



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Regular Meeting Agenda

5:30 PM, Tuesday, January 13, 2026

Council Chambers (Room 100)

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 Katrice MacKay

Councilor Jeff Whitlock

Chief Administrative Officer Scott Henderson

City Attorney Brian Jones

Councilor Craig Christensen

Councilor Travis Hoban

Councilor Rachel Whipple

Mayor Marsha Judkins

Council Executive Director Justin Harrison

City Recorder Heidi Allman

Conducting: Vice-Chair Rachel Whipple

Prayer – Ruth Hoban

Pledge of Allegiance – Councilor Whitlock

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

1 A ceremony recognizing of the winners of the 2025 Women Who SPARK team award (26-007) [00:01:40](#)

Mayor Judkins presented Amanda Ercanbrack, Annalee Larsen, and Britny Densley of Customer Service as winners of the Women Who SPARK Team Award. She explained that the award honors women who drive meaningful change and strengthen their organizations. Mayor Judkins noted that the team stepped up during one of the City's most challenging operational periods, helping guide Provo through major utility system changes while navigating environmental and social disruptions. She stated that their work went beyond maintaining operations; they asked difficult questions, challenged outdated systems, and helped build clear, purpose-driven processes that emphasized problem solving and continuous improvement. She further highlighted their efforts to strengthen customer service through improved billing practices, better use of data, streamlined billing cycles, and increased efficiency, all while supporting work-life balance for staff. Mayor Judkins shared that their mentorship approach helped empower employees and identify new leaders, and that their commitment to open communication ensured customer feedback directly informed service improvements. Mayor Judkins concluded that the team's efforts not only stabilized operations but set a new standard across the organization. She described the honorees as top-tier leaders in public service and shared that she has consistently heard positive feedback about the Customer Service team. She expressed her appreciation and excitement in presenting the recognition to them.

2 A ceremony recognizing the newly certified business licensing officers (26-007) [00:05:34](#)

Amanda Ercanbrack, Director of Customer Service, presented and invited Laramie Gonzales and Lindsey Rasmussen to join her at the front. She explained that earning the Certified Business Licensing Official (CBLO) certification is a significant professional accomplishment that reflects a strong commitment to expertise, ethics, integrity, and excellence in business licensing.

She shared that the CBLO program requires approximately three years of intensive training in areas including ethics, customer service, regulatory licensing, license enforcement, case law, constitutional law, taxation, and alcohol licensing. She noted that this comprehensive preparation equips licensing officials to serve the business community and the public with accuracy, fairness, and professionalism. Ms. Ercanbrack stated that having CBLO-certified staff strengthens the City's business licensing program by improving credibility, consistency, and compliance, while also enhancing customer service for local businesses. She added that it demonstrates Provo City's commitment to professional excellence and public trust. She further noted that Provo historically had not employed a CBLO-certified staff member, making the addition of two certified employees within the past year a significant milestone that positions the City as a leader among municipalities. She concluded by congratulating Laramie Gonzales and Lindsey Rasmussen on their achievement.

3 A presentation recognizing outgoing Council Leadership for 2025 (26-007) [00:07:42](#)

Justin Harrison, Council Executive Director, presented. He expressed appreciation on behalf of the Council, Council staff, and the City for the service of Chair Garrett and Vice Chair Whipple as they concluded their leadership roles. Mr. Harrison noted that Chair Garrett and Vice Chair Whipple dedicated significant time to their roles over the past year, often beyond what is visible to the public or even their families. He recognized their participation in numerous public meetings, as well as meetings with constituents, colleagues, and other stakeholders, and referenced the many communications they handled in support of their leadership responsibilities. He thanked them for their willingness to serve as elected officials and for their leadership.

Public Comment

Vice-Chair Whipple read the public comment preamble and opened the public comment period.

