

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF PLEASANT VIEW CITY, UTAH**

February 24, 2026

**The public meeting was held at City Hall, 520 W Elberta Drive, Pleasant View, Utah,
commencing at 6:00 P.M.**

MAYOR:

Steve Gibson

COUNCILMEMBERS:

Ann Arrington
Johnny Ferry
David Marriott
Sara Urry
Sean Wilkinson

STAFF:

Andrea Z Steiniger
Laurie Hellstrom
Stetson Talbot
Tammy Eveson
Cindy Harrison
Matt Wilson-attorney

VISITORS:

Scott Nicholson	Dixie Higgs
Bryan Higgs	Brocke L.
Jaran Nicholls	Chris Casey
Art Bingham	Holly Homan
Dave Bolos	Chris Scheinder
Drew Snyder	

1. Introduction.

- a. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading, or Expression of Thought: (*Councilmember Sean Wilkinson*).**
- b. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest.** CM Marriott: I am not related to the Marriott's on #9 of the agenda.
- c. Public Comments/Questions for the Mayor & Council (limited to 3 minutes).**
None.

2. Consent Items. Minutes of January 27, 2026, February 4, 2026, and February 10, 2026 (open & closed)

Motion was made by CM Arrington to approve the minutes of January 27, 2026, February 4, 2026, and February 10, 2026 (open & closed) and the bills of Pleasant View City. 2nd by CM Urry. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

3. Caught Being Good. Presentation of award. (Presenters: Neighborhoods in Action Committee - Mayor Gibson & Dana Gibson)

Postponed to March 10, 2026.

4. Park Regulations Amendment. Discussion and possible action to amend Chapter 12.12-Park Regulation to add pickleball court regulations and to remove listed fees from the code, Ordinance 2026-9. (Presenter: Cindy Harrison)

Cindy Harrison: we are proposing to move all fees out of the ordinance text to the consolidated fee schedule for clarity and consistency. We have done a market study conducted with Brigham City, Farmington and Syracuse. Cindy reviewed the new language for pickleball regulations. The council questioned court availability during tournaments. Cindy Harrison: the restriction is once per month for full-court reservations. CM Wilkinson: replace “prior to the reservation” with “in advance.” CM Arrington: there is a discrepancy between park curfew (11:00 p.m.) in guidelines and sunset/sunrise language in ordinance. The council agreed to align park use guidelines with ordinance language for consistency.

Motion was made by CM Marriott to amend the Park Regulation with the following adjustments of a language change to “in advance” and align the park curfew language with ordinance. 2nd by CM Urry. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

5. Consolidated Fee Schedule. Discussion and possible action to amend the Consolidated Fee Schedule for Parks & Receptions Fees. Resolution 2026-B. (Presenter: Cindy Harrison)

Cindy Harrison: the proposal is to increase baseball registration fees by \$5 (to \$60) due to rising jersey costs. Flag football fee adjusted to \$60 to align with other upper-grade programs (Grades 3–6). Instructional basketball and T-ball (younger grades) remain at \$50. Proposed reducing pickleball clinic fee from the originally listed \$55 to \$35, aligning with the youth running club, since no jerseys are required. Youth running club fee remains \$35. I expect participation in pickleball to be similar to last year’s running club (approximately 40 participants). We have comparable league pricing. The Kitchen (indoor facility charges \$60–\$90 depending on league length. Our staffing is to be handled by seasonal recreation staff. We use volunteer coaches for the other recreation programs. We are comparable to the neighboring cities. We coordinate our fees with North Ogden. The other cities (Harrisville, Plain City, Farr West) are previously around \$55. We are requiring a \$1 million liability insurance policy for for-profit events. Farmington requires \$3 million. The insurance applies to for-profit leagues/tournaments and not required for private reunions or non-commercial gatherings.

Motion was made by CM Marriott to approve the Consolidated Fee Schedule for Parks & Receptions Fees as presented, Resolution 2026-B. 2nd by CM Urry. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

6. General Plan Amendment. Discussion and possible action to consider amending the General Plan by amending approximately 4.93 acres of land located at approx. 3100 N 1030 W, from Low Density Residential (current applicable zone: RE-20) to Medium Density Residential (desired applied zone: Limited Single Family Residential (LSFR)).

