



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Work Meeting Minutes

12:15 PM, Tuesday, June 19, 2018

Room 310, City Conference Room

351 West Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

Agenda (0:00:00)

Roll Call

The following elected officials were present at the meeting:

Council Vice-chair David Harding, conducting

Councilor David Knecht

Councilor George Handley

Councilor George Stewart

Councilor David Sewell

Councilor Kay Van Buren, arrived 12:20 PM

Council Chair Gary Winterton, via conference call, joined at 12:56 PM

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi, arrived 12:28 PM

Excused: Council Executive Director Cliff Strachan

Prayer

The prayer was given by Bryce Mumford, Policy Analyst.

Business

1. A discussion on tax increment funding (18-057) (0:02:54)

Council Vice-chair David Harding shared some scenarios to start the discussion. Mr. Harding thought an ideal use of tax increment funding (TIF) was to incentivize a company to help redevelop a blighted area. In a scenario where several cities in the community are competing to attract the same retailers, it did not benefit the County to participate in the TIF; when many cities use TIFs, it did not give a specific advantage to any one of them. Mr. Harding supported finding a way to coordinate county-wide to be more strategic with the application of TIFs. Councilors commented on the scenarios Mr. Harding outlined. Councilor David Sewell thought it was a great idea to have the conversation with other cities, but felt that cities might be reluctant to change their model if they felt they had an advantage. Councilor Kay Van Buren did not think the first scenario would be attractive to businesses unless the increment were large.

Dixon Holmes, Economic Development Director, said his understanding was that the Council had named economic development and retail as a priority. Economic Development has tried to attract retail to the community and were looking for a catalyst to do that as previous methods were not effective. In response to Councilor questions, Mr. Holmes indicated that he has not gone beyond his own comfort level with structuring any of the incentives. Councilor George Handley liked the progressive and proactive approach and appreciated the information provided by Economic Development in previous discussions. Councilor George Stewart felt that location as a central mantra of the real estate industry was tantamount; businesses were unlikely to locate in a different place based on an incentive. Mr. Stewart felt that another important consideration were the impacts and benefit to the City. *Discussion only.*

2. A discussion on the Real Estate Purchase Agreement and Development Agreement for a medical school at the golf course (17-136) ([0:27:33](#))

Dixon Holmes, Economic Development Director, presented. The last official decision before the Council relative to this project was on January 9, 2018. Mr. Holmes updated the Council on the latest of several drafts of the real estate purchase agreement and development agreement. Mr. Holmes also provided an update on the timeline and how the seasonal considerations could impact the progress for the redesign of the three holes affected at the golf course. Rocky Mountain University would pay for the three holes redesign, but the project would go out to a public bid through the City's usual process.

Camille Williams and Brian Jones, City Attorneys, gave an update on the legal review of the documents. Mr. Jones outlined the various sequences for negotiating and executing an agreement, noting at which points the Council could be involved. A notable difference was whether the Council authorized the Administration to negotiate and execute an agreement, or if the authorization would extend only to the negotiation, with the Council later approving execution of an agreement. Mr. Jones noted that Council policy and handbook dictated that every item be opened for public comment, whether or not a public hearing was required. Councilors shared comments on these options. Several Council members thought having a public dialogue would be important for public trust, given the nature of the public reception early on. Councilor George Stewart supported the document if it was consistent with the deal points.

Councilor Kay Van Buren noted 9 issues in the real estate agreement and 15 in the purchase agreement (drafts dated May 30) which he felt were inconsistent with the Council discussion and decision in January. In summarizing his top few concerns, he thought the purchase agreement placed undue pressure on the golf course; a transition needed to be handled carefully to not negatively impact the golf course. He was also concerned about the replacement holes and that they may not be ready for play at the appropriate time, given the concerns with seasonality and how that would affect creation of the replacement holes.

Motion: George Stewart moved that the Administration return to the Council after negotiating the agreement. Seconded by David Harding.

Councilors discussed the motion. Councilor George Handley requested a staff analysis of the discussion at the January 9, 2018 Council Meeting. Councilors and staff also discussed having a Work Meeting discussion for comments and questions.

Amended motion: Mr. Stewart amended the motion to state that the item would return to a Work Meeting and a Council Meeting for the same day. Seconded by David Harding.

Roll call vote: Approved 7:0.

