

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
February 7, 2017
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

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

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

Others: Curtis Miner, Curtis Miner Architects
Scott Evans, Curtis Miner Architects
Jay Taggart, Curtis Miner Architects
Jason Sanders, Curtis Miner Architects
Scott Wilkinson, Think Architecture
Jim Poloncic, Think Architecture
Jim Child, JRCA Architects
Danny Fuchs, JRCA Architects

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

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

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

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Scout Gavin Pace.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The opening remarks were given by Council Member Jensen.

4) **APPROVAL OF MEETING'S AGENDA**

Mayor Daniels reported that interviews would begin at 7:30 p.m. Item 10B would be split in half. The first half of the item would be to amend the 2016/2017 Fiscal Year Budget to reflect actual and anticipated expenditures for the Vac-Truck Decant Facility Project, located at approximately 400 North 600 West in the amount of \$308,900 with the funding source from the Storm Water Impact Fee Fund Balance and was postponed until February 21. Items 19 and 20 would take place before Item 17. Item 10C was also postponed until February 21.

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

5) **OPEN SESSION**

Mayor Daniels opened the open session.

Christopher Williams inquired about the roads discussion scheduled for February 14. He requested that the meeting scheduled for that evening be canceled due to the holiday and that the discussion in question be moved to another date. Staff and the elected officials briefly discussed the matter, and decided that next week's meeting would be canceled. The roads discussion to which Mr. Williams was referring will be moved to February 28th.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, recognized Scott Richards for his service on the Planning Commission. It was reported that Mr. Richards had served as Chair and Vice Chair for a number of years. Director Young presented Mr. Richards with a service award.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Daniels closed the open session.

6) **CONSENT ITEMS** (Consent items are only those which have been discussed beforehand, are non-controversial and do not require further discussion)

- a) **City Council Minutes:
City Council Minutes for the January 3, 2017 Meeting.
City Council Minutes for the January 10, 2017 Work Session Meeting.
City Council Minutes for the January 17, 2017 Meeting.**
- b) **To Consider Approval of Payment Vouchers for (January 20, 2017).**

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

7) **BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

There were no appointments.

8) **PRESENTATIONS**

A) INTERVIEW ARCHITECTURE APPLICANTS FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING FACILITIES.

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, reported that three firms would present as part of the interview process with the Mayor and Council. They were allowed a 20-minute presentation time, with an additional 10 minutes to answer questions. It was noted that the Council may decide to deliberate in a Closed Meeting.

Curtis Miner Architects

Curtis Miner introduced his team as Scott Evans, Jay Taggart, and Jason Sanders. The men represented two firms and in total staff of 25 people. Mr. Miner stated that he served on the R/UDAT Steering Committee, the Pleasant Grove Planning Commission for four years, the Downtown Design Standards Committee, and the Pleasant Grove Historic Preservation Committee. He has lived in Pleasant Grove for 14 years and relocated his business to Pleasant Grove in 2008. Curtis Miner Architects are experienced, close, and invested. He reported that they hired Scott Evans because of his experience designing courts buildings. Mr. Evans has been designing court facilities since 1984 and came highly recommended by his colleagues in the field.

Jay Taggart presented images of other projects they have facilitated, including the Lindon Public Safety Building, the Mapleton Public Library, and the Carbon County Courts Building. He explained that cost is an important factor for each project and Curtis Miner Architects comes in at or below budget every time.

Scott Evans explained that he serves as the courts specialist for the team. His experience began in the early 1980s, when he helped design the Uintah County Courthouse. He has also designed court facilities in the cities of Sandy, Vernal and Nephi. Mr. Evans has also done specialized restoration projects in collaboration with other architectural firms.

Mr. Taggart stated that each building is different because each city is unique. He explained that the process of community engagement is just as important as the building itself and as such, they have

developed several tools to aid in the public process. They utilize virtual reality technology to show users the interior and exterior of the building, which engages citizens throughout the design process. Each municipal building is part of a larger civic campus. Public safety buildings can either be welcoming or unapproachable and either way, it is vital to maintain security.

Mr. Evans stated that court facilities need to separate three different groups from interacting with one another to avoid a security breach – the public, staff, and detainees. While court buildings can be complex, through his knowledge and experience he can help resolve those challenges.

Mr. Miner and his team developed three concepts to identify the issues that need to be resolved. First, they determine a need to reestablish the transparency and trust in city government. Second, they recognized that a public safety building is centerpiece to a civic campus. Third, function and cost are important concepts when considering the success of the project. Mr. Miner explained that the building can be placed onsite in a single phase, while still maintaining all the necessary functions. The firm's position on the Old Recreation Center was that it needs to be demolished, as well as a portion of the Community Development Building. The Old Fire Station can remain occupied during construction and the Fire Department will move into the new building once it is complete.

Mr. Taggart explained that in their design, they propose having the main entrance on the west side of building, which will improve the presence of the park and provide a welcoming backdrop for a possible amphitheater. The park will also provide a necessary security buffer. Parking will be provided on the civic center campus by utilizing 100 South. He discussed possibilities for a monument to strengthen the connection between the civic campus, Main Street, and future development. This will also facilitate rehabilitation of existing buildings. Last, their design will allow opportunities for future additions or expansions of the civic campus, including the library expansion.

Mr. Evans identified a natural breaking point in the building between what would be the fire station and the rest of the facility. He explained that they have taken the beauty of the park into consideration in their design process. The building will be positioned in a way that will take advantage of the view of the mountains.

Mr. Sandberg stated that he was the Project Manager for the Lindon City Public Safety Building. He worked closely with their public safety personnel and building contractor and discussed key aspects of his approach, which ensured the success of the project. In Lindon's case, police and fire were separate; however, through cooperative planning strategies they decided to bring both uses together into one building, which ultimately saved both time and money. Mr. Sandberg emphasized that collaboration was key, as was listening and understanding the client's needs. In their opinion, everyone is on the same team. He pointed out that as a local firm, they have the advantage of being able to be onsite immediately if there is a need.

In response to questions from Council Member Jensen, Mr. Miner identified himself as the Principal in charge. Mr. Taggart is the Project Architect and Mr. Sandberg is the Project Manager. Messrs. Evans and Sandberg would also serve as consultants throughout the design phase and would be available throughout construction to answer questions.