Weber County Parcel: 19-016-0082, Ordinance 2026-6. Applicant: Omner Holdings LLC. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

Tammy Eveson: this is a proposal to amend the General Plan for approximately 4.93 acres currently designated Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential and apply the Limited Single Family Residential (LSFR) zone. The applicant submitted a concept plan for 19 residential lots, but it has not yet gone through subdivision review. Medium Density designation allows 4–8 dwelling units per acre. The proposal equates to approximately 6-units per acre. The LSFR standards include minimum lot sizes of 7,260 sq. ft., minimum lot width: 65 ft., front/rear setbacks: 25 ft., side setbacks: 8 ft. each side (16 ft. total), and a maximum 60% impervious surface. The area is located between an existing RE-15 residential area and a commercial/manufacturing area and near the future city decant facility and cemetery expansion. The planning commission recommended approval with a 5–2 vote. PC member Julie Farr’s concern was having a comprehensive General Plan update rather than piecemeal amendments. PC member David Gosner’s concern was about public noticing not being adequate and low community turnout. Tammy Eveson: state noticing requirements were met. Public comments received were positive regarding the rezone. CM Arrington: this was created for needed housing type for seniors/patio-homes. Tammy Eveson: the location is a good transition area between low-density residential and commercial zones. CM Marriott: this is a little piece of property. Tammy Eveson: there is another property owner adjacent that is looking for the same thing for their property (Casey’s). CM Urry: the intent of the LSFR was to create smaller “pocket” developments, not large contiguous areas. CM Marriott: I am concerned with road connectivity and a road plan in the area.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to approve the General Plan by amending approximately 4.93 acres of land located at approx. 3100 N 1030 W, from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential for Weber County Parcel: 19-016-0082, Ordinance 2026-6. 2nd by CM Urry. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington and CM Urry. CM Ferry, CM Marriott and CM Wilkinson. (2-3) Motion failed.

7. Rezone-Public Hearing. Discussion and possible action to consider a rezone for approximately 4.93 acres of land located at approx. 3100 N 1030 W, from RE-20 (Residential) to Limited Single Family Residential-LSFR (Residential). Weber County Parcel: 19-016-0082, Ordinance 2026-7. Applicant: Omner Holdings LLC. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

Mayor Gibson: how do we proceed following a failure of the General Plan Amendment? Matt Wilson: it is a separate action and should still receive a vote.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to go into a public hearing to consider a rezone for approximately 4.93 acres of land located at approx. 3100 N 1030 W, from RE-20 to Limited Single Family Residential-LSFR. 2nd by CM Wilkinson. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

Chris Casey: I am an adjacent property owner. I am confused about the council’s prior denial of the General Plan Amendment. The state encourages additional housing opportunities. The planning commission members expressed support for the concept, with concerns primarily about piecemeal planning and noticing. What is the council’s objections and the future plans. CM Marriott: we need a comprehensive plan for the entire surrounding area. We need an

updated General Plan with road connectivity plans and coordination with nearby undeveloped parcels. CM Urry: our General Plan hasn't been updated since 2017. CM Wilkinson: we have a proposal and an adjacent property owner who wants to do the same thing and additional properties. It would be fantastic if those property owners could come together and put a plan together and show us what that will look like. We should not piece mill develop. I have no idea what this will do to our infrastructure. I would expect if they want this much more density there would be some explanation how this will affect the city and have some due diligence done. There would have been some effort or expense so the city is not bearing the burden. That is why I voted against this. I am not opposed to it being in this location, but I don't have that information to make that decision. Dixie Higgs: I live on the adjacent dead-end street. I am not opposed to development but I want clarity on the road connectivity and traffic flow. I desire to maintain the quiet character of the street and avoid a through-street connection to Highway 89. I would like to see a comprehensive layout plan before approval. Ryan Higgs: I am opposed to additional density development across Highway 89. I support medium or higher density if appropriate. I am also concerned about my property value. Chris Casey: how much information does the council requires for consideration? Detailed planning can be costly for landowners. I am frustrated with city coordination and communication. Mayor Gibson asked for additional comments. None were given.

