

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
October 07, 2014
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Council Members:

Dianna Andersen
Cyd LeMone
Ben Stanley
Jay Meacham –Mayor Pro-Tem

Excused:

Mayor Daniels
Council Member Boyd

Staff Present:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
David Larson, Assistant to the City Administrator
Deon Giles, Parks and Recreation Director
Dean Lundell, Finance Director
Degen Lewis, City Engineer
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Marc Sanderson, Fire Chief
Ken Young, Community Development Director
Lynn Walker, Public Works Director
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director
Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech
Libby Flegal, NAB Chairperson

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

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved that Council Member Meacham serve as the Mayor Pro-Tem for this meeting only. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

1) **CALL TO ORDER.**

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

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Don Paas.

3) **OPENING REMARKS.**

The opening remarks were given by City Administrator, Scott Darrington.

4) **APPROVAL OF AGENDA.**

Administrator Darrington informed those present that Item G would not be discussed tonight.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved to approve the agenda as written, with the removal of Item G. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

5) **CONSENT ITEMS.**

- a. **City Council and Work Session Minutes;
City Council Work Session Minutes for the August 28, 2014 meeting.
City Council Minutes for the September 9, 2014 meeting.**
- b. **To consider for approval Change Orders No. 1 & No. 2 for Allied Construction Inc. for the FY 2013-14 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.**
- c. **To consider for approval Change Order No. 3 and Partial Pay Request No. 2 for Cody Ekker Construction for the FY 2013-14 Culinary Water Improvements Project.**
- d. **To consider for approval of paid vouchers for (September 23, 2014).**

The consent items were reviewed and discussed.

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

6) **OPEN SESSION.**

Council Member Meacham opened the Open Session.

Administrator Darrington reported that staff met with the Utah Taxpayers Association (UTA) the previous Friday regarding the upcoming GO Bond that will be voted on at the upcoming election. He explained that UTA is a group funded by various businesses and individual citizens. They are a "watchdog" over various State, County, and City tax increases by researching the issues. Administrator Darrington stated that most of the time, they voice opposition to proposed tax increases.

Senator Howard Stephenson, who formed the group years ago and the organization's current President, along with two of his staff members, approached the City about the Public Safety Building project. They toured the facilities, asked questions about the bond process, and were given the informational brochure that was distributed at the public hearing on September 16. Administrator Darrington reported that they were very impressed with the information provided and were flabbergasted at the condition of the current Public Safety facilities. Senator Stephenson and his staff agreed that the City needs a new building. Furthermore, while UTA is typically opposed to any tax increases, they endorsed the bond proposal for Salt Lake City's Public Safety facility.

Senator Stephenson relayed to City staff that if the building gets funded, UTA has a third-party architect who can review the plans to see if there are any cost savings missed in the process. Administrator Darrington stated that staff is on board for having a third-party review the design plan prior to construction. In the end, the Utah Taxpayers Association endorsed the bond by way of an official statement signed by Senator Stephenson. Administrator Darrington read the statement to those in attendance. Moving forward, UTA would like Pleasant Grove City to distribute their statement in a press release.

Council Member Stanley remarked that this is good news. Mr. Paas suggested the City send out a mailer for citizens who don't have internet access. NAB Chairperson Libby Flegal inquired as to how mailers are sent to multi-family dwellings. Administrator Darrington explained that the City has a list of every mailing address in the City that includes approximately 11,600 addresses. Council Member LeMone voiced concern with the timing of making the statement public. Administrator Darrington agreed that it is a sensitive issue.

Council Member Meacham closed the open session.