Council Member LeMone asked several questions. First, she wanted to know if this would be their largest project. Second, she asked if they had ever designed a facility that combined fire, police, and courts. Mr. Miner confirmed that this would be his firm's largest project to date. Other projects in their portfolio were approximately half the size of the Pleasant Grove facility. Furthermore, this would be their first project where all three Public Safety Departments were combined under the same roof. He emphasized that Mr. Evans has decades of experience designing court facilities.

Council Member LeMone stated that as a 165-year-old town, preservation of the City's history is important. She asked how Mr. Miner would incorporate that history and heritage into the new facility. Mr. Miner explained that orienting the building toward Main Street would best integrate the facility with the rest of downtown. Facing it any other direction would defeat the purpose of the civic campus and be detrimental to the park. He explained that turning the entrance toward the park would completely change the nature of the park, thus strengthening both the park as well as Main Street. Council Member LeMone asked Mr. Miner how he would incorporate or memorialize the Old Recreation Center in the new building. Mr. Miner stated that there were a number of ways of accomplishing this objective. They could incorporate some of the design characteristics or features of the old building into the new facility. Alternatively, they could incorporate similar materials into the framework of the building. They could also have a museum where artifacts from the Old Recreation Center could be preserved.

In response to a question from Council Member Stanley, Mr. Miner indicated that he was not opposed to designing two buildings instead of one. The concept he presented was based on what his firm understood was desired.

Council Member Jensen inquired about the pros and cons of the Lindon facility. Mr. Miner described the design process and it was determined that combining the two uses was the best solution for their City. Council Member Jensen asked Mr. Miner how fluid he was with his proposed timeline. Mr. Miner stated that they put together what they felt was a reasonable schedule.

Mr. Sandberg briefly noted that they had worked with Warner Construction on the Lindon facility. The Project Manager was a former police officer from West Valley City and he brought a wealth of knowledge to the process.

Mayor Daniels asked about the budget. Mr. Miner stated that the best way to control the budget is to get frequent feedback from the contractor.

Think Architecture

Scott Wilkinson and Jim Poloncic presented on behalf of Think Architecture. Mr. Wilkinson stated that he and Mr. Poloncic have worked together on these types of projects for 17 years. They oversee a strong staff that is prepared to handle a project of this size. He mentioned that all of the prior projects they will be presenting had historical guidelines respective to their individual cities. He provided an overview of the following projects designed by Think Architecture:

- Draper City Courts and Police addition. The concept for this design came from an existing school. It contained modern overtones, but preserved traditional elements of the school's history in Draper.
- Bluffdale City Courts and City Hall. Traditional design features that relate to the existing fire station across the street.
- Riverton City Police Station. This facility is part of a campus with a senior center and library. Their city wanted the building to tie in closely to the existing building.
- Holladay Fire Station. The design of the building was a traditional, Boston theme. Their Mayor was insistent on having a tower. Features from neighboring residential areas were shown in the design.

Mr. Wilkinson reported that they like the concept of a single building, if it can fit onsite. Additional programming will take place after a Construction Manager is selected. They recognize the need to adhere to the standards of downtown.

Mr. Polonic reviewed the scope of Pleasant Grove's project, in terms of square footage, location and phasing. He explained that small towns are exciting and he made mention of a retail building he has been working on in Draper that also follows design specifications of their downtown. He recognized that downtown specifications are restrictive because they are based on preserving the City's culture. He proposed using some of the existing brick from the Old Recreation Center to build a feature archway. They could also incorporate some of the glass from the Old Recreation Center into the new facility. He stated that the project would be an exciting opportunity for Think Architecture.

Mr. Wilkinson stated that Think Architecture has the experience, knowledge base, and commitment necessary to take on the project. They recently secured their 22nd Fire Station project in Murray City, which will be a five-bay station. He stated that Think Architecture's history in working with Pleasant Grove was critical as the City moves forward with the project.

Council Member LeMone asked several questions. First, she asked about Think Architecture's largest project to date. Second, she asked if they have ever designed a building that included all three public safety departments under the same roof. Mr. Wilkinson stated that have not ever designed a combined use building. However, as a firm they have already deliberated on the best approach to meet Pleasant Grove's specific needs. Their view is to connect two buildings to make it look like one. He recognized there are efficiencies of combining uses in one building, and noted that most of their projects have been of a similar size to what will be done in Pleasant Grove. Their largest project was the Layton City Courts facility, which is 60,000 square feet in size.

Mayor Daniels asked about the budget. Mr. Wilkinson stated that they handle budgets with construction managers from the first day. He stated that the Construction Manager is the expert in this arena, and the channel of communication between the architects and contractor is always a two-way street. He briefly discussed his interactions in working on facilities in both Woods Cross and Sandy. All of Think Architecture's prior projects have either been at or below budget.

Council Member LeMone asked if Think Architecture has a process that involves the community in the design process. Mr. Wilkinson stated that they can link websites and conduct surveys, and are also open to work-shopping with the public. In response to Mayor Daniels, he briefly reviewed their anticipated timeline, which was approximately 12 months in total. Key personnel on the project were reviewed. In addition to Mr. Wilkinson and Mr. Polonic, Troy Sanders would be the Land Planner and Landscape Architect and would oversee site planning, land planning, and all the support staff.

JRCA Architects

Jim Child identified his team members as Danny Fuchs, Chris Child, Annette Coleman, and John Swain. He indicated that the project schedule was submitted in a previous proposal. Mr. Child stated that JRCA Architects has assisted more than 40 municipalities throughout the country over the course of the last 34 years. Their facilities have included both combined and standalone public safety facilities. They identified four goals in their approach to Pleasant Grove's projects:

- Create a Fire, Police, and Courts facility that will improve the ability of staff to provide critical municipal services to the community.
- Continue to build on the previous community involvement of the past several years and develop a consensus regarding site planning, building design, and project budget.
- Work within the available funding limits to create a facility that will serve the community for many years.
- The design of the buildings should complement, reinforce, and expand the functionality of the surrounding park, City Hall, and neighborhoods.

As an architectural firm, their processes include the following components:

- Model facility tours (onsite and virtual);
- Needs assessment verification;
- Interviews and workshops with the public, "learned lessons" evaluations of each completed public safety project;
- Assurances that their facilities provide three types of spaces; public, interface and secure zones;
- Interactive design workshops;
- Project mock-ups;
- Regular Council updates;

- Community outreach (conceptual design, public visioning sessions, social media updates, etc.).
- Proven integration of processes (real-time cost data, early cost assessment and decision making);
- Concurrent architectural and CM/GC estimating; and
- Response to current market trends.