Motion was made by CM Urry to end the public hearing. 2nd by CM Marriott. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

CM Wilkinson: we don't need engineering but a concept for the larger area and discuss with staff on infrastructure capacity and city benefit. Rezone decisions are legislative actions and should provide benefit to the entire city.

Motion was made by CM Urry to deny the rezone for land located at approx. 3100 N 1030 W, from RE-20 to Limited Single Family Residential-LSFR, Ordinance 2026-7. 2nd by CM Marriott. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0 passed to deny.

8. Rezone-Public Hearing. Discussion and possible action to consider a rezone for approximately .50 acres of land located at 3347 N 1000 W, from A-2 (Agricultural) and RE-15 (Residential) to RE-20 (Residential), Weber County Parcel: 17-062-0076, Ordinance 2026-8. Applicant: Holly Horman. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

Tammy Eveson: this request involves two adjacent lots owned by Ms. Horman, located on the corner of 3350 North and 1000 West. One lot is currently zoned RE-15; the other is split-zoned RE-20 and A-2. The applicant is pursuing a boundary line adjustment which is under DRC review to combine an L-shaped portion of the RE15 lot with her existing RE-20 lot to create a more usable parcel. The remaining parcel would retain sufficient square footage to meet RE-15 requirements and remain buildable. The description needs to be corrected in the ordinance and match the description in the boundary adjustment.

Motion was made by CM Urry to go into a public hearing to consider a rezone for approximately .50 acres of land located at 3347 N 1000 W, from A-2 (Agricultural) and RE-15 (Residential) to RE-20 (Residential), Weber County Parcel: 17-062-0076. 2nd by CM Ferry. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

Mayor Gibson read into record an email from Toby Mileski, adjacent property owner, expressing support for the rezone and encouraging approval. No additional public comments made.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to end the public hearing. 2nd by CM Ferry. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to approve the rezone for approximately .50 acres of land located at 3347 N 1000 W, from A-2 (Agricultural) and RE-15 (Residential) to RE-20 (Residential), Weber County Parcel: 17-062-0076. Ordinance 2026-8 with corrected description. 2nd by CM Ferry. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

9. Development Agreement. Discussion and possible action to approve a Development Agreement for a residential subdivision (*Grand Legacy Subdivision*) to be conducted in two phases, consisting of a total of 63 single family residential building lots, located in the RE-20 zone at approximately 3950 N 200 W. Applicant: Amy Roskelley-Marriott Companies. (Presenter: Andrea Steiniger)

Andrea Steiniger: Presented the proposed Development Agreement for the Grand Legacy Subdivision (63 lots, two phases). The project was originally started around 2008 and partially constructed before being stalled. This agreement outlines standards for completing and evaluating previously installed infrastructure. For the sanitary sewer & storm drain infrastructure the developer will camera existing lines and identify segments proposed to remain and the city will evaluate per the Public Works Standards and require replacements if necessary. For the culinary water infrastructure all internal lines (including specified valve section) will be replaced. External pressurized lines are currently in use and will remain. For the secondary water infrastructure, the developer and Pine View Water are to evaluate the system and determine necessary replacements. For the curb & gutter, the developer is to inspect and propose segments to remain and the city is to verify compliance and require additional replacement if needed. For the development standards fire safety, spark arresters, and vegetation requirements follow standard code. Rock outcroppings are to be avoided and preserved where possible. The developer proposes mass grading and installation of retaining walls. Maximum slope: less than 25% on building pads; 35% outside building pads. Retaining walls are to be installed by the developer and maintained by individual lot owners after completion. Trail access to the canal trail required. Developer to install five off-street parking stalls to be dedicated to the city upon acceptance. The planning commission recommended approval with no changes. CM Marriott: does the infrastructure inspections require a third party. Andrea Steiniger: Tyson and Dana are confident in evaluating infrastructure but may contract out services if needed. The planning commission public comments were concerns about potential blasting. The developer indicated no blasting is planned. Drainage and stormwater management concerns. Liability concerns regarding natural hazards, rocks, rattlesnakes and poison ivy. Drainage engineering will be reviewed during the subdivision approval, separate from the development agreement. Matt Wilson: this is not the subdivision & infrastructure approval.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to approve the Development Agreement for a residential subdivision (*Grand Legacy Subdivision*) to be conducted in two phases, consisting of a total of 63 single family residential building lots, located in the RE-20 zone at approximately 3950 N 200 W. 2nd by CM Marriott. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

