

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
March 3, 2015
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Michael W. Daniels

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

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Dean Lundell, Finance Director
Mike Smith, Police Chief
Dave Thomas, Fire Chief
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder
Clint Warnick, Recreation Manager
John Goodman, Street Superintendent
Degan Lewis, City Engineer
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 Member Meacham was not in attendance. He arrived shortly thereafter at 6:03 p.m.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Gary Yeates.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The opening remarks were given by Eric Jensen.

4) **APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Mayor Daniels informed the Council that Item 7A was to be continued to the March 10, 2015, meeting.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved to approve the agenda with Item 7A being continued to the March 10, 2015, City Council Meeting. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

5) **OPEN SESSION**

Prior to beginning the open session, Mayor Daniels informed the City Council that the meeting was being streamed live over the internet. Meetings would be available for viewing on the PG Citizens Facebook page, and on Youtube.

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

6) **CONSENT ITEMS**

a. **City Council Minutes:**

There were no minutes for approval.

b. **To consider approval of paid vouchers for February 23, 2015**

The consent items were reviewed.

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

7) **PRESENTATIONS**

A) **PRESENTATION OF THE 2015 BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT EXTRA MILE AWARD TO ALL AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT FOR THE EXCELLENCE OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW CULINARY CRAFTS BUILDING AT 515 WEST STATE STREET. **Continued to the March 10, 2015 City Council Meeting.***

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

A) **CONTINUED ITEM: TO CONSIDER APPROVAL OF ST. JOHN PROPERTIES' REQUEST TO DEVELOP LESS THAN THE REQUIRED 50% OF RETAIL USES IN ONE OF THE PROJECT AREAS IN THE GROVE INTERCHANGE SUBDISTRICT (PARCEL #1 ON MAP 2 "PROJECT AREAS" EXHIBITS TO 10-14-24-3) AND TO TRANSFER THE RETAIL USE REQUIREMENT TO PARCELS #2 AND #3 OF MAP 2. NOTE: SAID REQUEST IS PURSUANT TO THE TERMS OF LAND USE CODE 6500 IN THE PLEASANT GROVE MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 10-14-24-3. APPROVAL OF SAID REQUEST WILL EFFECTIVELY ELIMINATE ANY RETAIL USE REQUIREMENT IN PARCEL #1 AND INCREASE THE RETAIL USE REQUIREMENTS ON PARCELS #2 AND #3 TO A MINIMUM OF 68% OF THE TOTAL ACREAGE OF PARCELS #2 AND #3 (APPROXIMATELY 26.85 ACRES MINIMUM). *Presenter: Director Young (Continued from the February 24, 2015 meeting).***

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, reviewed the discussion from the previous meeting. It was reported that three parcels of land in the Grove Interchange Subdistrict are required to have at least 50% used for retail use. Administrator Darrington stated that the Code allows the Council to grant the applicant approval to consider the three parcels as one project area. If granted, the applicant would be able to use Parcel 1 as 100% office space. Parcels 2 and 3 would be required to have 68% used for retail use.

Administrator Darrington brought up two major concerns from the previous meeting. The first was to create an assurance that the change runs with the land. The Council feared that if the property was sold later, the new owner would attempt to go back to the previous zoning requirements, the Council and the City Attorney, Tina Petersen, wanted protection for the City. The second concern was the need to have a definition of retail written into a development agreement. Administrator Darrington commented that this has caused some issues. The solution presented the previous week was to create a Development Agreement outlining the responsibilities of St. Johns Properties. When drafting the agreements, staff encountered conflicts between the Code and the language in the Development Agreement. In spirit, they say the same thing, but the actual wording has the potential to cause a legal challenge. Administrator Darrington stated that the Code does not actually specify that 50% has to be retail and indicates that no more than 50% can be professional services. It had always been assumed that it has to be retail. Administrator Darrington commented that a bank, for instance, would count as retail in this case. He explained that the applicant is on a time constraint with this application, however, Attorney Petersen was out of town until the following Monday. The Council could make a decision on the issue or wait until they have her input next week.

A copy of the Code was provided to the Council Members for their information. In response to a question from Mayor Daniels, Administrator Darrington confirmed that the section with the potential for legal issues was Section 1.3 of the Development Agreement.

Council Member Boyd commented that banking seemed to be the only item on the allowed uses list that was not a sales tax generator. Community Development Director, Ken Young, responded that there were a few others on the list that weren't sales tax generators, including commercial service, professional schools, and convention halls.

Daniel Thomas from St. John Properties stated that the overreaching legal concern pertained to contract zoning. They did not want to get into trouble with the City by effectuating a document that changes the zoning. The applicant wants to remain consistent with the conditional use the City Council has already permitted in the zone.

Mayor Daniels asked what legal counsel suggested the language be.

Mr. Thomas responded that they intend to remain consistent with line 6500 of the Municipal Code and asked that the City Council grant approval to combine the three project areas into one area. They do not intend to change the use table or to change density.

In response to an inquiry from Council Member Meacham, Director Young presented a map that is part of the Municipal Code that shows the three parcels. The request was for the City Council to approve a combination of the three parcels into one project area, which is already permitted by the Code. This combination would allow the applicant to transfer the 50% retail anywhere

within the project area. Director Young stated that it may not be necessary to create a Development Agreement at all, because it is already specified in the Code. Mr. Thomas stated that their Legal Department agreed with that.

Mayor Daniels restated the proposal to be sure that the City Council understood the same thing. Director Young confirmed that the Code currently in place would dispel the need for a Development Agreement. The City Council needs to specify that the three parcels can be considered as the same project area. Administrator Darrington added that the list of uses should also cover the issues.

Council Member Boyd requested a clarification regarding the running of the land, in the case of future sales. Director Young confirmed that there would not be risk of that because of the current Code. Mayor Daniels expressed a desire for the applicant to present a Master Plan with their intentions for the area so that the citizens will be able to express their opinion on it.

Mr. Thomas remarked that St. John Properties believes there is a market for the 40 acres of retail along the subject area. He stated that they have great hopes for it but they would like to have a minimum of 50% retail to fall back on as the zone currently requires. Brandon Fugal stated that they are not seeking special treatment and just want clarification. Mayor Daniels asked if the request was to strike both of the previous requests and treat the three parcels as one project. Mr. Fugal stated that even if the developer fails to perform, granting the request would create a much better scenario for the City.