Brian Jones, Council Attorney, invited Councilors to submit any comments or feedback on the drafts of the agreements to Legal for review.

3. A discussion on police personnel levels (18-069) ([0:58:58](#))

Police Chief Rich Ferguson and Daniel Softley, Human Resources Division Director, presented. Chief Ferguson said that there were over 600 vacancies in law enforcement positions in Utah alone, and he highlighted some reasons for the vacancies. Provo has faced challenges with staffing shortages and retention. It is difficult to determine the true costs of turnover, but Chief Ferguson put the cost at about \$150,000 to put an officer through the police academy and other training. Provo has lost five experienced officers in the past year, but has not been able to find experienced officers to hire as replacements, which was fairly consistent with other cities. Chief Ferguson highlighted elements of Provo's Police Department

that provide an incentive for officers to join the force, including training and advanced equipment. Chief Ferguson noted that a new public safety building would further boost the rapport of the force and attract new officers to work for Provo. He also stressed the importance of the annual review of benefits and compensation, noting the need to compare with the structures of other agencies and the market.

Mr. Softley explained that he has been tracking police turnover for the 18 years he has been at Provo City. Based on that experience, this phenomenon of losing five officers to smaller surrounding agencies is highly unusual. Other agencies have been more aggressive in trying to attract tenured officers—it is a trend that speaks to a general shortage of people that want to go into a law enforcement career.

Chief Ferguson had asked Mr. Softley to cost out options if Provo were to use the most aggressive aspects of the City's market comparison strategy and top levels of the compensation strategy. Mr. Softley shared changes such as adjusting starting pay and adjusting the steps within the ranges in a career series. The cost to make those changes effective July 1 would be \$316,000 (to increase starting pay and readjust career series). Mr. Softley also examined measures to retain officers from years 5-10. HR would propose adding a level to the career series. This would not be ready to implement on July 1, but the cost for adding this in fiscal year 2019 would be \$215,000. A third approach would be to increase the top of the career series. This would create salary compression against supervisory levels, which would likewise need to be increased. The impact of this change starting on July 1 would be \$103,000. If all these changes went into effect on July 1, it would represent a total cost of \$634,000.

Motion: George Stewart moved that the Council ask the Administration to bring this item back after the Council approves the budget with a recommendation asking the Council to appropriate out of general fund balance the amount necessary to implement a program sufficient to address this situation. Seconded by David Knecht.

Mr. Stewart stated that he was not in favor of making an adjustment for the budget prior to the approval of the budget that evening. Wayne Parker, CAO, and John Borget, Administrative Services Director, shared some strategies for funding these needs within the current budget. Mr. Borget expressed his support of this recommendation, which was critical for the Police Department, but stressed that as an ongoing expense, it was critical to identify an ongoing funding source; he felt that adopting this without identifying how to pay for it would be a mistake. Mr. Borget outlined several financing options:

- Option 1 – No changes
- Option 2 – Consider a property tax increase – a 14% increase in the General Fund property tax rate. The annual impact for a \$275,000 home would be \$18.33 annually or \$1.53 monthly.
- Option 3 – Reevaluate some of the proposals in the current budget to find areas where funds could be reallocated or reprogrammed to go instead to the retention plan:
 - Reconsider the recommended four officers; while this has been prioritized in the recommended budget, ultimately it may be that retention becomes more important in order to maintain a strong base for the Police Department. \$405,212
 - Reconsider the recommended Police budget officer; Finance would be committed to helping to the Police Department to bridge this gap as they have in the past. \$80,941.
 - Reconsider the additional equipment purchases for body-worn cameras \$19,600
 - Reconsider the proposal to include funding for fire equipment replacement and revisit in the next year. Great idea but based on crisis – have that be a discussion next year. \$40,000
 - Removing those items would free \$545,753, just short of \$554,000 needed to implement the retention changes for July 1, 2018. Mr. Borget noted that these would all be painful decisions, but he felt that these options were more practical than creating a situation where there were not funding sources for ongoing expenses. Mr. Borget and Chief Ferguson said that a new public safety building was also critical for improving morale and retention.

