

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



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

Regular Meeting Minutes

5:30 PM, Tuesday, March 27, 2018

Room 200, Municipal Council Chambers

351 West Center, Provo, Utah

Opening Ceremony

Roll Call

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Council Member George Handley
Council Member David Knecht
Council Member George Stewart
Council Member Gary Winterton
Council Attorney Brian Jones
Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

Council Member David Harding
Council Member David Sewell
Council Member Kay Van Buren
Council Executive Director Clifford Strachan
Chief Administrative Officer Wayne Parker

Conducting: Chair Winterton

Prayer – Kelsey Zarbock

Pledge of Allegiance – Amanda Ercanbrack

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

1 A presentation of the March 2018 Employee of the Month. (0:34:10)

Chaz Addis, Employees Association President, announced Cathy Smits, Aquatic Supervisor, as the March Employee of the Month for 2018. Scott Henderson, Parks and Recreation Director, said Ms. Smits was very respected in her field and in the department. Bryce Merrill, Recreation Center Manager, introduced Ms. Smits. He said she had been the Aquatics Facility Supervisor for nine months and was an innovative program planner. She introduced popular programs, such as the Puppy Paddle, which was held annually. She also created several employee programs to help in managing up to 150 lifeguards. Mr. Merrill said she was a great asset to the Rec Center.

Public Comment (0:40:04)

Fifteen minutes had been set aside for any person to express ideas, concerns, comments, or issues that are not on the agenda. Chair Winterton opened public comment.

Beth Alligood, Provo, spoke to council about proposed changes to major home occupation permits. She said she was supportive of many of the changes but thought there needed to be some protections in place to preserve the quality of the neighborhoods. She also wanted to ensure ingenuity was being

fostered in Provo by permitting home businesses. Ms. Alligood said the intent should be universal enforcement for all.

Consent Agenda

2 Ordinance 2018-11 amending Provo City Code regarding the recodification of Provo City Code. (18-033) (0:43:43)

Chair Winterton explained the consent agenda was intended for items that may not require further discussion, such as, approval of minutes, routine contracts that meet the requirements set forth in ordinances and policies, resolutions and ordinances that have been fully vetted in other meetings, and other items that require formal approval but do not need council meeting discussion. He said if any council member wanted an item removed from the consent agenda, it could be handled separately, following the approval of the consent agenda.

Ordinance 2018-11 was approved by unanimous consent.

Action Agenda

3 Resolution 2018-08 ratifying the Mayor's signature on the first addendum to the Fifth Amended Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Provo City and Utah County relating to the Ice Sheet Authority. (17-055) (0:44:23)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-08, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mr. Jones explained that more than year earlier Utah County sent a Notice of Termination of the Fifth Amended Interlocal Cooperation Agreement, the governing document for the Ice Sheet. The Notice of Termination automatically triggered a public auction of the facility to take place twelve months from the date the notice was sent. The Mayor and County Commission had met one week earlier and signed an amended agreement that provided an additional month before a public auction would be required.

Chair Winterton opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion Passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

4 Ordinance 2018-12 granting Zayo Group LLC a nonexclusive franchise to operate a telecommunications network in Provo City, Utah. (18-010) (0:46:38)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2018-12, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Marcus Draper, Assistant City Attorney, explained the legal department had negotiated a non-exclusive franchise agreement with Zayo Group, LLC. A standard template was used with one variation: Zayo Group, LLC had requested the occasional use of multimode fiber, if the need were to arise.

Mr. Winterton asked how many telecommunication franchises the city could support. Mr. Draper explained there had also been a pole-attachment agreement negotiated, it did not require council approval. He stated there was statute that required the city to allow access on a non-discriminatory basis. Mr. Draper did not think the city was at a point where there was a need to deny access. Mr. Winterton clarified that his question was mostly related to infrastructure and pole attachments. Mr. Draper had not been made aware of any infrastructure issues yet. Mr. Jones said even if there was an infrastructure issue, non-discrimination clauses would still require the city to grant a franchise, but then when a design application was received, it could be denied. Lack of space was grounds for denial under federal law.