7) **BUSINESS.**

A) **PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2014-38) AMENDING THE PLEASANT GROVE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN REGARDING THE REMOVAL OF A PLANNED ROUNDABOUT AT THE INTERSECTION OF 1000 SOUTH AND LOCUST AVENUE. (SCRATCH GRAVEL NEIGHBORHOOD) Presenter: Engineer Lewis.**

City Engineer, Degen Lewis, presented the staff report and explained that staff received a request from the neighboring property owner, Johnathan Bushnell, to remove the roundabout from the Transportation Master Plan. The matter was discussed about one year ago when Clark Evans was developing his property. The staff report included a letter written by Mr. Evans who voiced his support for having it removed. Mr. Evans owns property in Lindon. In order to develop his property 1000 South must be constructed.

Engineer Lewis continued that Mr. Bushnell is concerned with the amount of property that would be required as part of the exaction for creating the roundabout. The Planning Commission reviewed the request on September 11, 2014, and recommended the City Council deny the proposed removal of the roundabout at the intersection of 1000 South and Locust Avenue from the City's Transportation Master Plan with a 4-to-2 split vote.

Engineer Lewis presented drawings of the roundabout concept and property impacts, as well as an aerial photo of the subject property. He explained that a traffic circle or roundabout is an alternative intersection design that will handle more traffic with less delay than a four-way stop. The current Transportation Master Plan identifies several intersections where traffic volume is expected to be high enough to make a traffic circle an option. These are also locations where it is expected that traffic will not increase to the level where a traffic signal would be recommended or warranted. A four-way stop will provide for a safe intersection but will cause more traffic delays than would be expected with a traffic circle. It was noted that 1000 South will ultimately connect with 1200 East in Lindon, which continues south into Orem as 400 East. This provides a continuous collector class

street from the south end of North County Boulevard at State Street to the eastern portions of Pleasant Grove, Lindon, and Orem.

While additional property will be required to construct a traffic circle at the proposed location, it is typical for roadway system improvements to require additional rights-of-way. Failure to plan for a traffic circle could potentially increase the future cost of construction. If traffic volume increases to a point where a four-way stop is undesirable, a traffic signal may be the only other option. A signal is expected to be more expensive and the anticipated future traffic does not warrant a traffic signal. Therefore, a traffic circle provides an option to address the gap between a signal and a four-way stop. Based on the build out population and traffic volume anticipated at the intersection of Locust and 1000 South, a traffic circle will provide a better level of service than a four-way stop.

City Attorney, Tina Petersen, described the terms of exacting property from a development, and noted that the amount is determined based on the impact the development will put on the City's road system. She explained that for the City to ask a single lot owner to dedicate 5,003 square feet for free to install a roundabout would be unfair; therefore, the City would be required to pay for the property. Normally, developers are obligated to install all of the required street improvements. However, in this case the property needed for the roundabout exceeds the burden the development is placing on the City's system.

In response to a question from Council Member Meacham, Attorney Petersen noted that the developer would not be responsible for any of the roundabout improvements. They would, however, be responsible for the improvements to Locust Avenue. Negotiations were ongoing regarding 1000 South. Engineer Lewis added that the Planning Commission reviewed the matter in detail and ultimately their vote on the issue was not unanimous. The roundabout would cost around \$100,000, not including a right-of-way purchase. Engineer Lewis explained that the time frame would be determined by the purchase of the additional right-of-way. Council Member Meacham expressed concerns relative to safety. There was further review of the aerial photo of the subject property.

Council Member LeMone inquired as to the advantages of constructing a roundabout rather than a four-way stop. Engineer Lewis explained that a roundabout will operate at a higher level of service than a four-way stop. He also mentioned a roundabout study that provides an overview of the pros and cons of installing roundabouts. It was noted that the proposed roundabout is 130 feet, which is larger than the minimum required space of 110 feet. Engineer Lewis explained that the larger radius was designed for larger trucks, which are anticipated to go through the area. It was noted that the subject property is within the R1-9 zone, and the two lots comprise more than 18,000 square feet.

The applicant, Johnathan Bushnell, explained that the roundabout would create very little buildable space, making the homes on the lots very tall and narrow. Furthermore, access from the southeast corner would be difficult. Therefore, his biggest concern was how to develop the property if a roundabout is installed.

