why we increased it. We do not have anything built under the 2.5 to say whether that is too much or whether it is just the right amount. We could consider moving it down.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said Amy Cardon on the Planning Commission lives in the Grove area and asked her if she had any comments about parking issues. Commissioner Cardon said it is really difficult and she does not know what measure one would use because, as Attorney Petersen said, there is not anything that has that current requirement to compare it to. Her complex is all units with three bedrooms and you cannot really control who rents the units, but several units have three or five single people in a unit and each one of them has a vehicle. Even families may have two teenage kids with cars, so they need more than two spaces. This causes issues. The only way for the HOA to control it would be to issue permits; there are already numbered stalls for condos but not townhomes. That takes away the neighborhood feel and makes it seem like living on a campus. When a visitor comes they cannot park. It is difficult and crowded. She does not know whether we can take into consideration the number of bedrooms per unit to calculate how many parking stalls might be needed. Council Member Boyd said that would even make it more. If we are already high at 2.5, if we go by bedrooms ... Commissioner Cardon said if it were averaged, taking bedrooms into consideration and also whoever is building could include some kind of rental capacity. That might be something the City could try to govern.

Director Young said as far as rentals, the City does have state code that we have to follow. Council Member Boyd said that is difficult to enforce, even by an HOA. City Administrator Darrington said if we stick with 2.5 for now and get some developments with that, we will have a better feel for whether more is needed or whether that is too high. He recommending sticking with that and seeing how it goes. Issues with five renters in one apartment cannot be addressed. There are national standards that we pull these numbers from; they may or may not be completely reflective of our current demographics, but we do know that 2.5 is on the high end.

Council Member Meacham said we did a study a couple of months ago comparing other cities' percentages. He asked if we can talk to a couple of those cities and see what their parking is. Administrative Darrington said we did not do a thorough review of parking at that time, but Director Young did talk to at least some of them and we did get the view that we are on the high

end. There are a lot of cities that are between 2.25 and 2.3, but there were a few at 2.5. Council Member Meacham asked whether anyone was over 2.5, and said he did not see anybody over that.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson asked whether we have any ordinance in place that compliments on-street parking; do the HOAs enforce the street parking? Attorney Petersen said yes and no; HOAs can enforce it if they choose to engage private towing and booting companies. We have on occasion enforced the no on-street parking when it has been a problem for us. They had people at Pleasant Springs apartments parking out on that narrow 700 South where it is not improved and that was an issue. They also had people parking in front of Belle Monet again when it was unimproved for awhile on both sides. People could not get through. There were times when cars were red-tagged. We already have the ordinance that through the winter cars are not allowed to park overnight on public streets.

Commissioner Cardon said some of the associations' complexes have an area designated for RV or additional storage for vehicles that are not in use (hers did not). She wondered if that was something that we could require of builders: a specific amount of space for that. If the association decided it did not want to use it for RV storage, it could be turned into additional parking or room for growth. Attorney Petersen said they did not let anyone come in with RVs because there was no room for them on the street, but that does not stop people from doing it.

Engineer Lewis said part of the problem with parking is that we are essentially providing something for free, so no one has a vested financial interest in reserving the use of it. In some ways, having a sufficient number of stalls and then having those be assigned or requiring that there be an owner for the stall may help. There is a financial incentive to rent a unit to five or six people because the owner does not have to worry about finding parking stalls for them. If they can get there first, they get them. But if I only control three parking stalls, then I have to go acquire additional stalls in order to provide them to tenants. He said he thinks the basic problem is that we are requiring parking, but they are there for anybody to use at no cost. Things that are free tend to get used up faster than otherwise. Administrator Darrington said if we require the 2.5 spaces, the HOA still gets to decide how those are assigned. Engineer Lewis said that the true problem here is that there is no value associated with parking use. Administrator Darrington said he does not know that we as a City need to figure out all the details of the parking for every development. We have our requirement and the HOAs can figure out if they want to make a portion of that for RV storage or otherwise; that can be up to them.

Council Member Meacham said he is concerned about a high number driving developers away. City Administrator Darrington said that is part of the conversation—are we comfortable if someone comes in with a higher-density housing project and says they cannot meet the parking requirement. As a City, are we willing to say that is fine, we are okay if your project is not built here? That is the trade-off. He thinks when Council Member Boyd refers to quality; he is assuming this is the direction she is heading. We are going to say these are the quality standards we have, and if you cannot meet them we are okay to see this land stay vacant as opposed to seeing it developed. Those are decisions we make, what we are comfortable with.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said she does not recall seeing other communities requirements but has heard from the developers. She would suggest getting online and seeing what is typical. Administrator Darrington said staff has already taken a cursory look and ours is high.

