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| Image_0 | **PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL**  **Redevelopment Agency of Provo**  **Regular Meeting Minutes**  5:30 PM, Tuesday, September 25, 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 David Harding | | Council Member David Knecht |
|  | Council Member David Sewell | | Council Member Gary Winterton |
|  | Council Member George Handley | | Council Member George Stewart (5:55 p.m.) |
|  | Council Member Vernon K. Van Buren | | Mayor Michelle Kaufusi (5:38 p.m.) |
|  | Council Attorney Brian Jones | |  |
|  |  | |  |
| Excused: | | Council Executive Director Cliff Strachan and CAO Wayne Parker | |
| Conducting: | | Council Chair Gary Winterton | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Prayer – Brian King** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Pledge of Allegiance – Seth Clark** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Approval of Minutes** | | |
|  | **July 10, 2018 Council Meeting** |
|  | **July 17, 2018 Council Meeting** |
|  | **September 11, 2018 Council Meeting** |

The meeting minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

|  |
| --- |
| **Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **Neighborhood Spotlight - Rock Canyon Neighborhood (**[**0:08:53**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=533)**)** |

The Rock Canyon Neighborhood Chair, Rachel Luke, presented. She said they had a great neighborhood that had challenges like other neighborhoods near BYU. Ms. Luke planned to survey her neighbors to establish priorities and goals, but one priority for Ms. Luke was conserving the character of the neighborhood.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2** | **A presentation of the Employee of the Month for September 2018 (**[**0:10:41**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=641)**)** |

The Employees Association President, Jenny Starley, announced the September Employee of the Month as Raquel Kerr, Library Custodian.

Gene Nelson, Library Director, described Ms. Kerr as outstanding. She would arrive to work before 4:30 a.m. and always had a smile on her face. Mr. Nelson said she was a hard worker. Ms. Kerr was the mother of two. She enjoys traveling, running, and reading. She also likes attending demolition derbies. She volunteered at her children’s school. Mr. Nelson said he often received compliments about the cleanliness of the library, this was in large part due to Ms. Kerr’s diligent efforts.

|  |
| --- |
| **Public Comment (**[**0:15:35**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=935)**)** |

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

Ryan King, Provo, worked for startup company that was based a block from the City Center. He wanted to present an idea. He suggested passing a city-wide renewable energy mandate. He read from Vision 2030 as well as the future goals of draft Vision 2050. Mr. King was an avid skier and enjoyed outdoor opportunities. He said shorter winters were leading to water problems in the summer. He was willing to work with the council to provide any resources he had. Mr. Winterton encouraged Mr. King to look for an exciting announcement the next day. Mr. Handley said there would be an upcoming meeting on October 18, additional information could be found on the Mayor’s blog at [mayorkaufusi.com](https://www.mayorkaufusi.com/).

Nicholas Merrill, BYU Student, expressed thanks and appreciation for the new public transportation system in Provo. He used public transportation frequently and appreciated that he did not feel the need to have a vehicle. He said he loved it because it runs often and not only provided transportation within Provo but could also connect him with family in the North. Mr. Merrill said the downtown UVX route was his favorite.

|  |
| --- |
| **Action Agenda** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3** | **Resolution 2018-34 authorizing certain Provo City Administrative Services and Finance personnel to continue to manage the Public Treasurer's Investment Fund. (18-090) (**[**0:23:50**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=1430)**)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Motion:** | An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-34, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule. |

John Borget, Director of Administrative Services, presented. He said a large portion of Provo’s funds were invested in Public Treasurer’s Investment Fund (PTIF). To ensure strong controls, the state asked the council to authorize certain people to have access to the account. Dan Follett, Division Director of Finance, would be the primary accessor. John Borget would also have access in the event of Mr. Follett’s absence. Mr. Borget said Journal entries and other things that relate to the PTIF transactions were conducted a separate person, who did not have access to the account.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Roll Call Vote:** | The implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-34 passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | **An ordinance amending the Zone Map Classification of approximately 5.89 acres of real property, generally located at 1437 East 2300 North from Public Facilities (PF) to Agricultural 1 (A1.1). Rock Canyon Neighborhood. (PLRZ20180239) (**[**0:26:26**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=1586)**)** |

