AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
JULY 7, 2026
WORK SESSION AGENDA

Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Tim Holley	Council Member
Ryan Hunter	Council Member **electronically**
Ernie John	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Assist. City Administrator
Anna Montoya	Finance Director
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Sam Kelly	Public Works Director
Al Scott	Assistant PW Director
Derric Rykert	Community Services Director
Jay Thompson	Parks Director
Ben Hunter	City Engineer
Cody Opperman	City Planner
R. Archuletta	Police Lieutenant
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief

Also present: Royce Shelley and Brady McNaughton (Arborist)

Notice is hereby given that the American Fork City Council held a work session on Tuesday, July 7, 2026, in the City Administration Conference Room, located at 51 East Main Street, commencing at 4:02 p.m.

1. Discussion on pressurized irrigation shareholder agreements.
   Mayor Frost stated that Council Member Hunter is participating remotely by telephone for the public record. He asked Mr. Bunker if he could lead the discussion on the shareholder agreement.

   Mr. Bunker introduced a discussion regarding the City's pressurized irrigation shareholder discount agreement. He explained that in 2022 the Utah Legislature enacted House Bill 242, which requires all pressurized irrigation laterals to be metered by 2030. He noted that the legislation also included grant funding to assist with implementation, and American Fork received sufficient funding to cover the full cost of installing the required meters. He further explained that the city had already maintained a shareholder discount agreement and long-term rental agreement for pressurized irrigation shareholders since approximately 2008, prior to the passage of HB 242. He stated that the discussion would focus on how those existing agreements relate to the new state requirements and the City's metering program.

Mr. Bunker presented proposed revisions to the shareholder discount agreement, explaining that the changes primarily clarify existing practices rather than create new policies. The revisions formally define the conveyance and distribution requirement, clarify base and usage rate provisions, and explain how certain irrigation shares are tied to individual properties.

In response to Council Member Carroll, Mr. Bunker explained that under the rental agreement, the city leases an entire irrigation share, receives all 2 acre-feet of water associated with the share, and pays the shareholder's annual irrigation assessment. Under the shareholder discount agreement, the shareholder dedicates one-half of the water allocation (1 acre-foot per share) to the City for conveyance and distribution while retaining the remaining half for irrigation use on the property.

Council Member Holley summarized his understanding that the rental agreement transfers the full water allocation to the city, whereas the shareholder discount agreement divides the allocation equally between the city and the shareholder. Mr. Bunker confirmed that understanding. Council Member John added that the arrangement is applied proportionally based on the number of irrigation shares assigned to a property and noted that the proposed agreement simply formalizes the City's longstanding practice.

Mr. Bunker directed the Council to the proposed revisions in Section 2 of the agreement, explaining that the red-lined language formally documents the City's longstanding practice of crediting 1 acre-foot of water, representing one-half of an irrigation share—to the city as compensation for conveying and distributing pressurized irrigation water. He emphasized that the arrangement has always operated as a 50/50 split between the city and the shareholder, and that the amendment simply memorializes the existing practice in writing.

Turning to the proposed pressurized irrigation base rate, Mr. Bunker explained that shareholders participating in the discount agreement would pay a base rate equal to one-half of the standard base rate charged to non-shareholders. He noted that the base rate is determined according to the square footage of the property, consistent with the rate structure previously discussed by the Council as the most equitable method for recovering fixed system costs.

Mr. Bunker further explained that if a property has more or fewer irrigation shares than the amount required based on its lot size, the discount would be pro-rated accordingly. However, the discount could not exceed the full amount of the base rate, meaning property owners could reduce their base rate to zero but would not receive a credit or payment for contributing additional shares beyond the amount needed.

Council Member Taylor asked what base rate shareholders currently pay. Mr. Bunker initially stated that it was one-half of the standard base rate, but Council Member John clarified that under the City's current rate structure shareholders do not pay a separate base rate because they receive service under a fixed-rate system.

Council Member Carroll then asked how the proposed discounted base rate would function. She noted that shareholders already dedicate one-half of their irrigation share to the City for conveyance while retaining the other half for irrigation use and asked whether the discounted base rate would apply only after a shareholder exceeded the water allocated to the property.

Mr. Bunker responded that the one-half share dedicated to the city serves solely as the conveyance charge for delivering pressurized irrigation water through the City's system and that shareholders do not pay separately for the remaining half of their owned water. Council Member John added that the retained water would effectively serve as the property's Tier 1 allocation under the proposed rate structure. When Council Member Carroll asked whether the base rate related to water usage beyond the shareholder's owned allocation, Council Member John responded that it did not, indicating that the proposed base rate served a different purpose.

Council Member Carroll asked what the proposed base rate would cover if it was not a charge for additional water. Mr. Bunker explained that the base rate is intended to recover the costs of operating and maintain the City's pressurized irrigation system, while Council Member Taylor added that it helps pay for the infrastructure and service required to deliver irrigation water to each property.

Council Member Carroll then asked how that differed from the conveyance credit discussed earlier. Mr. Bunker explained that the proposal consists of two separate components: shareholders contribute 1 acre-foot per share to the city as compensation for conveyance and distribution, and they also pay one-half of the standard base rate to help recover system costs.

Council Member John clarified that the discounted base rate is based on the size of the property rather than the amount of water owned. As an example, he explained that if the standard base rate for a property were $100 per month, a qualifying shareholder would pay $50. He then asked whether shareholders with irrigation shares in excess of their property's allocation could apply those additional shares to further reduce or eliminate the remaining base rate, noting that the concept had been discussed by the irrigation board.

Ms. Montoya responded that this is effectively how the current system operates. She explained that shareholders already receive additional base rate reductions when they dedicate more irrigation shares and indicated that nothing in the proposed base rate structure would change that practice.

Council Member Carroll asked whether shareholders currently pay a flat fee for pressurized irrigation service. Ms. Montoya explained that under the existing rate structure, shareholders who dedicate sufficient irrigation shares receive a full base rate credit, reducing their base rate to zero. Under the proposed structure, those shareholders would instead pay one-half of the standard base rate, with additional credits available for properties that dedicate more shares than the minimum required.

Council Member Taylor summarized that when a property has sufficient irrigation shares to meet its required allocation, one-half of the water associated with those shares is dedicated to the City for conveyance and delivery through the pressurized irrigation system, while the remaining half is retained by the property owner for irrigation use.

Mr. Bunker added that shareholders who participate in the discount agreement do not pay a usage charge for the water represented by the shares they have dedicated to the system because they have already contributed that water as part of the agreement. Under the proposed structure, shareholders would pay one-half of the standard base rate but would not incur usage charges until they exceeded the amount of water allocated to them through their irrigation shares.