Council Member Boyd said what might be helpful for her (and would take a little work on Director Young's part) is a picture. We know what we do not like because we have seen it. What we need to see is something on paper, in color, what a development is going to look like that follows this protocol. Community Development Director Young said it would take a lot of time and effort to prepare, and he is not sure they are ready to do that within the time until the moratorium deadline. The format that can be prepared is a "Do this and not this" with photo examples of the type of development we are looking for. "This meets the zoning criteria and this does not." It can be either photos, graphics, or drawings that show visually what we are looking for. It cannot, however, be so explicit that it would say this is the only way it can look, or this is all the multiple varieties that it can look like. Council Member Boyd said she knows of developments she likes and developments she particularly does not like. Director Young said we could find a lot of examples here in Pleasant Grove or in the area. Council Member Boyd said a 30-minute or one-hour ride-around would give a concrete visual when we are trying to talk about parking structures and trying to encourage the right ones.

Council Member LeMone said she is concerned that we do not have a development within Pleasant Grove that looks like what we are trying to project for the future. Director Young suggested that the Council let staff talk about presenting visually the difference between two spaces per unit and 2.5 spaces. Council Member Boyd suggested also showing what the open space would look like and see the whole layout of integrated housing, open space, etc. Director Young said that the time and effort involved with doing that is extreme and is much more than he would be able to do at this time. We would have to hire more staff or a consultant to do it effectively. Council Member Boyd said we should have that discussion.

Council Member LeMone said she knows of two developers who have mentioned Draper developments they have done. Ivory was one where they have done senior housing with townhomes. She could call and get specific addresses. Director Young said the difficulty we may run into is that if we incorporate all of our changes into a drawing; it might be a little hard to figure that out because there are so many variations possible. He asked if she was just asking for one variation, and Council Member Boyd said yes, she did not want every scenario. She just wants to look at a plan that describes this. He said we can do that. City Administrator Darrington wanted confirmation that she was saying one development plan according to what we want; this is what it looks like on paper. He said we still would have to hire someone to draw that.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson asked whether, if Council Member Meacham was concerned about developers going away because the requirement is 2.5, there was a set measurement of each of these 2.5 stalls as to what they were required to be, or is there some manipulation that can be done regarding compact vehicles versus full-size. Council Member Meacham said if 2.5 are required, it will cost the developer more. He will sacrifice quality because of that, and that is his concern. Council Member Boyd said there is a ratio used of full-size versus compact stalls. Council Member Meacham said he would prefer quality. Administrator Darrington said you have so many that are for compact vehicles, but that does not always suit the needs of current or future residents in a particular location. It can be onerous trying to make things fit. Engineer Lewis said currently we have minimum standards for parking stalls: 22 feet.

Director Young said on page 3, regarding open space, there was another significant change being proposed. Currently there is a minimum of 25 percent of the project area required to be open space, and 50 percent of that area must be usable and contiguous so that there is room for

recreational use. We are proposing that we change that 25 percent to 30 percent and the 50 percent to 75 percent. Even though those numbers may not paint a very big picture for the Council right now, and maybe the 25 percent to 30 percent does not sound that significant, but as it affects the project area it is significant. He thinks this will force a higher-quality development as far as the utilization of its outdoor space. Here again, this is probably something that would be beneficial to see laid out. It is only a five percent increase, but it is planned openness that is more effective. He then flipped over to the fourth page, landscaping. The Grove zone requirements are a lot more stringent than CS-2 zone, so he is proposing that they be the same in both. There were also a few things they wanted to add from the BMP zone (only one building has been built there so far). Some of the landscaping requirements there are good as we talk about larger projects for internal circulation roads, mature trees, etc.

Director Young then moved on to the design features bonus density. This is one thing that will make a significant impact. The thing we had for projects was that they could achieve bonus density if they earned certain points by adding in some of these features. As they went through these things, they realized that we want our projects to have most of these things; we want to require these things, not make them optional where they can pick and choose and earn points and then get bonus density for it. There are some things on the list, however, that perhaps should not be required; they are nice but maybe it is a little onerous to require every single one of these things. What they did is to make a recommendation to make them either required or optional, and if they fall under the optional list (next page), points can be achieved and we require that they achieve half of those points by picking and choosing what they want from that list. That way we are requiring a higher quality and giving a little optional ability with some of the things that are a bit more difficult or costly, such as active or passive solar features, roofs with 40-year grade tile or slate shingles, multi-purposes storm water detention, special features in highly visible locations, common building for meetings, recreation, etc., trees and shrubs 20 percent more than minimum, open space 10 percent more than minimum, construction and dedication of a park or trail. They would need to achieve 25 points out of the 50 possible, in addition to meeting all other requirements, to get approval.