Mr. Child presented images of the civic centers in Highland, South Ogden, and Springville, and explained that each campus includes exterior wayfinding for both the public and staff. This helps reinforce community policing and provides connectivity with existing buildings onsite. Each image reflected building impacts on adjacent parks. Mr. Child briefly described the benefits of single phase projects versus those with multiple phases.

Council Member Jensen inquired about the Bluffdale project. Mr. Child noted that the project was scheduled for completion next month. Originally, the Bluffdale facility was programmed as a 30,000-square foot facility with a budget of \$8.4 million. However, it was a struggle staying within the budget. After looking at ways to consolidate space, they were able to build a facility that was 23,800 square feet on two floors with an unfinished basement, and a construction budget of \$6.4 million. Bluffdale's facility is also adjacent to a park and combines both police and fire.

Mr. Child noted that their largest project was the municipal building in Vernal, which is 74,000 square feet. The facility combined police, courts, and city hall under the same roof. Council Member LeMone asked how JRCA Architects would incorporate Pleasant Grove's history and heritage in the design of the building. Mr. Child stated that the elements could be incorporated in scale, materials, or architectural style. He noted that none of their previous projects are alike and all are different and unique and tailored to the needs of the respective communities.

In response to comments from Council Member Jensen, Mr. Child reviewed some of the combined facilities they have constructed. He acknowledged that unique issues arise when combining facilities.

Mayor Daniels asked how much of the materials from past years JRCA Architects would plan on incorporating into the new project. Mr. Child stated that they plan to learn from prior documents as they create new drafts moving forward. Mr. Child and Mr. Fuchs briefly reviewed their anticipated timeline and noted that they hope to have a final bid from a contractor by October 1.

Mayor Daniels thanked each firm for their presentation and stated that the Council will attempt to make a decision tonight.

9) **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- A) **PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2017-8) AMENDING THE ADOPTED CITY TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN, WHICH IS AN APPENDIX OF THE GENERAL PLAN. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING THE REMOVAL OF A PLANNED THREE (3) LANE MINOR ARTERIAL ROAD THAT WOULD CROSS THE PARCEL LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 220 SOUTH PLEASANT GROVE BOULEVARD, PAGE 2 OF 3 CONNECTING THE EXISTING 220 SOUTH STREET TO 100 SOUTH STREET. (Reid Dickson, Applicant) *Presenter: Director Young.***

Community Development Director, Ken Young, presented the staff report and explained that the applicant is proposing the development of property located at approximately 220 South Pleasant Grove Boulevard. The applicant has provided information and plans for the development proposal. In summary, in order for the applicant to develop the property as planned, he would need approval of an amendment to the Transportation Master Plan in addition to approval of a rezone on a portion of the parcel and approval of the site plan.

The applicant, Reid Dickson, met with the Council on November 1, 2016 to discuss the potential of developing his property as he proposed. At another meeting held on December 13, 2016, the Council clarified that they would be more likely to entertain the development proposal, including a rezone and a Transportation Master Plan amendment, if the development included commercial retail on the corner of Pleasant Grove Boulevard and 1300 West, or if commercial retail was otherwise a significant part of Mr. Dickson's development. An application for the rezone as well as the Transportation Master Plan amendment was received on December 22, 2016.

At the Public Hearing held by the Planning Commission on January 12, 2017, a recommendation of approval was forwarded to the City Council for the rezone of the northwestern portion of the parcel from the Grove Zone Commercial Sales Sub-District to the Mixed Housing Sub-District, with the condition that an amendment to the Transportation Master Plan was needed before the submittal of any residential or commercial development.

Development Proposal: Mr. Dickson proposed developing a professional office building on approximately seven acres of the total 8.15-acre property owned by John Harr, with frontage on Pleasant Grove Boulevard. This would require the elimination of the planned roadway that would bifurcate the property and utilize some of the area in the northwestern strip that connects to 1300 West. The northwestern strip of land within the parcel is proposed to be subdivided and sold for potential multi-family development, associated with the development to the north. Although buildings are shown, Mr. Dickson's proposed development is only on Mr. Harr's property and does not include properties on or near the corner of Pleasant Grove Boulevard and 1300 West.

Master Planned Road Connection: According to the Transportation Master Plan, the John Harr property has been planned to accommodate a future road. The road is planned to be a three lane, minor arterial road which will connect 220 South with 100 South by crossing the Harr property, with a signaled intersection at Pleasant Grove Boulevard. Staff recognizes there is significant value in keeping the three-lane minor arterial road as planned in the Roadway Master Plan, not only

because of the east-west interconnectivity provided for traffic and pedestrian use, but also for the accommodation of future City infrastructure. The planned corridor, connecting the upper east bench areas on 200 South across town to North County Boulevard and further west into American Fork, is the only such east-west connector in the southern portion of the City. However, according to the Engineering Department, the road is not critical for development of the area. The loss of the connection will force traffic to use other roadway connections in the area. Traffic will primarily be handled by the existing connections of Pleasant Grove Boulevard, 1300 West, and 100 South. It is anticipated that although the traffic load will increase on these existing roadways if the planned connection is removed from the Master Plan, the roadways will still have sufficient capacity.

Zoning and Development Proposal of Northwest Strip: John Dester, owner of Georgetown Development's mixed housing project known as Garden Grove, located at 100 South 1300 West, has joined in the proposal by planning the 1.3-acre northwest strip of the John Harr property, which is being sought for rezone to the Grove, Mixed Housing. The area makes a natural extension of his development, and he has proposed two alternate development proposals to include the property into the existing development.

Proposed Joint Venture: Mr. Dickson mentioned at the Planning Commission public hearing on January 26 that he is planning a joint venture with the property owners on and near the corner of Pleasant Grove Boulevard and 1300 West, whereby the development of the corner properties would be focused on retail commercial. The following three properties comprise the potential corner development:

- 1.4 acres owned by David Adams;
- 1.5 acres owned by Robert Carter; and
- .92 acres owned by Pleasant Grove City.

To date, there had been no action or discussion regarding the purchasing of the City property on the corner to be part of the proposed development. It was not known whether the owners of the other two parcels have become involved with a joint venture with Mr. Dickson.