Chair Winterton opened public comment, there was no response. There was no other council discussion. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion Passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

5 Resolution 2018-09 appropriating \$178,620 in the Fire Department, General Fund for the purchase of wild fire equipment and other needs applying to the fiscal year ending June 30, 2018. (18-031) (0:50:43)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-09, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

James Miguel, Provo City Fire Chief, presented. In 2017 Provo had actively participated in the western states wildfire program. Provo Fire helped fight wildfires in Southern Utah, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and California. As a result of the agreement with the state and federal government, Provo received reimbursement for costs associated with helping. The reimbursement rate was not based upon actual costs, an established formula was used to determine the reimbursement amount. Provo would be reimbursed \$387,484. The actual costs were less than \$180,000. Therefore, there was an excess of \$207,563.

Chief Miguel asked council for a revenue allocation for a wildland vehicle that would be used specifically for traveling long distances to battle wildfires. The total cost of the vehicle, equipment included, would be \$171,800. Additionally, he said they had been working on the reconstruction of Fire Station 2. The architect strongly recommended a geotechnical study and a boundary and topography study. Chief Miguel asked for \$6,820 to cover these costs. The total requested revenue allocation would be \$178,620. There would be \$28,943 left over and deposited into the general fund.

Chair Winterton opened public comment, there was no response.

Mr. Harding thanked Chief Miguel for a well-run department and the excellent service and value given to the citizens of Provo. He was impressed that Provo was able to provide their wildfire services for half the amount of the calculated reimbursement.

Chief Winterton called for a vote on the implied motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion Passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

6 Resolution 2018-10 amending the General Plan Land Use Map designation for property generally located at 490 South State Street from Commercial to Residential. Maeser Neighborhood. (17-0002GPA) (0:59:31)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-10, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Dustin Wright, Community Development Planner, presented. The applicant requested an amendment to the general plan map that would be applied to one of two parcels in the proposed project area. He explained the next item on the agenda would be to rezone the 1.92-acre project area. Chair Winterton read in the next agenda item so they could be discussed together.

Mr. Wright explained an HDR zone was being requested to accommodate a 64-unit residential development. The HDR zone allowed up to 50 units per acre, the applicant's project was well under that at 34 units per acre. The applicant would have requested MDR, but it only allowed for 30 units per acre. The maximum building height in an HDR zone was 55 feet and the proposed building was four stories, totaling 44 feet tall. If the property were to be rezoned as HDR, without development agreement in place, it would be possible for someone to build a larger building in the future. Neighbors expressed concerns about the building height and preferred three stories. The planning commission recommended approval, but only if there were a development agreement in place to restrict the building to three stories.

Mr. Sewell asked about the second condition recommended by the planning commission that suggested the two lots should be combined into a single lot as part of a separate application. Mr. Wright explained combining the two lots would prevent setback issues.

Mr. Handley asked if a development agreement would prevent the building from being made taller later. Mr. Wright said the development agreement would remain tied to the land and transferred to any future owners. Mr. Jones clarified the development agreement template used by the city would expire once the certificate of occupancy had been issued. The agreement could be amended to last longer, but historically, development agreements had been challenging to track.

The applicant, Tim Soffe of Fink Architecture, explained his proposal to the council. Mr. Soffe said when he began work on the project two years earlier, he made it his objective to let city ordinance determine the zone they would apply for. He said a market study was conducted and he determined the greatest need in the area was for married student housing.

Mr. Soffe said they attended a neighborhood meeting and learned there was concern about the project not fitting into the neighborhood. He explained to council how his property would be situated along state street to create a buffer. He showed various pictorial views of the property. Mr. Soffe offered to reduce the building height by one story for half of the second building. The building along State Street would remain four stories.

Mr. Handley was interested in something that would guarantee the building height would never be increased as part of a remodel or rebuild. Mr. Soffe said once the building was in place, the cost of adding another story would be prohibitive.

Mr. Knecht recalled the last development in the area was 30 units with two entrances, one on State Street and one into the side street. He asked Mr. Soffe why both of his entrances flowed into the side street. Mr. Soffe explained that early in the process they hired a traffic engineer who contacted UDOT and Provo Public Works, an entrance onto State Street was discouraged because of the proximity to the intersection.