Director Young said then there are just a few other items, but he thinks that the combination of requiring the formerly bonus density options, having additional open space, and lowering the density across the board to 12 units per acre will really force developments to be higher quality than anything we have seen in Pleasant Grove so far.

Council Member Meacham asked whether this applies to the mixed housing zone in the Grove. Director Young said yes, as well as the CS-2 zone. If the Council is comfortable with this, staff will put it into ordinance format for review and then if that is acceptable go ahead and schedule it for public hearing. We are coming up on the February 21 six-month deadline on the moratorium.

The Downtown Village zone also allows multi-family housing, but he thinks through the review of the Allred project and some other considerations downtown, and the trailer park, we need to handle downtown differently. The Council gave a nod in the direction of the concept plan that Steve Allred presented in December, so we are presenting a concept master plan to be attached as an appendix to the General Plan for that block. The only difference from what the Council has seen previously that is on this iteration is that he has added four studio apartments that front on 100 North. They are just taking up some of the space in those condominium buildings. He wanted to try those out as an experiment. Otherwise it is the same thing that we have looked at

before. We are going forward to the Planning Commission this Thursday with a public hearing to review this as a potential appendix to the General Plan for that block.

With that, he thinks we will want to go forward with some amendments to the Downtown Village zone as to what we are doing with multiple-family housing. He has not created anything yet and asked the Council if they have any direction as to what they would like to see, keeping in mind that the Allred project does not meet the same numbers criteria as in the Grove zone (the Allred density would be higher) that we just reviewed, and the trailer park scenario previously discussed might fall into that Grove zone-type density and open-space criteria. Some of those would not be applicable in the downtown setting, such as requiring 30 percent open space. Even the parking requirements would want to allow for shared parking, and we do have that ability in this concept plan here. Requiring 2.5 spaces without shared will be nearly impossible in a downtown setting, so he thinks we do need to look at the Downtown zone a little differently.

Administrator Darrington suggested doing the same thing as this with the Downtown zone, showing staff recommendations, and possibly having it prepared in two weeks for the joint meeting with the Planning Commission. He asked if our feelings on density in Downtown are different than in the Grove.

Council Member Boyd said her concern with density is what it looks like, what fits. She is most concerned with getting the best-quality development in there that we can possibly get. The number is not as important.

Council Member LeMone said she did not want to be in the same situation with every other area besides CS-2 and the Grove that we are right now. She does not want to put a max at 12 for the Downtown Village zone, but she also does not want to see 18-24 units an acre.

City Administrator Darrington suggested letting Director Young put this together and then we will go over it. Council Member Boyd said she agrees with Director Young that there is a difference; there is a whole different feel to downtown than the spread-out Grove area. There do need to be some changes made to accommodate multi-level housing in the areas out by Maverik, downtown, and the trailer park area. She asked Director Young to come with some suggestions so we can find a good balance between what we are allowing in the Grove and up here.

Administrator Darrington said we did not go over every line; they can, but it will take them awhile. If the Council wants to review it, because there are changes, they just do not want someone to come in and build something and have the Council ask how that happened. The visuals will help. He asked the Council to please review the material, and if there are questions, let's talk about them before we adopt this in ordinance for because staff did not go over every single item in her. Director Young said they tried to highlight the most significant changes.

Council Member LeMone said the emphasis on quality and some of the design feature bonus density options were good and staff has done a phenomenal job. She does want to go over it and understand the required aspects. She wants to understand the 2.5 requirement as far as the market. Administrator Darrington said we will do some research on that, on the 24th or the 31st, and will show some comparables with other cities. If some other cities have built with the 2.5 standard, they might be able to take a picture of what that looks like, or maybe get an aerial view or map. Director Young said it is going to be difficult to take a picture that will really tell you what you need to see, because depending on the time of day you may just see a picture of a

parking lot. That may not be beneficial. Council Member Boyd suggested taking the picture at night when the parking is usually full. Director Young said they would figure out how to do it. Council Member Boyd said just some more information in general on the 2.5 would be helpful.

