

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF PROVO PROVO CITY STORMWATER SERVICE DISTRICT Regular Meeting Agenda

5:30 PM, Tuesday, May 14, 2024

Council Chambers

Hybrid meeting: 445 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601 or

<https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil>

Roll Call

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Councilor Becky Bogdin

Councilor Gary Garrett

Councilor Travis Hoban

Councilor Katrice MacKay

Councilor Rachel Whipple

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

Chief Administrative Officer Scott Henderson

Assistant City Attorney Gary Millward

Council Executive Director Justin Harrison

City Recorder Heidi Allman

Conducting: Chair Katrice MacKay

Excused: Councilors Craig Christensen and George Handley

Prayer – Rebecca Hoskins

Pledge of Allegiance – Councilor Garrett

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

1. Provo City Employee of the Month – May 2024 [0:13:07](#)

Mayor Kaufusi said she is privileged to honor an employee who has demonstrated exceptional care for our exceptional community. She invited Travis Ball, Energy Director, to present the employee of the month.

Mr. Ball introduced Jonathan Saluone, a notable employee from the Energy Department. He said Jonathan has made a significant impact since he was hired. As the planning supervisor, he brought his engineering and planning skills from his previous role in Public Works. He added that Jonathan was hands-on from the beginning, working directly with field crews and even operating a backhoe to dig trenches for the fire station. His efforts bridged the gap between planners and line crews, enhancing their relationship to an unprecedented level. Jonathan's collaboration extended beyond his department. His connections from public works fostered excellent relationships with other city departments, embodying the spirit of unity within Provo. His exceptional interpersonal skills ensured no one spoke ill of him, as he maintained positive interactions with all departments. In his planning role, Jonathan also worked with developers, often delivering tough messages diplomatically. He understood the importance of efficient development processes and advanced plans with notable efficiency. Mr. Ball concluded by expressing gratitude for Jonathan's outstanding contributions to the Energy Department.

2. Recognition of the Spring 2024 Provology Graduates [0:18:45](#)

Scott Henderson, Chief Administrative Officer, presented the 2024 Spring Provology Graduates. He highlighted that these graduates dedicated two to three hours every Wednesday from February to April to learn more about their community, exemplifying Provo's best and most informed citizens. He then invited Mayor Kaufusi to present the certificates and Chair MacKay to offer congratulations on behalf of the council. The graduates included Stephanie Case, Tammy Case, Sam Cosgrove, Emily Craig, Ivone Duffin, Lillian Everett, Dustin Higginson, Ashlon Hill, Lance Holmes, Gary Lindley, Trisha Nielson, Cindy Smith, Tim Smith, Stan Stewart, Clayton Tullis, and Amy Wright.

Public Comment

Chair MacKay read the public comment preamble and opened the public comment period.

Bonnie Schiffler-Olsen spoke on behalf of various community members, emphasizing the importance of recognizing everyone's value. She shared a personal story about her father, as she held the flag that draped his casket thirty years ago. She said the last time she saw him was in Santa Monica, California, when she was dropped off at a shelter by her grandmother with \$20 and a carton of cigarettes. She wanted to stay with her father after his brain tumor surgery, despite not having seen him in five years due to family separation caused by his actions. Bonnie highlighted that she is here today because she had three weeks of shelter to live in during that difficult time.

As Bonnie continued speaking passed the allotted time limit, Chair MacKay and Brian Jones reminded Bonnie that she was out of time and was violating the rules of decorum.

With no other public comments, Chair MacKay closed the public comment period.

Action Agenda

3. **A resolution to place a 0.061 acre parcel of property located generally at 480 West Center Street on the Surplus Property List and authorize the Mayor to dispose of the property (24-047) [0:32:50](#)**

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2024-24, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Tara Riddle, Property Manager, presented. She provided some history of the property at 480 West Center, which Provo City had demolished in 2012 after it was deemed unsafe and condemned. The property owner could not repay the demolition costs, so in September 2013, they deeded the 2,657-square-foot property to the city. Since then, it has remained vacant, sometimes used by Parks and Recreation for storage. Recently, Provo Cinema LLC proposed constructing a community theater on the site, in response to a request for proposals for the city center block. Before any action can be taken, the property must be placed on the surplus property list. She noted the proposed resolution would add the property to this list and authorize Mayor Kaufusi to sell it at its appraised value of \$133,000, following city code criteria.