10. Development Agreement. Discussion and possible action to approve a Development Agreement for a mixed use (commercial/residential) development (*Lync Crossing Subdivision*) to be conducted in 3 phases, including 137 townhouse units, located in the Mixed Use West zone at approximately 2700 N Highway 89. Applicant: Patrick Burns. (Presenter: Andrea Steiniger)

A presentation was provided by Andrea Steiniger for the proposed development agreement for the Lync Crossing mixed-use project. The project includes residential units as part of a mixed-use commercial/residential development, phased to ensure commercial development completion before full residential occupancy. Phasing will happen per the ordinance. There is an ambiguity in ordinance regarding residential units in mixed-use buildings: up to 25% of commercial building area may be residential. Also noted that “flex space” terminology is not defined and should be taken out of the agreement. The planning commission recommended the developers provide screening along property boundaries adjacent to residential uses, provide walking paths, landscaping, and open space for the residential component. Those specifics will be addressed in site plan and conditional use permit. If the regional detention basin in that area is to be combined with their basin, the city want it to be dedicated to City and maintained by the city. If it is not combined it needs to remain private and private maintenance. In Section 11, the recommended amended language is to require city consent for assignment of the agreement to third parties, with consent not unreasonably withheld. The city attorney’s opinion was that multiple property owners could be bound by agreement and the city doesn’t have legal authority to require them to create an entity. It was acknowledged that this is a key intersection and highly visible location for the city.

Motion was made by CM Urry to approve the development agreement for the Lync Crossing Subdivision with the correction suggested by everyone (removal of “flex space,” and change the assignment language of the agreement). 2nd by CM Marriott. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

11. Public Infrastructure District (PID). Discussion and possible action to create a Public Infrastructure District (PID) for Farr West Landing located at approximately east of I-15 and north of 2700 N in Farr West City and Pleasant View City. Applicant: Woodsonia Farr West, LLC. (Presenter: Andrea Steiniger)

Mayor Gibson: there was some misinformation and some different things. The TIF aspect was denied, which is part of their public funding that they were going to get. This is the PID for the Farr West Landing. I have invited Drew Snyder with Woodsonia and Mayor Bolos from Farr West to speak to us in a minute. Andrea Steiniger: this item is before you again. You did have it on your last council agenda, but because we didn't have a corrected Letter of Intent and Petition, we couldn't take action on that. This is the same slides as last time regarding what a PID is. This is what they're proposing to bring into that development. This is a layout. It's 37.697 total acres. The acreage that affects Pleasant View is 8.01. Here's the proposal with the numbers out here. Our PID policy says that they can't do a tax levy of more than six mills, which is \$6 per \$1,000 of taxable value. The housing element is not included in their map. On the far right, that's the final local entity plat. So, only the outlined areas in that are included in this public infrastructure district. As you can see, the section right about center that's excluded is going to be proposed housing. This runs the numbers in their letter of intent. They only included Farr