Council Member Boyd said she had some questions about the definitions. Director Young said those were intended to be just helpful. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said some history would be helpful, starting with earlier requirements and why we changed them. City Attorney Petersen said there is a history there that can be provided. Council Member Boyd asked about the definition of apartment; did we have the discussion that there are no apartments, they are all owner-occupied? She thought we were trying to get away from apartments down there. Director Young said what he was trying to do was give a definition as to what we are talking about when we say this word. It will not be in the ordinance. It was suggested that since we are talking about different types of units that we describe what it is that we are talking about, not necessarily that we add it into the ordinance. Administrator Darrington said part of our discussion is to eliminate the word "apartments" anywhere in the code. Council Member Boyd said if we are going to have definitions, there should be more choices, such as single-family or other concepts or prototypes.

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said these projects will be presented at the Planning Commission on Thursday. She asked whether the studios would be ground-level for handicapped access. Director Young said there was a little legend on the side breaking down the components: 16 townhomes, three stories, those are the ones that are in the interior of the project. There are 32 residential condos, three stories. All of these buildings have been proposed at three stories in height. The 32 would include all those on the exterior fronting on 100 North and fronting on Main Street. There are also the four ground-floor studios that are fronting on 100 North. The next bullet is eight ground-floor commercial units with residential above on Main Street. You will see the little boxes there representing the front facing Main Street. Those could be individual small units or they could be combined together to make a larger one. There are three new commercial buildings on Center Street and 100 East, one three stories. It is shown here as two stories, but he thinks we want to leave an option there for three stories. The question came up earlier about whether Center Street would be a better location for the multi-family or the mixed use (condos above commercial) than the northern part of Main Street. That is not how it is planned right now, but it is something that we may need to consider. Maybe north Main Street is not as viable as a commercial corridor as Center Street is. Should we require commercial units on north Main Street (as currently required by the ordinance)? Is this section of Main Street as pertinent for commercial frontage?

Council Member Boyd said this is a continuation of our downtown, and it extends it one more block. Director Young said it does, and that was the idea. As we look at the other side of the street (the west side), as it redevelops, we would hope it would do the same thing. Council Member Meacham said he does not know that he agrees with that because of the disjointed roadway. You do not go straight down Main Street, you have to jog to go on, and that is a deterrent to commercial. The Mayor Pro Tem then said she does not know about that because there is nothing there now to go to. Engineer Lewis asked whether it was ultimately our decision as a City or more for the developer to say what fits better. Director Young said it is being shown as commercial on the bottom floor, so if we adopt this as a master plan in the General Plan, that is what we are going to require when they come in. Do we want to require that, or should we leave it as an option? Can they just do residential and not commercial on that part of Main Street?

Council Member Meacham asked if retail/office switches with what is on Main Street here, is that any concern to us as a City where they actually put that. Director Young said perhaps he was blending two concepts together in the same discussion. Talking strictly about Main Street, not looking at Center Street, we have eight commercial units being proposed there because it is required. He does not know that they would otherwise have been shown there. The City told them they were required. The question is should they be required on that section of Main Street.

City Engineer Lewis said there is no engineering review on this proposal yet, so the concept that came in, had comments gone out, would have had comments about where the right-of-way line is because Main Street does jog. As we look long term, we are going to be redeveloping that street and finishing it. We do not want to encourage that significant jog to remain. Looking at this, he has concerns about the proposals for diagonal parking on Main Street and on 100 North and there actually being enough room to make that work. What is being shown there is narrower than the rest of Main Street, so the ability to back out of the diagonal parking has not been answered. It is a good concept to look at what might happen, but he is not sure how much space they actually have to work with there.

Director Young said Engineer Lewis brought up the concern about the barbershop being right in the middle of the jog area, and perhaps we need to talk about it. Council Member LeMone said we could make the jog and not have diagonal parking. Director Young said the problem with that is that diagonal parking provides for some of the required parking for this project. If you do not allow diagonal parking, you are taking away some of their parking ability. Engineer Lewis said they have looked at it from an engineering standpoint and have assumed that the barbershop will not survive long-term. It could, but as they lay out the right-of-way requirements, that is a decision that will be made in order to get the street to line up and be functional.

Council Member Meacham asked Director Young to explain that parking to him again. The diagonal parking is private property but parallel parking would be City property? Director Young said not necessarily, but normally it is. This parking is within the project. With street improvements going in, parallel parking would be street parking and not project. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said there is no parking on Main Street. Attorney Petersen said the way it is drawn right now it is within the property, but it is the City's option to say no, we will not let them put parking on their property, they will have to dedicate it as part of the private right-of-way to get rid of some of that jog, and then it would be public parking. Administrator Darrington said they would then need other parking spots within the project area.