Chair MacKay opened the item for public comment. With no comments and no council discussion, she called for a vote.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Christensen and Handley excused.

4. An ordinance amending the Zone Map Classification of real property, generally located at 1354 N Geneva Rd, from the Agricultural (A1.5) Zone to the One-Family Residential (R1.8) Zone – Lakeview North Neighborhood (PLRZ20240018) [0:35:35](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2024-25, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Nancy Robinson, City Planner, presented. She explained that the property is currently zoned for agricultural use. The applicant wants to subdivide the single lot into three residential lots, requesting a change to the Residential R1.8 zone. The property contains one single-family home and four sheds, one of which would need to be demolished to meet residential setback requirements. The applicant has arranged with UDOT for two access points onto Geneva Road, necessitating a shared driveway for two of the properties. She added that the planning commission reviewed this request on April 24 and unanimously recommended that the municipal council approve the application.

Chair MacKay opened the item for public comment. With no comments and no council discussion, she called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Christensen and Handley excused.

5. A resolution approving an amended development agreement related to property generally located at 2050 North Canyon Road – Pleasant View Neighborhood (PLRZ20220302) [0:37:22](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2024-25, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Aaron Ardmore, Planning Supervisor, presented. He first addressed questions from an earlier work session regarding the project. He clarified that the sidewalk along Canyon Road would be six feet wide and would not include a park strip through the corridor. Regarding the setbacks for the Timpanogos Towers, he explained that the setbacks vary between six to ten feet from the property line depending on the angle up Canyon Road. He provided background on the project, noting it was initially approved a year ago with a medium density residential zone applied to 2050 North Canyon Road. The original development agreement became financially unfeasible, prompting the current amendment request. Despite the amendments, the project still adheres to the 30-foot maximum building height and parking requirements from the original agreement. The main changes include an increase from 12 to 14 units, a height increase from approximately 26 feet to just over 28 feet, and an increase in parking spaces from 21 to 30.

Councilor Garrett asked if Mr. Ardmore could describe the difference in setback requirements between the proposed amended agreement and the original.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Mr. Ardmore said the original agreement required a setback of 14 feet, while the amended agreement requests a reduced setback of eight feet eight inches. Mr. Ardmore referenced the Timp Towers as a comparable example to illustrate the proposed change.

Councilor Bogdin asked Mr. Salmon to discuss the date the original development agreement was filed.

Mr. Salmon admitted that he mistakenly believed an agreement had been in place since a meeting about a year ago. He mentioned that he had sent and signed an agreement before the meeting, and there were no significant changes discussed. However, a few months ago, Aaron inquired about the status of the agreement, revealing it had not been executed as Mr. Salmon thought. Consequently, they quickly finalized and executed the agreement, which explains the recent file date.

Councilor Bogdin asked if Mr. Salmon could explain why he was seeking approval of a different development agreement instead of sticking with the original.

Mr. Salmon clarified that he always viewed the project as a concept plan and believed the development agreement set limits on aspects like building height, density, and parking. To keep costs low, he minimized work with engineers and architects, focusing on the basic concept. Over the past year, he discovered practical issues, leading to many revisions. He stressed that the changes were not last-minute but part of a continuous, year-long development process.

Councilor Bogdin asked about concerns regarding the development potentially becoming a rental property, leading to over-occupancy and inadequate parking, and noted that the development agreement does not address these issues.

Mr. Salmon addressed owner occupancy by outlining several measures in place. Each unit will be individually metered, which is a requirement for owner occupancy. They are also applying for FHA project approval, which allows buyers to access lower down payments and interest rates. This approval requires owner occupancy and excludes investors. To maintain FHA approval, the project must meet a certain owner-to-investor occupancy ratio, likely around 3:1. This economically incentivizes selling primarily to owner-occupiers. Additionally, they are consulting with attorneys on HOA bylaws to enforce occupancy ratios, possibly including permits or additional fees for renting out units. Mr. Salmon acknowledged legal limitations on controlling occupancy but emphasized the project's intent to favor owner-occupiers as much as possible. He noted the potential for some buyers to dishonestly claim owner occupancy, only to rent the units later, and recognized the difficulty in controlling this. Despite these challenges, the overall goal is to ensure that as many units as possible are sold to and occupied by owners.