Aaron Ardmore, Community Development Planner, presented. This request was for an area of land from 2300 North to the Rock Canyon Trailhead. The land had been mostly vacant and was used for storage. The request was to amend to zone map classification from Public Facilities (PF) to Agricultural 1 (A1.1). There would be three lots each just under 2 acres each. With a map of the area displayed, he pointed out hazardous fault lines that could make development complicated, especially for the second lot. Mr. Ardmore said the applicant had no intention of subdividing the lots in the future, which was why this zone had been requested. Planning Staff and the Planning Commission recommended approval. One item of concern was the fact that this zone would allow for animals, beyond what was allowed in residential zones. The applicant offered to restrict certain animal uses to alleviate these concerns of noise or foul odor that might come from agricultural use.

Mr. Winterton asked who was responsible for preparing a list of restricted uses. Mr. Ardmore said the applicant would prepare the covenants and Mayor would approve via a development agreement. Mr. Jones, Council Attorney, asked for the revised ordinance to be displayed. It included the development agreement version of the zone change ordinance. It specifically said the restrictive covenants on the property would limit or prohibit certain high-impact agricultural uses.

Mr. Handley asked to see the language that would describe the house size. Mr. Ardmore said this was described in the A1.1 zone; he felt this was consistent with the size of other homes in the neighborhood.

David Gardner, the developer who was representing the applicant, explained the applicant did want the ability to have horses. He said they were willing to enter into restrictive covenants to outline agricultural uses.

Mr. Harding thought the covenants were important and intended to protect the residential character of the area. While the current plan didn’t include higher impact uses, it was hard to tell what might happen in the future.

Mr. Winterton wanted to know how many horses the applicant planned to have, but Mr. Gardner was unsure. He would find out and follow up with Mayor Kaufusi.

Mr. Handley asked if the neighbors were aware of the intent to have horses. Mr. Gardner said the neighbors were aware of the request for agricultural uses, but they had not specifically discussed the horses.

Mr. Van Buren asked Mr. Ardmore if there were other horses or agricultural uses in the area. Mr. Ardmore did not know of other horses in the area, with the exception of the horses entering the Rock Canyon Trailhead.

Rachel Luke, Rock Canyon Neighborhood Chair, sent the item to her neighborhood Facebook group (270 members) and neighborhood email list (120 residents). There was immediate concern about the trail from the park to the trailhead, but Mr. Handley clarified the trail would not be directly impacted. The neighborhood treasured the trail and they hoped it would stay in place. There was another concern that the use of the land was not prudent, but she didn’t think they knew about the fault lines. She thought the majority of the neighborhood supported the lower density. Some residents felt ill-informed about the request, there had been no neighborhood meeting. There were also concerns about the size and placement of the homes. Ms. Luke said they had not considered the horses, but there were other horses on Timpview Drive, and it was welcomed by the community. She didn’t know how the neighbors closest to the development would feel about horses being there all the time. Otherwise, she saw no reason why this should not move forward.

Mr. Handley asked Ms. Luke if she wanted the opportunity to speak with her neighborhood about the horses, she said she would appreciate this opportunity, especially since she had only recently been elected and was new to the proposal. Mr. Knecht told Ms. Luke the number of horses and the placement would likely be an important factor.

Chair Winterton opened public comment, there was no response.

Both Mr. Handley and Mr. Knecht wanted to hear the item at the next meeting, pursuant to council rules. Mr. Handley felt this was a good proposal and he was supportive, but he thought it was important to give the neighbors a chance to weigh in.

Mr. Van Buren asked Mr. Gardner if he had seen the site plans or knew how large the homes would be. Mr. Gardner had not seen the site plans but assumed the homes would likely be substantial and would include outbuildings behind the homes. He said they did not have a neighborhood meeting because the previous neighborhood chair did not think it was necessary. Mr. Van Buren was concerned the horses would bring flies. He wondered if the horses could be kept away from the neighbor’s property line. Mr. Gardner thought the horses would impact the park more than the neighbors.