Director Young said he thinks what we are talking about is accepting a concept, that we will hold them to the spirit of this in a lot of ways. Administrator Darrington said as we do that, if it does become an appendix to the General Plan, there needs to be some verbiage attached to that that this is a concept plan, the finite details may be changed. There needs to be some kind of clarification in that regard.

Council Member Meacham asked if this is what is currently being proposed, will this change the zoning? How does the General Plan work in conjunction with the zoning? Director Young said the idea for adopting this as an appendix to the General Plan was that it would force or at least steer future development of the entire block, even though only a portion of it is being looked at to be developed soon. We wanted to have it make sense within anything that happens in the future. What is being proposed here is currently permissible under the current code.

Engineer Lewis said his second question is that the original concept plan said it was 12-13 units per acre, stretched over the whole project/entire block. Council Member Boyd asked what is being proposed now. Director Young said it is about 13 units per acre over the entire block. We are doing that because there is parking that is shared between the units here that crosses some of the lines. He thinks it is really the only sensible way to look at density and parking—to look at the entire block, not just Steve Allred's property. Administrator Darrington said the Council should also understand that it is likely the housing portion will go in first and the commercial portion is going to happen when it happens. Council Member Meacham said those commercial units that are part of Steve Allred's project on Main Street would go in at the same time as the residential. Director Young said yes, but the commercial here is not going to be required to be put in at the same time. Engineer Lewis said the plan ensures that when it occurs, this is how we want it to occur. Director Young said along Center Street and 100 East, this is one of the issues we ran into before, that the housing comes in first and the commercial may come in eventually sometime. Council Member Boyd said unless we have someone come in and just purchase the whole project. Director Young said if we do not, again, we need to know if the Council is okay with the idea that the housing will come in first and that portion of the project will be a little bit more than 12 units per acre, and that the commercial might take a few more years to develop.

Fire Chief Sanderson asked if this specific concept will go back through the DRC and be evaluated for fire access. Administrator Darrington said that is the engineering part we were talking about that the site plan looks good right now; there might be some things that do not meet our standards that will be flushed out once they start the actual design phase. Director Young said this will be kind of a guide. When the development proposal comes in, we will say the General Plan shows this, are you meeting the spirit of what this is doing? Administrator Darrington said his sense is that as a City we want to see this developed. Steve Allred has been sitting on this property for awhile and we just want to protect ourselves as to what the code says and what the quality is because of past experience, where we have had similar proposals that really did not come out how they looked initially. Particularly now when we do not know who might purchase the project or actually develop the project. Sometimes this is all we have to go back to and things can change. Maple Grove is a good example of something that came in, was proposed, and then somebody buys the project and it comes out different. It still met all the standards but it was different than what was originally approved by the Council.

Council Member LeMone said that is why we need to get these standards in place. She does not want to go on to do this again without our requirements and standards that we are setting for the Grove and CS-2 zones. Council Member Meacham said part of it is that they are hitting the Planning Commission, so is this going to in essence grandfather them in with current codes, or do we want to work through all of our Downtown Village issues before we allow it. Director Young said that is not his question to answer. The direction he thought he got in December was generally this concept is favorable and we like the idea of making it attach to the General Plan. With that, there should not be reasoning to not allow us to go forward with that. We can still tweak the zoning requirements, but he does not know that they are going to be tweaked nearly as much as the Grove zone.

Council Member LeMone said then what about if a concept gets turned over to someone else, and now we are dealing with a whole different development that we really did not sign up for to begin with, and we were not willing to settle for vacant buildings not being filled for three years down in the Grove, so she is wondering why we are settling for that up here. It seems like the

quality is changing from one area to another and she would like to see it a little more consistent. She definitely thinks that the different areas will have different density, and wonders why were are wavering on some of the quality issues. Like Administrator Darrington is saying, we get one concept in and now we are talking about another one. That is why she is worried about pushing it through and then we are making some changes, and we are confusing the developer and not being business-friendly because we are changing our minds. She wants to make sure we are being the most favorable to the developer and to the quality standards we are setting now. That is why we have the moratorium in place, but it does concern her now that all of a sudden we are okay with a building sitting vacant for three years with nothing in it when we were not okay with it in the Grove.

Director Young said technically the buildings probably are not going to be built unless they have tenants that are ready to go. It is unlikely that these will be built and stay vacant. Council Member Boyd said what we will get first is what he can build—the multi-family and internal parts, and then as he gets people to buy the commercial property on Main Street and the back section, that whole area will be done. She said she definitely wants to see it happen; we need it for the survival of downtown. She just does not want to see it happen as it did in the Grove where we give up quality just to hurry and get a project in and then hope.

