

Please Note – These minutes have been prepared with a timestamp 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

Work Meeting Minutes

12:30 PM, Tuesday, February 01, 2022

Hybrid meeting: <https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil> or 351 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

Agenda ([0:00:00](#))

Roll Call

The following elected officials participated:

Council Chair Travis Hoban, conducting
Council Vice-chair George Handley
Councilor Katrice MacKay
Councilor Bill Fillmore
Councilor Rachel Whipple
Councilor David Shipley
Councilor Shannon Ellsworth
Mayor Michelle Kaufusi, arrived 12:36 PM

Prayer

The prayer was given by Councilor Travis Hoban.

Approval of Minutes ([0:03:08](#))

December 14, 2021 Council Meeting
January 18, 2022 Work Meeting
Approved by unanimous consent.

Policy Items Referred from the Landmarks Commission

1. **A resolution adding the structure known as the Milner-Wright Home, located at 1115 East 640 South, to the Provo Landmarks Register. Provost Neighborhood. (PLLN20210394) ([0:03:53](#))**

Dustin Wright, Planner, presented. The property owner of the Milner-Wright Home has nominated her property to be listed on the Provo landmarks register. City staff have reviewed the application and ensured the property meets the necessary landmarks criteria. The Landmarks Commission has forwarded a positive recommendation to list this property on the landmarks register. Councilor Bill Fillmore asked what the consequences were of a historical landmark designation. Mr. Wright indicated that listing the property can make the owner eligible to apply for certain tax credits toward rehabilitating the home. There are incentives to be on the register, as well as protections for the property; if an owner wanted to construct an addition, they would

need to obtain a certificate of appropriateness from the Landmarks Commission. Mr. Fillmore asked how many homes are on the landmarks register. Mr. Wright indicated about 100 homes were listed as historic landmarks. Councilor Rachel Whipple asked how the historic significance is measured for the house. Mr. Wright indicated that some of the criteria relate to significant persons or history in Provo. This home was connected to a large dairy farm in Provo which provided a benefit to the community, and this comprised the most significant element of the home's historic connections. Ms. Whipple said she loved the idea of being able to protect the house. She felt the improvements made to it were consistent with the architecture and she'd like to help them continue to protect the home. Mr. Wright indicated that encouraging property owners to treat historic homes with care provides a benefit to the neighborhood as well to look better and improve. Mr. Wright referenced some older photos from the 1980s showing the condition of the home before the current owner worked on it; her improvements have brought the home into a more consistent aesthetic with the historic character of the home. ***Presentation only. This item was already scheduled for the Council Meeting on February 1, 2022.***

Policy Items Referred from the Planning Commission

2. An ordinance amending Provo City Code Chapter 15.08 (Fees). Citywide Application. (PLOT20210273) (0:11:22)

Dixon Holmes, Assistant CAO, presented. Mr. Holmes explained that this ordinance would allow the owner or contractor to appeal the impact fee imposed on the project if they feel the fee was unfair or disproportionate. In some areas, the appeal process has been used frequently such as for traffic impact fees, which are based on a national standard. This ordinance would establish a process and criteria. Previously the appeal process would go all the way to the mayor, which tended to result in a more political process. The updated process would make it administrative in nature, with the ability for the applicant to appeal to a court of law. Brian Jones, City Attorney, noted that since the materials were originally published, some formatting problems have been corrected. Some language had been inadvertently left in one section which had been removed before it went to the Planning Commission, so this has been corrected.

Mr. Jones summarized the changes; notably this would align the appeal process with state code, as well as clarify that an appeal applies only to how the impact fee applies to a project rather than an appeal of the way the impact fee was calculated. Councilor David Shipley asked how many times in the past five years the Mayor has had to make a decision on the appeal. Mr. Holmes indicated that has happened once. Councilor Rachel Whipple asked a question about the parks impact fee and a typo. Mr. Jones noted that several grammatical corrections had been made over the weekend due to the timing of the Planning Commission meeting. ***Presentation only. This item was already scheduled for the Council Meeting on February 1, 2022.***

3. An ordinance amending the Zone Map Classification of approx. 1.10 acres at 669 S 1600 W from the A1.1 (Agricultural) to R1.8 (One-Family Residential) to create four residential building lots. Sunset Neighborhood. (PLRZ20210383) (0:20:34)