In response, Mayor Daniels asked what action needed to be taken. Administrator Darrington stated that item 8A needs to be approved and Item 8B discarded. Director Young and Mr. Thomas expressed their support. It was stated that Item 8A has already been approved by both attorneys but not by the City Council.

Council Member Stanley felt it was important to take into account that City Attorney Petersen felt the need to enter into a Development Agreement to guarantee the running of the land. He admitted that this might have been overly cautious but they should take her advice into consideration. Mr. Thomas reiterated that recording a Development Agreement would create issues down the road if the developer wants to modify, amend, or change the agreement.

Mayor Daniels and Council Member Stanley discussed the possible importance of having something more ironclad to ensure the running of the land. Council Member Boyd commented that City Attorney Petersen may have insisted on a Development Agreement to rest the fears expressed by the Council Members in the last meeting.

Council Member Meacham asked if further action needed to be taken to ensure that the three parcels are combined into one project area. It was confirmed that if the Council felt that further action needed to be taken, the issue could be brought back to the City Council to be put into the General Plan, but it wasn't necessary yet. Director Young insisted that the parcels could be considered combined whether it was reflected on the map or not. Mayor Daniels compared the issue to lot size averaging and stated that the City is still protected because of the verbiage in the Code.

Council Member Andersen was comfortable with all of the permitted uses listed except for one regarding short order eating establishments. A discussion regarding fast food establishments commenced. Administrator Darrington was not sure how to proceed but it was decided that no action could be taken tonight, but should be discussed again at a later date. Director Young commented that the City's intention was to have higher scale development in the subject area.

Before a motion was presented, Council Member Boyd expressed appreciation for Mr. Thomas coming to speak and answer the Council Members' questions. She reiterated the Mayor's comment regarding the Master Plan for the area. The intent was to present it to the citizens at a future date.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved that the Council approve St. John Properties' request to develop less than the required 50% of retail uses in one of the Project Areas in the Grove Interchange Subdistrict (Parcel #1 on Map 2 "Project Areas" Exhibits to 10-14-24-3) and to transfer the retail use requirement to Parcels #2 and #3 of Map 2. Note: Said request is pursuant to the terms of Land Use Code 6500 in the Pleasant Grove Municipal Code Section 10-14-24-3. Approval of said request will effectively eliminate any retail use requirement in Parcel #1 and increase the retail use requirement on Parcels #2 and #3 to a minimum of 68% of the total acreage of Parcels #2 and #3 (approximately 26.85 acres minimum). Council Member Meacham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Before moving on to Item 8B, there was a short discussion regarding Parcel 4, and its potential development.

B) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2015-07) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH ST. JOHN PROPERTIES; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved that the Council deny adoption of a Resolution (2015-07) authorizing the Mayor to sign a Development Agreement with St. John Properties; and provide for an effective date. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

9) ACTION ITEMS WITH PUBLIC DISCUSSION

There were no action items with public discussion.

10) DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR THE MARCH 10, 2015 MEETING

Note: Item 10 was discussed after Item 11.

The following items will be reviewed at next week's meeting:

- A) Presentation of the 2015 Business Development Extra Mile Award to All American Development for the excellence of design and construction of the new Culinary Crafts Building at 515 West State Street.

- B) Public Hearing to Consider a Resolution (2015-07) Authorizing the Mayor to sign a Quit Claim Deed correcting an easement that was incorrectly deeded to the City and deeding the property back to Nick and Maryann Matlock. Property located at approximately 1300 East Crystal View Drive; and providing for an effective date.
- C) Discussion of 4000 North Sewer.
- D) Discussion on Roads.

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

Note: Item 11 was discussed before Item 10.

A) DISCUSSION ON RECREATION CENTER USE POLICY.

Administrator Darrington explained that last year there was an issue with private coaches who were using the Recreation Center and providing paid services. To address this matter, a policy was created, called the Pleasant Grove Recreation Center Practice and Instruction Policy. The policy essentially states that if a team wants to use court space they need to make a reservation and pay a fee. Teams have taken advantage of this opportunity, because they struggle to find practice space elsewhere. It was noted that there are hundreds of sports teams in Utah County, so the City is trying to be accommodating and generate revenue, while not being completely overrun with teams and groups. Staff wants the general use of the facility to be for every day pass holders.

Staff ran into an issue a few weeks ago where a resident emailed the Mayor and Council. A coach brought in several of his players to run drills, use the weight room, and do some circuit training. This activity was against the aforementioned policy. Clarification wasn't made, however, and the coach was told that he was unable to bring his team in to the recreation center to run drills. The coach's argument was that if he pays the fee and all of the youth pay the fee, there shouldn't be a problem with them using the facility, just because they are an organized group. Staff responded that while they do not object to teams using the facility, they could run into a problem if 15 teams show up at the same time. The policy does allow for parents to run organized workouts with their children, however, there may be some inconsistency in what staff is trying to accomplish through the policy.

Administrator Darrington outlined five possible solutions. First, there needs to be a balance with regular patrons and organized team training. Furthermore, if teams are paying the fee to enter the facility, they should have the right to use it. The current policy is specific to the weight room and cardio machines, but not necessarily the gyms. Administrator Darrington explained that staff would like to maintain the gyms according to the guidelines set forth in the original policy. They are confident that if they open up the gyms for team practices, the facility will be overwhelmed by multiple organized practices at a time.

Another issue that has arisen is that occasionally a patron will come in and not be able to use the equipment because groups are doing organized circuit training. Therefore, Administrator Darrington presented solutions. First, he suggested that the City have a trial period for weight room or cardio room use. All complaints can be tracked, so that staff has an idea of what types

of issues arise. Next, workouts that occur in hallways or walkway spaces could be limited. One particular team sets up cones in the hallways and walk areas for the purpose of running drills, which Administrator Darrington pointed out can be problematic for foot traffic. The City also runs programs that are typically designed from the dance area down to the multipurpose room. Staff is trying to differentiate between the two scenarios. Administrator Darrington suggested that the track remain open to patrons only and that no organized teams be allowed to use it for practices. It was noted that when the policy was established, there was not an official resolution adopted by the Council. This allows flexibility so that the policy can be amended as needed.

