



# PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

## Work Meeting Minutes

12:00 PM, Tuesday, June 05, 2018

Room 310, Provo City Conference Room

351 West Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

### Roll Call

1

THE FOLLOWING ELECTED OFFICIALS WERE PRESENT:

Council Chair Gary Winterton, conducting

Council Vice-Chair David Harding

Councilor David Sewell

Councilor Vernon K. Van Buren

Councilor David Knecht

Councilor George Stewart

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

*Excused:* Councilor George Handley

### Agenda

2

#### Prayer

3

4

The prayer was offered by Joseph Hamblin, Council Intern.

5

#### Approval of Minutes

6

April 17, 2018 Joint Meeting with the Planning Commission

May 1, 2018 Work Meeting

*Approved by unanimous consent.*

7

#### Business

8

##### 1. A discussion on funding options for Miss Provo and parade float (18-055) (0:02:08)

9

##### 10 Parade Float

11 Mayor Kaufusi asked Scott Henderson, Parks and Recreation Director, to estimate the yearly costs of  
12 operating and maintaining the Miss Provo parade float. He reported it would cost approximately \$1,000 per  
13 parade. At an average of 12 parades per year, the city would need to budget \$12,000 each year to cover the  
14 costs. The estimate included a driver, two spotters, and fuel. It did not include costs associated with  
15 storage and possible damages or liability.

16

17 Mayor Kaufusi stated the Mayor's office budgeted \$11,000 per year for the float with an additional \$10,000  
18 per year for the Miss Provo contest. The Council would need to find another \$1,000 for the current budget.

19

20 As for liability, Wayne Parker, CAO, said the City would responsible for any damages if this was a city  
21 service. They planned to have a city driver and two spotters, with radio headsets, to communicate with the

22 driver to help prevent accidents. Councilor David Harding said this would be best practice, and the  
23 responsible thing to do, if the city felt there was value in having a float.

24  
25 Chair Winterton noted that float storage at the airport had not been included in the estimate. The float was  
26 being stored in a broken hangar so there was no cost. However, the hangar needed to be repaired so the  
27 airport could start charging rent. If necessary, the administration said they could find an alternate location  
28 to store the float.

29  
30 Councilor David Sewell was supportive of continued funding. He did not feel the cost difference of moving  
31 to a best practice policy was that great.

32  
33 Mr. Parker stated the allocation was on an ongoing list of items the council would like to see budgeted. The  
34 administration would find a source for the additional funding.

35  
**Motion:** Council Member Stewart made a motion to allocate the proposed amount of  
money for the float. The motion was seconded by Council Member Harding.

**Roll Call Vote:** The motion passed 5:1 with Council Members Harding, Knecht, Sewell,  
Stewart, and Winterton in favor and Council Member Van Buren opposed.  
Council Member Handley was excused.

36  
37 Miss Provo Pageant

38 Chair Winterton stated that, years ago, the Miss Provo Pageant was administered by the Freedom Festival  
39 committee. The Freedom Festival Board of Directors was meeting later that day and would discuss the  
40 possibility of taking back the Miss Provo event from the Miss Provo Organization. He said the city had  
41 been funding \$10,000 per year for the event, with around \$5,200 going toward scholarships.

42  
43 Mayor Kaufusi said the city would like to continue support for the scholarship portion of the pageant. The  
44 women work hard and the scholarship was a large part of their education.

45  
46 Mr. Sewell wanted to continue supporting the pageant, at least at the current level. Titleholders provided  
47 various city and school services. In an age when women still did not have equal opportunities for  
48 scholarships and were not heavily involved in local government this provided a unique opportunity for  
49 leadership skills. It helped boost their confidence and communication skills. It was a great partnership  
50 because we received so many benefits in return.

51  
52 Mr. Stewart supported funding the event up to \$10,000. Each Miss Provo provided services to the  
53 community so it was money well spent. He applauded the National Miss America organization for  
54 eliminating the swimsuit competition portion of the event.