Dallin Flake, of Provo, urged the Council to terminate Provo City's contract with Flock Safety. He stated that the City leases automated license plate recognition (ALPR) cameras, which use artificial intelligence to collect and store information about vehicles and their movements. Mr. Flake expressed concern that the system functions as a mass surveillance network that tracks all drivers, including those not suspected of a crime, and allows law enforcement access without a warrant. He cited reported instances of misuse in other jurisdictions, raised concerns about federal access to local data, and described the system as a cybersecurity risk due to centralized data storage by a private company. He stated that while he supports public safety and the police department, he believes the use of this technology results in warrantless tracking of law-abiding residents and was implemented without public input.

Ryan Hauge, of Provo, shared that he was collecting signatures for a petition outside a recreational facility when he was asked to leave, which he stated left him feeling confused and unfairly treated. He noted that the facility regularly hosts community and private events and expressed his belief that petitioning is protected under the First Amendment. Mr. Hauge respectfully requested that staff be directed to allow petitioning activities at the facility or, alternatively, that an expedited permit process be considered to allow signature gathering on the property. He stated that the activity is conducted

respectfully and is generally well received by the public. He thanked the Council for considering his request.

Vice-Chair Whipple closed the public comment period.

Action Agenda

4 The election of the Municipal Council Chair and Vice-chair (26-007) [00:17:14](#)

Mr. Harrison reminded those present that according to the city code, the council is required to elect a chair and vice chair each year, with the stipulation that a chair cannot serve more than two consecutive terms. He noted that if there are no questions, a motion can be made, emphasizing that there will be no debate on this item. He encouraged the council to vote at their own pace, whether quickly or taking more time as needed.

Motion: Councilor Hoban nominated Councilor Katrice MacKay as chair.

Vice-Chair Whipple called for a vote on the nomination.

Vote: The vote passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

Motion: Chair Garrett nominated the Councilor Craig Christensen as vice chair.

Vice-Chair Whipple called for a vote on the nomination.

Vote: The vote passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

Chair MacKay conducted the remainder of the meeting.

5 A resolution appropriating \$234,611 in the general fund for pay adjustments to select sworn public safety positions. (26-011) [00:21:25](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2026-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Daniel Softley, Director of Human Resources, presented. He requested an appropriation of \$234,611 from the General Fund to make a grade adjustment for certain sworn Police and Fire positions, effective with the pay period beginning January 18, 2026. He noted that this item was previously discussed with the Council during a work session on December 16, 2025. Mr. Softley explained that the market for sworn public safety positions remains highly competitive. He stated that Human Resources recently completed a compensation study reviewing 32 police agencies and 22 fire agencies to assess Provo City's current position following recent market adjustments made by other agencies. He explained that the City's goal is to keep pay grade maximums within 5 percent of the market median. He noted that starting pay for police officers was adjusted in July based on available market data, but that pay ranges for key positions, including the officer series and sergeants and their fire department equivalents, are

now approaching the City's threshold. He stated that additional market movement, particularly among agencies operating on a calendar-year fiscal cycle, has prompted the need for further adjustments. Mr. Softley explained that the proposed police adjustments include a one-grade increase for Senior Officer, Master Officer, Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Captain positions. He stated that for employees with five or more years of experience, this would increase the pay range maximum by 5 percent, resulting in an immediate pay adjustment of approximately 2.44 percent. He added that proposed fire adjustments include a one-grade increase for all ranks from EMT through Battalion Chief, maintaining equity between the Police and Fire Departments and aligning with market data. He concluded that the City's overall compensation strategy is to keep police and fire pay relatively aligned, noting that minor variations exist due to differences in market data across agencies.

Chair MacKay thanked Mr. Softley and opened the public comment period. With no comments received, she closed the public comment period.

Vice-Chair Christensen thanked staff for their work and expressed support for the proposed adjustments. He stated that the City does not want to invest in training public safety personnel only to lose them and appreciated the diligence shown in efforts to retain those employees.

Chair MacKay called for a vote.

Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

6 An ordinance amending the zone map classification of real property, generally located at 258 W 200 N, from the General Downtown (DT1) and the Residential Conservation (RC) zones to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) zone. Timp. (PLRZ20250431) [00:25:42](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Dustin Wright, City Planner, presented the proposed rezone request for a property the applicant is seeking to rezone to the Medium Density Residential (MDR) zone. He explained that the site contains several existing structures and that the applicant has incorporated neighborhood input into plans to preserve those buildings as part of the redevelopment. Mr. Wright stated that there are eight existing single-family homes on the property, some of which currently contain multiple units. The applicant proposes converting seven of the homes back to single-family residences and selling them, with the intent that they be owner occupied, though no deed restrictions are proposed. The eighth structure, a duplex located near 200 North, would remain as a rental unit as part of the overall development. He reviewed the concept plan, which includes new multifamily development on the remaining portion of the site, including fourplexes and fiveplexes. One fourplex at the corner of 300 North and 300 West would be partially owner-occupied, with the upper units owner-occupied and the lower units rented. Mr. Wright explained that the property is currently split between the Residential Conservation zone and the DT1 zone, and the applicant is requesting that the entire site be rezoned to MDR. He noted that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezone request with a development agreement to ensure the project aligns with the presented concept plan and density. He outlined key elements proposed for the development agreement, including limiting density to 17 units per acre, converting the seven existing homes back to single-family use, requiring any future additions to meet current City code,

requiring owner occupancy of the upper units in the fourplex, and providing new gutters and sidewalks around the property.

Corbin Church, of Provo and applicant, explained that the property has been for sale for several years and that the City or nearby residents did not support prior redevelopment proposals. He stated that he worked closely with neighbors and City staff to develop a proposal he believes balances neighborhood concerns with the realities of development. Mr. Church described plans to renovate existing homes on the site and convert them to owner-occupied single-family residences, increasing owner occupancy in the neighborhood. He explained that new development would be limited and designed to fit the existing character of the area, with a mix of owner-occupied and rental units, including duplexes, fourplexes, and fiveplexes, all designed to blend with the surrounding neighborhood.

He noted that the proposed density is 17 units per acre, well below what is allowed in the MDR zone, and stated that the project would significantly improve a long-neglected property. Mr. Church emphasized that the project is not highly profitable but reflects a commitment to preserving existing homes and responding to neighborhood input. He concluded by asking the Council to consider future support, including potential Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, to assist with sidewalk and gutter improvements that extend beyond the project site.

Chair MacKay opened public comment.

John Sutherland, of Provo, asked for clarification on what was meant by the homes being owner occupied without deed restrictions and how that would be enforced. He also asked whether the proposed parking meets City code requirements and expressed concern about whether parking would be sufficient given the number of rental units and the potential student population.

Shannon Bingham, of Provo, shared that the Residential Conservation (RC) zone has been essential in preserving existing homes on the block and preventing high-density development. She noted that the neighborhood has rejected multiple high-density proposals over the years and emphasized that the area is heavily rental based, making increased owner occupancy important for neighborhood stability. Ms. Bingham expressed support for Mr. Church's proposal, stating that he worked closely with neighbors and incorporated their feedback, resulting in a plan that significantly increases owner-occupied homes. While acknowledging concerns about rental units, she stated that the neighborhood is willing to support the project in exchange for more owner occupancy. She also stated that parking in the area is sufficient and expressed a preference for preserving green space, tree-lined streets, and the historic character of the neighborhood. She raised concerns about widening sidewalks and encouraged solutions that maintain accessibility without negatively impacting neighborhood character.

Chrissy Basher, of Provo, spoke in support of the project, stating that it would help prevent existing homes from falling into disrepair or being replaced with large, high-density apartment complexes in an already rental-heavy neighborhood. She noted that the proposal increases owner-occupied homes and maintains neighborhood character by preserving many of the existing houses. She acknowledged tradeoffs, including increased density, reduced yard space, and loss of some green space and wildlife habitat, as well as the loss of a potential neighborhood park identified in the neighborhood plan. Ms. Basher encouraged high-quality construction, designs that maintain neighborhood character, and consideration of deed restrictions to support long-term owner occupancy. She also emphasized the need for a pedestrian and bicycle crossing at 300 North and Freedom Boulevard, noting that it is identified in the neighborhood plan and would improve safety given existing pedestrian, cyclist, and transit activity in the area.

