



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

Regular Meeting Minutes

5:36 PM, Tuesday, November 27, 2018

Room 200, Municipal Council Chambers

Municipal Council Chambers, 351 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

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 George Handley

Council Member George Stewart

Council Member Vernon K. Van Buren

Council Member Gary Winterton

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

CAO Wayne Parker

Council Attorney Brian Jones

Council Executive Director Clifford Strachan

Conducting: Council Chair Gary Winterton

Prayer – Mary Millar, Spring Creek Neighborhood Chair

Pledge of Allegiance – Nisha King, Provo City Police Department

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

A presentation of the Employee of the Month for November 2018 ([0:11:04](#))

Police Chief Ferguson announced that Jacob Wilson was selected as Employee of the Month for November 2018. Mr. Wilson started with the police department seven years ago as a parking enforcement officer. He had been employed in his current position as an animal control officer for the past three years. Mr. Wilson has been instrumental in administering the Urban Deer Program for Provo City. He has the ability to communicate with people and being sympathetic to their concerns. Mr. Wilson and his wife Abby have four children. He enjoyed spending time with his family and the spending time in the outdoors. He was a hardworking and invaluable member of the police department.

A presentation on the establishment of the proposed impact fees (18-099) ([0:17:04](#))

John Borget, Provo City Administrative Services Director, stated it was important to note the impact fee study had been through a very thorough process, beginning in July 2017. The complete report would be available on the council and finance webpages. Zion's Finance was selected as the consultant for this project with Susie Becker as project manager. Ms. Becker was invited to give a brief overview of the proposed impact fees. Mr. Borget noted the official public hearing for this item would be held on Tuesday, December 11, 2018.

Ms. Becker introduced the entire consultant team. The team consisted of Megan Weber with Zion’s Finance (water, sewer, fire, police), Keith Larsen with Bowen Collins (engineering for sewer, storm drain, and water), and Jeremy Searle with Hales Engineering (transportation).

Ms. Becker gave a presentation summarizing the proposed impact fees that the council would consider for adoption (presentation attached to permanent minutes). She stated that impact fees needed to address projects that would have citywide impact, not projects for specific areas.

Shown below is a table listing the current impact fees and proposed impact fees in each department for single-family residential (SFR) and multi-family residential (MFR) units. The fees for MFR included an impact fee per unit for dwellings with three or more units. Duplexes were assessed the SFR fee for impact fees such as transportation.

<u>Description</u>	<u>Current Fee</u>	<u>Proposed SFR Fee</u>	<u>Proposed MFR Fee</u>
Power	\$1,282.00	\$1,750.00	\$1,750.00
Sewer	\$1,230.00	\$2,370.64	\$2,370.64
Water	\$ 760.00	\$4,042.80	\$4,042.80
Fire	N/A	\$ 196.47	\$ 82.16
Police	N/A	\$ 165.60	\$ 203.25
Storm Drain	\$ 890.00	\$1,755.44	\$ 438.86
Transportation	\$ 986.00	\$1,293.06	\$ 960.96
Parks & Recreation	<u>\$3,088.00</u>	<u>\$3,105.10</u>	<u>\$2,884.62</u>
Total Impact Fees	\$8,236.00	\$14,949.53	\$12,733.29

Chair Winterton invited public comment but explained the official public hearing for this item would be held on December 11, 2018.

Krisel Travis, D.R. Horton, noted the sewer impact fee was based on the average equivalent unit (ERU). The report stated the ERU’s in Provo had 26 fixtures. D.R. Horton built thousands of homes and she estimated the average ERU’s should be closer to 20 fixtures. She asked for clarification on how they settled on 26 fixtures.

Steve Turley, Provo, supported the concept of increasing the impact fees. His concern was that the proposed impact fee would almost double the current fee. He hoped the council would consider phasing in the impact fees over the next few years.

There were no more public comments.

Keith Larsen, Bowen Collins, was invited to address the sewer ERU question raised by Ms. Travis. He reported the 26 fixture units was a value provided by the city, based on historic observations. He clarified that the 26 fixture units was only being used for the conversion of non-residential properties. As for single-family residences, they looked at flows per house, independent of fixture units. If they went from 26 to 20, the fee for non-residential would go up because non-residential units using 1,000 gallons would be equal to a larger number of ERU’s. He was willing to look at the 26 fixtures for commercial units to determine if adjustments needed to be made.