Council Member Jensen asked if staff had spoken to the developer about an agreement. Director Young explained that a Development Agreement was not part of tonight's discussion. They were simply deciding whether to remove the road. Mayor Daniels asked about the staff and Planning Commission recommendations. Director Young stated that the Planning Commission forwarded a positive unanimous recommendation; however, various concerns were expressed during their meeting.

The applicant, Reid Dickson (Wasatch Engineering and Development), stated that there was good discussion with the Planning Commission regarding the cost benefits of removing the road. He concurred with the recommendations as listed in the staff report. He explained that the City is one of three property owners and the applicant has approached the other two within the development arena. So far they have received two out of three signatures and they expect to obtain the third signature later in the week. The Joint Venture Agreement ties multiple developments together and

the applicant assumes the City will be willing to cooperate. They are considering adjusting the size of the office building as well as adding another retail/commercial component on the office building parcel.

Mayor Daniels asked Mr. Dickson to describe the Joint Venture Agreement. Mr. Dickson stated that all details were contained within the agreement, which they prepared for the City's review in the interest of providing full disclosure. They do not want to control property they do not own. Construction will take place in phases as the market demands. The Joint Venture Agreement indicates that all property owners will function as one entity.

In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Administrator Darrington stated that matters need to be contingent upon the Joint Venture Agreement. The Council could either approve the application contingent on the adoption of the agreement, or they could continue the item and give staff direction to negotiate a Development Agreement beforehand. City Attorney, Tina Petersen, recommended the Council go with the latter option.

Mr. Dickson stated that removal of the road would reduce circulation to a small degree. However, one comment given during the Planning Commission Meeting was from a mother who preferred the road be closed for safety reasons. By removing the road connection, traffic will be diverted on the existing major corridors.

Mayor Daniels asked if Mr. Dickson was proposing the City be part of the Joint Venture Agreement. Mr. Dickson answered in the affirmative. Administrator Darrington stated that one consideration is that the City needs to sell the property as they have no interest in its development.

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

Council Member LeMone was not in favor of the project. The Council had already approved a six-story office building and the impression she had from the residents was that they did not want more office space or multi-family housing. She was not in favor of the rezone. The property in question was in a prime location and they will be giving up retail tax revenue if the proposal is approved as-is. She opined that the proposal did not meet the City's vision for the area.

Council Member Andersen clarified that the plan presented was conceptual. The development could have more commercial than pictured. She noted that the multi-family housing was approximately nine units per acre. Attorney Petersen clarified that the Council was deciding whether to remove the road in question and not the rezone issue. Staff and the Council further deliberated on an appropriate action to take on the matter.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to adopt Ordinance 2017-8 to amend the Transportation Master Plan by removing the future planned road that will connect 220 South road with 100 South and the road that crosses the parcel located at approximately 220 South Pleasant Grove Boulevard; and adopt the exhibits, conditions, and findings contained in the staff report, and as modified by the following conditions:

1. A strong retail component should be associated with the future development of the parcel, either onsite or on neighboring property to the southwest.
2. A pedestrian and bike path is to be planned through the development to continue the east/west connections in the area.
3. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
4. A Development Agreement between the developers and the City assuring the development of retail development within the proposed development and/or proposed joint venture area including properties to the southwest must be entered into.

Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, Stanley and Walker voting “Aye”, and Council Member LeMone voting “Nay”. The motion passed 4-to-1.

B) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2017-9) TO REZONE THE NORTHWEST PART OF THE PARCEL (APPROXIMATELY 1.3 ACRES) FROM THE GROVE ZONE, COMMERCIAL SALES SUB-DISTRICT TO THE GROVE ZONE, MIXED HOUSING SUB-DISTRICT. (SAM WHITE’S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD) (REID DICKSON, APPLICANT) *Presenter: Director Young.*

Director Young presented the staff report and displayed an aerial map of the subject property. He explained that the applicant is requesting approval of a zone change for the northwestern 1.3-acre portion of a lot on property located at approximately 220 South Pleasant Grove Blvd. The requested zone change is from Commercial Sales Sub-District to Mixed Housing Sub-District within The Grove Zone with the intent to develop multi-family residential units. John Dester, of Georgetown Development, who has developed the Garden Grove mixed housing development at 100 South 1300 West, expressed interest and submitted concept plans to expand their project to include this potentially rezoned property. The remaining acreage was proposed to be developed as the site for a professional office building. Before a site plan for such proposed development can be approved, the rezone and an amendment to the Transportation Master Plan eliminating the planned road through the property needs to be approved to accommodate the development of a commercial/office building on the site. An application for the rezone was received on December 22, 2016.

The rezone of the 1.3-acre portion of land will allow for the development of multi-family units, either by the applicant or the developer of the Garden Grove mixed housing to the north. The proposed rezone to Mixed Housing Sub-District in the Grove Zone is proposed only for the 1.3-acre strip of land on the northwest corner of the property. This piece of property was planned to accommodate a future road established in the Transportation Master Plan, which will connect 220 South with 100 South. The future road was intended to cross the lot located at approximately 220 South Pleasant Grove Boulevard. The rezone should only be approved if an amendment of the Transportation Master Plan to remove the planned roadway is first approved. If the Master Plan is not amended, there is much less reason to rezone the property, as it might best be developed with some commercial use in conjunction with the Goodwin property immediately to the south. Staff

also considered that the rezone and future development of the property should be tied to a strong commercial retail component occurring on the Harr property or on adjoining properties to the southwest.

Mr. Dickson presented a map of the subject property. He explained that John Dester was interested in incorporating a narrow area into his existing project. Mr. Dickson understood the City's position of wanting more retail and stated that this narrow strip of land would make that allowance. He argued that changing the zoning would be synergistic to the City's vision. He explained that the turnarounds would be squared off instead of at an angle, which would be a minimal difference. Mr. Dickson stated that Mr. Dester wants flexibility in how he plans for the new narrow strip, and a 45-degree angle might not be the best solution for the proposed development.

Attorney Petersen stated that the noticing indicates 1.3 acres. She advised against making any modifications to the map included with the ordinance amendment. As such, the Council either should adopt as-is or continue the item in order to make a map change. Director Young stated that if there are different zones on a parcel, the City goes with the majority zoning, which regulates what kind of development can occur there. Mayor Daniels stated that for tonight's purposes, staff and the Council should stick with the map included in staff report.

