

**Pleasant Grove City  
City Council Regular Meeting Minutes  
January 16, 2018  
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:

Mayor: Guy L. Fugal

Council Members: Dianna Andersen  
Eric Jensen  
Cyd LeMone  
Lynn Walker  
Todd Williams

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

Others: Randy Sant, Economic Development Consultant

The City Council and Staff met in the Library at 30 East Center Street, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

---

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

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

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Scout Jake Roper.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The opening remarks were given by Council Member Jensen.

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

Administrator Darrington reported that Item 9D would be continued to February 6, 2018. An Executive Session was also needed at the end of the regular meeting.

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

5) **OPEN SESSION**

Mayor Fugal opened the Open Session. There were no public comments. The Open Session was closed.

6) **CONSENT ITEMS**

- a) **City Council Minutes:  
City Council Minutes for the January 2, 2018 Meeting.**
- b) **To Consider Approval for Approval Pay Request No. 6 for Dry Creek Structures LLC for the Walker Tank and Pump Station Project.**
- c) **To Consider Approval of Payment Approval Reports for (January 9, 2018).**

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

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

*There were no appointments.*

8) **PRESENTATIONS**

*There were no presentations.*

9) **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- A) **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2018-1) AMENDING CITY CODE CHAPTER 18: OFF-STREET PARKING STANDARDS BY ADDING A SECTION ALLOWING VERTICAL PARKING LIFTS AND OTHER AUTOMATED PARKING STRUCTURES TO SATISFY PARKING REQUIREMENTS; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (MATTHEW FLINDERS APPLICANT) Presenter: Director Cardenas (Continued from the January 2, 2018 Meeting).**

Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, presented the staff report which included a copy of the proposed text amendments, as well as accompanying images. He explained that the properties with frontage along Main Street, particularly between Center Street and 100 South, have retained their historic charm, with some buildings date back to the early 1900s. When the

properties were originally developed, automobiles were not as prevalent as they are today. As the properties are redeveloped, parking challenges are presented. The proposed text amendment is a creative solution for off-street parking that will help answer this question. An application for the proposed Code amendment was received by the Community Development on October 11, 2017.

The applicant was requesting that a new section be added to Chapter 18: Off-Street Parking Standards. This chapter regulates the size, number, and layout of off-street parking for all zones. A few zones have parking requirements that differ from this chapter, but for most zones, this chapter is the go-to guide for parking requirements in Pleasant Grove. The applicant proposed that the new section be called Section 10-18-5: Automated parking systems, structure, and vertical parking lifts. This section will provide regulations on how developers can utilize mechanical systems to stack cars vertically, above grade to conserve space on a site. These systems are often referred to as “stackers” or “parking lifts.”

The earliest use of parking lifts was in Chicago in 1932, where a machine was built that stored 48 cars in the space it would take to park six cars in a typical parking lot. This machine took just 55 seconds to deliver a car back to ground level to be driven away. Today, Chicago has an ordinance for these lifts that is very technical and specific, citing specific electrical codes and describing a detailed enforcement program. Murray City is the only city in Utah known to have an ordinance allowing parking lifts to be counted toward required parking spaces. Staff contacted Murray City’s Community Development Director and found that even though they allow lifts in the ordinance, no parking lifts have been installed in Murray to date. There was some interest in using parking lifts by dealerships and auto repair shops, but no businesses have actually installed the lifts.

The applicant is proposing a simple lift that would provide one additional parking space above a vehicle parked on grade. For example, two lifts would be placed side by side in a two-car garage. Thus, the garage would increase to a four-car garage by utilizing vertical space.

It was the opinion of staff that a Code as detailed as Chicago’s regarding lifts would not be necessary for the small scale lifts proposed. The applicant suggested that both manual and automatic lifts be allowed. Manual lifts require the user to turn a key and/or push a button to return the raised car to ground level. Automatic lifts vary based on the manufacturer. Some have more advanced safety sensors while some are operated remotely. Some systems can sense when a vehicle is on the pallet and lift accordingly.

Staff spoke to the City Attorney about the risks associated with allowing parking lifts to be counted toward parking requirements. The City Attorney did not see any risk to the City in allowing parking lifts, but remarked that research should be done to assess the common problems associated with them.

Common problems researched by staff were mostly related to the maintenance of the lift. Some reported malfunctions to the lift that required repair. Similar to an automobile, proper maintenance and care is needed to keep the lift operating and functioning properly. Another concern was that the lifts may cause traffic issues as individuals wait in a large parking lot for the vehicle beneath their car to drive away and for their car to return to grade. However, the stackers in this proposed project were for a large sports stadium. Director Cardenas explained that following a large sporting

event, all patrons would be attempting to drive away within the same time period causing a traffic issue. This issue would not be created by the small scale lifts as proposed by the text amendment. The applicant expressed that another option may be to restrict parking lifts to the Downtown Village Zone only. As currently proposed, parking lifts would be allowed in all zones. (Note: the ordinance states that the parking lifts are only allowed in the Downtown Village Zone.) The Planning Commission forwarded a unanimous recommendation of approval.

Drew Armstrong explained that he has sold many of these lifts, including properties in Salt Lake. They are commonly used in California, New York, and Florida. Pleasant Grove is the second oldest city in Utah County, and the lifts provide an alternative solution to meeting parking needs to accommodate rapid growth throughout the area. Mr. Armstrong stated that the car lifts will lift a car in less than 60 seconds. He mentioned that some of the parking units in Salt Lake are tandem units, where one parking space is situated in front of another. He explained that these lifts are designed to meet safety concerns as well.