55  
56 Mr. Harding did not feel the city should be spending public money on scholarships for the winner of this  
57 program. Based on surveys, a good portion of the community was not supportive of funding the  
58 scholarship. It was a great organization and provided many benefits to the city. However, there were many  
59 great organizations in the community that provided services to the city for which we do not provide  
60 scholarships. This was not the best vehicle to address the lack of opportunities for women. He could not  
61 support the continued relationship.

62  
63 Mr. Stewart viewed this as paying for contract services, not scholarship support. The city was contracting  
64 with the Miss Provo organization for services provided to the city. He was in favor of keeping the \$10,000  
65 in the budget for the Miss Provo pageant.

66

67 Mr. Van Buren noted that if we define the contribution as contract services we would need to go out for bid,  
68 provide job descriptions, etc.

69  
70 Mr. Stewart replied that he did not necessarily want a formal contract. He just wanted to make sure they  
71 found a way to continue budgeting for the pageant in the future, both legally and morally.

72  
73 Mr. Millward agreed to research the issue to determine if a contract was needed or if the funds could be  
74 considered a gift.

75  
76 Chair Winterton said they could table this item for two weeks until they heard if the Freedom Festival  
77 organization would take it back under their umbrella. If not, the council could discuss whether this was  
78 something the city would want to do. He noted it would stay in the FY 2019 budget.

79  
**Motion:** Council Member Winterton moved to table this item for two weeks. The  
80 motion was seconded by Council Member Stewart.

81 Mr. Harding was uncomfortable, morally and ethically, funding this out of taxpayer funds, regardless of  
82 whether it was called a scholarship or contract services. He would be voting in favor of the motion to  
83 continue.

84  
85 Chair Winterton noted we have had a contract with the Miss Provo organization in the past. One of the  
86 problems was that the city had not defined what they expected of Miss Provo. During the next two weeks,  
87 the council needed to define and clarify what they expected of the Miss Provo organization.

88  
89 Mr. Sewell said most of the negative comments on Open City Hall and similar emails dealt with the aspect  
90 of judging by physical appearance. He felt people needed to understand the swimsuit competition was not  
91 part of the Miss America program anymore. The contestants would not be judged on physical appearance.

92  
93 Chair Winterton called for a vote on the motion to table the item for two weeks.

94  
**Roll Call Vote:** The motion passed 6:0 with Council Members Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart,  
95 Van Buren, and Winterton in favor. Council Member Handley was excused.

96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
**2. A discussion on appropriating \$160,000 in the General Fund, Parks and Recreation  
Department to fund needs in the Recreation Center (18-064) (0:31:50)**

103 Scott Henderson, Parks and Recreation Director, presented. The recreation center has been a great success.  
104 For example, credit card transaction merchant fees were up by \$40,000, meaning more people were  
105 purchasing memberships or paying the daily entrance fee. The success had created the need for an  
106 appropriation adjustment. He invited Bryce Merrill, the recreation center manager, to review the request  
107 with council members.

108  
109 Mr. Merrill gave a presentation showing that day passes and membership revenues have had a consistent 8-  
110 12 percent growth rate for all five years of operation. During that same time, the operating costs and  
111 expenses remained flat. As of May 31, 2018, the recreation center revenues were \$225,000 more than the  
112 budgeted amount. By May 2018, the recreation center had almost 25,000 members, which was 1,000 more  
113 members than in May 2017. With the increase comes the need to improve the quality of service and  
114 maintenance. He was confident the residents were getting good value for their dollar.

115 The following statistics compared the recreation center to the national standards:  
116 • Operating cost per square feet – Provo \$23.04 and national average \$28.05

- 112 • Staffing per square feet – Provo \$15.04 and national average \$16.43  
113 • Cost recovery rate was 117 percent, including future capital – a national leader  
114 • Five times the national average of daily users  
115 • Level of service provided for residents was unparalleled.  
116

117 The appropriation request of \$160,000 (to cover costs through the end of the current fiscal year) would be  
118 used for the following:

- 119 • Additional staffing for child watch, fitness classes, custodial services, lifeguards, etc.  
120 • Concessions  
121 • Consumables  
122 • Merchant Fees  
123 • Special Events  
124

125 Mr. Merrill reported they had implemented the following cost saving strategies:

- 126 • Purchasing natural gas in bulk  
127 • Adding LED lights  
128 • Changing custodial vendors  
129 • Changing concession vendors  
130 • Eliminating some full-time staff positions and replacing them with part-time positions  
131

132 Council members expressed appreciation for the recreation center staff and the work they do to make the  
133 center successful. *This item was already scheduled for the council meeting that night.*  
134

### 135 3. A discussion on rental dwelling license fees (18-065) ([0:48:12](#))

136 Gary McGinn, Community Development Director, presented information concerning rental dwelling  
137 license fees. Provo City had 695 rental licenses, representing 1,243 properties and 1,997 rental units.  
138 Current license fees were \$20 for a single unit and \$60 for two units or more. If someone owned a duplex,  
139 lived in one side and rented out the other side, they did not need a rental dwelling license. Due to the  
140 conversion to a different software, revenue numbers were difficult to obtain so he was not confident sharing  
141 the actual figures yet.  
142

143 Mr. Knecht reported that a survey of his neighborhood showed around 700 units did not have rental  
144 licenses. Mr. McGinn replied that was very possible. Some of them could be accessory apartments for  
145 residents 65 or older that were not required to be licensed or duplexes.  
146

147 Mr. Harding pointed out that there were 2,000 rental units on Craig's list. The 1,997 licensed rental units  
148 represented a small percentage of the rental units in Provo.  
149

150 Mr. McGinn shared statistics from the latest United States Census showing there were 32,353 households  
151 from 2012-2016; 19,185 of those households were rentals; and 59.3 percent of households in Provo were  
152 not owner occupied. Enforcement issues between January 1, 2016 and June 5, 2018 included 183 Rental  
153 Dwelling Cases and 380 Occupancy Cases.  
154

155 Mr. Knecht noted that if the rental dwelling did not have a license then it was never inspected. Responding  
156 to Mr. Knecht, Mr. McGinn said the rental dwelling in south Provo that recently burned down did not have  
157 a license.  
158

159 Rental license programs in other communities included a good landlord program, per building fees, per unit  
160 fees, and agent fees. He reviewed some of the programs in other communities that showed some of the  
161 options available to Provo:

- 162 • Logan, UT
  - 163 ○ License Fee - \$50 or \$10 if good landlord certified
  - 164 ○ Late Fee – Calculated by a percentage of original fee with potential of a 100 percent  
165 increase
- 166 • Ogden, UT
  - 167 ○ License Fee
    - 168 ▪ Three or more units - \$83 per building and \$82 per unit
    - 169 ▪ Single Family - \$156
    - 170 ▪ Duplex - \$140
  - 171 ○ License Fee if Good Landlord Certified
    - 172 ▪ Three or more units - \$83 per building and \$10 per unit
    - 173 ▪ Single Family - \$13
    - 174 ▪ Duplex - \$12
  - 175 ○ Late Fee – Calculated by percentage of original fee with potential of 100 percent increase
- 176 • Salt Lake City, UT
  - 177 ○ License Fee - \$147 base fee and \$342 per unit
  - 178 ○ License Fee if Good Landlord Certified - \$147 base fee and \$20 per unit
  - 179 ○ Late Fee – Calculated on percentage of original fee with potential of a 100 percent increase
- 180 • Ephraim, UT
  - 181 ○ License Fee - \$25 for two or less units and \$50 for three or more units
  - 182 ○ Late Fee – 50 percent of original fee applied to application the day after due date
- 183 • St. George, UT
  - 184 ○ License Fee - \$50
  - 185 ○ Agent Fee - \$10 (Applied to original fee if owner does not reside in Washington County)
  - 186 ○ Late Fee - \$25 applied two months after renewal date

187  
188 Mr. McGinn responded to several council members concerns and questions.

- 189 • Provo City rental dwelling fees were not covering the cost of service so increasing them could be  
190 justified.
- 191 • The license fee should cover the costs necessary to recoup the cost of the program, not just to raise  
192 revenues. Enforcement of license fees would be considered part of the program with personnel  
193 costs the largest part of enforcement.
- 194 • Not every rental was required to have a license, but there was still a significant number of  
195 unlicensed units.
- 196 • Enforcement for many years was on a complaint basis because staff could not tell if there were  
197 rental violations simply by looking at the home. There could be other options of finding the  
198 violations but staff had enough work to do just investigating complaints.
- 199 • Increasing staff and finding other options of enforcing violations would be a policy question for  
200 council.
- 201 • The scope of the health safety issues was fairly limited by the state legislature. The state was  
202 hesitant to move toward a property maintenance code. Many of the complaints we receive about  
203 landlords have to be handled on a private basis, between the renter and the landlord.

204  
205 Chair Winterton said it was obvious there needed to be more research and discussion on this topic.  
206

207 *Presentation only.*  
208

209 **4. A presentation on reinvestment for the Shops at Riverwoods(18-066) (1:04:57)**

210 Dixon Holmes, Deputy Mayor/Economic Development, presented. Owners of the Shops at Riverwoods  
211 (Riverwoods) have requested a tax increment financing incentive to offset costs of improvements to the  
212 shopping center. Riverwoods was investing \$9 million in the improvements and was asking for \$1.5  
213 million over a 15-year period from the city. The incentive would not come from property taxes; it would be  
214 a post-performance sales tax incentive with a baseline cap at \$1.5 million. Riverwoods would have to  
215 double their annual sales and sustain their baseline to be eligible for the financing.

216  
217 Mr. Holmes asked the council to give authorization to Mayor Kaufusi to negotiate terms of an agreement  
218 with Riverwoods ownership.

219  
220 Mr. Van Buren expressed concern about increased sales projections and asked if they were realistic. Mr.  
221 Dixon said the 50 percent projected increase in the first year was a possibility, but not likely.

222  
223 Responding to Mr. Van Buren, Jeremy Blickenstaff, with Riverwoods, said that as additional spaces and  
224 new property was added the sales taxes would increase. The remodeled theatre alone would bring in six to  
225 seven times its current revenue and they were working on adding six additional retail tenants this year.  
226 They would also be adding 450 new parking stalls. In total, the improvements would add 60,000 square  
227 feet in the first phase bringing the total gross leasable area to more than 250,000 square feet. This opened  
228 the door to tenants they did not have access to before because of their size.

229  
230 Mr. Holmes emphasized the incentive would be performance based; there would not be any upfront  
231 funding. To earn the full incentive, they would need to double their current sales.

232  
233 Chair Winterton was in favor of the incentive but was concerned about how the base had been established.  
234 Mr. Holmes replied that last year would be used to set the baseline, which would be after Tucano's left and  
235 Rodizio came in. Riverwoods had been open for twenty years and had not received any incentives during  
236 that time. The current ownership did not have other retail centers to draw from. This was a local  
237 development that Mr. Holmes felt was worthy of consideration. Mr. Knecht pointed out that Orem had  
238 taken two of their profitable tenants and offered them incentives when they left Provo.

239  
240 Mr. Sewell said this was a local success story and the center had been well managed. He was supportive of  
241 moving ahead.

242  
243 Council Member Stewart made the following motion:

244  
245 **Motion:** Council Member Stewart moved to continue this item and bring it to the  
council in two weeks. The motion was seconded by Mr. Knecht.

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

246  
247 **5. A discussion with officials from Utah League of Cities and Towns regarding State legislative  
items (18-067) (1:19:50)**

248 Cameron Diehl, Executive Director for the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT), gave a presentation  
249 concerning several legislative items affecting Provo City. He introduced Rachel Otto, hired in December,  
250 who would also present.

- 251 • HB36 – Free Expression amendments sponsored by Representative Thurston
- 252 ○ Began in 2017 and re-emerged this year

- 253 ○ Codified constitutional requirements under Title 11
- 254 ○ Permitted a city to put reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions on expressive
- 255 activities by ordinance
- 256 ○ The ordinance must be consistent with what the constitution required
- 257 ○ Outside of those ordinances, a city could not restrict free expression activity outside of a
- 258 public building
- 259 ○ Representative Thurston may expand this legislation in future sessions
- 260 ○ This legislation did not allow expressive activity regulated through the election code – Title
- 261 20A
- 262 ○ Some access on public property for election issues would be allowed within reasonable
- 263 boundaries, such as sidewalks
- 264 ○ Should address the difference between campaigning and gathering signatures for ballot
- 265 initiatives
- 266 ● SB120 – Transportation Utility Fee sponsored by Senator Henderson
- 267 ○ Legitimize a city’s transportation utility fee but exclude counties from being taxed or
- 268 charged
- 269 ○ Define a transportation fee
- 270 ○ Fee could not be assessed to any entity created under Title 11 (this would exempt counties
- 271 and charter cities)
- 272 ○ Exemptions would make it easier to defend the fee
- 273 ○ ULCT would continue to advocate for Provo and other cities that had implemented, or were
- 274 in the process of implementing, a transportation fee
- 275 ○ This bill came out of a task force discussion that recommended cities use transportation
- 276 utility fees
- 277 ○ Created a pilot program allowing citizens to sign up for a vehicle miles program instead of
- 278 paying a gas tax
- 279 ● Property Taxes
- 280 ○ Tax reform sounded good until people realized it came with the need to tax people that
- 281 were not being taxed.
- 282 ○ Last year, tax reform was discussed on a federal level, state level, and local level.
- 283 ○ On the local level, legislators wanted to expand the sales tax base to bring in services not
- 284 currently taxed (such as attorneys) and begin taxing internet sales.
- 285 ○ The new pot of money would facilitate a discussion of changing the local option sales tax
- 286 formula of 50/50.
- 287 ○ Utah Taxpayers Association acknowledged that now was the time to reevaluate the truth-
- 288 in-taxation process and include an inflationary component or some type of annual
- 289 adjustment.
- 290 ○ All state tax reform discussion was put on pause in December due to federal tax reform,
- 291 outside of SB136.
- 292 ○ A unique political dynamic was created with “Our Schools Now” asking how tax revenues
- 293 were being spent.
- 294 ○ Our Schools Now compromise:
- 295 ■ Ballot initiative to increase tax gas tax by ten cents
- 296 ■ If approved, three cents would go to local government with counties getting 36
- 297 percent and cities getting 64 percent.
- 298 ■ The remaining seven cents would go into the state transportation fund
- 299 ■ An equivalent amount of state sales tax money would go back to the state general
- 300 fund and freed up to spend on education.
- 301 ○ The ULCT board supported the Our Schools Now compromise.

- 302           ○ With Senator Howard Stephenson and President Wayne Niederhauser retiring, ULCT will  
303           need to begin again with other representatives to work on tax reform issues. Not sure  
304           where new representatives will stand on the truth-in-taxation issue.  
305           ○ Governor Herbert wants to work on sales tax reform, so the focus will likely shift from the  
306           legislature to the governor's office.  
307           ○ ULCT welcomes resolutions from cities supporting their tax reform.  
308

309 Mr. Diehl said they were in the process of modernizing the ULCT organization. He encouraged local  
310 officials to get involved in statewide legislative issues by participating on the Legislative Policy Committee  
311 (LPC). The LPC sent ideas to ULCT staff for further action. The LPC was a large group so he encouraged  
312 cities to also participate in the smaller caucus groups. Legislators wanted local officials to work through  
313 ULCT/LPC so they would know that one city's request would not interfere with other cities. The LPC  
314 meetings were public meetings so anyone could attend but each city was allowed only three voting  
315 members. The LPC met monthly until January when the legislative session began. During the session they  
316 met weekly with meetings available online.  
317

318 The main issues that ULCT would be looking into for the upcoming legislative session included housing  
319 affordability and affordable housing (two different issues). Every city was required to have a modern  
320 income housing plans. Provo had kept up to speed but many cities were not in compliant. ULCT supported  
321 a bill that modernized those plans to make them data focused. They were encouraging cities to think  
322 regionally and understand how all cities fit together.  
323

324 The second most important issue would be water including surplus water contracts and extra territorial  
325 jurisdiction of water in the canyons.  
326

327 *This discussion was presentation only, no action was taken.*  
328

#### 6. A discussion on Bulldog Blvd. construction (18-068) (2:00:44)

329  
330 Dave Graves, Provo City Engineer, gave a presentation on the status of the Bulldog Boulevard construction.  
331 The goal of the project, which began six years ago, was to provide a safer travel experience along Bulldog  
332 Blvd for all modes of transportation. The crash rate on Bulldog was 7.5 times higher than other arterial  
333 streets. The use of planted medians would help reduce the rate of accidents. The plan to add bicycle lanes  
334 on Bulldog was approved with the 2013 Bicycle Master Plan amendment.  
335

336 Mr. Stewart said that by keeping three lanes in both direction and putting medians in the road that would  
337 not allow left hand turns would address the safety issues. Mr. Graves replied that it would address the  
338 vehicle safety issues but not bicycle and pedestrian safety. The current ADT on Bulldog was 27,000 and  
339 was estimated to increase to 31,000 by 2040. In order to be accurate, the model had to predict where the  
340 growth would be, such as the west side, density along the BRT route, and downtown.  
341

342 The current design included raised center medians, U-turns allowed at intersections, repurposed outside  
343 travel lanes to provide buffered bike lanes, a second left-hand turn lane at 500 West Bulldog, and a new  
344 signalized intersection at 400 West (due to Target). The design would increase the awareness of all  
345 travelers.  
346

347 Jonathan Knight, Engineer III, reviewed the project schedule with council members.

- 348           • June 2018 – plan-in-hand review (50% design milestone)
- 349           • July 2018 – plans, specifications, and estimates review (PS&E, 90%)
- 350           • August 2018 – begin construction



- Late Winter/Early Spring 2019 – estimated construction time

The scope of the project ran from the Provo River Trail on Columbia Lane to Canyon Road (near the entrance to BYU campus). Mr. Knight reviewed maps showing improvements to be made in each block. In response to questions from council members

- The right turn lane from 500 West onto Bulldog would be tightened and signaled controlled because it crossed a bike lane.
- The traffic signal at 400 West would give better access to the hospital on the south and Porters/the alley behind Riverside Plaza on the north. Target requested the light to accommodate left hand turns out of the shopping center. He acknowledged it was not the ideal situation for businesses or vehicles.
- The right turn lane queue from Bulldog to 200 West would stay the same with a longer right turn lane queue at University Avenue.
- The bike lane from University Avenue to Canyon road would not be buffered.

In summary:

- Four travel lanes provides capacity for about 40,000 ADT
- Peak hour morning commute (eastbound) increased by approximately 40 seconds
- Peak hour evening commute (westbound) increased by approximately 40 seconds at 2040 projection
- Center median channel all cross-traffic movements to intersections where they are expected and controlled
- Buffered bike lanes remove bicycles from travel lanes and sidewalks increasing safety for all modes of transportation and all skill levels
- Facilitating active transportation complies with Provo City vision for complete streets

Leah Jaramillo, Public Engagement Professional, had worked on similar transportation projects for almost 19 years, with Provo City, UDOT, and construction contractors. The first step in this project began in 2013 with an open house to see if people were interested in the project. She met with every business on the corridor, talked through their concerns, and tried to account for their feedback in the design. Plans were revised when the Target conversation came up. The first step of public engagement for the design phase of the project began on May 21 with an open house. Preliminary designs needed to be prepared before the open house so the public could see how the project would affect them. During that meeting, citizens were asked to comment on the plans with 42 pro project, 13 neutral, and 23 anti-project. Those against the project struggled with the idea of congestion while others had construction fatigue. The public comment period will continue through June 8, after which the construction team would determine how the comments would affect the project design.

Council Members expressed the following concerns:

- Mr. Stewart asked how the public had been engaged when the current council did not know about it and it had not been discussed since 2014. There should be multiple public hearings and open houses.
- Mr. Knecht noted there was a mock-up complete street project near the recreation center on 500 North last year or the year before. He asked why they could not do something similar by putting up temporary barriers to simulate how it would work and get feedback that way.
- Chair Winterton said this needs more discussion and suggested revisiting in two weeks or in a special session. The last presentation was in October 2015 and there was inadequate funding at that time. We need to make sure the right discussions are taking place so he could get a better grasp on the project.

- 400 • Mr. Sewell asked for a breakdown of funding sources. The biggest pushback has been about the  
401 commute time with a lane reduction. He was in favor of the proposal and, if the information was  
402 accurate from engineers and construction firms, it seemed to be a good choice. There had not been  
403 a good push to sell the project to the public. He suggested devoting council staff time to prepare  
404 something that could be shared on social media sites.  
405

406 Responding to Mr. Knecht's request, Ms. Jaramillo said it would be difficult to prepare a mockup model for  
407 just one block. It would be a significant challenge because traffic on Bulldog was too high and the system  
408 had dedicated traffic signaling.  
409

410 ***Mr. Strachan will work with leadership to determine a time to bring the item back for further discussion.***  
411

412 Due to high temperatures in the city center conference room, the meeting was moved to the council  
413 chambers for the remaining agenda item.  
414

#### 7. **An update on the proposed budget (18-005) (0:13:15)**

415  
416 Dustin Grabau, Provo City Budget Officer, presented an update on the proposed FY 2019 budget. He noted  
417 there were very few changes in the current updated version compared to the version presented to council  
418 two weeks ago. The changes included:

- 419 • Increased funding for Parks events by \$19,908. Funding will come from adjusted property tax  
420 increase estimates. Although we had not received reported property tax revenue from the county  
421 assessor, we were confident the number would increase by at least \$20,000.
- 422 • Recycling costs were increased by \$65,000 so revenues were increased to match the costs.
- 423 • Radio Equipment replacement budget of \$372,406 was not included in the original budget  
424 presented to council. The financing from the General Fund had been included.
- 425 • General changes in the final budget version would include:
  - 426 ○ Departments would have a standardized scale of the graphs represented, based upon the  
427 size of their budget.
  - 428 ○ Future budgets would have budget highlights with changes to major fees.
  - 429 ○ Changes were made to the Storm Water Storm District budget based on actual  
430 expenditures.
- 431 • Works in progress:
  - 432 ○ The fire station had not been addressed.
  - 433 ○ Police compensation needed to be discussed. There was a host of opportunities, but  
434 nothing had been built into the budget.
  - 435 ○ Changes related to the Miss Provo float would be incorporated by the next meeting.
  - 436 ○ Funding for the urban deer program for next year.  
437

438 Mr. Harding had received feedback from one resident who was concerned there was not a citizen budget  
439 committee like there had been in the past. Mr. Harding had not been able to review the budget in detail.  
440 Mr. Grabau replied that the Administration was preparing a list of citizens to serve on a committee but it  
441 would not be available for this year.  
442

443 Mr. Harding said they still had funding for the Parking Administrator, but the funding for the program itself  
444 was reduced. Parking had been a priority in the past but was dropped at the beginning of the year because  
445 they felt it had been addressed. He felt it was falling off their priority list.  
446

447 Mr. Parker stated the funding level was the same as the FY 2018 budget. The intent was to fill the position  
448 and share responsibilities with sustainability. There were a number of plans with improvements to parking

