

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
December 16, 2014
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Cyd LeMone
Ben Stanley
Jay Meacham
Cindy Boyd

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Dean Lundell, Finance Director
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Lynn Walker, Public Works Director
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director

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

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Daniels called the meeting to order and noted that Council Members Andersen, Boyd, LeMone, Meacham, and Stanley were present.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council Member LeMone.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The opening remarks were given by Library and Arts Director, Sheri Britsch.

4) **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve the agenda with a discussion on the Peterson property to take place during the Open Session. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

5) OPEN SESSION

Mayor Daniels opened the open session.

Craig Thorne stated that the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) in Northern Utah County had a program entitled "Operation Teddy Bear". He explained that during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, the VFW provided comfort bears to the children of deployed soldiers. Mr. Thorne invited two children from Pleasant Grove to present their comfort bears. He noted that the Utah VFW distributed over 600 teddy bears, and hosted several "bear parties" where military families gathered together. Mr. Thorne stated that at one party that took place at the Veterans Memorial Park, the City of Pleasant Grove generously distributed free swim passes to the children who attended. Mr. Thorne presented the Mayor and Council with an award in appreciation for their support of the VFW's "Operation Teddy Bear".

Mr. Thorne presented three additional awards of recognition. First, he spoke about the Rushton family and their wonderful band performances. He made mention of the National Guard Unit 1457 in American Fork and stated that the Rushton family performed for their Christmas party. Mr. Thorne presented them with a plaque, thanking them for their service to the community. Next, he stated that Firebird Pizza is giving the Jensen family a meal to show their appreciation for their service as well. Last, Mr. Thorne acknowledged Miss Pleasant Grove for performing for National Guard Unit 1457 and the Veterans Christmas party. He presented her with a plaque of service.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, stated that staff intended to have a discussion regarding the Peterson property on tonight's agenda. He explained that the Petersons own property off of 2600 North, where they would like to create a flag lot. An aerial map and photos of the subject property were presented and discussed. Director Young stated that the City requires developments to adhere to a vicinity plan or to provide an alternative plan that allows for similar access and benefits to the area. He presented an alternative vicinity plan that was submitted by Mr. Peterson, and turned the time over to the applicant to better explain his request.

Mr. Peterson spoke about his family's history in Pleasant Grove and stated that he has many fond memories of the area. He explained that as a developer, the property in question has been challenging. When Bryton Estates was developed, an existing dirt road was incorporated into the subdivision. Mr. Peterson stated that he coordinated with the developer of Bryton Estates and was told that there would be access to his property. This, however, never occurred regardless of a contract agreement that was established.

There was further review of the photos of the property as well as the vicinity map. Mr. Peterson stated that he has had an opportunity to meet with City staff, including Engineer Lewis, Attorney Petersen, and Director Young, to discuss ways to access the subject property. A flyer was distributed to the affected neighbors and property owners that contained a proposed layout that included a thru road. Mr. Peterson reported that the flyers only generated one formal response and the neighbor with whom Mr. Peterson met did not want an access cut through the property.

Mr. Peterson was proposing estate lots, which will all be one acre or greater in size. According to the handouts that were distributed to the Council, it was noted that the trees in the area will all be preserved. He commented that the proposal is good land planning and that the lots will be very nice. He asked that the Council endorse the flag lot application.

In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Mr. Peterson identified the existing homes on the property as well as the turnaround. Council Member LeMone remarked that she likes the design and the preservation of the trees. Mr. Peterson pointed out that many years ago, a 15-foot pipe was installed on the property for irrigation purposes. From the time the property was developed, there have been storm water pipes that have gotten backed up due to their size and capacity levels. Therefore, a regional pond is needed. In order to preserve an existing pond, Mr. Peterson was willing to work with the City to ensure that there are restricted setbacks.

Council Member LeMone asked if the proposed lots will strictly be family lots or if they will be available for sale. Mr. Peterson responded that some of the lots will be sold. Council Member Boyd expressed support for the proposal, especially the idea of maintaining larger lots. Council Member Meacham asked if there are any issues with having three lots on a flag lot. Director Young replied that three lots on a flag lot is the maximum allowed.