Council Member Meacham opened the public hearing.

Jennifer Baptista gave her address as 32 North 1300 East. She expressed concern with master plans being used for what could potentially happen rather than what exists. She was of the opinion that in these cases, the property owners are being held hostage because they are unable to properly develop their property. Ms. Baptista stated that she does not like roundabouts and felt they can increase

rather than decrease speed. She voiced her preference for stop signs or stop lights. Ms. Baptista referred to a recent Planning Commission Meeting where the issue was discussed and stated that there could potentially be legal action taken. Last, Ms. Baptista expressed concern that the City is discussing potential plans without considering such things as additional possible expenditures, funding, and legal actions.

Planning Commission Chair, Scott Richards, gave his address 4354 North 900 West and explained that the Planning Commission examined the issue from several perspectives, including the property owner and the City. He is neutral on roundabouts and noted that he has seen cases where they have and have not worked well. He believed their success depends on the location.

Mr. Richards explained that the Planning Commission reviewed several different options, including the proposed roundabout being smaller. In comparing the two sizes, there wasn't a significant decrease in the amount of property needed. He also noted that currently there isn't a significant traffic issue on Locust Avenue. However, as properties to the east and in Lindon develop the situation could change. The Commission also looked at the option of installing a four-way stop and where accesses into the property would be located. Upon reviewing this option, several traffic issues were identified. Last, Mr. Richards indicated that he understands Mr. Bushnell's perspective, as well as the points brought up by Ms. Baptista. With regard to possible legal action, Mr. Richards commented that the recommendation made by the Commission can be reviewed by the City Attorney.

The Council asked the applicant what actions he would like to see. Mr. Bushnell replied that he would like to see the roundabout removed altogether. He remarked that he is stuck until the matter is finalized.

There were no further public comments. Council Member Meacham closed the public hearing.

Council Member Stanley commented that he does not like making changes to the Master Plan and acknowledged the public's concerns. Furthermore, Council Member Stanley expressed his confidence in the Planning Commission's judgment.

Attorney Petersen provided a historical overview of the correspondence between the City and the applicant. Originally, the City intended to require Mr. Bushnell dedicate the necessary property for the roundabout for free. Mr. Bushnell, however, felt that this would create a disproportionate impact on his property. Therefore, he sought assistance from the private property rights ombudsmen. The previous week, an informal mediation was held to further review the matter. Attorney Petersen was of the legal opinion that if the City decides to keep the roundabout, they will need to compensate Mr. Bushnell for a portion of his property, as outlined on the roundabout concept drawing.

Council Member LeMone stated that the matter has been discussed on several occasions and she had enough information to make a decision. She was of the opinion that the City would be encroaching on Mr. Bushnell's property and it doesn't make sense to install a roundabout in this particular area. Furthermore, she explained that there are other options available. She was in favor of removing it from the Master Plan. Council Member Andersen inquired as to the projected amount of traffic. Engineer Lewis explained that it is difficult for a model to predict numbers where there isn't a road. He noted that the roundabout was suggested primarily for the level of

service. Other roundabout options were discussed, such as a mini-roundabout. A mini-roundabout would be installed in an existing four-way intersection and would not push the circle out because the corners wouldn't need to be removed. Council Member Meacham remarked that he would like to see additional options and noted that roundabouts are intended to slow down traffic.

Council Member Andersen expressed her support for roundabouts. She lives between two, four-way stops and traffic is constantly backed up in front of her house. She was also concerned for the property owner and stated that she would be fine with a four-way stop for this particular area. Council Member Stanley pointed out that the roundabout was on the Master Plan at the time the applicant purchased his property. He agreed that there may be more options and suggested that quantifiable numbers on cost of land acquisition and costs associated with different right-of-way options would be helpful to consider prior to making a decision.

