



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Work Meeting Minutes

1:05 PM, Tuesday, January 22, 2019

Room 310, Provo City Conference Room

351 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

1

2 **Agenda**

3

4 **Roll Call**

5

6 The following elected officials were present:

7 Council Chair David Harding, conducting

8 Council Vice-Chair Kay Van Buren

9 Councilor Gary Winterton

10 Councilor George Stewart

11 Councilor David Knecht

12 Councilor David Sewell

13 Councilor George Handley

14 Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

15

Prayer

16 Council Member David Knecht offered the prayer.

17

Approval of Minutes

18

1. **September 25, 2018 Joint Meeting with Energy Board**

19

2. **September 25, 2018 Work Meeting**

20

21 Minutes approved by unanimous consent.

22

Business

23

3. **A Quarterly Financial Report on the 1st Quarter of FY 2018-2019. (19-007) (0:05:02)**

24

25 John Borget, Administrative Services Director, presented the 1st quarter financial report for FY
26 2018-2019. He noted the quarterly report was for information purposes only and had not been
27 audited.

28

General Fund

29

- 30 • Total revenues were at 24 percent, slightly ahead of budgeted expectations. This was
31 good news because some items, such as property tax revenues, would not be reported
32 until November.

- Transfers in (from enterprise funds) were at 31 percent of budget. Water and power usage was higher during the summer months, which influenced the higher percentage.
- Sales tax revenue was 3.5 percent ahead of prior years and budget estimates.
- Community Development revenues were slightly below budget and prior years. Many of the previous year revenues came from large commercial projects.
- Expenditures were at 20 percent of the estimated budget.

Enterprise Funds

- Water, wastewater, sanitation, and storm drain revenue funds were all slightly above prior years and budget estimates. Some of that could be attributed to increased rates.
- Energy revenues were slightly behind last year and the budget estimate.
- Airport revenues were close to budget but below the prior year comparison.
- Golf course revenues were above budget and expenditures below budget. The city's subsidy has been declining over the past few years. The city was offering a triple play recreation option that should help increase revenues at the golf course.
- Many of the enterprise funds have strong fund balances, which will help build adequate funds to meet the future needs of the departments.

Council members asked if the water CIP budget of \$12,197,282 included the major water line project in Provo Canyon. They also noted the wastewater revenues were nearly \$1 million above last year at this time. Mr. Parker replied that it was probably due to a significant rate increase in the current fiscal year.

Mr. Borget expected the city to stay on a similar trend as the first quarter, meaning our revenues would be higher than budgeted and expenditures lower than budgeted. He would follow up on council member's questions about the CIP budget and increased revenues and report back.

No action taken – presentation only.

4. A discussion on the issuance of up to \$69,000,000 of general obligation bonds for the purpose of financing Fire, Police, and City Facilities and related matters. (19-014) (0:31:52)

Daniel Follett, Division Director – Finance, stated a successful sale of the general obligation bonds was held that morning. Twelve underwriters bid on the bonds. Robert Baird and Company won the bid with an interest rate of 3.03 percent. The annual debt service for 20 years would be approximately \$4.7 mill per year. Annual cost for a \$265,000 home would be \$117.84 per year (\$1.96 less than estimated). For a median business of \$500,000, the annual cost would be \$404.25 (\$6.72 less than estimated). If property values increased during that time, the debt service payments would remain the same but the annual resident/business cost would go down.

The amount of funds available for the new city facilities was \$70,137,872, a little more than \$1 million above estimates. The funds will be used for architectural services and construction. The cost of issuing the bonds was \$240,000. Sale of the bonds was subject to council approval later that night.

75 In response to a question from Mr. Winterton, Mr. Follett stated he would determine the
76 percentage of bond payments paid by residents versus businesses and report back to the council.
77 *Presentation only. This item was scheduled for the regular council meeting later that night.*
78

79 **5. A semi-annual report from the Sustainability Committee. (19-016) (0:38:05)**

80 Don Jarvis, Chair of the Mayor's Sustainability and Natural Resources Committee, gave a
81 presentation to council members. He thanked the city for their broad support of clean air and
82 reviewed several recent contributions.