Administrator Darrington said he does not know if “quality” is the proper word. Quality to him is the type of materials they use to build it, but quality could also mean the type of development and how well it conforms to our vision of downtown. He thinks looking at this, it meets the spirit of what we are doing and the devil is in the details as to whether they can meet parking and do the other things that are going to make sense for us as a City. What we are talking about here is establishing this in the spirit of changing our Downtown Village code. If the densities are going to be pretty close, we will probably be okay. If there are certain design standards or features or things we want to change from what is currently in place, it probably would not affect this unless we are going to wait and not approve this until we do our Downtown Village stuff. He does not know if that puts Steve in a bind with what he is trying to get going on this. What we do not want is to thwart what Steve is trying to do, while still protecting ourselves as a City regarding this project as a whole.

Council Member Boyd asked how different is it. She does not think it is far off, so it would only be a tweak here and a tweak there. Director Young said we have spent a lot of time for the several years looking at downtown and have created design standards and guidelines that we require there. We went through the Downtown Village zone and made a lot of changes to that. The fact that this currently meets what we have already looked at for downtown and it meets the concept and idea we saw up in Bountiful means this is really close without doing anything. When he comes back with something like this on the Downtown Village zone, it will be much less. We are already almost there.

Administrator Darrington said he thinks that is the point. Our tweaks to the Downtown Village are going to be pretty minimal, and if these meets the spirit of what our Downtown Village already is, he does not think we are going to change much as we talk about the details, unless we go into radical changes on design features. He does not believe that is the intent of what we want to do. He thinks moving forward we should get this in front of the Planning Commission, where they can address this on the General Plan issue. This will come to the Council once the Planning Commission is done with it. We will have more discussion.

Steve Allred said he is trying to meet the zoning requirements. They have been looking at this for quite a few years and trying to meet the spirit. They recognize that it is just a concept. Engineer Lewis has given some input and they have made some changes. Whether those things will work, what this concept does is allow for some things that are favorable to the whole project if we can get those things to go through. At the same time, they look at it as not being what was once proposed. It has changed dramatically trying to make it livable. This is where he lives and something he wants to benefit not only his community but also the downtown. They own property on both sides of Main Street, so it is important to them to try to do what they can to help maintain it. They are totally invested in the City. He has talked to developers, and not many of them are willing to take on a project like this. This is a local boy trying to make something work. They would love to see it happen and they hope it will also benefit the local community and the downtown. As they went up to Bountiful and saw the types of businesses that were put into those little places, something like that could fit perfectly into this type of a concept. They are not big retail places, not big boxes; they are the personality that is good for the town. As the Council looks at the whole block, he thinks it can be a great concept. Whether Center Street can happen as quickly, he does not know. The developers he talks to say they are still very nervous about the commercial retail aspect. He hopes that the two of them together can work.

Council Member Boyd said she is sure Mr. Allred has heard the Council's concerns and understands them. She thinks residential or retail or commercial, he is leading out to a real central focus of our community. That is what she is looking forward to. When people see dirt dug up, they get excited. She does not have a concern with it being presented at the Planning Commission.

Administrator Darrington said it will go through planning. Attorney Petersen has a couple of notes and they will double back with Engineer Lewis, as well. Before this hits the Council they will have addressed these issues and clarified a little more for the developers as to some of the things that might need to be done. They do not want to slow up the process, but as a City it does not happen until the Council says so. Their issues are somewhat minor.

Council Member Boyd asked Director Young if he could have some of those differences ready for the Planning Commission on Thursday for the Downtown Village zone. He asked what she means by "differences." She replied that we are talking about the "tweaking." Director Young said that is more of a City Engineer Lewis thing and it is possible. In general as we look at this, he knows that we cannot act because we do not have a design, but regarding the parking we can have some general guidelines or a feel for what we want to do.

Engineer Lewis said we really need as much space as we can on Main Street to make diagonal parking work, and we are not talking about a right-of-way that is anywhere near that wide. Director Young said that is exactly what we need to identify so the Planning Commission can address that.

11. Mayor, City Council, and Staff Business

Arts and Culture Director Harrison said she had just met with the Arts and Culture Department last Thursday. It was a short and productive meeting and they will be meeting quarterly.

Director Young said he had talked to the owner of Cocalitos today and, though we had mentioned previously the possibility of having a Christmas Council dinner there when we

thought they might be open before Christmas, there might still be a desire that we do something in January of that nature. Another possibility is when the Council has their retreat in February we could have them cater it. It would not be the same thing as going to their business, but he just wanted to throw that out. They will have their own business and they have one room that might be sizeable enough for all of us.