Council Member Meacham added that it would be helpful to understand the different levels of service. She agreed that more defined costs for each option are needed. Council Member Andersen echoed comments made by Council Members Meacham and Stanley. She also requested that staff collect traffic information for the intersection at 200 South and 300 East to compare the two intersections. Engineer Lewis stated that in two weeks staff can provide estimates on the cost of the land acquisition from Mr. Bushnell and compare roundabout sizes.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved that the Council continue Ordinance (2014-38) to October 21, 2014, with the understanding that in the interim, staff will investigate the items requested by the Council. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

B) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2014-39) AMENDING SECTION 10-14-21-1C, PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL USES, ADDING LAND USES #1511 HOTELS, AND #1512 MOTELS AND MOTOR HOTELS, AS PERMITTED USES IN THE GROVE COMMERCIAL SALES SUBDISTRICT. (SAM WHITE'S LANE NEIGHBORHOOD) Presenter: Director Young.

Community Development Director, Ken Young, presented the staff report and explained that a few months ago, there was discussion regarding the opportunity for motels and hotels to be permitted uses in the Grove Zone. They are currently only allowed in the Interchange Subdistrict. The City decided not to allow motels and hotels as permitted uses in the Grove Zone and were working with a hotel and convention center company and identified a need to limit opportunities for competition. However, now that the City is no longer in that particular arena, there has been some interest expressed on the matter, particularly by Evermore Park who would like to add a hotel as part of Phase III of their development. It was suggested to the City allow hotels and motels in the Grove Commercial Sales Subdistrict.

When the Commission reviewed the matter on September 11, 2014, they determined that adding hotels and motels would be in harmony with the goals and intentions of the General Plan for the Grove Zone, but that motor hotels should be excluded. A motor hotel is an older type of lodging that normally has a small number of units where vehicles park directly in front of the unit door. It was also determined that allowing hotels and motels would provide more economic development opportunities for the City.

Council Member Meacham opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Council Member Meacham closed the public hearing.

ACTION: Council Member Stanley moved that the Council adopt Ordinance (2014-39) amending Section 10-14-21-1C, Permitted and Conditional Uses, adding land uses #1511 Hotels, and #1512 Motels, excluding Motor Hotels, as permitted uses in the Grove Commercial Sales Subdistrict. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken, with Council Members Andersen, LeMone, Stanley, and Meacham voting "Aye". The motion carried.

C) DISCUSSION WITH GROVE CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT REGARDING A POTENTIAL ASSISTED LIVING CENTER ON 100 EAST AND MAIN STREET (ALLRED PROPERTY). Presenter: Director Young.

Director Young presented the Council with an aerial photo of the Allred property, which was adopted as an appendix to the General Plan. A proposal was submitted to the City that steers away from that vision. The applicant requested an opportunity to present their proposal to the Council directly. Director Young explained that if the Council is favorable to their proposal, an amendment to the aforementioned General Plan appendix would be needed. The site plan was presented.

Mark Stevenson identified himself as the Project Architect and was present representing the applicant. In reviewing the site plan, he explained that the applicant is proposing to maintain retail and residential development along Main Street. They would like to take the infill area and build two buildings comprised of approximately 9,500 square feet each. A significant amount of landscape would be included and the proposed site would be a secured assisted living facility. The applicant also discussed with staff the possibility of maintaining the trail system throughout the project. Mr. Stevenson noted that the trails would be configured to the west, to prevent them from going through the middle of the development. Additionally, the site plan includes construction of wrought iron fencing around the entire development, which will be very visually appealing in the downtown area. Mr. Stevenson asked for input on the City's architectural requirements.

