



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Work Meeting

12:00 PM, Tuesday, May 17, 2022

Hybrid meeting: [youtube.com/provocitycouncil](https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil) or 351 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601

The in-person meeting will be held in the **Council Chambers**. The meeting will be available to the public for live broadcast and on-demand viewing on YouTube and Facebook at: [youtube.com/provocitycouncil](https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil) and [facebook.com/provocouncil](https://www.facebook.com/provocouncil). If one platform is unavailable, please try the other. If you do not have access to the Internet, you can join via telephone following the instructions below.

To listen to the meeting by phone: May 17 Work Meeting: Dial 346-248-7799. Enter Meeting ID 817 4652 6910 and press #. When asked for a participant ID, press #.

Agenda

Roll Call

Prayer

Approval of Minutes

March 29, 2022 Council Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2022 Council Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2022 Budget Work Meeting

Business

1. A presentation regarding the effects FY 23 Airport Budget with new air carrier, planes, and routes. (22-016)
2. A presentation regarding the Lakeview Parkway Phase 4 Interlocal Agreement. (22-046)
3. A discussion regarding the mission statement, committee members, and committee chair & vice-chair for the Council's Natural Resources Committee. (22-005)
4. Potential Emergency Dispatch Center Consolidation. (22-047)
5. A presentation regarding a comparison of Council and Mayor Office budget expenditures in various Utah cities. (22-016)
6. A presentation regarding utility rates, property tax rates, and fees. (22-016)

7. A presentation regarding budget increases from FY2022 to FY2023. (22-016)
8. A presentation regarding transfers in the FY2023 budget. (22-016)
9. A presentation regarding the Tentative Budget FY2023 and Council priorities (22-016 & 22-037)

Closed Meeting

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.

Adjournment

If you have a comment regarding items on the agenda, please contact Councilors at council@provo.org or using their contact information listed at: provo.org/government/city-council/meet-the-council

Materials and Agenda: agendas.provo.org

Council meetings are broadcast live and available later on demand at youtube.com/ProvoCityCouncil

To send comments to the Council or weigh in on current issues, visit OpenCityHall.provo.org.

The next Work Meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 7, 2022. The meeting will be held in the Council Chambers, 351 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601 with an online broadcast. Work Meetings generally begin between 12 and 4 PM. Council Meetings begin at 5:30 PM. The start time for additional meetings may vary. All meeting start times are noticed at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Notice of Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

In compliance with the ADA, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting are invited to notify the Provo Council Office at 351 W. Center, Provo, Utah 84601, phone: (801) 852-6120 or email evanderwerken@provo.org at least three working days prior to the meeting. Council meetings are broadcast live and available for on demand viewing at youtube.com/ProvoCityCouncil.

Notice of Telephonic Communications

One or more Council members may participate by telephone or Internet communication in this meeting. Telephone or Internet communications will be amplified as needed so all Council members and others attending the meeting will be able to hear the person(s) participating electronically as well as those participating in person. The meeting will be conducted using the same procedures applicable to regular Municipal Council meetings.

Notice of Compliance with Public Noticing Regulations

This meeting was noticed in compliance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4), which supersedes some requirements listed in Utah Code 52-4-202 and Provo City Code 14.02.010. Agendas and minutes are accessible through the Provo City website at agendas.provo.org. Council meeting agendas are available through the Utah Public Meeting Notice website at utah.gov/pmn, which also offers email subscriptions to notices.

Draft Minutes

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

Regular Meeting Agenda

5:30 PM, Tuesday, March 29, 2022

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

Roll Call

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Councilor Shannon Ellsworth

Councilor Bill Fillmore

Councilor George Handley

Councilor Travis Hoban

Councilor Katrice MacKay

Councilor David Shipley

Councilor Rachel Whipple

Council Executive Interim Director John Magness

Chief Administrative Officer Wayne Parker

City Attorney Brian Jones

Deputy Mayor Isaac Paxman

Conducting: Chair Travis Hoban

Prayer – Chief Jim Miguel

Pledge of Allegiance – Councilor Whipple

Public Comment

Melanie McCoard, of Provo, asked why the Parks or Arts Board Members were not present in today's work meeting. She proposed that no briefing be provided to Council unless board members have been asked or provided input. She also shared her belief that a Public Works board is necessary. She added that the Airport needs to be a separate department.

With no other comments, Chair Hoban closed public comment.

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

1. A presentation of 2020 Utah Firefighters of the Year. (22-034) [\(13:25\)](#)

Lynn Schofield, Fire Battalion Chief, introduced other participants to council and asked them to join him at the front. Mr. Schofield discussed an incident that happened in February 2021.

David Larsen, Chair of the Joint Council of Fire Service Organizations, recognized and presented the award to the following members of the Fire Department: Jeff Wise, Jeremy Moon, Nick Blackburn, Koby Hubbs, Todd Glassford, Brenin Anderson, Jake Dennison, Chad Chapman, and Spencer Long.

Action Agenda

Draft Minutes

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.

2. A resolution appointing individuals to the Metropolitan Water Board (22-009) [\(23:22\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2022-13, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Brian Jones, City Attorney, provided information about the Metropolitan Water Board. He mentioned that there are currently four available seats but only three applications were received. The following individuals were recommended to fill the seats: Wood Miller, Dennis Weir, and Robin Roberts.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor.

3. A resolution adopting the Mountainland Pre-Disaster Hazard Mitigation Plan. (22-036) [\(27:08\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2022-14, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Chris Blinzinger, Emergency Management Coordinator, provided summary as extensive discussion was had during the work session.

Chair Hoban opened public comment. With none, he closed public comment and brought discussion back to council.

With no council discussion, Chair Hoban called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor.

4. A resolution adopting the 2021 Provo Foothills Trail Master Plan. (22-024) [\(29:04\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2022-15, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Doug Robins, Assistant Director of Parks and Recreation, presented the Master Plan.

Councilor Fillmore asked if they are anticipating any federal funding.

Mr. Robins responded that funding would be provided.

Councilor MacKay applauded those who put the plan together. She shared her concern for private property and suggested a clause be added to acknowledge property rights would not be taken away.

Mr. Robins said their focus is to work with property owners.

Draft Minutes

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.

53
54 Brian Jones read suggested text and said a motion would be required prior to the addition to passing the
55 resolution.

56
57 Councilor Ellsworth discussed a law that was passed last year regarding eminent domain.

58
59 Mr. Jones clarified the bill and mentioned he did not know if the bill was passed this session.

60
61 Councilor Handley asked if there was any risk in adding the text.

62
63 Mr. Jones said he believes this clarifies the rights and responsibilities of parties involved.

64
65 Councilor Handley said he is worried about adding the text. He suggested an additional sentence that
66 includes “the adoption of this plan by the Provo Municipal Council signifies our support of the plan as a
67 whole and all the areas included in the plan.”
68

Motion: A motion to add language to the Master Plan was made by Councilor MacKay.
Seconded by Councilor Fillmore

69
70 Councilor Ellsworth asked how this relates to the other trails in the city and how they would be
71 incorporated into a future master plan.

72
73 Mr. Robins said a master plan for all trails could easily be included in the future.

74
75 Councilor Handley mentioned the possibility of the foothills committee exploring other trails in the city.

76
77 Councilor Ellsworth suggested Provo should be the first city in Utah County to build a mountain biking
78 course.

79
80 Chair Hoban called for a vote on the motion.

81
Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Hoban,
Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor.

82
83 Chair Hoban opened item for public comment.

84
85 Melanie McCoard, of Provo, asked if the Parks Board and other committees were in support. She also
86 asked about the access of properties. She said she wants to make sure access to public property is
87 protected.

88
89 With no other comments, Chair Hoban closed public comment.

90
91 Mr. Jones responded to Ms. McCoard’s question.
92

Draft Minutes

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.

Councilor Whipple said that issues with public right of ways and property rights are not decisions that the city is required to make.

Chair Hoban clarified and asked if this would help any future lawsuits.

Mr. Jones clarified what the Master Plan does and said it does not grant rights. He added that legal action would be required, and Council does not have the authority.

Chair Hoban explained that the scenario that Ms. McCoard shared is different from what this document does.

Chair Hoban called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor.

5. ****CONTINUED** A resolution authorizing the issuance of wastewater revenue bonds of Provo City, Utah; Authorizing the execution and delivery of a supplemental indenture and other documents required in connection with the bonds. (22-033)**

6. **An ordinance regarding redistricting adjustments to City Council District Maps. (22-003)**
[\(1:01:27\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2022-13, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Brian Jones presented the 3 Maps that Council recommended be voted on during the work session. He explained how it would look if they decided to use ranked choice voting.

Councilor Handley shared his opinion of rank choice voting.

Karen Tapahe, Community Relations Coordinator, provided history of how we got to this point.

Chair Hoban expressed his opinion to get rid of Map 33 and only discuss the other two Maps after seeing the results of the initial vote.

Councilor Ellsworth pointed out the differences between Maps 34 and 113 regarding her district.

Councilor Handley asked about timeline of applicability.

Mr. Jones proposed the effective date be at the end of the year to prepare for next year's elections.

Councilor Handley asked how it affects council members after the restructuring of the districts.

Draft Minutes

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.