Mr. Borget reported that our legal counsel expressed concern about phasing in the impact fees. They stated that impact fees were tied to project plans. If the full amount was not collected from the beginning, there would not be enough impact fees to fund the growth. Impact fees were complex. The council would be discussing this issue in detail in order to make an informed decision.

Mr. Stewart said that impact fees had not been increased since 2005. For all those years, developers paid impact fees that were not covering our actual costs. As a result, the proposed fees were significantly higher because, in the past, they were artificially low. The state required a 90-day waiting period before implementation of the new fees. That would give developers time to prepare for the increase so he was not in favor of phasing in the new fees.

Mr. Van Buren noted that the city was built 150 years ago without impact fees. It was important to consider that impact fees were now being increased, not to make up for past fee shortages, but to cover the cost of new construction.

Chair Winterton stated again that this item would be on the December 11, 2018 council meeting agenda for the official public hearing and final review.

Public Comment ([0:17:04](#))

Chair Winterton invited public comment on matters that were not on the agenda.

Teri McCabe, Franklin Neighborhood Chair, reported the neighborhood was concerned with the lack of street lighting in their neighborhood. Three blocks did not have street lighting and 12 of the existing lights in the neighborhood were not functioning. In addition, the intersection at 600 West 300 South had a stop sign but cars were flying through the intersection during drop-off and pick-up times for Franklin Elementary. There should be a crossing guard or flashing red stop sign at that location. She asked the mayor and council to follow up on their concerns.

Police Chief Ferguson and Fire Chief Miguel issued challenge coins to council members for going above and beyond during the recent bond election for new public safety facilities. The new facilities would change the face of our police and fire departments. They also thanked Mayor Kaufusi for her work and dedication towards passing the bond. They said it was an honor to work for a city that cared so much about public safety and their officers.

Council members expressed their support for public services and said the bond would not have been approved if not for the needs and great leadership from our police and fire departments.

Lisa Brockbank, Edgemont area, said a statement in the last meeting implied that 100 percent of residents in the area did not support the Timp-Kiwanis Bounous Park conversion. She wanted to express her desire to move forward with approving the environmental assessment in hopes of selling the Timp-Kiwanis Bounous Park to the school district. Parks and Recreation had gone above and beyond to provide a regional sports park for the community. She asked council members to think about what was best for the entire community and not a small area.

Action Agenda

1. An ordinance amending Provo City Code to Public Works standards. Citywide impact. (PLOTA20180348) ([1:05:57](#))

Josh Yost, Provo City Planner, presented. The proposed ordinance was a yearly amendment to update the public works development guidelines and standard drawings. There were a limited number of changes to the guidelines and drawings. The Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval.

David Day, Development Engineering Coordinator, indicated the update included 15 drawings with minor alterations and one new drawing. He reviewed the minor alterations with council members. The new drawing was for directional boring to help address problems with companies hitting sewer lines. There were also a number of text changes made to clarify the requirements.

The only changes to the development guideline section was in the culinary water and sewer systems. Most of those changes were technical updates.

Chair Winterton invited public comment. There was no response to the request.

Chair Winterton proposed putting this item on the consent agenda in two weeks. If any council member wanted further discussion at that time, they could request the item be placed back on the action agenda.

Mr. Stewart made the following motion.

Motion: Council Member Stewart made a motion to take this item off the action agenda and place it on the consent agenda in two weeks. The motion was seconded by Council Member Handley.

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

2. Ordinance 2018-33 amending the Zone Map Classification of approximately 2.94 acres generally located at 1080 E 1320 S, from Residential (R1.10) to Low Density Residential (LDR). Spring Creek Neighborhood. (PLRZ20180102) ([1:14:48](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Ordinance 2018-33, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Bill Peperone, Provo City Community Development Assistant Director, presented. The proposed property was rezoned a few months ago from Light Industrial (M1) to R1.10 as part of the Southeast Neighborhood Plan. According to the plan, it was anticipated the property would eventually be Low Density Residential (LDR). The LDR zone would allow townhomes, up to 15 units per acre, with no stacked housing. The developer had been working with staff to redesign his project to meet those requirements. The Planning Commission supported the amendment.