Joe Gephardt identified the various project phases shown on the site plan. He noted that Phase I will consist of approximately 9,600 square feet and feature 18 bedrooms. He explained that a fountain, two ponds, and a stream between the buildings will also be included in this phase. Additionally, there will be glass atriums on both sides of the property. Level one will be assisted living and level two will be a two person transfer. Phase II will be an additional 9,000 square feet with a meandering path in the back. This unit will be a memory loss unit with 18 bedrooms, for patients with Alzheimer's or dementia, and will be locked down. Mr. Gephardt noted that there are no other similar facilities in the area. The facility will have plenty of parking including 20 stalls in the lot and another 10 on the side street. Phase III will consist of four commercial units. Mr. Gephardt stated that it will be the premiere building in the downtown area. The commercial units will include uses such as bistros, barbershops, beauty salons, etc., and will be first class.

In response to a question from Council Member LeMone, Mr. Gephardt explained that the businesses will cater to the assisted living facility with respect to amenities. He noted that the development will essentially be "a city within a city". He stressed that Pleasant Grove doesn't have facilities like this one, and it will benefit the residents. Council Member LeMone pointed out that

there are 250 senior housing units coming to Pleasant Grove. Mr. Gephardt stated that this facility will primarily be for individuals who are handicapped, disabled, or suffer from memory loss, and is unrelated to senior housing. He referenced the Handicapped and Disabled Act of 1968, and noted that these types of facilities can be placed anywhere as long as there are no CC&Rs. Attorney Petersen asked for clarification on the site plan that was presented.

Council Member Stanley commented that this is a unique development for the City and is a valuable service. He felt this project was worth considering and encouraged Messrs. Gephardt and Stevenson to move forward. Council Member Andersen agreed that the proposed development is classified as a medical, rather than residential project. She stated that her father has Alzheimer's and she would like to move her parents to Pleasant Grove. Council Member Andersen suggested that the retail be put in earlier than the last phase of the project. Mr. Gephardt explained that the total project will cost around \$3.7 million. The first two phases will generate the revenue needed to construct the last phase.

Mr. Gephardt explained that kitchens will not be included in the facility because it is for patients who have memory loss. Therefore, there will be a separate cooking facility where food will be prepared and then delivered to the residents. Council Member Andersen referred to previous comments made by Council Member LeMone and expressed concerns about potentially giving away an opportunity to keep the downtown area more of a hub or gathering place. Director Young summarized the applicant's inquiry of whether the Council is willing to entertain a proposed amendment to the General Plan. The Council responded in the affirmative.

D) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2014-032) AMENDING THE PLEASANT GROVE CITY'S CONSTRUCTION STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS MANUAL; FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPDATING CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS AND CIVIL REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPROVEMENTS AND OTHER MINOR UPDATES, AS REQUESTED BY THE CITY ENGINEER. (CITY WIDE) Presenter: Engineer Lewis.

Engineer Lewis explained that staff is recommending that the City's minimum sidewalk size be modified from four feet to five feet. A four-foot sidewalk is not wide enough for two people to walk side-by-side. The Public Works Department made an additional recommendation to change the minimum thickness of the sidewalk from four inches to six inches. The two changes combined will double the amount of concrete needed for sidewalks. In researching the matter, staff collected information on the sidewalk requirements in neighboring cities and found that the requirements vary.

Council Member Meacham asked why the City should change the minimum thickness to six inches. Engineer Lewis explained that the additional thickness will help prevent sidewalks from getting broken. He added that the minimum thickness for driveways is also six inches. Council Member Meacham asked what the City's experience has been with sidewalks cracking within the warranty period. Engineer Lewis replied that heavy equipment can cause cracking. He rarely sees sidewalks crack due to a construction defect. Staff was of the opinion that six-inch concrete would be able to better sustain an auxiliary truck used for loading sheet rock and similar materials. Engineer Lewis noted that in a new subdivision 40% to 50% of the sidewalks need to be replaced.

Staff explained that between thickness and width, width is more important. Council Member Meacham commented that if there is proper compaction, cracking shouldn't be a problem. Council Member LeMone asked if the City or property owner is responsible for fixing broken sidewalks. She concluded that she was not in favor of the proposed amendments. She stated that there isn't any evidence suggesting that doubling the amount of concrete will solve the problems as described.