Mr. Jones responded that regardless of districts, council members represent and make decisions for the city. He said the only difference it makes is who will be voting for each council member during the next election.

Councilor Ellsworth asked if that meant she is an at large council member for the duration of the next year.

Mr. Jones responded.

Councilor Handley suggested Map 34 be selected and provided reasoning to why it would benefit multiple districts.

Councilor Whipple asked about Map 113 and how the colors match the district numbers.

Mr. Jones explained that after the Map is selected, the council could determine which district is which.

Karen Tapahe added that the staff could change the numbers to reflect the correct districts.

Councilor Handley asked clarifying questions regarding his district and the area around BYU.

Councilor Whipple asked if it was possible to move one precinct from a section and move it to another.

Ms. Tapahe responded that it is something staff could look at.

Staff pulled up the Map to view how the population would become unbalanced if the precinct in question was changed to a different district.

Chair Hoban suggested the council look at a Map that was provided by Eric Chase.

Councilor Ellsworth shared that it might not be the best idea to design from the dais after the public was presented with the other Maps.

Staff brought up the Map that Mr. Chase designed.

Chair Hoban opened public comment.

Melanie McCoard asked what street the boundary for District 5 is. She stated she is in favor of seven at large council members.

Jeremy Rieske, of Provo, encouraged Map 34 since Map 113 splits the Franklin neighborhood.

Chair Hoban closed public comment.

Councilor Ellsworth stated her preference is Map 34.

Draft Minutes

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.

Motion: A motion to remove Map 33 for consideration was made by Chair Hoban. Seconded by Councilor Ellsworth.

Vote: The motion was approved 4:3 with Councilors Ellsworth, Handley, Hoban, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Fillmore, MacKay, and Shipley opposed.

Chair Hoban said the council now has two maps to consider, Map 34 and Map 113.

Motion: A motion to adopt Map 34 was made by Councilor Ellsworth. Seconded by Councilor Whipple.

Mr. Jones clarified what the correct procedure would be as far as amended motions go and said a final vote would need to be taken.

Councilor Fillmore asked which maps are being considered and said it looks like there are three.

Chair Hoban explained how the rank choice voting affected the decision and how Map 113b would replace 113a if council decided.

Motion: A motion to adopt Map 113b was made by Councilor Fillmore. Seconded by Councilor Shipley.

Councilor Ellsworth questioned Councilor Handley's district.

Councilor Handley responded that he feels like Map 34 is a modest improvement and does not make dramatic changes to District 3.

Councilor Ellsworth echoed Councilor Handley's statements. She also addressed Councilor Fillmore's concerns.

Councilor Fillmore disclosed why he does not support Map 34. He also discussed his rationale for Map 113b.

Councilor Shipley shared his experience with living on the westside and said the westside deserves more representation and connectivity.

Councilor Ellsworth asked about the impact Grandview has in relation to the westside.

Councilor Shipley responded.

Councilor Whipple asked Councilor Shipley about the Franklin Neighborhood vs the Grandview Neighborhood.

Councilor Shipley responded.

Draft Minutes

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.

Councilor Whipple added that any of the options will have uniquely shaped districts and hopes that the public will understand that they are due to the precincts.

Councilor Handley asked Councilor Shipley to clarify his comments regarding the westside being inconvenienced.

Councilor Shipley shared his belief of shared communities making more sense than others.

Councilor MacKay shared experience while campaigning for her seat in the Grandview Neighborhood.

Mr. Jones simplified the differences between Map 113a vs 113b and said that neither one kept Councilor Ellsworth in her district.

Councilor Fillmore asked about the effective date of these changes.

Councilor Handley asked for Chair Hoban's view of Map 34 in relation to Grandview.

Councilor Ellsworth reminded that the job at hand is to decide the boundaries of the districts and name them based on when the election will be for that district councilmember.

Chair Hoban asked Councilor Whipple which she preferred in relation to her district between Map 113a and Map 113b.

Councilor Whipple responded that she preferred Map 113b.

Motion: A substitute motion to supplant Map 113a with Map 113b was made by Chair Hoban. Seconded by Councilor Ellsworth.

Councilor Ellsworth questioned if Councilor Whipple felt like there is enough stability or permanence to facilitate candidates over time.

Councilor Whipple said that there have been many people investing in properties to stay in downtown area. She also said that there are new apartment buildings being constructed whose residents will be eligible to run for office.

Chair Hoban called for a vote on the substitute motion.

Vote: The motion was approved 5:2 with Councilors Fillmore, Hoban, Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor. Councilors Ellsworth and Handley opposed.

Chair Hoban asked for Councilor Whipple's feedback on which district the Grandview Neighborhood should be part of.

Councilor Whipple answered that she did not know what was best.

Draft Minutes

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.

Chair Hoban asked Councilor Ellsworth and Councilor Handley what they liked about each option.

Councilor Ellsworth shared thoughts on how the council should do what is best for the entire city, not necessarily what is best for their own districts.

Vote: The motion to adopt Map 113b was approved 4:3 with Councilors Fillmore, Hoban, Mackay, and Shipley in favor. Councilors Ellsworth, Handley, and Whipple opposed.

Mr. Jones discussed the need to rename the colors on the Map to reflect the correct districts.

Councilor Ellsworth asked questions regarding the elections.

Mr. Jones responded.

Motion: A motion to label the purple section on the map District 3 was made by Chair Hoban. Seconded by Councilor Fillmore.

Vote: The motion was approved 4:3 with Councilors Fillmore, Hoban, Mackay, and Shipley in favor. Councilors Ellsworth, Handley, and Whipple opposed.

Councilor Whipple asked if Councilor Handley could resign prior to his term expiring to allow for Councilor Ellsworth to run in that district.

Councilor Ellsworth asked for Councilor Handley's opinion and thoughts.

Councilor Handley shared it does not affect him much as he does not intend to run again or resign prior to his term ending.

Councilor Ellsworth added that she hopes everyone will do what is best for Provo and not what is best for her personally.

Chair Hoban shared his thoughts on why he voted for the motion.

Chair Hoban asked for those who voted for the motion to raise their hands, those that were opposed changed their vote.

Revote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Fillmore, Hoban, Mackay, and Shipley in favor. Councilors Ellsworth, Handley, and Whipple opposed.

Chair Hoban called for a five-minute recess. [\(2:49:00\)](#)

Mr. Jones reviewed the finalized Ordinance.

Councilor Fillmore suggested a press release be presented to public prior to elections for clarification.

Draft Minutes

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.

288 Councilor Whipple asked to confirm the precincts.

289

290 Councilor Ellsworth shared that she hopes the council did the right thing disregarding her personal
291 stance.

292

293 Councilor Whipple reviewed the process and echoed Councilor Ellsworth's comments of doing the right
294 thing. She also applauded council members for their teamwork and respect for each other's opinions
295 and viewpoints.

296

297 Councilor Handley shared that the boundary lines are less significant than the political culture that is
298 built throughout the city.

299

300 Chair Hoban called for a vote.

301

Vote: The motion was approved 7:0 with Councilors Ellsworth, Fillmore, Handley, Hoban,
Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor.

302

Adjournment

303

304 The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 8:23 PM.

Draft Minutes

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

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

Regular Meeting Agenda

5:30 PM, Tuesday, April 19, 2022

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

Roll Call

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Councilor George Handley

Councilor Bill Fillmore

Councilor Katrice MacKay

Councilor Travis Hoban

Councilor Rachel Whipple

Councilor David Shipley

Deputy Mayor Isaac Paxman

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi

Interim Council Executive Director John Magness

City Attorney Brian Jones

Vice-Chair George Handley

Conducting: Vice-Chair George Handley

Excused: Councilor Shannon Ellsworth

Prayer – Paul Oscarson

Pledge of Allegiance – Councilor Rachel Whipple

Public Comment [\(8:26\)](#)

No public comment.

Action Agenda

1. **A resolution consenting to the appointment of individuals to various boards and commissions (22-009) [\(10:50\)](#)**

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2022-16, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mayor Michelle Kaufusi recommended Ann Calder for the Airport Board and Barta Heiner for the Arts Council Board.

Vice-Chair Handley called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 6:0 with Councilors Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay,

Draft Minutes

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.

Shipley, and Whipple in favor and Councilor Ellsworth excused.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

2. A resolution approving a substantial amendment to the Program Year 2019 Annual Action Plan reprogramming CDBG-CV funds for Covid-19 public health response. (22-038) [\(13:20\)](#)

Dan Gonzalez, Management Analyst, provided history of program and shared what its purpose is.

Vice-Chair Handley opened item for public comment. With none, he closed public comment.

Vice-Chair Handley mentioned this is the first of two public hearings and that the vote would be taken at the meeting on May 17.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

3. A resolution approving the Year Three, Annual Action Plan of the 2020-2024 Five-Year Consolidated Plan. (22-038) [\(20:36\)](#)

Mr. Gonzalez presented.

Councilor Shipley asked if there was a cap on how much the city could assist with.

Mr. Gonzalez responded that there are several caps the city must look at.

Councilor Whipple mentioned the emergency home repair program funds increasing and asked if individuals could receive the \$15,000 loan in addition to the grant.

Mr. Gonzalez answered that they could only be receive the grant.