West City's numbers on the tax rates. So, I've run the numbers for Pleasant View because our certified tax rate is a little bit higher than Farr West's. On the right-hand side, Pleasant View's tax rate is at .000786 as compared to the .000333 that Farr West City has. I then dropped those numbers down for the total tax rate and the difference with the proposal of the six-mill tax levy. Over on your left-hand side is what they've been seeking as far as public financing for their development. As you can see, they've got a total infrastructure cost of \$27 million. So, just for clarification, out of \$27 million, the developer is funding \$7 million. With the Farr West CRA changing, that is going to affect their numbers, so I'm not sure what the actual number is at this point. What's being proposed in the PID itself is the \$30,055,000. So that portion would be covered in this district, and that's what would be bonded for properties. But the majority is coming from public funds—tax dollars—in this proposal. I don't know what the final numbers look like. These are some issues that were brought up by Weber County. A PID can't be co-created, which is how they've applied for this PID—for a co-creation between Far West and Pleasant View City. Your options as far as the PID approval goes tonight are 1) no—you don't want to participate at all—and then we would just enter into an interlocal transfer agreement because we have public infrastructure that would be on the Far West side of things. So, we would need a transfer agreement in order to handle that storm water and sewer infrastructure and then anything included in that PID within our city boundaries. 2) If you say yes and allow Farr West to be the creating entity of this, then they would have the developer create a governing document which would outline what could be included in that public infrastructure district and what tax mill levy they would go with. If we entered into an interlocal agreement with Farr West to participate in the PID that they've created, we would either have to come to an agreement with Farr West City on the terms of that governing document, or we would be bound by anything that Farr West decides. So, it just kind of depends on how workable it is between the two cities. 3) There's also the option of yes, but that would be creating a separate PID for Pleasant View City. I do not believe the developer is looking at that as the most advantageous approach. So, those are basically your three options tonight, or you could table it for further consideration. Mayor are there any questions? I've asked Drew Snyder to present. He is from Nebraska. He's going to be best friend of Pleasant View, right? Drew Snyder: Yes, of course. Well, first off, this has been a marathon. So, Andrea, thank you. Mayor, thank you. The staff has been amazing. We do weekly calls. I think I'm on speed dial with everybody. I just want to thank everybody. This thing has really gone on for a long time, and it's complicated. It's a really complicated transaction. I don't think we totally knew what we were getting into when we signed up for this thing. But I do think it's going to be a great project. Andrea's slides were actually really helpful. If whoever's driving wants to shift back to the funding. I've got a little handout that I think will be helpful. We created this this afternoon and I think this will help a little bit. I should mention that Farr West is considering this but lowering the mill levy to five mills, which is what he has indicated on the sheet. And Farr West still hasn't approved any sort of PID. I believe it's going to council next week. What you'll see on the sheet is a complicated piece of property but really what we're talking about is what we call the shark fin. It's the northern 8.01 acres. Initially, this was predominantly going to be all detention. As we got into the engineering of the site, we were able to shrink that basin, which you can see is lot eight. That allowed us to retain five developable acres. Obviously, this would be subject to council approval. We would like to come back and go through a rezoning application with Pleasant View. So, obviously, this is a little bit

hypothetical, but assuming the council would approve this, we would like to put this land in service and get it developable. We're showing a hotel and then two restaurants on this property. One of the other big burdens that has made this a challenging project is building a mile worth of new road to get all of this interconnected and really activate all this property. You can see the shopping center, which has generally stayed the same. That remains in Farr West, that's not highlighted in yellow but, then the shark fin property is all in Pleasant View. We sketched out, again assuming a rezoning would be approved and we could get those uses to locate on that property. There really would be a sales benefit to Pleasant View. We think a hotel, \$4 million in sales, two restaurants with \$7 million in total annual sales—we could bring \$10 million to maybe \$13 million in total gross sales. I don't know exactly—we kind of researched everything but, maybe Andrea can help us on what sales tax percentage Pleasant View gets. We just put in 1% to try to show a benefit. You can see the sales tax benefit and then the property tax benefit. This is based on some comparable properties. A hotel would be about \$13.3 million, and then two restaurants we thought would be around \$6 million in total taxable value. So, just short of \$20 million. A five-mill PID—NPV is net present value—so really what those revenue streams are worth today if we were to bond those revenue streams. The reason I'm here and we're talking to you about the PID is that the original structure of this whole project was based on Farr West and there was a sales tax sharing agreement and then there was property tax. Over the course of a year, the taxing entities declined to participate in the property tax TIF, which put a huge burden on this project. If you go back to Andrea's sheet, there is \$5.8 million that's coming out of \$12.78 million. So that money is just gone. The county, the school district declined to participate, which was a surprise. I won't tell you all the backstory, but the previous administration did a great job. It probably could have approached differently, but it is what it is. Our intent is we want to do the project and move forward. The staff has spent an incredible amount of time with us. This design and anchor retailer is ready to move forward. We'd like to come back to Pleasant View and ask for your consideration on a rezoning. The PID is really intended to replace what we lost with the property tax. On the chart on the right-hand corner of this plan, you can see the original TIF amounts. The participation agreement caps and those are really the dollar amounts. What is coming out of that \$12.78 million is this participation agreement cap of \$5.78 million. That's the exact number that would get reduced by. A 30-year PID at five mills brings in gross revenue of \$8,754,121 and a net present value of \$3,692,158. DA Davidson helped us prepare the Letter of Intent (LOI) and the petition. They put in the actual bond numbers. When you take into consideration some of the cost of bonding and the revenue stream, the dollars are less. But that would be our ask of the city council tonight, to really help us. This is the last step we really need to get this project moving forward. It's been two years in the making. The staff's been great. We've worked through all the details, which have been extensive. So, with that, I'm happy to answer any questions. I just want to make sure the council really understands what we're asking. I think it's helping Farr West. One of the challenges with this project is two different municipalities, and that's been very challenging working through the process. Most of this is in Farr West, I recognize that but, there is a portion in Pleasant View. Pleasant View is administering the way funds, so we're working extensively with your staff to get that done and get this right. Mayor Gibson asked Mayor Bolos of Farr West to come up. Mayor Bolos, Farr West: I like to add a few thoughts. Nearly \$224 million of the total investment was private funding from the developers. Public investment represents only about 6% of the total

infrastructure cost. I initially had concerns about the PID and pushed back on aspects of the participation agreement and incentives. However, after conducting due diligence, consulting third parties, speaking with economic consultant Doug Larson, the county commission, and Stephanie Russell, I am more comfortable with the proposal. Stephanie Russell indicated the PID would allow critical infrastructure to be funded by the development itself rather than burdening existing residents or taxpayers. The PID would help recoup a roughly \$6 million shortfall caused by the lack of participation from Weber County and the school district. This is an effort to recover funding previously anticipated but not secured. The mutual benefits of the project, include development of the "shark fin" parcel, which would generate sales tax revenue. The project would bring additional retailers and positive growth to both communities. Farr West has not yet formally approved the PID but they intended to do so with a reduced mill levy from six to five mills. He stressed that the PID would not burden existing residents or businesses, as it would apply only within the designated district. CM Urry: how much has Farr West reduced its CRA contribution in renegotiations? Mayor Bolos: They had not reduced the \$7 million sales tax participation amount. Instead, they had restructured the agreement so that the city would receive 15% of sales tax revenue during years one through five, rather than 0%, allowing the city to begin capturing revenue earlier. Andrea Steiniger: when I approached Stephanie Russell about the PID, she expressed opposition to it in Pleasant View. She recommended either voting no or approving it with conditions, suggesting that Pleasant View create its own governing document rather than relying on Farr West. Drew Snyder: the project faced a March 12 deadline and could not withstand further delays. Consistency across the district would be preferable but that they would proceed even if two separate PIDs were required. He requested conditional approval, contingent upon Farr West's approval. The Council asked questions about tenant commitments. Drew Snyder: three tenants were under executed contracts and that all tenants had been informed about the PID. He confirmed that Target was the anchor tenant, though he noted certain contractual sensitivities. The Council raised questions whether the PID would deter tenants due to higher taxes. Drew Snyder: the retailers had not expressed significant concerns and that similar districts existed throughout Utah. Mayor Bolos: Farr West would move forward with or without Pleasant View but requested partnership and cooperation. I estimate Pleasant View's portion of the PID revenue over 30 years would be approximately \$600,000. The Council members debated whether to create a separate PID or participate jointly with Farr West. Legal counsel explained that an interlocal agreement would define governance and that creating two PIDs would increase administrative costs, estimated at \$35,000 per district.

Motion was made by CM Wilkinson to create a Public Infrastructure District (PID) for Farr West Landing located at approximately east of I-15 and north of 2700 N in Farr West City and Pleasant View City contingent upon: Farr West City being the creating entity, reduce the mill levy to five, contingent that Farr West City's approval of the PID and work together on an interlocal agreement. 2nd by CM Arrington. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

12. Disposal of Real Property in Exchange for a Road Expansion-Public Hearing. Discussion and possible action to approve the Disposal of Real Property located at 2739 N Parkland Blvd in exchange for a Road Expansion at 1740 W 2700 N with MHP #1 LLC. (Presenter: Andrea Steiniger)

Mayor Gibson: there is a long history of the project and I acknowledge staff efforts, particularly Andrea Steiner, for their work in coordinating multiple aspects of the agreement. There is importance of securing proper entrance and exit access for the development. Andrea Steiner: the property at 2739 North Parkland Boulevard is located in the northeast corner of the mobile home park. The City previously required a second access point for fire code compliance as mobile homes were reinstalled in that section. The subject property was appraised at \$353,200. The City would receive in exchange approximately 0.23 acres near the entrance to the mobile home park (near the Jimmy John's intersection), appraised at \$211,800. Both properties were appraised at the same time. The Parkland property was originally purchased using WACOG funding for the 2700 North expansion project. Any net value gained in the exchange must be returned to WACOG due to funding requirements. The acquisition agent has attempted to contact the property owner and their attorney; certified mail with an offer was sent. Final negotiated compensation will return to Council for approval once completed. This transaction doesn't completes all needs for the road project. Additional items will be addressed under the next agenda item.

Motion was made by CM Urry to go into a public hearing to consider the Disposal of Real Property located at 2739 N Parkland Blvd in exchange for a Road Expansion at 1740 W 2700 N with MHP #1 LLC. 2nd by CM Arrington. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

Mayor Gibson asked for comments from the public. None were given.

Motion was made by CM Urry to end the public hearing. 2nd by CM Marriott. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to approve the Disposal of Real Property located at 2739 N Parkland Blvd in exchange for a Road Expansion at 1740 W 2700 N with MHP #1 LLC. 2nd by CM Ferry. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

13. Letter of Understanding. Discussion and possible action to approve the Union Pacific Railroad's Letter of Understanding. (Presenter: Andrea Steiniger)

Mayor Gibson: this item has been in progress for an extended period. Andrea Steiner: this a privately owned parcel within the project area has been deeded to Pleasant View City. The mobile home park property (previously discussed under Agenda Item 12) is included in the overall acquisition effort. An easement/line crossing agreement is being secured from Tesoro Pipeline, granting the City crossing rights (ownership not included). The final required parcel is owned by Union Pacific Railroad. The council previously provided informal direction ("head nod") to proceed with the Letter of Understanding. The railroad property appraised significantly higher than anticipated. Union Pacific Railroad accepted a substantially lower offer than the appraised value. The red-outlined area shown in the project map represents the property being acquired, extending from 2700 North to north of the roadway. Multiple property owners were involved, and significant coordination has been required to assemble all necessary parcels.

Motion was made by CM Ferry to approve the Union Pacific Railroad's Letter of Understanding. 2nd by CM Arrington. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

14. Rare Disease Day. Consideration to declare February 28, 2026 as Rare Disease Day in Pleasant View City to raise awareness within our community.

Mayor Gibson: we are considering to declare February 28, 2026 as Rare Disease Day in Pleasant View. The request and acknowledged Heather's personal challenges and advocacy efforts. I have pride in bringing the resolution forward and entertained a motion. CM Marriott: what does this mean for us? Mayor Gibson: it is a formal resolution declaring the day in recognition and raising awareness within the community.

Motion was made by CM Urry to declare approve the Union Pacific Railroad's Letter of Understanding. 2nd by CM Arrington. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 5-0.

The council expressed support for notifying Heather of the Council's approval and recognition.

15. Other Business.

Andrea Steiniger: our planning does an excellent job. CM Arrington: we know. Heather Gale and the declaration of Rare Disease Day. She is a saint and has a book published.

Mayor Gibson: at the Saturday's meeting I have invited two developers. I want the city council to be more involved. I would each councilmember come with a 15 minutes. I want to set goals as a city council and work on them. I am grateful for our council.

16. Closed Meeting. Consideration for a closed meeting for a strategy session to discuss collective bargaining according to the Utah Open and Public Meetings Law, Utah Code § 52-4-205(1).

Motion was made by CM Arrington to go into a closed meeting to discuss collective bargaining here in the city council chambers in Pleasant View City. 2nd by CM Marriott. Roll call vote. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. Motion passed 5-0.

Minutes of the closed meeting are protected records and are filed separately.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to end the closed meeting. 2nd by CM Ferry. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. Motion passed 5-0.

17. Adjournment: 9:18

Motion was made by CM Arrington to adjourn. 2nd by CM Marriott. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Marriott, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. Motion passed 5-0.