Aaron Ardmore, Planning Supervisor, presented. This does comply with the future land use map. The four lots will have access off a shared central driveway. Staff and the Planning Commission

have recommended approval. *Presentation only. This item was already scheduled for the Council Meeting on February 1, 2022.*

4. An ordinance amending the zone map classification of approx. 1.39 acres of real property, from 46 W to 90 W on 800 N, from Residential Conservation (RC) to Campus Mixed Use (CMU). North Park Neighborhood. (PLRZ20210112) (0:22:45)

Aaron Ardmore, Planning Supervisor, presented. This area has four aging homes which the property owner has proposed replacing with an apartment building. The campus mixed use zone was established between University Avenue and 900 East in the area just south of BYU campus. This is just across University Avenue from that location. Due to the proximity to campus and transit, staff felt this was appropriate to rezone as campus mixed use and have recommended approval. Councilor David Shipley asked about the Planning Commission's discussion of the concept plan. Mr. Ardmore explained that the concept plan does not have enough parking at present. If the developer uses the current version of the concept plan after securing the rezone, the applicant will need to pursue a parking reduction. The applicant's response is that they have managed similar apartments in the area with a similar parking ratio. The applicant is providing additional bike storage and they are securing a traffic study to include with their application as well. Mr. Shipley asked about the outcome of the reduced parking at the Amanda Knight Hall—Bill Peperone, Development Services Director, said they have not received any complaints.

Councilor George Handley asked if this owner was using a similar process as the owners of Amanda Knight Hall to manage the reduced parking availability for tenants to screen applicants. Mr. Ardmore indicated the applicant plans to manage it to reduce the number of cars that come to the property; when approving contracts, they will review the number of cars that tenants are bringing. Mr. Handley also asked about a figure in the General Plan that refers to rental needs in the city; Mr. Handley wondered whether staff had a sense of whether this type of housing at market level is needed. Mr. Ardmore spoke to this question; based on the volume of apartments being constructed and requested to be built, and the rental prices associated with those types of apartments in Provo, there is the demand for this type of project.

Councilor Bill Fillmore asked about the parking standard and reduced ratio request. Mr. Ardmore indicated that this size of apartment requires 1.5 cars per unit and the applicant has proposed decreasing the parking to 1.34 cars per unit. Mr. Ardmore indicated they have only submitted a concept plan at this time, but that amount is what they have contemplated. Mr. Ardmore indicated Mr. Fillmore's additional questions would be better answered by the applicant at the Council Meeting that night. Mr. Fillmore asked if there were any reasons for the Planning Commission denial besides the parking area. Mr. Ardmore indicated that the Planning Commission also had some misunderstandings of the purpose of the campus mixed use. Mr. Ardmore explained that the CMU zone does not contemplate necessarily requiring a commercial element as in other mixed use zone areas.

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth asked if the Planning Commission had some concern about the ownership of the properties. Mr. Ardmore indicated that the applicant owns all the properties proposed for the zone change. There was some discussion of phasing, but no concerns about the ownership. Councilor Katrice MacKay thought the Council needed to discuss this—she noted

that since the Council had implemented Transportation Demand Management plans, an increased number of applications have been submitted including a request for a parking reduction. She appreciated that this development was only 10 parking spaces short; it's not a big difference, but the TDM can allow them to go as low as 1 parking space per unit. She thought that since parking is such a significant issue in the City and since the Council receives many communications about parking, it was an important policy discussion to have. She also wondered whether the applicant was only able to rezone to the Campus Mixed Use zone because they had included the Foxwood Apartments. Mr. Ardmore indicated they could still do the CMU zone even if they did not add the Foxwood Apartment, but that adding the apartments changed the overall number of units. Ms. Ellsworth asked whether an applicant has used an adjacent property to increase their density in the past. Mr. Ardmore noted that the main question was whether CMU is an appropriate zone for all of these properties, or just for the four properties on 800 North. The numbers in the concept plan become less important as the question of whether it's the appropriate zone in the appropriate place.

Councilor Rachel Whipple asked some follow-up questions regarding the second phase of the project and how the removal of Foxwood Apartments would impact the final results. Mr. Ardmore explained that there was no firm timeline for the phases; the applicant owns and manages the complex, and they wanted to be financially solvent after completing the first phase before moving onto the second phase.