Mayor Daniels opened the public hearing.

Brandon Mills, a Pleasant Grove resident, stated that he works for Georgetown Development. He presented images of examples of garden houses, live/work units and townhomes. The applicant would like to add 10 more garden homes, four more townhomes, and two more live/work units. Additionally, they have added a pavilion and park area where there would be outdoor use in the project. Mr. Mills stated that there was significant demand for townhomes. They are in Phase 1 of the project and the eight townhomes in the original proposal sold out immediately. They did not have a preference to do garden homes or townhomes in the area identified, but there was strong interest in townhomes. They were interested in having the zoning be consistent throughout the project.

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

Administrator Darrington stated that the permitted density is 12 units per acre. The Garden Grove project would be less than nine units per acre, and the expansion would stay within that same density.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved that the City Council approve the request of Reid Dickson to rezone approximately 1.3 acres in the northwest area of property at approximately 220 South Pleasant Grove Boulevard, from the Commercial Sales Sub-District to the Mixed Housing Sub-District within the Grove Zone; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the staff report, and as modified by the following conditions:

1. An amendment of the adopted Transportation Master Plans shall be approved before the submittal of any residential or commercial development.

2. A development agreement between the developers and the City assuring the development of retail development within the proposed development and/or proposed joint venture area including properties to the southwest, based on the strength of the recommendations of the Planning Commission is required.
3. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, Stanley and Walker voting “Aye”, and Council Member LeMone voting “Nay”. The motion passed 4-to-1.

Council Member LeMone stated that if the Council does not want more high density housing in the City, they need to stop voting favorably for rezone proposals that would allow for those types of developments. Council Member Andersen stated that this proposal wasn't for high density housing. Council Member LeMone stated it was still a housing development rather than retail. She commented that no progress will be made if as a Council they continue to approve these types of developments.

C) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED PLEASANT GROVE CITY FISCAL YEAR 2016/2017 BUDGET AMENDMENT. (CITY WIDE) A COPY OF THE PROPOSED BUDGET AMENDMENT IS AVAILABLE AT THE RECORDERS OFFICE, 70 SOUTH 100 EAST, THE LIBRARY 30 EAST CENTER AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, 86 EAST 100 SOUTH. (Continued from the January 17, 2017 Meeting).

Finance Director, Denise Roy, explained that the budget amendment listed above is for the appropriation of \$120,000 in the Storm Water Impact Fee Fund for a Joint Venture Agreement to build a detention basin with American Fork City. Pleasant Grove's percentages represent approximately 16% of the construction costs of the detention basin. The total cost of the project was \$690,000.

Public Works Director, Marty Beaumont, explained that when Pleasant Grove annexed the Mayfield project into the City, there was an understanding that some of the storm water from the area would flow into a shared facility with American Fork. The flows are estimated based on what each city was contributing. The agreement had not been finalized; however, a final draft will be presented to the Council shortly.

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

10) **ACTION ITEMS READY FOR A VOTE**

- A) **CONTINUED ITEM: TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2017-02) AMENDING THE 2016/2017 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET TO REFLECT ACTUAL AND ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES FOR THE AMERICAN FORK DETENTION BASIN PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$120,000 WITH THE FUNDING SOURCE FROM THE STORM WATER IMPACT FEES FUND BALANCE AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (Continued from the January 17, 2017 Meeting) Presenter: Director Beaumont.**

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to adopt a Resolution (2017-02) amending the 2016/2017 Fiscal Year Budget to reflect actual and anticipated expenditures for the American Fork Detention Basin Project in the amount of \$120,000 with the funding source from the Storm Water Impact Fees Fund Balance and provide an effective date. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley and Walker voted "Aye." The motion carried unanimously.

- B) **TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2017-04) AMENDING THE 2016/2017 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET TO REFLECT ACTUAL AND ANTICIPATED EXPENDITURES FOR THE VAC-TRUCK DECANT FACILITY PROJECT, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 400 NORTH 600 WEST IN THE AMOUNT OF \$308,900 WITH THE FUNDING SOURCE FROM THE STORM WATER IMPACT FEE FUND BALANCE; AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN THE NOTICE OF AWARD TO VANCON INC. AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. Presenter: Director Beaumont.**

As noted at the start of the meeting, the first half of the item was postponed until February 21, 2017.

Director Beaumont stated that staff has been working on the design of the project for six months. They felt that the design fulfills the facilities purpose. They have since added a water component to the structure. He explained that when vac trucks clean out a storm drain line, they must get rid of the material into a decant facility that discharges into the sewer system. There were five bidders on the project. There was a base bid and an additive alternative to allow for an expansion of those basins. Staff recommended that the Council award the bid as outlined tonight. In a few weeks, staff would come back and make a recommendation to transfer funds from the Water Fund to cover the rest of the project. Director Beaumont stated that approving the second half of the agenda item does not condition anything specific to the project. Rather, they are simply discussing the value of adding a water component. The project came in slightly over budget and at some point in the future staff will present an amendment. If the amendment is not approved, staff will move forward with the base bid as awarded tonight.

Council Member Stanley asked what kind of noticing to the neighbors occurred on the possibility of a decant facility being built in this area. Director Beaumont stated they were not required to do a full site plan of the future Public Works Facility. Rather, they are simply constructing a small portion of that facility. No noticing of construction was required. Council Member Stanley asked what the City did a few years ago with contaminated sludge from the sewer lines. Director Beaumont

explained that in the past, they have discharged material into a pit; however, the EPA has since enforced new requirements with which the City must comply.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to authorize the Mayor to sign the Notice of Award to VanCon Inc. and provide for an effective date. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

C) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2017-05) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH VALLEY GROVE, LLC REGARDING A COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION PROJECT AND AN ONSITE STORM WATER DETENTION FACILITY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2093 WEST PLEASANT GROVE BOULEVARD; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington *Continued to February 21, 2017.*

D) TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL A TWO-LOT COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT CALLED GROVE COMMONS SUBDIVISION PLAT B, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1809 WEST STATE STREET IN THE GROVE ZONE. (SAM WHITE'S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD) *Presenter: Director Young.*