- 83 • A 2017 resolution, passed by council, supporting diesel testing in Utah County. As a
84 result, Utah State HB 101 was approved last year, which required mandatory testing of all
85 diesel trucks in Utah County. Utah County was the last county along the Wasatch Front
86 to require this testing.
- 87 • Revised Community Property Assessed Clean Energy (C-PACE) regulations made it
88 easier for people to obtain green energy financing to remodel or build new homes with
89 more energy efficient measures. The program also applied to solar net metering projects.
- 90 • Community Development supported the committee by providing facilities for meetings
91 and clerical help.
- 92 • Provo City's employee sustainability committee worked with the committee to share
93 conservation ideas and projects.
- 94 • Provo City hired a parking/sustainability coordinator that will be working with the
95 committee.
- 96 • Greater cooperation with the Provo City Energy Department in creating and promoting
97 energy efficiency in the city. The committee recommended that Provo mount a vigorous
98 campaign advertising Renew Choice.
- 99 • The committee has been invited to participate with land use planning, specifically in
100 southwest Provo.
- 101 • Provo City had an active Agricultural Commission. The commission had been working
102 with the United States Department of Agriculture to find funding for a 38-acre
103 agricultural protection area in northwest Provo.

104
105 Mr. Jarvis reported that Provo and UMPA were moving from coal to lower carbon source power
106 supplies. Natural gas was replacing coal because it was cheaper, more flexible, and produced
107 fewer pollutants. UMPA had proposed that, by the year 2022, 42 percent of their electricity
108 would be produced from low carbon sources. The committee has recommended that 50 percent
109 of Provo's supply of power come from low carbon sources by the year 2030.

110
111 Responding to Chair Harding, Mr. Jarvis replied that he had not heard of any Provo City resident
112 using C-PACE funding. The city needed to raise awareness of the program because it made it
113 less expensive to borrow money for environmental or energy efficiency projects.

114
115 Chair Harding wanted to learn more about electricity rates for solar and commercial
116 improvements. Travis Ball, Energy Department Director, said he would meet with Chair
117 Harding later to discuss rates.

118

119 Mr. Handley asked what efforts were being made to increase the awareness of the Provo Clean
120 Air Toolkit. Mr. Jarvis replied that Congressman Curtis and Envision Utah was working on
121 raising money to increase statewide awareness of the program. The Sustainability Committee
122 was amending the toolkit to include changes that would make it friendlier and easier to
123 implement for families. Mr. Handley agreed with the focus being on small and simple steps,
124 such as using public transportation, combining car trips, and reducing idling.

125
126 Austin Taylor, Provo City Parking and Sustainability Coordinator, gave a presentation
127 concerning zero energy buildings. The purpose was to provide onsite renewable energy systems
128 that would generate as much energy as the building used. It usually costs only five to ten percent
129 more to build large net zero commercial buildings, while saving around 65 percent on energy
130 costs. It was anticipated the new net zero public safety building in Salt Lake City would break
131 even after two years and would save millions in the future. Mr. Taylor proposed that the RFP for
132 the new police, fire, and city buildings encourage net zero bids. Mr. Sewell agreed stating it
133 could save the taxpayers a lot of money over the next 50 years (if not longer). It would make
134 financial sense for the future.

135
136 In response to a question from Mr. Knecht, Mr. Taylor replied that it would take four percent of
137 the building budget to become LEED certified (Leadership in Energy and Environmental
138 Design). Many other companies met the same standards as LEED without the high price tag.

139
140 Mr. Handley expressed concern about the cost of the LEED certification. He felt the
141 certification was not worth the money it would cost. It would be better to spend the funds on
142 energy efficient equipment and upgrades.