Councilor Garrett asked about the issues raised by the neighborhood during the meeting held a year ago and inquired about what has been done through the iterative process to address their greatest concerns.

Mr. Salmon stated that parking was a significant concern raised by the neighborhood. The existing parking issues are exacerbated by nearby student housing where students park on the street to avoid parking fees. This led neighbors to worry that the new development would worsen the problem, with one even jokingly suggesting a parking structure instead of a multifamily project. To address this, the new design has increased parking capacity from 22 to 29 spaces, despite adding two more units. Mr. Salmon emphasized that parking has been a key focus in the revised plans, ensuring they meet required

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

standards. He added that he would be willing to continue to meet with neighbors to discuss any other concerns.

Chair MacKay praised the new concept plan, noting its improved attractiveness and potential to enhance the neighborhood. However, she expressed concerns about parking, agreeing with Councilor Bogdin that owner occupancy would mitigate parking issues, while rentals would exacerbate them. She mentioned that HOA rules, such as CC&Rs, can legally enforce owner occupancy and limit rentals. Chair MacKay emphasized the need for one- and two-bedroom units for first-time homebuyers, but warned that if rented, these units could lead to overcrowding and increased parking problems.

Councilor Hoban praised the development and expressed excitement about it. He mentioned that the council is considering sending the plan back to the neighborhood and planning commission for further approval, but he wondered about the potential implications of this delay. He questioned whether there was a specific reason to approve the plan today instead of waiting another two months, given the year-long process already undertaken.

Mr. Salmon noted that delaying the project would increase carrying costs and expressed concern about further design revisions, given the extensive work already done with around 40 different designs. He questioned the value of returning to the neighborhood, suggesting that if a delay is necessary, it might be better to reconsider the 30-foot height limit and explore alternative options. He indicated a willingness to proceed based on the council's collective decision, despite the potential for additional time and cost.

With no other questions for Mr. Salmon, Chair MacKay opened the public comment period.

Lynn Sorenson, the Pleasant View neighborhood chair, expressed frustration that Mr. Salmon's new three-story plan differs from the two-story plan previously agreed upon in 2023. Despite Mr. Salmon's assurances of openness and effort, the neighborhood only recently learned of the significant change. Ms. Sorenson emphasized the need for a new neighborhood meeting to address concerns about parking and project size, as the current plan deviates from what was initially discussed.

DV Jacobs, a long-time resident of Garden Villa condominiums, expressed concern over the new proposal from Ryan Salmon. He noted that the plan, initially proposed as a three-story building and later changed to two stories, is now unexpectedly back as a three-story design. Jacobs urged the council to review the concerns raised by neighborhood representative Paul Evans and highlighted that the new proposal deviates from previous discussions and approvals. He requested that the council halt consideration of the proposal and ensure it undergoes the proper neighborhood and planning commission review process.

Cindy Madsen, of Provo, advocated for Ryan Salmon's project and emphasized the need for affordable housing in Provo. She argued that current housing options often do not cater to young families and that Salmon's project offers a crucial opportunity for such housing. Madsen noted that Salmon's plan includes significant parking provisions and questioned why the three-story aspect is a concern if it complies with height restrictions. She urged the council to consider the pressing need for affordable housing and to explore ways to address this need effectively.

Jan Godfrey, of Provo, praised Ryan Salmon's character, describing him as reliable, cooperative, and honorable. She highlighted the need for affordable housing, noting that young couples often struggle to

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

find affordable options despite having good jobs. Godfrey also mentioned that the property Salmon is developing is currently an eyesore and would benefit from an update. She urged the council to support the project as it aligns with community needs and improves the property.

Christina Davis thanked the council for addressing funds for safety improvements on Slate Canyon Drive. She encouraged them to allocate the money for parking enforcement and expressed appreciation for their efforts in researching the issue and engaging with the neighborhood.

