

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council and Planning Commission
Joint Meeting Minutes
November 29, 2016
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

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

Planning Commission: Jennifer Baptista
Drew Armstrong
Scott Richards
Peter Steele
Lisa Coombs

Staff Present: Denise Roy, Finance Director
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Dave Thomas, Fire Chief
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director

EXCUSED: Levi Adams, Planning Commission
Tina Petersen, City Attorney

The City Council and Staff met in the Council Chambers 86 East 100 South Utah 84062.

1) CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Daniels called the meeting to order and noted that all Council Members were present.

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council Member Walker.

3) OPENING REMARKS

The opening remarks were given by Council Member LeMone.

4) APPROVAL OF MEETING'S AGENDA

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

5) OPEN SESSION

Mayor Daniels opened the open session.

Mark Ryan was opposed to demolishing the old Recreation Center and stated that after speaking with several residents and business owners, he found that very few supported locating the fire station downtown. Most voted in favor of the bond but were opposed to razing the building. He opined that the Council was out of touch with the community but was still making powerful decisions. He encouraged the Mayor and Council to listen to the citizens' feedback on this issue.

Demont Hill reported that he owns a basement apartment that his family has rented out since 2010. It does not comply with the Code as written because of a circular staircase he removed. He expressed concern about getting it approved because it cannot be blocked off. He saw no reason for the staircase between apartments. He asked the City Council to readdress the regulations. Mayor Daniels advised Mr. Hill to meet with Community Development Director, Ken Young, on the matter.

Christopher Williams inquired as to whether or not the issue of 100 East (Canyon Road) would be discussed tonight. Administrator Darrington confirmed that it would. Mr. Williams asked if the item could be opened for public discussion. Council Member Stanley responded that they could take public comment but it could not be opened as a public hearing.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to allow public comment for Item 10B. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Blaine Thatcher asked what efforts were being made to reduce the cost of the Public Safety Building. There were a number of statements made on what could be done to reduce the cost of construction. He mentioned that there has been no word regarding the private donations and how the funds would be applied. Mayor Daniels confirmed that the bond will be discussed under Item 11B. Mr. Thatcher asked what cost-cutting measures will bring the project under budget. There were no further public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the open session.

6) CONSENT ITEMS

- a) **City Council Minutes:
City Council Minutes for the November 1, 2016 Meeting.**

b) To Consider Approval of Payment Vouchers for (November 23, 2016)

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve the consent items. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried with the unanimous consent of the Council.

7) BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

A) TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL THE APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE: ALICIA REDDING, NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE; PETE BLAKE, NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE; JENNIFER BAPTISTA, PLANNING COMMISSION; DREW ARMSTRONG, PLANNING COMMISSION; SCOTT RICHARDS, PLANNING COMMISSION (CITIZEN); LYNN WALKER, CITY COUNCIL; DIANNA ANDERSEN, CITY COUNCIL.

Council Member Stanley raised some residents' concerns about whether blending responsibilities was appropriate for the task of updating the City's General Plan. Director Young explained that the aforementioned appointments were discussed between Mayor Daniels and City Attorney, Tina Peterson. He mentioned that this was a common way to conduct General Plan updates. He explained that it was legal to have members of the Planning Commission and City Council work together on an advisory board because they would not be acting in their usual capacities. All updates would still go through the proper legal channels by way of review from the Planning Commission and City Council. Administrator Darrington commented that this would be an advisory committee similar to the Public Safety Building Committee.

Council Member Stanley stated there was the potential for disproportionate influence by members of the committee. However, he was willing to vote favorably on the matter with the express understanding that the practice was represented as both appropriate and commonplace. There was further deliberation on the matter prior to a motion being made.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved to approve the appointment of members to the General Plan Advisory Committee: Alicia Redding, Neighborhood Committee; Pete Blake, Neighborhood Committee; Jennifer Baptista, Planning Commission; Drew Armstrong, Planning Commission; Scott Richards, Planning Commission (Citizen); Lynn Walker, City Council; Dianna Andersen, City Council. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

B) TO CONSIDER THE APPOINTMENT OF JON HAWKINS AS ALTERNATE PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER.

Mayor Daniels reported that he interviewed Jon Hawkins and he was very impressed by his qualifications. Director Young clarified that the appointment will begin on January 15, 2017.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to appoint Jon Hawkins as an Alternate Planning Commission Member with a term beginning January 15, 2017. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

8) PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations.

9) PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A) PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED PLEASANT GROVE CITY FISCAL YEAR 2016/2017 BUDGET AMENDMENT. (CITY WIDE) Presenter: Director Roy.

Director Roy explained that they are asking to amend the Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Budget to include \$40,000, which will reflect actual and anticipated expenditures for the Lions/Sportsmen Center. Projects will include the construction and stabilization of the floor, installation of a new ventilation system, and ceiling tiles in the gun range for Lions/Sportsmen Center. The funding source will be a transfer from the Fiscal Year 2016 General Fund Revenue Excess to the Capital Project Fund.

Mayor Daniels mentioned that the Council previously approved the projects. Director Roy stated they wanted to amend the budget so that payments could be made on the contract. The funds are in excess from the General Fund at the close of the audit, which would be presented in greater detail on December 13.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the public hearing.

10) ACTION ITEMS READY FOR A VOTE

A) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2016-049) ADJUSTING AND AMENDING THE ACTUAL AND ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2016/2017; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. Presenter: Director Roy.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved to adopt Resolution (2016-049) adjusting and amending the actual and anticipated expenditures for the Fiscal Year 2016/2017; and providing for an effective date. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley, and Walker voting “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

B) CONTINUED ITEM: TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2016-045) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AN INTERLOCAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN PLEASANT GROVE AND UTAH COUNTY REGARDING CANYON ROAD (100 EAST); AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington. *Continued from the November 1, 2016 Meeting.*

Administrator Darrington provided an overview on the above stated interlocal agreement, as the matter had been discussed in previous meetings. It was noted that the Council conducted a joint meeting with the Cedar Hills City Council and County Commissioners on November 22. Mayor Daniels noted that Commissioner-Elect Ivy was present at the joint meeting, as were Commissioners Lee and Ellertson. Commissioner Graves was not present; however, Mayor Daniels noted that he made it clear in other meetings that he was not in favor of the County keeping the road in perpetuity if the improvements were made.

The original agreement included Cedar Hills, Pleasant Grove, and Utah County. However, Cedar Hills declined the first proposal and requested the County accept MAG funds to improve the road anyway. A new contract was proposed with several modifications.

According to the new agreement, the County would be in charge of the design and bidding of the project, all of which would be done using grant funds. The grant funding was originally intended for the entire road; however, if Cedar Hills again rejects the modified agreement but Pleasant Grove approves it, the project funds will be reduced to improve only the section of road that lies in Pleasant Grove. Engineering will determine how much funding would be needed at that point. The modified agreement added a condition that the cities could terminate the agreement at any point. Should an agreement not be reached, the County would proceed with basic mill and fill repairs. If in a few years the City (or cities) request a bike lane or improvements beyond the MAG-funded project, it would become their responsibility to supply the funding. As per the agreement, the County will be required to maintain or recondition the road to reflect a pavement condition index (PCI) of 70 or better at the time of transfer in 30 years. Additional language was added indicating that overlay would be done during the course of the project. The agreement was to be reviewed by the Utah County Commission on December 6.

The City is responsible for snow removal, pothole repair, signage and striping, removing debris, and enforcing traffic and safety. Director Beaumont determined annual maintenance costs as part of the agreement. The County was asked to contract with Pleasant Grove for the services if Cedar Hills chooses not to participate in the agreement. A water line on the road needs to be replaced, which was also factored into the agreement. It would be bid as part of the project, but the expense would be solely the responsibility of the City.

The agreement includes a termination clause. If the County wants to terminate the agreement before the 30 years, they would need to pay the City in cash the cost of maintaining the road through the 30 years. If that number cannot be determined, the matter would be turned over to third party arbitration.

Director Beaumont presented an aerial map of the road and identified which areas would be impacted in Pleasant Grove if the Council decided to enter into the agreement. Curb and gutter would be installed from 200 North to 400 North. A section of road along 200 North would be brought up to grade and the sidewalk replaced. Portions from 1100 North and 1290 North would receive curb, gutter and widening improvements. From State Street to 2600 North, there would be a three-lane cross-section. Currently the average section accommodates two lanes and a center turn lane, along with two five-foot side lanes all the way up the road. Several improvements will also be done by developers later.