143
144 Mr. Harding asked if the city could apply for C-PACE funding. Mr. Taylor said the city could
145 obtain grants and rebates from Dominion Energy and possibly from the federal government for
146 solar projects.

147
148 Mr. Knecht noted it was more expensive to build energy efficiency into a rebuilt or retrofit
149 building than a new building.

150 *No action taken – presentation only.*

151
152 **6. A Discussion on an appropriation for the Urban Deer Program. (18-061) (1:11:07)**

153 Dustin Grabau, Provo City Budget Officer, presented. The appropriation request was for
154 \$20,000 to cover the program costs through the remainder of the fiscal year. The police
155 department would only be participating in the deer removal (harvesting) part of the program and
156 would need \$10,500 to cover those costs. Trapping was off the table at this point because they
157 would need additional staff and funds to administer that portion of the program.

158
159 The council had two options. They could appropriate the full \$20,000 and any remaining funds
160 would drop to fund balance if not used for deer removal. The second option would be to reduce
161 the appropriation to \$10,500 to cover the estimated costs.

162

163 Council members discussed the options and determined that, until there was data on how
164 effective the program had been, it would be best to limit the appropriation to \$10,500. A
165 discussion about the future of the Urban Deer Program would be held after council members
166 received data on how effective the program has been.
167

Motion: Council Member Kay Van Buren made a motion to reduce the
appropriation from \$20,000 to \$10,500. The motion was seconded by
Council Member George Stewart.

168
Roll Call Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Council Members Handley, Harding,
Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren, and Winterton in favor.

169
170 *This item was scheduled for the regular council meeting later that night. An amended*
171 *resolution with the reduced appropriation amount will be available for council members.*
172

7. A presentation on the Provo Airport and potential budget requests. (19-004) ([1:21:28](#))

173
174 Steve Gleason, Provo City Airport Manager, presented the Airport Master Plan update. The
175 update focused on several important issues at the airport, including an airfield hotspot, a new
176 passenger terminal area, immediate aircraft hangar development, primary runway enhancements,
177 crosswind runway justification, and on/off-airport land use considerations. Many of the master
178 plan objectives had been completed.

179
180 Mr. Gleason reviewed the following airport operations with council members:

181 Aviation Activity Forecast

- 182 • Aircraft Operations (takeoff or landing) – In 2006 the airport operations hit a low due to
183 the economy. This was not unique to Provo, many airports saw general aviation decline
184 as the economy crashed. Provo also added a control tower at that time, which caused
185 some pilots to use other airports. Operations have been increasing steadily since that
186 time.
- 187 • Based Aircraft – Based aircraft included helicopters, jets, multi-engine, and single-engine
188 aircraft. The Provo airport had 168-based aircraft in 2017 with estimates reaching 218 in
189 2035. Provo ranked fourth in the state for based aircraft.
- 190 • Passenger Enplanements (the number of passengers that board a commercial aircraft in
191 Provo) – By 2019 Provo should have more than 100,000 enplanements. This number
192 might level off unless the airport addressed their terminal capacity issues.
 - 193 ○ We have only one checkpoint for passengers to get through security.
 - 194 ○ We have only 177 seats in the terminal. One aircraft holds 160 passengers so we
195 cannot stack airplanes (have two aircraft at the terminal at the same time).
 - 196 ○ Allegiant Air does not have connections so it allowed them to schedule their flight
197 times to avoid stacking. Other airlines have to time their schedules to meet
198 connections. Until we have the ability to stack planes, we will not be able to
199 attract other airlines.
 - 200 ○ With a second gate, our enplanements could double. The masterplan
201 recommended adding up to ten gates.
202

203 Facility Requirements

204 Runway Improvements

- 205 • The wind was blowing down our primary runway 95 percent of the time. This was
- 206 important for aircraft operations.
- 207 • We no longer qualified for FAA grants to repair the secondary runway because it was
- 208 only in use about two or three percent of the time.
- 209 • The secondary runway did not give us any airspace because it intersected with the
- 210 primary runway.
- 211 • Future work on the primary runway would involve closing the runway until work had
- 212 been completed.