Duncan Cole, of Pleasant View Neighborhood in Provo, expressed strong support for the project, emphasizing the need for affordable housing for young adults like her five children. She believes the three-story design is suitable for the area, which already has other large apartment complexes. Ms. Cole appreciated the efforts made by Ryan Salmon to keep the community informed and criticized neighbors who oppose both out-of-state and local developers. She praised Salmon's dedication and hoped the council would approve the project so she would not need to return for further meetings.

Court Godfrey, of Provo, expressed strong support for Ryan Salmon's project, highlighting Salmon's commitment to delivering a beneficial and fair development for the community. As a close friend of Salmon, Mr. Godfrey vouched for his integrity and dedication. He acknowledged that the project has evolved over time due to changing circumstances and praised Salmon's efforts to adapt accordingly. Mr. Godfrey emphasized that the current building on the property is an eyesore, and that the new development would significantly improve the area. He urged neighbors to embrace the change and recognize the value of having a responsible local developer like Salmon.

Paul Evans, of Provo, raised three main concerns about the development project. First, he noted that the property has been for sale for over six months, questioning who will develop it. Second, he emphasized that neighborhood discussions focused on parking and building height, highlighting that the original agreement was for a two-story building with a 24-foot roof height, not 30 feet. The increase from 12 to 14 units and the lack of neighborhood review of the development agreement were also points of contention. Finally, Mr. Evans pointed out that the one-bedroom and two-bedroom apartments have the same square footage and stressed the need to review CC&R or HOA rules to ensure owner occupancy. He also mentioned concerns about reduced setbacks for a taller building and stated that comparing this project to Timpanogos Towers is inappropriate.

Sharron Memmott, a neighborhood board member, expressed concerns about the development project. She highlighted that the original proposal to the neighborhood was for 15 one-bedroom units in a three-story building, which was scaled down to an agreed plan for eight single-family homes. However, the new proposal seeks 14 two-bedroom units, which exceeds both the initial and previously agreed plans. She pointed out that the project has not gone through a neighborhood meeting or the planning commission. Memmott emphasized that the current proposal does not meet parking requirements, has reduced setbacks, and could potentially change further without proper neighborhood input. She urged the council not to disregard the existing development agreement, which was responsive to neighborhood concerns and was passed a year ago. She also noted that the property is currently for sale, and these changes might be intended for future projects rather than the current one.

With no other public comments, Chair MacKay invited a council discussion.

Councilor Bogdin inquired whether Mr. Salmon could address the issue of the property being for sale.

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Mr. Salmon shared that the development process has been grueling, leading him to question whether it is worth persisting with city approval. He noted that the property was listed for sale to assess market interest. Although there have been inquiries from potential buyers, none are dependent on the project's outcome tonight. He explained that the developer's agreement would carry over to any new owner and stressed that selling the property in parts would impede development. The listing was primarily a way to determine if selling the property might be a better option than continuing with the project.

Chair MacKay emphasized that the neighborhood's role is not to approve development agreements but to provide input. She highlighted that having a local developer like Mr. Salmon is beneficial for Provo, as local developers often have a deeper connection to the community. Chair MacKay praised Mr. Salmon's positive interactions with staff and acknowledged that making changes is a natural part of the development process. She noted that learning and adapting are part of any first-time project, and it is important to consider this in evaluating the development.

Councilor Hoban expressed appreciation for the public's involvement and highlighted the dilemma of either approving the development project or potentially facing an unsightly property or a 12-unit apartment. He noted concerns about the neighborhood's objections to minor changes, such as height differences and additional units, emphasizing that these adjustments are relatively small compared to the overall impact. He acknowledged the addition of parking spots as a positive change and stressed that the development could be a net improvement. He also expressed that, while he values neighborhood input, he felt the character of the developer, Mr. Salmon, was positively highlighted by the community. He stated for him to support the project, he would need assurance in writing that the units will be owner-occupied.

Mr. Jones outlined two options for the Council. The first option is to continue the discussion to allow further exploration of the proposal and return with a development agreement that explicitly includes the requested language regarding owner occupancy. The second option is to approve the development agreement as proposed but with a substitute motion to add the specific language about owner occupancy. In this case, staff would then incorporate the added language into the final agreement after approval.

Motion: Councilor Hoban made a substitute motion to approve the development agreement as proposed contingent upon adding language regarding ongoing owner occupancy. Seconded by Chair MacKay.