Councilors shared comments on the proposed options. Because of the imminent need for possibly bonding, Mr. Stewart felt most favorable toward the third option. Councilor George Handley wondered whether the state of the City's facility was really a significant impediment; Chief Ferguson explained the role that the aging facility and insufficient infrastructure had on the morale and prominence of the department. Councilor David Harding was concerned that the proposed reductions were all public safety-related and the position in which the City would be left to try and catch up. Chief Ferguson explained that officer safety was a high priority for him and the need for more officers would never go away. Dustin Grabau, Budget Officer, explained that staff had been reviewing the entire budget for other possible options. The vacant Economic Development position was a possibility, though there was a desire to fill the position during fiscal year 2019 in order to meet the City's economic development goals and needs. Mr. Grabau said there would be painful decisions no matter where the funding originated. Councilor Kay Van Buren noted similar trends in employee shortages in the building industry; he asked whether there were any kind of national or local program to improve the image of the Police Department. Chief Ferguson highlighted the poor public safety retirement system in Utah and more broadly the western United States. There are many contributing factors which are difficult to control.

Mr. Stewart withdrew his previous motion.

Motion: George Stewart moved to remove the Economic Development position and reallocate those funds to accommodate changes to the Police Department (adding body-worn cameras and fire equipment back to the budget). Seconded by Kay Van Buren.

Councilor George Handley asked about the proportion of Provo's property tax rate dedicated to public safety as compared with other cities. Staff explained that the City's property tax revenue was split between the general fund, debt service (bond payments for the recreation center), and library operations; the amount going to the general fund would not come close to funding public safety, so it was not a great comparison. Councilors discussed the implications of this structure to the property tax revenue compared to other jurisdictions. Councilor David Sewell asked the Administration for their thoughts on Mr. Stewart's motion. Mr. Parker indicated that the Mayor had considered the options and implications, and with economic development as a priority of the Council, felt that keeping that position in Economic Development was critical. Mr. Stewart was not in favor of holding truth in taxation for a property tax increase in the same year when the City would be proposing a bond.

Mr. Parker explained that the Administration has tried to bring only supplemental requests which were funded based on the economic principles stated in the budget document. One other option would be to fund the Economic Development position for a half year. Mr. Harding asked about the possibility of using some carryover Council funds as a source. Mr. Parker explained that a budget amendment could be brought back in July utilizing carryovers and identifying interdepartmental changes that could accommodate the proposals. Councilors were favorable to exploring a budget amendment rather than legislating on the fly. Mr. Borget again stressed that any cuts or reallocations would be painful, but were a matter of identifying what were the highest priorities with limited resources.

Mr. Stewart withdrew his second motion.

4. A discussion on funding options for Miss Provo and parade float (18-055) ([1:51:31](#))

Councilor David Sewell framed the discussion. There has been a proposal for \$5250.00 for Miss Provo's scholarship funds that would come through the City. It was not finalized, but the Freedom Festival leadership were open to taking on the administration of the Miss Provo Organization (MPO). The budget which would be presented at the Council Meeting included \$10,000 funding for the float as presented by Parks and Recreation two weeks previously; no changes had been made pending this discussion.

Motion: David Sewell moved to provide \$5250 for the Miss Provo scholarships and use of the Covey Center for the pageant event. Seconded by George Stewart.

Council Attorney Brian Jones, indicated that a support agreement was a vital component of the arrangement with MPO for justifying the use of taxpayer funds. Kelsey Zarbock, Policy Analyst, had drafted an example support agreement which could serve as a starting point.

Amended motion: Mr. Sewell amended the motion to include to authorization of the Mayor and the Administration to negotiate the agreement. Seconded by George Stewart.

Councilors discussed aspects of the use of and costs to the Covey Center, which had personnel and fixed costs for the City. Mr. Winterton expressed his desire that the MPO become more and more self-sufficient. Mr. Jones noted that one of the conditions of the support agreement could obligate that Miss Provo attend specified City events in return for receiving the scholarship. Mr. Harding clarified the division of responsibilities: the Administration would take on operation of the float; the Council would continue to sponsor the scholarship; administration of the Miss Provo program would either reside with the Freedom Festival or the Administration.

Substitute motion: David Harding made a substitute motion that the Council sponsor the scholarship for the coming year with a support agreement for \$5250.00 but that that is the extent of the Council's support of the program, with the remaining \$4750.00 to go back toward other uses in the budget. Seconded by David Sewell.

Councilors discussed the motion. Mr. Winterton indicated that Miss Provo leadership would be grateful for the City to take on the float, as it would allow them to spend more efforts on fundraising. Their fundraising could cover any funds needed to pay for the Covey Center, if the Administration passed on that fee.