Kristen Cramer, of Provo, spoke to continue the comments of Shannon Bingham, whose time had run out. She shared that multiple neighbors have requested that the nine perimeter homes remain owner occupied in perpetuity through deed restrictions. She also encouraged the Council to consider approving the rezone with a condition that deed restrictions be applied to the four interior townhomes if they are sold in the future. Ms. Cramer emphasized that maintaining long-term owner occupancy is of the utmost importance to the Timp neighborhood and stated that deed restrictions would help support a strong, healthy community now and in the future.

Ethan Unkelsby, of Provo, spoke in strong support of the proposal, stating that neighborhood residents are enthusiastic about the plan. He said the project would help clean up long-neglected properties, bring in long-term, owner-occupied neighbors, and strengthen the sense of community in the neighborhood. Mr. Unkelsby shared a personal perspective, noting his desire to see more families with children move into the area and stay, rather than experiencing frequent turnover from short-term rentals. He stated that the proposal creates that opportunity and reflects the type of development residents want to see. He encouraged the Council to reduce barriers and support similar projects elsewhere in the City, acknowledging that while the plan may not meet every preference, the overall benefits to the neighborhood make it worth supporting.

Andrea Busby, of Provo, shared her support of the proposal, noting her professional background in human development and neighborhood research. She stated that the Timp neighborhood should not become a “child desert,” where housing patterns prevent families from living, building community, and thriving. Ms. Busby explained that research shows children and families benefit from neighborhoods with higher owner occupancy and lower residential turnover. She noted that owner-occupied homes and larger rental units, such as three-bedroom units, tend to have lower turnover than smaller rentals, which currently dominate the neighborhood. She stated that the proposed mix of housing would allow families to remain in the neighborhood as their needs change. She added that the development would help retain young families, increase neighborhood stability, preserve owner-occupied housing, and add family-sized rental options, while still supporting increased density. She concluded that the proposal aligns with the neighborhood’s goal of remaining family-friendly and stable.

Katie Frey, of Provo, expressed support for the project and shared her excitement about the opportunity it would provide for her family. She stated that she and her partner recently had a baby and view the proposed housing as a long-term option that would allow them to live close to family and within walking distance of the recreation center. Ms. Frey expressed hope that the project could move forward soon and shared her enthusiasm about raising her family in the neighborhood, which she described as a great location and a place where they are eager to put down roots.

Jessica Templeton, of Provo, expressed support for the project and echoed the comments made by her sister. She shared that she and her husband are excited to move into the neighborhood and look forward to raising their family there long term. Ms. Templeton described their excitement about becoming part of the neighborhood, planting roots, and growing their family in Provo. She thanked the Council for its time and for considering the proposal.

Chair MacKay closed public comment and invited a council discussion.

Councilor Bogdin expressed appreciation that the proposal would add owner-occupied housing to the Timp neighborhood, noting that this has been a long-standing need she has discussed with

neighborhood residents. She stated that she is hesitant to support the proposal without deed restrictions, explaining that long-term owner occupancy is important for neighborhood stability. She also raised concerns about sidewalk width and ADA compliance, noting that accessible sidewalks are especially important given the proximity to the recreation center. Councilor Bogdin stated that she understood the concessions already made by the applicant and indicated that, if Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding were considered, sidewalk improvements would be a high priority for her.

Chair MacKay responded to questions raised by a citizen regarding parking and deed restrictions. She stated that the proposed development exceeds the City's parking requirements for the new units, noting that the parking is provided in a clustered configuration as a creative infill approach. She also explained the purpose of deed restrictions, stating that they are used to ensure homes remain owner occupied in perpetuity. She noted that deed restrictions follow the property through each sale and are often used alongside, or in place of, homeowners associations. Chair MacKay added that this tool has been used in recent years and historically to help preserve and stabilize older neighborhoods in Provo.