Brian Jones, City Attorney, said the City does not require development agreements but the Council can express concerns about the impacts of the project and then the developer can decide whether to proffer a development agreement. Mr. Jones indicated this is advantageous to the City and to developers in the case of a multiphase project. The city cannot obligate the developer to build the second phase, but the city can require that the developer not do something other than what was proposed in phase two. Mr. Peperone indicated that the developer has offered to limit the height to 45 feet (the zone allows them to build to up to 75 feet). The development agreement can restrict those factors and assuage the City's concerns. Mr. Peperone said many developers and property managers are very diligent about managing their parking and the city never gets complaints; other owners say they will manage the parking, but then actually do not. Mr. Peperone said it really comes down to the specific property owners.

Council Chair Travis Hoban asked that Mr. Fillmore's additional questions be deferred to the evening meeting discussion for answers from the developer at that time. ***Presentation only. This item was already scheduled for the Council Meeting on February 1, 2022.***

Business

5. A presentation of the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 Budget Calendar. (22-016) (0:40:40)

Kristal Howarth, Budget Analyst, presented. The budget calendar is an outline of what to expect in the coming months and what their time will be spent on in Finance. Kelsey Zarbock, Budget Officer, completed this calendar and she is on maternity leave and Ms. Howarth was grateful to have this outline in her absence. Ms. Howarth gave an update on the progress of the budget

process so far and highlighted the budget presentations at upcoming Work Meetings and the process which would unfold over the coming months. *Presentation only.*

6. A presentation regarding Provo City's use of federal dollars from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). (22-017) (0:46:58)

Wayne Parker, CAO, presented. Mr. Parker officially welcomed Ms. Howarth to the budget team. She came from Community and Neighborhood Services, where she has been a fantastic employee. They have been working closely with her on ARPA. Mr. Parker began with the history of the American Rescue Plan Act and other economic stimulus activities of the federal government during the pandemic. Mr. Parker highlighted some of the City's uses of CARES Act funding. ARPA funds initially had more restrictions imposed by the federal government, but have since been expanded to more eligible uses, including:

- Support the public health response to the pandemic
- Address negative impacts to workers, families, small business, and non-profits
- Replace public sector revenue loss
- Premium pay for essential workers
- Water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure

Mr. Parker highlighted what had changed in ARPA regarding lost revenue replacement and the timeline for its usage. These are one-time allocations which should not be used for ongoing expenses. Any funds used must be obligated by the end of December 2024 and fully spent by the end of December 2026. Mr. Parker outlined the next steps and parameters of the discussion. Council Leadership asked the Administration to prepare a recommendation of their preferred projects for the \$10 million and \$23 million segments. The Council will also come up with a list and suggest priority projects. Mr. Parker indicated they hoped to firm up some ideas by mid-to-late March, after which the Council will appropriate funds based on the Council and Administration's priorities.

Cliff Strachan, Council Executive Director, said that to expedite this process, Councilors should indicate if they want to be on that committee or to submit projects that they would like the City to consider. Councilor David Shipley asked about what the city has received and what they have spent so far; Mr. Parker responded with details. Mr. Shipley asked about the delay with the wastewater treatment plant. Mr. Parker indicated he would speak with Dave Decker about the specifics of that project and report back to the Council. Councilor Shannon Ellsworth hoped the Council would be specific and objective about the process.

Councilor George Handley expressed a desire to examine the specific needs of community members who have been hardest hit by the pandemic. Ms. Ellsworth shared the comments of a fifth grade class at Provost Elementary School which she spoke with—they suggested helping the poor and homeless and this resonated with Mr. Handley's comments. Mr. Handley asked where the impacts have been in the community. Mr. Parker said they could try to identify specific needs and opportunities. He noted that with the CARES Act, millions of dollars were given to non-profits. Utah County also allocated over \$12 million for small business assistance. Mr. Parker noted that the impacts of the pandemic have been felt differently during the different variants and as vaccines have become more widely available.

