



**PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL
Redevelopment Agency Governing Board
Stormwater Service District Governing Board
Regular Meeting Minutes**

5:30 PM, Tuesday, June 09, 2026
Council Chambers (Room 100)
445 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601 or
<https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil>

Roll Call

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Councilor Becky Bogdin	Councilor Craig Christensen
Councilor Gary Garrett	Councilor Travis Hoban
Councilor Katrice MacKay	Councilor Rachel Whipple
Councilor Jeff Whitlock	Mayor Marsha Judkins
Council Executive Director Justin Harrison	Chief Administrative Officer Scott Henderson
City Attorney Brian Jones	City Recorder Heidi Allman

Conducting: Chair Katrice MacKay

Prayer – Grant Pace

Pledge of Allegiance – Councilor Jeff Whitlock

Public Comment

Chair MacKay read the public comment guidelines and opened the public comment period. No comments were made, and she subsequently closed the public comment period.

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

1 A presentation regarding the FY 2027 Provo City Citizens Budget (26-001) [00:03:26](#)

Britton Johnson, Council Intern, presented an overview of the proposed tentative budget designed to highlight key financial information for the public. He reviewed projected revenues of approximately \$334.62 million and expenditures of \$341.6 million, noting that utility sales, fees, and sales tax remain the City's primary revenue sources. He highlighted an increase in projected sales tax revenue, major General Fund expenditures, and the Capital Improvement Plan, including the continued construction of the new drinking water treatment plant. Mr. Johnson also reviewed proposed utility rate adjustments, emphasizing that no residential electric rate increase is proposed for Fiscal Year 2027, and outlined available utility rebate and sustainability programs. He highlighted several initiatives to improve fiscal efficiency, including tighter oversight of supplemental appropriations, creation of an annual vehicle fleet budget, reduced fire department overtime through additional staffing, investment in an economic development strategic plan, and improvements to the building permit process. He concluded by reviewing community achievements, the City's long-term vision, opportunities for public participation in the budget process, and resources for accessing the full tentative budget before inviting questions from the Council.

Action Agenda

2 **A resolution to place 5.079 acres of real property generally located to the south of the Epic Sports Park on Lakeview Parkway on the surplus property list (26-012) [00:11:45](#)**

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2026-18, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Cody Hill, Economic Development Division Director, presented a proposal to declare approximately 5.079 acres of City-owned property located south of Epic Sports Park as surplus property. He explained that the parcel was acquired as part of the original Epic Sports Park property purchase and was later zoned SC-2 (Service Commercial) in coordination with the Development Services and Parks and Recreation departments to support future commercial development. Mr. Hill noted that the Council had previously discussed the property and the related request for proposals (RFP) process during work sessions. He explained that declaring the property surplus would allow it to be sold for future development and offered to answer any additional questions.

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

Councilor Whitlock explained that declaring the property surplus was a procedural step necessary to facilitate its future sale and development. He noted that the parcel is located near the airport and Epic Sports Park and referenced plans discussed during the work session for a hotel and restaurant development intended to serve visitors to both facilities.

Chair MacKay called for a vote.

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

3 **An ordinance amending the zone map classification of real property, generally located at 5568 N Canyon Road, from the medium density residential (MDR) zone to the Arbors on the Avenue (PRO-A10) zone. North Timpview. (PLRZ20260076) [00:14:22](#)**

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-16, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Aaron Ardmore, Planning Supervisor, presented a proposal to amend the previously approved development agreement for the property. He explained that the Council had previously approved a Medium Density Residential zoning designation and a development agreement allowing 16 townhome units. The applicant is now proposing to develop 46 condominium units under the Arbors on the Avenue zone. Mr. Ardmore stated that the proposal had completed staff and Planning Commission review and that the concept plan demonstrates compliance with the proposed zoning. He noted that approval would also require amending the recorded development agreement to reflect the revised project and offered to answer questions.

Councilor Christensen asked how the proposed development would be accommodated by the existing sewer system, noting that sewer capacity had not been discussed during the work session.

Gordon Haight, Public Works Director, explained that the City's sewer master plan originally allocated capacity for 12 units on the property based on its planned development at the time. Since then, the City has reevaluated available sewer capacity after other anticipated developments did not proceed as originally planned, allowing capacity to be reallocated to support the proposed increase in units. Director Haight acknowledged that sewer capacity in the area remains limited but stated that the City has sufficient capacity for the proposed project under the adopted master plan. He noted that future requests for additional density beyond current planning assumptions could present challenges.

Councilor Whitlock asked about the existing development agreement for the property, including whether it remains in effect and whether it includes an owner-occupancy requirement.

Aaron Ardmore confirmed that the current development agreement remains in effect and that both the existing and proposed agreements require at least 50% of the units to be deed-restricted for owner occupancy.

Councilor Whitlock also asked how the proposed condominium development would address housing affordability and neighborhood concerns about traffic. He also inquired what the former use was for the property.

Mr. Ardmore explained that the smaller condominium units are expected to be more affordable than the previously approved townhomes and noted that the development agreement requires roadway and infrastructure improvements that will enhance the surrounding transportation system. In response to Councilor Whitlock's final question, Mr. Ardmore confirmed that the site is a former gravel pit.

Councilor Bogdin asked whether the proposed development would retain the trail connection required under the existing development agreement and raised questions about whether the development would provide adequate parking.

Aaron Ardmore confirmed that the proposal includes construction of the trail connection to the City's existing trail system and meets the City's parking requirement of 2.25 spaces per unit. In response to questions about potential overflow parking, Mr. Ardmore noted that the proposal complies with City parking standards and that parking is prohibited along the adjacent section of Canyon Road, which he believed would address concerns about on-street parking.

Councilor Whipple expressed support for the revised proposal, noting that it would result in more owner-occupied units than the previously approved townhome development while also providing more affordable homeownership opportunities. She acknowledged the challenges associated with developing the site, including nearby infrastructure constraints, and observed that the earlier proposal had been limited by sewer capacity. She stated that she viewed the revised condominium proposal as an improvement over the previous development plan.

Councilor Christensen expressed concern that, although the proposal meets the City's parking standards, the site's unique location and lack of adjacent on-street parking could create parking challenges. He also questioned whether the proposed density was appropriate given the property's location along Canyon Road and the traffic and access concerns previously discussed.

David Bragonje, Applicant, addressed concerns about parking, explaining that each condominium would include two parking spaces, with a limited number of units having the option to purchase an additional underground space. He noted that visitor parking would also be available on-site but stated that nearby streets and trailhead parking are not intended to accommodate long-term overflow parking. Mr. Bragonje said the parking limitations would naturally restrict the number of vehicles associated with each unit and reduce the likelihood of excessive student parking in the development.

Chair MacKay asked how parking would be managed within the development and requested additional information about the anticipated pricing and target market for the condominiums.

Mr. Bragonje explained that each unit would have two assigned parking spaces, with visitor parking available and limited opportunities for residents to rent additional spaces through the homeowner's association. He stated that the condominiums would be smaller and more affordable than the previously proposed townhomes, although they would not be considered entry-level housing due to their location and amenities, including underground parking. Mr. Bragonje said he anticipates the development will appeal primarily to residents looking to downsize from larger homes and confirmed that the building will include an elevator to improve accessibility.

Councilor Christensen asked how the proposed 50% owner-occupancy requirement would be implemented within the development.

Mr. Bragonje confirmed that the development agreement requires a minimum of 50% owner-occupied units and explained that the threshold also aligns with Federal Housing Administration (FHA) financing requirements for condominium projects. He noted that maintaining owner occupancy supports long-term marketability and financing options for future buyers while allowing sufficient flexibility to market and sell all 46 units during and after construction.

Mr. Bragonje explained that the requested zoning change is intended to accommodate the site's parking layout rather than increase building height. He stated that the proposed building complies with the existing Medium Density Residential height limits and would remain lower in elevation than the adjacent electrical substation. He explained that the design places parking in front of the building and uses the parking structure to help retain the hillside while providing the required parking. Mr. Bragonje also noted that sewer capacity is available for the project and stated that parking, rather than sewer service, is the primary design constraint. He concluded by expressing his belief that the condominium building would provide a more attractive streetscape along Canyon Road than the rear elevations of the previously approved townhomes.

Chair MacKay asked if Mr. Bragonje would entertain the idea of increasing the owner occupancy requirement in the Development Agreement.

Mr. Bragonje responded that he is not opposed to a higher owner-occupancy percentage, including up to 80% or 100%, but requested flexibility during the initial sales process. He also noted that second-home owners would still qualify as owner occupants under the requirement.

Councilor Whitlock asked the applicant to describe how the site's existing terrain, including the former gravel pit and hillside, would be transformed by the proposed development so the Council could better visualize the finished project.

Mr. Bragonje explained that the proposed building would generally occupy the footprint of the existing gravel pit, with limited retaining into the adjacent hillside. He noted that most site modifications would occur near the entrance between Canyon Road and the electrical substation. Mr. Bragonje also described prior coordination with the City to realign property boundaries around the substation, establish a new substation access, and execute an agreement to transfer property needed for a future roadway expansion in exchange for related site improvements by the City.

Councilor Whipple asked how long the applicant anticipated it would take to sell the owner-occupied condominium units compared with leasing any rental units, noting that a developer who presented during the Council work session described challenges selling condominiums despite offering buyer incentives. She questioned whether increasing the owner-occupancy requirement could extend the project's sales timeline given the proposed market and financing considerations.

Mr. Bragonje responded that market conditions, particularly interest rates, would significantly influence the pace of condominium sales. He explained that higher interest rates make purchases more difficult for first-time homebuyers, while buyers who are downsizing and paying with existing home equity may be less affected. He acknowledged that the market could absorb only a limited number of condominium units over time, creating some uncertainty in the sales timeline, but expressed confidence that the Provo location would remain attractive compared with similar housing opportunities elsewhere in the county.

Councilor Whitlock asked whether there were additional features of the existing development agreement that would be helpful for the Council and public to understand, including planned public improvements such as the trail connection to the Indian Trail area.

Mr. Bragonje explained that while the conceptual plan illustrates a future trail connection to the Indian Trail area, he did not propose including the trail as a requirement in the development agreement because its final design and access have not yet been determined. He stated that the trail appears feasible and would provide a valuable amenity for future residents. Mr. Bragonje also highlighted several infrastructure improvements associated with the project, including new looped water, sewer, gas, and fiber utility connections that would improve service to both the development and the surrounding area.

Chair MacKay asked if the renderings were AI generated.

Mr. Bragonje explained that the building rendering is based on architectural plans prepared by a licensed architect and that artificial intelligence was used only to enhance the exterior finishes and appearance of the rendering, not to generate the building design itself.

Councilor Christensen asked whether the project would be constructed in phases.

Mr. Bragonje responded that the development is intended to be built as a single phase, explaining that the underground parking structure represents a substantial portion of the project's cost and must be constructed regardless, making it more practical to complete the entire building at once.

Chair MacKay asked for clarification regarding the development agreement, recalling that it included a trail requirement.

Mr. Ardmore clarified that the development agreement requires the developer to transfer the portion of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail that crosses the property to the City by deed or easement before a building permit is issued, but it does not require construction of the trail itself.

Councilor Garrett asked whether the proposed development has generated any pre-sale interest and inquired about the level of interest from prospective condominium buyers or renters.

Mr. Bragonje responded that the project has not yet generated presale interest from prospective end users, explaining that it is still too early in the process. He noted that marketing efforts would begin after the requested zoning is approved and the project design is finalized.

Chair MacKay asked whether Mr. Bragonje intends to develop the project himself or obtain the necessary land use approvals before selling it.

Mr. Bragonje responded that his plan is to entitle the project and then sell it to an experienced developer while remaining involved as a partner. He explained that, although he has extensive knowledge of the project, he believes it is best completed by a developer with experience constructing similar developments. He added that the property's former configuration, consisting of multiple overlapping parcels, had discouraged experienced developers until the ownership and boundary issues were resolved.

Chair MacKay opened the item for public comment.

David Chappell, a Provo resident, spoke in support of the proposed higher-density development and suggested that incorporating some affordable housing units could improve both affordability and marketability. He recommended requiring 100% owner occupancy rather than the proposed 50%, expressing concern that a lower threshold would be difficult to enforce. Mr. Chappell suggested allowing the developer a limited transition period, such as five years, to rent units before requiring all units to become owner occupied. He also stated that the proposed parking spaces appeared adequate.

With no other comments, Chair MacKay closed public comment and invited a council discussion. With no other council comments or questions, Chair MacKay called for a vote.

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

4 An ordinance amending Provo City Code regarding floodplain management and development standards. (PLOT20260185) [00:46:14](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-17, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Tommy Scherbel, Floodplain Engineer, explained that the changes are required for Provo City's continued participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and are intended to ensure the City's regulations meet or exceed updated FEMA minimum standards. Mr. Scherbel noted that the ordinance updates definitions, administrative authority, permitting requirements, and floodproofing

standards to provide greater clarity for development within flood hazard areas. Mr. Scherbel reviewed updated FEMA floodplain maps, explaining that the revisions expand certain 1% annual chance flood hazard areas and 0.2% annual chance flood hazard areas in portions of the city, including areas near the airport. He clarified that properties within the 1% flood hazard area may be subject to federal flood insurance requirements for federally backed mortgages, while the 0.2% flood hazard areas are identified for informational purposes but do not carry the same insurance requirements. He emphasized that the ordinance changes are the result of updated FEMA mapping and coordination with FEMA, the Utah Division of Emergency Management, and the City's consultant, WSP.