Director Young presented the staff report and displayed an aerial map of the subject property. He explained that the proposed Grove Commons Plat "B" Subdivision consists of two commercial lots. One lot, which is 3.80 acres in size, is already partially developed with the Walmart Store and a new proposed lot of .98 acres will be created for future development. The process includes the vacation of Lot 1 in the Grove Commons Subdivision Plat "A". At the time of this application, no plans had been submitted for a commercial development. Both proposed lots comply with the zoning requirements regarding size and frontage, except that cross access easements between the two lots need to be shown.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved to approve a two-lot commercial subdivision final plat called Grove Commons Subdivision Plat B, located at approximately 1809 West State Street in the Grove Zone, subject to the following conditions:

1. A cross access easement between Lots 7 and 8, as well as all other existing easements in the development, need to be shown on the plat.
2. All final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

E) TO CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL A TWO-LOT SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT CALLED CASSIE ESTATES SUBDIVISION PLAT A, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 700 NORTH 300 EAST IN THE R1-8 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE. (LITTLE DENMARK NEIGHBORHOOD) *Presenter: Director Young.*

Director Young presented the staff report and displayed an aerial map of the subject property. He explained that the applicant is requesting approval of a two-lot final subdivision called Cassie Estates Plat A located at 700 North 300 East in the R1-8 (Single-Family) Zone, with a General Plan designation of Medium Density Residential. The proposed subdivision was previously approved by the City Council on May 26, 2015. This approval was valid for a period of 12 months, during which time the plat was to be finalized and recorded. In cases where recordation does not take place within one year, the recommendation of approval or final approval expires resulting in the need for either a new approval or a renewal of the past approval. Several civil issues regarding the location of property lines delayed the final recordation of the plat for a period of approximately 22 months. As a result, new approval was required. No changes had been made to the subdivision since it was last reviewed by the Council.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to approve a two-lot subdivision final plat called Cassie Estates Subdivision Plat A, located at approximately 700 North 300 East in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

F) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2017-06) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN THE EXECUTION OF A CERTAIN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT PROVIDING FOR THE DISSOLUTION OF THE NORTH UTAH COUNTY AQUIFER ASSOCIATION AND TERMINATING THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT CREATING THE SAME; AND PROVIDE FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. *Presenter: Director Beaumont.*

Director Beaumont explained that the above item and the next are connected. He explained that the North Utah County Aquifer Association (NUCA) was created in 2009 in an effort to gain grant funding for aquifer storage and recharge study. A study was ultimately conducted by USGS and funding was obtained. Now that the project is complete, there is no need for the association to continue. As such, they will dissolve the association and create a new group with a different purpose.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to adopt a Resolution (2017-06) authorizing the Mayor to sign the execution of a certain interlocal agreement providing for the dissolution of the North Utah County Aquifer Association and Terminating the Interlocal Agreement creating the same; and provide 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 carried unanimously.

G) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2017-07) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN THE EXECUTION OF A CERTAIN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT CREATING THE NORTH UTAH COUNTY AQUIFER COUNCIL, ACCORDING TO THE TERMS THEREOF, AND RELATED MATTERS; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. *Presenter: Director Beaumont.*

Director Beaumont explained that with the dissolution of the association, the Board still felt there was value in having a Council that represents the municipalities in the area that use the aquifer.

Since all of the entities involved take water out of the aquifer, they need to coordinate with one another on future new wells, storage, and recovery projects. As such, having representation makes sense for reviewing any project bids from third parties on an as needed basis. It was not logical to maintain the association for the purpose of obtaining grant funding, because they are not actively pursuing any projects. Director Beaumont mentioned a study that was conducted in 2003 of all the wells throughout the aquifer, and stated that it would be beneficial to have an updated study done. The North Utah County Aquifer Council would still be able to help with funding in that regard, but at the same time the noticing and audit procedures required of the association would no longer be necessary. Auditing was to take place under the realm of the newly formed Council rather than the association.

Council Member Stanley asked about Pleasant Grove's representation on the Council and how the positions were decided. Director Beaumont stated that he is the City's representative, a responsibility previously filled by Degen Lewis. Every municipality has just one member, for a total of six Council Members. They are in the process of actively recruiting other municipalities that pull out of the same aquifer. Council Member Stanley asked what would happen if there wasn't a Council and asked if the cities could still coordinate. Director Beaumont explained that the Council helps maintain clarity and organization. The group serves as the coordination between the cities, and fosters communication on a continual basis. Council Member Stanley asked if the Council will have an operating budget. Director Beaumont explained that there was some money in the association that was transferred to Central Utah Water, and every year they will approve a budget. He anticipated that sometime in the future the Council will recommend an update to the study that was conducted in 2003. As such, the Council will come before Pleasant Grove City and make a recommendation with regard to the City's participation in the study. If approved, Pleasant Grove City funds will go into the North Utah County Aquifer Council's budget. However, there would be no ongoing financial commitment from Pleasant Grove City.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to adopt a Resolution (2017-07) authorizing the Mayor to sign the execution of a certain interlocal agreement creating the North Utah County Aquifer Council, according to the terms thereof, and related matters; and provide for an effective date. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Stanley, Walker, Andersen, LeMone and Jensen voting "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

H) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2017-08) OF THE UTAH COUNTY MAYORS URGING THE DEFEAT OF HB 164, MUNICIPAL ENTERPRISE FUND AMENDMENTS AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. *Presenter: Mayor Daniels.*

Administrator Darrington explained that HB 164 would limit the abilities of cities to move money from the enterprise funds. Currently, if the City needs to move money from fund to fund there is a process to which the City must adhere. In Pleasant Grove's case, they have only done this procedure once. The City was working through utility rates in 2010 and 2011 and they needed an opportunity to move money from the Sewer Fund to the Water Fund to avoid having to increase rates significantly. Some cities use enterprise fund-to-fund transfers on an annual basis. The proposed legislation was more about local control in that there is already a public process in place for the transfers to occur and for cities to remain accountable to the public. When the legislation was

initially proposed, mayors in Utah County received an email looking for individual support to oppose the bill and hence the proposed resolution was created. The Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) was representing the City in this matter.