213 Site Requirements for New Terminal

- 214 • Reserved land was available on the southeast portion of the airport for ten gated positions
- 215 within the next 20 years.
- 216 • The proposed location provided good access off the runway to taxiways and passenger
- 217 access with a new entrance off Lakeview Parkway.
- 218 • The initial plan was to build a 70,000 square foot terminal with room for expansion. Our
- 219 current terminal was 6,000 square feet.
- 220 • Reserved land was available for a total of 1,150 parking spaces

221 Provide a Location for General Aviation

- 222 • The airport was deficient in every hangar type.
- 223 • Future needs included:
 - 224 ○ T-Hangars – 29
 - 225 ○ Box Hangars – 12
 - 226 ○ Corporate Hangars – We anticipated five but those have already been filled.
 - 227 We will need to add additional corporate hangars.

228
229 Mr. Gleason identified airport expansion options chosen by staff and consultants for council
230 consideration and public input:

- 231 • Secondary Runway – rebuild the secondary runway to run parallel to the primary runway
- 232 with an 800-foot separation. This would increase safety, provide new land for
- 233 improvements, and increase airfield capacity. General aviation aircraft could use the
- 234 secondary runway, thereby allowing two aircraft to land at the airport at the same time.
- 235 Estimated cost was \$12 million and would be funded through FAA airport improvement
- 236 project (AIP) grants.
- 237 • Linear Terminal Configuration – A linear terminal provided roads on one side of the
- 238 terminal and aircraft on the other side. It allowed for more apron frontage, gates, and
- 239 room for passengers. We could start by building the central building with four or five
- 240 gates and expanding with additional gates on either side in the future. The airport was
- 241 working with the Utah Transit Authority to provide mass transit options at the airport.
- 242 The plan assumed all aircraft were 737's. With a larger terminal, we could accommodate
- 243 other airlines and become a hub feed.
- 244 • Land Use Alternatives – The analysis began with a conceptual idea of what the area
- 245 could look like in 40 plus years. We need to evaluate the long term on airport and off
- 246 airport land use. Development of a new terminal building, relocation of the secondary
- 247 runway, and continued growth of Provo towards the airport would all make major
- 248 impacts to land use while still providing the required airport protection area. Purchasing

249 available land (as it comes up for sale) around the airport should be a high priority. Land
250 purchases did not have to be contiguous to the airport but must be close and have an
251 airport use. Airport expansion to the south and west was not possible because of the lake
252 and high water year problems.

253
254 Mr. Gleason stated the next steps included:

- 255 • Incorporate council comments on the proposals and complete final documentation.
- 256 • Finalize the development plan and integrate it into a final ALP set for FAA review and
257 approval.
- 258 • Begin the implementation phase and incorporate phasing/timing/funding into the 20-year
259 development plan.
- 260 • Hold a final AC meeting and public workshop in late February or early March for public
261 comment and input.
- 262 • Complete the environmental review for the terminal and terminal apron.
- 263 • Begin the terminal and apron design as soon as the environmental review was completed.
- 264 • Begin construction on the corporate taxi lane.

265
266 Mr. Gleason reviewed future budget recommendations for the airport. The transfer from the
267 general fund to the airport had been declining over the past few years. Mr. Gleason anticipated
268 the trend would continue. Dave Decker, Public Works Director, stated that there might be a
269 bump in the future when the new terminal was built. They would not be able to run a larger
270 terminal with their current staffing so general fund transfers would probably be needed for a
271 short time when new employees were hired. As parking and other revenues from the new
272 terminal were generated, those transfers should decrease. We used MAG funding for the radar
273 in the past and we could potentially borrow against future MAG allotments for part of the
274 construction.