Vice-Chair Christensen stated that he toured the site and expressed support for the project, describing it as a creative infill proposal that preserves existing homes and responds to both the housing and homeownership challenges in the neighborhood. He noted that the developer has worked closely with neighbors and made reasonable concessions. He emphasized the importance of increasing deed-restricted homeownership, stating that while he generally supports a goal of 50 percent homeownership in projects, he recognizes the unique nature of this proposal. He said he would support the project if all nine standalone homes are deed restricted to remain owner occupied in perpetuity. Councilor Christensen also stated that he would be open to not requiring six-foot-wide sidewalks around the entire block, suggesting that sidewalk improvements along 300 North, which provides access to the recreation center, may be a higher priority. He concluded that without deed restrictions on all nine standalone homes, he could not support the proposal.

Chair MacKay stated that she understood the neighborhood's preference for three-foot sidewalks and expressed support for allowing that option if it is what the developer ultimately proposes. She noted that her understanding of approving sidewalks narrower than current standards would require a Council exemption.

Councilor Garrett stated that the Council could influence the sidewalk approach and noted that the development includes parking in excess of City requirements, with 58 stalls proposed compared to 44 required. He expressed support for placing deed restrictions on the nine owner-occupied homes and stated his hope that the developer would agree to that condition. He added that he has toured the site and described the project as well designed and beneficial to the neighborhood. Councilor Garrett concluded that he would support the project if deed restrictions were included.

Councilor Hoban expressed appreciation to the developer for proposing a creative project and for working closely with the neighborhood. He stated that it was encouraging to see strong neighborhood support for the proposal. He echoed comments from other Council members, stating that ensuring the homes remained owner occupied in perpetuity would help address neighborhood concerns and would make him more comfortable supporting the requested changes.

Chair MacKay expressed strong support for the project, stating that she is very passionate about the proposal and appreciates the effort to preserve and restore the historic homes in the neighborhood. She shared that she first learned about the area through neighborhood residents, toured the homes, and worked extensively to find a developer willing to pursue a preservation-focused approach rather than high-density demolition. She noted that many previous proposals involved demolishing the homes for large apartment developments and stated her appreciation that Mr. Church was willing to take on a more challenging and costly restoration project. Chair MacKay highlighted that the project would significantly increase owner occupancy in the block, from a single owner-occupied home historically to nine under the proposed plan. She stated that her primary concern is ensuring that the nine homes remain owner occupied through deed restrictions and expressed support for moving forward with the project if that condition is included.

Councilor Whipple expressed strong support for the project and thanked the developer for working on behalf of the community. She discussed the proposed street improvements, noting that removing the existing deep irrigation gutters would likely be more costly than sidewalk construction but it is important for safety and parking. She stated that Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding could be appropriate to assist with those improvements. She shared that she is supportive of wider sidewalks if they can be constructed while preserving existing trees and noted that the decision would largely depend on cost. Councilor Whipple also raised a question about one property shown without off-street parking and suggested exploring whether a driveway or tandem parking could be accommodated through a variance or other approval. Regarding deed restrictions, she sought clarification and stated her understanding that the restriction would require owner occupancy for at least one year after a sale, during which time a rental dwelling license would not be issued. She noted that this approach would still allow flexibility for temporary absences, such as missions or sabbaticals, while maintaining the expectation of long-term owner occupancy. She concluded by thanking the developer again and expressed appreciation that his daughters would be moving into the neighborhood, noting the positive reception from nearby residents.

Mr. Church stated that the proposed conditions discussed by the Council are acceptable to him, including applying deed restrictions on all nine homes to ensure owner occupancy. He explained that while the development agreement requires the homes to remain single-family residences, he acknowledged that this alone would not prevent future rentals, and he agreed that deed restrictions would address that concern. He also stated that adding a driveway to the referenced property is feasible and that he would work with planners to make that adjustment. Regarding sidewalks, Mr. Church expressed support for six-foot sidewalks if Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding is used, noting that he would prefer flexibility to narrow sidewalks where necessary to preserve existing trees.