In response to a question from Council Member Williams, Mr. Armstrong explained that the approximate height for these garage structures will be 17 feet, which is tall enough to stack two F-150 trucks on top of each other. The structures will need to be enclosed, and the proposed ordinance language is written to this effect. Council Member Andersen remarked that she has seen similar structures in New York.

Mayor Fugal opened the public hearing.

Lori Williams noted that the agenda identifies the applicant as Matthew Flinders. However, Mr. Flinders was not the person who addressed the Council on the item. She asked if that mattered. Mayor Fugal responded that it did not matter.

Kurt Jurgens asked for clarification regarding what areas of the City constituted the Downtown Village Zone. On a map displayed, Mayor Fugal identified the areas where the proposed ordinance would be applied. Mr. Jurgens stated that the area in question is already cramped. He asked where businesses would find room to construct these types of garage structures. He also asked how drivers parked on the upper level will access their cars, if they are unrelated to the drivers parked beneath them.

Attorney Petersen clarified that the proposed ordinance would restrict the use of these types of facilities to residential units and stated that they would not be used for businesses. In addition, the structures would be inside garages toward the back end of properties.

Casey Larson asked if the ordinance defines whether these would be two or four-post lifts. Director Cardenas responded that at this point, staff has not discussed the specifics of the mechanics of the structures. He also responded to Mr. Jurgens' question regarding access to the vehicles and explained that these structures would only belong to one, living unit.

There were no further public comments. Mayor Fugal closed the public hearing. Council Member LeMone commented that this was a creative way to solve parking issues in the area.

**ACTION:** Council Member LeMone moved to adopt an Ordinance (2018-1) amending City Code Chapter 18: Off-Street Parking Standards by adding a section allowing vertical parking lifts and other automated parking structures to satisfy parking requirements; and providing for an effective date. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Walker and Williams voting “Aye”. The motion carried unanimously.

**B) CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2018-2) TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 7.45 ACRES TO APPLY THE RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE OVERLAY (RAO) ZONE TO MULTIPLE, SEPARATE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 810 EAST GROVE CREEK DRIVE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (GROVE CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD) (Richard Guernsey Applicant) Presenter: Director Cardenas (Continued from the January 2, 2018 Meeting).**

Director Cardenas presented the staff report which included aerial and zoning maps of the subject property, the General Plan map, ownership map, net useable agricultural acreage map, a written statement from the applicant and the relevant portion of City Code. He explained that the applicant is requesting approval of a zone change for several parcels owned by a total of four property owners. The applicant, Richard Guernsey, expressed interest in having farm animals on his property. The parcels owned by the applicant are within the R1-20 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. In R1 zones, residents may only keep chickens and household pets. In order to have farm animals on his property, the applicant applied for a rezone on October 31, 2017. He spoke with many of his neighbors and educated them about the rezone proposal and gauging their support. Three neighboring property owners submitted property owner’s affidavits authorizing the applicant to act as an agent on their behalf. Properties with said affidavits were included in the overall acreage of the proposed rezone. The goal of the rezone is to apply the Residential Agriculture Overlay (RAO) to the subject properties. The Planning Commission forwarded a unanimous recommendation of approval.

The applicant, Richard Guernsey, described the nature of his property and the ownership of the surrounding properties. He explained that he has owned his property for 45 years, and 25 years ago they built their home. Historically, the property has been agricultural and they have had animal rights off and on over the years. He anticipated that the entire area will eventually be developed. For many years he has wanted to create a small family farm. Now that he is retired, he has more time to pursue this goal. He stated that his request for large animal rights aligns with the nature of the area, based on its history.

Mayor Fugal opened the public hearing.

Kurt Jurgens commented that there are several properties in the area that have at times had animals. He asked if the residents in the surrounding areas that are not directly connected to this proposal have had an opportunity to voice their opinions. He stated that there are residents who have purchased their properties based on the expectation that there would not be large animals, which produce odors and noises.

Director Cardenas identified the noticing radius required by ordinance. He stated that the homes within that radius received notice of tonight's meeting, and had an opportunity to voice their opinions. He explained that the overlay contains language dictating the number and type of animals that would be allowed on the property, if the overlay is applied to the zone.

Attorney Petersen added that the total number of animals allowed varies based on the animals' size, which helps maintain an overall density of animals that is appropriate for the size of the property. She explained that an overlay is a particular set of allowances, which subsequently comes with restrictions as set by the City, that a property owner can request to be applied to their property. Anyone who owns property large enough to apply for the overlay may do so.

Lori Williams voiced her support for Mr. Guernsey's proposal and indicated that she is an advocate of property rights. As a resident, she would prefer to live in an area with animals.

Denise Willy reported that she owns property north of the subject property. They housed goats immediately after purchasing their property 21 years ago. She was under the impression that this area had always been agricultural, and she did not realize that someone could not put up a barn. Ms. Willy supported Mr. Guernsey's proposal as outlined.

Mr. Jurgens stated that he was neither for or against the proposal but wanted to make sure that all potential problems had been considered and addressed.

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

**ACTION:** Council Member LeMone moved to adopt an Ordinance (2018-2) to rezone approximately 7.45 acres to apply the Residential Agriculture Overlay (RAO) Zone to multiple, separate properties located at approximately 810 E Grove Creek Drive; and providing for an effective date. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Walker and Williams voting "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

**C. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2018-3) AMENDING THE PLEASANT GROVE CITY CODE BY MODIFYING LAND USE PROVISIONS THAT REGULATE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FOOD TRUCKS WITHIN CITY BOUNDARIES. THE REQUEST INCLUDES THE ELIMINATION OF THE TEMPORARY STAY ASPECT OF THE FOOD TRUCK AND ALLOWING FOOD TRUCKS TO STAY PERMANENTLY IN ONE LOCATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (Curtis Miles Applicant) Presenter: Director Cardenas (Continued from the January 2, 2018 Meeting).**

Director Cardenas presented the staff report, which included a copy of the proposed ordinance provision, aerial maps of the subject property, and images. He explained that Pleasant Grove City is lacking a specific ordinance regarding the establishment of food trucks within City boundaries. Staff has been working on a comprehensive and inclusive ordinance that allows food trucks to

operate within the City, but at the same time protect the general welfare by encouraging the most appropriate use of land.

The first official version of the ordinance was drafted for the Planning Commission on April 13, 2017. As staff was preparing to bring their version of the proposed ordinance to the Planning Commission, the applicant approached staff to request changes to the proposed text. Concurrently, Utah State Legislature was also working on a bill that would affect the licensing process for food trucks. City staff and the applicant did not finalize the proposed text until the State Legislature completed their process. The results of the new bill were reflected in the proposed ordinance provisions contained in the staff report for the Planning Commission on April 13, 2017.

At the April 13, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting, two versions of a proposed ordinance were presented. The staff version received a recommendation of approval from the Planning Commission to the City Council. The Commissioners voted 6-to-1 in favor of the staff version. At the City Council Meeting held on June 6, 2017, staff received direction from the City Council to draft an alternative proposal with language that would allow for a compromise where the food truck would be allowed to be permanent in one location for one year. It was proposed that at the end of the one-year period the applicant would either complete all the site improvements to the site to become a permanent establishment or adopt the mobile nature of a food truck, which includes being in one unimproved lot no more than three consecutive days.

As staff was working on the ordinance, the applicant presented his own proposal. Staff recognizes and encourages the participation of applicants in the drafting or amending of ordinances; however, in this case, there were significant changes in the applicant's proposal that did not align with the staff recommendations. As a result, staff recommended the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to adopt the staff version for the following reasons:

**Transient Use - Permanent Use:** Staff recommended that the use of a food truck is transient in nature. The Utah State Legislature agrees that the nature of a food truck is temporary and transient to the extent that most of their changes and creation of the new Food Truck Act, pertains to the elimination of licensing from each local jurisdiction. This thereby allows a food truck to operate throughout the state with a current business license from their local jurisdiction. The new Food Truck Act in no way reduces or attenuates the land use requirements, either on public or private land, from the jurisdiction where the food truck operates.

The text from the act reads: "Nothing in this subsection prevents a political subdivision from enforcing the political subdivision's land use regulations, zoning, and other ordinances in relation to the operation of a food truck..."

The applicant was proposing that a food truck may operate on a permanent basis in a given location. In contrast, staff proposed that the maximum period which a food truck can be stationary in the same place for daily operations, as the food truck must return every night to their commissary as required by the Health Department, is three consecutive days within a seven-day period. The food truck may operate the other three days in a different location(s). If the applicant desires to be permanent and operate every day in the same location, it should be treated as a permanent restaurant and the business should comply with the same requirements as any permanent restaurant

is required to observe within the City. That includes site improvements such as impervious parking lots, landscaping, and compliance with the Building Code requirements.

**Use of food trucks on the public right-of-way:** Staff considered that to keep the order and safety of the operations and the costumers, food truck businesses utilizing parking space within the public right-of-way shall park only in parallel parking spaces. Mobile food businesses must be parked so that neither the vehicle nor the customers interfere with public access to adjacent parking stalls, to driveways or to entrances of existing buildings or uses. In cases where no parallel parking exists, the mobile food business cannot occupy more than two parking stalls in a public right-of-way and three on private property. The applicant considers the previous provision unnecessarily restrictive; however, staff thinks the provision is vital for the space dedicated as a public right-of-way.

**Drive-thru:** Drive-thru elements are closely reviewed during the site plan review process of any commercial business. There are specifications for a drive-thru that the Engineering Department closely reviews such as turning ratios for standard vehicles, the stacking capacity of the drive-thru lane and the impact the drive-thru has on site access and surrounding rights-of-way. All of these elements would require approval during a site plan review process and, according to engineering staff, the standards applied to the drive-thru for a food truck would be the same as the standards for a permanent brick and mortar restaurant.

**Power source:** The Building Official specified that no temporary electric system shall be used for a permanent commercial business regardless of the property being of private nature. Temporary power should only be used for temporary uses.

In the new proposed ordinance, staff differentiates regulations on public property versus private property and also takes into consideration the direction from the City Council with regard to a proposal that would allow a food truck to permanently settle on an unimproved lot for the duration of one year. During that one-year period, site improvement requirements shall be waived with the exception of the building permit requirement for the installation of proper utilities for power. At the end of the one-year period the applicant shall either install all of the required site improvements on the lot or become transient in nature (which is defined as remaining on a property for a maximum of three consecutive days).

The applicant, Curtis Miles, noted that he began the process a few years ago. In response to a question from Council Member Williams, Mr. Miles stated that initially he hoped to remain in one location for a longer period of time. He, however, accepted staff's concerns and counterproposal as outlined in the draft ordinance.

Mayor Fugal opened the public hearing.

Matthew Adamson asked if the definition for food trucks also applies to shaved ice stands. Director Cardenas responded in the negative and explained that these stands are treated differently.

Hillary Stirling complimented staff and the elected officials for how hard they have worked on this item. She was impressed by how much the City cares about its citizens.

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

Council Member LeMone stated that she would like these businesses to be in the City on a permanent basis. She explained that the intent of giving a food truck business a permit for 365 days is to show starter businesses how successful their business would be in Pleasant Grove. She hoped that the end goal with these businesses is to eventually open a brick and mortar store. The proposed temporary permit would give them an opportunity to work toward that goal. If a business decides to remain in Pleasant Grove, the City can assess what they can do to help that business be successful. She did not, however, want to open the door for any food truck to park within the City indefinitely.

Council Member Andersen stated that the food truck business model is mobile for a reason. The brick and mortar business model exists for a reason as well, and unlike food trucks, established restaurants pay property taxes. She was more in favor of the original ordinance.

Council Member Jensen supported the last motion made on the item. He explained that the term “food truck” implies mobility. He urged the Council to be cautious about the language in the ordinance because it will open up options throughout the entire City. He explained that there are many factors to consider and that he was willing to listen.

Council Member Williams asked Mr. Miles where he currently operates his business, and Mr. Miles stated that the food truck is currently being stored in Salt Lake. He explained that his food truck business is only open six or seven months out of the year. Council Member Williams asked Mr. Miles to explain why he selected the site in Pleasant Grove. Mr. Miles explained that he also runs a shaved ice stand in the City and it was a matter of convenience for him to use the same power source for both businesses. Additionally, it will be helpful to have all of his employees in the same location. If his business is successful in Pleasant Grove, he would love to establish it permanently in the City. Council Member Williams asked Mr. Miles why he could not have his business remain mobile throughout the City and suggested a few locations where he could rotate. Mr. Miles explained that one of the reasons he would like to plug in his business rather than run on a generator all the time, is to reduce noise.

Council Member Jensen commented that obtaining a power permit is one component the City cannot waive. He asked Mr. Miles if he was okay with that requirement. Mr. Miles answered in the affirmative.

Council Member Williams stated that while he wants Mr. Miles’ business to thrive, he is concerned with making a City-wide change. There was subsequent discussion regarding an appropriate motion to make on the item. Instances throughout the area where temporary food truck businesses lead to brick and mortar businesses were also briefly discussed.

**ACTION:** Council Member LeMone moved to adopt Ordinance (2018-3) amending the Pleasant Grove City Code by modifying land use provisions that regulate the establishment of food trucks within City boundaries. The request includes the elimination of the temporary stay aspect of the food truck and allowing food trucks to remain permanently in one location, with the condition that the ordinance will be reviewed within one year of the date of implementation; and providing for an effective date. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. A public hearing was held. A

voice vote was taken with Council Members Jensen, LeMone, Walker and Williams voting “Aye” and Council Member Andersen voting “Nay”. The motion passed 4-to-1.

Mayor Fugal briefly discussed his experience living in Tahiti and his observations on how the country’s capital city treated food truck businesses.

**D) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2018-4) AMENDING CITY CODE SECTION 10-13D-3: PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL USES, IN ORDER TO SUPPORT BUSINESSES RELATED TO WEDDINGS SUCH AS RETAIL FOR MEN AND WOMEN’S CLOTHING, FLOWERS, AND GIFTS, BY LISTING THEM AS PERMITTED USES IN THE RURAL COMMERCIAL OVERLAY (RCO) ZONE. (CITY WIDE) (Jennie Johnson Applicant) Presenter: Director Cardenas (This item was continued to February 6, 2018 meeting).**

**E) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE (2018-5) AMENDING CITY CODE SECTION 10-9B-7C: YARD REQUIREMENTS, TO REDUCE THE REAR YARD REQUIREMENT FOR PRIMARY STRUCTURES, ON CORNER LOTS, IN THE R-1 (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) ZONES. (CITY WIDE) (Pleasant Grove City Applicant) Presenter: Director Cardenas.**

Director Cardenas presented the staff report, which included aerial maps and images. He explained that a high percentage of the land use applications received at the front counter of the Community Development Department is for the construction of new single-family dwellings, as well as remodeling and additions to existing dwellings. One of the elements of the review process was compliance with the yard requirements, or in other words, compliance with the required setbacks for any structure in the lot or parcel in relation to the property line.

It is the goal of staff to simplify the process of obtaining a building/land use permit by helping the residents understand the Code and how it applies to their properties. To reach this goal, planning staff uses a variety of land use tools and interpretations of the code. One such interpretation is the common practice to allow a corner lot to reduce the backyard setback from 25 feet to 10 feet. This is done by deeming the backyard of a corner lot as the side-yard and applying the side-yard setbacks. While this is a common practice, it is important that the City Code also reflects and backs up the common practices used by the planners, building officials, and building inspectors.

As of today the specifications for the application of yard setbacks on corner lots do not reflect the common practice used by the staff to review and check compliance for building new structures, including additions, on properties considered corner lots. All interior lots would require, in terms of yard setbacks, two 25-foot setbacks located in the front and back of the property, and two 10-foot side setbacks (10 feet on each side). For corner lots, staff would require three 25-foot yard setbacks, two of which would be along the property lines abutting a street and 25-foot setback on whatever side the applicant calls the backyard. By requiring three 25-foot setbacks, properties readily lose some usable space. Staff’s proposal was to normalize and clarify in the Code that corner lots would be required to conform to the same setbacks as interior lots, by providing two 25-foot yard setbacks, which will be along the right-of-way, and two 10-foot yard setbacks. This

would allow the property owner more flexibility and provide more opportunities for the design and the layout of any proposed addition or new structure. The neighboring properties would not lose any rights in terms of safety and privacy by adopting and allowing the proposed amendment.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide flexibility in the compliance review for the required setbacks of corner lots and legalize a common practice use by the staff to reduce the impact of land usage by providing two 25-foot yard setbacks along the property lines adjacent to public or private streets. The Planning Commission forwarded a unanimous recommendation of approval.

Council Member Andersen commented that 20 years ago she met with the Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment because she wanted to create a backyard for her home. She expressed support for the proposal and thanked staff for bringing the matter forward to the Council.

Mayor Fugal opened the public hearing.

Tamara Oborn expressed support for the proposal.

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

**ACTION:** Council Member Jensen moved to adopt an Ordinance (2018-5) amending City Code Section 10-9B-7C: Yard Requirements, to reduce the rear yard requirement for primary structures, on corner lots, in the R-1 (Single-family Residential) Zones. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Walker and Williams voting “Aye”. The motion carried unanimously.

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

**A) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2018-02) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO DECLARE A 2016 FORD F-150 PICKUP TRUCK AND 12 CELL PHONES AS SURPLUS AND DIRECT THAT THEY BE DISPOSED OF ACCORDING TO THE CITY’S POLICY FOR DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PROPERTY. *Presenters: Director Giles, Director Beaumont and Chief Thomas.***

Parks and Recreation Director, Deon Giles, explained that his department has implemented a program where vehicles are traded in for new vehicles on a regular basis. This saves the City money in maintaining a high functioning fleet. Administrator Darrington added that the City owns 12 phones which need to be surplus. The phones have been in use by the Public Works and Fire Departments.

Council Member Williams asked how a member of the public could go about purchasing the phones. Administrator Darrington explained that the City’s policy is to give employees the opportunity to purchase surplus equipment first, which is sold to them at market value. If the employee doesn’t want to purchase the equipment, they can be sold to the public.

Council Member Andersen asked if cell phones are wiped clean before being sold to the public. Staff responded in the affirmative.

**ACTION:** Council Member Jensen moved to adopt a Resolution (2018-02) authorizing the Mayor to declare a 2016 Ford F-150 Pickup Truck and 12 cell phones as surplus and direct that they be disposed of according to the City's policy for disposing of surplus property. Council Member Williams seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Walker and Williams voting "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

**B) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2018-03) AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH UTAH COUNTY REGARDING THE COUNTY 100 EAST RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT. THE AGREEMENT SETS FORTH THE CONDITIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CITY AND THE COUNTY FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS THAT CITY REQUESTED BE INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. Presenter: Director Beaumont.**

Public Works Director, Mary Beaumont, stated that the 100 East Reconstruction Project has been moving forward. The plan is to have funds available by the end of the month and the bids will be due by February 14, 2018. He explained that the City needs to replace a culinary water line beneath 100 East prior to the road reconstruction project. In addition, two storm drain crossings need to be installed at 200 North and 500 North. Eventually the two crossings will be connected to the Pipe Plant Detention Facility. Director Beaumont explained that a developer was installing a new culvert under the road for the Mill Ditch crossing. The County needed the culvert in question to extend further for one of their projects and they ended up contracting with the same developer for this to be accomplished. The contract has since been paid, and the proposed interlocal agreement indicates that the County will reimburse the City for the full amount of those expenses. This item will come back to the Council on February 20, after the bids have been received and reviewed by staff.

Mayor Fugal asked if there were sewer line extensions on the north end of the road. Director Beaumont answered in the affirmative.

**ACTION:** Council Member Andersen moved to adopt Resolution (2018-03) authorizing the Mayor to execute an Interlocal Agreement with Utah County regarding the County 100 East reconstruction project. The Agreement sets forth the conditions and responsibilities of the City and the County for the infrastructure improvements that the City requested be included in the project; and providing for an effective date. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Walker and Williams voting "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

**C) TO CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION A RESOLUTION (2018-04) IN SUPPORT OF CONSTRUCTING THE MURDOCK COLLECTOR ROAD AND CONSTRUCTING IT AS A COLLECTOR CLASS STREET; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. Presenter: Administrator Darrington.**

Administrator Darrington presented an aerial map and identified the locations of Lone Peak High School, the LDS temple, and the Murdock Trail in relation to the Murdock collector road. He stated that this area has been master planned for a long time. Portions of the property in question are located within Highland, Cedar Hills, and American Fork city limits. These cities have been presented several options to consider for this project and have reached a mutual consensus on where they would like the alignment to occur. Administrator Darrington identified this alignment on the aerial map shown in the presentation. Highland, Cedar Hills, and American Fork are working with the State and requesting Pleasant Grove's political support in the matter.

Mayor Fugal reported that he received a call from Highland Mayor, Rod Mann, asking for Pleasant Grove's support. Mayor Mann explained to Mayor Fugal that this process had been drawn out and the cities were working diligently to move forward. Mayor Fugal stated that subsequent to Mayor Mann's request, he received similar requests of support from Mayor Jenney Rees and Mayor Brad Frost from Cedar Hills and American Fork, respectively.

In response to a question from Council Member Williams, Administrator Darrington noted that the road runs on the north side of the Fox Hollow Golf Course. Council Member LeMone asked if the reason for the request was to obtain funding from MAG. Administrator Darrington responded that the funding has already been received. At this point, the cities are trying to speed up the construction project. Mayor Fugal commented that American Fork has indicated this will take more pressure off the road adjacent to their cemetery.

**ACTION:** Council Member Andersen moved to adopt a Resolution (2018-04) in support of constructing the Murdock Collector Road and constructing it as a Collector Class Street; and providing for an effective date. Council Member Walker seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, Walker and Williams voting "Aye". The motion carried unanimously.

## 11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

### A) **DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION ON DOTERRA FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION PACKAGE. *Presenter: Economic Development Consultant Randy Sant.***

Administrator Darrington stated that the City was approached by DoTERRA with regard to the expansion of their site. DoTERRA will be adding three new buildings as part of Phase II. Future phases were in the works. They have asked the City, County, and school district to participate in the expansion projects as financial partners. These entities have convened in information meetings and will decide whether to participate once an official agreement is drafted. Administrator Darrington explained that the City's funding portion will be used to install a traffic signal at 220 South and Pleasant Grove Boulevard and improvements on Pleasant Grove Boulevard.

Economic Development Consultant, Randy Sant, outlined the costs and benefits of participation. He distributed an information sheet to members of the Council and explained that the DoTERRA property has been designated as a community development area. Under State law, the Redevelopment Agency and City Council are allowed to collect increased property taxes within

redevelopment areas, with the approval of the taxing entities. The funds can then be used to incentivize the developer. In 2013, the City agreed to a participation of a \$4.7 million capita to be paid over 20 years. Mr. Sant stated that when they met with the school district, they agreed to participate in 25% of the tax increment. Utah County, Pleasant Grove City, and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District all agreed to a participation level of 75%. These amounts were detailed in the interlocal agreements established with the taxing entities within the redevelopment area.

Mr. Sant explained that the intent of the DoTERRA Phase II project is to ask agencies to continue participating at the same rates listed above. If this were to occur, the City would be able to collect enough tax increment to offer an incentive of \$1.3 million, which is the estimated cost of the improvements described by Administrator Darrington. The same terms and conditions listed in the original interlocal agreement would apply. They would not extend past 20 years of participation, thereby requiring DoTERRA to work within the remaining years of the original agreement.

Mr. Sant explained that the participation to repay the \$1.3 million equates to approximately \$184,955 per year. The taxing entities will keep \$324,521 from the property tax. Using the 75%, the total tax produced for Pleasant Grove will be approximately \$82,500. Under this agreement, the City would remit \$61,875 back as their participation and they would keep \$20,625 for the City's use. The City would be contributing \$413,159 in total over a 6 ½ year period to pay this incentive. Mr. Sant subsequently reviewed the amounts that the other taxing entities including Utah County, Alpine School District and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District, would be paying over that same period of time. Since there will be more input after the 6 ½ year period, the total participation of 20 years will be reduced by five years. In other words, the City's funds will be recouped much faster. Mr. Sant stated that this will end up being a great deal for all of the participating taxing entities.

Mr. Sant explained that if the City would like to move forward, the next step is to amend the existing interlocal agreements with the other taxing entities. The amended agreement will then come back to the Redevelopment Agency for review and approval.

In response to a question from Council Member Jensen, Administrator Darrington reported that he has met with Rob Smith, Finance Director for the Alpine School District, as well as their Facilities Committee. He stated that the meeting was very positive and noted that the school district has maintained a positive relationship with DoTERRA. Administrator Darrington also reported that he has meet with Utah County Commissioners Lee and Ivy on two separate occasions. Commissioner Lee and Commissioner Ivy found it appealing that DoTERRA would be relocating operations from another state to Pleasant Grove.

Council Member Williams asked how many more employees would be brought into the area as result of the expansion. Administrator Darrington stated that approximately 1,000 more jobs will be created.

**B) DISCUSSION ON ACCESSORY APARTMENTS. *Presenter: Director Cardenas.***

Administrator Darrington stated that a program was set in motion two years ago whereby accessory apartments in the City could be legalized. The process requires property owners to register their accessory apartments with the City, which includes a \$25 fee. In addition, staff conducts a brief inspection of the home to make sure it is safe before it is added to a registry. In the time since the program was implemented, around 90 property owners have registered their accessory apartments.

Administrator Darrington stated that the two-year program expires at the end of January. Anyone who has not registered a known accessory apartment will face a \$500 fine. He explained that this fine was included in the program as an incentive for property owners to register their apartments. Staff, however, was of the opinion that there are many more of these types of apartments in the City. At this time, they are asking the City Council to allow staff not to enforce the \$500 fine. Staff believes that the best course of action will be to publicize the matter again, rather than extend the deadline. He explained that all of the usual channels of communication would be utilized to publicize the issue including social media, the City's website, the City's newsletter, etc. In addition, staff will send mailers to each resident with their utility bills.

Council Member Williams asked staff to define accessory apartments. He noted that his 20-year old child lives in his basement and pays rent. He wanted to know if this is defined as an accessory apartment. Director Cardenas and Attorney Petersen both responded in the negative and stated that this scenario is not considered an accessory apartment because the tenants are immediate family members.

Director Cardenas stated that two or more persons related by blood, marriage, adoption, legal guardianship, foster children, or up to four related and/or unrelated persons living as a single household unit is the definition of "family" in the context of accessory apartments. However, if there is a close friend living in the basement or if there is some type of shed or guest house on the property that is rented for profit, this scenario would qualify as an accessory apartment. Administrator Darrington noted that extensive deliberation went into defining accessory apartments. He advised Council Member Williams to meet with Director Cardenas to review the Code.

Council Member Williams asked if the City really wants to regulate accessory apartments. Administrator Darrington stated that this question was previously discussed at length as well. He provided a historical overview of the matter and stated that ultimately the City felt that accessory apartments need to be regulated for health and safety reasons. After subsequent deliberation, the Council indicated they would like additional public outreach and education to take place regarding this issue.

*Note: The Council took a short break.*

**C) DISCUSSION ON ROAD FUNDING. *Presenter: Administrator Darrington.***

Administrator Darrington recapped the discussion that took place during the City Council Work Session held on January 9, 2018. The Council requested that staff prepare a funding scenario that reflects a generation of \$3.8 million in road funding by Fiscal Year 2019. In addition, they also wanted to see a breakdown of trips on the commercial side.

Administrator Darrington reviewed each of the funding sources and explained that in order to reach the \$3.8 million, the City would need to generate \$2.2 million in addition to current sources. He presented the following charts:

Scenario- Fully Funded in FY 2019	FY 19	Scenario- Fully Funded in FY 2019	FY 19
<b>Commercial Averaged</b>		<b>Commercial Averaged</b>	
Class C Revenue/Gas Tax	\$ 1,180,000	Class C Revenue/Gas Tax	\$ 1,180,000
General Fund-Base Budget	\$ 325,000	General Fund-Base Budget	\$ 425,000
New General Fund Money	\$ 650,000	Road Fee	\$ 2,200,000
Road Fee	\$ 1,625,000	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,805,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,780,000</b>	Road Fee Per Month-Residential	\$ 10.78
Road Fee Per Month-Residential	\$ 7.96	Road Fee Per Month-< 2 Trips	\$ 44.66
Road Fee Per Month-All Trips	\$ 97.83	Road Fee Per Month-< 2-4 Trips	\$ 132.44
		Road Fee Per Month-< 4-20 Trips	\$ 413.16
		Road Fee Per Month-> 20 Trips	\$ 1,083.28

**Potential Road Funding- Goal \$3.8M**

Scenario #0	No new General Fund Money			No new Road Fee		
	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
Class C Revenue	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
Additional Gas Tax	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 180,000
General Fund-Base Budget	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000
General Fund-New Money	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Road Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Less Bond Payment						
<b>Total Revenue Available</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,605,000</b>
Road Fee Per Month-Residential	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Road Fee Per Month-Commercial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Scenario #1	\$1M Road Fee		4 Tiers on Trips			
	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
Class C Revenue	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000
General Fund-Base Budget	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000
Road Fee (5% annual increase)	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,102,500	\$ 1,157,625	\$ 1,215,506	\$ 1,276,281
<b>Total Revenue Available</b>	<b>\$ 2,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,655,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,707,500</b>	<b>\$ 2,762,625</b>	<b>\$ 2,820,506</b>	<b>\$ 2,881,281</b>
Road Fee Per Month-Residential	\$ 4.90	\$ 5.15	\$ 5.40	\$ 5.67	\$ 5.96	\$ 6.25
Road Fee Per Month-< 2 Trips	\$ 20.30	\$ 21.32	\$ 22.38	\$ 22.50	\$ 24.67	\$ 25.91
Road Fee Per Month-< 2-4 Trips	\$ 60.20	\$ 63.21	\$ 66.37	\$ 69.69	\$ 73.17	\$ 76.83
Road Fee Per Month-< 4-20 Trips	\$ 187.80	\$ 197.19	\$ 207.05	\$ 217.40	\$ 228.27	\$ 239.69
Road Fee Per Month-> 20 Trips	\$ 492.40	\$ 517.02	\$ 542.87	\$ 570.01	\$ 598.51	\$ 628.44

Scenario #2	\$1M Road Fee		2 Tiers on Trips			
	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
Class C Revenue	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000
General Fund-Base Budget	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000
Road Fee (5% annual increase)	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,102,500	\$ 1,157,625	\$ 1,215,506	\$ 1,276,281
<b>Total Revenue Available</b>	<b>\$ 2,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,655,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,707,500</b>	<b>\$ 2,762,625</b>	<b>\$ 2,820,506</b>	<b>\$ 2,881,281</b>
Road Fee Per Month-Residential	\$ 4.90	\$ 5.15	\$ 5.40	\$ 5.67	\$ 5.96	\$ 6.25
Road Fee Per Month-0-4 Trips	\$ 43.50	\$ 45.68	\$ 47.96	\$ 50.36	\$ 52.87	\$ 55.52
Road Fee Per Month-4+ Trips	\$ 248.80	\$ 261.24	\$ 274.30	\$ 288.02	\$ 302.42	\$ 317.54

  

Scenario #3	\$1M Road Fee		1 Tier on Trips			
	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
Class C Revenue	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000
General Fund-Base Budget	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000
Road Fee (5% annual increase)	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,102,500	\$ 1,157,625	\$ 1,215,506	\$ 1,276,281
<b>Total Revenue Available</b>	<b>\$ 2,605,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,655,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,707,500</b>	<b>\$ 2,762,625</b>	<b>\$ 2,820,506</b>	<b>\$ 2,881,281</b>
Road Fee Per Month-Residential	\$ 4.90	\$ 5.15	\$ 5.40	\$ 5.67	\$ 5.96	\$ 6.25
Road Fee Per Month-All Trips	\$ 60.20	\$ 63.21	\$ 66.37	\$ 69.69	\$ 73.17	\$ 76.83

  

Scenario #4			\$3.8 M by FY 26			
	FY 19	FY 20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
Class C Revenue	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000	\$ 1,180,000
General Fund-Base Budget	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 425,000
General Fund-New Money	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Road Fee (5% annual increase)	\$ 1,580,000	\$ 1,659,000	\$ 1,741,950	\$ 1,829,047	\$ 1,920,499	\$ 2,016,524
<b>Total Revenue Available</b>	<b>\$ 3,185,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,264,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,346,950</b>	<b>\$ 3,434,047</b>	<b>\$ 3,525,499</b>	<b>\$ 3,621,524</b>
Road Fee Per Month-Residential	\$ 7.74	\$ 8.13	\$ 8.53	\$ 8.96	\$ 9.41	\$ 9.88
Road Fee Per Month-< 2 Trips	\$ 32.07	\$ 33.67	\$ 35.36	\$ 37.13	\$ 38.98	\$ 40.93
Road Fee Per Month-< 2-4 Trips	\$ 95.12	\$ 99.88	\$ 104.87	\$ 110.11	\$ 115.62	\$ 121.40
Road Fee Per Month-< 4-20 Trips	\$ 296.72	\$ 311.56	\$ 327.13	\$ 343.49	\$ 360.67	\$ 378.70
Road Fee Per Month-> 20 Trips	\$ 777.99	\$ 816.89	\$ 857.73	\$ 900.62	\$ 945.65	\$ 992.93
Road Fee Per Month-Commercial	\$ 95.12	\$ 99.88	\$ 104.87	\$ 110.11	\$ 115.62	\$ 121.40

In response to questions from Council Member Jensen, Administrator Darrington explained that when averaging the numbers, it essentially is the same as charging everyone the same amount as shown in the two to four trips range (\$95.12).

Council Member Williams stated that based on his conversations with the public, most residents support the implementation of a Road Fee. He, however, felt they need to be careful in how they implement the fee and suggested they receive public input on the matter.

Administrator Darrington explained that with regard to business, he and Attorney Petersen are looking at ways to stay true to the study, while finding ways for businesses to participate

alternatively. For example, one consideration was that businesses could be granted a discount based on the fact that they are already paying 100% of the property tax based on their valuation. If the Council decided they wanted to pursue this, staff would need to recalculate the numbers.

Mayor Fugal asked if the Class C Road Funds are flatly distributed. Administrator Darrington answered in the affirmative. The Mayor asked when the Class C Road Funds will increase. Administrator Darrington stated that historically these funds have not increased. He explained that if gas prices go up, people drive less. Therefore, the City receives less revenue. Furthermore, electric and natural gas vehicles are not paying the gas tax. Administrator Darrington explained that two years ago the State Legislature passed a bill that added an additional \$180,000 in gas tax revenue for the City. The bill had an inflationary factor; however, because this term was not clearly defined, the City opted to use a flat distribution number in our scenarios at this point.

Administrator Darrington stated that the numbers presented above are conservative estimates. Director Beaumont added that every year staff submits a map to the State that identifies how many miles of road exist in the City. As the City's mileage increases, so will its Class C Road funding. In response to a question from Mayor Fugal, Director Beaumont stated that the \$3.8 million calculation accounted for cost inflation for the City's current roads. It did not, however, account for new roads built as a result of growth.

There was further deliberation on points previously stated, in addition to the scenarios presented above. The general consensus was to fully fund roads by implementing a \$10 fee for residents and develop a tiered system whereby fee reductions/exemptions are granted to businesses. Administrator Darrington presented a timeline for implementing a road funding plan as follows:

- January through February 6, 2018
  - Select a couple of options for consideration to present to the public for feedback.
  - Open House(s)—Have open house for public to attend to ask questions regarding the options for road funding. Send out specific notice to residents and businesses.
  - Meet with Chamber of Commerce.
- March 2018
  - Public Hearing
  - Implementation

12) **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON THE FEBRUARY 6, 2018 CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA**

The aforementioned meeting agenda was briefly reviewed and discussed.

13) **NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAFF BUSINESS**

Director Cardenas, distributed a Report and Active Projects (RAP) Sheet for the Council's review.

Assistant to the City Administrator, David Larson, discussed Mike Rowe’s web series entitled *Returning the Favor*, and announced that in a recent episode they spotlighted a small business in Pleasant Grove. He stated that the video could be viewed in the City’s Facebook page.

Library and Arts Director, Sheri Britsch, reported that United Way approached the Library about offering computer classes. The classes are taught by volunteers once a week. Eventually, Director Britsch would like to find funding to purchase laptops so they can hold classes on a more regular basis.

**14) MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS**

Council Member Andersen reported that Firefighter Sarah was recently announced as Firefighter of the Year. Council Member Jensen discussed an upcoming “Choose Kindness” event that will take place at DoTERRA. The event will be held on January 24 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Mayor Fugal reported that he attended the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce Meeting, where the economic forecast for the State of Utah was discussed. He reported that there have been eight years of expansion in the State and he hopes this trend can continue. He noted that the concluding speaker was Mitt Romney.

**15) SIGNING OF PLATS**

There were no plats.

**16) REVIEW CALENDAR**

There were no additional calendar items.

**17) CLOSED MEETING TO DISCUSS THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY (UCA 52-4-205 (1)(d)) AND/OR THE SALE OF REAL PROPERTY (UCA 52-4-205 (e))**

**ACTION:** At 9:03 pm Council Member Jensen moved to adjourn into a Closed Session. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

PRESENT:

Mayor: Guy L. Fugal

Council Members: Dianna Andersen  
Eric Jensen  
Cyd LeMone  
Lynn Walker  
Todd Williams

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator  
Tina Petersen, City Attorney

Kathy Kresser, City Recorder  
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director/City Engineer

**ACTION:** At 9:25 pm Council Member Jensen moved to come out of the Closed Session. Council Member Walker seconded. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

**18) ADJOURN**

**ACTION:** At 9:25 pm Council Member Walker moved to adjourn. Council Member Jensen seconded. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The minutes of January 16, 2018 City Council meeting were approved by the City Council on February 6, 2018.

---

Kathy T. Kresser, City Recorder, MMC

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