Councilor Bill Fillmore asked whether the City's money would be augmented with funds received by the state. Mr. Parker indicated some funds would go to the state, but due to the high demand it was unlikely that the City would receive much if any. Councilor Katrice MacKay asked about Davis Bacon wages. Mr. Parker explained that it is a standard that requires paying the prevailing wage and is usually a requirement of projects completed with federal dollars. Usually of the multiple contractors bidding on a project, a contractor who pays their employees less comes out ahead in the bidding, so it is a way to ensure fair pay for workers. Councilor Rachel Whipple asked about the specific types of water projects permitted and she also asked about levees. Mr. Parker indicated it was unclear whether stormwater projects qualified but they hoped for more clarification from the Treasury Department soon. Mr. Parker indicated they would include levees and west side sewer upgrades in their project list.

Several Councilors indicated interest in serving on an ad hoc committee to prepare the Council's suggestions. Cliff Strachan, Council Executive Director, suggested keeping the committee limited to Councilors with staff support; if the committee wanted to consult other groups, they could bring them in as guests rather than as formal committee members in order to keep things moving forward. Mr. Shipley suggested the committee take a liaison role between the Council and Administration. Ms. Ellsworth suggested a rating scale or grading system for projects.

Motion: Bill Fillmore moved to establish an ad hoc committee with members Shannon Ellsworth, Katrice MacKay, and David Shipley; with Mr. Shipley as chair; to liaise with the City Administration to review and recommend projects to be done with ARPA funds for recommendations to the entire Council. Seconded by Travis Hoban.

Vote: Approved 7:0.

7. A presentation regarding the My Hometown Initiative. (22-015) ([1:21:22](#))

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi introduced a new initiative called My Hometown. Wayne Parker, CAO, said the Mayor has been a significant player in this team effort to move this project forward. This initiative is the result of a pilot project done in West Valley with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The purpose is to help residents improve the physical condition and safety of public and private property; increase property values; curb intergenerational poverty; elevate K-12 educational performance; lift educational attainment of adults; raise incomes; increase home ownership; develop residents' leadership skills; and improve access to valuable resources such as health care, community participation, and resources needed for long-term generational prosperity.

For the project, they recruit block captains from neighborhood residents who will help to identify and distribute resources. There are also Church volunteers who will provide professional expertise to the projects. The Provo Freedom Stake and Provo South Stake have been identified as areas where this program will be piloted in Provo. Several older pioneer neighborhoods will also be included. Mr. Parker gave examples of services provided and how the Church will operate resource centers in the neighborhoods. They have designated two City liaisons, Dixon Holmes and Tara Riddle, each of whom will work with one of the stakes that are part of the project. Mr. Parker gave examples of the types of services that the city will provide as a support to the project. Mr. Parker also highlighted some of the outcomes of the West Valley project. He

shared broad information about the service missionaries that the Church is recruiting. They are also currently drafting and negotiating an agreement with the Church that will outline the City's participation in the project. Mr. Parker commented that it was fantastic to work with an organization that is able to quickly mobilize a lot of volunteers.

Councilor Bill Fillmore expressed that this was fantastic. Councilor Shannon Ellsworth asked what the Council can do to make this successful. Mr. Parker indicated that the Council's involvement would be key in recruiting folks to participate and in identifying funding sources for some of the opportunities. Ms. Ellsworth said former Councilor David Harding would be a great fit. Mr. Parker said that anyone who is community-minded would be a great fit and the church leaders are interested in engaging single adults in the project as well. In response to a question from Mr. Fillmore, Mr. Parker outlined the areas for the project—I-15 forms the west boundary, then it goes to 900 South, wraps around the Frontrunner station to 600 South, to 700 East, then north of Center Street to 200 or 300 North, then back to Center Street and out to I-15.

Ms. Ellsworth echoed that young adults and students are a tremendous resource in Provo and have already contributed greatly to service in the community. Mr. Parker commented that many young single adults already contribute hundreds of hours of service in places like South Franklin Community Center. Councilor Rachel Whipple asked how have they worked out the use of church facilities with Facilities Management and Risk Management. Mr. Parker indicated that a major component of the pilot project was figuring out those details but so far things are working successfully. Ms. Whipple suggested having outdoor facilities and pavilion and dog poop bag stations for this to have the full effect of a community center. Mr. Parker indicated they would be looking for volunteers to create outdoor spaces as part of the project. Mr. Parker also discussed other factors and components like broadband access for community residents.