Vice-Chair Handley opened item for public comment.

Karen Snow, of Provo, reminded council that many residents are on a fixed income.

With no other comments, Vice-Chair Handley closed public comment.

Vice-Chair Handley mentioned this is the first of two public hearings and that the vote would be taken at the meeting on May 17.

4. A resolution appropriating \$10,000 in the Council Office in the General Fund for upgrades to the Council Chambers. The funding source of the appropriation is fund balance in the General Fund. (22-040) [\(34:10\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2022-17, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Draft Minutes

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.

John Magness, Interim Executive Director of Council, gave summary of what this appropriation would be used for.

Councilor Whipple asked if the funds would be complete the entire project or just the wiring.

Mr. Magness responded that it would just be for the wiring that is needed prior to the building being finished.

Vice-Chair Handley opened public comment. With none, he closed public comment.

Vice-Chair Handley called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 6:0 with Councilors Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor and Councilor Ellsworth excused.

5. An ordinance amending Provo City code Chapters 6.15.110 (Conditions on Commercial Entertainment Businesses) and 9.14.120 (Treatment for Addicts - Prohibitions) to bring them into alignment with state law. (22-041) [\(37:11\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2022-14, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Brian Jones, City Attorney, presented.

Vice-Chair opened public comment.

Karen Snow, of Provo, shared her belief that addicts are in a self-inflicted situation. She stated that people need more education on how to help individuals and themselves.

With no other public comments, Vice-Chair called for vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 6:0 with Councilors Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor and Councilor Ellsworth excused.

6. A presentation on the Quarterly Financial Report for the 2nd Quarter 2022. (22-021) [\(42:09\)](#)

John Borget, Director of Administrative Services, gave presentation.

Councilor MacKay asked why the miscellaneous section is much higher than previous years and what is included in that section.

Mr. Borget said he would look it up and get back to council.

Draft Minutes

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.

Vice-Chair Handley asked when funds could be reallocated so we could be more in the surplus that funds could be used for other projects.

Mr. Borget said we have already appropriated funds for various projects this year. He added that his preference is to wait until the end of the year to see where the budget is.

Vice-Chair Handley opened item for public comment. With none, he closed public comment.

7. A resolution appropriating \$100,000 in the Mayor's Office in the General Fund for costs related to the "My Hometown" Initiative. (22-015) [\(53:59\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2022-18, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Mr. Borget provided summary of what the initiative entails. He explained that the funding would be used for banners/signage, nametags for volunteers, safety vests, meals, and days of service.

Councilor Shipley asked how large geographically the initiative will be during this first year.

Tara Riddle, Ombudsman, responded that the funds would mostly be used to set up the Community Resource Centers. She also discussed the two neighborhoods that are the targeted areas during the first year.

Chair Hoban asked what the value the church is providing in comparison to the city's contribution.

Ms. Riddle responded that the church is providing the facilities rent free and all the volunteers. She stated that her belief is the city is receiving the better side of the deal.

Chair Hoban also asked if other cities had provided us with any ROI reports.

Ms. Riddle said she could share the information she received from other cities with the council.

Vice-Chair Handley opened public comment.

Melanie McCoard, of Provo, shared she had been researching the initiative in West Valley City and believes this would be a misuse of money. She said the money could be used for other things like hiring more Police Officers.

Becky Bogden, of Provo, shared her support for this initiative.

Eric Hymn said more publicity for this initiative would be good for younger students who want to put roots down in Provo. He shared his belief that using funds to better the community is a good idea.

Draft Minutes

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.

Paul Oscarson, of Provo, said he has heard nothing but positive things from the initiative in West Valley.

Vice-Chair Handley closed public comment.

Councilor MacKay recalled some information regarding the return of investment that Mayor Kaufusi shared in a presentation. She shared her excitement for the initiative.

Vice-Chair Handley added his enthusiasm for the initiative.

Councilor Fillmore also provided his thoughts on the initiative.

Chair Hoban shared his thoughts about the investment vs. the return.

Vice-Chair Handley responded to Chair Hoban's statements.

Councilor Shipley replied to Ms. McCoard's comments regarding landlords.

Ms. Riddle shared that the project would only provide upgrades to owner occupied homes. She also said they would be helping renters who are responsible for their landscaping.

Councilor Whipple added that the initiative provides more specific focus on the community building aspect. She shared her enthusiasm for the initiative.

Vice-Chair Handley called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 6:0 with Councilors Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor and Councilor Ellsworth excused.

8. A public hearing regarding the issuance of up to \$10,000,000 of wastewater revenue bonds for construction costs of new and upgraded wastewater treatment plant facilities and the potential economic impact of the project on the private sector (22-033) [\(1:15:47\)](#)

Dave Decker, Director of Public Works, presented.

Vice-Chair Handley asked if there was any way to build the Wastewater Treatment Plant without a significant impact to the citizens.

Mr. Decker responded that there were three primary options that they looked at.

Councilor Whipple clarified the timeline of the project.

Vice-Chair Handley opened public comment.

Draft Minutes

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.

Melanie McCoard, of Provo, shared her dissatisfaction with Mr. Decker's presentation.

Walter Crawford, of Provo, asked if the newly constructed buildings will help reduce the algae and toxicity in Utah Lake. He shared his frustration that he has been paying for these taxes even though he has a septic tank at his home.

Eric Hymn shared younger residents want to see improvements within the city.

Vice-Chair closed public comment.

Mr. Jones suggested ending the public hearing and moving to the next agenda item to discuss the resolution.

9. A resolution authorizing the issuance of wastewater revenue bonds of Provo City, Utah; Authorizing the execution and delivery of a supplemental indenture and other documents required in connection with the bonds. (22-033) [\(1:45:30\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2022-19, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Councilor Shipley suggested we move forward with this especially considering the assistance being provided by the state.

Councilor MacKay agreed and said we are on the path to remedy what decisions had been made in the past.

Councilor Fillmore shared his support for the resolution.

Councilor Whipple said the time to act is now. She also stated that we have a great opportunity now.

Vice-Chair Handley also provided his support for this resolution.

Vice-Chair Handley called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 6:0 with Councilors Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor and Councilor Ellsworth excused.

10. An ordinance amending design standards for the West Gateway Zone. Citywide application. (PLOT20220010) [\(1:50:38\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2022-15, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Draft Minutes

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.

188
189 Dustin Wright, City Planner, shared the amendments being proposed.
190
191 Councilor MacKay shared her concerns with how expensive construction costs are and said she does not
192 want the cost to prevent the area from being developed.
193
194 Mr. Wright responded.
195
196 Councilor Fillmore said we need to make the area more welcoming and inviting. He said the only way to
197 accomplish that is to elevate the design standards.
198
199 Vice-Chair Handley opened public comment.
200
201 Quinn Peterson, chair of the design review committee, said this gateway is the first impression of our
202 city. He shared a recent experience with a development that changed their design in the area without
203 any design standards. He mentioned his desire is to make sure that does not happen again. He also said
204 he does not believe these design standards will deter developers from wanting to start projects in the
205 area.
206
207 Councilor Whipple asked if the design standards would affect existing buildings.
208
209 Mr. Peterson said this would be for new projects only.
210
211 Councilor Fillmore clarified the boundary on the map of the area.
212
213 Mr. Peterson said the area on the southeast corner already has the design standards being proposed. He
214 mentioned the southwest corner is RDA property.
215
216 Vice-Chair Handley opened public comment.
217
218 Becky Bogden, of Provo, shared her enthusiasm for the design standards. She said she believes with a
219 higher standard; it would help residents in the area want to do better also.
220
221 Melanie McCoard, of Provo, asked how far the economic development zone is from this area and if the
222 same rewards could be offered for this area.
223
224 Mr. Peterson responded to Ms. McCoard's comments.
225
226 With no other public comments, Vice-Chair Handley closed public comment.
227
228 Vice-Chair Handley called for a vote.
229

Vote: The motion was approved 6:0 with Councilors Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, Mackay,

Draft Minutes

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.

Shipley, and Whipple in favor and Councilor Ellsworth excused.

- 230 **11. An ordinance amending the zone map classification of approximately 0.17 acres of real property, generally located at 1029 West 1020 North, from One-Family Residential (R1.8) to Low-Density Residential (LDR). Rivergrove Neighborhood. (PLRZ20220075) [\(2:04:42\)](#)**

231 **Motion:** An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2022-16, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

232
233 Dustin Wright, City Planner, presented.

234
235 Chair Hoban shared his distaste for one-off applications like this. He asked if this would provide any legal precedents.

236
237
238 Brian Jones responded that this does open the door for others to apply. He also added that this would allow anything that falls under that zone to be established in that area.

239
240
241 Bill Peperone, Director of Development Services, agreed that it does allow others to apply for zone changes. He also mentioned the property is surrounded by duplexes and said it is fitting to entertain the request.

242
243
244 Councilor Whipple added that the size of the lot prohibits many other options.

245
246
247 Councilor Shipley asked about current ADU policy and how it relates to the map showing areas allowing ADU's.

248
249
250 Mr. Jones responded.

251
252 Phillip Ng, property owner, shared his desire to create more affordable housing.

253
254 Vice-Chair Handley opened public comment.

255
256 Aaron Skabelund, neighborhood chair, shared the neighborhood's support for the rezone.

257
258 With no other public comments, Vice-Chair Handley closed public comment.

259
260 Councilor MacKay shared her thoughts about zone changes in general.

261
262 Chair Hoban shared his concern of rezoning one property and suggested the Rivergrove Neighborhood apply for an overlay.

263
264
265 Councilor Whipple said this applicant has followed the current process. She said she sees no reason to deny this application.

Draft Minutes

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.

267
268 Vice-Chair Handley shared his thoughts regarding the implications of this rezone.
269
270 Councilor Fillmore said he is troubled with this item because he can view the pros and cons of both
271 sides.
272
273 Chair Hoban mentioned he wants to be aware of the message council is sending.
274
275 Councilor McKay shared her view that changing a zone is a big deal.
276
277 Councilor Shipley stated he wants residents to be able to come forward and request changes that allow
278 for more ADU's. He added that he does not see a risk in this zone change.
279
280 Councilor Whipple referred to the current map and shared several examples of single properties all over
281 the city.
282
283 Mr. Jones gave options as far as what would happen if there was a tie vote since Councilor Ellsworth is
284 excused.
285
286 Councilor Shipley suggested the council leadership put the item back on the agenda if there was a tie
287 vote.
288
289 Vice-Chair Handley and Chair Hoban both stated they would not have any problems with putting it on
290 the agenda for next meeting in the event of a tie.
291
292 Councilor Fillmore shared his thoughts on continuing the item and inviting Mr. Skabelund to meet with
293 his neighborhood to get more feedback.
294
295 Mr. Jones added that the planning commission could still rule out proposals that do not meet the same
296 criteria.
297
298 Mr. Peperone added that the planning commission and staff filter out many bad proposals.
299
300 Councilor Whipple reiterated this rezone would not be an invitation for others to apply.
301
302 Vice-Chair Handley shared his belief that this is a safe property to accept the rezone request.
303
304 Councilor Whipple also invited the Rivergrove Neighborhood to take a poll for council to consider an
305 overlay in their neighborhood.
306
307 Vice-Chair Handley called for a vote.
308

Vote: The motion was approved 4:2 with Councilors Fillmore, Handley, Shipley, and

Draft Minutes

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.

Whipple in favor. Councilors Hoban and MacKay against and Councilor Ellsworth excused.

The Provo Municipal Council recessed and convened as the governing board of the Redevelopment Agency of Provo with Vice-Chair Rachel Whipple conducting.

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

12. A resolution amending the By-laws of the Redevelopment Agency of Provo City Corporation regarding Executive Committee Meetings. (22-039) [\(2:35:33\)](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2022-RDA-04-19-1, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

John Magness, Policy Analyst, presented.

Vice-Chair Whipple opened public comment. With none, she closed public comment.

Board Member Handley made motion to approve the resolution as written.

Board Member Shipley seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Whipple called for a vote.

Vote: The motion was approved 6:0 with Board Members Fillmore, Handley, Hoban, McKay, Shipley, and Whipple in favor and Chair Ellsworth excused.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 8:04 PM.

Pending minutes – awaiting approval

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

Budget Work Meeting Minutes

3:30 PM, Tuesday, May 10, 2022

Hybrid meeting: [youtube.com/provocitycouncil](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
Mayor Michelle Kaufusi, arrived 3:38 PM
Councilor Rachel Whipple, arrived 3:43 PM
Councilor David Shipley, arrived 4:24 PM
Councilor Shannon Ellsworth, arrived 5:20 PM

Prayer

The prayer was given by John Borget.

Approval of Minutes ([0:10:49](#))

May 3, 2022 Work Meeting
Approved by unanimous consent.

Business

1. A presentation on supplemental budget requests. (22-016) ([0:11:23](#))

Melia Dayley, Policy Analyst, presented. There was a total of 73 supplemental requests, which were further divided into categories of critical, necessary, and aspirational. The requested funding for all categories totaled \$3.9 million. During the last fiscal year, about \$83,384 was funded toward supplemental requests. In the coming fiscal year, the tentative budget would fund over \$980,000 of supplemental requests. Ms. Dayley reviewed the details of the funded requests and displayed a list showing the funding sources and type of cost (recurring or one-time). Of the 34 critical requests, eight have been funded. Two are one-time costs with the others as recurring funding needs. The Fire Department submitted 16 requests of the 34, none of which were funded. All three of the critical Police requests were funded. Of the 28 necessary requests, five were funded, the majority of which were funded outside of the general fund. Ms. Dayley highlighted

Pending minutes – awaiting approval

the impacts to Full-Time Equivalent staffing in the funded requests. There were 11 aspirational requests, none of which were funded. Two may potentially be funded through carryover allocations. Most of these requests represented recurring costs. Ms. Dayley highlighted the memo and detailed spreadsheets available in the meeting materials packet. ***Presentation only.***

2. A presentation of all funds revenue forecast. (22-016) (0:18:45)

John Magness, Interim Council Executive Director, presented. For the last several budget cycles, staff have done an analysis of all the funds coming into the city to assist with broader revenue projections. Mr. Magness reviewed the categories included in the analysis: sales tax, utility revenue, property tax, fees, chargebacks, RAP (recreation, arts, and parks) tax, franchise fees, grants, telecom charges, B&C road funds, fines, miscellaneous, other, licensing fees, P&I (principal and interest), land sales, bonds, and transfers (such as utility transfers).

He noted that the economic impacts of the pandemic created a few anomalies during fiscal year 2020, but the remaining data still allows for helpful projections. Staff received the actual figures from the current fiscal year (which includes 8 months of data) earlier in the day. Mr. Magness displayed these figures and explained how this fit into the modeling staff have done. Staff will be doing a more detailed analysis on fees and will present that to the Council in the future.

Councilor George Handley asked for clarification on what constitutes chargebacks. Mr. Magness explained chargebacks worked as an internal service fund, to compensate certain city departments for services performed for other city departments. Continuing with a review of the different revenue sources, Mr. Magness noted that some years had been slightly lower for actuals but overall the city revenue and budgets evened out. Regarding grants, Mr. Magness noted these included a number of different grant-related funding sources. If a planned grant is not received, then the corresponding project is either delayed or does not get completed; the grants do not have a bearing on city services. Councilor Rachel Whipple asked what B&C roads stood for; Mr. Magness explained it was not an acronym but two different classes of roads for which the city receives funding. Mr. Magness displayed the total with and without bonds (since the bonds are essentially debt on specific projects). The total without bonds was about \$349,929.

Mr. Magness reviewed projections regarding the general fund and he reviewed each of the funding sources or categories (which were the same categories as in the all funds revenue forecast listed above). Councilor Katrice MacKay asked if these fees were increased already; Mr. Magness indicated those fees had not yet gone into effect but were included in the tentative budget. For property tax, if property values increase, the mill rate falls; consequently the only property tax increase the city receives is for new development. Ms. MacKay asked if the A, B, & C road tax comes from gas; Mr. Magness indicated that it did. There has been a slight decrease on licensing fees in recent years as licensing fees have not changed in some time. Some of the fines in the general fund have been impacted in recent years by the pandemic and they hope these will continue to recover. Transfers in (such as from other utility funds) will see a small increase. Some departments' transfers are decreasing over time. The general fund has experienced approximately 5% growth year-over-year. Mr. Magness invited the Council to submit any further questions they had for analysis. Ms. Whipple and Ms. MacKay indicated they

Pending minutes – awaiting approval

were still reading through the budget and absorbing a lot of information; they anticipated having more questions in the future. *Presentation only.*

3. A presentation regarding Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) gains and losses. (22-016) [\(0:42:09\)](#)

Karen Tapahe, Community Relations Coordinator, presented. In the general fund, there was an additional 4.9 FTEs in the tentative FY2023 budget. Ms. Tapahe reviewed the changes to individual departments and what resulted in these changes. Notable changes included:

- Increase of 2 FTE for Police related to airport security
- Community Development has an overall reduction of 1.75 FTE
- Airport has an increase of 7.5 FTE
- (need to add other bullet points)

Councilor Katrice MacKay asked if with dedicated airport staff, would other police staff be released from duties at the airport. Ms. Tapahe indicated that was the case. The airport security staff from Police would have dedicated office space at the Provo Airport. Regarding Community and Neighborhood Services, Ms. MacKay expressed concern about the decreasing employees in code enforcement. Ms. Tapahe clarified that some of the reduced positions were reassigned to Development Services so there was no overall reduction. Ms. MacKay asked if the increased IS staffing would allow them to be up-to-date on security patches. John Borget, Administrative Services Director, clarified that the cybersecurity position was part of Administrative Services and reports directly to the director. In response to Ms. MacKay's questions, Mr. Borget explained this would not change the level of staffing, it was another type of reassignment between divisions in the department. Many of the changes resulted from realignment of positions within different city departments. *Presentation only.*

4. A presentation regarding property tax. (22-016) [\(0:56:29\)](#)

John Magness, Interim Council Executive Director, presented. As property values increase in Provo, the mill rate decreases. The City will still receive increased revenue from new construction in Provo. Provo has three property tax streams, which include general operations, bond obligations, and library operations (which is a dedicated revenue source for the library). Since 2011, the mill rate for general operations has decreased 34%. In response to a question from Councilor George Handley, Mr. Magness indicated that the increased bond revenue in 2018 was related to the Provo City Center construction bond. Mr. Magness showed the changes to the property values in Provo from Fiscal Year 2011 to 2021.

Councilor Katrice MacKay asked about the County's role in the process of setting the certified tax rate versus the Council's role. Wayne Parker, CAO, responded and shared some details to answer Ms. MacKay's question. The County is required to calculate the certified tax rate, which they deliver to the city. The County's rate is not discretionary—rather, the County is required by state law to calculate the certified tax rate so that it brings in the same dollar amount, excluding new growth. The effect is that as property values increase, the mill rate is driven down; any increase to property tax revenue for the City is a result of new construction/growth. In the budget ordinance the Council will set the certified tax rate for the next year. They can either set it as the

Pending minutes – awaiting approval

County's certified tax rate, or set it as something else and go through the truth in taxation process. The certified tax rate is a percentage of total value. Councilor Bill Fillmore asked if Mr. Parker felt there was a need for CPI adjustment to the tax rate. Mr. Parker indicated that the budget was balanced without a change, but for structural sustainability over time it would probably make sense to index the rate. He noted that most cities usually pursue either a small inflationary adjustment every couple of years, or a large property tax increase once a decade. Councilors discussed the possible impacts and necessity of a property tax change. Mr. Magness displayed a projection which illustrated how the property tax revenue would be impacted by no change, by a moderate change, or by indexing to the CPI. Mr. Handley was interested to know what the School Board's deliberations have been regarding property tax increases. Mr. Magness indicated the School Board has explored an increase to help fund Timpview High School rebuild.

Councilor David Shipley supported making an inflationary adjustment to the property tax rate. One of the important considerations is the fact that when the Council began with the wastewater and water rate changes, those were going to be more aggressive in the last few years—there were significant makeup adjustments on those fees. If they can get past the bulk of those fee changes, it makes more sense now to look at property tax as an annual slight adjustment. Mr. Handley asked Mr. Shipley if he recommended waiting one year until the fees would drop down. Mr. Shipley did not think the fees dropped down, but the increases dropped down and were not as severe. John Borget, Administrative Services Director, indicated that under the five-year plan for wastewater, the coming fiscal year is the last year of those changes. The water fees have some additional increases still to come.

Mr. Magness showed the revenue history for the general fund including property tax and sales tax revenues. Data generally shows that property tax is a more stable funding source through a recession, compared to sales tax which tends to drop off under those economic circumstances. Fees are also typically pretty stable during a recession. Councilor Travis Hoban asked how the city's reserves are. Mr. Borget said that they increased the general fund balance last year to 28% (by law they can go up to 35% in general fund balance). Mr. Borget anticipated they would see another increase to the general fund balance in the coming fiscal year. If the city gets to that limit, they are as fiscally conservative as the state allows them to be.

Mr. Magness indicated that if the Council wanted to move forward with indexing the property tax rate to the CPI, he did not recommend using this year's CPI as it is very inflated—he would recommend some calculation such as an average of the CPI over the last 10 years. Mr. Handley commented about the Council's ability to plan over the next several years; any council at any point can decide they did not want to continue doing small increases every year. Mr. Handley thought this was one problematic approach to doing smaller incremental approaches, when there may not be the political will in the future to do continual smaller increases. Ms. MacKay asked for clarification about the truth in taxation process. Brian Jones, City Attorney, responded and clarified that one of the limitations is that to begin the process, the Council must publish a notice that includes the highest rate they are considering; after doing so, the Council can pass anything from 0 up to that stated maximum rate.

Mr. Shipley shared additional comments. He observed that on an ongoing basis, property tax increases become a public safety consideration—since public safety is the largest expense in the

Pending minutes – awaiting approval

general fund budget, if there were a recession (and a resulting downturn in sales tax), property tax truly becomes a public safety issue. He hopes the public would understand the rationale for this kind of adjustment in order to continue to provide a sustainable approach to public safety in Provo. He supported developing a format or framework for evaluating a nominal increase each year. Ms. MacKay thanked Mr. Shipley for his comments; she noted that many departments' supplemental requests were not funded—when there are so many requests that are not fulfilled that becomes a concern. Councilor Rachel Whipple noted that the Police Department will need several more officers than they requested. She agreed with Councilors' earlier comments about a five-year plan for public safety staffing to determine if, and how much, an increase in property tax would need to be. Mr. Handley was interested in seeing what a 3% change would bring in increased revenue. He was open to pursuing an increase this year and was interested to hear what other Councilors thought on the matter. Mr. Magness indicated that the CPI from 2011-2021 was an average of 2.36% per year in the western United States. *Presentation only.*

5. A presentation regarding non-General Fund expenditures (22-016) (1:46:17)

Melia Dayley, Policy Analyst, presented. Non-General Fund expenditures include all other city funds: enterprise, special revenue, capital improvement project (CIP), internal service, and debt service. Ms. Dayley referred to information in the published materials which provided additional context. She highlighted the summary of major changes to each fund from the last fiscal year to the next year's tentative budget. Enterprise Funds include the Provo Airport, Provo Power, Peaks Ice Arena, sanitation, water, wastewater, utility transportation fund, and Timpanogos Golf Course. Ms. Dayley offered a clarification about the materials in response to a question from Councilor Rachel Whipple. Most categories in the Special Revenue Fund included increases for the cost-of-living and market rate adjustments. The CIP Funds has large changes—this reflects the large projects happening in the current and coming fiscal years. Internal Service Funds include employee benefits and insurance as well as other internal inter-departmental services. Ms. Dayley noted she is awaiting more information about computer replacement and would follow up with the Council when she had received it. Council staff are also working on a report on fleet services. Ms. Dayley reviewed the Debt Service Fund. She noted staff would be preparing a separate analysis on the Airport budget, in light of recent announcements about expanded services at the Provo Airport. Councilor Katrice MacKay was interested in seeing more details on the wages for airport employees required by the FAA. Staff received several other requests from Councilors and responded to these questions. The May 24 budget meeting will be cancelled, with budget presentations to come on May 17 and in June. *Presentation only.*

Closed Meeting

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. *None requested.*

Adjournment

Adjourned by unanimous consent.

PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: JMCKNIGHT
Department: Public Works
Requested Meeting Date: 05-17-2022

SUBJECT: A presentation regarding the effects FY 23 Airport Budget with new air carrier, planes, and routes. (22-016)

RECOMMENDATION: Informational only

BACKGROUND: Public Works presented on the Airport budget at the April 19th 2022 work session. The purpose of this presentation is to follow up on additional details regarding Airport revenues and economic impacts.

FISCAL IMPACT: Yes

PRESENTER'S NAME: Dave Decker, Director Public Works

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 30 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-016

PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: JMCKNIGHT
Department: Public Works
Requested Meeting Date: 05-17-2022

SUBJECT: A presentation regarding the Lakeview Parkway Phase 4 Interlocal Agreement. (22-046)

RECOMMENDATION: Resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into an interlocal agreement with Utah County for MAG approved funding for the construction of phase 4 of Lakeview Parkway from Center Street to 620 North.

BACKGROUND: Provo City has been awarded \$4,260,870 (6.77% of which is City matching funds) through the Mountainland Association of Governments for the construction of phase 4 of Lakeview Parkway. Disbursement of these funds is done by reimbursement from Utah County, authorized through an interlocal agreement between the City and the County. This agreement has been approved by the County and Public Works intends for it to be approved by the Municipal Council at the June 7th meeting. This work session item is to introduce the agreement to the Council.

FISCAL IMPACT: Yes

PRESENTER'S NAME: Dave Decker, Public Works Director

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 10 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-046

Resolution 2022-

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVO CITY AND UTAH COUNTY REGARDING THE USE OF "PART 19 TAX REVENUES; AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN THAT AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY. ()

WHEREAS, Provo City is presently constructing a roadway ("Lakeview Parkway Phase 4") extending from Center Street to 620 North in Provo; and

WHEREAS, upon completion, Provo City will own and maintain the Lakeview Parkway in perpetuity and is responsible for payment of construction costs; and

WHEREAS, this roadway project has been authorized by the Mountainland MPO Regional Planning Committee to be funded at an amount not to exceed \$4,260,870 for the direct costs of the project, 6.77% of which is required as matching City funds which are currently appropriated; and

WHEREAS, in order for Provo City to use these monies to accomplish the project, Provo City and the Program Manager (Utah County) desire to enter into an interlocal cooperation agreement pursuant to Section 11-13-207, Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended; and

WHEREAS, after considering the facts and comments presented to the Municipal Council at a public meeting held on May 17th, 2022, the Council finds that such action reasonably furthers the health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of Provo City.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Municipal Council of Provo City, Utah, as follows:

PART I:

1. The City Council hereby resolves to approve the City's entrance into the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement, as attached in Exhibit A.

2. The Mayor is authorized to sign and execute all necessary and appropriate documents in conjunction with this agreement.

PART II:

This resolution shall take effect immediately.

END OF RESOLUTION

Agreement No. 2022 - 243

INTER-LOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT
between
UTAH COUNTY and
PROVO CITY

For A Project Known As

LAKEVIEW PARKWAY PHASE 4

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 23rd day of March, 2022, by and between **UTAH COUNTY**, an inter-local agency of the State of Utah, with principle offices located at 100 East Center Street, Suite 2300, Provo, Utah 84606, and **PROVO CITY**, a political subdivision of the State of Utah, with principle offices located at 351 West Center, Provo, Utah 84601.

RECITALS:

WHEREAS, the Utah Interlocal Co-operation Act, Title 11, Chapter 13, Utah Code Annotated (1953), as amended, permits local governmental units including cities, counties, inter-local agencies and political subdivisions of the State of Utah to make the most efficient use of their powers by enabling them to cooperate with other public entities on the basis of mutual advantage and to exercise joint cooperative action for the benefit of their respective citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Program Manager (Utah County) and the Project Sponsor (Provo City) desire to facilitate the construction of a Road project known as Lakeview Parkway Phase (**Approved Project**) which consists of a new 4-lane road connecting from Provo Center Street to 620 North, including two new bridges, and active transportation trails; and

WHEREAS, the Program Manager and the Project Sponsor held duly noticed public meetings wherein this Agreement was considered and an Authorizing Resolution was presented for approval by the respective legislative bodies.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the covenants and agreements contained herein and other valuable consideration, the sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the Program Manager and the Project Sponsor hereby agree as follows:

Section 1. PURPOSES.

This Agreement has been established and entered into between the Program Manager and the Project Sponsor for the purpose of outlining the respective rights and responsibilities of the Program Manager and the Project Sponsor in the construction of the Approved Project.

Section 2. ADMINISTRATION OF AGREEMENT.

The parties hereto agree that, pursuant to Section 11-13-207, Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended, the Utah County Public Works Director shall act as the administrator responsible for the administration of this Agreement. The parties further agree that this Agreement does not anticipate nor provide for any organizational changes in the parties. The administrator agrees to keep all books and records in such form and manner as the Utah County Clerk/Auditor shall specify and further agrees that said books shall be open for examination by the parties hereto at all reasonable times.

Section 3. MULTIPLE JURISDICTIONS.

If a project is within multiple jurisdictions and/or agencies, one jurisdiction or agency will enter in to this interlocal agreement and interface with the Program Manager as the Project Sponsor. Multiple jurisdictions and/or agencies interactions will be outlined within a separate interlocal agreement between said jurisdictions and/or agencies. This agreement shall be referenced in this agreement as an Exhibit.

Section 4. EFFECTIVE DATE; DURATION.

This Agreement shall become effective and shall enter into force within the meaning of the Interlocal Cooperation Act, upon the submission of this Agreement to, and the approval and execution hereof by the governing bodies of the Program Manager and the Project Sponsor. The term of this Agreement shall be from the date of execution hereof until the terms and obligations identified herein are completed, but in no event, longer than 3 years from the execution date.

Section 5. NO SEPARATE LEGAL ENTITY.

The Program Manager and the Project Sponsor do not contemplate nor intend to establish a separate legal or administrative entity under the terms of this Agreement.

Section 6. TERMS.

- 1) **Design and Construction:** The Project Sponsor has obtained, completed, and coordinated with the Project Sponsor all necessary right-of-way acquisitions, design, bidding, and management of the construction of the Highway to meet or exceed Project Sponsor highway standards. The Project Sponsor has completed environmental processes and obtained all required permits and approvals to proceed with the construction of the project.
- 2) **Total Project Cost** - Both the Program Manager and Project Sponsor acknowledge that the Approved Project has been authorized by the Mountainland MPO Regional Planning Committee (Utah County Commission must also approve if county funds are used) to be funded at an amount not to exceed \$4,260,870 (Total Project Cost) for the direct costs of the Approved Project.
 - a) **Matching Funds** - The Project Sponsor is required to pay a match or portion of the Total Project Cost. This amount is 6.77% of the Total Project Cost. The use of Project Sponsor equipment and/or Project Sponsor employee time for the project shall not be reimbursable, but can be claimed by the Project Sponsor as a soft match toward the required 6.77% matching funds required from the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor is required to pay the difference between the required match and the value of the soft match, if any.
 - b) **Reimbursement** - The Project Sponsor, if desiring reimbursement for the direct costs of the Approved Project, will provide the Program Manager with one monthly itemized invoice detailing actual costs for the ROW acquisition, design, utility relocation, construction, or other approved elements of the project. Appropriate backup materials shall also be supplied. The Program Manager agrees to reimburse the Project Sponsor within 30 days of receiving acceptable itemized invoices establishing the validity of the direct costs of the Approved Project. The maximum amount of reimbursement from the Program Manager to the Project Sponsor shall not exceed \$3,972,409. Any costs which exceed \$3,972,409 shall be the sole responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The Program Manager will review and approve monthly each itemized invoice and will reimburse the total invoice amount less the required matching funds.
 - c) **Cost Overruns** - The Program Manager maintains an account for cost overruns. The

Project Sponsor may request additional funds above the approved Total Project Cost with supporting documentation demonstrating the need for additional funds. The Program Manager may approve up to 10% of the Total Project Cost up to a maximum of \$500,000. The MPO Regional Planning Committee can approve higher amounts (Utah County Commission must also approve if county funds are used). The addition of these contingency funds would require a modification to this agreement. If no additional funds are awarded or the project still requires additional funds, the Project Sponsor will be responsible to fund the overrun.

- d) **Surplus Funds** - Any surplus funds remaining after the completion of the Approved Project will be returned to the Mountainland or Utah County fund balance to be reallocated to other projects selected through the MPO project selection process. Note that Mountainland and Utah County selects and funds projects, not sponsors. Surplus funds cannot be moved to a new project not already approved through the MPO project selection process. Any surplus funds paid by the Project Sponsor shall be returned to the Project Sponsor.
- 3) **Ownership and Maintenance of Approved Project** - The Project Sponsor shall own and be responsible for maintenance, repair and replacement of the completed project.
- 4) **Inspection of Approved Project** - The Program Manager and its designees, upon reasonable notice, reserve the right to enter upon the Approved Project to inspect the same to verify compliance with this Agreement.
- 5) **Other Expenses** - Except as otherwise expressly stated herein, all expenses not identified as a part of the Approved Project or executed prior to the Agreement shall be the sole responsibility of the Project Sponsor.
- 6) **No Third-Party Rights** - The obligations of the parties set forth in this Agreement shall not create any rights in or obligations to any persons or parties other than to the Project Sponsor and Program Manager. This Agreement is not intended to nor shall it be construed to benefit any third party.
- 7) **Recitals** - The Recitals portion of this Agreement constitutes a part of this Agreement.

Section 7. FILING OF INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT.

Executed copies of this Agreement shall be placed on file with the official keeper of records of the Program Manager and the Project Sponsor, and shall remain on file for public inspection during the term of this Agreement.

Section 8. AMENDMENTS.

- 1) **Amending this Agreement** - This Agreement may not be amended, changed, modified or altered except by an instrument in writing which shall be: (a) approved by Resolution of the governing body of each of the parties, (b) executed by a duly authorized official of each of the parties, and (c) filed in the official records of each party.
- 2) **Change Orders** - Changes can occur throughout a project. Changes that are outside the scope outlined in this contract must be amended as stated above. Minor changes and adjustments that fall within the original project scope can be addressed with a change order. A change order does not require amending this agreement. A change order is defined as that additional effort necessary by reason of changed conditions which are radical, unforeseen, and completely beyond the control of the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor shall create the change order and keep records of them. Any additional costs incurred can be covered by the construction contingency or by added local funding and should be addressed in the change order. If additional costs are more than the construction contingency and available local funds, the Project Sponsor shall contact the Program Manager to review funding options.

Section 9. EXTRA WORK

Extra work shall be undertaken only when previously authorized in writing by the Program Manager, and is defined as additional work which is neither shown nor defined in this Agreement. Extra work includes additional improvements adjacent to the Approved Project or in other locations that the Project Sponsor desires to complete as a package of projects. Extra work can be for utility projects, facilities that tie into the Approved Project, project betterments, or other work desired by the Project Sponsor. No costs incurred by extra work can be billed to the Approved Project. Any invoices submitted by the Project Sponsor shall clearly detail costs incurred by the Approved Project and list separately costs incurred by the extra work. This agreement shall be referenced in this agreement as an Exhibit.

Section 10. SEVERABILITY.

If any term or provision of this Agreement or the application thereof shall to any extent be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement, or the application of such term or provision to circumstances other than those with respect to which it is invalid or unenforceable, shall not be affected thereby, and shall be enforced to the extent permitted by law. To the extent permitted by applicable law, the parties hereby waive any provision of law, which would render any of the terms of this Agreement unenforceable.

Section 11. GOVERNING LAW.

All questions with respect to the construction of this Agreement, and the rights and liability of the parties hereto, shall be governed by the laws of the State of Utah.

Section 12. INDEMNIFICATION.

The Project Sponsor shall indemnify and hold the Program Manager harmless from any and all claims of liability for any injury or damage to any person or property whatsoever occurring in, on or about the Approved Project or any part thereof. The Project Sponsor shall further indemnify and hold the Program Manager harmless from and against any and all claims arising from any breach or default in the performance of any obligation on the Project Sponsor's part to be performed under the terms of this Agreement, or arising from any act or negligence of the Project Sponsor, or any of the Project Sponsor's agents, employees, contractors, subcontractors, or invitees and from and against all costs, reasonable attorney's fees, expenses and liabilities incurred in the defense of any such claim or any action or proceeding brought thereon. Both the Project Sponsor and Program Manager agree that the terms of this Agreement are subject to, and not a waiver of, the protections, immunities and liability limits of the Governmental Immunity Act, U.C.A. 63G-1-101, et. seq. The Project Sponsor's obligations under this provision shall survive the expiration or other termination of this Agreement.

Section 13. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Agreement shall constitute the entire agreement between the parties and any prior understanding or representation of any kind preceding the date of this Agreement shall not be binding upon either party except to the extent incorporated in this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have signed and executed this Agreement, after resolutions duly and lawfully passed, on the dates listed below:

UTAH COUNTY

Authorized by Resolution No. 2022-235, authorized and passed on the 23rd day of
March 2022.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

DocuSigned by:
Thomas V. Sakievich
4986D9FD4AD1458
THOMAS V. SAKIEVICH, Chair

ATTEST: JOSH DANIELS
Utah County Clerk/Auditor

By: Alice Black
2937075D91C74DB...
Deputy Utah County Clerk/Auditor

REVIEWED AS TO FORM AND COMPATIBILITY
WITH APPLICABLE LAW:
DAVID O. LEAVITT, Utah County Attorney

By: Ben Shum
889C11BACFB0471...
Deputy Utah County Attorney

PROVO CITY

Authorized by Resolution No. _____, authorized and passed on the _____ day of
_____ 2022.

PROVO CITY MAYOR, PROVO CITY, UTAH

MICHELLE KAUFUSI, Mayor

ATTEST:
HEIDI PEPINOS, City Recorder

By: _____

REVIEWED AS TO FORM AND COMPATIBILITY
WITH APPLICABLE LAW:
BRIAN JONES, Provo City Attorney

By: _____
Provo City Attorney



Interlocal Agreement Lakeview Parkway Phase 4

May 17, 2022

Lakeview Parkway Phase 4

- Center Street to 620 North
- \$21.5 million total project
 - \$13.5 million Provo River Mitigation Commission (Delta Restoration)
 - \$4 million MAG funding
 - \$4 million City funds

Interlocal Agreement

- Resolution authorizing Mayor to sign interlocal agreement with Utah County for reimbursement of project costs
- \$4 million County funds awarded through the Mountainland Association of Governments Regional Planning Committee







PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: MDAYLEY
Department: Council
Requested Meeting Date: 04-19-2022

SUBJECT: A discussion regarding the mission statement, committee members, and committee chair & vice-chair for the Council's Natural Resources Committee. (22-005)

RECOMMENDATION: Discussion and vote to approve the committee mission statement. Vote and approve the committee members (including the chair and vice-chair).

BACKGROUND: At the April 19 Work Meeting, the Council voted to combine the Foothills Protection Committee and Water Conservation Committee into one new committee, the Natural Resource Committee. Now the Council needs to approve a mission statement for the new/combined committee, as well as designate the committee members, chair, and vice-chair.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

PRESENTER'S NAME: John Magness, Interim Council Executive Director

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 5 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-005

PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: WAYNEP
Department: Mayor Office
Requested Meeting Date: 05-17-2022

SUBJECT: Potential Emergency Dispatch Center Consolidation. (22-047)

RECOMMENDATION: Review concepts and strategies for a potential consolidation between Provo and Orem's emergency dispatch centers.

BACKGROUND: For the last several months, public safety and administrative staff from Provo and Orem have been discussing and studying the potential of combining the emergency dispatch centers in Provo and Orem into a single entity. This discussion has been driven by the following factors.

- The consolidation would result in increased service levels to the residents of both cities by reducing response times and improving coordination between the police and fire agencies in both cities as they respond to emergencies.
- The effort has the potential for cost savings and efficiencies by reducing overhead and eventual staffing efficiencies available through attrition.
- The State of Utah is encouraging and incentivizing consolidations like this one.
- Orem is studying a potential replacement of some of their city facilities and freeing up space in their current public safety building could result in long-term cost savings and improved efficiency.
- Provo's new public safety center has adequate space in the dispatch center to accommodate a combined operation.
- Staffing both centers has been difficult in the current economic climate, and being able to combine would allow both entities to address the ability to attract and retain qualified employees.

The study effort – which we are calling the first phase of feasibility analysis – has shown promise to achieve these objectives. The work has included consideration of governance, finance, human resource, and public safety factors. The study team has determined that it is important at this stage to invite broader participation in the feasibility work. This additional participation will involve employees as well as elected officials at the local, regional, and state levels.

We are looking forward to discussing these ideas further with our Provo elected officials as we proceed toward a decision later this fall with, if all parties agree, a possible implementation on January 1, 2023.

FISCAL IMPACT: Potential efficiencies and cost savings in future years.

PRESENTER'S NAME: Wayne Parker- CAO and Jim Miguel- Fire Chief

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 20 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-047



MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Michelle Kaufusi and Members of the Municipal Council
FROM: Wayne Parker, CAO and Fire Chief Jim Miguel
DATE: May 11, 2022
SUBJECT: Potential Emergency Dispatch Center Consolidation with Orem

For the last several months, public safety and administrative staff from Provo and Orem have been discussing and studying the potential of combining the emergency dispatch centers in Provo and Orem into a single entity. This discussion has been driven by the following factors.

- The consolidation would result in increased service levels to the residents of both cities by reducing response times and improving coordination between the police and fire agencies in both cities as they respond to emergencies.
- The effort has the potential for cost savings and efficiencies by reducing overhead and eventual staffing efficiencies available through attrition.
- The State of Utah is encouraging and incentivizing consolidations like this one.
- Orem is studying a potential replacement of some of their city facilities and freeing up space in their current public safety building could result in long-term cost savings and improved efficiency.
- Provo's new public safety center has adequate space in the dispatch center to accommodate a combined operation.
- Staffing both centers has been difficult in the current economic climate, and being able to combine would allow both entities to address the ability to attract and retain qualified employees.

The study effort – which we are calling the first phase of feasibility analysis – has shown promise to achieve these objectives. The work has included consideration of governance, finance, human resource, and public safety factors. The study team has determined that it is important at this stage to invite broader participation in the feasibility work. This additional participation will involve employees as well as elected officials at the local, regional, and state levels.

Mayor Kaufusi and Council Members
May 11, 2022
page 2

The attached white paper provides many details about the process, the general conclusions and the proposed strategy and timeline for moving forward. We are looking forward to discussing these ideas further with our Provo elected officials as we proceed toward a decision later this fall with, if all parties agree, a possible implementation on January 1, 2023.

Provo-Orem Consolidated Dispatch - A White Paper

The cities of Provo and Orem are in the process of determining whether consolidating the two cities' emergency dispatch centers would improve the function, efficiency, and effectiveness in supporting public safety services in the two cities. This white paper examines the reasons for such a move, the indicators of success, the financial, human resources and governance components, and appropriate next steps in the examination process.

Background

Across the state of Utah, there has been a movement over the last three decades or so to consolidate public safety dispatch centers and function. For example, all cities in Weber County have consolidated their dispatch operations into a single interlocal entity. There are two public safety dispatch centers in Salt Lake County - Salt Lake City (who also dispatches for Sandy City) and the Salt Lake Valley Emergency Communications Center (VECC). In Utah County, there are currently four public safety answer points (PSAP) - Provo, Orem, Springville, and Central 911, which serves all other Utah County cities and the County Sheriff's Department, along with entities in neighboring counties.

The state legislature and the Utah Communications Authority, who provides support and funding for PSAPs across Utah, have encouraged dispatch center consolidation. Fewer emergency dispatch centers in the state tends to reduce overhead and overall costs of service, and makes better use of state and local tax dollars.

For more than five years, Provo and Orem officials have had conceptual discussions about whether the two cities should join forces, remain separate, or consolidate with Central 911. Both cities acknowledge that there are advantages and disadvantages to all of these options. However, recent developments with technology, space considerations and employee attraction and retention issues have motivated both cities to explore a consolidation between Provo and Orem - the two largest cities in the region. Provo's recent construction of a new, state-of-the-art public safety center with a new dispatch space of sufficient size to meet the needs of a consolidated center was a determining factor in advancing the issue.

For the last seven months, public safety and administrative officials in Provo and Orem have had serious discussions about the feasibility of a consolidation. The study

teams - including police and fire chiefs, finance and human resource leaders, and administrators - have developed preliminary findings and recommendations for a model for consolidation and are now ready to enter phase two of the feasibility analysis by involving public safety dispatchers, state officials and others in finalizing a proposal to be entertained by elected officials in both cities.

The preliminary findings suggest that a consolidated Provo-Orem dispatch center would increase levels of service, enhance training and advancement opportunities for employees, reduce overhead and improve efficiency, reduce physical space needs for both cities, and create opportunities for even more cooperation and collaboration between the two cities.

Concepts and Principles

Exploring an intergovernmental service consolidation is challenging in the best of situations. But with Orem and Provo having a long history of public safety collaboration and strong institutional commitments to innovation and effective service delivery, there are many factors that support exploring a cooperative relationship that serves the needs of both jurisdictions.

The working group has developed several key concepts and principles which have guided efforts thus far. These include:

- Creating an equal footing for both cities, which includes starting with a short-term contract for service with a goal within three years of creating an interlocal agreement creating a long-term, mutually beneficial structure.
- Having Provo assimilate the Orem dispatch employees into the Provo dispatch organization and having that occur in a way that does no harm to Orem employees in the aggregate as it relates to compensation, benefits, seniority and other employment conditions
- Reducing overhead and redundancies, leading to greater efficiencies
- Using the consolidation as a catalyst for looking at other ways to improve service levels to the residents of both cities

Service Delivery

It has become commonplace for Provo and Orem emergency services to support each other in the field. Also, during times of resource drawdown, Provo and Orem will provide additional resources to meet community needs. Currently, that process is slowed by the need to communicate with both dispatch centers to coordinate response. Merging dispatch centers would essentially expand the available emergency resources for both cities.

Governance

One of the significant challenges of any intergovernmental service consolidation is determining the governance structure to allow both partners an equal voice in key decisions about the service levels and organizational direction. As mentioned earlier, the goal of current efforts is to create a governance model around a contract for service between Provo and Orem with Provo as the service provider, with a mutual goal of developing an interlocal entity within a three year period. The governance will be different under these two models, but the governance structure for the contract will set the stage for the structure under a future interlocal entity.

The working group has focused on a model for the contract with two joint committees - a management committee composed of the city manager/administrator, police chief and fire chief of both cities focused on consensus and collaboration; and a technical committee composed of representatives of the police and fire departments of both cities and the Provo dispatch center manager. Recommendations from the technical committee will be brought to the management committee to make policy decisions and approve major investments or changes to the center's management structure.

Orem has justifiable concerns about having a way to return to their current separate program just in case the consolidation doesn't have the outcomes they expect. The working group intends to explore in the second phase of the feasibility analysis an equitable way for Orem to terminate the contractual relationship and to retain access to their current PSAP designation until the interlocal agreement can be adopted.

Budget and Finance

The working group and finance directors of the two cities have developed an outline for a funding model. The model would include:

- Using Provo City's emergency communications fund as the accounting entity for the consolidated service.
- The management committee would recommend a budget to Provo each year of the contract.
- Funding the operating budget between the two cities would include a formula as follows
 - 50% of the budget would be divided on a comparative population basis between the two cities, including any cities which are currently under

- contract to Orem for public safety services including dispatch services, and
 - 50% of the budget would be divided based on a three year rolling average of calls for service based on a definition of such currently under discussion by the technical committee
- Funding of a capital budget would be based entirely on the population of the two cities and any contract cities as articulated above.
- All retained earnings from budget savings or excess revenues would be kept in the emergency dispatch fund for future use by the consolidated center
- The management committee would review budget reports at least quarterly
- Orem City would “buy-in” to the dispatch center space in the Provo Public Safety Building based on Orem’s current dispatch center square footage which will be vacated upon consolidation at a cost of \$285/sf. The buy-in would be amortized over a three year period at an interest rate equivalent to the state treasurer’s investment pool at the time the contract becomes effective.
- Orem will provide dispatch consoles, IT equipment and other appurtenances necessary to equip the Provo dispatch center to meet Orem’s needs

Human Resources

One of the most important factors in a successful consolidation is addressing the very important concerns of employees who will be impacted by the consolidation. As the human resources directors of the two cities have studied the issues, there are a number of important differences between the compensation and benefits offered by Provo and Orem currently. These include things like participation in social security, differences in leave accruals, balances and insurance programs.

Given the principle articulated above of doing no harm in the aggregate to an employee’s total compensation, the consolidation plan would propose to:

- Make the employment transition as seamless as possible
- Target a January 1, 2023 move of employees from Orem to Provo to allow employees to explore other options if they want them and to allow a new calendar year start for health insurance and other benefits
- Commit that no employee will receive a lower hourly rate than they currently do
- Orem employees will retain their seniority status when moving to Provo employment
- Orem will buy out existing compensable leave balances beyond an amount of hours yet to be determined to be retained by Orem employees and will compensate Provo for those retained hours being transferred with the employees
- Orem and Provo will work together with employees to address the need for Orem employees to participate in social security when they become Provo

employees and find an equitable solution for retirement contributions and benefits

- Any excess positions that exist beyond the need of the new consolidated center will be eliminated through attrition

Other human resources issues will be addressed in the second phase of the feasibility analysis.

Second Phase Feasibility Analysis

The working group feels that many of the key issues around consolidation have been addressed, but also feels the need to expand the analysis now with other parties as indicated in the introduction to this paper. Based on the first phase of the review, the working group believes that there is a high probability of success in creating the consolidated dispatch center. Therefore, we are recommending a Phase 2 which includes:

- Testing the assumptions and recommendations with other stakeholders
 - Employees
 - Utah Communications Authority
 - Utah State Tax Commission
- Equipment and services vendors
- Requesting resolutions from both Provo and Orem's governing bodies supporting the concept and the second phase of feasibility analysis
- Targeting the end of October 2022 as the date for both entities to approve a contract for service between Provo and Orem, including contractual language to work in good faith to creating an interlocal entity within a 36 month period

Conclusion

The working group believes that there is a high likelihood that consolidating Provo and Orem's emergency dispatch centers will be successful. Key measures of success would include:

- Operational efficiencies
- Improved levels of service including response time, accuracy and customer service ratings
- Freeing up space in Orem's facilities cost effectively
- Creating a model for other future collaboration between the two cities
- Achieving state objectives of reducing the number of PSAPs in Utah

- Adoption of a formal interlocal agreement creating a new consolidated entity before the end of the three year period

We look forward to advancing the analysis of this proposal over the next few months and adopting a service contract between Provo and Orem prior to the end of October 2022.

PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: EVANDERWERKEN
Department: Council
Requested Meeting Date:

SUBJECT: A presentation regarding a comparison of Council and Mayor Office budget expenditures in various Utah cities. (22-016)

RECOMMENDATION: Presentation only.

BACKGROUND: At the Work Meeting on May 3, 2022, Council staff presented on a comparison of General Fund per capita expenditures in various Utah County cities. Several Councilors asked staff to provide a comparison between the budget expenditures of Provo's Council and Mayor Offices compared to those of other cities. Due to the different forms of government in many Utah County cities, staff have evaluated this request using a comparison of similarly structured cities (that have both a strong mayor form of government and a part-time council).

FISCAL IMPACT:

PRESENTER'S NAME: Mark Eyo, Council Intern

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 20 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-016

PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: EVANDERWERKEN
Department: Council
Requested Meeting Date:

SUBJECT: A presentation regarding utility rates, property tax rates, and fees. (22-016)

RECOMMENDATION: Presentation only. A motion may be needed for the Council to express intent regarding that is not currently articulated in the FY2023 Tentative Budget or in the Council's priorities.

BACKGROUND: This presentation will cover one of the reports staff have compiled to assist the Council in the budget analysis process. This presentation will cover the history and current status of utility rates, property tax rates, and fees. The FY2023 Tentative Budget includes several utility rate increases:

- An average 2% or \$2 monthly increase per average residential home on Energy utility sales (Energy Fund)
- An average 9% or \$6.85 monthly increase per average residential home on wastewater utility sales (Wastewater Fund)
- An average 5% or \$2.50 monthly increase per average residential home on water utility sales (Water Fund)

FISCAL IMPACT:

PRESENTER'S NAME: John Magness, Interim Council Executive Director

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 45 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-016

PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: EVANDERWERKEN
Department: Council
Requested Meeting Date:

SUBJECT: A presentation regarding budget increases from FY2022 to FY2023. (22-016)

RECOMMENDATION: Presentation only.

BACKGROUND: In this presentation, staff will highlight notable budget increases from the last fiscal year to the Tentative Budget FY2023.

FISCAL IMPACT:

PRESENTER'S NAME: Melia Dayley, Policy Analyst

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 35 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-016

PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: EVANDERWERKEN
Department: Council
Requested Meeting Date:

SUBJECT: A presentation regarding transfers in the FY2023 budget. (22-016)

RECOMMENDATION: Presentation only.

BACKGROUND: This is a review of transfers included in the tentative budget.

FISCAL IMPACT:

PRESENTER'S NAME: Dan Follett, Finance Director

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 30 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-016

PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL STAFF REPORT



Submitter: EVANDERWERKEN
Department: Council
Requested Meeting Date:

SUBJECT: A presentation regarding the Tentative Budget FY2023 and Council priorities (22-016 & 22-037)

RECOMMENDATION: Presentation only.

BACKGROUND: To assist the Council in their review of the budget, Council staff have prepared an analysis comparing the components of the Tentative Budget FY2023 with the Council budget priorities.

FISCAL IMPACT:

PRESENTER'S NAME: Melia Dayley, Policy Analyst

REQUESTED DURATION OF PRESENTATION: 40 minutes

COMPATIBILITY WITH GENERAL PLAN POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES:

CITYVIEW OR ISSUE FILE NUMBER: 22-016 & 22-037