Chair Winterton invited the neighborhood chair to speak.

Keera McClellan, Maeser Neighborhood Chair, asked council to consider an MDR zone. She was concerned about the density matching the neighborhood. Ms. McClellan said the design was attractive, but did not fit in with the historic nature of the area. She also thought having two entrances onto 500 South would cause further congestion on a street already faced with parking issues.

Chair Winterton opened public comment.

Vickie Knecht, Provost South Neighborhood Chair, asked about the setback. The applicant indicated it was a 15-foot setback. She thought a development of this size did not fit into the neighborhood.

Wayne McDonald lived across the street from the proposed project. He favored an MDR zone for the project.

Susan Hilbig was the owner of Monaco Court Apartments, located across from the proposed development. Ms. Hilbig explained the need for married student housing in Provo was great. Her apartment complex contained 48 apartments on 0.89 acres. In her experience, she said students did not come and go at one specific time; instead, they come and go at different times of the day in between classes, which prevented traffic congestion.

David Lewis, Maeser Neighborhood Resident, said he had not been in favor of the traffic light on 400 East when it was installed. He thought many of the people leaving the complex would exit through the residential neighborhood to University Avenue or 400 East. He preferred an exit onto State Street. Mr. Lewis also supported a three-story complex, but thought four stories would be too tall.

Kristy Danner, Maeser Neighborhood Resident, said the project would border her backyard. Ms. Danner petitioned her neighbors in support of a three-story complex. She collected 150-180 signatures, and only encountered one person who supported the four-story project plan. She said in the last five years there had been numerous nuisances on the property. Another concern for Mr. Danner was the traffic impact to 500 South.

Daniel Aparicio also lived in the Maeser neighborhood just four homes from the project site. He thought the design was out of context for the neighborhood. He supported a three-story complex, but not four. Traffic and parking also concerned to Mr. Aparicio.

Martha Rasmussen was the closest residential home to the west of the project. She was supportive of three stories and MDR. Ms. Rasmussen read from the Provo General Plan, Chapter 13. It recommended

permitting multi-family housing on the outskirts or edges low-density residential neighborhoods, only where there was direct access to collector or arterial roads without going through residential neighborhoods. She thought it would be more reasonable to have an exit onto State Street. She said the neighbors brought up privacy concerns related to a four-story complex, but were told they had no right to privacy, because they did not have privacy fences. Ms. Rasmussen said the tenants of the apartments across the street were already parking in their neighborhood, she did not want this problem to grow.

Paul Hilbig, Idaho, explained the property was already zoned general commercial which had no height restriction. He suggested a commercial development could be built much taller than four residential stories. He thought if the project were rezoned as MDR, the developer would move the buildings away from State Street and closer to the homes, eliminating the sound barrier. He cautioned people to be careful what they ask for. He explained the parking lot adjacent to Monaco Court had been under construction for some time, this had forced parking into the neighborhoods. He thought once the parking lot was usable again the parking issue would go away.

Brenda Brown lived in the Maeser Neighborhood and worried that a project of this size would cause additional traffic issues. Ms. Brown also thought a three-story building would be better suited for the neighborhood.

Leah Lewis, Provo, believed traffic would be negatively impacted by the project. She preferred a two-story building, but said she would settle for three stories.

There were no other comments from the public. Chair Winterton closed public comment.

Based upon feedback from the neighborhood, Mr. Stewart thought LDR would be the best option for the neighborhood. He said he would not support HDR for this project.

Mr. Harding reviewed the various options that had been discussed ([1:49:21](#)). He thought the region was facing a significant affordable housing predicament. For several years the council had discussed various demographic projections and possible options for addressing housing needs while maintaining the character of the city. Mr. Harding recognized the need for this type of housing option. If the project were not built on this parcel, he was not sure where it might be better suited.

Building a quality project that fit into the community was key for Mr. Harding. He was supportive of the project but was not sure how it would integrate into the neighborhood. The proposed project had a parking lot that served as a buffer between the development and neighborhood, Mr. Harding thought this was counterintuitive to forming a cohesive community. He would prefer to see a housing type that fit into the neighborhood and encouraged neighbors to interact. He thought three-stories and MDR was the best option, but he was willing to consider other compromises.