Director Young continued that in order to approve the proposal, a finding will need to be made by the Planning Commission and City Council based on the verbiage contained in the City's flag lot ordinance. The exact language of the ordinance was then read by City Attorney, Tina Petersen. Attorney Petersen mentioned that staff recommended demolishing the existing home in order to create a standard street, rather than a flag lot. She provided additional overview of the discussions that took place between staff and the applicant and noted that there were several differences in opinion that lead staff to seek the Council's input.

Council Member Stanley asked if staff has a legal sense of whether or not unaccommodating neighbors can be considered a basis for an impracticality finding. Attorney Petersen could not recall another instance when this analysis was used as a finding. Council Member Boyd asked if one-acre lots were addressed in the flag lot ordinance. She suggested that more leeway be granted in this situation, due to the size of the lots. Attorney Petersen stated staff has not previously discussed whether or not accommodations can be made for lots that exceed the minimum lot sizes as outlined in the flag lot ordinance. Council Member Boyd was of the opinion that in this situation, the applicant wants to utilize his property in a manner that fits the integrity of the area.

City Engineer, Degen Lewis, stated that another issue staff had when reviewing the application was that the ordinance relates specifically to historical, deep agricultural lots. He explained that the flag lot ordinance was created with the downtown area in mind. He was not sure that this particular application would meet that intention. Engineer Lewis remarked that the Council needs to consider the unintentional consequences of broadening the flag lot ordinance. Attorney Petersen stated that flag lots are not the preferred method of development and reiterated the purpose for which the flag lot ordinance was created.

Council Member Andersen stated that this application needs to go through the Planning Commission process. She expressed concern with access into Mr. Burr's property, and stated that she would like his input. Attorney Petersen agreed that this matter needs to be noticed to all of the surrounding property owners so that they can weigh in on the matter. Council Member Stanley added that there is a lot of value in holding public hearings. He expressed concerns with

broadening terms that should have a narrow scope, especially when the City does not have other examples of similar circumstances which have occurred in the past.

Mr. Peterson stated that it is not his intention to change the ordinance. Rather, he felt that the language of the ordinance is open for interpretation. He explained that it is not practical to remove 100-year-old trees and knock down homes in order to create a street. Mr. Peterson explained that he took a practical approach on the matter by reaching out to the neighbors for input. He asked the Council to give him the opportunity to make an application and go through the process of developing his property. He was under the impression that the proposal would not negatively affect anyone and he was open to suggestions.

Mark Ryan stated that Mr. Harvey indicated that even if he sold his property it would never be developed as a residential subdivision. It was noted that Mr. Harvey owns one of the neighboring properties. He suggested that staff look into this and pointed out that if Mr. Harvey's property isn't developed residentially, then there will not be the access shown on the vicinity plan. Mr. Ryan expressed support for Mr. Peterson's proposal.

Blaine Thatcher asked how the vicinity plan was developed for this section of undeveloped property.

Engineer Lewis explained that there were two different proposals for the vicinities in the area, including one submitted by Bryton Estates. He noted that developing streets over cul-de-sacs is preferred so that there are more options for traffic. The vicinity plan was designed to create streets and maximize the number of lots in the area, which is generally a developer's primary goal. The Planning Commission can adopt an alternative development plan, as long as it meets the intent of the vicinity plan, which is to provide the City with an interconnected network. Council Member Stanley added that vicinity plans are not binding; rather, they are suggestions from staff. Council Member Andersen remarked that all surrounding property owners are also considered when developing a vicinity plan.

Mayor Daniels stated that the Council can't make any decisions on this item tonight. He explained that while the Council can comment on the proposal, they can't give a specific endorsement, because that would be considered taking action. Mayor Daniels told Mr. Peterson that he is welcome to complete an application and go through the process. Mr. Peterson remarked that he asked for the Council's feedback, because he does not want to spend \$1,000 on an application that gets denied. Mayor Daniels and Mr. Peterson continued to discuss points made by Council Members.

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

6) **CONSENT ITEMS**

- a) **City Council and Work Session Minutes:
City Council Minutes for the November 5, 2014 meeting.
City Council Work Session Minutes for the November 12, 2014 meeting.**
- b) **To consider approval of paid vouchers for (December 10, 2014)**

The consent items were reviewed and discussed.