275
276 The proposed CIP budget would include \$36 million over the next few years for terminal and
277 apron construction. We had \$8 million for the terminal apron coming from AIP grants, which
278 left \$28 million to cover the terminal construction. An application has been submitted to the
279 FAA for supplemental AIP funds to build the terminal.

280
281 Brian Torgerson, Division Director for Public Services, reported that utility work on corporate
282 taxi lane 31 at the airport, to service the new corporate hangars, has been completed. Total cost
283 for the taxi lane, parking lot access, and utilities came to \$1,483,477.48. TacAir (\$550,000) and
284 Clyde companies (\$473,521.25) contributed to the project with the balance of \$459,956.23
285 coming from storm water, water, and the general fund. He noted that all corporate hangars were
286 either leased or “spoken for.” The frontage fee for the new corporate hangars was increased to
287 \$2,000 per linear foot. Total revenues (executed or in process) came to \$1,991,000 which left a
288 balance in the airport budget of \$507,523.

289
290 Mr. Gleason stated that funds appropriated from the general fund would be repaid through future
291 taxi lane revenues. Future budgets for airport operations would be increased to cover the cost of
292 staffing, call outs, and overtime.

293 ***Presentation Only – No Action Taken***

294

Break

295

Policy Items Referred from the Planning Commission

296

8. **A discussion for a request to rezone approximately 14 acres, generally located at 2300 N University Parkway, from Regional Shopping Center (SC3) to Interim Transit Oriented Development (ITOD). Carterville Neighborhood. (PLRZ20180406) ([2:17:25](#))**

297

298 Aaron Ardmore, Provo City Planner, presented a revised plan for The Mix (formerly Plum Tree
299 Plaza) submitted by the owner for approval. Due to market concerns, the owner was requesting a
300 rezone of 14 acres on the north and east portions of the property from Regional Shopping Center
301 (SC3) to Interim Transit Oriented Development (ITOD). The rezone would enable them to
302 develop residential properties while maintaining commercial development adjacent to University
303 Parkway. The owner has agreed to a development agreement that would require the residential
304 development to include 10 percent affordable housing (60 percent of average median income);
305 the remaining SC3 zone would not include any residential uses; and the cost of improvements to
306 the sewer facilities servicing the development would be paid by the developer.

307

308 Responding to a question from Mr. Van Buren, the developer would be required to improve the
309 city's sewer infrastructure serving the residential development.

310

311 Mr. Winterton asked why the development was divided into separate building lots. Mr. Ardmore
312 replied that the property was divided into lots under a previous site plan because they had been
313 marketing a different building for each lot. Staff suggested the property lines be eliminated to
314 make development easier.

315

316 Chair Harding stated the council needed to discuss how the city wanted to handle tax incentives
317 in the future for new developments. He felt that commercial could be incentivized but we would
318 need a good reason to incentivize housing.

319

320 Mr. Winterton asked if we were comfortable with an ITOD zone in that area because it was a
321 gateway into the city. He was concerned about the look of the development and wanted to make
322 sure it was something that would make the city proud.

323

324 Mr. Sewell asked if the developer was going to encourage owner occupied housing. Mr.
325 Peperone stated that there were more problems when multi-family and higher density housing
326 was owned individually rather than rented. Mr. Handley agreed stating that when investors
327 purchased some of the housing they had a tendency to be over-occupied.

328

This item was scheduled for the regular council meeting later that night.

329

Business

330

9. **A discussion for further consideration of an annexation petition for approximately 13.45 acres of property generally located at 5400 N Canyon Road (Peay Annexation). North Timpview and Riverbottoms Neighborhoods. (PLANEX20180355) ([2:27:55](#))**

331
332 Bob Maxfield, Planning Supervisor, stated that under state code, a petition requesting annexation
333 needed to be filed with a city. The petition would begin a 60-day waiting period to address
334 concerns and finalize the request.