Roll call vote: Approved 7:0.

5. A discussion on Bulldog Blvd. construction (18-068) ([2:08:57](#))

Dave Graves, Engineering Division Director, presented and was joined by Leah Jaramillo, project Communications Manager. Most road projects add capacity, change lanes, or fit other features in. This project would convert one thru-lane in each direction to a bicycle lane. Traffic counts and projections are under 35,000 daily, which is under the threshold for a four-lane road. Two lanes in each direction were identified as adequate to serve 2040 projected vehicle counts. The project includes some right-turn lane overlap for the westbound right-hand-turn at 500 West. The project will also add several dedicated lanes where they do not currently exist. The project would add a small delay in each direction, but Engineering felt it was a reasonable delay to prevent a high rate of severe incidents. Accommodations were made for redevelopment of the Provo High School property and the Target Express announced for Riverside Plaza.

Mr. Graves addressed a possible change of scope of the project—Mountainland Association of Government would review the scope change and give an updated recommendation. Any changes could jeopardize project funding, which was coming from several sources. Mr. Graves shared details about funding sources, noting that Provo City's match was just under 7% and that \$265,000 had been expended by the City to date for the design and public information phases of the project.

Councilor George Stewart was concerned that the current Council did not have an opportunity to vote on this, despite the effective public process. Mr. Stewart made a motion for the purpose of discussion.

Motion: George Stewart moved that the Council formally recommend to the Administration that the Bulldog Boulevard project be amended to exclude from its scope the reduction from three lanes to two and the addition of bike lanes. Seconded by David Knecht.

Councilors shared comments on the motion and the project, including:

- Mr. Stewart and many of his constituents supported the center median safety element, but did not feel that bicycle lanes were justified at this time.
- Councilor George Handley stated that data and evidence showed numerous bicycle fatalities; he felt that the rate of bicycle incidents justified the bicycle lanes. Mr. Handley apologized for any affront to Mr. Stewart; he felt it was important to have this conversation.
- Mr. Graves addressed the lane count from a technical perspective, highlighting examples in the City of 4-lane roads with similar vehicle counts as Bulldog Boulevard. Drivers have become accustomed to having three travel lanes in each direction on Bulldog Boulevard, but the models and capacity calculations that project road volumes out to 2040 show that additional lanes were not needed. Mr. Graves addressed the different levels of users on Bulldog Boulevard, versus areas in the City where the sidewalks and shoulder provided adequate facilities for varying levels of users. Buffered bicycle lanes were much safer and provided a protected area that would invite cyclist users of all levels. Buffered bicycle lanes also reduced visibility issues for all users. Bicycle lanes would be snowplowed with different equipment than the roadways; the landscaping buffer provides space for snow from the roadway to be deposited. The curb and gutter provided space for snow plowed from the bicycle lanes.
- Shane Winters, Traffic Engineer, had shared figures with Council Executive Director Cliff Strachan regarding cyclist counts, which showed an estimated 24 bicyclists per hour.
- Mr. Harding felt that eliminating one lane in each direction would mitigate safety issues. Adding bicycle lanes would complete the street network in that area allowing more people to use it.
- Councilor David Knecht had concerns with the process and that people opposed to the project had not felt they had adequate opportunity to give feedback and comments.
- Councilor David Sewell firmly believed this project would save lives. He worried about a successful motion to modify the project and remove bike lanes as he felt that would jeopardize the funding. A modified project would save some lives, but it would not have the safety benefits for cyclists that this project had. There was more potential for cycling on this corridor that leads right into BYU; many cyclists are hesitant to bike to work. Mr. Sewell shared his experience as a cyclist—he bikes to work only once weekly because of the trepidation he feels about cycling on major roadways. Diverting cyclists to sidewalks creates issues for pedestrians. Mr. Sewell thought this was a wonderful project for the health, safety, and welfare of citizens, which would encourage biking and walking in this corridor as well as provide a beautiful, well-landscaped corridor.
- Mr. Harding echoed Mr. Sewell's thoughts and support of the project. He also had concerns about the process—he suggested public involvement sooner on and to continue improving the process.
- Mr. Handley thought that in addition to the primary safety issues, this project also created a beautiful entry point into the City that would improve the atmosphere for residents and visitors.
- Mr. Sewell would have loved to see the project more broadly introduced to the public earlier.
- Wayne Parker, CAO, explained that funding was not always secured when projects were proposed. He noted that this project was blogged about extensively by Mayor Curtis—it was widely known and publicized for several years, as well as having been included in every CIP report and CIP plan. While it may not have been a high profile project, there were no efforts to hide its progress.
- Councilor Kay Van Buren said that many of his constituents were opposed because they expected more congestion from Columbia Lane to BYU. Mr. Van Buren thought it advisable to trust the experienced engineers who supported the project. He did have several concerns about access to Riverside Plaza and the number of entrances on the north side of Bulldog Boulevard. He also