Mr. Jones explained that while the legal process is a formal requirement, the substance of the project is up to the Council's discretion. He noted that if the Council needs more feedback from the neighborhood or Planning Commission, they can request it. He highlighted that concept plans often change significantly before construction, and development agreements can also be amended. The Planning Commission's role is to recommend land use regulations, not to dictate development agreements. Once a development agreement is in place, it governs the use of the property within the zoning regulations. The Council can amend the agreement without needing further Planning Commission input. They have the authority to continue the discussion, request additional feedback, or make decisions based on the agreement's alignment with their concerns.

Councilor Garrett emphasized the urgent need for entry-level housing in the community. He noted that the development could reach up to 35 feet if approved for R1 zoning, but he is comfortable with the proposed 30 feet. He supports the project but also wants to explore ways to keep the dialogue open

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

between Mr. Salmon and the neighbors. However, he shares concerns that delaying the decision too long might result in the project being abandoned.

Councilor Whipple expressed strong support for the project, noting that improvements to the plan are a rare and positive occurrence. She believes the revised plan is more attractive and beneficial for the neighborhood, with changes that align well with zoning and the original plan. She said she is pleased with the developer's efforts to secure FHA approval, ensuring the property will be available to owner-occupants. She values the developer's commitment to contributing to Provo and sees the project as a valuable addition, especially for young adults seeking housing. Councilor Whipple downplayed concerns about minor changes in the plan, viewing them as not significantly divergent from prior approvals.

Councilor Bogdin expressed concern that the project might become a rental complex, highlighting the need for more owner-occupied housing in Provo, as the city already has many rental properties.

Chair MacKay expressed appreciation for the community's involvement and noted her own residency in the neighborhood. She mentioned that despite past experiences with unsatisfactory developments where there was little public engagement, she values input from those who do participate. She acknowledged the passion and investment of the community members but noted that while neighborhood input is crucial, not every detail can be revised endlessly through the neighborhood process.

Councilor Hoban clarified that his motion did not require the development agreement to be reviewed by the council again. Instead, staff would add language to ensure that the units are owner-occupied.

Councilor Whipple requested more details on the percentage of the 14 units designated for owner occupancy, as Councilor Hoban's motion did not specify this.

In response, Councilor Hoban confirmed that his intention was for all 14 units to be owner-occupied.

Mr. Jones clarified that the development agreement terminates once the certificates of occupancy are issued. He said the goal is to add language that allows the city to enforce owner occupancy up until that point which includes ensuring that units are sold for owner occupancy and that an HOA is established with CC&Rs to maintain owner occupancy.

Councilor Hoban asked Mr. Salmon if he felt comfortable with the requests that the council was proposing.

Mr. Salmon agreed.

With no other council discussion, Chair MacKay called for a vote on the substitute motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Christensen and Handley excused.

6. A resolution approving the appropriation of \$200,000 in the Legacy CIP Fund for a Zoning re-write (24-006) [1:42:14](#)

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2024-26, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Bill Peperone, Director of Development Services, expressed his gratitude for considering funding a new zoning ordinance. He noted that the new general plan, which was funded a few years ago, has been very helpful. However, he emphasized that a new zoning ordinance would have a significantly greater impact on the future built environment of Provo City than the general plan, which is an advisory and high-level document. In contrast, the zoning ordinance is law and is overdue for an update. He conveyed his appreciation for any assistance in this matter.

Chair MacKay opened public comment. With none, she invited a council discussion.

Councilor Garrett asked Mr. Peperone to discuss the timeline for the full re-write.

Mr. Peperone said the vendor has proposed the full re-write to take approximately 11 months.

Justin Harrison, Council Executive Director, clarified that the appropriation is set to come from the legacy Capital Improvement Program (CIP) fund. This fund primarily contains one-time money from the ARPA allocation. The current balance is about \$1.58 million. There is a proposal in the tentative budget to use \$1.3 million for FY 25, which would leave approximately \$285,000 in the CIP fund. With this appropriation, around \$85,000 would remain in the fund.

Chair MacKay thanked Mr. Harrison for the explanation and called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Christensen and Handley excused.