Mary Millar, Spring Creek Neighborhood Chair, said this would be a good development for the area. There was no opposition to the proposal during a neighborhood meeting held last February. There were some concerns about a proposed road in the area but felt the city could work out any differences.

Chair Winterton invited public comment.

Steve Turley, Provo, lived in the area and had property under contract just south of the proposed development. He supported the development but felt the proposed road alignment would not work. The developers had been asked to add two streets that were not on the Provo City Master Street Plan or the adopted Southeast Area Plan - one street in the proposed development and another street on the property he owned. The street would be a thoroughfare (without stop signs) along the railroad tracks from the Mountain Vista area up through 900 East. The master plan had a dotted line showing the street further to the east. He hoped the council would consider the placement of the proposed roads as part of the approval process.

There were no more public comments.

Mr. Strachan stated the road issue was addressed at the Planning Commission meeting. It was explained that the dotted line on the master plan indicated a possible road in the area, but did not establish the actual path. The Planning Commission approved the proposed road alignments.

Responding to a question from Mr. Stewart, Gary McGinn, Provo City Community Development Director, agreed that the master plans did not indicate every road that would go into a development. Dashed lines on the plan indicated where roads were anticipated, but actual roads would be added or defined later based on the pattern of development and zoning.

Mr. Harding asked where the proposed thoroughfare was expected to start and terminate. Would structures need to be demolished in order to build the road? Mr. Peperone replied that, in some cases, houses would need to be taken down. There were also projects along the south portion that would require developers to dedicate land for the road. The proposed road would run from 600 South to 1860 South.

Mr. Harding expressed concern that the area was being developed with the same type of housing as other developments in the area. He would prefer a mix of developments but understood it was dependent upon the developers. He would like to have more roads to provide better interconnectivity between developments/communities.

Chair Winterton noted there was no request to continue this item for two weeks so he called for a vote on the implied motion to adopt the ordinance.

Roll Call Vote: The implied motion to adopt Ordinance 2018-33 was approved 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

3. 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. (PLOT20180216) ([1:40:15](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt the proposed ordinance, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Dustin Wright, Provo City Planner, presented. The applicant had requested the ordinance amendment to increase the standards for towing and impound yards adjacent to residential uses. After reviewing

the application, and looking at other sections of the code that applied to this issue, staff recommended enhancing the requirements. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the staff version. Provo City Code 14.24.350 was amended to include a list of criteria to help mitigate concerns regarding adjacency to residential uses. The following recommendations were made:

- Increase the setback from ten feet to 30 feet.
- Remove chain link fencing as an allowable fencing material around impound yards.
- Require masonry walls around impound yards adjacent to residential zones.
- Impound lots restricted to one towing company if adjacent to residential zone.
- Restrict impound lots to three towing companies if not adjacent to residential zones.
- Disallow impound lots in the General Commercial (CG) zone.

Mr. Van Buren asked if it was an industry standard that multiple towing companies used a single impound yard. If so, how would we enforce limiting them to one operator if adjacent to a residential zone? Mr. Wright did not know if the three existing impound lots adjacent to a residential zone had more than one operator. In general, many of impound lots had multiple towing operators. One way to enforce the ordinance would be to look up the property address of the impound lot when towing operators applied for their annual business license. If a towing company was already listed at that address, we would not issue a business license to that entity.

Mr. Jones noted that many of the towing companies wanted to be on the law enforcement rotation list. We have had issues in the past with one person owning multiple towing companies and putting them all on the rotation list. He said this amendment would determine whether a towing company was truly independent.

In response to a question from Mr. Stewart, Mr. Wright said the ordinance would eliminate multiple trips generated to and from one site if an impound lot adjacent to residential zones was limited to one towing operator.

Chair Winterton invited the applicant, Steve Turley, to comment. Mr. Turley said he was informed by a neighbor that an impound lot was opened up immediately adjacent to his proposed 63 unit residential development. There was no fencing or license application made. He said it was a single operator that owned five tow trucks, each listed under a different company name. He looked at the code and found some ambiguities so he submitted an application for amendments to the code. He asked if the city wanted impound lots adjacent to residential areas. An impound lot could be placed across the street from a residential zone and it would not apply to the same standard as if it was immediately adjacent. In order to address that concern, he had asked for a buffer zone of 200 feet. The Planning Commission recommended a 30-foot buffer so he asked the council to consider a larger transitional standard.

Mr. Turley felt the Planning Commission overlooked wood as a fencing material. They pulled out chain link fencing but left wood fencing in the code. He asked the council to remove wood as an allowed fencing material. Wood needed to be maintained on a regular basis in order to make it look nice. Additionally, wood was not a sound barrier and did not provide the same protection as a masonry fence.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sewell, Mr. Wright replied that eliminating wood fencing was not in the applicant's original application, only the 200-foot buffer zone.

Mr. Knecht stated that the amendment did not specify if the required masonry wall was on one side of the impound lot or on all sides of the property. If the property was adjacent to a residential property,

it would preclude wood because masonry would be required. Mr. Wright said they could add “on all sides” to the masonry requirement.

Mr. Harding did not feel that requiring a masonry wall on all sides would add value to residential units. If a zone boundary ran down a street, was it still considered adjacent? Mr. Wright replied that it would be considered adjacent because zone boundaries ran down the middle of streets. Therefore, an owner would be required to build a masonry wall along the street side of the lot.

Chair Winterton invited Mary Miller, Spring Lake Neighborhood Chair, to comment. Ms. Miller stated the new impound lot on south State Street was an eyesore and woefully inadequate and needed to be addressed. She agreed that wood fencing should be removed from the list of allowable fencing because it had a tendency to decay. A neighborhood meeting was not held concerning this issue but two other neighborhood chairs commented during the Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Winterton invited public comment. There was no response to the request.

In response to a question from Mr. Sewell, Mr. Wright replied that Community Development did not have a preference so they had no problem removing wood fencing from the list.

Mr. Harding said the council could adopt the ordinance as written because it was more stringent than the current ordinance. They could then request that Community Development look at other concerns, such as increasing the buffer zone and eliminating wood fencing.

Mr. Knecht was not in favor of adopting the ordinance if it was not right. Because of the current situation in south Provo, the concerns needed to be addressed properly. He opposed wood and chain link fencing around impound lots and was in favor of a masonry fence around the entire property (if it was adjacent to residential use). However, if they approved a 200-foot buffer, the type of fencing would not be as important. Taking out wood fencing limited what people could do in an industrial zone. He wanted an ordinance that was effective and reasonable, but also defensible.

Mr. Van Buren did not want to vote on the issue that night. The proposed 30-foot buffer did not protect residential areas. He was inclined to say a 200-foot buffer zone might be too large, but it protected neighborhoods.

Mr. Stewart was not in favor of allowing impound lots next to residential zones. He wanted to make sure the proposed ordinance was the best it could be to protect neighborhoods. He wanted this item continued for two weeks.

Chair Winterton stated that, due to council requests, this item would be continued to the December 11, 2018 meeting. Since the impound lot in question was in Mr. Knecht’s district he was asked to work with Community Development on proposed changes to the ordinance.

4. Resolution 2018-42 approving an Environmental Assessment regarding a proposed Land and Water Conversion Fund property conversion (17-036) ([2:09:43](#))

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-42, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Brian Jones, Council Attorney, clarified that state law required an open public comment period on this item. The official public comment period was closed at the November 13, 2018 council meeting. The council would still allow ten minutes of public comment, but the Environmental Assessment would not include any comments made that night.

Thomas McKenna, Provo City Parks & Recreation Planning and Projects Manager, asked the council to approve the Environmental Assessment report. If approved, it would be forwarded to the National Parks Service (NPS) for their review and authorization to sell the Timp-Kiwanis Bounous Park to the school district.

Chair Winterton invited public comment.

Sharon Memmott, Edgemont Neighborhood Vice Chair, thanked the council for letting them be part of the process and hoped their participation would continue. She asked that the council include deed restrictions as part of the resolution. She wanted to ensure that the school board put something in writing showing their willingness to maintain a portion of the property as a neighborhood park.

Elda Benson, Edgemont area, felt there had been give and take between council members, the school district, and the neighborhood. All parties were trying to accomplish the needs of everyone. She did not believe all the questions were answered fully in the revised Environmental Assessment, especially those considered outside the scope of the environmental assessment. She would like Provo City to respond to those questions.

Ms. Benson stated the council considered the Land, Water, and Conservation Fund (LWCF) document during the discussions and meetings. However, Mr. Jones referenced statutes from the Legal Information Institute. It seemed the city and citizens were getting information concerning this issue from two different sources. She asked which information was the most current and accurate.

Sharlene Goodliffe, Provo, did not believe that taking away a community park on the east side of Provo and replacing it with a regional sports park on the other side of the city was equivalent. Many cities were trying to build pocket parks to serve the physical and social environment in small areas of the community. Provo City already had that type of park. Having a local park was not the same as being forced to drive across town for a regional park. If the city chooses to break the agreements made in the past, they needed to obtain a written agreement from the school district that they would continue to provide a local park on the property.

Jay Goodliffe, Provo, commented. He clarified that Lisa Brockbank, who spoke earlier, was the Chair of the Parks & Recreation Board and was Region V Director for the Utah Youth Soccer Association. He just wanted to understand where she was coming from in expressing support for the regional sports complex over the "tiny" park in their neighborhood. He was in favor of tiny neighborhood pocket parks but was also in favor of the soccer complex. He did not feel you had to have one at the expense of the other. He noted the letter concerning deed restrictions, written by Provo School District Superintendent Keith Rittel, was non-binding. He asked for something in writing that would commit to maintaining the park in its current state (as much as possible).

Mr. Goodliffe felt the Environmental Assessment was more of an advocacy documents than an assessment document. They were finding any arguments that would get them what they wanted. For

instance, they wanted to follow the state's requirement of how much acreage a high school should have, but they did not want to follow those same guidelines for elementary and middle schools.

Chair Winterton closed public comment.

Mr. Handley expressed gratitude for all citizen input and staff work on this issue. There had been a healthy evolution with this project. If the resolution was approved, what type of binding agreement did they need in order to keep that space functioning as it had in perpetuity? We did not have a firm agreement in writing because the school board was reluctant to do that before the process had gone through to completion. He was firmly committed to making sure the deed restrictions happened.

Mr. Handley responded to one of Ms. Benson's unanswered questions concerning adequate protection for its parks so we are not constantly renegotiating selling a park. He said the LWCF required the city to complete an environmental assessment and provide equivalent property. He did not think the LWCF cared what happened to the property after the sale was completed. The council needed to be clear that they were committed to working with neighborhoods to provide green space and parks.

Mr. Handley did not think the assessment was justification for something they already wanted. The Environmental Assessment made it clear there were legitimate concerns about Title IX requirements and acreage that a high school needed. A 5A high school with athletic programs was not the same thing as other schools. If elementary and middle schools had space needs, we would need to look at those, but he did not want to trade out parks in order to solve the school district's problems. We need to make sure the needs of schools and neighborhoods were met. The council could work with Parks & Recreation to find ways of protecting our parks.

Chair Winterton stated it was good to have the school district within the boundary of the city. We did not have to work with other cities to address these types of concerns.

Mr. Jones responded to Ms. Benson's question about the most current document to use for researching LWCF guidelines. He had quoted from a website, hosted by the Cornell Law School, called the Legal Information Institute. They hosted an open source and free copy of the U.S. Code that was easier to navigate. If you go directly to the federal government website uscode.house.gov and search for Title 54 Section 200305, you would find the same information as shared from the Legal Information Institute.

Mr. Knecht understood the property had to be appraised and sold at its full book value. By putting deed restrictions or an easement on the property, could it affect the value? Could we sell the property with an easement? Mr. Jones responded that the city was required to establish the fair market value and substitute it with property of the same market value. He was not sure, but felt that restrictions could affect the value and would play into the question of whether full value was received.

Mr. Jones said that Mr. Rittel did not want to negotiate the precise terms of any deed restrictions prior to getting permission from the NPS to convert the property. They felt there was a chance the NPS might put conditions on the conversion that could change what had been negotiated.

Going a step further, Mr. Handley asked about making a deal to sell the property that included, in writing, a commitment that a deed restriction would be placed upon it. Once the appraisal was completed, we had to get that amount from the school district, even if that land was no longer worth the full amount with a deed restriction. Mr. Jones said this question needed further research.

Mr. Harding said the issue at hand was approving the Environmental Assessment. Further research and discussion could be held with the school district concerning possible deed restrictions or easements.

Mr. Sewell felt we were moving toward a win-win solution (as close as we could get). He expressed concern about the continued trust in government because he had seen many decisions made out of expediency. He tried to imagine how he would feel if he had been involved in the discussions when the Bounous family agreed to sell the property with an agreement it would remain a park in perpetuity. He hoped that the Bounous family would be happy if the school continued to use the property for sports fields and the south portion of the property had strong legal protection to remain a public park. He supported approving the Environmental Assessment and sending it to the federal government for consideration.

With no further council discussion, Chair Winterton called for a vote on the implied motion.

Roll Call Vote: The implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-42 was approved 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

5. Resolution 2018-43 approving a substantial amendment to the program year 2018 annual action plan, fourth year update to the five-year consolidation plan, as amended (18-100)
[\(2:46:04\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-43, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Dan Gonzalez, Redevelopment Agency, presented. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) imposed limits on the cost of a home that could be purchased using HOME funding. A considerable number of eligible homes were not large enough for families or were in need of repairs. Local Participating Jurisdictions (PJ) gathered and analyzed data of all single-family home sales in Utah County for the month of August 2018. A total of 656 homes were identified with an average price of \$398,135 and a median price of \$347,818. The amount that could be funded through HUD was 95 percent of a median home, or \$330,600. The current allowance was \$255,000. A search of realtor.com in Utah County identified the following available units that would qualify under HUD requirements:

	Current Limit	Proposed Limit
	<u>\$255,000</u>	<u>\$330,600</u>
Mobile Homes	10	10
Condominiums or Townhomes	305	550
Single-Family Homes	<u>132</u>	<u>714</u>
Total Available Units	447	1,274

It was clear that the HUD limit of \$255,000 was inadequate. We were providing the necessary analysis to HUD requesting an increase to \$330,600. This required an amendment to the annual action plan and fourth year update to the 2015 consolidation plan. A 30-day comment period began on October 28, 2018 and would conclude on November 26, 2018. The public was made aware of this proposal through public notices in the paper and social media outlets. The amendment would increase the number of homes available to families and allow a better variety of homes.

Mr. Knecht applauded the effort saying it gave more options to assist families. He asked if this was the first time we had requested an increase. Mr. Gonzalez replied that they had considered increases in the past but this was the first time they were submitting an actual request to HUD for an increase.

Chair Winterton invited public comment.

Brad Bishop, Executive Director of Self Help Homes, said they used HOME funds to help build affordable homes for families. They also used rural federal funds, which had higher allowances than HUD. The current HUD requirements limited the number of families they could assist and homes they could build. They had a 90 percent success rate with building and maintaining homes. It would be a great help to their program if the limits were increased.

There were no more public comments.

Mr. Harding said this was a substantive change and was uncomfortable approving it that night. While it was not controversial, he expressed concern that the money might not go as far. People that might not have qualified before would now qualify. Overall, it was a net positive opportunity for residents.

Responding to council concerns and questions, Mr. Gonzalez made the following comments:

- The amendment did not increase the income limit of qualifying families. It simply produced a larger number of available homes.
- The RDA used the same process to notify the public as all other RDA/HOME items. Public notices were placed in the newspaper and notification was made through several different social media outlets (e.g. emails, Facebook, etc.).
- He was not sure why this item did not go to the work session first. It was possible that with the conversion to new agenda software it was sent directly to a regular council meeting.
- Federal statutes required home value limits when using federal funds for down payment or homebuyer assistance.
- HUD allowed increases to the home value limits when it could be shown that home values in the area were higher than their requirements.
- For the past five years, there had been a dramatic decrease in families using the funds to purchase homes. Five years ago we helped 45 families purchase homes. Last year we helped nine families. The available homes were not adequate for families because they were too small or needed too many repairs.
- With the higher limits, we would be able to help more families.

With no requests to continue this item, Chair Winterton called for a vote on the implied motion to approve the resolution.

Roll Call Vote: The implied motion to approve Resolution 2018-43 was approved 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m. by common consent.