Council Member LeMone wanted to steer clear of using terms such as "issues" and "overrun". The City wants business at the Recreation Center and she did not feel like they were being overrun by groups that want to use the facility. She emphasized that that's the purpose and intent of the facility in the first place. Council Member LeMone didn't see any problem with allowing teams to use hallway space for drills. In fact, she pointed out that some of the workout classes taught at the Recreation Center occasionally use the stairs for circuit training. She agreed that if there are problems or complaints, they need to be addressed. She felt that directing teams to the multipurpose room was appropriate; however, if teams want to run sprints on the track, they should be able to use it. If patrons are paying the same fee as everyone else, they should be able to use the facility. Council Member LeMone encouraged staff to be welcome to the business, because they aren't any different than any other paying customer.

Council Member Boyd expressed concern with use of the hallways. She stated that if using the hallways for drills doesn't become a problem, she was open to the idea. Council Member Boyd also asked if crowding in the hallways would cause problems in the event of an emergency. Administrator Darrington replied that it could potentially be a problem. He explained that if this is a violation of the Fire Code, staff does not need to question whether to allow teams to use that space. If, however, there aren't any issues as far as the Fire Code is concerned, staff can craft specific rules.

Council Member Stanley stated that the last time he exchanged emails with the aforementioned resident, the gentleman indicated that he would not be able to attend tonight's meeting. Council Member Stanley wanted to be sure that staff has been working closely with the resident to arrive at a solution. Administrator Darrington responded that he hadn't spoken to the resident since their initial discussion. Staff wanted to review the policy and get Council feedback before contacting him. Council Member LeMone mentioned that she previously notified Administrator Darrington of a follow-up email she sent to the resident the previous week. Council Member Stanley stated that the proposal is great and agreed that a trial period makes a lot of sense. Administrator Darrington stated that staff can have a formal policy written up by next week.

Council Member Andersen remarked that she loves trial periods. She also stated that she loves to have kids running on the track faster than her because it helps motivate her. Therefore, she wouldn't limit usage of the track and would like to have it at least partially open to organized team practices.

Council Member Boyd commented that staff can approach coaches if there are any problems that arise between teams and regular patrons. Common courtesies of using the Recreation Center should be exercised. Council Member LeMone reiterated that no paying customer of the Recreation Center should ever be turned away. Administrator Darrington explained that staff

doesn't like to regulate and create policies for everything and if common courtesy is exercised, most concerns should be alleviated. Occasionally a policy is helpful as a reference point in specific instances. Administrator Darrington liked the idea of starting broad with the least amount of restrictions. If issues and complaints start consistently occurring, then the policy can be revisited. Council Member LeMone agreed with Administrator Darrington, and remarked that she has never observed any major issues as a patron.

A comment was made that individuals behave differently than a group of children. Some teams pay to use the gyms at the junior high and high schools. However, it is less expensive to go to the Recreation Center than to rent out the gym at the junior high for one hour a week. Council Member LeMone stated that there are requirements in place for groups that need to rent out courts, such as having renters and/or liability insurance. Mayor Daniels added that there hasn't been anything that has been suggested that can't be managed through safety and operating procedures. Furthermore, he didn't think it would be a good idea to create at a Council level all of the rules and regulations on a department-by-department, facility-by-facility basis. Administrator Darrington stated that this particular matter came before the Council because the resident sent an email to the Mayor and each member of the Council.

Council Member Boyd commented that the Recreation Center is an integral part of the community, and she agreed with Council Member LeMone that people shouldn't be turned away. It was noted that a copy of the policy is available at the Community Center and Recreation Center. A gentleman from the audience remarked that the policy is meant to represent over 30,000 citizens. There have been many people who have had to comply with the regulations set forth, and now, just because one person raises an issue, the City is faced with changing the entire policy.

Mayor Daniels asked if it would be a reasonable request to turn the management of the policy back over to staff. Administrator Darrington answered in the affirmative and explained that staff will manage it to the best of their ability. They are united in the goal of having as many patrons use the facility as possible. Mayor Daniels pointed out that the taxpayers are paying for the facility and should, therefore, be given first priority. Subsequently, anyone who buys a pass is expected to comply with the rules, which are designed to protect everyone.

B) DISCUSSION/CLARIFY PARAMETERS FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING COMMITTEE.

Mayor Daniels explained that the last conversation on the matter was in regard to a method for determining the members of the Public Safety Building Committee and the level of involvement from the City Council. A determination was made to formulate a group that would hold public meetings, and any member of the public would be welcome to attend. The committee would then determine the best method for getting input from the community. In the last discussion, the Council decided to shy away from creating multiple committees and subcommittees. Rather, decisions would be made at the level of the newly formed Public Safety Building Committee, who would then make recommendations to the Council.

Mayor Daniels explained that he has given the general makeup of the committee some thought over the past few weeks. He suggested modifying the size of the committee, so that it is comprised of nine members: three members who have been strongly in favor of the Public Safety

Building, three members who have strongly opposed, and three who are neutral. The possibility was discussed of randomly selecting individuals who fall into each category to comprise the committee. It would be assumed that the names being submitted are people who have already expressed a desire to participate or they have been recommended and/or accepted the recommendation to participate in the committee. The Mayor would then manage the group to ensure that it functions and fulfills its purpose. At the last meeting, an agreement was reached that no artificial deadline be set of when the proposal would come forward. The main purpose of the committee would be to properly vet all options so that staff and the elected officials are completely prepared to discuss with the public whatever suggestions are brought forward. Anyone who would like to be on the committee will be able submit their names to the Mayor who will make an assessment of matter.

Council Member Andersen suggested that the neutral members of the committee be outside citizens. Mayor Daniels remarked that he hadn't considered this option. Council Member Andersen added that they haven't received the engineers report yet and she would like a third party neutral survey to be conducted. She remarked that it is difficult to determine the committee's primary objective without this information.

Council Member Stanley asked for an update on the RFP process. Administrator Darrington replied that the mandatory walk through will be next week and that proposals are due by April 2. Nothing will be submitted until after the walk through. The bidding will take place through Bidsync.