wondered about the design for the State Street northbound right-turn onto Bulldog—Mr. Graves said it would not be a free right, but would go through the signal into the two lanes.

- Mr. Parker addressed a question about the landscaping, which would be shrubs or ground cover that did not require much maintenance. The landscaping would also be designed to an appropriate height for vehicles and cyclists to have appropriate visibility.

Roll call vote: The motion failed 0:7.

6. A discussion on the approval of a Governing Body Participation Agreement with C-PACE (16-092) ([2:56:56](#))

Brian Jones, Council Attorney, presented. During a previous Work Meeting, a motion requested that the Administration negotiate an agreement with the Governor's Office of Energy Development and return for discussion with the Council. The Mayor negotiated and signed the agreement, so this item was intended to introduce the item on the Council Meeting agenda, a resolution to ratify the Mayor's signature on the agreement. **Presentation only. This item was already scheduled for the June 19, 2018 Council Meeting.**

7. A discussion on proposed Provo City Code amendments to the Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA) (18-072) ([2:58:38](#))

Camille Williams, Senior City Attorney, presented. State Statute contained 52 pages covering the Government Records Access and Management Act. The City GRAMA ordinance contained 20 pages and was last revised in 2006. In the last five years, there have been significant revisions to State GRAMA code. Ms. Williams shared the proposed amendments:

- The amendments would reduce the City GRAMA ordinance to about five pages by adopting State code provisions, with the exception of sections which clarify the application of GRAMA for the Mayor-Council form of government.
- Updated composition of the appeals board to be compliant with a change to State statute.
- Clarification of the process for private and protected records and identification of the requestor as the subject of the record.

Amanda Ercanbrack, City Recorder, explained that the volume of requests received necessitated clear guidance and direction on GRAMA requests. During her time as City Recorder, the nature of GRAMA requests has changed and become much more issue driven. The budget included updates to GRAMA fees.

Councilors asked questions regarding the process and costs of GRAMA requests. Ms. Ercanbrack explained that requests for public information that is readily accessible do not generally incur fees. For more complex requests, a department would give an estimate on how much redaction would be needed. If the fee was over \$50, then a deposit would be required, which would be credited toward the final cost of the request. Wayne Parker, CAO, explained that requests for records such as bodycam footage sometimes included confidential information. The redaction had to occur with the bodycam contractor and there are hard costs in that respect, as well as time to fulfill the request. Mr. Parker has also noted the increasing complexity that Ms. Ercanbrack referenced. Mr. Parker said that many of the appeals received relate to appeals of a time constraint. Depending on the nature of the appeal, there are additional processes to handle each set of circumstances. More records are subject to GRAMA requests than used to be.

Ms. Ercanbrack noted examples of common requests:

- Requests from solicitors requesting massive amounts of information, such as from solar companies requesting information on numerous solar permits
- Requests for all emails between an elected official(s) and named individuals.

- Request for all calendar events for a certain employee from a three-year period.

Ms. Ercanbrack said that they try to work with the requestor to narrow the scope of the request with more specificity. This often involves several hours of back and forth communication and work that is never changed. Ms. Williams explained that this has become very costly to the City because the City has not been able to charge the actual costs for fulfilling extensive requests. *Presentation only. This item was intended to come to the July 10, 2018 Council Meeting.*

8. A discussion on Provo City Code amendments to the Deputy Recorder position (18-071) ([3:08:24](#))

John Borget, Administrative Services Director, presented. On several occasions, the City Recorder has been absent, but City Code does not allow certain responsibilities to be fulfilled by anyone else. This proposal would make several amendments to the Deputy Recorder position to include duties which could be deputized by the City Recorder in case of absence. This would not result in changes to the deputies' titles, but would allow Amanda Ercanbrack, City Recorder, to provide training to several individuals who could fulfill those enumerated responsibilities in her absence. *Presentation only. This item was intended to come to the July 10, 2018 Council Meeting.*

Policy Items Referred from the Planning Commission

9. A discussion on a proposed resolution to adopt the amendments to the General Plan text for the General Plan update (PLGPA20180142) ([3:10:36](#))

Mr. Harding introduced this item, but noted that due to Mr. Strachan's absence there had been a request to continue the discussion.