Chair MacKay opened public comment. With none, and no council discussion, she called for a vote.

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

5 A public hearing regarding the FY27 budget for Provo City (26-001) [00:52:21](#)

Kelsey Zarbock, Budget Officer, introduced the first public hearing on the proposed Fiscal Year 2027 budget. She noted that the tentative budget had been presented to the Council and is available on the City's website through the financial transparency portal. Ms. Zarbock highlighted sections of the budget that may be of particular interest to the public, including the Mayor's message, Council priorities, and budget highlights outlining major initiatives and revenue sources. She reminded the public that a second public hearing would be held on **June 23** before the Council considers adoption of the final budget, then invited public comment.

Chair MacKay opened the public hearing. With none, she closed the public hearing.

6 *CONTINUED*** A resolution approving property tax rates for Provo City Corporation for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2027 (26-001)**

7 *CONTINUED*** An ordinance amending the zone map classification of real property for a residential development with 75 lots and 50 townhomes, located approximately at 5450 N Canyon Rd. North Timpview neighborhood PLR220260115**

With no objections, the Provo Municipal Council adjourned and reconvened as the Redevelopment Agency Governing Board with Chair Christensen conducting.

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

*Although listed later on the agenda, Item 9 was heard prior to Item 8.

8 A resolution adopting a project area budget for the Lakeview Parkway Community Reinvestment Area (26-005) [00:56:22](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2026-RDA-06-09-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Melissa McNalley, Redevelopment Agency Administrator, presented the proposed Fiscal Year 2027 budget for the Lakeview Parkway Community Reinvestment Project Area. She explained that the budget assumes future retail and commercial development on three project parcels, including a hotel near Epic Sports Park, resulting in projected sales tax, property tax increment, and transient room tax revenues. Ms. McNalley noted that the figures are estimates because the sites have not yet been developed. She also clarified that the parcel adjacent to Epic Sports Park is currently owned by the City and therefore has no taxable value. She added that the budget includes projected increases in property values throughout the project area and anticipated benefits to participating taxing entities and noted that future budget amendments would be brought forward if additional development incentives are approved.

Board Member Bogdin asked whether the budget would be amended to reflect the agreed-upon base property value for the parcel south of Epic Sports Park once the remaining details are finalized.

Ms. McNalley confirmed that any revisions affecting projected property tax increment would be brought back to the Redevelopment Agency Board as a budget amendment. She added that the amendment could potentially be considered at the same time as the related development agreement for the property.

Chair Christensen opened public comment. With none, and no board discussion, he called for a vote.

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

9 A public hearing regarding the Redevelopment Agency's FY27 Budget (26-001) [00:55:22](#)

Ms. Zarbock introduced the public hearing on the proposed Fiscal Year 2027 budget for the Redevelopment Agency (RDA). She explained that although the RDA is a legally separate entity from Provo City, it is financially intertwined with the City and therefore requires a separate public hearing. Ms. Zarbock noted that the proposed RDA budget is included within the City's tentative Fiscal Year 2027 budget document and directed the public to the section containing the RDA budget.

Chair Christensen opened the public hearing. With none, he returned to item 8.

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

Stormwater Service District

10 A public hearing regarding the FY27 Budget for the Stormwater Service District (26-001) [01:01:02](#)

Ms. Zarbock introduced the public hearing on the proposed Fiscal Year 2027 budget for the Stormwater Service District. She noted that the proposed budget is included in the City's Fiscal Year 2027 budget document and directed the public to its location before opening the public hearing for comment.

Chair MacKay noted that this was the first of two required public hearings on the proposed budgets and opened the public hearing.

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

David Campbell, a Provo resident, encouraged the City to prioritize funding for water infrastructure improvements. He stated that the proposed budget does not appear to reflect the level of investment previously identified by consultants and acknowledged that future budget amendments and rate increases may be considered. Mr. Campbell urged the City to address water infrastructure needs, noting that such issues are often overlooked because they are not readily visible to the public.

Chair MacKay responded that the Council had discussed the issue during its work meeting earlier that day and had voted to support the consultants' recommended 6% water rate increase, noting that the proposed budget is consistent with that recommendation.

With no other comments, Chair MacKay adjourned the meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 6:34 PM.

These minutes were approved by unanimous consent on the 11th day of August, 2026.

X 

Heidi Allman
City Recorder