Council Member John explained that the shareholder program was created to allow shareholders to continue using their irrigation water while recognizing the City's investment in the pressurized irrigation system through a longstanding 50/50 allocation, with one-half of each share dedicated to the city for conveyance and one-half retained by the shareholder. He noted that the current system charges a single fixed rate based on lot size, while the proposed structure would establish a reduced base rate for shareholders and tiered usage rates. Shareholders would receive a Tier 1 water allocation based on their irrigation shares and pay usage charges only if they exceeded that allocation. He added that the proposed one-half base rate is intended to help recover the increased costs of operating and maintaining the pressurized irrigation system.

Council Member Taylor stated that his understanding was that the proposed base rate is intended to recover the ongoing costs of delivering water through and maintaining the pressurized irrigation system.

Council Member John agreed that this was one purpose of the base rate but explained that the cost recovery is also incorporated into the rates paid by non-shareholders, who begin paying usage charges immediately. He noted that the proposed base rate would be charged year-round and would be lower than the current fixed charge. Under the new structure, non-shareholders would pay the reduced base rate along with usage charges as they consume water. Shareholders, by contrast, would pay one-half of the base rate and would not incur usage charges unless their water use exceeded their Tier 1 allocation established by their irrigation shares.

Council Member Taylor asked whether shareholders would continue to pay the reduced base rate even if they remained within their Tier 1 water allocation. Council Member John confirmed that shareholders would generally pay one-half of the standard base rate. However, he explained that shareholders with irrigation shares in excess of their property's required allocation could either apply those additional shares to further reduce or eliminate the remaining base rate or use them to increase their Tier 1 water allocation. Using his own property as an example, he noted that his one-half-acre lot requires only 0.3 shares, while he owns 1.5 shares, giving him the flexibility to choose between those options.

Council Member Carroll summarized her understanding that every shareholder would have a base rate calculated under the proposal, but the amount ultimately paid could be reduced or eliminated depending on the number of irrigation shares dedicated to the property.

Council Member John agreed and explained that, at least initially, the calculations would need to be performed manually. Using an example, he said that if a property required 1.3 shares to fully offset the base rate, but the owner had only one share, the owner would receive a partial credit and pay the remaining balance. If the calculated base rate were $95 per month, the available share credit might reduce the amount owed to approximately $30 per month. He emphasized that shareholders retain ownership of their water rights, but the City recognizes that the costs of operating and maintaining the pressurized irrigation system have increased substantially. He noted that the Irrigation Board had spent considerable time discussing the issue and concluded that, while shareholders previously could reduce their base rate to zero more easily, the City's rising operating costs made the proposed one-half base rate necessary to maintain the system over the long term.

Council Member Carroll asked whether the proposal would result in shareholders paying more than they had under the previous rate structure. Mr. Bunker responded that irrigation costs are increasing overall. He referenced the City's irrigation rate study prepared by Bowen Collins & Associates, explaining that the costs of operating the pressurized irrigation system continue to rise and now include additional expenses associated with maintaining the new irrigation meters. He noted that Bowen Collins & Associates recommended approximately a 12% increase in pressurized irrigation rates. Although the City deferred implementing that increase during the current year, staff intend to introduce a new irrigation rate structure beginning in January, including the proposed base rate. Mr. Bunker concluded that the proposal reflects the reality that the cost of operating and maintaining the City's pressurized irrigation system is significantly higher than when the system was first established in the mid-2000s.

Council Member John recalled that when the city first developed the pressurized irrigation system, the initial rate studies showed that irrigation charges covered little more than the cost of delivering water. They did not adequately fund long-term operation and maintenance or reserve funds for future infrastructure needs. He noted that, at the time, the city had not anticipated statewide metering requirements because suitable irrigation meters were not yet available for untreated water systems. He commended City staff for obtaining state grant funding that allowed American Fork to install the required irrigation meters at little cost to the City. However, he emphasized that while the grants covered installation, the city is now responsible for the ongoing costs of operating, maintaining, repairing, and servicing the metering system, including replacing failed components such as transmitters and other equipment that were not contemplated when the system was designed approximately twenty years ago.

Council Member Taylor observed that the City's pressurized irrigation system was made possible through the participation and cooperation of irrigation shareholders. He stated that although the original arrangement allowed shareholders to receive service without paying a base rate, the increasing costs of operating and maintaining the system have made that approach unsustainable. He summarized that the proposed one-half base rate is intended to help recover those costs, while non-shareholders would pay the full base rate in addition to applicable usage charges.

Council Member John agreed, explaining that construction of the pressurized irrigation system required approval from both the City and the irrigation company shareholders. He noted that the system could not have been built without shareholder support and described the resulting agreement as a unique negotiated compromise. He added that, unlike many other pressurized irrigation systems, American Fork's system allows shareholders to receive their irrigation water through the City's pressurized distribution network in place of a traditional irrigation ditch while preserving their underlying water rights.

Mr. Bunker explained that the final proposed amendment, contained in Section 5 of the agreement, clarifies that ownership of the irrigation shareholder certificate must remain associated with the property receiving the shareholder discount. He noted that many irrigation shares are currently held in trusts or by individuals who own multiple properties, and the proposed language would still allow those owners to allocate shares among their properties. However, once a share is assigned to a particular property for purposes of the discount agreement, the ownership of that share must remain tied to that property so the City can accurately track where shareholder credits are being applied. He added that this requirement would continue in perpetuity.

Council Member Holley asked whether an irrigation share assigned to a property under the shareholder discount agreement could later be transferred to a different property. Mr. Bunker responded that transfers are permitted only under limited circumstances, prompting additional discussion.

Council Member Taylor explained that once a share is assigned to a property for purposes of the shareholder discount, it remains associated with that property and cannot be moved to another property at the owner's discretion. Council Member Holley confirmed his understanding by asking whether an owner with multiple properties could initially assign one share to each property but would be prohibited from later reallocating those shares among the properties. Council Member John clarified that when a property receiving the shareholder discount is sold, the assigned irrigation share remains with the property for purposes of the agreement and may not be retained by the seller for transfer to another parcel.

Council Member Holley sought clarification regarding the ownership and transferability of irrigation shares under the proposed agreement. He asked whether the shares are owned by the individual or by the property and whether an owner could reassign a share to another property after selling the original parcel. Mr. Bunker explained that the irrigation share remains owned by the individual, but a specified portion of the share is allocated to a particular property for purposes of the shareholder discount. Once allocated, that share must remain associated with the property to maintain the discount.

Mayor Frost clarified that although a property owner retains ownership of an irrigation share, the share cannot be reassigned to another property after it has been allocated under the shareholder discount agreement. Council Member John added that if a property is sold together with its assigned irrigation share, the new owner assumes the existing shareholder agreement and the allocation remain with the property. Mr. Bunker confirmed that this is consistent with the proposed policy.

Council Member Carroll then asked whether a seller could retain ownership of the irrigation share when selling the property. Council Member John responded that the owner could do so; however, Mr. Bunker explained that the retained share could not subsequently be assigned to another property to obtain the shareholder discount. Council Member Taylor observed that retaining the share would provide little benefit to the property being sold. Council Member John added that the owner could instead sell the irrigation share separately, such as to a developer, with the share ultimately being transferred to the City rather than reassigned to another property under the shareholder discount agreement.

Council Member Holley stated that he remained confused, noting that the discussion appeared to suggest both that irrigation shares remain tied to a property and that they may also be sold separately for development. Mr. Bunker clarified that the distinction results from the City's policy adopted in March, which discontinued acceptance of new shareholder discount allocations. Existing allocations may remain with their assigned properties, but property owners may not transfer a shareholder discount allocation to a different property after that date. He noted that a small number of pending applications submitted before the deadline were still being finalized.

Council Member Taylor explained that when a developer purchases irrigation shares to satisfy a development water requirement, those shares are not transferred to another property for purposes of the shareholder discount. Instead, they are conveyed to the City as part of the development approval process.

Council Member John agreed, explaining that the shares become City-owned once they are dedicated to satisfying a development requirement. Mr. Bunker added that, because the shares are conveyed to the city rather than retained by a private shareholder, they no longer qualify for the shareholder discount program.

Council Member Carroll raised a hypothetical scenario involving a property owner with multiple noncontiguous parcels. She asked whether, under the proposed policy, the owner would be prohibited from consolidating irrigation shares from several properties and transferring them to a single parcel being sold for development, expressing concern that the restriction could limit flexibility for owners with multiple properties. Council Member John responded to Council Member Carroll's hypothetical by explaining that a property owner could withdraw irrigation shares from multiple properties and dedicate them to the City for a development project because the owner retains ownership of the shares. However, doing so would eliminate the shareholder discounts associated with the properties from which those shares were removed, causing those properties to pay the standard pressurized irrigation rates.

Council Member Taylor added that, once the shares are removed, those properties would no longer qualify for shareholder discounts and would instead be billed like any other non-shareholder property.

Mayor Frost observed that the policy aligns with the City's water banking program and simplifies the overall process. He noted that developers may either acquire water already held in the City's water bank to satisfy development requirements or purchase water rights from private owners and dedicate those shares to the City.

Council Member John added that the Council regularly approves water banking transactions in which water rights are conveyed to the City and subsequently used to meet development requirements. He explained that developers frequently obtain the necessary water through this process, with the related transactions processed through City staff. Council Member Carroll acknowledged that she was familiar with the City's water banking program.

Council Member John explained that once irrigation shares are conveyed to the City, they remain under public ownership and, under Utah law, may only be transferred among public entities. They cannot be returned to private ownership after becoming part of the City's water portfolio. He explained that irrigation shares are generally transferred for development. He stated that the shareholder benefit was created to recognize existing shareholders who helped establish the pressurized irrigation system, with half their water dedicated to City conveyance and half retained for irrigation. Recent policy changes prevent new properties from obtaining the discount simply by purchasing shares.

Council Member Hunter clarified that the benefit may be transferred to a new owner when the qualifying property and its assigned share are sold together, but it is lost if the share is moved to another property. Council Member John stated that he believed the proposed agreement represented a fair compromise reached through extensive discussions among the Council, City staff, and legal counsel.

Royce Shelley questioned whether the proposed rate structure fairly reflected the value of shareholder-owned water. Using his own property as an example, he explained that his 0.49-acre lot has 2.13 irrigation shares assigned to it. Based on the City's recently adopted rates, he estimated that the amount of water available through his shareholder allocation would have an approximate value of $701, while using his full shareholder allocation under the new rate schedule would result in an estimated bill of about $870. He raised the concern that the proposed structure appeared to charge shareholders more than the value attributed to the water they contribute.

Council Member John responded that the arrangement should be viewed as a rental rather than a transfer of ownership. He compared it to renting a vehicle, explaining that although another party pays to use the asset, ownership remains with the original owner. Likewise, he emphasized that shareholders retain ownership of their water rights, which continue to have independent value, even though a portion of the water is dedicated to the City for operation of the pressurized irrigation system.

Mr. Shelley expressed concern that the proposed shareholder base rate would require irrigation shareholders to pay more than non-shareholders to use water they already own. He explained that, because shareholders must dedicate one-half of their irrigation water to the city for conveyance, he viewed that contribution as payment for delivery of his remaining water. Using his own property as an example, he stated that the City's adopted rate schedule values the water he contributes at approximately $870. In addition, he pays about $213 annually in irrigation company assessments and would also be required to pay the proposed one-half base rate. In his view, those combined costs would exceed what a non-shareholder would pay to use the same amount of water.

Mr. Shelley stated that he has no objection to paying the irrigation company assessment because he accepted that obligation when he acquired the water rights. However, he objected to paying an additional one-half base rate after already contributing a substantial portion of his water to the city for conveyance. He argued that irrigation shareholders should not pay more than non-shareholders to use water they own and emphasized that the water contributed to the city already helps offset the City's operating costs.

Council Member John noted that high-use non-shareholders could pay substantially more under the tiered rates than shareholders who remained within their allocations. Mr. Bunker clarified that Mr. Shelley was comparing the estimated value of contributed water, not predicting an $870 bill. Mr. Shelley argued that shareholder water should be valued at the same rate as the city charges non-shareholders. Council Member John also confirmed that shareholders could use their full allocation at any time during the irrigation season and apply excess shares to increase their Tier 1 allowance.

Mr. Shelley also asked whether the amount of water allocated to each property would continue to be determined using the methodology established when the pressurized irrigation system was implemented in 2007. Council Member John confirmed that the City would continue using the same property-size allocation calculator, which is based on irrigation water demand standards developed by Utah State University.

Mr. Bunker added that the methodology has recently been reviewed as part of the Bowen Collins & Associates irrigation rate study. He noted that the City's proposed allocations are actually somewhat more generous than the Utah State University recommendations, allowing shareholders a larger Tier 1 allocation than the technical guidance would otherwise suggest.

Mayor Frost and Council Member Taylor emphasized that shareholders retain ownership of a valuable water right and use that asset to offset part of their irrigation costs, while non-shareholders must pay the full cost in cash. Mr. Shelley responded that shareholders already dedicate a portion of their water to the city for conveyance and argued that imposing an additional half-base rate could cause their total contribution to exceed that of comparable non-shareholders. Mr. Bunker responded that the comparison should also account for the fact that non-shareholders pay the full base rate, while shareholders pay only one-half of that amount. Mr. Shelley replied that his analysis already incorporated the full cost a non-shareholder would pay and, in his view, demonstrated that shareholders would contribute more overall because they provide both the value of their water and the additional base rate.