The remainder of the project includes the section of road near the Murdock Canal. The only other area in the contract is the 4000 North intersection. Director Beaumont explained that 2600 North will be graded at a right angle to help mitigate visibility issues. He mentioned that the 4000 North intersection was recently widened due to the sewer project. The total project includes 8,000 linear feet of new curb and gutter as well as 75,000 square feet of additional widening. Current cost estimates were \$400,000 to \$500,000.

Director Beaumont discussed the City's cost commitment of entering into the agreement. State Street to the Murdock Canal spans 8.25 lane miles and would cost approximately \$4,200 to snowplow the road 40 times. Signage and crosswalk striping would cost an average of \$1,000 per year. Pothole repairs were anticipated to cost \$500 per year for 30 years and street sweeping costs were approximately \$2,400 per year. The City and County have shared facilities to meet storm water and drainage needs. Currently, the water flows across 100 East and storm water already flows into the pipes and boxes; however, here is a potential joint responsibility of \$2,000 for a vacuum truck and labor. In total, maintenance costs would be approximately \$10,100 per year.

Mayor Daniels stated that the annual maintenance costs as presented differed significantly from what was presented last week. Director Beaumont identified the added street sweeping and storm drainage costs in tonight's presentation. Mayor Daniels asked about the difference in lane miles between the two cities. Director Beaumont noted that Cedar Hills has a total of 5.5 lane miles compared to Pleasant Grove's 8.3 miles. There was continued discussion regarding the maintenance needs and costs to each city.

Mayor Daniels inquired as to what the PCI rating of the road would be with just the mill and fill overlay. Director Beaumont explained that while it would have a PCI of around 90, the road would degrade much more quickly. There would be a minimal difference over the course of the next 10 years, but additional treatments would be needed soon after. He also explained how curb and gutter improvements could help prevent asphalt cracking, thus extend the life of the road.

Director Beaumont responded to a question regarding the costs of water line replacements and explained that the pipes under 100 East are over 50 years old and should be replaced prior to fixing the road. According to the agreement, the water line project could be done in conjunction with the road, which would be more cost effective. Mayor Daniels noted that cutting into a road reduces its life by 50%. If they moved forward with the project, the cost of the water line replacement would come from the City's Water Fund.

In response to a question from Council Member Stanley, Director Beaumont explained that when the MAG project is complete the County will commit to maintaining pavement conditions in the corridor. If the City widens anything above 2600 North, the City would be invoiced for the cost of maintenance on the widened section to the road. Road widening would not affect the Class B or C Road Funds as they apply to miles and not lane miles. Once ownership is transferred to the City, the road funds for maintenance will come to the City instead of the County. He commented that for every 900 miles of road, the City gets \$1 million per year which covers 15% to 20% of maintenance costs. In 30 years, the \$60,000 cost of maintaining the road would be covered in part by Class C Road Funds. Director Beaumont explained that if the City wanted to widen the road for bike lanes they would be invoiced only for the treatments applied to the widened area.

Council Member Stanley asked about the cost of the City-provided law enforcement over 30 years. Police Chief, Mike Smith, explained that they already patrol the area and so the obligation would not be new. Various clerical details were then briefly discussed.

Council Member Stanley commented that the public was concerned about the long-term obligations to the City by assuming ownership of the road. He asked if it would be possible for the City to do the improvements independently. Mayor Daniels stated there currently is no City funding available for a project of this scale. Council Member Stanley opined that the least expensive way to handle the road was to fix it with City funds while the County maintains ownership. Administrator Darrington noted that because it was a County road, they would have to obtain approval from the County prior to moving forward with construction. Mayor Daniels was unsure how that type of scenario would play out financially and explained that the County would be able to put in better improvements due to greater funding availability. Furthermore, if the County did the improvements there would be greater longevity than what the City could afford on its own.

Council Member Stanley was concerned about the burden the agreement would place on future groups. Mayor Daniels stated that if they did nothing, there would be no liability. Council Member Stanley mentioned that the owner has the liability and moral obligation to maintain the road. Mayor Daniels commented that the same people make up both the City of Pleasant Grove and Utah County. If they do not take advantage of this opportunity, the grant funding will be used elsewhere. They currently have an opportunity for Pleasant Grove citizens to get their money back for a project that will greatly benefit them. Council Member Stanley reiterated it was the County's obligation to improve the road and maintain its ownership, which garnered further deliberation.