Engineer Lewis said he is looking forward to the time we install a traffic signal at Pleasant Grove Blvd. at 1300 West. A power line running along the west side of 1300 West will provide some conflict. There are a couple of options. One would be to install poles that could take it up higher; one would be moving the signal, but we are not quite sure how much freedom we have because we have not surveyed the bottom of the lines to know whether there will be a conflict with the red, yellow, and green signal.

The other option would be to go underground. They have talked to Rocky Mountain Power about that but it is expensive. The doctor likes the idea of going underground because he likes the improvement of the aesthetics on his property. He is willing to pay 30 percent of the cost to go from the last pole south to the pole on the Yuzon property to bury it all. The challenge is that to bury that distance is almost \$73,000. If he pays 30 percent of that, it still would leave us paying about \$50,000. The Mayor Pro Tem asked if we could negotiate with the doctor. Engineer Lewis said he is on the hook right now to move the poles out of the sidewalk for about \$16,000. In Engineer Lewis's mind, the doctor is making a generous offer, but on a pure frontage basis he would have said more a 60-40 split, and that is what he has proposed. The doctor has countered with the willingness to go 30 percent. The question is what is it worth to us to have that aesthetic improvement.

There are some ways that are cheaper. Rocky Mountain Power thinks that tall poles (maybe four) will be \$8,000-10,000 each, so the range will be \$30,000-40,000, and he does not know when we will build the signal. He would like to think that is something that will happen in the near future. The doctor needs to deal with his power, and if we do not go underground, he will make certain investments to the overhead situation and he will have sunk that money in. Council Member LeMone said if we do the poles, people are coming in who do not aesthetically want those poles there. Engineer Lewis said that is our thought process. We just did not want to approve a \$50,000 expense without talking to the Council. Engineer Lewis said we made the change along 700 South by the liquor store, there used to be a line there that we took out, and that did make a big improvement to that area.

The Mayor Pro Tem asked where the money comes from. Administrator Darrington said it will come out of our capital fund, which is limited and allocated annually through the budget process. Finance Director Lundell said it would need a budget amendment, and some of the money would have to come out of reserve. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson asked whether he would put together a presentation to let the Council understand the financial impact, because she thinks it would be better to do it right the first time. If we do not have the money, we should wait. The City Administrator said the money technically is there, it just could be at the expense of other projects. Financially, he thinks we will be okay as far as still being able to accomplish most of what we want to do. We have a reserve of \$3 million and we might have to use \$10,000 of that it is not going to hurt the City financially.

Engineer Lewis said he has a contract from Rocky Mountain Power to get the work started, and the doctor needs to set his power supply for the building, so there is some urgency. He thinks if he told them we are going to do this but it will take a couple of weeks to take a budget action, he does not know if that will be a huge deal. City Administrator Darrington said the question is whether we need to make this formal. If there is no one who opposes it, then we can move forward. The Council will act on it as a budget amendment, probably in about three weeks. He asked if there was anyone opposed to spending the \$50,000. Council Member Meacham asked whether that is \$50,000 additional, or is there an incremental amount we would be spending anyway. Administrator Darrington said we have to do something. Doing the poles would be \$30,000 or \$40,000, and undergrounding would only be an additional \$10,000. Engineer Lewis said the problem is he cannot get a hard answer out of Rocky Mountain Power until we can show them exactly what we want to do. He does not have the signal design done, so he cannot show them exactly what we want to do, but they can give him an exact price on burying it right now from point A to point B. Council Member LeMone asked for confirmation that we are working with an exact number. The City Engineer said he has the contract right here with an exact number to bury it; we do not have an exact number to make the poles go higher. Administrator Darrington said we will move forward with undergrounding.

Parks and Recreation Director Giles thanked everyone for attending the fair. It was a great turnout. Last year we sold about 57,000 annual passes, and this year we did 82,000. We came out about the same on the school swimming pool passes (7,000). We will offer another discount pass for the pool in February and then it will go up to the regular sale price. Council Member LeMone said she heard that with the pool sales, it was the toddler slide that really brought a lot of people.

Chief Sanderson reminded the Council of the e-mail he sent inviting them to a kick-off party and asked for RSVP e-mails. The party will be at Stonegate and they will do the catering.

Chief Smith said their association presented concealed weapons classes last weekend. They were very well attended; they had about 50-52 people attend. They will probably do another one and they are getting a lot of interest in that. They are also trying to set up a hunter's safety class for kids somewhere toward the end of January. They recently obtained a highway safety grant; they have been in need of new radars for their patrol cars for quite awhile. They are very expensive. They were able to get seven radar units (about \$21,000). They also secured another \$5,000 JAG grant that will help them get some better furniture for the training room.