Gordon Haight, Director of Public Works, stated that staff walked the site and determined that a six-foot sidewalk can be installed without impacting existing trees. He explained that while ADA standards require a minimum four-foot sidewalk with periodically wider passing areas, the City typically installs six-foot sidewalks, which meets accessibility requirements without needing additional accommodations. He noted that staff could manage either approach but confirmed that a six-foot sidewalk is feasible at the location.

Councilor Whitlock asked if the gutter is much more expensive than the sidewalks.

Mr. Haight explained that replacing the curb and gutter is more complex and costly than sidewalk work due to necessary changes to road grades and driveways. He stated that curb and gutter improvements

could cost at least one-and-a-half times more than sidewalk replacement. He noted that using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding was identified as a good solution and stated that Public Works supports pursuing that funding to help offset costs. Mr. Haight added that staff support the project and are committed to assisting with funding efforts.

Brian Jones, City Attorney, clarified that City standards related to property lines and sidewalk widths are established in code and that applications for variances may be submitted to the Board of Adjustment, not the Council. He noted that while variances are possible, they are not guaranteed and were not approved as part of this meeting.

Vice-Chair Christensen stated that while he supports sidewalk improvements, he expressed concern about prioritizing the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. He noted that there are other pressing needs in the City, such as providing safe routes to school for children, and questioned whether using CDBG funds for this project should be a priority. He also acknowledged that decisions on variances and certain funding matters may not ultimately rest with the Council.

Mr. Jones clarified that decisions regarding funding and variances would not ultimately be made by the Council. He emphasized that Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds are not guaranteed and may not be awarded. He stated that while there is enthusiasm for the project, any proposed funding or approvals would need to follow the appropriate, separate processes.

Councilor Bogdin explained that Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds can only be used in certain areas of the City, which limits their availability for other neighborhoods with sidewalk and safety needs. She noted that similar CDBG-funded projects have been completed in other areas and stated that using the funds for this location, particularly as a route to the recreation center, is a good opportunity to address the deep irrigation gutters. She asked staff whether the sidewalk improvements would extend further toward the street and potentially cover the existing gutters, noting that gutters in other neighborhoods are wider and more noticeable.

Councilor Whitlock raised a neighborhood safety concern for informational purposes. He noted that many pedestrians cross Freedom Boulevard near 300 North at an informal crossing by the Smith's parking lot, even though there is not a formal street intersection there. He shared from personal experience living in the area that the crossing is heavily used and can be unsafe and asked whether improvements at that location could be considered or potentially coordinated when discussing possible use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding.

Mr. Haight suggested looking at CIP funds for crosswalk.

Councilor Whipple asked whether a traffic study has been conducted to determine if a pedestrian and bicycle crossing is warranted at Freedom Boulevard and 300 North. She noted that Freedom Boulevard functions as a significant barrier for pedestrians, limiting safe access between the neighborhood and nearby grocery and commercial areas. She emphasized that the lack of a safe crossing makes an otherwise walkable area feel dangerous and stated that adding new housing near the intersection, directly across from Smith's, could increase pedestrian activity enough to warrant a crossing if one has not already been justified.

Councilor Christensen asked if the implied motion would include all the things discussed and offered by Mr. Church.

Mr. Jones explained that the ordinance does not make the rezone immediately effective. He stated that the ordinance first approves the rezone in concept and then authorizes the Mayor to negotiate and execute a development agreement consistent with the commitments discussed during the meeting. He explained that while the Council sometimes waits to vote until a draft development agreement is completed, it is also common practice to proceed in this manner. If approved, staff and legal counsel would work with the applicant to finalize a development agreement that memorializes the agreed-upon conditions. He noted that the zone change would not take effect until the development agreement is fully executed by both parties.

Chair MacKay called for a vote.

Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

7 An ordinance amending the zone map classification of real property, generally located at 1149 N 850 W, from the R1.8 (One-Family Residential) zone to the R1.6 (One-Family Residential) and Low Density Residential (LDR) zones. Rivergrove (PLRZ20250571) [01:23:43](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-2, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Nancy Robison, City Planner, presented a proposed rezone for a 0.6-acre, irregularly shaped property located near 850 West and 1149 North. She explained that an LDR (Low Density Residential) zone was originally requested to allow two narrow single-family lots, noting that the lot widths would be approximately 47 feet. She stated that a third lot is configured as a flag lot, which is not permitted in the LDR zone. As a result, the Planning Commission recommended that all three lots be rezoned to R1-6 to maintain consistent zoning across the property and avoid having a small, nonconforming area. Ms. Robison noted that staff supports this recommendation and described the proposal as a good infill project, emphasizing that the property has street access from both 1160 North and 850 West.

Chair MacKay opened public comment.

Kristen Cramer, of Provo, shared that she spoke with neighbors about the project and also addressed the Planning Commission. She stated that the general consensus in the neighborhood is strong support for the proposal, noting that residents are eager to see the overgrown lot redeveloped in a way that improves the area. She added that the project aligns with neighborhood needs and priorities, particularly the need for additional housing, and described the overall response as very positive.

Chair MacKay closed public comment and invited a council discussion.

Councilor Bogdin confirmed the lot lines in the diagram.

Chair MacKay called for a vote.

Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

**8 An ordinance amending Provo City Code regarding development in sensitive lands.
(PLOT20250567) [01:29:35](#)**

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-3, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Aaron Ardmore, Planning Supervisor, presented. He explained that the request before the Council proposes amendments to two sections of City code. He stated that Section 15.05.170 would revise the timing for when a hold harmless agreement must be recorded for properties located in a high-water table area. He also noted that Section 15.05.180 would remove the existing exception to the 100-foot river corridor setback for building or development. He stated that these items were discussed in detail earlier and indicated he was available to answer any additional questions from the Council.

Chair MacKay opened public comment.

Tammy Longson, of Provo, expressed concern about the proposed change to the 100-foot river corridor setback. She stated that disturbing the riverbank, particularly during spring runoff, could increase erosion and flooding risks to nearby homes, including hers. Ms. Longson shared personal experiences with past flooding, noting that the river had already overflowed into her backyard, and expressed fear that reducing the setback could worsen those conditions and put the neighborhood at risk. She emphasized that setbacks exist for a reason and stated that she does not support changing it.

Chair MacKay closed public comment and clarified that this would remove the exemption and require a 100-foot setback.

Councilor Bogdin clarified that the proposed code change would not affect projects that have already been approved, as those would be grandfathered in. She explained that any existing developments with a previously approved 40-foot setback would retain that allowance, but going forward, new applications would be required to comply with the 100-foot river corridor setback and could not request approval for development closer than that distance.

Councilor Whitlock expressed appreciation for the Council's shared focus on protecting the river as an important community asset. He noted that the river has not always received sufficient attention in the past and stated that it has been encouraging to see strong alignment among Council members on its importance. He explained that the proposed actions are intended to protect the river while the City develops a more comprehensive plan and framework to better integrate and enhance the river as a long-term asset for the community.

Chair MacKay called for a vote.

Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

9 *CONTINUED*** A resolution providing for the holding of a public hearing to satisfy certain federal tax law requirements in connection with the issuance of transportation sales tax revenue bonds of Provo City, Utah; and providing for related matters (26-009)**

10 A resolution adopting an updated water conservation plan. (26-010) [01:36:55](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2026-2, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Shane Jones, City Engineer, presented the City’s water conservation plan, noting that state law requires the plan to be reviewed and adopted by the Council every five years. He explained that the item is an update to the City’s existing water conservation plan. He reported that Provo’s water demand has decreased significantly since 2000 and that the City is currently meeting the State’s water conservation goal for the region, which is the most aggressive in Utah. He credited residents, City leadership, and the Council for supporting effective water management practices and noted that Provo has been meeting its conservation targets for several years. He outlined several strategies contributing to these results, including sustainable landscaping, tree planting programs, and encouraging wider park strips to reduce heat and evaporation. He also described the City’s use of aquifer storage to reduce water loss through evaporation and provide long-term drought reserves. Mr. Jones highlighted operational improvements such as the City’s SCADA system for real-time water system monitoring, automatic metering infrastructure that helps residents track water use and identify leaks, and ongoing efforts to improve leak-detection software. He also emphasized public education efforts, including the annual Consumer Confidence Report, and water efficiency programs such as drought-tolerant seed giveaways, discounted irrigation controllers, tree giveaways, high-efficiency sprinkler nozzles, and assistance with narrow park strip conversions.

Chair MacKay stated that Provo residents care deeply about water conservation and that this commitment is reflected in the City’s strong results. She noted that while residents may not always realize how well Provo is performing compared to others, the City has been very successful in its conservation efforts.

Vice-Chair Christensen asked for clarification on whether evaporation has any local benefit, noting that evaporation from nearby sources such as Utah Lake may still impact the region and not solely areas outside the state.

Mr. Jones responded that, based on his understanding, only about 5 to 10 percent of the water that evaporates from Utah Lake and the Great Salt Lake falls back into the Great Salt Lake Basin. He stated that while some evaporation does return locally through lake-effect precipitation and may influence local humidity, the majority of the evaporated water leaves the state. He explained that this is why reducing evaporation, such as avoiding watering impervious surfaces like concrete, is an important conservation strategy.

Vice-Chair Christensen stated his support for avoiding water waste, such as watering concrete, and emphasized the importance of recognizing natural water systems. He noted that evaporation and movement of water are part of a dynamic ecosystem and cautioned against framing the issue as water simply being “lost,” even if it moves beyond state boundaries. He clarified that he was not suggesting staff had mischaracterized the issue but wanted to ensure the broader ecological context, including the natural function of Utah Lake, was acknowledged in discussions about water conservation.

Councilor Whitlock referenced the water conservation plan’s note that system losses have averaged about 17 percent over the past five years and acknowledged that losses have recently decreased. He

asked whether staff has a breakdown of those losses, specifically how much is attributable to pipe breaks and leaks versus metering, accounting issues, or other factors.

Shane Jones explained that system losses include more than just leaks and acknowledged that staff does not yet have a precise breakdown of the causes. He noted that a significant effort has recently been made to replace compound meters, which have multiple registers that were sometimes wired incorrectly or required conversion from cubic feet to gallons, resulting in billing and accounting errors. He stated that correcting these issues should improve the City's water loss numbers. He added that once those corrections are complete, staff will reassess the data to identify other areas for improvement. Mr. Jones noted that an average system loss of around 15 percent is typical nationwide and explained that system losses also include unmetered uses such as firefighting, system flushing, and other routine operational activities, not just leaks or accounting errors.

Chair MacKay opened the item for public comment.

John Sutherland, of Provo, shared that his son in Park City uses a water-use application that provides daily usage data and alerts for potential leaks. He asked whether Provo City should consider investing in a similar tool to help residents better understand and manage their water use.

Chair MacKay closed public comment.

Councilor Bogdin responded that residents do have access to tools to monitor their water use. She explained that customers can view their utility usage online, which allows them to track consumption and see how close they are to reaching higher usage tiers. She added that residents can also contact the City during business hours for assistance in understanding their water usage. Councilor Bogdin noted that these tools were discussed previously as part of the City's tiered water rate structure, which allows residents to adjust their watering habits to manage consumption more effectively.

Chair MacKay called for a vote.

Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

11 *CONTINUED*** Provo City Public Works Department requests ordinance text amendments to sections 15.03.020(3) and 15.03.200 to update 2025 standards to 2026 standards. Citywide Application. PLOTA20250658**

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 7:21 PM.