449 structures and funding for a trial paid parking program. Those were one-time capital expenditures so the  
450 administration anticipated bringing a proposal to the council shortly after the beginning of the budget cycle.  
451 There was still some wayfinding budget that could be used for signage and other projects.  
452

453 In response to Chair Winterton, Mr. Grabau stated they were open to suggestions from council on how to  
454 fund some of the last minute projects, such as the deer program and the Miss Provo float. Mr. Parker stated  
455 that, since the budget now belonged to the council, the administration would work with council staff to find  
456 funding for the last minute requests. Mr. Strachan said that if the council wanted extra items funded they  
457 needed to determine priorities. The budget would need to be decreased in other areas or anticipated  
458 revenues would need to be increased.  
459

460 Mr. Grabau said they also discussed if raising rental dwelling license fees would generate enough to satisfy  
461 a part-time change in Community Development. They were not at a point to make that change so it was not  
462 included in the proposed budget. In order to generate those fees, we may need a separate position from the  
463 one that was originally proposed to be funded. He did not know if they could use those administrative fees  
464 to cover the positions. The revenues overall would need to be tripled in order to generate just that one  
465 change, let alone additional staff changes. There were several issues that needed to be discussed before a  
466 change could be made.  
467

468 Mr. Harding was uncomfortable with the needs in the Police Department going unmet. We were doing  
469 more than had been done in a long time, but it was still short of the original request. The residents want to  
470 be safe and he wanted to know what it would take to get an additional police officer funded. Chair  
471 Winterton agreed with Mr. Harding.  
472

473 Mr. Strachan said the budget analyst position would free up one of the senior officers so, in a way, they  
474 were providing five officers.  
475

476 Mr. Harding noted that three years ago the council said they were going to make a property tax inflation  
477 adjustment. Would three years of inflation adjustment be sufficient? Mr. Grabau said \$100,000 for an  
478 additional officer would be a property tax increase of approximately 2.3 percent. The median home cost of  
479 \$275,000 would be an annual increase of approximately \$2.98 (\$0.25 per month).  
480

481 Mr. Stewart did not want to consider a property tax increase when they might be considering a bond.  
482

483 Chair Winterton said that was something they had to weigh each time. They were looking at potential  
484 bonds for sewer issues and other opportunities.  
485

486 Mr. Van Buren acknowledged there were other needs but did not think they could all be funded in one year.  
487 He was not in favor of a property tax increase. We were in good economic times and sales tax was up.  
488 What would happen if the economy slowed and we had already used those resources? He felt a property tax  
489 increase should be a last resort.  
490

491 Mr. Sewell said if they were not making annual property tax inflation adjustments, they should remove it  
492 from the intent statements. The inflation rate was just over 2.3 percent and they had made no adjustments  
493 to match that rate.  
494

495 Mr. Harding said if the mil rate change was roughly the same as the inflation rate change, it would not be a  
496 tax increase it would just be holding it at the same rate. There were real needs and they were allowing tax  
497 rates to decrease.  
498

499 Mr. Strachan invited council members to present their funding requests to staff with suggestions for how to  
500 fund those requests.

501

### **Policy Items Referred from the Planning Commission**

502

8. **A presentation on a zone change from Planning Industrial Commercial (PIC) to Region Shopping Center (SC3) for property from 920 S to East Bay Blvd and from University Ave to 180 E, to encourage commercial redevelopment. East Bay Neighborhood. (PLRZ20180100)**

503

*This item was continued to the regular council meeting.*

504

9. **A presentation on an amendment to Section 14.06.020 (Definitions) to make the definitions of "Baching Singles" and "Family" consistent with Utah State Law. Citywide application. (PLOTA20180121)**

505

*This item was continued to the regular council meeting.*

506

### **Closed Meeting**

507

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.**

508

**Motion:** Council Member Van Buren made a motion to close the meeting to discuss pending litigation and real estate acquisitions. The motion was seconded by Council Member Harding.

509

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

510