Mr. Harding supported the continuance and hoped it would provide the opportunity to outline the development agreement and give the neighbors a chance to review and respond to the agreement

Per council rules, Chair Winterton said this item would be continued to October 9, 2018 at the request of Mr. Handley.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5** | **\*\*ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED\*\*An ordinance amending Provo City Code to increase buffering requirements and transitional standards when certain uses are adjacent to a residential zone. City-wide Impact. (PLOTA20180216)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6** | **\*\*ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED\*\*An ordinance amending Provo City Code to increase the amount of residential development in the Regional Shopping Center (SC3) Zone. City-wide Impact. (PLOTA20180231)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7** | **\*\*ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED\*\*An ordinance to amend the General Plan regarding the future Land Use Map that included Provo City Land west of the I-15 freeway, and south of the Provo River. Lakewood, Sunset, Provo Bay, and Fort Utah Neighborhoods. (PLGPA20180225)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8** | **Resolution 2018-35 appropriating $75,000 in the Fire Department, General Fund for fire station equipment improvements applying to the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019. (18-087) (**[**0:43:55**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=2635)**)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Motion:** | An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-35, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule. |

Fire Chief James Miguel presented. The Fire Department was requesting an appropriation of $75,000 for diesel emissions equipment to remove the emissions when the apparatus is running. This equipment reduces cancer causing agents. He showed an example of one of the devices currently being used. The existing system was from Europe and getting parts had become difficult and expensive. In 2017 and 2018 combined, the repair costs exceeded $25,000. When there was a delay, the system was out of order and the emissions remain in the bay. He wanted to avoid putting money into a failing system. He said there was better technology available and showed an example of a new air scrubbing technology that was already in use at the airport fire station. These systems were recommended by the FDA and OSHA. The systems would be installed in stations 3, 4, and 5. There was no need to replace stations 1 or 2 because if the Police, Fire, and City Facilities bond was approved by voters, these buildings would be replaced. Chief Miguel explained that $40,000 would come from the general fund and $35,000 from revenue generated from their involvement in battling wildfires in the western United States. The installation time was 8 weeks.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Roll Call Vote:** | The implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-34 passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9** | **Ordinance 2018-28 amending Provo City Code Chapter 14.41 (Home Occupations) to better preserve the residential character of Neighborhoods. (PLOTA20180109) (**[**0:49:41**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=2981)**)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Motion:** | An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2018-28, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule. |

Brian Maxfield, Planning Supervisor, explained this item had been heard by council several times. Mr. Handley had some questions from previous meetings, he asked if those had been resolved. Mr. Handley said he didn’t see changes in the ordinance pertaining specifically to daycare. One of the things he wondered about was mentioned in an email from someone else that pertained to a preschool situation. He thought the conditions of preschools needed be addressed separately. Mr. Jones agreed it would be best to address this separately because daycares were addressed in a separate section of the ordinance, not the one being amended.

Mr. Knecht said an email was sent to neighborhood chairs and vice chairs, he wondered if Mr. Maxfield had received any response. Mr. Maxfield said many did not like major home occupations, at all. Mr. Knecht agreed with Mr. Maxfield’s observation but said some were glad the city was trying to mitigate and deal with the impacts of major home occupations.

Mr. Harding said accessory apartments existed outside of the A and S overlay areas; for example, they could exist in RC zones, where duplexes were allowed. There was an option that had been outlined that would allow council to restrict major home occupation in the A and S overlays where accessory apartments existed. Mr. Jones explained the Housing Committee had been working on an ordinance the would amend the A and S overlays and would combine them into a single chapter of the code to reconcile the few differences between the two. So, if there was a concern that the council felt like major home occupations and accessory apartments should not coexist on a property in these overlays because of the intent for which the overlays were created, but did not think that the prohibition should apply elsewhere in the city where accessory apartments might also be found, like the RC zone, then that could be addressed by removing the prohibition against the coexisting accessory apartments and major home occupations from the current draft, and the same prohibition could be inserted into the proposed amendments to the A and S overlays.

Mr. Harding asked if the council had a preference. Mr. Stewart replied that he was ready to move ahead and vote on the item as is.

Chair Winterton opened public comment to neighborhood chairs.

Rachel Luke, Rock Canyon Neighborhood Chair, recalled that one week earlier in a neighborhood meeting, there was a proposal to increase density on a parcel and would allow 20 homes where only 10 had been previously allowed. She said this was common across the city. More people in less space, with less parking, privacy, etc. If the ordinance were to remain unchanged, and home occupation were to continue to have open ended restrictions, then problems would only increase and tax city resources. She was in favor of the amendment.

Nancy Wilson, Indian Hills Neighborhood Chair, explained that maintaining the residential character of their neighborhood was a priority. She appreciated the intent and was in favor of the amendment.

Pam Jones, Edgemont Vice Chair, said several years ago, there were many relatives renting a home across from her parents, they were in a band and liked to play trumpets at all hours, many neighbors complained. She was told the renters were not welcomed by the neighborhood and eventually they were asked to leave. They moved a few blocks away to Rock Canyon Neighborhood, but they have the same type of problem with noise, concerts, litter, parking, etc. Parents of young children were concerned. Ms. Jones was surprised this type of problem was still happening. She thought the noise ordinance should be enforced. Ms. Jones felt the hours proposed for this amendment were still too restrictive. She thought business hours should be able to begin at 7 a.m. to allow business to take place before standard work hours. Ms. Jones also wondered how the average number of customers would be determined. Mr. Knecht said it was a maximum per hour, not an average. He added the intent was to ensure the nature of the neighborhood remain intact.

Public comment was opened.

Nathan Welch, Provo, voiced his support for the amendments. The ambiguity of the current language has allowed home businesses to interpret this issue differently, causing neighborhoods to have to deal with significant commercial activities in an area that was not zoned for these purposes. He had read the changes and hoped council would support them. He wanted to compare the application for home businesses to that of accessory apartments. He said the code associated with applying for an accessory apartment was thorough, including the requirement for off-street parking and the requirement that the homes should continue to appear as a single-family dwelling. Mr. Welch thought it was interesting that the code for accessory apartment overlay zones was clearer than the process to apply for a home occupation permit.

Steve Luke, Rock Canyon Neighborhood, was in favor of the current amendments. He said clarifying the code would also help to protect business owners. It would help business owners start a new business without upsetting anyone. The intent was to preserve the residential character, but also helped business owners.

Chair Winterton closed public comment.

Mr. Handley expressed his support. It was a difficult balance to respect property rights, character of a neighborhood, and different types of businesses with different impacts. He said it was not always a perfect balance, but he was supportive for the reasons Mr. Luke described. Enforcing the conditions that were already in the code had been challenging, he hoped that having clarity would help. Mr. Handley was also looking forward to looking more specifically at the conditions for preschools.

Mr. Sewell thanked everyone who collaborated on the amendments. Many people, residents included, had participated over a period of time with meetings and email exchanges.

Chair Winterton called for a vote on the implied motion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Roll Call Vote:** | The implied motion to approve Ordinance 2018-28 passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **10** | **\*\*ITEM TO START AT/OR AFTER 6:30 PM\*\*A public meeting allowing for the presentation of arguments for and against the proposition to issue up to $69 million of general obligation bonds for the purpose of financing the costs of acquiring, constructing, and equipping in the downtown area a new police and fire headquarters, emergency dispatch center, and city hall; acquiring, constructing, and equipping a new fire station to replace the fire station on Canyon Road, and providing for related improvements in Provo City. (18-073) (**[**1:09:35**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=4175)**)** |

Mr. Jones explained that this was a statutory meeting. The bond election required the city gather arguments for and against the bond to be published in a voter information pamphlet. The arguments would be presented as part of this public meeting. State code also required a public meeting to be held to allow others to present their testimony. Mr. Jones explained the audience was the public, not the council. The council had already made their intent known by passing a resolution to put the item on the ballot. The procedure would include Amanda Ercanbrack, City Recorder, reading the City’s official position in favor of the bond and the reasons therefor, as well as reading the private citizen for and against arguments and rebuttals. Following this, council would allow public comment in 15-minute increments; 15 minutes for those who want to speak in favor of the bond and 15 minutes for those who want to speak against the bond. Because Mr. Winterton had written the argument for the bond, Mr. Harding would chair the remainder of the meeting to avoid the appearance of bias or impropriety.

Ms. Ercanbrack read the following:

* City’s statement in favor of the bond ([1:13:38](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?list=PLkFpcBv4i9_Bpan5oFpuqmZP3-u4UppaI&t=4418))
* Argument for the bond, written by Gary Winterton, Bill Fillmore, Austin Taylor, and Karl N. Snow Jr. ([1:16:47](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?list=PLkFpcBv4i9_Bpan5oFpuqmZP3-u4UppaI&t=4607))
* Rebuttal to the argument in favor, written by Sarah Asay ([1:19:38](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?list=PLkFpcBv4i9_Bpan5oFpuqmZP3-u4UppaI&t=4772))
* Argument against the bond, written by Ms. Asay ([1:21:03](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?list=PLkFpcBv4i9_Bpan5oFpuqmZP3-u4UppaI&t=4862))
* Rebuttal to the argument against the bond, written by Mr. Winterton ([1:23:56](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?list=PLkFpcBv4i9_Bpan5oFpuqmZP3-u4UppaI&t=5036))

All arguments and rebuttals are attached to the permanent minutes.

Vice Chair Harding opened public comment. He explained this process was guided by state statute and it was important to stay within the parameters of the statute. He reminded the public there would be a two-minute time limit for each speaker. The comment period would begin with 15 minutes for arguments in favor, followed by 15 minutes for arguments against. Mr. Harding asked the comments related to the issuance of the bond or economic impact of the buildings that would be built as a result of the bond, be reserved for item 11. Comments related to the procedures of holding a bond election should be reserved for item 12.

Pam Jones, Edgemont Neighborhood, said the person who wrote the argument against the bond must not have gone on the tours. She recalled telling former Mayor John Curtis that anytime Provo has considered a tax hike or bond, she has objected, but she is in favor of this. She said the difference was in getting more information. She felt this was a need, not a want.

Beth Alligood, Provo, was in favor of the bond, especially for the Police Department. The facilities were inadequate. When advocating for the bond at the Farmer’s Market, Ms. Alligood told people that technology has come a very long way since the 1970s and the building was not adequate to handle the new technology. Officers were working out of their cars to complete reports and there was not a safe space to conduct interviews with victims or suspects. The purpose of the bond was not for pretty new office buildings, rather a new police department. The city was renting other buildings to provide officers with the space needed. She said the dissenting arguments even acknowledge the critical need. Addressing the need now was better than addressing it later, according to Ms. Alligood.

With no further comments, the time for commenting in favor of the bond was closed. Mr. Harding invited anyone with comments against the bond to approach the podium.

John Payne, Provo property and business owner, was not in attendance to voice opposition, but he had questions. He understood the issue and the needs, and he wanted to do something about it. Mr. Payne’s questions included the following:

* Where would the final location be?
* Had a decision been made on which site was most effective and what would help council decide?
* Does the cost of the bond get distributed to any property in Utah County owned by a Provo resident; or only properties in Provo?
* Was there an alternative for citizens of Provo to pay over time, rather than those who only own property in Provo.
* Could a sales tax option be considered?

Mr. Payne estimated that over 10-15 years, the bond would cost him over $50,000 for the properties he owned in Provo.

Robin Roberts, Provo resident, was surprised at the lack of people in attendance. He owned two businesses and a home in Provo. According to Mr. Robert’s calculations, the bond would cost him $50,000 over 20 years. He wrote a letter to the council and asked for questions answered, he got three responses. He asked how much money had been saved in 45 years, knowing the buildings would need to be replaced. Spend it or lose it is the wrong concept. He said tax payers could not continue to foot the bill every time more money was needed. He planned to vote no. He was willing to support the cheaper option.

Nicholas Merrill, Provo, asked if renderings of the architecture or layouts would be available to help the voters make a decision. He also thought the costs could be more fairly distributed by not putting the burden solely on the property owners.

Mr. Jones advised the council not to answer questions during this portion of the meeting. His concern was that someone might think it was inequitable for the time being given for or against. He encouraged the public to visit voteprovo.com to find answers to their questions or visit with the councilors following the meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **11** | **A public hearing regarding (i) the proposed issuance of up to $69 million of general obligation bonds for the purpose of financing the costs of acquiring, constructing, and equipping in the downtown area a new police and fire headquarters, emergency dispatch center, and city hall; acquiring, constructing, and equipping a new fire station to replace the fire station on Canyon Road, and providing for related improvements in Provo City; and (ii) the economic impact of the project on the private sector. (18-073) (**[**1:42:10**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=6130)**)** |

John Borget, Administrative Services Director, explained this hearing was a legal requirement to give individuals the opportunity to come forward to discuss anything that was not covered with item 10. Mr. Harding emphasized that comments needed to be focused on this item only. Mr. Jones said this hearing was required by a different section of the code and was required anytime bonds were issued. He said this hearing had to take place before the election, despite being about the issuance of bonds that can only be issued if the bond election is successful. The commenters should take into consideration that the comments were only relevant if the bond was approved. This hearing was regarding the actual process for the issuance of bonds, assuming they have been approved by voters, as well as comments on the economic impact on the private sector of the facilities being built by the bond.

Vice Chair Harding opened public comment.

Robin Roberts, Provo, said it was interesting that public was supposed to comment on economic impact even thought a location had not been determined. Mr. Roberts wanted to know what the $69 million would be used for, where the building would be built, and what it would look like. He said the council had done their homework and he felt the bond for $48 million was sufficient (for one of the options previously considered at Provo Towne Centre Mall). He would have supported the smaller bond. He thought $69 million for the unknown was too much. He reiterated his surprise about the lack of people in attendance.

Beth Alligood, Provo, spoke with Wayne Parker and reviewed the renderings that had been created years ago. She thought this would have a great impact in downtown. She agreed with Mr. Roberts and believed there needed to be a physical representation of the building. She thought a physical structure would help to show the positive impact the building could have on downtown. The economic impact of the building itself would decrease the costs of maintenance for the city.

John Payne, Provo, wanted to know if there was a project rate at which the bonds would be sold. He also asked if they were general obligation bonds.

Eric Hunter, Bond Counsel from Chapman and Cutler LLP, said these would be general obligation bonds, with rates to be established at the time of pricing. Mr. Harding asked what the rate would be if the bonds were issued now. Mr. Hunter said as bond counsel, he would defer to the financial advisor.

There were no other comments. Vice Chair Harding closed public comment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **12** | **Resolution 2018-36 establishing certain procedures relating to the holding of a bond election relating to the proposed issuance of up to $69 million of general obligation bonds for the purpose of financing the costs of acquiring, constructing, and equipping in the downtown area a new police and fire headquarters, emergency dispatch center, and city hall; acquiring, constructing, and equipping a new fire station to replace the fire station on Canyon Road, and providing for related improvements in Provo City. (18-073) (**[**1:52:12**](https://youtu.be/6pmT7sCiLTA?t=6732)**)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Motion:** | An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-36, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule. |

Eric Hunter, Bond Counsel from Chapman and Cutler LLP, explained this resolution was procedural and sets in motion the various things the election officers, poll workers, and other various employees needed to do to prepare for the bond election. This resolution provides for a notice of the bond election to be published, a meeting of the board of canvassers, and a standard reimbursement resolution. This would allow reimbursement for project expenses that occurred before the bond closing.

Mr. Winterton wanted to help the public understand the process of getting a bond approved. Mr. Hunter said the city worked with the financial advisor and their firm to find an underwriter. Then the underwriter and the financial advisors provide checks and balances on each other to get the best rate on the bond under market conditions. Then, there would be another resolution to solidify parameters to lock in terms and there would be a public offering, unless the bonds were sold through a private offering which was not common with a bond this size. The security for the bond would be the general property taxes; if there was a short fall, it would be an unlimited property tax guarantee to the extent necessary to pay debt service on the bonds.

Public Comment was opened, there was no response.

Mr. Knecht said each of the previous three items had same language that described the building being located in the downtown area. He said there seemed to be some confusion about the placement of the building. He asked if it would be appropriate for council to address this, Mr. Jones agreed. Mr. Knecht said using this language left the option open, there was more than one possible location. If the bond passes, then the city would do what is best for the tax payers by locating at the most auspicious location, which had yet to be determined. Mr. Winterton mentioned there had been one proposal they considered just a week before selecting the option for a new building in the downtown area. Mr. Sewell said there was the possibility of building a tall vertical structure on the west side of the block, which would allow current offices to remain functioning during construction. There were other possibilities involving land swaps, but he felt it was inappropriate to discuss those.

There was no other council discussion. Vice Chair Harding called for a vote on the implied motion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Roll Call Vote:** | The implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-36 passed 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor. |

Prior to the meeting being adjourned, Mr. Jones said he had received an email from Cliff Strachan, Council Executive Director, announcing that all of the questions asked during the meeting were being added to the website.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 7:28 p.m.