Public Works Director, Lynn Walker, added that driveways are the citizens' responsibility. Furthermore, if a citizen is responsible for the sidewalk breaking, they are also responsible for repairing it. For example, if a property owner plants a tree near a sidewalk and the roots grow up and break the cement, they are liable. Council Member Andersen liked the proposed five-foot width but wanted to maintain the four-inch thickness. Alternatively, Council Member Stanley preferred the proposed six-inch thickness over the proposed width of five feet.

Engineer Lewis presented a drawing of the street lighting standard. Currently, the City requires street lighting at intersections at the end of cul-de-sac on a knuckle. Additionally, street lights are required mid-block when the distance between one of the required locations exceeds 500 feet. Engineer Lewis stated that this is insufficient pedestrian lighting and suggested that more comfortable lighting would be spaced 100 to 150 feet apart. He explained that currently the City does not have a budget for new street lights. He noted that they cost around \$1,900 to \$2,100 to install depending on how far away they are from the power source. Engineer Lewis commented that several citizens expressed concerns with the City's street lighting. Street lighting is a City expense unless the Council decides to hold new developments to a higher standard. Currently, the City pays about \$8.50 a month per street light, and light replacements are completed by Rocky Mountain Power at staff's request. Engineer Lewis described the level of urgency for each proposed revision at the request of Council Member LeMone.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved that the Council continue Resolution (2014-032) to a date certain of October 14, 2014, in order to review and discuss additional proposed revisions. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

E) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2014-043) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO DECLARE A 1994 PIERCE ARROW FIRE TRUCK VIN # 4P1CA02S0RA000751 AS SURPLUS AND DIRECTS THAT IT BE DISPOSED OF ACCORDING TO THE CITY'S POLICY FOR DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PROPERTY, AND PROVIDE FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. *Presenter: Chief Sanderson.*

Fire Chief, Marc Sanderson, explained that a few months ago, the Fire Department purchased a fire engine that is currently in the process of being refurbished. A decision was made to have Fire Trucks Unlimited broker the 1994 Pierce Arrow truck. Chief Sanderson explained that because the current apparatus is 20 years old, it has very little value. Staff initially anticipated getting \$25,000 to \$35,000 for the truck. However, in speaking with Mark Hales, who travels around the State as a salesperson for Russ Equipment, staff learned that Mr. Hales has been in the process of brokering a deal with Stockton, Utah. Stockton is located in Tooele County and is in need of a fire truck. Mr. Hales, who was the Chief of Purchases for Pleasant Grove City at the time the 1994 Pierce Arrow truck was purchased, was aware of the truck's condition and knew that the market value was higher than what Fire Trucks Unlimited was offering Nationwide. The Town of Stockton has since come

to an agreement with the City to purchase the truck for \$50,000, which was a deal facilitated with the aid of Mr. Hales. Chief Sanderson stated that the truck is in great condition, and has been well-maintained.

Council Member Meacham asked if this action meets the City's policy for disposing of surplus equipment. Attorney Petersen answered in the affirmative.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved that the Council adopt a Resolution (2014-043) authorizing the Mayor to declare a 1994 Pierce Arrow Fire Truck VIN # 4P1CA02S0RA000751 as surplus and direct that it be disposed of according to the City's policy for disposing of surplus property, and provide for an effective date. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Stanley, LeMone and Meacham voting "Aye". The motion carried.

**F) DISCUSSION ON SOLID WASTE AGREEMENT EXTENSION. *Presenter:*
*Administrator Darrington.***

Administrator Darrington explained that staff recently met with Reece DeMille from Republic Services, who provides the City's solid waste and recycling. In 2010, the City added a recycling program, with the option for citizens to opt out. A few years later, both the solid waste and recycling agreements were established with both to expire at the same time. Both of the contracts are set to expire next June. Republic Services provided options to extending the contract for three or five more years.

Mr. DeMille explained that Republic Services can offer Pleasant Grove more competitive pricing with a longer extension. For a three-year extension, which would expire on June 30, 2018, the pricing would remain the same and Republic Services would waive the contract and price increase scheduled to take effect on July 1, 2015. This would save the City approximately \$16,000 per year. If the City opts for a five-year extension, Republic Services can lower the current price by \$.10 per home, per service, on July 1, 2015. This would save the City approximately \$16,500 per year with the current home count, for a net savings of over \$91,000 over the course of a five-year period. Furthermore, the City would not see a price increase on either rate.

Alyssa Dailey, Community Relations Manager for Republic Services, explained that they are working with neighboring cities to develop a 12-month recycling communication program for each City to use through media outlets such as websites, Facebook pages, newsletters, etc. The program works to educate citizens on what is actually happening with their recycling. Research shows that people are more apt to be involved in a recycling program if they are educated on its purpose and reasoning. Ms. Dailey stated that she is happy to set up a recycling education booth at Pleasant Grove events, and was open to suggestions from staff and elected officials on ways to customize the program specifically for the City's residents.

Council Member Meacham asked Mr. DeMille when he will be presenting the agreement to the City. Mr. DeMille replied that the addendum has been written and is ready to be approved on the City's timetable. Attorney Petersen noted that the matter would need to be listed as an agenda item and publicly noticed prior to a decision. Council Member Meacham inquired on staff's recommendation. Administrator Darrington reported that Republic Services provides a great service to the City. There have been few complaints and any complaints are rectified quickly. He

stated that the contract extension length will be the Council's decision, however, he noted that the cost savings for the City will be greater if they lock in for the full five years.

The Council discussed the options, and came to a general consensus to pursue a five-year contract. Council Member Stanley asked if the Council would be willing to discuss other opt-out options for the recycling service. Administrator Darrington replied that the City owns the opt-out option for residents, and it is, therefore, not the responsibility of Republic Services. He explained that staff and elected officials can re-visit their policies for opting out of the recycling service. He noted that the issue will be added to the agenda for the October 21 Council Meeting.

G) DISCUSSION ON CEDAR HILLS SEWER LETTER. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington *Item continued to a date uncertain.*

H) Discussion Count wide Fire Services. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington*

Administrator Darrington explained that a couple of years ago, the Lone Peak Fire District, which comprises the cities of Highland, Alpine, Cedar Hills, American Fork, and Pleasant Grove City, entered into a study regarding the consolidation of fire services. As part of the process, a consultant was hired to determine if it would be worthwhile. Once the study was completed and distributed to the various Fire Chiefs, there was not a good consensus on whether to consolidate services. However, some communities expressed interest in pursuing this option. Pleasant Grove was invited to join the discussion.

Administrator Darrington explained that one option would be to create a fire district that would become its own entity, with a board comprised of Council Members from each participating city. One of the downsides to joining a district is that the City would give up local control. One advantage is to consolidate for the purpose of sharing equipment.

Council Member LeMone asked how this would affect the proposed Public Safety Building. Administrator Darrington replied that the new facility is needed regardless of whether or not Pleasant Grove becomes part of a new district. Council Member LeMone pointed out that joining a district could have potential cost savings for the City. Both Administrator Darrington and Chief Sanderson agreed. Council Member Meacham asked if the level of service would change by joining the district. Chief Sanderson stated that it will because new staffing arrangements would need to be made.

I) DISCUSSION ON MEETING SCHEDULE FOR THE REST OF THE YEAR. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington.*

Administrator Darrington reviewed the meeting schedule for the remaining portion of the year. The meeting dates were listed as follows:

- October 14: Work Session Meeting.
- October 21: Regular Council Meeting.
- October 28: Special Public Meeting, as required by State Law.