Mr. Handley asked if Mr. Soffe was opposed to an MDR zone and possibly reducing the building height to three stories. Mr. Soffe believed it was a benefit to have a four-story building on State Street to block the noise but would agree to drop the other building to three stories. This would be a loss of eight units, but would allow for the project to be zoned MDR.

Mr. Van Buren asked Mr. Wright if an MDR zone would provide any assurance the building height would not exceed three stories. Mr. Wright explained that whether it was zoned HDR or MDR, a development agreement would be necessary to ensure the building did not exceed three stories.

Mr. Handley noted the neighborhood had been very clear about their desire for three stories. He wanted to ensure this project could be a model for future developments. It seemed apparent the neighbors preferred residential to commercial. He was not opposed to a four-story building on State Street, if the other building was three stories, but he worried the neighborhood was not agreeable to this compromise.

Mr. Knecht stated his preference for MDR, three stories, and access to State Street to mitigate traffic concerns. He was opposed to the proposal as it was written. To ensure consistent enforcement of policy, Mr. Knecht wanted to see a written policy from UDOT that explained their opposition to an access point from the development onto State Street.

Mr. Harding proposed voting on the general plan amendment, but continuing the rezone item to the next meeting so that more discussion could take place. Under council rule, planning commission items were automatically continued to the next meeting if any council member desired, Mr. Harding indicated this was his preference. He suggested a stakeholder group could be formed and tasked with finding a compromise that worked for everyone.

Chair Winterton asked if there was any council member who wanted to continue item six, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion Passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

7 An ordinance amending the zone map classification of approximately 1.92 acres of real property, generally located at 422-490 South State Street, from General Commercial to High Density Residential. Maeser Neighborhood. (17-0010R) (0:59:31)

This item had been read in with the previous item for council discussion and public comment. Mr. Harding indicated his desire to continue this item to the next meeting.

8 An ordinance amending Provo City Code regarding parking requirements in the Supplementary Residential (S) Overlay Zone. Citywide Impact. (PLOTA20180025) (2:17:21)

Austin Corry, Community Development Planner, presented. He explained that accessory apartments were permitted in areas of the city with an (A) or (S) overlay zone. This amendment would only be applied to the (S) overlay. There was one main difference between the two overlays, the (A) overlay allowed the apartment to be occupied by two unrelated individuals or a family, the (S) overlay allowed the apartment to be occupied by four unrelated individuals or a family. This proposal would increase the number of required parking stalls by two, to match the total occupancy.

Mr. Knecht explained the last change to the (S) overlay had been applied retroactively, whereas, this change would only be applied to new permits.

Mr. Handley wanted to understand why this change was needed. He was concerned it encouraged the use of cars and would require homeowners to have more paved parking area. Mr. Corry said the intent of the ordinance was to ensure a 1:1 ratio of parking and allowable tenants. Mr. Handley thought many

of the tenants in the Pleasant View area chose to live there because it was within walking distance of BYU and not every tenant would have a car or require parking.

Mr. Harding asked how many accessory apartment permits existed in the (S) overlay zone. Mr. Corry said there were 73 in the Pleasant View Neighborhood and 58 in the Wasatch Neighborhood. There was an application and inspection process for all accessory apartment permits. Mr. Harding asked if the permits ever needed to be renewed. Mr. Corry explained if ownership changed, the new owner would be expected to come to the office to transfer the permit to their name. Because the use of accessory apartment had already been established for the location, the new owner would still be grandfathered in and would not have to provide six off-street parking stalls. The only things that would trigger the requirement would be complete reconstruction of the home or a new application where there had not previously been a use granted.

Several council members thought there needed to be more time for neighborhood feedback.

For the next meeting, Mr. Knecht asked Mr. Corry to research how many homes could potentially have an accessory use permit that did not already have one.

Chair Winterton opened public comment.

Vickie Knecht, Provost South Neighborhood Chair, responded to Mr. Handley's concern about additional paving. Ms. Knecht shared an experience from her neighborhood and emphasized how frustrating it could be to not have adequate off-street parking in a neighborhood. Ms. Knecht was considering a parking permit program for her own neighborhood in attempt to mitigate some of the parking problems.

Beth Alligood, Lakeview North Neighborhood Chair, thought this ordinance could be a tool for future affordable housing. She said until people were no longer car dependent, there was a need for adequate parking.

There were no other comments from the public. Under council rule, this item would be heard again at the next meeting.

9 Resolution 2018-11 approving the terms of agreement regarding a parking structure in downtown Provo (18-034) (2:42:04)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-11, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Wayne Parker, Chief Administrative Officer, presented. Mr. Parker explained that an administrative team from Provo worked with Utah County and PEG Development to find a solution for parking needs in Downtown Provo. Mr. Parker explained that Provo had an agreement with Utah County for parking at the Utah Valley Convention Center. Utah county filed two actions against Provo, a lawsuit alleging breach of contract and filed eminent domain to acquire RDA property. Provo challenged the breach of contract assertion.

Mr. Parker said one of the solutions Provo initially considered was a mixed-use development on the block immediately north of the convention center. The property was under contract, but an option

expired and PEG lost the ability to purchase the property. As the economy improved PEG finally acquired the property. There were plans for the state to build a new courthouse on the block to the east, but the state learned the site was too small and would not accommodate their building plans, so PEG and the state exchanged properties.

Another priority for the county had been lodging for the Convention Center, so when Hyatt approached Provo and asked for help in finding property, Provo entered into a parking agreement with Hyatt to allow them to park on RDA property adjacent to the hotel.

The original idea was to develop on the RC Wiley block and provide parking to the south, but when the county learned of the proposal, they filed the eminent domain action and it stalled the proposal. It was decided the best option would be to work with Utah County and PEG Development to find an amicable solution for all of the parties involved.

Mr. Parker explained the terms of the parking agreement:

Redevelopment Agency will:

- Transfer land to PEG for office and parking phase 1
- Relocate and expand the Freedom Plaza Community Development Area (CDA) to adjoining blocks
- Expand CDA one block in each direction, excluding the new state court block
- CDA would subsidize the new parking structure over a 15-year period via tax increment
- Have the ability purchase phase 1 parking structure in the future at market value

PEG Development will:

- Build a three-phase development
 - Office 1 and parking structure 1 (600 parking spaces)
 - Office 2 and parking structure 2 (600 parking spaces)
 - Apartment complex
- Take over all City and RDA related parking obligations associated with Hyatt and convention center.
- Provide 175 spaces in each structure dedicated to convention center parking
- Own and operate both parking structures
- Provide Hyatt 80 fixed spaces, 40 general spaces

Utah County will:

- Receive 12,600 free stall days per years for convention events
- Contribute to operation and management after 15 years
- Allow PEG to monetize the stalls when not in use
- Have the option to add levels to the structures at their expense
- Contribute 75 percent of their tax increment to development of PEG project

Provo City will:

- Agree to extend CDA
- Consider impact fee reductions for PEG
- Contribute 100 percent of City's tax increment in expanded area for parking
- Provide temporary surface parking and parking enforcement for the convention center

- Support PEG's efforts to entitle (get appropriate zoning) their development

Mr. Parker explained where each of the structures would be located within the proposed CDA ([2:58:37](#)).

Mr. Parker described several benefits:

- Meet obligation to county for convention center parking
- Support convention center's success
- Increase tax revenue
- Office space desirable to millennial employers
- Leverage investment in BRT
- Support walkable downtown
- Provide catalyst for additional development downtown.

Mr. Knecht asked how much each stall would cost to build. Mr. Parker said it varied widely, but about \$20,000 per stall for surface parking and \$65,000 per stall for structured parking. (Mr. Walter later corrected these figures.) He noted the only thing more expensive than structured parking was underground parking.

Mr. Winterton asked if there had been an appraisal on the property. Mr. Parker said the appraisal from Utah County's imminent domain action valued the property at about \$2.1 million.

Mr. Sewell said council had received an email from Jamie Littlefield which described two commitments that had been exchanged between the neighborhood leaders at a meeting. The first commitment was that both structures would have ground-floor habitable space. The second commitment was that each structure would be less than eight stories tall. Mr. Sewell asked if these could be included in the final agreement. Mr. Parker said that was possible and reminded council they controlled the zoning, but agreed this could be included in a development agreement.