Council Member Boyd recalled that at the retreat, the Council discussed proceeding after the RFP is completed, as the information from the RFP will provide direction. She asked who will interview the groups that will perform the evaluation. Administrator Darrington explained that the Council will determine how to evaluate the proposal. Staff, the elected officials, and the committee members will all be able to evaluate the information. Mayor Daniels recommended that the Council entrust the committee with evaluating the information and come back to the Council with specific recommendations. He felt that the Council should primarily remain in the decision making role.

Council Member Meacham explained that once staff goes through the RFP process and a selection is made by the committee, the study results will follow approximately three months later. He stated that the committee needs to be willing to evaluate the RFP. Many of the members will be non-technical, first time individuals reviewing an RFP. Guidelines on how to evaluate the information will need to be established. Mayor Daniels explained that the community is interested in having members of the public, including Council Members, participate in a collaborative process of assessing the need and possible solutions.

Council Member Meacham asked for clarification on the action of the committee. He asked if tasks will be developed and assigned to individual committee members who will then evaluate each task and report back to the Council. He felt this was similar to creating a subcommittee.

Mayor Daniels remarked that there have been pros and cons of what has taken place over the past two years and this proposal is a compromise to get people at the table who don't necessarily agree. The hope is that by the time the process is complete, everyone will come forward with one voice. Council Member Stanley echoed his hope for this outcome. Council Member

Meacham replied that uniting the citizenry has been the intent with all actions that have taken place up to this point. Mayor Daniels explained that the committee will bring opposing voices together and hopefully remove the political burden and put the outcome back into the hands of the people. The decision will ultimately come before the Council, but the work will be done by the committee.

Council Member LeMone stated that she would also like a third party survey to be conducted to determine why people voted against it or didn't vote at all. She also wanted to know the process by which names will be added to the hat and how citizens will be informed that they can participate. Mayor Daniels indicated that people who will want their names thrown in the hat are those who are regularly attending meetings on the matter. Furthermore, they are those individuals who watch meetings via live stream, and read the meeting minutes afterwards. He noted that there have been a core group of people who have spoken out through social media. Council Member LeMone added that the invitation to participate should also be extended via the City's website. Mayor Daniels agreed that this would be a great idea.

Council Member LeMone proposed that there be a minimum number of people who can put their name in the hat, so that the results aren't stacked when they are randomly selected. Mayor Daniels commented that he was contacted by several interested individuals after the last discussion that took place three weeks ago. Council Member LeMone asked if they will be able to know whose names are going in the hat. Council Member Boyd saw no reason this would not be possible.

Chris Berg remarked that people outside the City will not want to attend the meetings because it will be of no interest to them. Rather, he was under the impression that there are enough neutral citizens in Pleasant Grove who can get involved.

Staff explained that the Council Members will be able to attend the committee meetings and be able to put their names in the hat if they want to be on the committee. The only stipulation is that there cannot be more than two Council Members on the committee. Furthermore, all meetings will need to be publicly noticed.

Mayor Daniels suggested that the committee be formed prior to obtaining the results of the RFP and engineering studies. When the committee is dedicated to the cause, there is no predisposition on what needs to be decided. Council Member LeMone stated that the level of commitment needs to be outlined for the committee members prior to them consenting to participate. Citizens need to understand that if they can't meet the time commitment, they should not participate. Mayor agreed with Council Member LeMone, and stated that this will establish continuity.

There was discussion regarding the voting process. Council Member Andersen mentioned a local company that conducts public surveys. A survey could be taken regarding voters' concerns expressed during the last Public Safety Building proposal. Council Member Andersen remarked that it will be difficult for her to trust someone's self-declaration of neutrality. Mayor Daniels redefined what it means to be neutral. He explained that there were a number of people who were actively and passionately involved in the process last year but did not ultimately make up their minds until Election Day. Mayor Daniels concluded that the biggest concern is that of the makeup of the committee. Council Member Stanley expressed didn't have any concerns at this

point and commented that the proposal as presented is logical. He wanted to see a workable solution.

Greg Warburton expressed concerns that the committee will set a precedent that allows the community to act as the City Council. Council Member Stanley made it clear that the proposal does not change the structure of local government. In his mind, the value of the Mayor's proposal is that the City will recruit vested, committed individuals to come forward and find unity in a solution.

Council Member Andersen was not in a rush and felt they were moving toward a deadline last year. She explained that there were a lot of people in the community who voted against last year's proposal and don't want to be approached on the matter again. Hence the intent of the survey is to find out what deterred residents from supporting last year's proposal. Council Member Stanley pointed out that there will be costs associated with the survey and echoed a previous comment from the Mayor that there will be some answers they will never be able to obtain. Council Member Andersen disagreed to a certain extent and felt the citizens' could be better measured. Council Member Boyd expressed a desire to ensure that the process is as transparent as possible. Along with Council Member Andersen, Council Member Boyd stated that she was not in a hurry this time. Council Member Stanley suggested receiving comments from the public on the matter.

Matt Godsey gave his address as 1060 East 1100 North and explained that while the RFP will provide a lot information, there is so much more that has to happen on the front end in order to prepare to analyze an RFP. He recommended that the committee be formed immediately, so that when the RFP comes out the group will have the ability to analyze it properly. Otherwise, they will face significant delays.

Furthermore, with regard to knowing whose names are in the hat, Mr. Godsey was indifferent but he pointed out that people cast votes anonymously. Mr. Godsey considered himself neutral but stated that there needs to be a better definition of what that means. For example, he realizes that there is a need, but he didn't like the cost associated with previous proposals. He recommended that the committee have some sort of understanding of construction and what a community building project will entail. He did not feel that having outside individuals will be beneficial, because they don't have a vested interest on the matter. Therefore, they won't be able to contribute and give substantial input. Those who want to voice their opinion will attend the committee meetings.

Council Member LeMone thought it would be important to know whose names are in what hat for the purpose of remaining open and transparent. Furthermore, the meetings will be public, and people need to feel comfortable with the process from the very beginning. Council Member Meacham asked if everyone who applies to be in the hat will get to have their name submitted. Mayor Daniels replied stated that they will not. Council Member Boyd stated that being neutral does not equate to being ignorant on a subject.

Gary Yeates gave his address as 1225 Nathaniel Drive and was of the opinion that neutral people will not benefit the committee, but rather provide an opportunity for the deck to get stacked. Mr. Yeates reviewed the common reasons why citizens voted against the last proposal and felt that having representation from the two opposing sides would be the most beneficial.

Chris Berg gave his address as 2038 North 1560 West. Mr. Berg believed there is a huge neutral population in Pleasant Grove. He explained that everything comes down to money, which is the biggest hang-up for residents. The key to success is not convincing people on the committee whether or not they are for or against the Public Safety Building. It should instead be about convincing the citizenry that this is the right thing to do. This objective was what has been lacking in the past, although last year the City got closer to the goal. Mr. Berg spoke about the importance of moving forward, even if not everyone agrees entirely. He pointed out that the vast majority of citizens didn't attend meetings still cast votes. It is important to know who will potentially be on the committee, because it is part of the public process.

Shane Pierce gave his address as 2360 North 1050 West. Mr. Pierce believed there was a chance of stacking when trying to categorize participants into a neutral category. He had not met anyone who doesn't believe a solution needs to be reached. He agreed that it might be more effective to have a committee comprised only of those individuals who identify with one side or the other.

Amy Lindstrom gave her address 1160 East 100 North. She felt that a true neutral would simply be someone who didn't cast a vote. Anyone who went to the ballot voted for one side or the other for a specific reason. She reiterated that everything comes down to money. The committee might discover again that it costs a certain amount to construct the facility. She suggested inviting people who want to be on the committee to put their names in the hat and then have the Council narrow it down. On the other hand, she also pointed out that once the screening process begins, the element of transparency and randomness may be lost.

Ms. Lindstrom made reference to the budget retreat discussions and asked why there is such a rush on the project. She felt that all of the information should be gathered first, and subsequently a committee can be formed. Ms. Lindstrom was of the opinion that the Public Safety Building Committee is the exact same thing as last year's Citizens Committee, which didn't work in the end. Last, Ms. Lindstrom explained that while she supports the Public Safety Building, she will not support a facility that is poorly constructed or not built for the right price.

Council Member LeMone asked what the purpose of screening people is, if citizens know beforehand the level of commitment required for participation. Mayor Daniels explained that the Council is interested in having passionate people who are willing to be part of the process and have demonstrated that they are willing to stick with this over time through the thick and thin. Council Member LeMone acknowledged that screening would need to occur in order to make things even; however, she was concerned that this may take away from openness and transparency.

Greg Warburton stated his address as 779 East Center Street and asked what precedent has been set in the City for a secondary committee to decide something as important as this project. In response to Mr. Warburton's inquiry, Mayor Daniels alluded to the Centennial Project, which took place many years ago. At the time, the community decided to adopt it. Mayor Daniels volunteered to head the committee, and then reported through a Council Member, who in turn reported back to the Council. There were 12 individuals who were selected to chair the different areas of responsibility for the project and over the course of one year they spent time planning and analyzing what needed to be done. Volunteers and donations were solicited and approximately 6,000 people showed up over a nine-day period to construct the facility with

about \$500,000 in donations. Mayor Daniels noted that these individuals all came from the same group of people who are showing up the meetings about the Public Safety Building. The Mayor strongly believed that Pleasant Grove is comprised of passionate people who are willing to get involved in a public cause that will benefit everyone. The same people can hold each other accountable for expenses, legal issues and guidance. The Mayor stated that no tax dollars were required for the Centennial Project. When a project is placed on the ballot, citizens are asked to donate their finances to make the project happen. Citizens have the right to vote for or against it.

Mr. Warburton spoke about his property taxes and wanted to know when last time the percentage rate was adjusted. Administrator Darrington explained that staff does not know the last time property taxes were raised at the instigation of the City Council. However, the issue has come up twice because of the swimming pool general obligation bonds, which were issued in the early 1990s. Other than that instance, the Council has not instituted property tax increases.

Mr. Warburton remarked that there aren't very many dollars that have been saved and a lot of effort went into saving what is needed. He asked why the tax rates can't simply be increased, so that the City can have a little bit of savings and not have to bond for everything. Mayor Daniels recalled that this same question was raised 2 ½ years ago when the Council opted to pursue an MBA Bond, which effectively would have been a tax increase. He noted that the citizens spoke out in droves against this proposal. The next year, the Council entertained a GO Bond, which was placed on the ballot for the public vote.

Realizing there is a need for money, Mr. Warburton asked if there is any drive from the Council to pursue a tax rate increase. Mayor Daniels explained that there are two major ways of bringing money into the City; property tax and sales tax. There isn't enough money collected in either fund to allow sufficient surplus to fully fund the project. Hypothetically, the City could shut down all operations for five years and then maybe have enough money to complete this project through sales and property tax revenues. Mayor Daniels then explained how sales tax is distributed. He stated that even if the Council raised the property taxes, the community would have a public voice in an open forum on the matter and a mechanism would be put in place to reverse the process. There was about a \$2 million savings difference between the GO bond and the MBA bond in interest rates alone.

Blaine Thatcher gave his address as 120 North 1400 East. Mr. Thatcher was of the opinion that the City is losing sight of the purpose of the committee. He was less concerned with the potential of stacking the committee and expressed confidence in the abilities of the Mayor and Council to appropriately select a group of individuals to fulfill the task. Mr. Thatcher stressed that the real purpose is to get data and information in order to make a recommendation to the elected officials on how to proceed. He was under the impression that the Mayor and Council are afraid of collecting more data. He expressed support in either updating the current facility or constructing a new one, whichever option seems to be the most appropriate based on data. In general, Mr. Thatcher was supportive of the Mayor and Council and their abilities as elected officials.

Council Member LeMone emphasized that the process by which data is collected and analyzed is crucial. Last year, the Council was accused of not being transparent in their method of organizing the Citizens' Committee. She explained that openness and transparency has been the primary issue over the past two years. Mr. Thatcher disagreed. He felt the Council should be

more focused on the purpose of the committee, which is to collect and analyze data. In his opinion, how the committee is formed is less relevant of an issue. Council Member LeMone rebutted that if the citizens don't trust the organizational process, there are accusations of flawed data as well.

Council Member Andersen argued that in order to make a fair assessment, all data needs to be collected. Council Members Boyd and Meacham echoed previous comments by agreeing that the organization process is vital. Council Member Meacham added that there was plenty of data presented in previous years; however, the data was not validated because of the initial process of how it was selected. For this reason, the Council was taking a more hands-off approach, so that the method of data collection is acceptable to the general public. Council Member Andersen implored the public to be patient with the Council on this very important matter.

Mayor Daniels pointed out that there are very strong figures who have represented both sides of the debate in past years. These citizens influenced both the increase in the number of voters who turned out, which was an additional 1,800, and changed the results from a 70/30 in 2013 to 52/49 in 2014. It would be beneficial to have these same citizens participate in the data evaluation process, which is why Mayor Daniels felt inclined to make his recommendation.

Jason Hunter gave his address as 680 East 300 North and questioned whether or not there is neutral ground on this issue. There have already been two years of committees, and every year the public has been divided. Mr. Hunter expressed compassion for the Council because they have been tasked with the responsibility representing many different ideas. Mr. Hunter explained that projects can always be done with less or more money. The public needs to agree on the type of building they want to construct; whether it is built to last 10, 20 or 100 years. Mr. Hunter said that people can spin information any way that they want, and reiterated his lack of assurance that there is a neutral ground on the matter.

Mayor Daniels redefined the term "neutral", by explaining that it allows a person to see both sides of the argument and hold both parties accountable to the rationality that something needs to be done. He felt strongly that a neutral voice is needed.

Karl Coon commented that after participating in the process for the past two years and seeking to be part of the solution, he is saddened by this meeting. He argued that the massive trust divide still exists. Furthermore, he stated that there is an even bigger problem with the fact that the Mayor is being held back from his ability to act as the City's CEO. Mr. Coon was of the opinion that nobody is allowing the Mayor to truly lead the ship, which is why he was elected. He explained that he has voted against both proposals but would be supportive this time because he is committed to finding a solution. Mr. Coon implored those present to let the Mayor lead to the best of his ability and have faith that Mayor Daniels will do what he committed to doing as a write-in candidate.

Jacob Sutch gave his address as 291 South 300 East and commented that as a resident he has felt very underrepresented in this process. The Council has generally been very in favor of this building and while they have been very open to discussion, he doesn't feel like they have been actually listening to the concerns presented. Mr. Sutch felt the new process is irrational, and does not believe that randomness equates to transparency. He preferred that the most qualified people move forward, rather than a randomly selected committee. Mr. Sutch noted that this

particular method would never occur in any other selection process for committees in the City. He was of the opinion that the Council would be wise to step back and let the Mayor make a decision. He disagreed with the idea of drawing names out of a hat.

Mr. Sutch remarked that there was a record voter turnout last year because of the committees in the community. While he was personally against the proposal, he still invited his neighbors to attend the Council Meetings to hear what the elected officials had to say on the matter. He stated that the Mayor was elected and Council Member LeMone interjected that all of the Council Members were also elected to address the City's needs. Council Member Boyd added that the American form of government allows everyone to have a vote. The Mayor and Council all work together and support each other. There was discussion about previous year's processes and the reason for the idea of a randomly selecting a committee for this year.

Stan Smith gave his address as 362 North 2000 West. Mr. Smith noted that he lives on the outskirts of town and he was contacted by different groups to put signs on his property, which he allowed. Mr. Smith had heard from other people that \$1 less than \$10 million would generate enough public support to construct the facility. Mr. Smith also felt that the building shouldn't be built downtown.

Mr. Smith explained that he attended the meeting in early August 2013, and that the City still wasn't listening to what the citizens are saying, which is to construct the facility for less. He reiterated that if the City wants to build the building and have public support, it has to be built for under \$10 million. Mr. Smith was confident that the project can be done for this amount, and believed the building should be located in the new development, where the fire and police departments can have better access. He didn't believe the City should sell properties to fund the project. Mr. Smith noted that Mayor Daniels is where he is today because he sat in that same meeting on August 7, 2013, and publicly voiced that the Council at that time was being irresponsible. Last, Mr. Smith encouraged those present to go back and reread the minutes from that meeting.

Note: The City Council took a break from 9:08 to 9:22 pm.

Drew Armstrong gave his address as 995 East Center Street and explained that he didn't vote for all of it what was being proposed but he did vote for much of what was presented. As a whole, he trusted that the Council represents the citizens of Pleasant Grove. Mr. Armstrong noted that the elected officials won their elections, which means they each got the majority of the vote in their respective races. Three weeks earlier when discussing the possibility of this year's committee, the Council could have shut the whole idea down but didn't. They displayed the will and ability to move forward.

Mr. Armstrong explained that two years ago he voted against the proposal because he felt that the price tag was too high. Last year, however, he voted yes. He was of the opinion that finding neutrality is difficult and, similar to other comments made, does not necessarily believe that it exists. Mr. Armstrong stated that it is important to look for people who are willing to listen, compromise, and gather data. One method of gathering data is to finish the RFP because there is no point in gathering data unless there is professional input. Last, Mr. Armstrong stated that he trusts that the Mayor and Council will do the right thing for Pleasant Grove. He expressed appreciation for their service to the community.

Jennifer Baptista gave her address as 32 North 1300 East and noted that she has been involved for both years. She got pulled into the process and has been heartbroken by the results. She explained that the miscommunication and lack of information has caused a divide among the citizens. Everyone has a question that needs to be answered, and she only got involved because people were asking her questions. She was prepared to make a decision until she had obtained her answers. Regardless of whether the questions being asked are for or against the Public Safety Building, they are still important questions to voters. Everyone has a right to vote and they should not be categorized. Ms. Baptista declared that she is not the type of person who deliberately causes problems for which she will have to apologize for later. Rather, she tends to be safe and not support a cause unless she is completely willing to put her name and reputation behind it.

Ms. Baptista remarked that Mayor Daniels was a write-in candidate because she personally asked him to run for office; she subsequently became his campaign manager. Mayor Daniels ran because he saw a divided City, and was saddened by it. He wanted to give the citizens options and bring everyone together. The public has, however, continued to tear things apart and become more divided. Ms. Baptista attended the retreat and spoke about how she feels, despite being challenged. She remarked that if the Council wants to do the same things they have done in the past, they should not expect a different result. She continued that the ultimate goal is to bring everyone together and believed that drawing names randomly out of a hat will not bring unity to the City. The lack of unity is caused by profound problems, including a lack of trust with both sides refusing to listen to one another. Ms. Baptista asked what the purpose of the committee will be and if they will do the same things that have been done for the past two years. She suggested putting those people who disagree the most together in a meeting to hash out their issues. Her opinion was that otherwise a bond will never pass. The fight is between the citizens and they need to decide if they are willing to pay for the project. Last, Ms. Baptista emphasized the need for transparency and community involvement.

Debbie Hong gave her address as 992 East 100 South. She pointed out that everyone has been battling this discussion for hours. She called for a truce and suggested leaving the issue for a while. She believed it would be wise to give the matter six months for both sides to calm down.

Jack Freeman gave his address as 450 East 100 North. He remarked that there are plenty of people who like the existing buildings and don't want new ones. The question was whether or not to build a new Public Safety Building at all. If the answer is no, the answer of how to move forward is simple. Everyone has a right to their own opinion, regardless of whether they are right.

Mr. Freeman informed the Council that they need to indicate to the citizens whether or not the Public Safety Building is even necessary and then make a decision. Currently there are citizens who are wondering why a new Public Safety Building is needed. Once the Council indicates that they plan to pursue a Public Safety Building, it becomes an issue of cost. Mr. Freeman commented that a lot of emotions have been expressed about whether or not the City is even going to build the facility. It is the authority of the Mayor and Council to make this declaration. Professionals have indicated through studies that a new facility is needed because the current one is insufficient. The next discussion pertains to renovation of old facilities versus constructing new facilities, and the location of any new buildings.

Mr. Freeman remarked that he has sat in on a lot of court sessions and he suggested the Council observe a case sometime. The judge is calm and listens to both sides, similar to how the Mayor and Council respond to citizen concerns. Emotions are often high in court cases and Mr. Freeman noted that recently he sat in on a session for two hours as a witness was questioned. Despite escalated emotions, the judge still had to make a fair assessment. Likewise, the Mayor and Council were elected to make difficult decisions based on fair assessments, just like the judge has to make tough decisions.

Darold McDade gave his address as 671 South 1500 East and encouraged all to listen to Mr. Freeman's remarks. He stated that Mr. Freeman truly has the best interest of the City in mind. Mr. McDade agreed that the elected officials should make a decision about whether or not to build the Public Safety Building. Once the decision is made they should stick with that decision. The project doesn't have to take place in its entirety this year or next. There are good, fair people who can serve on the committee and everyone who is present at the meeting is there because they care. Last, Mr. McDade stated that the Mayor and Council are doing a great job, and he thanked them for their service.

Amy Lindstrom remarked that there is more peace in the room following Mr. Freeman's remarks. Ms. Lindstrom felt that the random selection idea was a good method for this year's committee. Last year, the plan was debunked because the Council was accused of stacking the debt. She noted that there will be people who are for or against every suggestion that has been made. She continued that in speaking with Bruce Chesnut, he suggested taking the issue off of the table for six months or more. It is difficult to come to a good decision when emotions are high and there is no harm in taking the issue off the table until everyone has a more level head.

Eric Jensen inquired about the time frame of the RFP. Administrator Darrington explained that the proposals are due by April 2. Staff has asked as part of the proposal process that each firm specify an estimated study period within their respective proposals. This will be criteria that will be assessed when deciding on the firm. Mr. Jensen thanked the Mayor and Council for their service and expressed appreciation for what they do for the City. He also spoke about the importance of respecting one another and acting civilly.

Mayor Daniels asked the Council if throughout this discussion they changed their position on whether or not to begin the research process and look into things that are critical for the health and safety of the Public Safety personnel. He asked if they want to postpone any work on the project or if they prefer to continue with the committee as previously explained.

Council Member Meacham preferred to take a break. Realistically, he did not see the RFP and study coming out until June or July. By the time it is processed and evaluated, it will be too late to take action this year. Council Member Boyd seconded Council Member Meacham's feelings and appreciated of how the tone of the meeting had evolved. She apologized to Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Sutch for being short in her communications with them. Overall, Council Member Boyd felt good about waiting to move forward.

Council Member Stanley explained that the message he received at the end of the last vote was that the citizens do not want to see the Council take no action at all. The vast majority of the City felt there are real needs that need to be met, especially with regard to discussions about the possibility of buildings collapsing in the event of an earthquake. The City should be planning

and moving forward and citizens want to know what the plan is for solving the problem. Council Member Stanley stated that it is not necessary to have artificial deadlines but he did not want unofficial delays either. He expressed an eagerness to address the problems and try again. Council Member Stanley was respectful of the need for healing and remarked that Pleasant Grove is made up of tremendously wonderful people on both sides of the issue. People genuinely care about one other and want to see things work.

Council Member LeMone suggested that an informal get together take place in order for everyone to get to know each other on a more personal level. She commented that citizens are still attacking each other and she did not feel that shoving everyone in a room again in a formal public meeting to hash things out will benefit anyone. Council Member LeMone did not want to unnecessarily prolong the process and pointed out that progress continues through the RFP.

Council Member LeMone apologized for being feisty and outspoken and stated that she will defend her opinion and beliefs. She acknowledged that her interactions can occasionally be negative and explained that this is not how she wants to interact with citizens. Council Member LeMone stated she did not want to battle anymore because no progress is being made. She concluded that the process by which the matter was addressed a third time will determine its success. She was in favor of slowing down and noted that it has only been six months since the bond. She felt it was time to let the dust settle.

Council Member Andersen asked Mayor Daniels if the discussion had influenced his thoughts on inviting neutral participants to join the committee. Mayor Daniels still believed that having a neutral point-of-view was a good idea. He suggested that the Council allow the Mayor to select and run the committee, and felt that the 3-3-3 ratio of public opinions would be a safe approach. Council Member Andersen asked Mayor Daniels what he sees happening on the committee past the RFP and through the study period.

Mayor Daniels explained that there is a need to bring people to the table who are both passionate and level-headed about the direction that needs to be taken. For example, he recently spent two uninterrupted weeks with his wife far away from Pleasant Grove. He recalled that there were moments throughout the trip when he looked at her expressions, and thought that she was angry with him. Upon asking her what was wrong she indicated that she was simply contemplating which souvenirs to buy. He used this example to explain that a change of expression and a change in the management of the decision making process altogether will help the City continue to make progress on something that may or may not be life threatening to the personnel who protect Pleasant Grove citizens every day. Mayor Daniels pointed out that the individuals who feel that they are passionate on the issue but refuse to find common ground and compromise with those of differing opinions, are probably not the people who are going to help find the solution.

In the end, the Council, as well as previous councils and a large group of citizens, have all expressed that there are needs that have been kicked down the road too far. The community may be in dangerous situations. Pleasant Grove does not want to be a City that one day finds out that they should have done something and didn't. The committee will determine to what extent work needs to be done. Mayor Daniels remarked that this is not about the Mayor, Council, or the people in the room. It is about the current issues that need to be addressed and a determination of needs to be made as to whether or not these issues can wait. He explained that sometimes our view is so narrow that we become clouded on an issue. It was his belief that the process that has

been outlined is an appropriate way to address the concerns raised. As Mayor, he was asking for support, and was willing to do whatever the Council asks of him.

Council Member Andersen commented that she loves creative solution spaces. Today has proven that there is a lot of work to be done. She observed that there is still a lot of anger directed at the elected officials and felt that more kindness has been expressed in smaller groups. Council Member Andersen expressed sadness and stated her belief that as a Council, they can be trusted.

Mayor Daniels was pleased with the changes he has observed with the current Council since his re-election. Everything that has occurred has been a step forward. He has witnessed compromise and heard discussion between Council Members that he didn't think was possible. He has seen hearts softened, egos dropped, and sacrifices made. Furthermore, he observed similar occurrences between citizens on all sides of the issue. Mayor Daniels had great hope for the City of Pleasant Grove and believes that as a community they can resolve the public safety issue peacefully. He urged everyone to continue to move forward and set emotional differences aside. He spoke about the importance of focusing on what is right and not who is right.

Council Member Boyd remarked that the Council isn't arguing about whether to move forward. She simply believes that they need more time and should take a break from this issue. Council Member LeMone agreed and pointed out that this has been a non-stop topic for the past 2 ½ years. She suggested taking a break until the RFP comes back and then go from that point. Council Member LeMone alluded to a previous comment made by Mayor Daniels by expressing that those present are the ones who are affecting the success or failure of the project.

Council Member Stanley voiced his support and was 100% supportive of moving forward. He did not want to wait and believes that forming the committee and moving forward will be part of the healing process. Council Member Andersen commented that her heart says to slow down but her head says to keep going. She felt that a resolution will naturally take time. She did not feel the same urgency as Council Member Stanley but felt that six months might be excessive. Council Member Meacham was okay moving forward with the committee. However, he did not expect them to engage for quite a few months. He agreed with Council Member Stanley that perhaps creating the committee will provide an opportunity to bond or heal.

Mayor Daniels concluded that the Council has received a lot of input from the citizens on a variety of subjects. He observed that everyone is nervous about charging forward haphazardly and inadvertently creating a bigger problem than what existed previously. The Council was trying to be more deliberate in the process of forming a team with a clearer understanding of their responsibilities and ensure that citizens are represented on both sides.

Council Member Andersen asked in what forum the individuals would be selected at random for the committee. Mayor Daniels wanted to entertain the idea of forgoing the random selection and see if the Council would allow him to appoint committee members at their advice and consent. Council Member LeMone refused to do that and did not want to be put in that position. She was not comfortable talking about specific people in a public forum and being accused for the third year in a row of stacking a committee or choosing people against one another. She strongly favored selecting committee members at random. There was discussion about whether or not the Mayor would determine the names to put in the hat or if interested individuals will submit an

application. Mayor Daniels suggested that the names not be revealed, because otherwise they will have to be discussed in an open forum. It was noted that noticing will occur through every media outlet.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to continue the meeting past 11:00 p.m., as necessary. Council Member Meacham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Mayor Daniels remarked that there were still a lot of unanswered questions. He believed, however, that there is a way to achieve transparency, dignity, fairness, and get everyone to make the right choices. While everyone may not agree on everything that takes place, as elected officials they will know what the citizens want because they will have spoken. All of the options will have the chance to be vetted and all the costs will be known.

Council Member Stanley stated that the discretion of an individual is impossible to remove from the equation, because it is critical. He pointed out that for every other committee that is formed, the Mayor proposes a group of people, he chairs the group, and the Council votes. Mayor Daniels agreed that this was a good idea, because it goes back to how the process was originally designed. Individuals do not need to be discussed one at a time but rather, a list will be presented, and the Council will vote on the entire list at one time. Mayor Daniels emphasized that everyone will be given the opportunity to apply for a spot on the committee, regardless of their qualifications. The Mayor will present names based on the advice and consent of the Council. There was further deliberation on the matter. An informal vote was taken. Council Members Boyd, LeMone, Meacham, and Andersen were in favor of moving forward with selecting committee members at random by way of a hat drawing. Council Member Stanley preferred not to conduct a drawing but agreed to be amenable with whatever the group decides.

Debbie Hong remarked that some people who won't budge on their position, no matter what. She asked if there would be any way to turn down certain applicants, to allow groups the ability to move forward. Currently, the Mayor was the one who will make those judgment calls. The process was further reviewed.

12) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS

NAB Chair, Libby Flegal, commented that Mayor Daniels is a good Mayor. She had missed very few meetings in 20 years and was involved with community work prior to moving to Utah. She had never observed anything like this before.

Director Young reminded those in attendance that they are still seeking an Alternate Planning Commission Member.

13) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS

Council Member Meacham asked if anyone else was concerned about the secondary water situation this summer. Staff replied that there will be a presentation on this issue on March 17. He noted that the snow on Timpanogos has dropped sharply in the last three weeks, and is not picking up even with the most recent storms. Staff mentioned that the City will have some

carryover water as well. Last, Council Member Meacham announced that he will not be at next week's meeting.

Council Member Andersen expressed interest in having a conversation about making food courts available at the interchange.

Mayor Daniels stated that what was accomplished tonight, as little as it may seem, will be what makes the difference in years to come in terms of communication and openness. He thanked everyone for their participation.

14) SIGNING OF PLATS

There were no plats signed.

15) REVIEW CALENDAR

There were no further calendar items to review.

16) ADJOURN

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

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 11:19 p.m.

Minutes of March 3, 2015 meeting were approved by the City Council on March 31, 2015.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

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