Councilor George Handley was thrilled that these church buildings would be utilized when they are often empty for much of the week with large empty parking lots. When most churchgoers live within walking distance of their church buildings, he hoped the many parking lots could be reimagined entirely. He also said that School Board member McKay Jensen is the bishop of a mid-singles ward in his area, which is a tremendous resource. Councilor Katrice MacKay was really excited about this project. In her discussions with Bill Hulterstrom of United Way of Utah County, they both observed this project would create so many benefits to the neighborhoods. The long-term effects excite her a lot. *Presentation only.*

8. A presentation reviewing Provo City General Plan- Part 2 of 3 (22-011). ([1:54:07](#))

Melissa McNalley and Brandon Larsen, Planners, presented. Mr. Larsen reviewed the progress the Council has made in their review thus far and what they would cover during this discussion. The Mayor would like a statistical survey to solicit feedback from the community about the General Plan. They are currently in the process of hiring a consultant to conduct the survey. Once a consultant is secured, they will start drafting the survey before distributing it. Before reviewing chapter 5, Mr. Larsen referenced a previously distributed list of revisions made to the General Plan and reviewed items on the list which have been addressed. Mr. Larsen referred to the General Plan future land use map and noted areas which had been identified as possible concerns and the adjustments which had been made as a result.

Councilor Rachel Whipple asked how specifically the future land use map was going to be applied and whether there was a clear expectation of the purpose of this map which was drawn with broad strokes. Mr. Larsen explained that the map is drawn with broad strokes; the changes made so far were to address some concerns which had been raised during the review process. Several Councilors expressed that they thought the changes made were good.

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth commented about the commercial designation of 300 South, noting that the area is primarily residential. She also asked about South State Street—a mixed use designation doesn't seem fitting for that area as it is primarily developing as multifamily with some clusters of commercial; it does not seem like mixed use in the classic planning sense. She felt that mixed use works where it is walkable and in a downtown center; however, South State Street is not walkable and it did not seem realistic or like the area fit the criteria. Ms. McNalley said they have gone over these maps and taken suggestions from the Council during the last meeting. They asked for the Council to email in changes about that. They wanted to focus on chapters 5, 6, and 7. They wanted to illustrate some of the changes they have considered to give to the consultants which are in the packets. Council Chair Travis Hoban asked the Council to move on from the map for now; he indicated that the Council could email in comments and try to cover the main chapters content for the current discussion.

Councilor Katrice MacKay said they have been emailing Hannah Salzl and asked whether they needed to email anyone else. Staff indicated that Ms. Salzl was taking point and collecting the Councilors' comments. Mr. Larsen asked Brian Jones to clarify how they should proceed. Mr. Jones, City Attorney, had commented in the last meeting that motions clarifying a majority intent of the Council were helpful in guiding staff. A helpful part of the process is for Councilors to send proposed edits and comments to the clearinghouse of planning staff who will sort them.

Councilor George Handley commented on the section "A City that Leads." He liked goal number 4 on page 64 to encourage diversification of tax base and revenue streams through efficiency and proactive governance. He felt that was the most pressing problem that Provo has; he hoped they could add more substance behind that goal since that is a significant economic challenge in Provo. Mr. Handley noted that his comment was meant as an effort to balance this document more and strengthening its language about economic well-being. Councilor Bill Fillmore agreed that was an important area to reinforce.

Ms. Ellsworth thought the policy on page 52 under LP4 was not very strong; it seemed incomplete. Ms. Whipple asked about the term leakage on page 43 in the first paragraph on the right column; she wondered if that term would confuse readers. Mr. Fillmore asked about the population growth rates on page 44. He referenced a statistic shared by a constituent that the growth rate is shrinking over recent decades. Mr. Larsen said they could look at these number in more detail, but that they were based on Mountainlands projections. Mr. Fillmore also felt the income information on page 44 was skewed as it included students who often had part-time household incomes due to their full-time student status. Ms. Ellsworth said that there are multiple demographers at the Kem Gardner institute; with demographics being such a highly specialized field of study, she was confident in the data being used. Mr. Hoban noted that the Census data was skewed because many students were gone for the Census count due to the pandemic.