Chair Winterton opened public comment, there was no response.

Mr. Harding thanked the administration for working with the county to come to an agreement. He recognized there were many parts to the agreement and wanted to know what the estimated liability would be for the city. It was unclear what the total investment cost would be. Mr. Harding wanted to make an informed decision.

David Walter, Redevelopment Agency Director, said the tax increment over 15 years was roughly \$240,000 per year. He said the net present value could be deducted, but he was unsure exactly what that figure was. Mr. Walter said it would cost the city \$9 million if they were to build surface parking.

Mr. Parker clarified \$240,000 was the full tax increment, Provo's portion was about 25 percent. Mr. Stewart pointed out it would still be \$60,000 diverted from the general fund each year. Mr. Parker said his calculation assumed the dollars would come to the city without the incentive, which he said was an unfair assumption. Further, he said without this deal, the cost for Provo to build a 1,200-stall parking structure would be \$23 million and Provo would also have to manage it. Mr. Walter corrected Mr. Parker's earlier estimate of \$65,000 per stall; he said it was about \$20,000 to \$25,000 per stall for above ground parking.

Motion: Council Member Sewell moved to express to administration the desire to have the following terms in the final agreements: both parking structures will have ground floor habitable space, i.e., retail where they face the street on 200 North and 100 West as required by city code, and the parking structures will be less than eight stories tall. Council Member Handley seconded the motion.

Chair Winterton called for a vote on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion Passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

In the work meeting council reviewed a number of possible resolutions. The resolution they selected would ratify the general terms and conditions previously described by Mr. Parker, and it would authorize the Mayor to negotiate and execute additional agreements consistent these terms. There was an implied motion to approve this version of the resolution.

Substitute Motion: Council Member Harding moved to pass a different version of the resolution that would ratify the agreement after it had been negotiated. Council Member Sewell seconded the motion.

Mr. Sewell said he had seconded the motion for discussion purposes only, he preferred the implied motion.

Chair Winterton also preferred the implied motion. He thought ratifying the agreement after it had been negotiated would send the wrong message to the administration. He was appreciative of the work that had been done to negotiate the agreement.

Mr. Stewart said there was no need to ratify the final agreement after it had been negotiated. He had confidence the administration would work within the parameters of the term sheet.

Mr. Sewell said this process had been about building trust and relationships. He wanted the momentum to continue by extending trust to the administration. He favored the implied motion.

Mr. Harding was excited the city was rebuilding trust with the county. He assured the administration his preference to ratify post-negotiation was not a sign of distrust. The council had been tasked with oversight responsibilities and he thought this was worth more research. He was surprised by some of the dollar figures that had been provided and wanted to be sure they were accurate. Mr. Harding also had concerns about the expanded CDA. He worried that if a business in the CDA wanted a tax increment incentive for a remodel, the council would be limited with their options.

Chair Winterton suggested that PEG Development already owned or had an option on much of the property within the CDA. Mr. Walter displayed a map and demonstrated what portions of the area was owned by PEG Development ([3:26:04](#)).

Chair Winterton called for a vote on Mr. Harding's substitute motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion failed 1:6 with Council Member Harding in favor and Council Members Handley, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton opposed.

Chair Winterton called for a vote on the implied motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

Adjourn as the Municipal Council and convene as the Redevelopment Agency.

Motion: Council Member Harding made a motion to adjourn as the Municipal Council and convene as the Redevelopment Agency. Council Member Handley seconded the motion.

Chair Winterton called for a vote on the motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion Passed 6:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor. Council Member Knecht was excused.

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

10 Resolution 2018-RDA-03-27-1 approving the terms of agreement regarding a parking structure in downtown Provo (18-034) [\(3:31:43\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-RDA-03-27-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mr. Parker explained this was the same item discussed previously but needed to be approved by the board for the RDA.

Chair Stewart opened public comment, there was no response. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Roll Call Vote: The motion Passed 6:0 with Board Members Handley, Harding, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor. Board Member Knecht was excused.

Adjournment

The meeting was declared adjourned by unanimous consent at 9:02 p.m.