Council Member LeMone asked if at any time the County could give ownership of the road to the City. Council Member Jensen explained that the Code addressed vacating roads but he did not know if the County had that same legal ability. Council Member Stanley mentioned that the County Commissioners indicated that they would never take such action. Administrator Darrington mentioned that while the State has taken similar actions in the past, he has never heard of a County following suit. Council Member Jensen read language from the State Code explaining that a County could vacate a road. He also expressed appreciation to the County Commissioners for their straightforwardness in last week's meeting.

Director Beaumont did not understand why the County would not just take the money and do the project. He explained that Pleasant Grove citizens pay taxes to the County so some money should be given back. Since the County is not going to do the project on its own, he opined that this agreement was the best way to move forward in making the necessary improvements.

Mayor Daniels stated that while it was clearly the County's responsibility to care for the road, it has not received the attention needed. With the improvements negotiated in the agreement, there are repairs that could not be afforded otherwise. He agreed with Director Beaumont that this was a good opportunity to move forward.

Mayor Daniels invited public comments.

Christopher Williams asked if any improvements would be made past Murdock Canal. Director Beaumont explained that there would be mill and fill done to the north as it shares a boundary with Cedar Hills. Mr. Williams asked why MAG money wasn't going to be used to add sidewalks to the entire road and bring it up to City standards. Director Beaumont explained that the County has committed to spend a certain amount, which is not enough to cover sidewalk improvements. He did, however, expect more funding to become available in the future. Mayor Daniels explained that the project has not yet gone to bid so the actual costs are unknown.

Karl Kuhi noted that the original interlocal agreement stated that the City would be required to pay any overages of the \$9.3 million and cover the costs of maintenance. He remarked that no one wanted to assume responsibility for the road and opined that it was a bad business deal. He wanted the City to repair their roads first before assuming responsibility of a County road.

Drew Armstrong expressed frustration because the needs of the road have changed. From his vantage point, it appeared that the County was treating the matter like it was the City's problem because of North County Boulevard. While he was not pleased with all aspects of the agreement, he acknowledged that he would like the road improved.

Blaine Thatcher stated that the City has not maintained its existing roads well. He was concerned that they were trying to justify taking on more. He questioned whether this was a wise financial transaction and did not feel that tonight's presentation reflects what was outlined in the proposed agreement.

Peter Steele opined that the County has moved from giving Pleasant Grove a terrible road to transferring over a good road, which will cost the County several million dollars. He commented that \$60,000 will not make much difference if the City is committed to maintaining the roads. The County has shown they are not interested in maintaining 100 East and it was difficult to determine whether this was a bad financial deal. The City's Master Plan calls for 100 East to eventually be a five-lane road and based on the terms of the agreement it will be close to 50 years before the City will incur any major expenses outside of annual maintenance costs.

Mike Lyons supported widening the road. He stated that he and his children regularly use the road and he was concerned about their safety in its current condition. He commented that a life is worth more than \$60,000 a year.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the public comment period.

The Mayor summarized the discussion and thanked the public for their feedback. He also recognized the efforts of the County, staff, and representatives from Cedar Hills.

Council Member Stanley reaffirmed his opposition to entering into the agreement. The Council discussed how the numbers would differ if Cedar Hills again opposed entering in the agreement, as modified. Staff stated that those factors were still unknown. Administrator Darrington remarked that it did not matter because they still had the option of backing out due to the termination clause.

Council Member Andersen asked for clarification about the invoicing. Administrator Darrington explained that it was never the County's intent to bill the City for the improvements. Council Member Andersen asked about the possibility of creating a Special Service District to address the sidewalks not included in the project. Mayor Daniels stated that they could pursue that option independent of the MAG project. Safety was Council Member Andersen's top priority. She commented that it has been an unsafe road for several years. From her perspective, roads are not assets because they do not generate revenue. She expressed support for moving forward with the agreement.

Council Member LeMone asked about the road being maintained at a 70 PCI at the time of transfer and wanted to know if this requirement would be met at all times. Director Beaumont explained that the contract only required the County to turn the road over at a 70 PCI at the time of transfer. He commented that the County was already anticipating the need for regular maintenance. Council Member Andersen noted it was in the County's best financial interest to keep the road well-maintained over the 30-year period. Council Member LeMone stated that she would like a condition included in writing that the road must be maintained at a PCI level of 70 at all times throughout the 30-year period.