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

7) **PRESENTATIONS**

A) **RICHARD GUERNSEY PRESENTATION ON GLASS RECYCLING.**

Mr. Guernsey reported that his family has lived in Pleasant Grove for over 20 years and that he retired from the Navy four years ago. He explained that while he was in the Navy, his family was well taken care of by the community. As a way of giving back to the community, he has volunteered for the past couple of years in a role to facilitate an emergency response exercise. Mr. Guernsey remarked that these were very rewarding experiences for him. He has now moved on to glass recycling as his next community endeavor.

Mr. Guernsey used a slide show presentation to present his proposal to the City Council. He explained that almost one year ago, he formed a limited liability company with his sons. The company is called Richard A. Guernsey and Sons, LLC, and its purpose is to bring products or services to market that don't currently exist. Furthermore, Mr. Guernsey read the following company policy statement:

"Any venture that we pursue will be undertaken with the specific purpose in mind to either bring a needed product or service to market that is not currently available, or, to provide that product or service exponentially better than it is currently being provided by the competition in that market."

The business's first venture is Planet Green Recycling, which is the proposal to be presented. Mr. Guernsey spoke about his son, Jordan Guernsey, who passed away last week. He stated that Jordan will leave a hole in everyone's hearts as well as in the business and that will be very difficult to replace. He assured the Council that even without Jordan, the company's management ability will not be affected for Planet Green Recycling, or any other venture. Mr. Guernsey noted that he will be bringing his three daughters on board with the company as well. He stated that as more members join the limited liability company, they will bring a wealth of experience, talent, and management capabilities to future projects.

Mr. Guernsey outlined five substantial reasons for recycling. First, it is easy and reduces waste in landfills. Second, it saves money. Third, it creates jobs. Fourth, it saves energy, and last, recycling preserves natural resources. He spoke specifically about the importance of reducing waste in landfills and stated that recycling prolongs the amount of time landfills can be used. Furthermore, there are tight federal regulations on landfills that makes them very expensive to operate. Therefore, taxpayers will ultimately save millions of dollars by recycling because opening new landfills will be avoided.

Mr. Guernsey explained that single stream recycling is a system in which all paper, cardboard, plastic, metal, and glass containers are deposited for collection in a single bin, and sorted into separate commodities at a materials recovery facility (MRF). He noted that currently there is not a single MRF in the State of Utah that can accommodate single stream recycling. As a result, curbside recycling is limited to paper, cardboard, and plastic. Mr. Guernsey was pleased to see the recycling efforts that began five years ago; however, he was still concerned with the fact that glass is not being recycled, because it is a very large recyclable commodity. He remarked that while

there currently is not an MRF in Utah, in researching the issue, his company predicts that this resource will be available in the State within the next five years.

Momentum Recycling is a company in Salt Lake City that started about five years ago. Two years ago, they opened a glass plant and started accepting post consumer glass. Concurrent with the glass plant, they also began doing curbside recycling pickups in the Salt Lake valley. Mr. Guernsey stated that his company has developed a very close working relationship with Momentum Recycling, and they toured their facility about five or six months ago. Now that glass recycling is an economic possibility in Utah, Planet Green Recycling would like to implement glass recycling with curbside collection. Overall, Utah is about 10 years behind the recycling movement and is about five years behind having the ability to process mixed recyclables.

In light of this information, Mr. Guernsey stated that single stream recycling is the ultimate goal. In order to achieve this objective, Planet Green Recycling is proposing monthly curbside glass collection in a separate, smaller bin. This service would be provided by subscription only, and no one would be coerced into curbside glass recycling. The marketing, billing, and payment of this service would also be coordinated with the City. The projected cost would be \$8.00 per month per residential household. Planet Green Recycling will provide marketing inserts to be included in the City newsletter. In turn, the City will provide Planet Green Recycling with a monthly spreadsheet indicating who has signed up for the service. Subsequently, an additional line item will be added to the utility bill for this service.

Mr. Guernsey noted that around 500 subscriptions will be needed to begin operations and at least 125 of those subscriptions need to come from Pleasant Grove. He explained that Planet Green Recycling will be operating smaller, more maneuverable and safer collection vehicles, and operations are expected to begin by June 2015. A picture of what the vehicles will look like was then presented.