Attorney Petersen stated that the previous day, the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) reported at their Legislative Policy Committee Meeting that they have been working with the bill sponsor to promote amendments. They have tentatively spoken about a substitute proposal that would not restrict the transfer from an enterprise fund to the General Fund, but would have enhanced transparency requirements. The requirements would include the following:

- An independent hearing where the City would be required to establish a detailed overview of the enterprise funds with a cost accounting breakdown;
- Each city would need to clearly define the dollar amount and percentage of transfer as part of their budget document, and provide that information to the Utah State Auditor;
- Cities would be required to send an annual letter to the residents and post on the website in an easily accessible spot about the various enterprise funds of the City, with a cost accounting breakdown of how those funds are used to cover administrative costs and the size of the dividend (transfer amount).

Attorney Petersen stated that the above three items have not been formalized. Discussions were underway between ULCT Representatives and the bill sponsors.

Council Member Stanley was in favor of enhanced transparency. He opined that the bill with amendments still allows flexibility for cities, while promoting more transparency to the residents they represent. The Utah Taxpayers Association has championed this reform. Council Member Stanley expressed a willingness to sign a letter with other elected officials across the State in favor of the reform and as such, he will oppose the proposed resolution.

Attorney Petersen clarified that the resolution is a statement that the City is opposed to the bill in its current format. Furthermore, it indicates that as a City they do not support total prohibition of fund transfers from enterprise funds to the General Fund.

Council Member Jensen stated that the matter comes down to local control over their funds. He noted that Pleasant Grove City has been a good steward of their funds. In the past year, some residents have requested the City be freer with their enterprise funds. He was in favor of the resolution because he supports local control of funds.

Council Member Andersen requested the Mayor's input on the matter. Mayor Daniels stated that in Pleasant Grove's situation, enterprise funds were created for a specific purpose. The General Fund can be used to put money into an enterprise fund, but they do not take money out of enterprise funds except for the services staff performs to support the fund such as billing, administrative costs, etc. The proposed resolution allows the City to continue charging the enterprise funds for the work staff is performing. Pleasant Grove does not use them for any other purpose.

Administrator Darrington explained that the proposed legislation does not affect administrative charge backs. Mayor Daniels stated that the original draft of the bill eliminated any transfer of funds. Administrator Darrington explained that there is already a public process in place for fund transfers, which the City has strictly followed. There has already been a great level of transparency, which is why there is pushback from cities.

Council Member Stanley said many citizens do not understand how enterprise funds work. Mayor Daniels stated that the bill will erode the ability of local entities to charge appropriately for its needs. By signing the resolution, the statement is that while the City is not opposed to transparency, they reject the idea that there needs to be an elimination of a city's ability to transfer funds. Council Member Stanley argued that Pleasant Grove City doesn't take advantage of transfers, and the public wants more transparency. Administrator Darrington explained that the City needs the flexibility in case the matter becomes relevant to a situation in the future.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to adopt a Resolution (2017-08) of the Utah County Mayors urging the defeat of HB 164, Municipal Enterprise Fund amendments and providing for an effective date. Council Member Andersen 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 Council took a five-minute break.

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

There were no discussion items.

12) REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE FEBRUARY 14, 2017 CITY COUNCIL AND WORK SESSION MEETING AGENDA

The above stated meeting was cancelled.

13) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS

Staff provided several updates pertinent to their respective departments. Director Young reported that on February 21st he will review the survey results and report on the public participation activities that have taken place recently. He reported that there were 675 survey submissions. Library and Arts Director, Sheri Britsch, reported on the data collected from a survey recently facilitated by the National Literacy Program. Last, Administrator Darrington recommended the Council cancel the meeting scheduled for April 4, as that is in the middle of spring break.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to cancel the meeting scheduled for February 14, 2017. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

14) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Council Member Jensen: This may not be the right place to do this, but –

Mayor Daniels: Okay, next – [LAUGHTER]

Council Member Jensen: I just, this last week we became aware of some issues that have been happening, and that I think the majority of the Council has not been aware of and I think maybe you, and – it talks about, I mean we talk a lot about transparency in our Council and our community, believing in it. And, it may mean different things to different people, but we came to the understanding that Ben has been contacting the County, the County Commissioners on the side without us being aware and trying to change the agreement that we have with 100 East. And so, I know Ben you talk about believing in transparency very strongly –

Council Member Stanley: Very much.

Council Member Jensen: But we are not aware of what you've been doing with the County Commissioners, until County Commissioner Graves contacted us – I think it was via the Mayor – who forwarded those messages on. And so I'm very concerned about the direction that you're heading with that, in dealing with transparency to our, with our citizens in our community. [CROSSTALK] We weren't aware of it. We just were not aware of it.

Council Member Stanley: I'd be happy to discuss the issue. I don't know that there's any statute that requires me to copy every Council Member on every other correspondence I have, but I do believe that we can get better solutions if we work cooperatively with other elected officials. Have good relationships with each of the County Commissioners, have a lot of good relationships with people at Capitol Hill, and I will continue to do what I can to serve the public, to be responsive to requests of the public, and to do all that I can to get good solutions for the people of Pleasant Grove.

Council Member Jensen: You do understand that all of us are elected officials and representatives of our citizens in this community [CROSSTALK] and when you go do something like that without us being aware of that, it affects not only our staff but us as Council Members representing the citizens, and so that's why I'm concerned with that direction.

Council Member Stanley: I'm not sure I understand the concern, but let's talk about this off line why because – [CROSSTALK]

Council Member Jensen: This is called transparency, talking about it in front of people, and that's why I'm concerned is because you're trying to change an agreement that we as elected officials voted on, and agreed on, and worked with staff and the County Commissioners on. And that's why I'm concerned. I'll just leave it there.

Council Member Stanley: So for the sake of a public, transparent conversation, I am happy to explain to everyone that's here and anyone that's curious that wants to talk about this, I'll talk about it all day long. I have been requested by numerous residents of Pleasant Grove City to try to salvage a bad negotiated deal that was disastrous in a lot of ways for our City financially. I have reached out to County Commissioners. I will continue to reach out to people to secure money for roads. Roads are a high priority for the public. The highest priority I have had over the last three years as

I've served in this office. And I will continue to do all that I can to get solutions – positive and effective solutions – and reach out to people that have the ability to get more money for roads for Pleasant Grove. If you are opposed to money for Pleasant Grove, that surprises me. I think we need more money for roads; we've got a crisis in infrastructure in our City. And so I will continue to do what I can, and what the public asks me to do to use my one voice and my one vote to serve the people of Pleasant Grove to make our City better, make it more transparent, to move it in the right direction, and I will do all that I can to serve people to the very best of my ability to uphold the oath that I took when I took this office.