Council Member Jensen stated the basis of his decisions came down to the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens. He believed this was the right action to take. He commented that Pleasant Grove and Cedar Hills are two different cities and they should not be compared to one another. Council Member Walker also expressed support for moving forward with the agreement.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to adopt Resolution (2016-045) authorizing the Mayor to enter into an Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between Pleasant Grove and Utah County regarding Canyon Road (100 East); and providing for an effective date. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, and Walker voting "Aye" and Council Member Stanley voting "Nay". The motion carried 4-to-1.

Note: The group took a break at 8:29 p.m.

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

A) REVIEW OF THE PLAN OF ACTION AND THE PROPOSED PUBLIC SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE.

Director Young explained that the City would soon be addressing the update to the General Plan, which should be done every five years. Since the bond for the Public Safety Buildings passed in the recent election, the City is now in a good position to begin the project. Director Young reported that the Utah State University Architecture and Planning Department agreed to assist in planning the downtown area and their work would become part of the Downtown Master Plan. Director Young presented the General Plan Update Plan of Action.

Director Young explained that Mayor Daniels formed a General Plan Committee and he was trying to schedule a meeting with them in December. Their work would commence between January and March of 2017.

Director Young presented the survey questions that were reviewed and discussed by the Planning Commission on October 27. He asked the City Council to review the questions in the next two weeks and contact him with any feedback. The survey would be conducted primarily online but hard copies would be available upon request.

Council Member Stanley commented that the last page of the survey contained language about a billing credit. Director Young explained that this was something the City offered as part of the survey in 2011. That language should be omitted from this version unless the City Council felt it was worth keeping.

Council Member Andersen felt that question #13 should either be removed or reworded. It would be more beneficial to ask the residents what they would be willing to pay additional taxes for. She asked if it would be helpful or advantageous to include dollar amounts next to the options listed. Director Young explained that the question was intended to gauge whether the citizens would be open to these ideas. It would be nearly impossible to assign a reasonable dollar amount to each of the options listed at that point.

Council Member Stanley commented that the value of the question was to see if the residents want the City to spend resources conducting additional research and ultimately what it would cost. Director Young agreed to adjust the verbiage of the question to clarify that taxes would be used to pay for those items.

Commissioner Steele suggested that the residents also be asked to prioritize their choices on question number 13 as well. Mayor Daniels confirmed that the results of the 2011 survey were available. He asked staff if the City had followed through with the results of the survey.

Administrator Darrington stated that the City began working on the Downtown Four Block Plan as a result of the 2011 survey, which eventually led into the public safety aspect and the nature of the roads in general.

Council Member Stanley asked if staff would accept feedback from the City Council regarding the survey questions. Director Young answered in the affirmative and asked that they contact him within two weeks with that feedback.

Director Young reviewed the Plan of Action and the target dates specified in the document. He hoped to have a draft of the General Plan Update ready to present to the Planning Commission and City Council in May.

Commissioner Baptista added to Council Member Andersen's concerns about giving the residents a wish list without outlining practical costs. She asked if the survey questions would be presented to the General Plan Committee before it was distributed. Director Young stated that they would have an opportunity to review the questions during their initial meeting in December.

B) DISCUSSION REGARDING A PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE MOST CONDITIONAL USES.

Director Young did not have any handouts regarding this item but wanted to review the information with the group. At the previous Planning Commission Meeting, there was discussion regarding conditional uses and the possibility of eliminating them from the Code. Staff received direction from the Utah League of Cities and Towns on several occasions regarding this issue because conditional uses have caused numerous legal challenges for many cities in Utah. The League recommended the elimination of as many conditional uses as possible. Director Young wanted to move forward with that process. Conditional uses within the Code would be changed to approvable or permitted uses with a set of standards specified in the Code. If a proposed use meets the conditions in the Code, it can be approved. Director Young commented that this would streamline the process for an applicant and the City. The majority of the Planning Commission Members were in favor of the change.

Commissioner Armstrong reported that he had attended four APA Conferences in the past two years and there had been a lot of concern that conditional uses are not being handled correctly. He noted that that has put cities in extremely precarious legal positions. The request to eliminate conditional uses stemmed from legislation passed in 2005. He was in favor of the change.

Commissioner Baptista stated that she had been advocating for the elimination of conditional uses since she was appointed to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Armstrong added that the general public has an incorrect perception of conditional uses and believe that the Planning Commission has the authority to deny an application if they want to. Director Young explained that notices are sent to neighbors within 300 feet of the subject property to advertise the public hearing, which gives a misleading impression that the residents have an ability to change or affect the outcome of the public hearing. The reality is that the Code states that a conditional use is a permitted use to which conditions can be attached. Director Young felt it would be beneficial to remove the public hearing aspect.