He said they were discussing what they could do as a police department with their staffing levels. They cannot do what they would like to do, but they can do something. What they have come up with is to have their officers do walk-throughs on a daily basis in every school in our jurisdiction. They started today and it was very successful. They met with the principals and let them know what we are doing and had a good reception from the teachers. Because we cannot spend the time we want, our message is that we are going to be in the schools and you are not going to know when, and it will be uniformed officers. He sent a little statement for the press on what we are doing. We want to be in the schools and be as proactive as we can given our staffing levels.

Council Member Boyd said the report today is that the teachers welcomed them. At one charter school the secretary questioned how she would know he was a police officer and called dispatch to confirm. Mayor Pro Tem Robinson said we appreciate the department, and the more that schoolchildren become familiar with our officers, the better we will be. She took the concealed

weapons course after a recent assault and it was such rich information and the class was invaluable. It really stressed the importance of safety throughout our community when it comes to arms. She would encourage any of the staff or elected officials to take the course.

Chief Smith said he has worked out another program they are going to launch. It is called "Refuse to be a Victim," and he has done a lot of research on it. It comes from the NRA and looks like a very good program; he wants to get it going in our community. It covers awareness of kids to senior citizens. Director Harrison asked whether that was something he could offer to staff. The Mayor Pro Tem said Rec Center employees could also use it. Chief Smith said he plans to open it up to everybody. There is a cost involved with the materials, but if a law enforcement agency does it and we limit the class to 20 at a time, the NRA will cover all materials. They do not care how many classes you do in a year.

Council Member LeMone asked Chief Smith whether the officer assigned to a particular school will be the one who does the visit for the day, and when the NOVA program is over will it still be the same officer. Chief Smith said the day shift crew will have their assignments for the schools to go to. They rotate every two months, so as a new crew comes in, the school will get a different officer. She also asked who has been maintaining his Facebook page, and he said Austin Edwards.

Council Member Boyd wanted to have some kind of discussion about retention of our businesses in Pleasant Grove. The reason she is bringing it up is because Sammy's is leaving. There were some code enforcement issues and she is not trying to point a finger, and most of what she is hearing is hearsay, but someone spoke with a Sammy's employee today and heard that one of the reasons they left was because Provo had offered them another site to open a second store. Her question to the Council is are we trying to keep the businesses we have. Did anyone reach out to Sammy's? City Administrator Darrington said the mayor met with the owner the week before and there was no sign they were leaving. Council Member Boyd asked whether we offered anything to try to get them to stay. Administrator Darrington said his understanding was the discussion revolved around the code problems, but there was no indication at all that they were considering other sites or leaving. We did not know that was even an issue for them. Council Member Boyd asked whether he thinks it is important that we get them back now and ask them why they left. Administrator Darrington said it would be nice to know why. Director Young said their caterer did talk to us and his understanding was that this store in Pleasant Grove was being supported by his other locations and he just could not justify it being open. He said we will call them and find out. Council Member LeMone said they do have an established customer base in Provo and was more successful there.

ACTION: At 9:15 p.m., Council Member Boyd moved to go into Executive Session to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property and sale of real property. Council Member Boyd seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with Council Members Boyd, Jensen, LeMone, Meacham, and Robinson voting "Aye."

12. Executive Session to Discuss the Purchase, Exchange or Lease of Real Property (UCA 52-4-205 (1)(D)) and Sale of Real Property (UCA 52-4-205 (E))

PRESENT:

Mayor Pro Tem Robinson
Council Member Boyd
Council Member LeMone
Council Member Meacham

STAFF PRESENT:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Tina Petersen, Attorney
Degen Lewis, City Engineer
Andrea Romanczyk, Transcriptionist

ACTION: At 9:50 p.m. Council Member LeMone moved to come out of Executive Session. Council Member Boyd seconded and the motion passed unanimously, with Council Members Boyd, Jensen, LeMone, Meacham, and Robinson voting “Aye.”

13. Adjourn

ACTION: At 9:51 p.m., Council Member Meacham moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member LeMone seconded and the motion passed unanimously, with Council Members Boyd, LeMone, Meacham, and Robinson voting “Aye.”

This certifies that the City Council Work Session Minutes of January 8, 2013, are a true, full and correct copy as approved by the City Council on July 2, 2013

Kathy T. Kresser, CMC
City Recorder

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