Ms. Whipple noted that on page 46, having average and median income used in the same sentence to refer to the same number was confusing. Mr. Handley asked for clarification on how to interpret the table about apartments on page 44. He thought some guidance on how the Council could use this data when considering development proposals would be helpful for future reference. Mr. Larsen indicated staff could look into this and address it in more detail during the next presentation. Mr. Handley also wondered how to quantify this data on an ongoing basis rather than as a static number within the general plan which may change over time. Ms. MacKay was very happy the Council was going to do a housing audit—she noted the difference between a student who may have parental financial support versus a single mom with multiple kids who is working two jobs. Student poverty versus other resident poverty have stark differences. Ms. Whipple asked about table 3 and how to account for apartments which are renting out to multiple single adults. Most student or single adult households don't have a common household budget or income, so she wanted to understand how that data was calculated. Ms. McNalley indicated that this data is from the Census, so they are using that as their data source.

Mr. Larsen explained that Public Works has reviewed the General Plan and given their feedback, particularly on the transportation elements in Chapter 6, and staff have implemented edits based on their feedback. Ms. Whipple noted a gap in the general plan about railroad crossings. Ms. Ellsworth echoed her comment, noting that multiple railroads were barriers in many parts of the city. She felt that Provo needs to be more conscientious than most communities about how we get over, under, and around railroads. Mr. Fillmore echoed Ms. Ellsworth's comments as well. Ms. McNalley explained that the transportation master plan addresses many of these elements but adding railroad crossings to the general plan would be appropriate. Mr. Fillmore also suggested adding slowing down Center Street and Slate Canyon Drive. He noted there was only one reference to east-west connectivity in the general plan. Ms. McNalley again noted this was addressed in more detail in the transportation master plan. Mr. Fillmore thought a brief reference to keep these connectivity issues top-of-mind was merited. Ms. Whipple liked the frequent references to bicycling.

Mr. Fillmore reiterated his comments from previous meetings that he felt public safety should be a priority in the general plan. Mr. Hoban referenced a previous comment by Hannah Salzl that the General Plan is specific to land use. Mr. Fillmore noted instances in which land use relates closely with public safety; he hoped staff would also obtain input from Fire and Police.

Mr. Larsen clarified that the General Plan is on pause but they will have the next presentation at the next Council Meetings as planned and would defer discussion of chapter 7 to that time. Mr. Handley asked for clarification about the objective of the Mayor's survey and the intended results, which Mr. Larsen indicated he would address via email. ***Presentation only. This item was already scheduled for the Council Meeting on February 1, 2022, and the upcoming Work and Council Meetings as well.***

9. A discussion regarding redistricting adjustments to Provo School Board District maps. (22-003) ([2:47:39](#))

Cliff Strachan, Council Executive Director, presented. They have received 105 maps from the public engagement process. Mr. Strachan reviewed some of the map options and how staff

endeavored to narrow the selection. He reviewed the criteria that staff used based on feedback from the Council, including requirements of state code, and considerations including displacing incumbents, district core preservation, balanced number of schools per district, and creating a west side district. Mr. Strachan reviewed the methodology by which they ranked and rated the submitted maps and responded to several clarifying questions from Councilors. Mr. Strachan displayed the top 12 maps based on the rankings. Councilors supported following a similar process for obtaining school board feedback as staff did with the Council on their feedback.

Motion: George Handley moved to follow the same process with school district as they have done with the Council. Seconded by Bill Fillmore.

Substitute Motion: David Shipley moved to follow the same process with the school district as they have done with the Council, including the superintendent as well. Seconded by Bill Fillmore.

Vote: Approved 7:0.

Councilors briefly discussed plans for Open City Hall and obtaining public feedback on the top several maps.

Motion: Travis Hoban moved to wait to post on OCH until the Council has received feedback from the School Board to help narrow down the number of maps that go out. Seconded by Bill Fillmore.

Vote: Approved 7:0.

10. A discussion regarding redistricting adjustments to City Council District maps. (22-003) ([3:16:13](#))

Cliff Strachan, Council Executive Director, presented. Mr. Strachan highlighted the past discussions on this issue and some of the factors and considerations they have looked into as staff. He reviewed some possible courses of action and possible timelines.

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth commented that there were different pros and cons to every form. She thought citizens might be better served with seven districts. She noted that whatever cons accompanied that model had never been problems with the school district. The state legislature is also operating with a one-person-per-district model. She is interested in seeing where this goes.

Motion: Shannon Ellsworth moved that the Council create seven districts and identify alternatives for seven Council districts. No second received.

Councilor George Handley has been weighing this carefully and sympathized with what Ms. Ellsworth described. He thought the current status quo of five districts and two citywide seats was the way to go. He thought that the benefits of the citywide seat, which allows more candidates from more areas to run more frequently, was a significant benefit of the current system. Brian Jones noted that no motion was necessary as the law already exists to result in that outcome, but the Council may wish to vote on a motion in that vein to end debate.

Motion: George Handley moved to stick with five districts and two citywide seats and to move forward with that expectation of redrawing the boundaries. Seconded by Bill Fillmore.

Councilor Rachel Whipple asked if the Council moved forward with 7 districts, whether they needed to align with the school board districts. Mr. Hoban did not think this question needed consideration since the motion did not receive a second. Mr. Fillmore agreed with Mr. Handley's comments. He was hesitant to take any steps to adversely affect a district where there is more civic mindedness. Mr. Hoban addressed Ms. Whipple's comment; he noted that some of the criteria they examined for the school board, such as the number of schools in a district, were not relevant constraints for the Council maps, so they did not necessarily need to be the same.

Councilor David Shipley shared his thoughts about the merits of expanding the districts to 6 or 7 to address the needs of future growth and representation on the west side of Provo. He felt it was a critical change to address for the coming decade and he wanted to register his support for that idea, fully acknowledging that making such a change would eliminate his citywide seat.

Mr. Fillmore noted that the perceived imbalance of representation from the northeast of the City may not have been consistent historically. He agreed that the west side merited more representation. Mr. Shipley responded to Mr. Fillmore's comment and clarified that he felt that the issue was not of overrepresentation from one area, but that some areas may be underrepresented as a result of five districts and two citywide seats; the 'overrepresentation' could very well shift between different areas over time.

Ms. Whipple was considering increasing the number of districts. She noted that districts 2, 3, and 5 have the greatest proportion of the student population, which skews the number of registered voters and voter participation. She did not think this was a reflection on the civic engagement or any perceived lack from residents in those areas; she thought it was simply a reflection of the composition of the population in those areas. Mr. Strachan shared observations of some of the map proposals and how this was impacted by the way precincts were drawn.

Substitute Motion: David Shipley moved to expand to six districts with one citywide seat. Seconded by Rachel Whipple.

Mr. Handley reiterated others' comments on student population and how it impacts voter turnout. He noted that district 2 includes the precinct with the highest voter turnout, but it is skewed by the other precincts in that district. He preferred the five-district and two citywide seat-split because in every election, there are multiple choices for voters as well as multiple opportunities for candidates to run from a specific area. Six districts and one citywide seat felt imbalanced to him. Overemphasizing or underemphasizing regions was problematic and for this reason he liked having the additional citywide seat.

Vote on substitute motion: Failed 3:4, with Travis Hoban, Katrice MacKay, Bill Fillmore, and George Handley opposed.

Mr. Shipley really appreciated Mr. Handley's comments. He noted that the high expense of running a citywide campaign was high enough that it could detract grassroots campaigns from accomplishing that. In politics in general, the fact that the price tag is so high is a real problem.

Councilor Katrice MacKay commented that as someone who just did a citywide campaign, it is expensive, and it is so much work. At the same time, she and her opponent both funded their campaigns through donations (rather than their own financial resources) and a lot of hard work. The amount of work it takes to get to know the entire city and campaign in the entire city really makes it a robust race, which requires candidates who are serious and passionate about it. Part of the work that goes into the campaign is about selling your goals and work, and you don't rely on someone's own financial means to get to the end; she thought that was really relevant.

Ms. Whipple decided not to run citywide because she lives in downtown and didn't think she'd have access to the social capital to get large donations. She noted that based on voter turnout, some candidates might decide to overlook certain areas of the city as a tactical decision, but that could increase the likelihood that those people feel underrepresented. Ms. Ellsworth appreciated Ms. Whipple's comments and wondered how campaign donations were distributed throughout the city. She thought staff might also have better information on voter turnout and hoped these factors could be examined again in 10 years when going through this process again.

Vote: Approved 4:3, with Rachel Whipple, David Shipley, and Shannon Ellsworth opposed.

Mr. Strachan outlined the timeline and process moving forward, including opening the map tool online for city council maps and posting an Open City Hall topic for the school board maps.

Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent.