

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a time-stamp linking the agenda items to the video discussion. Electronic version of minutes will allow citizens to view discussion held during council meeting.



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Regular Meeting Minutes

5:30 PM, Tuesday, February 19, 2019

Room 200, Municipal Council Chambers

351 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

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
Council Member Vernon K. Van Buren	Mayor Michelle Kaufusi
Council Executive Director Cliff Strachan	Wayne Parker, CAO
Council Attorney Brian Jones	

Conducting: Council Chair David Harding

Prayer

Quinn Wilder

Pledge

Mark Wilder

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

1. Provo City Employees' Association Employee of the Year Presentation ([0:08:29](#))

Shilo Harris, Employees Association President, presented. She said when ballots were returned for Employee of the Year, it was clear that Ryan Stewart stood out. Mr. Stewart was the October 2018 Employee of the Month and was respected and admired by his peers. Following a short presentation Mr. Harris was presented with a certificate and recognized as the 2018 Employee of the Year.

2. A presentation about future construction on Bulldog Boulevard and 500 West. (19-026) ([0:12:06](#))

Leah Jaramillo was the Vice President and Senior Project Manager of Sommers-Jaramillo and Associates. Ms. Jaramillo provided updates on two UDOT projects: 500 West Upgrade and Bulldog Boulevard Improvements Project.

500 West Project:

- Replace asphalt with concrete
- Add on-street bicycle lanes
- New sewer, storm drain, curb and gutter
- Widened sidewalks
- Raised, planted medians

- Improved pedestrian crosswalks
- Upgraded traffic signalization
- Drainage work to begin immediately
- Work to begin March 4 with an 18-month completion time

She said this project was similar to the 300 South project that took place a few years ago. The intent was to improve the road, not increase capacity.

Bulldog Boulevard Improvements Project:

- Convert one travel lane in each direction into protected bicycle lanes
- Install a raised center median between all signalized intersections
- Add a new signalized intersection at 400 West
- Add landscaping in the buffers and medians, where space allows
- Highlight areas where vehicles and bike paths cross
- Install physically separated or striped dedicated bike lanes 500 West to University Avenue
- Add shared shoulders between University Avenue and Canyon Road.
- Signal work to begin first
- Work to begin March 4 with a six-month completion time

Mr. Knecht clarified that both projects would begin on the same day, March 4. The 500 West project would extend to 500 South, stopping just before the train tracks. He asked was the vision was for the portion of road that continued further south. Ms. Jaramillo explained the lane configuration would not change but there would be drain improvements.

Mr. Winterton suggested it may be a good time to consider changing the name of Bulldog Boulevard since Provo High had relocated and the Bulldog was their mascot. Brian Torgersen, Engineer, said this had been discussed and was possible but would not be easy. There were many things to consider, including the impact to the businesses located along this road.

Approval of Minutes

3. January 22, 2019 Council Meeting Minutes

The January 22, 2019 minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Public Comment ([0:22:50](#))

Mr. Jones, Council Attorney, explained the process for public comment. Chair Harding opened public comment. There were no comments from the public. Mr. Harding closed public comment.

Action Agenda

4. Resolution 2019-08 appropriating \$26,172 in the Police Department General Fund for expenses related to the death of an officer in the line of duty, applying to the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019. (19-019) ([0:24:11](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2019-08 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Dustin Grabau, Budget Officer, presented. This appropriation would cover Police Department expenses related to the death of Master Officer Joseph Shinnars.

Mr. Winterton noted there had been many donations, including Utah Valley University waiving the fee for use of the UCCU Event Center where the funeral was held. Mr. Winterton asked if this appropriation covered funeral related expenses. Mr. Grabau explained these were actual expenses incurred by the department related to vigils, overtime, etc. A detailed list of itemized receipts was available upon request.

Chair Harding opened public hearing, there was no response. He invited council discussion, seeing none, he called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion to approve Resolution 2019-08 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

Chair Harding noted this had been an especially difficult time for the Police Department. He hoped they felt the love and support of the Council and community.

5. Resolution 2019-09 appropriating \$72,597,691 in the General Capital Improvement Plan Fund and \$240,000 in Debt Service Fund for construction and debt payments related to the new City facilities applying to the fiscal year ending June 30, 2019. (19-021) [\(0:27:12\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2019-09 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Dustin Grabau, Budget Officer, presented. This reflects an appropriation of the bonds that were issued for Police, Fire & City Facilities. This number was slightly higher than the amount of debt issued as a result of the bond sale because the interest expected to be gained throughout the life of the project was also included. The amount of \$240,000 came from the bond proceeds and would be used to pay for expenses related to issuing the debt, such as paying the firm that helped with the process.

Mr. Knecht noted this represented the amount of money available, but not necessarily the amount of money that would be used, it was possible the City would spend less.

Chair Harding opened public hearing, there was no response. There was no council discussion. Mr. Harding called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion to approve Resolution 2019-09 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

6. Resolution 2019-10 appropriating \$196,475 in the Airport Fund, Operating Division for the Airport Bond payment. (19-020) [\(0:30:23\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2019-10 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Dustin Grabau, Budget Officer, explained Airport bonds had recently been issued for the purpose of infrastructure construction. This amount, \$196,475, represented two semiannual payments, including a portion of interest paid during the initial phases of the bonds. The early stages of the bond repayment schedule included capitalizing interests and other aspects. Beginning with fiscal year 2020, this would be included in future budgets.

Chair Harding opened the public hearing and invited the public to comment, there was no response. There was no council discussion. Mr. Harding called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion to approve Resolution 2019-10 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

7. Joint Resolution 2019-11 of the Provo City Mayor and Municipal Council in Support of the Provo City Airport and requested state funding to add a commercial passenger facility (terminal). (19-028) ([0:32:11](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2019-11 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Isaac Paxman, Deputy Mayor, presented the joint resolution to the Council. Recently the FAA had authorized Provo City to proceed with an apron for a terminal. The City was considering adding four gates now, with the possibility of up to ten in the future. The estimated project cost was \$41,710,085. There were state and federal grants available, but Provo City would need to procure the remaining funds of approximately \$19 million.

The proposed funding sources were as follows:

Federal FAA Grants with \$947,957 local grant match	\$10,113,097.00
State Legislature Appropriation	\$9,000,000.00
Provo Public Works CIP Projects	\$9,564,372.50
Inter-Departmental Loan from Energy ¼ Cent Sales Tax	\$4,000,000.00
Previously acquired terminal area property	\$4,734,917.00
Funding Gap – Possibly Utah County MAG	\$4,297,699.05
Agency Funding Totals	\$41,710,085.55

In addition to the FAA grants, Mr. Paxman had been working with the legislature to secure funding. As part of this process, it was important for Provo to be able to show what they would be contributing. The administration considered shifting CIP Project funding (\$9,564,372.50) to the airport. An inter-departmental loan could be used to borrow \$4,000,000 from the Energy department, a ¼ cent sales tax increase was going into effect in July. The City already owned 66 acres within the airport boundary, which had a value of \$4,734,917. The administration would be asking Utah County for the remaining \$4,297,699.05.

The purpose of this resolution was to signal that Provo was serious about making this work. Mr. Paxman thought it was important to act upon this opportunity and discover ways to procure the remaining funds.

Mr. Sewell thanked Mr. Paxman for pursuing this opportunity. He was fully supportive.

Mr. Winterton suggested looking to other entities or foundations that might be willing to help. Mr. Paxman said they would look into this.

Mr. Winterton explained the City was eligible for grants based upon the value of the property at the airport, this had been a valuable resource in the past. Mr. Torgersen explained the City had 66 acres of land in the airport boundary. The City was not actively looking to take property but would make offers to willing sellers to secure more land so that the added value could be considered in the future.

Mr. Stewart congratulated previous administrations for their contributions to the airport, specifically Mayor Billings and Mayor Curtis. They laid the groundwork that made this possible.

Chair Harding opened public comment, there was no response.

Mr. Van Buren was supportive but thought they needed to go on record by saying it will have some costs. He asked what CIP projects might be delayed because of this. Mr. Decker responded there would be an impact from a utility standpoint. He estimated \$4 million would be needed in infrastructure improvements for the terminal, this would come from water, waste water, and storm water funds. It was not an insignificant investment.

Chair Harding called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion to approve Resolution 2019-11 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

8. Resolution 2019-12 to place seven parcels of property located generally at the mouth of Provo Canyon, east of Nevada Ave. and Slate Canyon Dr., 350 S Slate Canyon Dr., and 1320 S State St. on the surplus property list. (19-015) (0:43:10)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2019-12 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Tara Riddle, Property Coordinator, presented. She explained that staff had determined the following properties were no longer needed by the City and could be added to the surplus property list. She described the following properties:

Size	County Tax ID	General Description
39 Acres	20-015-0004	Mouth of Provo Canyon
17.71 Acres	22-048-0068	Three parcels, east of former County Jail property (Buckley Draw)
	22-048-0007	
	22-048-0005	
4.347 Acres	22-038-0063	Old Slate Canyon Gun Range on 300 South
1 Acre	22-051-0024	Remnant substation property near 1320 N. State Street
	22-051-0071	

Mr. Knecht asked if proceeds from the sale of Buckley Draw would go to Bicentennial Park. Ms. Riddle confirmed they would.

Chair Harding opened public comment.

Doug Gail, Provo Resident, was the Chairman of the Provo Housing Authority. He said they were working to provide affordable housing in Provo and the surrounding area. He asked council to consider the land for several of the projects they were working on, such as land trust. Or as developers purchase properties, ten percent could be set aside for affordable housing.

There were no other comments from the public. Chair Harding closed public comment.

Mr. Handley appreciated Mr. Gail's comments. He clarified that the sale of each property would go through the regular approval process. Mr. Handley did not want to see the property get developed without considering how the development would meet the City's overall needs.

Mr. Knecht recognized the properties would go through the regular process, but they did not need to wait for a private developer to make an offer. Provo Housing could also make a proposal to Council.

Mr. Winterton said the property near the Indian Hills trailhead needed quite a bit of work before it could be developed, he asked Ms. Riddle whether the other properties were ready to be developed. Ms. Riddle agreed the Indian Hills property would be the most difficult to develop, but the other properties had infrastructure close by and would not be as challenging.

Mr. Knecht asked if any fault line studies had been conducted. Ms. Riddle explained the City had conducted environmental studies, but they would not have included fault line studies. A developer would need to arrange and pay for that type of study.

Chair Harding called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion to approve Resolution 2019-12 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

9. Resolution 2019-13 adopting the Provo City Storm Drain Master Plan for decision making and policy formation regarding Storm Drain matters within the City. (18-102) (0:53:00)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Resolution 2019-13 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Brian Torgersen, Division Director of Public Services, presented. He said it had been 33 years since the last Storm Drain Master Plan was adopted. The plan had been presented earlier in the day, Mr. Torgersen provided a brief overview of some of the changes:

- The storm intensity design was changed to a 10-year event from a 25-year event. This was to be consistent with plans in surrounding cities.
- The plan included proposed improvements to save money by reducing pipe sized by using a regional detention basis.
- The 500 West construction project included a significant trunk line improvement, this would replace the buried irrigation canal that previously ran through Pioneer Park.

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

Vote: The motion to approve Resolution 2019-13 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

10. Ordinance 2019-04 amending Provo City Code regarding on-street parking and enforcement of publicly owned lots and garages. (19-023) ([0:59:35](#))

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Ordinance 2019-04 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Austin Taylor, Parking and Sustainability Coordinator, presented. Mr. Taylor explained that under the current code there was no enforcement of off-street parking, even on City property. This amendment would allow off-street parking enforcement on City owned property, such as the Recreation Center. This amendment would also provide clarification regarding abandoned vehicles by specifying how far a car must move before returning to the original spot within a 72-hour period.

Mr. Winterton spoke about abandoned vehicles on private property. He understood that parking enforcement had no jurisdiction on private property, but he was concerned that privacy laws made it difficult for property owners to get the vehicle owner's information to contact them before just having a vehicle towed. Mr. Knecht had experience with this, he said abandoned vehicles were often left in the parking lots of churches. He agreed that it was difficult to track down the owner, he wondered if Provo Police would help by notifying the vehicle owner. Mr. Winterton thought that was already taking place, he appreciated their efforts but wanted to make it easier for private property owners to deal with abandoned vehicles. He would follow up with Mr. Taylor later to discuss this. Mr. Jones clarified that private property owners had the authority under State law to initiate parking enforcement on their property. State law said you could enforce parking on private property, City code said you could enforce parking on-street, but nothing regulated off-street parking on City owned property.

Chair Harding opened public comment but there was no response. There was no other Council discussion. He called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion to approve Ordinance 2019-04 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

11. An ordinance amending the Zone Map Classification of approximately 0.96 acres of real property, generally located at 1356 South 500 West, from Residential Agricultural (RA) to Residential (R1.8). Lakewood Neighborhood. (17-0017R) ([1:05:36](#))

Austin Ardmore, Planner, presented. A map was displayed to show an existing home on about 1 acre of land near 1356 South 500 West. The applicant hoped to subdivide and develop the rear part of their property, they had requested R1.8 zoning. Staff determined the lots met R1.8 standards and recommended approval. Mr. Ardmore thought this was a good idea that would allow the City to provide more housing in the area and complete this portion of 570 West. The Planning Commission also recommended approval. The neighborhood had a concern about the building height, but the owner was willing to limit the building to two stories and was willing to put a note on the plat stating this. Further, the R1.8 zone would restrict building height to 35 feet, measured at the middle of the roof. Mr.

Winterton asked if 35 feet was measured before or after fill was brought in for grading. Mr. Ardmore said it was measured from the average to finished grade, after any fill was brought in.

Mr. Harding asked if the neighbors were satisfied by the applicant's offer to record a note on the plat to restrict the height. He invited the applicant, Angela Eckstein, to speak. Ms. Eckstein explained the property no longer served its purpose as agricultural, irrigation had been disconnected and the land was no longer used for hay crops. She thought the land would be best used to bring in a few more homes. The property extended into the road which made the road very narrow and difficult to navigate. Ms. Eckstein explained the Osprey Development included very tall homes which worried her neighbors because they did not want more tall homes. At the planning commission meeting the neighbors agreed a two-story home would be appropriate and basements were not feasible in the neighborhood due to the sewer depth of four feet.

Mr. Knecht noted from the pictures presented that the road was incomplete, there were not curb, gutter, or sidewalks on one side of the road. He asked if it would all be complete after development. Ms. Eckstein explained there would still be an incomplete section, it was her neighbor's property and they were not interested in paying to have it finished.

Chair Harding invited the Lakewood Neighborhood Chair, Becky Bogdin, to speak. Ms. Bogdin said the neighbor to the south where the incomplete section existed was 80 years old and lacked the funding to pay for curb, gutter, and sidewalk behind her home. Ms. Bogdin still had concerns about the plat note because it did not specify that a basement would not be put in. She worried the applicant would sell the property and a new developer would build a two-story home with a basement. She said a basement was not considered a story. She would feel more comfortable if it clearly stated no basement or if 35 feet was measured from the existing street. Ms. Bogdin also wanted written assurances the planter strip would be consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. Lastly, she said the existing sidewalks were only three feet wide and the new requirement for sidewalks was six feet, she wanted an exception made so the new sidewalk matched the rest of the neighborhood.

Chair Harding opened public comment, there were no other comments.

Mr. Ardmore explained that the details being discussed would be addressed with the site plan, this request was only for a zone change.

Considering the concerns brought forth by Ms. Bogdin, Mr. Stewart thought it was best to allow this item to be heard again in two weeks and allow time for those issues to be resolved.

Mr. Harding recognized there would be another process for site plan approval but that would be handled administratively so this was Council's only opportunity to weigh in. Allowing the item to be continued would provide an opportunity for these issues to get resolved while Council still had control.

Mr. Sewell knew there were many R1.8 zones in the City but not many had this type restriction on basements. He wondered if this was compensation for a flaw in the code. Mr. Ardmore said there were a few areas on the west side of the city that had this type of restriction due to the contour level. He thought this request was a reaction to the Osprey Development.

Mr. Van Buren clarified that the 35-foot requirement was part of the zone, so if this passed the home would be limited to 35 feet. Mr. Knecht said this was the standard for the zone unless there was a development agreement.

Chair Harding explained this was the first hearing for this item and any Councilor could request to continue this to the next meeting. Mr. Stewart stated his preference for this item to be continued to the next meeting.

Mr. Harding asked if the applicant and neighborhood chair could come to an agreement now that 35 feet was to be measured from the street level. Ms. Eckstein said it was more important to her to have this developed than to have a basement or homes of a certain height, she was willing to agree to this. Mr. Harding asked if they were opposed to working on the details and waiting two weeks. Regardless, Mr. Stewart said he wanted to wait two weeks.

Mr. Jones requested to be notified if a development agreement was proffered so that he could have an alternate version of the ordinance prepared for the next meeting.

Ms. Bogdin was not concerned about working with Ms. Eckstein but worried what might happen in the future. She hoped the code would be amended to prevent another development like Osprey from being built in the R1.8 zone. Mr. Harding said he would be interested in revisiting how height is defined and closing any loopholes.

Mr. Knecht noted this situation was unique because the new homes would be built in an existing neighborhood. If this were a new development in an undeveloped area there would be no imposition on existing homes and there would be no issue on how the height was measured. He hoped Community Development would consider what zone language might be used if the code were amended to properly regulate everything else built on the west side.

As allowed by Council rule, this item would be presented again at the next meeting.

12. *****CONTINUED*** An ordinance amending Provo City Code Section 14.38.085 to clarify limitations on signage within the North University Riverbottoms Design Corridor. City-wide application. (PLOTA20190026)**
13. ****CONTINUED** An ordinance amending the General Plan from Public Facilities (PF) to Residential (R) for approximately 0.78 acres located at approximately 862 E Quail Valley Drive. Edgemont Neighborhood. (PLGPA20190009)**
14. ****CONTINUED** An ordinance amending the zone map classification of approx. 0.78 acres of real property, generally located at 862 East Quail Valley Dr, from Public Facilities (PF) to Low Density Residential (LDR). Edgemont Neighborhood. (PLRZ20180430)**
15. *****CONTINUED*** An ordinance amending Provo City Code Section 14.34.285 regarding the design standards for buildings in the Campus Mixed Use Zone. City-wide application. (PLOTA20190025)**
16. **Ordinance 2019-05 amending Provo City Code Section 14.14E.030(2) to remove the maximum density restriction in the Campus Mixed Use Zone. City-wide impact. ([1:33:58](#)) (PLOTA20180432)**

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Ordinance 2019-05 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Josh Yost, Planner, explained the Campus Mixed Use Zone was most commonly found around universities and colleges. There was a request to apply this to the land where the Noorda School of Osteopathic Medicine would be built near 1860 South in the East Bay Neighborhood. The zone had a number of regulations that govern the geometric size and form of the building. This request removes the density restriction but would regulate above and beyond other regulations in this zone, according to Mr. Yost. He said density was not a good regulatory mechanism. The Planning Commission voted 6:1 to recommend approval.

Mr. Knecht asked what the current parking requirement was. Mr. Yost said a batching occupancy in the South Campus Planning Area was 0.8 per residence, plus 0.2 per unit for visitor parking. A three-bedroom unit with three occupants would be 2.6 stalls per unit. Mr. Knecht was concerned about visitor parking turning into resident parking. Josh agreed and said there needed to be additional discussion, but that was outside of the scope of this application.

Mr. Harding said from a community planning perspective this was a good proposal, but he wondered if Engineering had considered the impact of the potential density. Mr. Yost said the engineering staff originally had concerns that removing the cap on density could make it difficult to plan for infrastructure, but after discussing how the geometric regulations were working in the ITOD zone, they felt more comfortable. Mr. Yost added that there was discussion about removing this zone from the Joaquin Neighborhood so that every project would need to apply for a rezone individually, this would provide an additional level of scrutiny and consideration for infrastructure impact. From a planning perspective, having more students next to campus and near mass transit would decrease traffic. He thought this was a wise land use decision.

Chair Harding invited the applicant, Todd Sinks, to comment. Mr. Knecht felt the Council was in favor of removing the density restriction but asked if Mr. Sinks had a density estimate. Mr. Sinks estimated there would be 787 units on 9.3 acres or about 84 units per acre.

Chair Harding opened public comment, there was no response. Council had no further discussion and Mr. Harding called for a vote on the implied motion.

Vote: The motion to approve Ordinance 2019-05 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

17. An ordinance amending the General Plan Map from Commercial (C) to Public Facilities (PF) for approximately 23 acres and from Commercial (C) to Mixed Use (MU) for approximately 12 acres, located at 178 E 1860 S. East Bay Neighborhood. (PLGPA20180407) ([1:47:10](#))

Joshua Yost, Planner, presented the item. The intent was to align the General Plan with plans to develop a medical school and student housing on the northwest corner of the golf course. This request had been made by Economic Development. In addition to zone map changes, Mr. Yost suggested removing three policy statements from the General Plan that were conflicting with the current General Plan Map:

- Central Area Policy No. 19 stated that freeway oriented commercial zoning should be initiated for property adjacent to I-15, but that was not possible in this area.
- Policy No. 6 stated the intent to dedicate 60 acres in this area for commercial use, but this was no longer the plan.
- Policy No. 9 called for a study of potential future locations for the East Bay Golf Course, but this had been resolved with the transfer of property for the medical school.

The Planning Commission also recommended removing these items from the General Plan.

Mr. Harding thought the resolution only contemplated changes to the map, not the policy statements. He asked for clarification. Mr. Yost said both items were included in the staff report, but he was not sure what was in the resolution. Mr. Jones reviewed the resolution and concluded only the map changes were included in this resolution. Mr. Yost said they would include the removal of these policy statements in future General Plan amendments concerning the golf course.

Mr. Van Buren did not want to see the removal of these policies be forgotten, he asked what the timeframe would be. Mr. Yost said he could open an application the next day to resolve the policy statements.

The City had two I-15 interchanges, East Bay and Center Street. Mr. Harding thought it still made sense to have freeway oriented commercial zoning at the Center Street interchange. Rather than completely removing Policy 19, he hoped the text could just be amended to exclude the East Bay interchange for this policy.

Mr. Jones had reviewed the staff report which included removing these policy statements, he offered to amend the ordinance to include the removal of these statements. Mr. Van Buren did not want to delay voting but did want this included in the resolution. Mr. Yost and Mr. Jones would work on this and present an amended ordinance at the next meeting, they would also be sure to include Mr. Harding's suggestion. Mr. Van Buren preferred this option and stated his preference to vote on an amended resolution at the next meeting.

Chair Harding opened public comment, there was no response. There was no further Council discussion.

18. Ordinance 2019-06 to amend the General Plan regarding the Downtown Master Plan to clarify right-of-way improvements for 100 West. City-wide impact. (PLGPA20190008) [\(1:56:28\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to adopt Ordinance 2019-06 as currently constituted, had been made by council rule.

Javin Weaver, Planner, presented. The Downtown Master Plan described 100 West from 600 South to 500 North as a Pedestrian Corridor. Multiple departments including Economic Development and Redevelopment had identified a cross section of 100 West from 100 South to 600 South as a potential pedestrian corridor.

One new development in the area would be a pedestrian overpass connecting the Provo Station at 100 West 600 South. Mr. Weaver said there had also been discussion of UDOT installing a pedestrian bicycle traffic light at 300 West and 100 South.

The proposed street section would include two bike lanes and 45 degree back-in parking which was thought to be safer for pedestrians and bicyclists. This was a new concept for the City.

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

Vote: The motion to approve Ordinance 2019-06 was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

19. *****CONTINUED*** An ordinance amending the Downtown Streetscape Standards to clarify right-of-way improvements for 100 West. City-wide impact. (PLOT20190007)**

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

Mr. Jones said the administration had requested a closed meeting for the purpose of strategizing about the sale of property. The property being discussed had been publicly noticed and met the requirements for a strategy session.

Motion: Councilor Stewart moved to close the meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilor Van Buren.

Vote: The motion to close the meeting was approved 7:0 with Councilors Handley, Harding, Knecht, Sewell, Stewart, Van Buren and Winterton in favor.

Adjournment

The regular meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 7:34 p.m.