Administrator Darrington explained that during the Special Public Meeting, the Council and any citizen who wishes to attend, will hear the pros and cons of the Public Safety ballot proposition. This meeting will be more formalized than the meeting held on September 16, as an allotted amount

of time will be given to each side of the debate. Attorney Petersen explained that a new statute was recently enacted, called the Ballot Transparency Act. Pleasant Grove is the first municipality to hold a GO Bond election under this new statute and there are still several unanswered questions on the requirements that need to be met for the Special Public Meeting. Staff was working closely with the Lieutenant Governor's Office to understand these requirements. Essentially, an equal amount of time must be given to both sides of the debate.

- November 4: Election Day.
- November 5: Work Session Meeting.
- November 11: Veteran's Day.
- November 12: Regular Council Meeting.
- November 18: Work Session Meeting.
- November 25: Staff recommended cancelling this meeting, as it is the Tuesday before Thanksgiving.
- December 2: Regular Council Meeting.
- December 9: Work Session Meeting.

Staff recommended the Council only meet the first two weeks in December, unless there is a pressing item. A regular schedule will then commence at the start of 2015.

Mayor Pro-Tem Meacham called for a motion to go into the RDA meeting.

ACTION: At 8:50 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn as the Pleasant Grove City Council and convene as the Pleasant Grove Redevelopment Agency. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

ACTION: At 9:01 p.m. Council Member LeMone moved to adjourn as the Pleasant Grove Redevelopment Agency and reconvene as the Pleasant Grove City Council. Council Member Stanley seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8) NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS.

Scott Richards, Planning Commission Chair, reported that they have approached a few individuals regarding the vacant position on the Commission. He explained that the position will be filled by way of recommendations and an interview process.

Administrator Darrington thanks all those that came to the Chili cook off competition for the City games and noted that the Recreation Department got the most points. He then said that we are trying to do one or two activities a month.

Council Member LeMone questioned if the boards that were used at the open house for the PSB have been put up at the Recreation Center yet. Administrator Darrington replied that they have not been put up yet but he will get that done. A discussion was held about the changes that need to be made to the City website regarding the PSB information.

9) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS.

The Council requested that staff post the letter from the Utah Taxpayers Association on the City's website. Attorney Petersen informed the Council that UTA has written a very nice article in their own newsletter about the bond as well. Administrator Darrington planned to write a press release the following day and take information directly from the UTA website and use their endorsement quote. He would also obtain a quote from Mayor Daniels.

10) SIGNING OF PLATS.

There were no plats signed.

11) REVIEW CALENDAR.

There were no calendar items to review.

At 9:10 p.m. Mayor Pro-Tem Meacham called for a motion to go into executive session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation. The Council then took a 5 minute break before going into executive session.

12) EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION. (UCA 52-4-205 1 (c))

ACTION: At 9:15 p.m. Council Member LeMone moved to go into executive session to discuss pending or reasonable imminent litigation. Council Member Andersen seconded. The motion passed unanimously with the consent of the Council.

PRESENT:

Council Members:

Dianna Andersen
Cyd LeMone
Ben Stanley
Jay Meacham –Mayor Pro-Tem

Excused:

Mayor Daniels
Council Member Boyd

Staff Present:

Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Barbara Johnson, Planning Tech

Mayor Pro-Tem Meacham called for a motion to come out of executive session.

ACTION: At 9:36 p.m. Council Member LeMone moved to come out of executive session. Council Member Stanley seconded. The moved passed unanimously with the consent of the Council.

ACTION: At 9:37 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to authorize Administrator Darrington to proceed as discussed in executive session. Council Member Andersen seconded. The motion passed unanimously with the consent of the Council.

13) **ADJOURN.**

ACTION: At 9:37 p.m. Council Member Stanley moved to adjourn. Council Member Andersen seconded. The motion passed unanimously with the consent of the Council.

Approved by the City Council on November 5, 2014.

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder

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