Motion: David Knecht moved to move the discussions to the July 17, 2018 Work and Council Meetings and to consider a change to the title and description. Seconded by George Stewart.

Councilors discussed the intent of this project, which was to combine what was existing in Vision 2030 and the current General Plan, as a precursor to a formal update of the General Plan, which last occurred in 2010. Councilors felt that if there was misunderstanding about the intent, then it needed to be properly explained to clear up any confusion. Council Attorney Brian Jones noted that the City and State code include the term "comprehensive general plan update"; the use of update in the context of this discussion has been taken to mean that process, whereas Council has understood this process to be a housekeeping project prior to the comprehensive update.

Councilor David Sewell recommended that before making a decision, each Councilor read [Utah State Statute 10-9a-403](#) and watch the video of the Planning Commission meeting in question. Mr. Sewell felt from his reading of the State code that the Council was supposed to start from the Planning Commission's recommendation; he felt it would be important to send the update back to the Planning Commission.

Councilor George Handley felt that it was important to clarify what was intended in the first stage of the process by making a commitment to the process which would follow; much of the confusion seemed to be about the process. Mr. Sewell felt some of the Planning Commissioners stated they recognized the intent, but they did not have enough time to digest the information in order to give a recommendation. Mr. Sewell outlined what he envisioned as the process, which would also serve to strengthen the relationships between the Council and Planning Commission.

Substitute motion: David Sewell moved to send the amendments back to the Planning Commission with the discussed clarifications about the purpose of the revision, which was to

merge the General Plan and Vision 2030 as a preliminary step to a future comprehensive update of the General Plan. Seconded by George Handley.

Mr. Jones shared his insight regarding the State Statute. His concern was that the Planning Commission was not required to respond to the Council's request. He did not interpret anything in State Statute about the required origins of General Plan amendments except for comprehensive amendments; this was simply a general plan amendment originating with the request of the Council by Council staff. The Council had received a recommendation, albeit a recommendation of denial, from the Planning Commission; Mr. Jones felt it was not necessary legally to go back to the Planning Commission, though there may have been political benefit to doing so and aligning the Planning Commission with the view of the process.

Substitute motion: George Handley moved to continue the discussion to the July 17, 2018 Work Meeting with Mr. Strachan and members of the Planning Commission present. Seconded by David Sewell.

Mr. Handley suggested inviting Planning Commission Chair, Deborah Jensen, and other Planning Commissioners to a meeting in which Council Executive Director Cliff Strachan would be present. Mr. Handley thought to identify what the Council is doing and voting on, and what would take place immediately after; he felt that as a Council, this process required the political work of building bridges. Mr. Jones shared his concern about the proposed course of action, which was that given the nature of the relationship with the Planning Commission, the Commission may not think it was important to reconcile the two documents, and they may still choose to do nothing. Council Chair Gary Winterton supported Mr. Handley's suggestion of this revision as a template for the coming comprehensive General Plan update.

Revised substitute motion: George Handley revised the motion to continue the evening meeting discussion to an unspecified future date to be determined by Leadership and to continue the Work Meeting discussion to July 17, 2018, when Council Executive Director Cliff Strachan would be present and members of the Planning Commission could be invited to attend. Seconded by David Sewell.

Roll call vote: Approved 7:0.

Closed Meeting

10. The Municipal Council or the Governing Board of the Redevelopment Agency will consider a motion to close the meeting for the purposes of holding a strategy session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation, and/or to discuss the purchase, sale, exchange, or lease of real property, and/or the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual in conformance with § 52-4-204 and 52-4-205 et. seq., Utah Code.

Motion: George Stewart moved to close the meeting. Seconded by Kay Van Buren.

Roll call vote: Approved 7:0.

Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent.