



AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
MAY 21, 2024
WORK SESSION AGENDA

Members Present:

Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Ernie John	Council Member
Tim Holley	Council Member

Members Absent:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
------------------	-------

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Assistant City Administrator
Anna Montoya	Finance Director
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Angie Katoa	Utility Billing & Business Licensing
Patrick O'Brien	Development Services Director
Sam Kelly	Public Works Director
Al Scott	Assistant Public Works Director
Cherylyn Egner	Legal Counsel
George Schade	IT Director
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief
Cameron Paul	Police Chief
Jay Brems	Water Superintendent

Also present: Keith Larson (Bowen Collins & Associates), Tanya Royslance, Sheri Anderson (Intermountain Regional Landfill), Cheloise Klepper (Utility Customer Service), and Neil Schwendiman (District Manager North Pointe Solid Waste).

The American Fork City Council met in a work session on Tuesday, May 21, 2024, in the American Fork City Administration Conference Room, located at 51 E. Main Street, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

WORK SESSION

1. Discussion on pressurized irrigation and culinary water rates.

Pro Temp Taylor filled in for the mayor and excused his absence. He turned the time over to Keith Larsen of Bowen, Collins & Associates to discuss the pressurized irrigation water study.

Mr. Larsen mentioned two things that needed to be discussed today. One being *Revenue Needs* and the overall water fund projections and the other being that meters have been installed to secondary irrigation system and historically the city has charged a flat fee and so making decisions on how to charge for that is the discussion that needs to be made.

Mr. Larsen stated that the city has been in great shape for the last several years but there have been some additional challenges that have come up with system expansion and aging infrastructure. He reported that the city has an area of growth where it has to provide new infrastructure and then there are older areas of the town that need to be maintained and reaching the end of its life, so it becomes a capital need. He added that inflation is a major issue and something to be considered.

Revenue Needs: WATER SYSTEM FINANCIAL CHALLENGES

- System expansion and Aging Infrastructure
- Inflation (increased cost) – Since 2017 American Fork secondary rates have been flat, culinary rates have gone up 4%. Typically, systems have programed 3% per year for inflation.
- Conservation (Decreased revenue) the amount of water that has been produced has been under 9% from 2020-2023 (includes Culinary and Pressurized Irrigation)

Jay Brems commented that with culinary, they have done a lot of projects that have been taking care of a lot of leaks and then new meters were put in on some of the city sources (wells) and now it gives a more accurate data which is why the amount of water has decreased.

Mr. Larsen stated that statewide there was a trend in decreased water use overall with education and awareness. In addition, concerns about the Great Salt Lake have affected that decrease.

Upcoming Capital Projects

- System Improvements
- Master Planned Projects
- System Replacements/R&R
-

Mr. Larsen stated that the Master Plan projects include rehabilitation and replacement of existing systems over the next 10 years. Council Member Carroll asked for examples of those projects. Mr. Bunker replied that several wells need to be refurbished, water lines have to be replaced, 100 East is an example where the water line is getting replaced right now. Pacific Drive up to 300 North has already had the water line replaced. Mr. Bunker commented that it's in the R&R (system replacement).

Sam Kelly commented that there is a buildout of a transmission line, 42" to go from 700 North down to one of our tanks which is a \$13 million price tag which is Impact Fee eligible as well. He added there are some big water projects that are coming up. He stated that most of the work in the PI system has been done besides filter stations and boosters. He added that in 20 years we have to start looking at having to go in and replace some of the infrastructure because of some of the fittings and valves, we will have to start putting money back into the system due to it being a new water system today.

Council Member Taylor asked which pumps need to be replaced. Jay Brems replied that the hospital, the Country Club, the racetrack, and Boley well. He added that the Golf Course was put in in 1995 so that's in decent shape.

Mr. Bunker commented that another Master Plan project that needs to be incorporated is to get reuse water from the treatment plant. He added that the city has been working with TSSD to get that flow and put it back into our system.

Mr. Larsen discussed expenses regarding O&M, salaries, benefits, debt service (focused on construction of the PI), and expenditures (capital projects and rehabilitation replacement). One of the things he pointed out is that based on the growth of our system, there would need to be additional system operation staff.

Mr. Larsen stated that in regard to pipelines needed, he added that what they do is take the values of the city system and divide it, figure out how much it would cost, replace the entire system and divide that by the expected lifespan of the facilities. He commented that in a water system he'd hope to get 60 years out of the water lines but often it can get more than that and stretch up to 70 or 80 years. He added that if you take the value and divide it by 60 to 80 years, the range of expenditures that is expected to see as a long-term average on what the city should be investing in the system. He went on to discuss the revenues from what the city receives in terms of rates it charges and some miscellaneous fees, also total revenues including impact fees.

Mr. Larsen commented that the city is bringing in revenue that is sufficient to cover the capital expenditures and is in range of the expected design life. He added that due to inflation, conservation and ongoing capital needs, revenue will start to fall behind.

What are options for addressing the revenue deficit?

Reduce Expenditures

- O&M largely fixed
- Debt service fixed
- Capital projects – could postpone some capital or R&R investment, this does not reduce costs, just shifts them to later and usually results in high costs overall (and postpones development)

Mr. Larsen stated that the O&M is fixed, and the staff is working to keep that efficient as possible. The debt service is fixed by the contracts that the city has for bonds (PI bond ends 2037). He added that if the city decides to defer maintenance or postpone, we could get away with a year or two but that it will catch up eventually and he recommended not to go that route.

Increase Revenues

- Rates – Current recommendations
- Impact Fees – Limited by State code
- Subsidy from General Fund

Mr. Larsen commented that with the finishing of the Master Plan it will update the Impact Fee which are closely regulated by state code that whatever the city gets out of it is what we get. He commented that the city will see a massive increase that would take care of the gap and it might help a little bit but not cover it all. He suggested that another thing the city could do has to do with taxes. The city can subsidize from the General Fund, which the Council is reluctant to do but that is an option for a source. He recommended the city increase to 12% in the upcoming year (2025) and then do a couple 5% increases (2026-2027) and then 3% (2028) increases moving forward.

Discussion amongst the Council and Mr. Larsen ensued regarding revenues from building permits, increases in fees, what surrounding cities are facing due to increases and how inflation has affected costs.

Rate Structure Design

Current Rate Structures

- Culinary
 - Current Structure includes base rate + 4 volumetric tiers. (you pay more the more you use)
 - The last increase was in 2022.

Jay Brems commented that the meters are in other than the 4” and 6” connections and the Water Division is currently going around and putting the endpoint of the device that reads the meter on. He added that 70% of the meters are done. He reported that 17 out of the 41 towers are in that are reading the meters and it is reading 5,000 to 6,000 of the culinary meters and about 5,000 of the PI meters based off the tower set ups and currently over the

next six months, hope to have the rest of the towers put in.

Mr. Larson stated that if the Council decided to go with the 12% increase, you would take the existing rate and multiply it by 12% and the impact would vary depending on how much is being used.

- Pressurized Irrigation
 - The current structure includes a base rate + Fixed overage (based on lot size).
 - Last increase was in 2016
 - Small percentage of connections currently not metered (80% done)
 - Transitioning to metered use for all connections.
 - Recommend updating PI structure to be tied to usage when metering begins.
 - Proposed structure includes a base rate + consumption rate (to be set based on cost of service)

Example Culinary Rates

- No recommended structural changes to culinary fees

Mr. Larson went on to state examples and explain the chart based on impact costs and rates for 2025. He discussed different scenarios of providing water, size of pipes, water storage, costs, and how it would compare to surrounding cities water use.