In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Director Young explained that the standards set for each use would be called development standards rather than conditions. The task of changing all

of the conditional uses would be excessive, as there are many sections of the Code that contain conditional uses. The amendments would likely be brought before the Planning Commission and City Council in sections.

C) DISCUSSION REGARDING A PROPOSAL TO HAVE FINAL PLATS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY.

Director Young explained that another recommendation from the Utah League of Cities and Towns was to handle final plat approvals at an administrative level. He stated that a public hearing is required during the final plat process, but not specifically for final plat approval. Normally, the public hearing is held during preliminary plat approval with the Planning Commission. Also during that time the details of the plat are examined and discussed, so by the time the issue comes before the City Council there are normally very few issues left to resolve. Director Young noted that the real final approval comes when the City Engineer puts his stamp of approval on the plat. He recommended that the City Council consider allowing the final plats to be approved administratively.

Council Member LeMone asked if other municipalities have handled final plat approval in this manner. Director Young stated that this was handled in a variety of ways, depending on the City's preference, but there were several who allowed staff to approve final plats. Director Young stated that the City Council would still be able to review large developments, such as a commercial development proposal in The Grove Zone.

Council Member Stanley was comfortable allowing the change as long as the City Council and the public received reports regarding the projects. He asked if it was possible to anticipate applications that would cause greater conflict and allow those to be heard before the City Council.

Council Member Jensen asked how much time the City Council spends approving final plats. Director Young stated that many of the final plats are approved without much or any discussion, so the time spent by the City Council is brief. This change would not only save time for the City Council but for the applicant as well. If the final plat approval was heard by the City Council, the item would have to be placed on the agenda, noticed, and the applicant would have to be present.

Council Member Andersen asked if there was a fee associated with final plat approval. Director Young explained that there is a separate permit application and fee for both the preliminary and final plat review, so the proposed change would not save the applicant any money.

Council Member Jensen was in favor of providing the citizens another opportunity to voice their concerns to the City Council. Director Young commented that the most of the public comments are made during the zoning or site plan hearings.

Council Member Andersen liked knowing what was being approved within the City. Council Member Stanley reiterated the need for updates on applications but saw value in allowing the final plat to be approved administratively. Director Young stated that if the Council was uncomfortable with all of the final plats going to administration for approval, staff could still bring major

developments to the City Council for discussion while only approving small one or two-lot subdivisions or boundary adjustments.

Council Member LeMone agreed with Council Member Andersen's comment about the City Council being informed and involved in approvals.

Director Young was not eager for the proposed change. It was a suggestion from the Utah League of Cities and Towns and he wanted input from the City Council. It seemed that there were concerns expressed regarding the change and Director Young suggested they continue approving final plats as they have been. Council Member Stanley suggested that they keep track of how often the City Council does final plat approvals and how many of them pass without conflict. Council Member Jensen suggested that the item be discussed further at the upcoming Budget Retreat.

Commissioner Armstrong recommended Director Young speak with Provo City about their process. He commented that they seem to have a more intense process for large developments and particularly those that have gone through a zoning change. Smaller developments, however, are handled by the Planning Commission.

Mayor Daniels asked staff to research how much time was spent by the City Council on final plat approvals over the past few years and bring that information back to the Budget Retreat for review and further discussion.

D) DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION ON THE PROPOSED AMOUNT TO BORROW ON THE BOND. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington.*

Mayor Daniels explained that the above item was on the agenda for discussion based on direction giving by the City Council during their last meeting. Administrator Darrington was asked to research options regarding the public safety bond.

Administrator Darrington explained that city bonds are not like construction loans where one has the option of giving the money back if not all of it is used. When the City commits to a bond, they commit to that entire dollar amount. If the City Council is concerned that some of the \$9.5 million will not be used, they have the option of taking the bond out in two sections. Administrator Darrington further explained that the City could first do an issuance for \$7 million. Once that money is used and they have a better idea of what is still needed, the City could do another issuance for the remainder. The financial advisor told Administrator Darrington that the cost of an issuance is \$34,930, so there would be an additional cost for two issuances. Administrator Darrington also noted that interest rates are unpredictable so it would be somewhat of a gamble to take out a portion of the bond later. If the City chose to bond for the entire \$9.5 million upfront and there ended up being some unused funds after construction, the City could use that money as part of the first bond payment. Administrator Darrington also noted that historically, the best time to bond is late January. The City would have three years to spend the bond proceeds.