Mr. Guernsey remarked that there is currently little to no competition in this industry. He noted that Republic Services (Allied Waste), Waste Management, and Ace Disposal are the three major players in the waste disposal and recycling industry in Utah. Republic Services and Waste Management are large, national firms, while Ace Disposal is an independent Utah company that has expanded into the western United States. None of these companies currently offer curbside glass recycling services. Momentum Recycling is the only company in Utah that offers this service; however, they work almost exclusively in Salt Lake County, and have no intention of expanding their scope.

Mr. Guernsey spoke about a marketing blitz that Momentum Recycling coordinated with Salt Lake County, during which they were able to increase their monthly curbside glass collections in one neighborhood from 80 subscriptions to nearly 300. He continued to explain that if residents are informed of their options, there will be some households that have an environmental consciousness that will want this service. Landfills are managed by the County and future marketing efforts will be run through them. Therefore, there is an incentive for the County to push this movement as well. It was noted that Momentum Recycling now divert over 100 tons of glass out of Salt Lake County. This is a significant amount of material, which equates to huge savings for the taxpayers.

Mr. Guernsey concluded by summarizing his presentation and explaining that Momentum Recycling is glad to see Planet Green Recycling making a similar proposal in Pleasant Grove and

Utah County. He stated that as a City they have only begun to scratch the surface of recycling and much more can be done to develop a comprehensive recycling program.

Council Member LeMone asked how often glass would get picked up. Mr. Guernsey explained that it will be collected monthly. Also, the glass cans are about half the size of regular garbage cans. Council Member LeMone suggested that Planet Green Recycling also reach out to local businesses. Mr. Guernsey replied that businesses will coordinate with each other, rather than through the City. Furthermore, businesses will not count toward the 125 local subscriptions. Council Member LeMone asked how he plans to spread the word. Mr. Guernsey explained that they are taking things one step at a time. The initial first step is to establish the service in Pleasant Grove. The next step is to have discussions with the County Commission. Other communities will be approached after Planet Green Recycling has obtained the County's endorsement.

Council Member Andersen asked about the process by which residents will subscribe to this service. Mr. Guernsey explained that residents will coordinate through the City, in order to save money. Council Member Meacham remarked that he found the proposal to be very well-written. He wanted to know why glass is not currently being recycled. Mr. Guernsey explained that the three major waste and recycling firms in Utah don't have glass processing facilities. He explained that the reason Planet Green Recycling can provide this service is because they are less driven by the finances involved and more focused on the service itself. He noted, however, that some of the costs need to be recouped. Mr. Guernsey explained that as Planet Green Recycling grows its infrastructure, they will become a recognized player in this industry, which will be especially beneficial when single stream recycling becomes a possibility in Utah.

There was brief discussion regarding the administrative services that the City would need to provide Planet Green Recycling. Mr. Guernsey continued to review an incentive for Pleasant Grove City for a proposed subsidy. He explained that if Pleasant Grove City will offer a \$2.00 subsidy for the service per household during the first year of operations, Planet Green Recycling will agree to drop the subsidy and reduce the price of the service by \$2.00 per household for the second and subsequent years. If the City agrees to offer this subsidy and 500 households subscribe to this service between now and June 2015, Planet Green Recycling will agree to take responsibility of maintaining a recycling bin outside of City Hall free of charge in perpetuity.

Council Member LeMone agreed with Council Member Meacham, that Mr. Guernsey presented a very well-written proposal. She asked additional questions about the subsidy and administrative costs. City Administrator, Scott Darrington stated that staff needs to sit down with Mr. Guernsey to crunch the numbers. Council Member LeMone asked if Planet Green Recycling could do a brief market study in the community, and Mr. Guernsey answered in the affirmative.

Council Member Stanley acknowledged that this is a very ambitious endeavor and admired his entrepreneurial business sense. He, however, had several concerns. He appreciates partnerships between public and private sectors, but stated that they need to be done in a way that completely respects the role of government and associated financial obligations. Council Member Stanley stated that as the numbers are reviewed in depth, the Council will look at any potential legal restrictions. Mr. Guernsey concluded that Planet Green Recycling is willing to meet this need in the community, which is currently going unaddressed. If successful, it could also potentially open an avenue for Planet Green Recycling becoming competitive for a larger, more comprehensive recycling contract in the future.

Note: There was a break at 7:30 p.m.

8) **ACTION ITEMS READY FOR VOTE:**

A) **TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2014-052) AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF NOT MORE THAN \$10,500,000 AGGREGATE THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF WATER REVENUE FUNDING BONDS; SERIES 2015; AND RELATED MATTERS; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

Presenter: Director Lundell.