7. A resolution approving the appropriation of \$28,400 in the General Fund for Slate Canyon Parking Enforcement costs (24-006) [1:45:13](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2024-27, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Melia Dayley, Council Analyst, explained that the funds will be used for parking signs on Slate Canyon Drive and to cover the costs of changing a parking enforcement officer from part-time to full-time for the last month and a half of the current fiscal year, until the next budget year begins.

Chair MacKay opened public comment. With no comments, and no council discussion, she called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Christensen and Handley excused.

8. A resolution tentatively adopting a proposed budget for Provo City for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2024 and ending June 30, 2025 (24-007) [1:46:25](#)

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2024-28, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mayor Kaufusi presented the proposed publicity budget for fiscal year 2025, highlighting the extensive work by various departments and the finance team, including John Borget, Kelsey Zarbock, and Andrea Wright. The budget focuses on key priorities communicated by the council: funding two additional police officers, an additional parking enforcement officer, a zoning update, adjustments to retain talented employees, and maintaining current services and projects. The budget is balanced and does not require tax or utility fee increases. Mayor Kaufusi emphasized that utility fee adjustments should be handled separately to focus on current funding needs and acknowledged the financial challenges residents face. She expressed pride in delivering a plan that meets all key goals and remains committed to efficient operations and exceptional community care.

Chair MacKay clarified that tentatively adopting the budget does not make it permanent. It is a temporary measure, as the council has not yet reviewed it in detail. The council can request any necessary changes before the final adoption.

Kelsey Zarbock confirmed Chair MacKay's comments, stating that tonight's goal is to acknowledge receipt of the budget and tentatively adopt it. The official adoption will take place later, after public hearings. She noted that the tentative city budget totals \$292,856,761, and John Borget provided budget highlights during the work meeting. She added that the budget documents could be found online for any members of the public who are interested in viewing them.

Chair MacKay opened public comment. With no comments, and no council discussion, she called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Christensen and Handley excused.

Councilor Hoban commended the mayor, her team, the administration, and all departments for their sacrifices in making the budget work despite significantly lower revenues and higher costs. He acknowledged the effort and creativity involved in achieving this, noting that it was a challenging feat. He emphasized that while such efforts cannot be repeated every year, this year's accomplishment was impressive.

With no objections, the Provo Municipal Council adjourned and reconvened as the Provo City Stormwater Service District with Chair MacKay conducting.

Stormwater Service District

9. A resolution tentatively adopting a proposed budget for the Provo City Stormwater Service District for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2024 and ending June 30, 2025 (24-007) [1:53:35](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve 2024-SSD-05-14-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Ms. Zarbock explained that the Stormwater Service District's tentative budget, like the city budget, is being acknowledged as being received. Although it is a separate entity, it is included at the end of the

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.

city budget book on page 141. She praised Andrea Wright for her excellent work on the budget book. The tentative budget for the Stormwater Service District's is \$6,485,898 for the fiscal year 2025.

Chair MacKay opened public comment. With no comments, and no council discussion, she called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Christensen and Handley excused.

With no objections, the Provo City Stormwater Service District adjourned and reconvened as the Governing Board of the Redevelopment Agency of Provo with Chair Whipple conducting.

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

10. **A resolution tentatively adopting a proposed budget for the Redevelopment Agency of Provo City for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2024 and ending June 30, 2025 (24-007)**
[1:55:08](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve 2024-RDA-05-14-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Ms. Zarbock noted that the Redevelopment Agency budget can be found on page 142 of the budget book. She explained that this budget consists of two funds: the tax increment fund and the new development fund, both administered by the Development Services department. She said the tentative budget for the Redevelopment Agency in fiscal year 2025 is \$1,512,815.

Chair Whipple opened public comment. After no comments, she invited a board member discussion.

Board Member Hoban remarked that it is challenging to discuss the budget right after receiving it. He noted that much of the budget process is done beforehand, and although it may seem rushed, the council has thoroughly considered and discussed these items. For the public's benefit, he emphasized that the council is very thoughtful about the budget.

Chair Whipple echoed Board Member Hoban's sentiments and acknowledged that they have had many budget meetings and now have the document to review, which they will read thoroughly before the final adoption. She then called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:0 with Board Members Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, and Whipple in favor. Board Members Christensen and Handley excused.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 7:24 PM.