Proposed PI Structure

- Create 5-6 classes of users with similar lots
- Design base rates and tiered blocks according to typical irrigation needs of lot sizes.
- For examples, revenue neutral rates will be like the following:

	≤9000 sf	9000-12000 sf	12000-16000 sf	16000-22000 sf	22000-43500 sf	>43,500 sf
Base Rate	\$13.55	\$18.07	\$24.09	\$33.12	\$65.49	\$98.37
Tier 1 (\$.80)	\$0-10 kgal	0-13 kgal	0-18 kgal	0-24 kgal	0-48 kgal	0-73 kgal
Tier 2 (\$1.04)	10-30 kgal	13-40 kgal	18-53 kgal	24-73 kgal	48-145 kgal	73-218 kgal
Tier 3 (\$1.54)	30-50 kgal	40-67 kgal	53-89 kgal	73-122 kgal	145-242 kgal	218-363 kgal
Tier 4 (\$3.20)	>50 kgal	>67 kgal	>89 kgal	>122 kgal	>242 kgal	363 kgal

Mr. Larsen proposed based on the analysis that for residential, 1” meters that is tied to a lot size – 9,000 square feet would receive 10,000 gallons of water and it would go up depending on lot size and water usage. Different lot sizes will range from 30,000 to 50,000 gallons of water and up with the bigger lots. He commented that it would be a

policy decision that would need to be made, but it is a starting point. He stated anything about 550,000 gallons a month in the summer is a lot and estimated above the cost of service for that use to be able to provide an incentive to not use as much at that point.

Council Member Carroll asked if there was enough data since meters have just been installed to show what the average use is. Mr. Larsen replied that with meters installed residents are seeing how much water they're using, and the study has shown that once people are paying for the water instead of a flat fee, the reduction is on average is 30% reduction in water use.

Council Members asked if there is a reduction in water use and the 12% needs to go to 17% just to offset the cost because you either conserve too much or didn't use enough water. Mr. Larsen replied that he did consider that and so the 12% is assuming that people drop in water use. He commented that he's taken into account the conservation and calculated where the rates need to be to get the 12% revenue so it's not double dipping. He added that if people don't conserve as much as the projections are, there could be more revenue and may not have to do too much moving forward.

Mr. Bunker commented that there are more high-density projects coming in and they have less irrigatable areas in their projects per unit compared to typical ¼ acre lots or 1/3 acre lots. He added we do need conservation and if we don't then the pipes, we have in the ground today cannot sustain us through build out. He stated that the PI system was designed for build out, but we have maxed out the flow that we can send through the main distribution system. He added that the velocities in the distribution system are getting high and pushing a lot of water through the system.

Mr. Bunker went on to state that the pipes were designed appropriately based on the lower usage numbers of what we should be using, but because everybody is using more than they should, the distribution system is maxed out and we still have growth happening in the city. So, if there is no conservation happening in the future we will have to either parallel one of our main lines with another main line and somehow deliver more water to the system. He stated it is important to conserve to make our system work.

Discussion between staff and the Council ensued regarding the design of the distribution system and future water uses.

Mr. Larsen proposed that the base rate (revenue neutral) plus the high rates and if the city decides to bring in the same amount of money that have been bringing in (doesn't have the 12% increase), what can happen is the base rate would drop from \$21.68 down to \$13.55 but then charge \$0.80 up to \$3.20 (Tier 4) which is still cheaper than any culinary water.

Discussion ensued between staff and the Council about the PI proposed structure costs

and each scenario.

Mr. Bunker commented that the intent with culinary is that the meter is read every month once the towers are up, and the meters are set. We will go to a monthly meter read unlike before when after three months, residents are shocked that their bill is so high from an actual meter read.

Mr. Larsen then discussed in detail the PI structure based on size of lots with the Council and staff.

Shareholders in American Fork Irrigation Company – Value based off ¼ acre lot

- Full cost at Current Rates - \$26.80/month
- Current Discount (50% of total) - \$13.40/month
- Present value of Discount (based on perpetual lease at interest rate of 5%/year) - \$3,192/year
- Required shares for discount - 0.25 shares
- Present Value of discount per share - \$12,766
- Current Market Value of AFIC water shares - \$12,000

Conclusion: Current credit is fair (slightly generous) compensation for use of AFIC shares.

Mr. Larsen stated that the credit that is given is a generous offer for what it was and added that the city would have to decide what it is they want to offer. Now that we know the PI structures are going to be a lot more complicated and if a credit is provided against the volume charges, then you are messing with the cost of service.

Shareholder Credit Adjustments

- Challenges
 - More complicated PI rate structure increases administrative effort
 - Providing credit against volume charges could conflict with conservation goals and cost of service principles
- Proposed Solutions
 - Structure credit as simple reduction in bill of \$53.60/month/share
 - Credit applied to total bill after calculating charges following the same procedure used for all other users.
 - Credit is independent of lot size
 - Credit may not reduce bill below \$0.00

Mr. Bunker added that based on information we gather and how it's worked out, that number may not be \$53.60, it might be lower, and we will figure out how to come to that calculation.

Discussion ensued about base rates based on off the PI Structure chart and the rates per tier.

Mr. Bunker commented that they'll get back later today on this additional information that the Council is looking for and circle back in a couple of weeks and keep the ball moving.

2. Presentation by North Point Solid Waste District on upcoming changes.

Neal Schwendiman gave a brief history of the company. He showed the Council and staff a map of their locations and what is offered there.

Services Provided

- Municipal Solid Waste MSW (residential or commercial front load)
- Small commercial
- Public self-haul into the transfer station
- Green waste collection
- Take in clean concrete from construction
- Hazardous waste program – paint, chemicals, cleaners, batteries etc.

Mr. Schwendiman claimed that their C&D has grown over the years moving over 300,000 tons of waste through the transfer station. He went over percentages of MSW compared to construction demolition. He explained that curbside is all of the city contracts with Waste Management and Republic Services picking up the garbage cans at the curb. The other MSW would be commercial front load trucks or roll off trucks or residents just bringing their garbage directly into the station.

He stated that the current rate is \$38/ton for MSW, but all cities get curbside. The district gives a \$4.00/ton break to all the cities, so they are paying \$34/ton. American Fork curbside numbers is 14,000 tons, public self-hauls are 6,655 coming into drop off waste, of that amount, 3,900 of them used the dump passes. Customers hauling green waste weighed in at 178 tons.

Mr. Bunker commented that in 2020 the city gave an extra push for yard cleanup since people were home and gave residents extra dump passes.

Mr. Schwendiman commented on the future of the district stating that in updated Master Plan in 2022 the scope of that plan was to determine what the feasibility of expanding our current location versus trying to find a another area to build a second transfer station within the district and whether or not it was feasible to expand that current facility and then to provide recommendations on what that expansion would look like also to determine the condition of the existing facility and then provide estimates on all aspects

of that master plan. He added that some of the findings was that they needed to install new stormwater infrastructure, paving repairs throughout the site, replace damaged siding to the transportation and ventilation system.

He did state that there is some structural issue with the transportation building. Unfortunately, the way the beams are, the loaders can hit them and so we tried to push our operators to stay away from the sides. We have made some site operational improvements to improve workflow and customer services to relocate our household hazardous waste facility on site and not where it's at in the current building where everything funnels right to there. We relocated our compost bunker, added a push wall in the public building so we can compact the trash better and get better weights on the loads going out.

Mr. Schwendiman stated that there were two viable options to expand the current facility to handle the projected volumes for the next 25 years and it was determined that expanding the current site was more cost effective than trying to find another site to build a second. He went over the expansion of the curb facility is to take the public building and expand it to have two loading options.

He went over all the expansions and upgrades they have done in the facility.

- New cell in Bayview Landfill that increased capacity to 26 acres
- Gas collection systems – 19 wells
- Acquired additional 140 acres from SITLA at the Bayview Landfill
 - Extended land lease with SITLA until December 31, 2082

He reported in summary that some of the estimated costs for the transportation expansion are in the range of \$10 to \$15 million. The district board is in the process of evaluating timing for that expansion, getting approval from the County Commissioner to issue revenue bonds so they can afford the expansion. He showed some plans of what the existing transfer station would look like with the upgrades and expansion.

Mr. Schwendiman reported that a price increase happened in 2020 and another increase in 2023. He added that MSW rate will be going to \$40, that is what South Utah Valley is doing, so the city rate instead of being \$34/ton it will be going to \$36/ton which is about a 6% increase.

Mr. Bunker stated that Republic will include a 3.5% increase in July. He added the city will absorb that for 6 months. We don't have to pass that on just yet.

Discussion ensued with staff and Council about surrounding cities and businesses and the work North Pointe does for them.

3. Discussion on the city's code re-write pertaining to parking and signs.

Ms. Egner reported that she will be discussing two separate sections of the code. One will be parking the other one will be on signs. She stated that she sent revisions on the parking code regarding the discussion that was had in a previous work session on the TOD area, how we could issue citations, red curb and the difference between red curb and signs. She stated she went back to the code and tried to clean *Title 10* and will only be discussing the changes.

She reported that the city had adopted codes out of the Utah State code, but those codes don't even exist anymore. On *Chapter 10.04* she eliminated all of them. She reported that the city had adopted 5 different sections of code and there was no need for it, it was all state law that we have the right to enforce it. She did state that generally we are hereby adopting very broadly *Title 41*, *53* and *72*. Those are all of the traffic related sections. She added that if anything were to change or titles needed to be renumbered that it would be an easy fix.

She stated that one of the sections that she eliminated was “driving under the influence of alcohol”. She added that it doesn't need to be in the code since it's a state law.

Title 10.04

- Current code significantly out of date
- Eliminated multiple sections that are captured by the adoption of *Title 41*, *53*, and *72*
- Reduced penalties from Class B to infractions
 - They are regularly reduced to interactions.
 - This will expedite the process for the city and the individual.

Title 10 – Vehicles and Traffic

- Chapter 10.12 is the Utah State Training Facility (now USDC) stating that our laws are enforceable there. She wanted to take that out and they are looked into making sure none of those roads are public property, which they are not, they are USDC private property.
 - This is removed.
 - Seeking clarification on property ownership
- Chapter 10.16
 - Eliminated unnecessary.
- Chapter 10.20 (trucks, boats, recreational vehicles) and Chapter 10.24
 - No changes
- Chapter 10.28 (states you can't park from this section to this section) Ms. Egner stated she will work Mr. O'Brien that there will be signs or red curb in those locations before removing this section. She added that one of the sections stating that we would be giving authority to the City Engineer with consultation with the

City Planner to make the determination of whether something needs to be red curbed or signed. She added that the Council can overrule their decisions or even come up with an additional red curb or signage but that way it doesn't have to come back to the Council every time there's a parking issue somewhere.

- No substantive changes
 - Recommend eliminating entire section
- Chapter 10.29
 - Eliminated, Incorporated 10.32
- Chapter 10.32 will be the largest changes in this section. This section we identify all the different areas that you can account to park. There are some things in this section that aren't state law. Ms. Egner stated that she took out all the penalties in each specific code and made one section for violation of any of these sections is an **infraction**. There was one point in time that state law still allows these to be Class B misdemeanors. We took the approach of they should be Class B misdemeanors and then we can prosecute them less. The problem with doing that is when they're misdemeanors, the courts don't like them to make a mandatory appearance for tickets, which just bogs down the system. She added it causes residents to come into court instead of just showing up to the courthouse, paying a fine and being done. This is going to be a big factor with us moving to Justice Court in Utah County. She commented that she doesn't want to bog down the system if residents can just go online and pay their ticket to save everybody a lot of time, money and effort.
 - 10.32.010
 - Added additional clarity
 - Included no parking in/near red curb, bike lane, fire hydrant etc.
 - Reduced penalties to infraction
 - 10.32.020
 - No substantive change
 - 10.32.030 Ms. Egner proposed to give authority to the City Engineer and Development Services to put out red curbs where appropriate and throw in basic parking standards.
 - Added compliance with signs
 - Added procedure for determination of painted curbs
 - 10.32.040
 - Added parallel parking
 - 10.32.050
 - Added double parking
 - 10.32.060
 - Added off street parking
 - 10.32.070
 - Relocated snow removal code
 - Added ability for the mayor to make emergency determination.

Council Member Carroll suggested that based on falling snow that maybe it not be in the code but more of announcement as needed.

Ms. Egner replied that there are two separate sections. The first is an accumulation of 6” or more of snow that automatically triggers parking restrictions. The other is if the mayor finds that on the basis of snow, freezing rain etc., then something can be put in as an announcement. She noted that she will put some language in the code about notification (social media or website). She commented that there will more changes to this section and will let the Council know about the changes.

Council Member Carroll mentioned towing that the ability to tow doesn’t require the police or enforcement of the city in order to do so and was in favor of considering it.

Ms. Egner replied that the city would have to be careful with that and the specifications of it. She commented that she would talk with Chief Paul and come up with some language to put in the towing section of the code.

Ms. Egner mentioned that a couple of years ago she looked into a whole sign code rewrite. A lot of sign companies were not pleased with what was presented. She added that it was tabled at the PC, and it never came back. The sign companies identified all the issues they had with the city code. She stated she wanted to get the Council view on their issues before putting a code together.

Chapter 17.20 – Signs

- Prohibited Signs
 - Abandoned signs
 - Snipe signs. Signs may only be attached to utility poles in conformance with state and utility regulations and the requirements of this Chapter.
 - Vehicular signs. This regulation does not include the use of business logos, identification or advertising on vehicles primarily and actively used for business purposes and/or personal transportation.
 - Mechanical movement signs, including revolving signs
 - Pennant strings and streamers
 - [Animated signs, flashing signs, or signs that scroll or flash text or graphics](#). Sign companies were not happy about this one, they wanted animated signs and scrolling signs. Staff felt that it could be distracting to drivers.

Ms. Egner stated that currently it is not in the current code, but the proposed code would prohibit animated signs, flashing signs and scrolling signs and that’s when the sign companies pushed back. She asked the council for their input. Discussion ensued regarding this section of the code with the Council and staff stating examples of what they would like to see and what can be distracting.

- Inflatable devices or balloon signs, except for balloons used in temporary, non-commercial situations.
- Any signs that imitate, resemble, interfere with, or obstruct official traffic lights, signs, or signals.
- Signs which prevent free ingress or egress from any door, window, fire escape, or that prevent free access from one part of a roof to any other part. No sign other than a safety sign shall be attached to a standpipe or fire escape.
- Signs which emit smoke, visible vapors, particulate matter, sound, odor or contain open flames.
- Reflective signs or signs containing mirrors.
- Interactive signs
- Signs incorporating beacon or festoon lighting.
- Any banner or sign of any type suspended across a public street, without the permission of the owner of the property and road.
- Roof signs.
- Signs erected without the permission of the property owner, with the exception of those authorized or required by local, state, or federal government.
- Exempt Signs (No permit required)
 - Any sign containing information which states or implies that a property may be used for any purpose not permitted under federal, state, or local laws and regulations.
 - Any sign that promotes illegal activity.
 - Official traffic signs.
 - Government/regulatory signs.
 - Signs inside a building, or other enclosed facility, which are not meant to be viewed from the outside and are located greater than three (3) feet from the window.
 - Holiday and seasonal decorations.
 - Address signs - Up to two (2) signs stating the address, number and/or name of occupants of the premises and do not include any commercial advertising or other identification.
 - Residential districts. Signs not to exceed three (3) sq. ft. in area.
 - Non-residential districts. Signs not to exceed five (5) sq. ft. in area.
 - Public signs - Signs erected or required by government agencies or utilities, including traffic, utility, safety, railroad crossing, and identification or directional signs for public facilities.
 - Private drive signs - One (1) sign per driveway entrance, not to exceed two (2) sq. ft. in area.
 - Flags

- Location. Flags and flagpoles shall not be located within any right-of-way.
- Height. Flags shall have a maximum height of 30 ft.
- Number. No more than two (2) flags per lot in residential districts, no more than three (3) flags per lot in all other districts.
- Size. Maximum flag size is 24 sq. ft. in residential districts, 35 sq. ft. in all other districts.
- Legal Notices
- Memorial signs, public monuments or historical identification signs erected by the city, including plaque signs up to three (3) sq. ft. in area.
- Directional signs.
 - Area. No single directional sign shall exceed four (4) sq. ft. in area.
 - Height. Directional signs shall have a maximum height of five (5) ft.
 - Illumination. Directional signs shall be non-illuminated.
- Art and murals provided with such signs do not contain any commercial messaging.
- Temporary signs in compliance with this Chapter.
- **General Regulations**
 - Illumination 5am – 11 pm, or a half hour after closing. *Sign companies want the ability to have illumination 24 hours a day.*

Discussion ensued in regard to allowing illumination 24 hours a day between the Council and staff. Chief Paul mentioned that any light is good in areas that aren't well lit. Ms. Egner offered a solution that says building signs or wall signs can be lit but not free-standing ones.

- No animation, scrolling or flashing (8 second hold time)
- Message Center Signs – *sign companies were not fond of this one.*
 - On premises - may not exceed 50% of total area
 - Off premises – may be 100% of sign

Suggestions about message center signs by staff and the Council were to eliminate the 50% or instead of 50%, change it to 75% and the business can still have their branding, but the messaging can be bigger than what we had allowed in the past to compromise a bit.

- Instant changes
- Temporary signs: *signing companies want this to bigger*
 - Free standing, window, or wall sign shall have a max area of 16 square feet
 - Banner signs a maximum area of 32 sq. ft.

- The total area of all walls, awning/canopy, and projecting signs for non-residential uses shall be limited to one and a half (1.5) square feet per one (1) linear foot of building frontage that faces a public street or parking lot, subject to maximum size limitations based on sign type.
- Wall signs, non-residential
 - Area: Each sign shall have a maximum area of 32 sq. ft. per sign face.
 - Number: One (1) sign per tenant per street frontage, up to a maximum of two (2) signs per tenant. Where a store has entrances facing both a street and a parking lot, a second sign is permitted to face the parking lot.

Ms. Egner asked the Council if they want the wall sign to be some percentage of the size of the building. She mentioned that one precaution is not wanting the sign and a large building putting in a massive LED screen on the sign of their building. The Council feedback was maybe there needs to classifications of what signage it is going to be as in: company brand logo, restriction of LED sign size, and offering same type of lettering signs on a multi-office building for businesses housed in there.

Ms. Egner offered to put some language in the code to make it more friendly to businesses and to what the Council suggested.

Council Member Hunter excused to leave at 6:24 pm.

- Building signs, freestanding signs; non-residential
 - Area: Each sign shall have a maximum area of 50 sq. ft. plus an additional 10 sq. ft. per tenant up to a maximum of 100 sq. ft.
 - Height: Signs shall have a maximum height of 20 ft. (current 35')
- All illuminated signs shall require certification every three years (*signing companies pushed back on this*) in order to demonstrate continued compliance with the brightness requirements

Ms. Egner stated that from a staff perspective the signing company will initially put in what they are permitted to do and then as they change bulbs out, they just put in whatever they want and that leads to an illumination issue. Signing companies don't like it because they feel it would require engineering and additional cost that's unnecessary.

CM Hunter excused at 6:24 pm to leave meeting

MURALS

Ms. Egner mentioned if the Council wants murals. If the Council says yes, they are saying yes to any murals. She added that murals are not signs but can be signs. She asked the Council if they wanted to add murals to the code knowing that there is potential for

something they might not want in the city or not being able to say no or allow murals and try to restrict based on that you cannot regulate speech.

Mr. Bunker stated that the city could start out with no murals and then works out something after some research. Then we could land on something that might work to give time for the Council and staff to propose a solution.

Ms. Egner commented that if businesses are allowed to paint a mural about their business and if they own the building then it is a “sign”, and they would have to paint within the confines of the sign ordinance. She added that there is a restriction on size. From a legal perspective she stated that murals can be tastefully done but can also cause an outcry.

Discussion ensued about the types of murals that can be painted and people using their first amendment of free speech. Ms. Egner mentioned that if the Council proceeds in the direction of murals, they need to understand what can happen because it has happened in other cities in local areas where people have come in and decided to push the city code limits and cause alarm with the residents of the city.

Pro Tem Clark mentioned this discussion would need more time and stated that he would hate to have to disregard every good thing that could happen with murals because of the potential of someone doing something offensive.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:34 p.m.



Stephanie Finau
Deputy Recorder