Finance Director, Dean Lundell, explained that in 2006, the City issued just over \$11.5 million in water bonds for the secondary water system. He stated that the City has an opportunity to refinance these bonds at a lower rate and the estimated savings will be about \$60,000 per year. The proposed resolution adopts parameters, such as the maximum amount of the bonds that can be issued, maximum term and interest rate. The money will be used to refund existing projects and cannot be used for construction projects. The maximum interest rate is 3.5% and a Pricing Committee will be established to finalize the terms of the bond.

Director Lundell introduced Mr. Marc Edminster, Vice President at Lewis, Young, Robertson & Burningham, who are one of the City's financial advisors for this transaction. Council Member Stanley asked how the refinance originated. Director Lundell replied that the City's financial advisors keep staff informed of refunding opportunities. The interest rates are low enough that there will be significant savings for the City.

Council Member Stanley asked about the lockout period on the bonds. Mr. Edminster explained that under Federal regulation, the City can only do an advance refunding once, which is when a bond is refunded substantially in advance of its call date. In this case, the call date is December 1, 2016. Therefore, the proposed refinance would be the City's opportunity to do an advance refunding. If the refinance were done within 90 days of the call date, it would not count against the one time limit.

Mayor Daniels mentioned that the term "bonding" is used in government, whereas businesses use the term "loan". He asked Mr. Edminster to provide a more comprehensive term overview and explain how these terms apply to government. Mr. Edminster stated that the call date refers to a contractual part of the existing bond that indicates that a bond cannot be refunded before a certain date. Typically, the standard in the industry is within 10 years of the bond sale. He explained that the term "bond" refers to the legal structure and requirements as set forth by the State of Utah for issuance of municipal debt.

The call date is when the City will be able to pay off the old bonds prior to their maturity. Existing bonds can be refunded by issuing new bonds and the proceeds from the new bonds go into an escrow account. The funds sit in the escrow account and pay debt service on existing bonds until December 1, 2016.

Mr. Thatcher asked about the cost of issuing new bonds. Mr. Edminster stated that the projected cost of issuance is around \$160,000. This includes the bond attorneys, the cost of acquiring bond insurance, the bond rating, and everything necessary to get the bonds out to the public markets. After this expense, there is a projected cost flow savings of around \$60,000 per year, with a total savings of over \$1.1 million. Mr. Edminster remarked that the benefits of adopting the proposed

resolution is that it sets specific perimeters for legal purposes. The resolution does not compel the City to issue bonds, which is a decision that will occur after all of the mandatory steps have been taken to get to the bond sale. At that point, if the markets have changed and the savings are no longer available, the City is not obligated to proceed.

In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Mr. Edminster explained that in the case of a refunding bond, the City is not required to hold a public hearing. Public hearings are only required in the event that a new money bond is being issued for a new project. However, the City can decide to hold a public hearing for a refunding bond, if they desire to hold one. Mr. Edminster noted that the resolution indicates that a pricing committee will be formed, consisting of the Mayor, Council Members and staff. When the time comes to sell the bonds, the pricing committee will decide to lock in on the refinance.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved that the Council adopt a Resolution (2014-052) authorizing the issuance and sale of not more than \$10,500,000 aggregate the principal amount of water revenue funding bonds; Series 2015; and related matters; and providing for an effective date. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken. Council Members Stanley, Meacham, LeMone, Boyd, and Andersen voted "Aye". The motion carried.

A) TO CONSIDER A MOTION ABANDONING THE CURRENT CIVIC CENTER PLAN AND DIRECTING STAFF TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY ACTIONS TO REMOVE PLAN FROM ALL FORMAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS. *Presenter: Attorney Petersen.*

Administrator Darrington explained that a couple of years ago, the City discussed a plan for future facilities. At the time, the Council wanted to hire an architect and develop a way for future facilities to be laid out in the downtown area. The facilities discussed included the Public Safety Building (fire and police), Library, City Hall and a Performing Arts Center. A couple of options were made available to the public through this process and a public meeting was held on the matter in April 2012. The two options had the same facilities with different layouts. Administrator Darrington identified the four-block plan in the downtown area.