335
336 Mr. Maxfield stated that, even though the proposed annexation would create a peninsula or
337 island, state law had changed which now allowed this if the city and county agreed to the
338 annexation. The annexation area had many development concerns that needed to be addressed.
339 Mr. Jones explained that, even if a property was on the Provo City Annexation Plan, we were not
340 under any obligation to annex the area. The decision for the council that night would be to
341 accept the petition or deny it.

342
343 Mr. Stewart felt that approving the resolution that night would be tantamount to approving the
344 annexation. They should deny the resolution if they did not want to annex the property.

345
346 Mr. Knecht expressed concern about annexing the property if we could not provide services. He
347 did not want to feel obligated to provide services if they were not easily available.

348 *This item was scheduled for the regular council meeting later that night.*

349
10. A discussion on an affordable housing resolution and policy for Provo City. (18-070)
(2:35:03)

350
351 Clifford Strachan, Council Executive Director, led a discussion on a proposed affordable housing
352 resolution and policy for Provo City. During the last meeting, the council asked that more
353 information be included in the proposed resolution. Mr. Strachan addressed those concerns and
354 stated the following had been incorporated into the document.

- 355 • Lines 46 and 47 – added the following language, “... the Municipal Council of Provo
356 City has included multiple measures supporting housing affordability and affordable
357 housing in the city’s General Plan.”
- 358 • Lines 49-50 – added language stating that 29 of 47 affordable housing projects in Utah
359 County were located in Provo City (62 percent).
- 360 • Section 1 – Issued a pledge of support with a regional perspective and called upon other
361 cities in Utah County to join with us as we endeavor to find solutions to the shortage of
362 affordable housing.
- 363 • Section 2.7 – Promoted collaboration with other communities to find additional solutions.

364
365 The following items were discussed:

- 366 • Mr. Handley proposed amending the Section 2 title to read, “Measures to be taken.
367 Consistent with the goals of Provo City’s General Plan, the Municipal Council Pledges
368 to:”
- 369 • The administration was in favor of the action but did not feel it needed to be a joint
370 resolution.
- 371 • The proposed resolution did not commit the city to take more action. The resolution
372 restated what Provo City was already doing and invited other cities to participate.
- 373 • The resolution was sending a strong message to the county that Provo needed help and
374 we needed other cities to commit to do more.

- 375 • If we back away from approving the resolution, it might send a message to other cities
376 that we were not interested in working with them.
377

378 After the discussion, the following motion was made:
379

Motion: Council Member George Handley made a motion to move the item forward with the amendment he proposed. The motion was seconded by Council Member David Knecht.

380

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

381

382 *This item was scheduled for the regular council meeting later that night.*
383

11. A review of Council Board and Committee assignments, including a discussion regarding Council goals (Part 2 of 2). (19-002) ([2:51:49](#))

384

385 Chair Harding led a discussion concerning council goals and board and committee assignments.

386 The following ideas were suggested as 2019 goals for the council to consider:

- 387 • Accessory Dwelling Units
388 • Short Term Rentals
389 • Parking Policies (Joaquin/Downtown)
390 • Zoning Compliance (including acknowledgement disclosures/reporting)
391 • Rental Dwelling Licenses
392 • CIP Review
393 • Election Code Review
394 • Ranked Choice Voting (community conversation)
395 • Comprehensive City-Wide Housing Audit
396 • Gravel Pit Issues Related to Mining/Protection of Foothills
397 • Fireworks
398 • Increase HOA Involvement on a Neighborhood Level
399 • Ensure Best Outcome for City Facilities

400

401 Budget Goals:

- 402 • Police
403 ○ Officer Safety (do not sacrifice safety for zero energy use)
404 ○ Increased Staffing – To decrease workload, response time, and provide proactive prevention.
405 ○ Recruitment/Retention
406 • Parking Enforcement Needs
407 • Zoning Enforcement/Compliance
408 • Funding for a Comprehensive Housing Audit / Research (General Plan 3.4.2.1)
409

410

411 Mr. Strachan suggested council members review the proposed goals and determine which goals
412 had broad support for future council committees.

413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427

Mr. Harding suggested that the list would be available and goals that needed immediate attention could be addressed through small ad-hoc committees. As soon as that goal was addressed, it could be checked off the list. Some goals did not require a committee; they could be handled through the administration.

Mr. Knecht stated that many of these goals were being addressed in current committees. For those that did not fit into a committee, the council would need to find another way to move them forward. Council members needed to indicate if they were interested in a specific goal, and how they were going to accomplish the goal.

Chair Harding reviewed the current committee/board assignments for council members. Council members shown in red were added to a committee/board while those removed from a committee were indicated by a ~~strikeout~~.

	Status	Council Representative	Council Representative	Council Representative
Council Leadership	Standing	David Harding (Chair)	Kay Van Buren (Vice-Chair)	
RDA Leadership	Standing	David Knecht (Chair)	George Handley (Vice-Chair)	
Neighborhood Advisory Board	PCC	David Knecht (Chair)	David Sewell (Vice-Chair)	
Housing Committee	Ad-hoc	David Knecht (Chair)	George Handley (Vice-Chair)	David Harding
Zoning Compliance Committee	Ad-hoc	David Knecht (Chair)	George Handley (Vice-Chair)	David Sewell
Library Board (appointed by Mayor)	3-year term	David Sewell	George Stewart	
Airport Board	Liaison	Gary Winterton		
Energy Board	Liaison	George Stewart	Gary Winterton	George Handley
TMAC	Liaison	David Harding		
Parks & Rec Board	Liaison	Gary Winterton	Kay Van Buren	George Handley
Rock Canyon Advisory Committee	Liaison	George Handley		
Sustainability Committee	Liaison	George Handley		
Utah Valley Clean Air Task Force	Liaison	Gary Winterton		
CDBG General Committee	Liaison	David Harding		
CDBG Social Services Committee	Liaison	David Knecht		
Metropolitan Water District Board	Liaison	Gary Winterton	Kay Van Buren	

Provo Housing Authority	Board Member	George Handley		
Downtown Provo, Inc.	Liaison	Gary Winterton		
ULCT Legislative Policy Committee		David Harding		
Arts Council	Liaison	David Sewell		
Agricultural Committee	Liaison	David Knecht		

428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441

The following committees were discontinued until further notice:

- The Policy Governance Committee - They were just finishing the parking permit application process. After one more meeting, this committee could be disbanded.
- The Council Rules Committee – The council rulebook had been updated recently.
- The Impact Fee Review Committee – Disband until needed.
- The Development Approval Process Review Committee had been reviewing a gravel pit application process. The committee was winding down. The committee could be abolished and replaced by an ad-hoc committee to review mining/foothill protection issues. George Handley could serve as chair with David Sewell as vice-chair.

Mr. Strachan will update the council committee chart, type up the goals, and send them to council members for their input.

12. A discussion on the use of the surplus property list. (19-015) (3:40:59)

442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451

Brian Jones, Council Attorney, led a discussion on surplus property. The council was required to give public notice that a property was to be placed on the surplus property list and sold before a closed meeting could be held to discuss the sale of the property. It was suggested that Provo City prepare a list of all properties that might be for sale if the price was right. Placing the property on the list did not mean we were actively selling the property. A resolution placing those properties on the surplus property list could be approved by the council, which would provide the required public notice. It should be noted that the surplus property list should be used for individual property purchases, not a mass sale of all Provo City property. Tara Riddle, Provo City Property Manager, would work on preparing the list.

452
453

Presentation only.

Closed Meeting (No closed meeting held)

454

Adjournment

455
456

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m. by unanimous consent.

457