Council Member LeMone: Will you continue to do that in a public purview without going behind our backs after we've cast a vote as a majority of the Council.

Council Member Stanley: I have never gone behind anyone's back to do anything.

Council Member LeMone: That's not what Commissioner Graves reported to us after we saw the email chain that you were trying to change the proposal after the majority made a final vote. Everything we do, we don't disagree with you of anything you are saying with roads, but our business should be done in public without emails going back and forth between County Commissioners, trying to change the proposal. That's not how we should do business here in Pleasant Grove.

Council Member Stanley: I very much disagree. I think we need to use the relationships that we have to try to get better deals, and I did that, and I don't regret doing that, I don't think there was anything improper about doing that, and I would do it again if it would help benefit our citizens. I wish that some of you would do more to serve the public in the ways that I will always try to serve the public.

Council Member Jensen: So, I appreciate when we had the meeting with Cedar Hills and the County Commissioners, and I think they were very transparent in their dialogue with us, I don't know where you're going with this. I really don't. They were pretty direct in their dialogue with what direction they were going and heading.

Council Member Andersen: The County Commissioners.

Council Member Jensen: County Commissioners.

Council Member Stanley: This is a productive conversation, Mayor, I'm happy to keep having it.

Mayor Daniels: Let me clarify what I'm hearing here. I think there's two separate issues that are being discussed. One is specific to a specific vote that the Council took and a direction and agreement that the Council entered into on behalf of the citizens. The second one is Council Member Stanley, and everyone's right as an individual, whether you're an elected official or a member of the citizenry to express yourself in a way that you feel represents yourself or other people that you work with. The part about this that I'd like the Council as a whole to separate is that when the Council has been elected, or each member of the Council has been elected, we are elected to represent everybody. And, when the Council wants to speak officially, that's done through the

voting process and then direction is given either to myself – the Mayor – or to the staff to represent the vote of the majority of the Council. When that’s done, it would be inappropriate for any of us to go and represent the City of Pleasant Grove, speaking for the City, as if they were, you know, empowered to speak differently than what the majority vote has been. That requires a new vote of the elected body in order to do that. So, as long as we are not using our official position, the resources of the City or representing ourselves in some way as representing the official position of the Council, then I think we’re okay.

Council Member Stanley: Thank you.

Mayor Daniels: And I think that in this particular case, that’s being called into question, as to whether you are using your personal relationship and your influence as a citizen, as opposed to representing the Council and the majority vote of the citizens. [INAUDIBLE]

Council Member Stanley: I’d be happy to publish the letter that I sent, the email that I sent to the County Commissioners. Nowhere did I claim that I spoke for all of this Council. I don’t think there’s any possible way anyone could think that I speak for all of this Council. I don’t speak for the entire City of Pleasant Grove. I am one voice, one vote. I represent 38,000 plus people who constantly ask me to do what I can to get more money for roads.

Mayor Daniels: Yeah, I don’t think the intent is bad. I think that Commissioner Graves in his response certainly interpreted what you said differently than just you were speaking for yourself-

Council Member Stanley: [INTERPOSING] I disagree.

Mayor Daniels: And not for the Council. So, it’s fine. So, I’m, we don’t have to resolve this issue here. I’m stating that as a matter of policy, no one individual on this Council represents the entire Council. Is that clear. And we do not use our individual elected office or the resources of the City to represent that we do represent a change in the position of the Council. When the Council votes and we’ve signed an agreement and turned it in, it requires another official act of the Council in order to make that change.

Council Member Stanley: I hope everyone understands that.

Mayor: Okay, if everyone, if everyone can just follow that particular method of communication with one another I think we’d be okay. The other thing that’s unacceptable is for us as a Council to conduct business electronically. Either through text, or email, or Facebook, or any other method where we are discussing policies and decisions, details of anything that’s going on, amongst ourselves, that then lead to a vote in public which the public has not had the purview of seeing that interaction, dialogue, and understanding what’s being discussed. So, again, that has to not be done at all. Alright, any kind of these issues, we bring it here. Now, when we’re going to discuss matters of character and action of people, I’d request that we do that in an Executive Session. Let’s notice it, let’s put it on the agenda, we can go into an Executive Session and discuss those particular things as we’ve been in Council many times. Alright, any discussion on that further.

Council Member Jensen: I’m done.

Mayor Daniels: Okay.

Council Member Stanley mentioned that at the retreat there was a group of residents who had requested an opportunity to speak at a Council Meeting about the Walker tank. Staff agreed to add them to the February 21 agenda.

Mayor Daniels reported that the City was invited to a meeting with the Jimmer Fredette Family Foundation. They have been working in Utah and around the globe to help prevent suicide and bullying within schools. He has been using his notoriety in the nation and world to encompass the efforts of various groups focused on this issue. Council Member Jensen offered to spearhead and attend the organization meetings to see if there is a way Pleasant Grove can participate. The meeting is scheduled for February 17. Mayor Daniels stated that it will be a great opportunity for the City.

15) SIGNING OF PLATS

The following plats were signed: Valley Grove Business Park Plat B and Allred Acres.

16) REVIEW CALENDAR

It was reported that the City's offices will be closed on President's Day but open on Valentine's Day however the City Council meeting was canceled for that day.

17) ADJOURN AND CONVENE AS THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF PLEASANT GROVE CITY

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn as the Pleasant Grove City Council and convene as the Pleasant Grove Redevelopment Agency. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

18) ADJOURN AS THE PLEASANT GROVE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND RECONVENE AS THE PLEASANT GROVE CITY COUNCIL

ACTION: Board Member Jensen moved to adjourn as the Pleasant Grove Redevelopment Agency and reconvene as the Pleasant Grove City Council. Board Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

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

ACTION: At 9:40 p.m. Council Member LeMone moved to adjourn into a Closed Meeting to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley and Walker voted "Aye." The motion carried unanimously.

ACTION: At 10:25 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to reconvene in a Regular Session. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Stanley and Walker voted “Aye.” The motion carried unanimously.

20) DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING SELECTION OF AN ARCHITECTURE FIRM

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved to direct staff to enter into negotiations with JRCA Architects. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

21) ADJOURN

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:27 pm.

The minutes of February 7, 2017 City Council Meeting were approved by the City Council on March 7, 2017.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder, MMC

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