Mr. Bunker explained that the value of a shareholder's contribution is not intended to equal what a non-shareholder would pay in water charges but rather to provide sufficient water to meet the property's irrigation needs. He noted that if a shareholder contributes more water than is required—using Council Member John's property as an example—the additional water increases the property's Tier 1 allocation and may be used without incurring usage charges. However, if a shareholder uses more water than is covered by the allocated shares, the excess consumption becomes subject to the applicable usage charges.

Mr. Shelley responded that he supports paying additional charges when a shareholder does not contribute enough water to cover the property's irrigation use under the 50/50 arrangement. However, he maintained that shareholders who dedicate sufficient water to fully meet their irrigation needs should not also be required to pay a one-half base rate.

Mr. Bunker clarified that, under the proposed agreement, shareholders do not pay additional charges on the portion of water covered by their allocated shares. Council Member John added that, even if a shareholder's water use extended into higher usage tiers, the shareholder would pay only the applicable usage charges for the excess consumption. Mr. Bunker confirmed that understanding.

Council Member Carroll asked whether the charges being discussed referred to the base rate. Mr. Bunker clarified that they did not. He explained that shareholders who exceed their Tier 1 allocation pay only the tiered usage charges, which are based on the amount of water consumed.

Council Member Taylor observed that, under the proposal, shareholders would pay one-half of the standard base rate regardless of whether they exceeded their Tier 1 allocation.

Council Member Hunter stated that this remained his primary concern with the proposal. He argued that shareholders who remain within the water allocated by their irrigation shares should not be required to pay a base rate in addition to contributing water to the city. Instead, he suggested that shareholders should pay usage charges only if they exceed their allocated water.

Council Member John estimated that he would have incurred only $10 to $15 in usage charges during two months of the previous season. Mayor Frost noted that eliminating the base rate would make City revenue dependent on variable water use. Council Member Hunter responded that requiring an approximately $240 annual base rate from shareholders who generally remain within their allocation would undermine the shareholder benefit and suggested charging them only for usage exceeding their allotted water.

Council Member John clarified that the proposed base rate would be charged year-round. Using his property as an example, he confirmed that a reduced base rate of approximately $20 per month would total about $240 annually, compared with approximately $480 per year for a comparable non-shareholder property.

Council Member Taylor then asked what irrigation costs shareholders would have incurred if the City had never constructed the pressurized irrigation system. Council Member John explained that he previously paid both culinary water charges for lawn irrigation and the annual assessment on his irrigation shares. Council Member Taylor observed that, under the proposal, shareholders would continue paying the annual irrigation assessment while also paying the new monthly pressurized irrigation base rate.

Council Member Holley clarified that, using Council Member John's example, he had historically paid approximately $200 annually for his irrigation assessment but would now also pay about $240 per year in base-rate charges under the proposed rate structure.

Mayor Frost stated that the transition to a pressurized irrigation system was largely driven by changing state regulatory requirements and said the proposed 50% base-rate discount represented a reasonable compromise that recognized shareholders' historic contributions while addressing current operating costs.

Council Member John observed that allowing shareholders to apply the value of excess irrigation shares toward the discounted base rate could eliminate that charge entirely for some property owners. Mayor Frost agreed. Mr. Bunker added that the City's operating and maintenance costs have increased substantially and noted that irrigation companies would have faced rising infrastructure costs regardless of whether the pressurized system had been built. He also explained that the State's metering mandate was not anticipated when the system was originally developed, a point with which Council Member John agreed.

Mr. Bunker emphasized that operating costs have increased for the system as a whole and that those increases affect both shareholders and non-shareholders.

Council Member Hunter requested a comparison of American Fork’s combined culinary and pressurized irrigation costs with Provo’s metered culinary system. Mr. Bunker agreed that comparisons with Provo and Orem could be informative but cautioned that they would be imperfect because American Fork lacked the culinary infrastructure and water rights needed to provide citywide outdoor irrigation. He explained that the separate system required a new distribution network but allowed the City to use existing irrigation rights. Council Member John added that shareholders had rejected an earlier system proposal in 1994 before it was ultimately approved.

Mr. Bunker explained that the City constructed a larger distribution system to serve shareholder properties and now bears the ongoing costs of operating and maintaining that infrastructure. He added that, without the pressurized irrigation system, shareholders would have continued experiencing significant conveyance losses through the ditch system and, during drought conditions, many might not have received sufficient irrigation water later in the season. He stated that the pressurized system has provided substantial benefits to both shareholders and the city.

Council Member Hunter acknowledged that the proposed 50% shareholder discount was a meaningful concession but questioned whether shareholders should also pay a monthly base rate for water they already own. He noted that shareholders contributed valuable water rights to the City and continue to pay their full annual irrigation company assessments, while the City benefits from one-half of those water rights without paying those assessments. Mr. Bunker responded that shareholders also benefit from avoiding the significant conveyance losses that occurred under the former ditch system, suggesting that those avoided losses help balance the overall exchange, although he acknowledged he was not involved in developing the original conveyance-loss calculations.

Council Member John observed that, under current drought conditions, the amount of water represented by an individual shareholder's allocation at the mouth of American Fork Canyon would be too small to deliver effectively through the historic ditch system.

Mr. Bunker explained that the City's investment in a pressurized irrigation pipeline system largely eliminated the conveyance losses associated with open ditches. Council Member Hunter agreed, noting that avoiding those losses was the reason shareholders originally agreed to dedicate one-half of their irrigation shares to the city. Mr. Bunker confirmed that the 50% transfer was intended to compensate the city for the conveyance improvements

Mayor Frost asked whether the various components of the proposed shareholder rate structure could be presented in a clearer format so customers could better understand how the charges and credits would appear on a monthly bill. Council Member John responded that not every shareholder owns enough water rights to eliminate their irrigation bill entirely. He explained that some shareholders, including himself and Mr. Shelley, own more than enough water to offset their usage, while others own only the minimum amount required to participate. Under the City's ordinance, a property owner must own at least one-half of the irrigation water required for the property to qualify as a shareholder participant, leaving many shareholders with only partial offsets.

Mr. Bunker added that the number of shareholders will likely continue to decline over time as properties change ownership and water rights are sold separately from the land. Council Member John agreed, noting that the City's policies do not allow the creation of new shareholder accounts.

Council Members discussed how the shareholder program will likely diminish over time because no new participants may enter and water rights are often sold separately from homes. Council Member Carroll emphasized the City's obligation to honor commitments made to the original shareholders, whose participation was essential to constructing the pressurized irrigation system, despite potential cost shifts to other ratepayers. Mr. Bunker noted that the city could not have anticipated state-metering mandates or substantial increases in operating costs, while Council Member John clarified that the agreement permits amendments but does not require periodic review.

Council Member John noted that the original shareholder agreement includes a process for amendment, indicating that future changes were anticipated. Council Member Carroll then asked whether shareholders had voted on the proposed 50% base-rate policy, and Mr. Bunker responded that the agreement expressly contemplated future modifications.
Council Member John clarified that shareholders have not voted on the proposed half-base-rate policy. He explained that, after consulting with legal counsel, the irrigation board concluded that shareholder approval is not required because the decision falls within the authority of the board rather than the shareholders.

Council Member Carroll confirmed that the irrigation board had not acted formally on the proposal, which remained under discussion. Council Member Taylor suggested recovering operating costs through a modest per-share assessment rather than a monthly base rate. Council Member John proposed charging shareholders no base rate while they remained within their water allocation and the full base rate once they exceeded it, while acknowledging potential billing-system challenges.

Ms. Montoya explained that the City's current billing system already operates similarly to a discounted base-rate structure by reducing a shareholder's fixed charge according to the number of irrigation shares dedicated to the property, with the charge decreasing until it reaches zero for properties with sufficient shares. She suggested staff review the calculations together to ensure the billing methodology was being interpreted consistently.

Council Member John clarified that the calculation is based on the amount of water represented by the property's irrigation shares rather than a fixed 50% discount. He explained that customers pay only the portion of the charge not offset by their own water allocation. Ms. Montoya agreed that the adjustment is determined by the amount of water represented by the shares.

Ms. Montoya then stated that, under her interpretation of the shareholder agreement, the proposed changes would not alter the existing treatment of the fixed charge. Shareholders would continue receiving a reduction based on the amount of water they own, while the primary change would occur in the proposed tiered usage rates, where shareholders would apply their owned acre-feet of water toward their irrigation consumption before incurring charges for additional usage.

Council Member Carroll asked whether Ms. Montoya was suggesting that the proposed policy already operates in that manner. Council Member John responded that the current system does not establish a separate base rate but instead applies a single fixed charge that is reduced proportionally based on the shareholder's water allocation.

Mr. Bunker confirmed that the existing shareholder billing structure does not include a separate base rate. Ms. Montoya explained that the fixed monthly charge functions similarly to a base rate and suggested the same proportional discount methodology could be applied if the City adopted a formal base-rate structure. Council Member John agreed, emphasizing that the charge decreases in proportion to the amount of water owned and can be reduced to zero when a shareholder has sufficient irrigation shares.

Council Member John explained that shareholders could apply additional shares to increase their Tier 1 allocation before higher usage rates applied. Using his property as an example, he noted that he could assign an additional two-tenths of a share to his allocation rather than allow it to enter the system without credit. Ms. Montoya confirmed that applying a proportional base-rate discount based on additional shares would be relatively straightforward within the billing system.

Council Member John asked whether shareholders could be charged the full base rate only when they exceeded the water covered by their shares. Ms. Montoya explained that fixed and usage charges are calculated separately and that such an approach would require additional programming and a method for distributing annual allocations across the irrigation season. Mr. Shelley suggested allowing shareholders to use their allocation flexibly throughout the season to reflect changing demand, but Council Member John noted that staff had determined this would be difficult to administer.

Council Member Carroll requested approximately 15 customer scenarios illustrating how the proposed rates would affect different shareholders. Council Member Taylor questioned whether the examples would resolve the broader policy issue of how to recover system operating costs but agreed they could show that impacts would vary based on each shareholder's water rights. Council Member John noted that, as an irrigation board member, he could participate in the discussion but would not vote.

Mr. Bunker reported that staff had located the relevant provision in the original shareholder agreement, which states that the initial schedule of charges was based on estimated costs and "may need to be amended from time to time as deemed appropriate by the City." He stated that this language demonstrates the parties anticipated future changes to rates and fees as operating costs increased.

Council Member Carroll questioned what charges actually existed when the agreement was executed, noting that shareholders with sufficient irrigation shares paid no charges under the original rate structure. She asked why the amendment language would authorize new charges if the original fee schedule resulted in no bill for those shareholders. Council Member John confirmed that her understanding of the original rate structure was correct.

Mayor Frost commented that the provision was nonetheless helpful because it demonstrated that the agreement recognized the possibility of future changes. He stated that, while the agreement did not specifically anticipate inflation or the State's later metering requirements, it acknowledged that future circumstances could be unpredictable and that adjustments to the schedule of charges might become necessary over time.

Mr. Bunker and Council Member John noted that the original shareholder agreement did not anticipate the State's later requirement to meter pressurized irrigation systems, explaining that the mandate significantly changed the regulatory and operational landscape.

Mayor Frost concluded that, although the discussion had been helpful, additional consideration was needed and proposed bringing the matter back as a future action item before the City Council for formal consideration and public comment.

Council Member John explained that the irrigation board had postponed its vote on the proposed half-base-rate policy until after the City Council acted. He stated that the Council would consider the proposal on July 28, followed by an irrigation board vote on August 5, and noted that the board was divided on the issue.

Council Member Carroll asked what would happen if the irrigation board rejected the proposal. Council Member John clarified that both the City Council and the irrigation board must approve any amendment to the shareholder agreement. If either body declined to approve the proposal, it would not take effect, although the Council could choose to modify the proposal before acting.

2. Discussion on road cross section with bike lanes and trails.
Sam Kelly introduced a discussion on roadway cross-sections, explaining that decisions regarding bike lanes, shared-use paths, sidewalks, park strips, and street trees are closely interconnected and would overlap with the next agenda item. He explained that similar to the improvements made on 100 West, implementing the City's Bicycle Master Plan on corridors such as 300 North may require reallocating limited roadway space. While parking was removed from one side of 100 West to accommodate bike lanes, he noted that many older collectors and arterial streets lack sufficient right-of-way to use the same approach because they are already fully developed with existing homes.

Mr. Kelly explained that, beyond that point, widening the roadway would likely require reducing park strips or removing mature trees. He asked the Council for direction on preferred street designs as staff develop the Capital Improvement Plan, including whether to prioritize bike lanes, shared-use paths, wider sidewalks, larger park strips with trees, or narrower roadways. He also noted that the city is obligated to implement elements of its Bicycle Master Plan, including the addition of bike lanes where appropriate.

Council Member Carroll asked whether the discussion was limited to bicycle routes identified in the City's Bicycle Master Plan or whether alternative corridors could be considered if they better accommodated bicycle facilities. Mr. Hunter responded that staff had evaluated other east-west routes but concluded that 300 North remains the most practical continuous corridor identified in the Master Plan, although they remain open to additional ideas.

Council Member Holley questioned whether the proposed bicycle facilities were intended for recreation or commuting and whether sufficient commuter demand existed along 300 North. Council Member John explained that the Bicycle Master Plan identifies the corridor as a commuter connection between the Frontrunner station and neighborhoods on the city’s east side.

Mr. Kelly confirmed that the bike lanes on 300 North are identified in the City's adopted Bicycle Master Plan. He explained that staff are attempting to remain consistent with the adopted plan while determining the appropriate facility type. He noted that shared-lane markings are generally appropriate only on streets with speeds of 25 mph or less, whereas the higher traffic volumes and speeds on 300 North require consideration of dedicated bike lanes or shared-use paths instead.

Mr. Hunter noted that the posted speed limit on 300 North is 30 mph east of 100 East and 25 mph west of 100 East, affecting the types of bicycle facilities that can be considered.

Council Member Taylor, drawing on his experience living along 300 North, questioned whether the corridor could reasonably accommodate bike lanes and suggested 200 North as a possible alternative, while acknowledging that its frequent stop signs would make it less attractive for cyclists. Council Member John noted that 300 North widens east of approximately 700 East, providing greater flexibility for future improvements.

Council Members Taylor and John discussed routing cyclists between 300 North and 200 North but concluded that gaps in the street network prevent a continuous connection. Mr. Hunter agreed that discontinuous roadway connections are a primary obstacle to relocating the route, and Council Member Taylor added that other streets, such as 100 North, present similar limitations and would not provide the continuous east-west corridor envisioned in the Bicycle Master Plan.

Mayor Frost asked whether another east-west corridor, such as 50 South, could be used instead of 300 North. Council Member Taylor responded that Main Street could accommodate a bike facility but noted that the route is becoming more difficult near State Street. Mr. Bunker agreed, explaining that conditions become challenging at the SR-92 interchange.

The Council discussed alternative bicycle routes that would provide safer, signalized crossings and better connections to the Frontrunner station and existing trail network. Options included using 100 North to connect through 700 East to 300 North or routing cyclists along 300 East. Council members also noted that cyclists can currently travel from the station to Center Street using existing trails and then continue north via the Center Street bike lanes.

Mr. Opperman encouraged the Council to consider destinations beyond commuter travel, noting that bicycle facilities also serve students, families, and residents traveling to parks, schools, churches, and other community destinations. He suggested that a shared-use path along 300 North could improve both safety and east-west connectivity.

Council Member Taylor maintained that 100 North or 200 North might provide better access to community destinations, while acknowledging the challenge of meeting all transportation needs within a single corridor. Mr. Bunker responded that 200 North's frequent stop signs and busy intersections make it less suitable as a primary bicycle route. He then asked whether a shared-use path could replace on-street bike lanes, and Mr. Kelly replied that it was a viable option. Mr. Bunker suggested constructing a shared-use path along the north side of 300 North by removing the existing planter strip.

Mr. Hunter presented several design alternatives for 300 North and requested Council direction before advancing the design. He noted that formalizing existing on-street parking could improve organization, visibility, and intersection safety. Other options included buffered bike lanes or bike lanes with a center turn lane, both of which would eliminate parking; the latter would also require narrower-than-recommended bicycle lanes.

Council Member Taylor stated that eliminating on-street parking was not a realistic option for 300 North. Mr. Hunter acknowledged the concern and explained that staff was seeking Council direction because similar tradeoffs would arise on many 40-foot-wide residential streets, which generally cannot accommodate parking on both sides, dedicated bike lanes, and standard-width travel lanes simultaneously.

Mr. Hunter presented additional design alternatives, including a configuration similar to 100 West that would retain parking on one side of the street while providing bike lanes. He also described options to construct shared-use paths behind the curb by removing the existing park strips or widening the roadway and reconstruct the curb, gutter, and sidewalks to accommodate both parking and dedicated bike lanes. He noted that both alternatives would be substantially more expensive than restriping the existing roadway.

Council Member John observed that many older homes along 300 North lack sufficient off-street parking, making on-street parking an important necessity. Mr. Hunter agreed that preserving parking would likely require either roadway widening or construction of shared-use paths rather than relying solely on bike lanes within the existing pavement.

Mr. Kelly clarified that constructing a shared-use path would not require acquiring additional property but would instead involve replacing the existing park strips and sidewalks within the public right-of-way.

Mr. Bird reminded the Council that the city is completing a trail connection from the Murdock Canal Trail through Art Dye Park to the American Fork River Trail, noting that the existing and planned trail network already provides an alternative east-west bicycle route and should be considered when evaluating improvements along 300 North.

Council Member Carroll asked whether the city could construct a single shared-use path on one side of 300 North rather than paths on both sides. Council Member John suggested widening the existing sidewalk into a shared-use path along the north side from approximately 400 East to 700 East, where the roadway widens and provides greater design flexibility.

Mr. Hunter responded that the existing public right-of-way would generally accommodate that approach by replacing the 4- to 6-foot-wide park strips with a shared-use path, although utility poles, mailboxes, and other roadside features would require coordination. Council Member John concluded that the shared-use path could extend to approximately 700 East, where additional roadway width would allow other bicycle improvements. He added that staff preferred the north side because an existing shared-use path is already located there, allowing the facility to continue on the same side of the street and reducing the number of roadway crossings for bicyclists.

Council Member Holley asked whether the proposed shared-use path would function as an extra-wide sidewalk with separate areas for pedestrians and bicyclists. Mr. Hunter explained that it would operate as a single shared-use path, similar to the existing facility along portions of 860 East, without separate lanes. He noted that while national guidance recommends shared-use paths 12 to 14 feet wide, the existing right-of-way along 300 North would generally accommodate only a 9- to 10-foot-wide facility, which is why staff were seeking Council directions.

Participating remotely, Council Member Hunter raised two concerns. He questioned whether a wider shared-use path could create conflicts between faster-moving bicyclists and pedestrians, and he reiterated his opposition to green pavement markings, stating that they are unattractive, costly to maintain, and wear out quickly.

Mr. Hunter explained that the concepts under discussion would not include continuous green bike lanes. Instead, consistent with national guidance, green pavement would generally be limited to short conflict areas such as intersections where bicyclists and motorists' cross paths. He noted that the extensive green markings in the Transit-Oriented Core were required by previously adopted cross-sections and added that other methods of identifying conflict zones could be used in future projects.

Council Member Hunter reiterated his opposition to green pavement markings, stating that he believed the recently installed markings on 700 South were inconsistent with the Council's previous direction and that he did not support the continued use of colored pavement for bicycle facilities.

Council Member Taylor clarified that the 700 South improvements included green pavement only at conflict areas, such as crosswalks and intersections, rather than continuous green bike lanes. Council Member Hunter maintained his concern and requested that his objection be reflected in the discussion.

Mayor Frost recalled the Council's prior discussions on the issue and suggested bringing the matter back for formal consideration, noting that discontinuing the use of green pavement markings would require amendments to the City's adopted roadway standards and cross-sections.

Mr. Hunter agreed, explaining that several adopted roadway cross-sections currently specify green pavement markings. If the Council wished to eliminate them, staff would need to revise those standards and adopt updated cross-sections. He added that some recently installed green markings may have resulted from contractors completing outstanding punch-list items or restoring previously approved improvements. Nevertheless, he agreed that the City's standards should be revisited if the Council's policy direction had changed.

Mayor Frost clarified that his concern was not with the roadway cross-sections themselves but with the long-term maintenance costs associated with green pavement markings. While the markings may be appealing when initially installed as part of a construction project, he noted that the City ultimately bears the ongoing expense of maintaining and replacing them.

Council Member Hunter reiterated his opposition to expanding the use of green pavement markings, citing their maintenance costs, and expressed concern that wider shared-use paths could encourage higher bicycle speeds and increase conflicts with pedestrians. He stated that he preferred a practical path width that safely accommodates both users without encouraging excessive bicycle speeds.

Mr. Hunter summarized that the Council appeared to generally support preserving on-street parking on established residential streets. He asked for additional policy directions on how best to incorporate bicycle facilities while maintaining parking, including options such as roadway widening, one-sided parking, or shared-use paths. Using one block of 300 North between 400 and 500 East as an example, he presented preliminary cost comparisons showing that restriping for bike lanes would cost approximately $15 per linear foot, while constructing a shared-use path would cost approximately $520 per linear foot. He noted that roadway widening would be even more expensive and that the estimates excluded costs for items such as landscape restoration, traffic control, curb and gutter replacement, and sidewalk reconstruction were required.

Mayor Frost observed that the significant cost differences underscored the importance of selecting a clear long-term direction before committing to a particular design approach. He questioned whether such substantial expenditures would be necessary.

Council Members questioned whether another corridor could provide bicycle facilities more cost-effectively through restriping. Council Member Taylor noted that every option involves tradeoffs and emphasized responsible roadway sharing, while Council Member Holley questioned whether the potential increase in bicycle use would justify the substantial cost of a shared-use path.

Mr. Hunter explained that bicycle facilities should be designed corridor by corridor based on the destinations and users they serve. He stated that safe, well-designed infrastructure can increase bicycle use, citing protected lanes near schools in Lehi. Council Member Holley agreed that anticipated demand and travel patterns should guide investments to ensure meaningful public benefit and prudent use of City funds.

Mayor Frost asked whether bicycle and multi-use trail projects could qualify for regional, state, or federal transportation funding intended to support alternative transportation modes.

Mr. Kelly confirmed that grant funding is available but noted that acquiring property for trail projects can be challenging because eminent domain generally cannot be used for recreational trails. Mr. Bunker responded that he believed there may be an exception for trails constructed along collector or arterial roadways, citing a court case in Mapleton. Mr. Kelly acknowledged that such an exception might exist and, if applicable, could allow the City to pursue projects along certain corridors while seeking funding through organizations such as MAG.

Council Member Carroll added that, in addition to regional funding opportunities, state and federal grants may also be available for bicycle and trail projects. Overall, the discussion highlighted the potential availability of outside funding while recognizing that right-of-way acquisition and legal authority remain important considerations.

Mr. Hunter noted that the city is already working with UDOT as part of the Governor's Utah Trail Network initiative on a feasibility study for the American Fork River Trail. The study is evaluating potential alignments and how the trail could overcome major barriers such as Main Street, State Street, Interstate 15, and the railroad. He explained that, because the project is part of a broader state effort, it could be eligible for state-level funding.

Mr. Opperman suggested exploring additional grant opportunities, such as Safe Routes to School or other programs that support bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure connecting schools and neighborhoods.

Council Member John explained that Utah law permits the use of eminent domain for trail projects only when the primary purpose is transportation rather than recreation. Mr. Hunter responded that demonstrating a transportation purpose would likely require evidence of anticipated commuter use, while Mr. Kelly added that corridors connecting major destinations, such as Frontrunner stations or regional trails, would present a stronger case.

Council Members discussed right-of-way and funding requirements for shared-use paths. Staff explained that MAG-funded projects would likely require paths approximately 10 to 12 feet wide but would not necessarily require additional property acquisition if those standards could be met within the existing right-of-way. Council Member Carroll noted that a path could be constructed on one side of the street by removing the park strip, while Mr. Hunter explained that the design would maximize available width and maintain a consistent elevation across driveways.

Council Members expressed general interest in shared-use paths because they would improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity while preserving on-street parking, although concerns remained about cost, maintenance, and potential conflicts among users. Mr. Hunter compared the lower initial cost and higher maintenance of asphalt with the greater durability and cost of concrete. Council Members also discussed safely accommodating the expected growth of e-bikes, scooters, and other micromobility devices, including potential separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic where feasible. It was noted that state law regulates these devices, including limiting e-bikes to 750 watts. Mr. Kelly concluded that staff had heard a general preference for shared-use paths that preserve on-street parking, and Mr. Hunter added that staff would continue evaluating alternative bicycle corridors to improve citywide connectivity.

Council Members discussed constructing a shared-use path on only one side of the street to reduce costs and evaluate other corridors. Mr. Bunker and Council Member Taylor noted that 100 North may have sufficient width for bicycle facilities within the existing roadway, while Fleming Drive near Evergreen Park was also identified for consideration.

Mr. Hunter explained that because many of the City's older residential streets have pavement widths of only 40 to 44 feet, the same tradeoffs between on-street parking and bicycle facilities would exist in most corridors. He noted that, unless a roadway is widened, preserving parking on both sides would generally require a shared-use path rather than dedicated on-street bike lanes.

Council Members discussed balancing parking, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, mature trees, and other roadway features within the existing right-of-way. A shared-use path remained a viable option for 300 North, while Center Street was suggested as an alternative. Mr. Kelly clarified that the discussion was intended to guide future planning rather than select a final corridor and noted that reconstruction of 300 North would occur after the 100 West project.

3. Discussion on trees and park strips.
   Ben McNaugton, the city Arborist, presented revisions to the proposed park strip tree standards, explaining that the recommendations were built on established arboricultural practices rather than introducing new concepts. Using the City's LiDAR-based tree inventory, he proposed maintaining the prohibition on trees in park strips less than 4 feet wide while refining the size categories to allow only small trees in 4- to 6-foot park strips, medium trees in 6- to 8-foot park strips, and large trees in park strips wider than 8 feet**.** He also introduced a prohibited tree list that includes undesirable or invasive species such as *Siberian Elm*, *Tree-of-Heaven*, and *Cottonwood.*

   Council Members Carroll and Holley supported providing residents with guidance on unsuitable tree species, noting that homeowners would benefit from knowing which trees are prone to disease, structural failure, or infrastructure damage before planting them.

   Mr. McNaughton explained that the approved tree lists would identify specific cultivars appropriate for each park strip size, emphasizing that matching the correct tree to the available space would help avoid future maintenance and infrastructure conflicts. In response to Council Member Carroll, he added that the recommended species were selected from trees commonly available through local nurseries and regional suppliers.