Administrator Darrington stated that the public voiced general favorability of the four-block plan at the open house that took place in April 2012, and noted that about 300 people attended. The four-block plan precipitated discussions specifically on the Public Safety Building and staff and the Council decided to pursue the Public Safety Building as the first facility on the four-block plan. When the Public Safety Building was up for bond in 2013, the proposed location of the facility was on the corner of 100 East and Center Street.

When the bond didn't pass, other potential sites were discussed at the next planning session. Ultimately, staff and the Council decided to hire a consultant to go through the process of determining the logistics of the facility. Therefore, the proposal in 2014 was different than what was outlined in the original four-block plan. The Council decided at that point that the four-block plan either needed to be changed or eliminated. No formal resolution has been adopted, other than the Council requested that this item be part of a future planning document. Therefore, the Council needs to determine whether or not to remove the four-block plan from all formal planning documents.

Attorney Petersen added that staff was unsure as to whether or not the four-block plan was formally adopted in 2012. Tonight's action was to simply make a motion to abandon the plan and direct staff to make any necessary changes to the City's formal planning documents. It was noted that this plan is less formal than the vicinity maps, which were discussed earlier in the meeting. Administrator Darrington explained that the four-block plan was a vision for downtown Pleasant Grove, but because it was not formally adopted, flexibility was given for a shift in the City's vision.

Council Member Meacham asked if the City will need a new vision if this plan is abandoned. Administrator Darrington answered in the affirmative and remarked that the City will eventually want to revisit discussions regarding future facilities. He noted that a strategic plan for a city is updated about every five years, sometimes sooner depending on circumstances. Attorney Petersen pointed out that the four-block plan was never made part of the General Plan amendment. She explained that if had it been made part of the General Plan, it would have been more binding. Attorney Petersen presented a compilation of information that was provided by VCBO.

Administrator Darrington explained that when the City chose the location of the facilities in the four-block plan, the direction of the Council at the time was to start purchasing properties. There were three properties acquired for a little over \$500,000. Mayor Daniels concluded that the plan was significant enough that public safety impact fees were used for the acquisition of these properties. Council Member Stanley stated that there is value in having plans and a vision for Pleasant Grove. He remarked that the public has made a loud and clear statement that the City needs to have plans that are practical and realistic and anticipate the burdens they may place on the citizenry. He stated that alternative plans need to be determined sooner rather than later.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved that the Council abandon the current Civic Center Plan and direct Staff to take all necessary actions to remove plan from all formal planning documents. Council Member Boyd seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Greg Washburn representing the Blue Ribbon Committee commented that as a committee, they realize that this plan might not be the final plan. However, there is value for the City in owning certain properties.

Bill West gave his address as 48 North 1400 East, and was of the opinion that the City Council had previously made decisions on this matter with an insufficient amount of information. He stated that the City wasted a lot of money on real estate and that those funds cannot be recouped. He urged the Council to be more wise and careful moving forward. Mr. West felt that the majority of Pleasant Grove citizens do not want to see a downtown campus as was proposed in the four-block plan.

Mark Ryan stated his address as 1194 North 850 East, and remarked that there are some parts of the four-block plan that he liked. However, there are aspects of it that he disliked. He agreed with Mr. West that a lot of money has been wasted over the last six to 10 years. Mr. Ryan stated that he was adamantly against the four-block plan, and made several formal protests against it. He pointed out that a lot of money is being spent paying consultants who do not live in Pleasant Grove to provide ideas on how to develop the community. Mr. Ryan believed that more could be done to better involve the community in the planning and decision-making processes.

Drew Armstrong gave his address as 995 East Center and cautioned staff and the Council to be careful about divesting the City of the land that has been acquired. He expressed confidence that

with the current zoning, a decent profit can be made off of the properties one day. However, now is not the time to be looking to make a profit until a decision is made about the future. Mr. Armstrong stated that Provo City just went through a \$108 million bonding process with far less public input than that which has taken place in Pleasant Grove. He suggested that perhaps right now there are "too many cooks in the kitchen". The City has learned several lessons that will carry over into the future and sometimes education is costly. He was concerned that whatever plan is developed in the future they will end up in a video and be misconstrued by certain members of the citizenry.

Mayor Daniels thanked everyone for their support in moving the item along.

9) **ACTION ITEMS WITH PUBLIC DISCUSSION**

- A) **PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2014-44) TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY .2 ACRES FROM R1-20 TO R1-9 ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 900 EAST 100 NORTH; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. APPLICANT KIM SPRAGUE AND PLEASANT GROVE CITY. MONKEY TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD. Presenter: Director Young.**

Director Young presented the staff report and displayed an aerial map of the subject property. He noted that there are a couple of existing homes that face 100 North. According to the General Plan, the area within which the subject property falls is medium density residential. The permitted medium density residential zones include R1-8, R1-9 and R1-10. On the north side of the canal, low density residential zones are permitted, such as R1-12 and R1-15. The properties on the west and east sides are zoned R1-9, and the property to the south is zoned R1-10. Director Young noted that this item was reviewed by the Planning Commission who recommended approval. Furthermore, a subdivision plat was submitted and is currently being reviewed by staff.

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

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved that the Council adopt an Ordinance (2014-44) to rezone approximately .2 acres from R1-20 to R1-9 on property located at approximately 900 East 100 North; and provide for an effective date. Council Member Meacham seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken, with Council Members Andersen, Boyd, LeMone, Meacham and Stanley voting "Aye". The motion carried.

10) **DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR THE JANUARY 6, 2015 MEETING**

- a) **Presentation and discussion on the results of the City's Accessory Apartment Survey.**

Administrator Darrington noted that the results of the City's Accessory Apartment Survey will be discussed on January 6, 2015; however, a decision will not be made.

11) **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION – NO ACTION TAKEN:**

There were no further items for discussion.

12) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS

Several members of staff provided updates. Public Works Director, Lynn Walker, reported that the City is experiencing a lot of water leaks this time of year. Police Chief, Mike Smith, reported that for the City games, the Police Department did a service project. He then read a letter received by the entity that benefitted from the project.

Additionally, earlier in the year the Police Department entered into a contract with Everbridge for a mass notification system. When Everbridge made their proposal, it was proposed on a County-wide contract, and at the time it was not going to work. However, the County has contacted Everbridge about entertaining a contract again, and is proposing that Pleasant Grove join a group contract. This would equate to roughly \$2,000 to \$3,000 in savings per year. Chief Smith presented a letter of intent to be signed by the Mayor. Attorney Petersen stated that a formal action will need to be taken prior to the Mayor signing the letter of intent or any other contract.

ACTION: Council Member Boyd moved that the Council grant the Mayor permission to sign a letter of intent for the Pleasant Grove Police Department to entertain discussions for joining a County-wide contract with Everbridge. Council Member Meacham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Library and Arts Director, Sheri Britsch, noted that a couple of years ago, Mr. Dale Adams donated \$10,000 to digitize *The Pleasant Grove Review*. She stated that Mr. Adams lives in Park City and has family history in Pleasant Grove. With his donation, the library was able to digitize *The Pleasant Grove Review* from the years 1929 to 1947. About five months ago, Mr. Adams approached Director Britsch again, and offered to make another donation in matched funds. Director Britsch reported that she applied for a \$2,500 grant and was awarded the funds. The library now has \$7,500 in additional funds for this project.

Attorney Petersen reported that she is still waiting for comments from Christina Coronado on the Hammons agreement. The item will most likely be on the January 6, 2015, meeting agenda. Engineer Lewis informed the Council that there are two plats that will need to be recorded by the end of the year so he will be contacting the Council to come in and sign the plats when they are ready for signature.

13) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Mayor Daniels announced that there will be a Christmas gathering at Council Member Boyd's home. No items will be discussed and it will strictly be a social gathering. Mayor Daniels thanked everyone for their attendance.

14) SIGNING OF PLATS

There were no plats signed.

15) REVIEW CALENDAR

There were no calendar items to review.

16) EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL

COMPETENCE, OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL
(UCA 52-4-205 (1)(a))

Mayor Daniels called for a motion to go into executive session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual.

ACTION: At 8:30 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn into an Executive Session discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

ACTION: At 11:00 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to extend the meeting past 11:00 p.m. Council Member Andersen seconded. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

ACTION: At 11:15 p.m. Council Member Andersen moved to come out of executive session. Council Member Meacham seconded. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

ACTION: At 11:20 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn. Council Member Meacham seconded. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Council.

17) ADJOURN

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Minutes approved by the City Council on January 13, 2015.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

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