Mayor Daniels wanted to be sure that the City approaches the bond responsibly as they may not be spending the bond money for some time. The architectural and design work had not yet been completed for the Public Safety Buildings. Administrator Darrington reported that the City has

impact fee monies available for the architectural and design work, so it would be possible for the bond to be taken later. He reiterated that interest rates could go up during that time.

Administrator Darrington stated that the financial advisor provided him with a 20-year history of market rates and noted that rates hit their lowest point six to eight months ago. Although rates have increased slightly since then, they are still quite low. Administrator Darrington asked the City Council for their thoughts on borrowing all of the money at once or in two sections. He noted that the dollar amount they have currently is simply a cost estimate and the buildings still have to be designed. There was also an unknown amount of donor money to be factored in.

In response to a question from Council Member Stanley, Administrator Darrington explained that if any extra money was used to make the first bond payment, the taxpayers' burden would be lessened for that year of repayment. The residents would still be responsible to pay interest on the entire bond amount and the bond would not sunset early.

Council Member Jensen was concerned that it may cost the City more to make two separate issuances or to wait several months before borrowing the money. Mayor Daniels agreed. Administrator Darrington reported that it was rare for a bond of this size to be taken in sections.

Council Member LeMone liked the idea of making the first bond payment with any unused monies. Mayor Daniels agreed and stated that taking the whole \$9.5 million in January seemed to be the best option for the City.

Administrator Darrington stated that a Resolution would be presented to the City Council on the next agenda.

E) DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION ON ARCHITECTURE SERVICES FOR PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDINGS. *Presenter: Council Member Jensen.*

Council Member Jensen reported that two individuals have put in a bid to be the Owner's Representative for the Public Safety Building Project. Since the bids have been made, he asked if it would be wise for staff to begin the RFP process. Administrator Darrington stated that the City Council had this discussion two weeks earlier. He recommended that an Owner's Representative be on board before starting the RFP process. If the City Council wanted to change that direction, staff could begin the process.

Mayor Daniels explained that the Owner's Representative would be someone who had extensive experience in managing large construction projects. That person would be able to help the Public Safety Building Committee and staff through the entire process including writing an RFP and selecting an architect. Council Member Stanley commented that the decision to wait on the RFP was unanimous.

Administrator Darrington reported that he had gathered information regarding what other cities have included in their RFPs, but he has not reviewed that information. He wanted to wait until they had an Owner's Representative on board.

Mayor Daniels asked if the City would be locked into a certain type of delivery mechanism if an architect was selected now. Administrator Darrington responded in the negative and explained that an architect and general contractor could be hired simultaneously or separately. He stated that the City Council would be interviewing the Owner's Representative candidates at the next meeting and they would be able to discuss these individuals during the following Work Session. Staff would engage the person they feel most qualified.

F) REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON THE DECEMBER 6, 2016 CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

Mayor Daniels reviewed the agenda items for the December 6, 2016 City Council Meeting. With regard to Item 9B, Director Beaumont explained the purpose for the release of easements at the Palisades Subdivision. Staff believed this would be an improvement that the City would be able to maintain.

Item 10B would be a consideration for a one-year extension of final plat approval for the Grove Greek Center Commercial Subdivision. Director Young explained that the developer had not completed the requirements necessary for the plat to be recorded and was requesting an extension rather than go through the approval process again. Director Young noted that the extension would be backdated to the end of the summer.

G) PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS

There was no Planning Commission Business.

H) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS

Library and Arts Director, Sheri Britsch, reported that Mrs. Claus would be visiting the Library the following week. The library staff would also be having a training during their staff Christmas Party the following Friday at 6:00 p.m.

I) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Council Members Andersen and LeMone expressed thanks to the Parks and Recreation Department for the lights throughout the City and to the Public Works Department for plowing the recent snow.

J) SIGNING OF PLATS

The Larson Acres Plat C was signed.

K) REVIEW CALENDAR

There were no calendar items.

L) ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

The minutes of the November 29, 2016 City Council meeting were approved by the City Council on January 3, 2017

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech

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