   Council Member Carroll asked whether a 6-foot-wide park strip could accommodate trees from either the small or medium tree lists. Mr. McNaughton confirmed that smaller approved species may also be planted in larger park strips, providing additional flexibility for property owners.

   Mr. McNaughton explained that the prohibited tree list excludes species with well-documented maintenance and structural problems, such as *Silver Maple*, rather than reflecting arbitrary preferences. In response to a question about conifers, he stated that *Evergreen* trees are generally unsuitable for park strips because they can obstruct sight lines, require frequent pruning, and create additional maintenance issues from falling needles and cones.

   Mr. Bunker asked whether *London Plane* trees were included on the recommended tree list. Mr. McNaughton replied that he planned to discuss *London Planes* separately later in the presentation because they require additional consideration. He noted that, due to their mature size, they would generally be appropriate only in park strips at least 8 feet wide.

   Using 100 East as an example, Mr. McNaughton illustrated the importance of selecting the correct tree cultivar rather than simply the correct species. He pointed to a *Norway Maple* growing in a 6-foot park strip that had become too large and was no longer appropriate for the space. He explained that while certain compact cultivars of *Norway Maple* could be suitable for narrower park strips, standard-grown *Norway Maples* become too large and should not be planted in those locations.

   Council Member Holley asked whether a standard *Norway Maple* would be appropriate for park strips 8 feet wide or larger. Mr. McNaughton responded that he would not recommend planting a standard *Norway Maple* in a park strip of any width and instead suggested more compact species, such as *Japanese Tree Lilac*, that provide shade without creating conflicts with vehicles or the roadway.

Using additional LiDAR examples, Mr. McNaughton demonstrated how different tree species perform in various park strip widths. He highlighted a *Spring Snow Crabapple* thriving in a 5-foot park strip and explained that the City's inventory software tracks roadway and utility clearances to identify pruning needs. He also used *Zelkova* as an example of a species available in multiple cultivars, emphasizing that selecting the appropriate cultivar is essential to matching a tree with the available planting space.

In response to Mr. Bunker's earlier question, Mr. McNaughton explained that *London Plane* trees are large shade trees that require generous planting areas, such as those along Pacific Drive, and are generally unsuitable for typical park strips. In response to Council Member John, he added that although some improved cultivars have better disease and frost resistance, he remains hesitant to recommend *London Planes* until their long-term performance in American Fork is better understood.

Mr. McNaughton concluded the presentation by highlighting additional species on the proposed approved tree list, including *Amber Maple, Tricolor Beech*, and several *Eastern Redbud* cultivars. He explained that these trees are appropriately sized for their intended park strip widths, have performed well in similar environments, and can be maintained to provide adequate pedestrian and roadway clearances. He added that *Eastern Redbud* is particularly well suited for smaller park strips because its cultivars remain relatively compact while offering a variety of ornamental characteristics.

In response to a question from Mr. Bird, Mr. McNaughton stated that no tree is completely free from the risk of sidewalk damage, as maintenance, irrigation, soil conditions, and root growth all influence long-term performance. He explained that the proposed standards are intended to reduce those risks by matching appropriate species and cultivars to the available planting space.

Council Member John added that the proposed tree list is designed to standardize tree selection and minimize future maintenance and infrastructure conflicts, and Mr. McNaughton agreed that the recommended species were selected to reduce, rather than eliminate, those risks.

Mr. Bird outlined the City's planned approach to enforcing park strip maintenance requirements for side and rear yard frontages. He explained that staff will first restore severely overgrown areas, educate affected property owners about their responsibilities, and provide a reasonable transition period before using code enforcement as a last resort.

Mr. McNaughton concluded his presentation by highlighting additional recommended park strip trees, including *Chitalpa*, upright *Black Tupelo* cultivars, *Chinese Pistache*, and the *City Sprite Japanese Zelkova,* emphasizing their suitability for urban conditions because of their drought tolerance, manageable size, and durability. In response to questions, he noted that the dieback shown in one Chinese Pistache photograph was not typical of the species and described *'City Sprite' Zelkova* as one of the best-performing street trees for constrained planting areas.

Mayor Frost asked whether the City's approved tree list should remain limited or include a broader selection of species. Mr. Bunker supported offering residents more approved options and suggested hosting an annual tree or park strip open house to educate the public about appropriate tree selection and maintenance.

Council Member John emphasized that park strip tree standards should be incorporated into the City's code, with the code referring to an approved tree list maintained by the City Forester so it can be updated administratively. Council Member Carroll asked that the information be provided to new property owners and builders early in the development process, and Mayor Frost noted that coordination with homeowners' associations would also be important because some currently require tree species that would not meet the proposed standards.

Mr. McNaughton encouraged diversifying the City's urban forest rather than relying heavily on species such as *Autumn Blaze Maples*. He explained that fast-growing trees, including many ornamental plums and cherries, establish quickly but typically require more maintenance and are more prone to structural problems. Mayor Frost also encouraged involving the Beautification Committee in public education efforts, and Mr. Rykert agreed that the committee could assist with outreach through open houses, Arbor Day activities, and similar events.

Council Member Holley suggested partnering with the Beautification Committee during Steel Days to educate residents about the City's proposed tree standards through informational displays and approved tree lists, an idea supported by Council Member Carroll and Mr. Bunker.

Mr. Bird stated that staff's goal is to educate the Council about the planned implementation process so members can accurately respond to public questions. Council Member Carroll then asked about the City's process for pruning park strip trees. Mr. McNaughton explained that staff responds to complaints and inspection requests, addressing immediate safety hazards promptly while providing advance notice to property owners whenever possible. Mr. Bunker suggested giving homeowners the opportunity to complete required pruning themselves, and Mr. Rykert confirmed that this approach is consistent with the City's code and educational efforts.

Council Member Holley then asked whether homeowners are charged when the city performs the work. Mr. Rykert responded that the current code does not authorize the city to recover those costs.

Mr. McNaughton explained that proposed code revisions would clarify that if a tree were determined to be a nuisance or hazard and the owner fails to correct the issue within the required notice period, the property owner may be cited. He added that in emergency situations the City may perform the work immediately, with the property owner responsible for the associated costs. Council Member Holley expressed support for allowing the City to recover its costs when property owners fail to fulfill their maintenance responsibilities, stating that residents should not expect the City to absorb the expense of correcting neglected trees. Council Member Carroll asked how citations would be issued for rental properties, and Mr. Bunker responded that enforcement would follow the City's standard citation process.

Mayor Frost thanked Mr. McNaughton for his presentation and reflected on the City's decision to hire a dedicated forester several years earlier. He remarked that trees are an important community asset and stated that having a professional dedicated to urban forestry has proven to be a valuable investment for the city.

4. Adjourn.
   The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

   Stephanie Finau

   Stephanie Finau
   Deputy Recorder