

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
February 24, 2009**

TIME & PLACE
OF MEETING

This Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council, was scheduled for **Tuesday, February 24, 2009, at 7:00 PM;** this was preceded by a **Public Hearing at 6:00 PM,** on a proposed amendment to the 2008/2009 fiscal year Budget; and **City Council Work Session items.** The meetings were held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

Notice of the time, place and Agenda of these Meetings were provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E Utah Ave, Payson, UT, and to the members of the Governing Body, on February 20, 2009.

6:00 PM –

PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE 2008/2009 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

Public Hearing/To consider a proposed amendment to the 2008/2009 Fiscal Year Budget for he Operation of Elk Ridge City

ROLL

Mayor: Dennis A. Dunn; *City Council:* Nelson Abbott, Raymond Brown, Julie Haskell & Sean Roylance & Derrek Johnson; *City Planner:* Shawn Eliot; *Public:* Scouts: Tyrel Carter, Tyler Christensen, Ryan & Garrett May; Rodger Hardy (Deseret News), Rob & Lari Fitzgerald, Ed Christensen; and the *City Recorder:* Janice H. Davis

Discussion:

Nelson Abbott: (Regarding availability of water rights from SUVMWA) He attended a meeting at SUVMWA; the money collected from the sale of water rights will be disbursed to the individual cities and Elk Ridge actually has a portion of that money coming back. We can either have it literally come back to us or we can leave it at SUVMWA and apply it to the annual assessment for the Regional Sewer Plant (about \$6,468 credit).

(Mayor Dunn recommended leaving the money at SUVMWA, rather than have it returned to the City; and Councilmember Brown agreed.)

The money will not earn any interest; but SUVMWA will apply it to the assessment if they are told to do so. The Change Order has been processed for the 6 shares of water rights that the City will now sell to the LDS Church. Tony Fuller is coordinating efforts toward this sale. The shares will transfer out to about 19 acre feet. These have been paid for and the certificate transferred into the City's name.

City Recorder: The City Recorder had written a memo summarizing some of the major changes in the Budget.

The main area of concern and focus was the General Fund, with revenues dropping from \$1,115,674 to \$964,136, a difference of \$151,538. The proposal is to transfer \$124,190 back into the General Fund from Capital Projects (Town Hall/Fire Station) & \$109,287 from the (Capital Projects Fund / Future Improvements). Ms. Davis said in the memo that she had presented some ideas to the City Finance Director, Curtis Roberts, regarding balancing the General Fund through bringing back in some of the fund balances from some of the Capital Projects' Funds; he recommended only transferring back into the General Fund the Fund Balance from the Town Hall/Fire Station Capital Projects Fund and applying that to assist in off-setting the Sales Tax Revenue Bond payment for this year. He agreed with Ms. Davis about canceling all transfers out of the General Fund...using the analogy that if one's checking account runs low, one does not place money into "savings" when there is no extra money. Mr. Roberts had expressed concern about "reaching the Council" regarding looking to the future and making proactive decisions now to affect a better future for the City.

His recommendations for the budget were based on the fact that this is a mid-year amendment and there would be time to better assess the revenues and final expenditures before the final amendment in June and the Audit of this fiscal year.

Mayor Dunn began the discussion by looking back to the decision made by the majority of the Council against raising property taxes last summer. Councilmembers Roylance and Johnson reacted to the comment and referred to what they feel was a "bad" decision to purchase six acres of land through a Sales Tax Revenue Bond, for \$900,000. Councilmember Johnson feels the City paid too much for the land and that there were "warning signs" at the time to indicate the failing economy.

Tempers flared as the attempt was continued to place blame for the present economic problems the City is experiencing on past decisions.

The Mayor called a "point of order" with the gavel, in an attempt to bring order to the heated discussion.

City Recorder: She asked if she might relay the conversation she had with the City Finance Director. She reiterated some of the points made in the memo written to the Council...she said that the memo was to inform and to express opinion to them (not necessarily to the public) of the options available to address the financial issues facing the City at this time.

(There was a brief explanation about the "fund balances" for the various Funds.)

Mayor Dunn: The Mayor spoke to one of the County Commissioner and he commented that property taxes have "gone down" and the recession has caused an increase in the percentage of those not paying their property taxes. Sales Tax: (Explanation of how sales tax is collected) A portion (50%) of the return is determined by "point of sale" and the rest is placed in a "big pot" and disbursed by population...that second "pot" is mostly what comes to Elk Ridge. The deadline for that disbursement is 2/25; so we won't really know what that amount will be until that comes in (this will show up on the statement that comes from the PTIF or the State Treasury...and those statements are a month behind).

City Recorder: The Council was encouraged to not look back to past decisions, but to look at the options available now. Part of the decision to adopt the suggested tax rate from the County was based on some action that was to take place on the part of the Council with regards to developing some of the City-owned property to sell it. Decisions are generally made using the best information available at the time.

1
2
3 Derrek Johnson: 1) He reiterated that there were warning signs regarding the purchase of the land for a
4 possible City Center...so he did not agree that it was a decision made with the “best information
5 available”...he feels there was “plenty information available and the decision was made hastily and, I think, in
6 ignorance”.

7 2) He felt the conversation was leading toward a proposed increase in property taxes.
8 He said he would “not vote to raise anything” (referring to any increase to fees and/or taxes), while citizens are
9 struggling with their own financial problems. He feels that government has to take the same responsibility as
10 homeowners do when poor choices are made; the government cannot simply raise revenue by raising fees; he
11 feels that is irresponsible.

12 Mayor Dunn: He agrees with those thoughts that many are suffering financially; but so are the cities. He added
13 that Elk Ridge is not alone in the struggle between plans for future improvements and the failing economy...all
14 the Mayors in the County have said they are struggling. The motivation for holding the Truth in Taxation
15 Hearing in August came from about this time last year when Councilmember Abbott brought to the Council's
16 attention that the City had not really been maintaining property taxes for some time and suggested a serious
17 review of that policy. The suggestion to consider raising the percentage rate for property taxes was not
18 generated by recession, it was more of a “house maintenance” project...meaning that the Council should take
19 on the duty of making sure that the property taxes collected for the City is in line with keeping the General
20 Fund balanced. There were no “course corrections” through the gathering of property taxes; and there should
21 have been.

22 Many cities also had the Truth in Taxation Hearings and did increase their taxes. Some times Councils have to
23 make choices for the good of the City that may bring some unpleasantness to the Council. He feels that
24 planning requires the Council to review all aspects of the City's finances, even property taxes and the
25 possibility of an increase...as well as other option available.

26 Raymond Brown: (Addressing the purchase of the City property) He and Councilmember Abbott were on the
27 City Council when that land was purchased and he found the comments regarding that decision made by
28 Councilmember Johnson offensive. He does not agree that the Council should attack the intelligence of other
29 Councilmembers when there is a difference of opinion. He has withheld reacting when disparaging comments
30 have been made in the past, even to the newspaper. He felt that if such information had been available, that it
31 should have been made known to the Council at the time.

32 Derrek Johnson: Councilmember Johnson disagreed in that he said he did meet with Mayor Dunn re: the
33 water tank & future of the economy, before the purchase of the property and expressed his concerns at that
34 time...yet he felt he was ignored.

35 Raymond Brown: He still felt he should have come to the public hearing and informed the rest of the Council.
36 He prompted Councilmember Abbott to disagree if he felt there was anything being misrepresented. He still
37 maintains that the decisions made on that purchase were good decision; and he resents being accused
38 otherwise in a demeaning way. (Reasons for the purchase were reviewed.)

39 Derrek Johnson: He quoted the price that the previous owners paid for the land as \$550,000...and he felt
40 nearly doubling it in about a year's time period and the City agreeing to it was not a wise choice. He doubted
41 that sharing that information with the Council at the time would have made any difference.

42 Sean Roylance: He agrees that sharing information would not have made a difference; he referred to the
43 address change issues and that people expressed their disfavor and it was passed anyway. (*He was asked to*
44 *stay on the topic.*) Councilmember Roylance also referred to the survey that went out to citizens and that 82%
45 of those that responded said they did not want to have their taxes raised to pay for a City Center; he feels this
46 was not taken into consideration in the decision-making process.

47 Mayor Dunn: He felt it is important to understand that the four parcels of land the City owned in that area were
48 not contiguous; the land was arranged in “pairs” (the map on the wall was referred to). One of the main points
49 in favor of purchasing that ground was the ability to connect these other parcels of land and tie them together;
50 it would also satisfy another aspect of that same survey...the desire of the citizens for more open space and
51 parks. The land is flat and good for park space; not just for a City Center. There were many opportunities
52 attached to that land; all to be accomplished as possible...in sections. It was never even talked about that it
53 would happen “overnight” or all at once. One of the steps in getting there was to acquire the ground. The
54 Council was also discussing Hole #7 and the possibility of purchasing that from Payson City; however,
55 negotiations did not work out financially nor would it for a park where sports could be played due to the
56 topography of the land.

57 Sean Roylance: He does not wish to debate what has been done in the past; he has an opinion and that will
58 not change...if the Council wishes to discuss this further, at some point that could be arranged; but he does
59 also believe that the previous Council acted according to their best judgment...just because he has a different
60 opinion does not mean the Councilmembers involved were not doing their best. He does agree with what has
61 been stated that regardless of what happened, “we are here”.

62 Raymond Brown: Although he agrees with this perspective, he further expressed his offense at being referred
63 to “as an idiot”; the decisions were not made in a “vacuum” or to go against the citizens of the Community. He
64 feels that there are not pieces of property available in the area that would meet the needs of the City as well as
65 this particular piece.

66 Derrek Johnson: There have also been ill feelings expressed regarding the Council's vote to not increase the
67 tax rate and negative comments made about that; how should that be taken? He finds that attitude offensive,
68 as well.

69 (*Councilmember Brown felt the discussion should stay focused on the land purchase.*)

70 Nelson Abbott: (RE: Tax Rate) He was the one that brought up the possibility of an increase and encouraged
71 the Council to hold a public hearing...he was the “driving force” behind it;

but when it got down to “crunching the numbers”, he felt that an increase beyond that which the County was planning, was not necessary. “If everybody paid their taxes, some of this discussion wouldn’t even be happening tonight. The bottom line is, we have people who don’t pay taxes; that’s part of the frustration. I wish we could get our legislators to ‘put more teeth in that’ because a zero percent loan for 5 years...it’s ridiculous!” Everyone else that “do things right” bare the burdens of those who won’t pay their way. “This is what we’ve got; we’ve got to work through it together...and if we don’t work together, we will not come up with a solution.”

Raymond Brown: He feels strongly that the Council should not “throw rocks”...he was the only one who voted for the tax increase; but name calling was not a part of it. “Now we are in a bind; hindsight is 20X20”.

Sean Roylance: He pointed out that there would be another opportunity to discuss property taxes in August; but he would still vote the same way.

There was further discussion on the public hearing that took place in August, 2008...Councilmember Brown felt that the majority of the public in attendance were not opposed to some kind of tax increase...Councilmembers Johnson and Roylance felt that the “majority” of the public were not represented at the public hearing. The point was made by Councilmember Brown that opinions may differ but, again name-calling should not be a part of the public meeting.

Sean Roylance: He felt that any debate on the issues at hand could be arranged at another time and place; he did not feel it was useful to continue the debate in the meeting.

Raymond Brown: He agreed to meet at any time to continue the discussion at a “neutral” place where he and Councilmember Roylance can “talk plainly” (not on a recording) and he would tell Councilmember Roylance exactly what he thinks.

Sean Roylance: He came to the meeting prepared not to get into these differing opinions about the past; but he felt that the meeting started out with accusations regarding the property tax issue. He had the attitude of “looking forward”.

Discussion: Regarding the newspaper article that came out regarding the purchase of the land; there were comments about the past decision that were offensive to Councilmember Brown.

Raymond Brown: “We’ve got to work together, or we can’t work at all.”

Verbal challenges were issued between Councilmember Brown and Councilmembers Johnson and Roylance; with tempers flaring.

Councilmember Haskell called for a “point of order” to end the arguing. The Council is supposed to be discussing the amended budget.

Mayor Dunn: Confirmed the “point of order” with his gavel and called for the Council to get back on task.

Raymond Brown: (Back to the budget) He pointed out that the budget figure is actually \$5,000 lower in “Road Repair” than the original bid; it was lowered.

The Recorder spoke to the Council about the respect she has for any citizens willing to run for elected office. It is a difficult job to fulfill. The ill feelings being expressed are not accomplishing anything toward a solution to the City’s financial problems. There have been tough times to get through in the past; the City has come through it, but it has taken some creative work on the part of Councilmembers. There are possibilities for added revenue that need to be explored. Next month will take the City to that time of year when we are in the middle of two budgets. The condition of the economy brings out fear in people and fear results in short tempers and frustrations. To “blame” is not productive...personally and as a Council. This Council has the future of the City in their hands; regardless of how we arrived at this point. Foresight has to be the focus. Putting the bond money (City land purchase) that is left back onto the end of the bond, will take time off the back but will do nothing to lessen the annual bond payments. Perhaps that money could be utilized proactively instead.

Mayor Dunn: Information came to the Mayor not long ago that Woodland Hills might be building a new City Center (they are still working on a new one currently). After time he found out that a private citizen in the City contacted other professionals in the City and got commitments from them to fund a commercial type building close to the entrance and offered to lease space to the City Government. The other one would then be turned over to the Fire Dept. for a Fire Station. The offer came from the private sector.

Before the Mayor took office, he was on an Economic Development Committee and they had been looking at the property the City ended up purchasing + some other land in the area for possible “soft commercial”. The goal of the Economic Development Committee was to supplement the City’s property tax.

There is a great deal of talent on the Council; thinking “outside the box” could bring some good results, if the Council works together.

The Mayor had a long conversation with Mark Rindlesbach (one of the developers involved with the purchase of the land where the PUD developed); and though the land purchase appeared to be a good deal at the time, he said he wished he had not bought then land now. He has land a various places going through the same problems as a result of the economic recession.

There are opportunities with the land that the City purchased. Construction costs are way down; including materials and labor. Advantage could be taken of these lower costs. IF we take action on something; whether in a “modular fashion” or in some way...we would have the fact that commodity prices are down.

City Recorder: The mid-year amendment to the Budget is a “guide” for the Council; it is not sent in to the State. The Budget will be amended again at the end of the Fiscal Year...but, the actual year-end financial report is the Audit. This amendment acts as a “wake-up call” for future planning.

Questions:

- Will the replacement of the old water line on North Canyon View Drive take place this year or next?
- How much will be needed for spring repairs on roads?

Suggestion: When Loafer Canyon Rd. is finished, the curb and gutter expense should be coded to the Storm Drainage Fund rather than to Roads (General Fund);

in fact Councilmember Brown and the Recorder could get together and figure out how much of this year's expense on Loafer Canyon Rd. could go to Storm Drain (this should be done before June).

Raymond Brown: Much of the prep work to finish Loafer Canyon Rd. could be done this year and the curb & gutter could wait until July.

- Sewer: The O & M payments to Payson have been shorted somehow. There has been a discrepancy in the number of connections we actually have and what they are charging us for. It is straightened now, but will results in some fees being made up.

Mayor Dunn closed the Public Hearing. He asked if anyone has any final concerns to express.

Sean Roylance: He has been looking into "online bill pay"; he has found that consistent bill payment increases with online payment possibilities. He has no facts to substantiate that; however the claim seems to be in favor of online payments. Perhaps if a higher percentage of residents are paying their bills to the City, there may be the possibility of lowering utility (water) rates to help off-set an increase elsewhere.

Mayor Dunn: He has looked into online payment possibilities with Linda Cooper and a representative from a firm that does that type of service. There is a difference between "online bill pay" and the "automatic withdrawal" option. Beaver City had online bill pay and went off of it.

The City has also signed up with a collection agency to assist with some of the "bad debt" the City incurs.

The conclusion that Linda Cooper and the Mayor had come to was that it needs to be a pretty fair sized community to benefit from online payments due the associated costs.

*Sean Roylance: If no one has any strong objections, he would like to further investigate this type of option for the citizens.

Mayor Dunn: He feels that the City would benefit from any added information like this. The level of "bad debt" has decreased and is somewhere around \$2,500 per year. There are also stricter measures being taken with "shut-offs".

PRIMARY WELL PRESENTATION

Mayor Dunn: This was not included in the Council packets because much of the information requires some explanation. The information gathered together represents water usage dating back to April, 2003.

The peaks on the chart (high point of usage) are in the same summer months year after year. All of the figures come from past billing and pumping records, compiled from past bills from SESD.

Looking at the chart: every thing below the red line = water that could come from one well (Loafer Canyon Well); and everything above the red line could come from the Cloward Well.

The summer time surge is where supplemental water would come into place. The Cloward Well has been producing most of the water and this has resulted ion high pumping costs.

Well production per hour:

- 700 East Park Well: about 46 gpm about 220 gal. per kilowatt hour (Not a very efficient well)
- Loafer Canyon Well: about 1,000 gal. per kilowatt hour
- Cloward Well: about 180 gal. per kilowatt hour
- Fairway Booster Pumps (combined with Cloward Well): about 450 gal. Per kilowatt hour (This is about twice the pumping cost of the Loafer Well)

Explanation of "single phase" vs. "three phase" systems...along with the electrical charges that accompany both. Demand charges can be less in the middle of the night than earlier in the evening with peak usage.

Determination (after meeting with Kent Haskell):

- To turn off the smaller well located at E. Park Drive in Loafer Canyon.
- Leave the Oak Lane Booster Pump (Well is currently not in use due to sand being pumped)
- Loafer Canyon Well: All the winter demands can be met by running the Loafer Well 91 minutes pre day
- Hillside Tank: Replace the altitude valve (About \$1,000) for accuracy so that the Loafer Well can be considered the primary well for the City. This will reduce costs by possibly \$20,000 to \$30,000 per year; which will bring that 2% return on assets back up to 4%.

Nelson Abbott: Is there a specific time when it is most efficient for water usage during those "peak times"?

If so, this should be communicated to the citizens.

Mayor Dunn: Example: On a windy day, a person could save over 80% of water usage by not watering.

Watering at night could also save about 80% of the usage, in 15 minute cycles...say, with 6 stations (perhaps twice in one night...2 or 3 times per week. Watering at night allows the water to avoid evaporation.

ADDRESS UPDATE

Mayor Dunn: "This has been a hot topic"; but the Mayor wanted to update the Council on some things.

Two of the City's EMT's came in to talk to the Mayor; reporting a problem that they had been called out on some calls and there are still addresses that have not been changed nor updated. These EMT's went around to check every single address in the City and brought the Mayor a list of the existing issues:

- addresses with no visible marking
- double addresses on mailboxes (old & new)
- wrong addresses on houses / mailbox good
- wrong addresses on mailboxes / house number good
- (small list) no address changes at all either on the houses or mailboxes

The mayor brought this up due to what the Census Bureau has been asking the Mayor to do for the last 18 months. He got a packet from the Census Bureau in preparation for the 2010 Census. The Mayor had to go through and put al the correct house numbers in the information...everyone's address...this was done by the end of March, 2008. The Census Bureau has that record...they will not recognize the old (incorrect) numbers.

All of the systems (911, emergency services, post office, etc) have the new numbers; these new numbers fit the established grid. (Brief explanation of the grid system created in the City, as well as the resulting problems of applying the grid backwards some years ago)

The changes were not done due to any "personal agenda"; but to put the numbering back in line with the system used to establish the town...this was done to match the standard for the sake of emergency services and other services could have numbers that match the standard.

The Mayor wanted to know if the Council thinks he should send out letters to residents not in compliance, as assessed by the EMT's, as to where they are in relation to the address changes; this would be done in a pleasant manner (some citizens will take the letters pleasantly and some will not). This still needs to be dealt with; we need the standard to work for now and for future growth.

Nelson Abbott: This issue has re-surfaced due to the EMT's research; he feels the EMT's should issue the letter; it may be received with a more positive response than if the Council were to write the letter.

Julie Haskell: She feels that these are safety issues and it should not matter who generates the letter.

Nelson Abbot: There will come a time when the Post Office will no longer recognize the old addresses.

Sean Roylance: He agreed with the suggestion to actually have the EMT Department draft the letter and send it.

Nelson Abbott: That was his intent; there are certain people within the EMT and Fire Departments who are good at drafting letters that educate as well as inform people.

Derrek Johnson: He agreed that a reminder would be received better if it came from the EMT's.

Sean Roylance: He still hears complaints about the address changes. He does not think too many people realize that so many residents have changed their addresses; the letter could point this out and that it would create more problems to switch back at this point. This would educate people.

Nelson Abbott: He suggested that the Council review the letter prior to mailing it out to residents.

*Mayor Dunn: He will speak to the EMS people and ask them to draft a letter and he will try to have it by the next Council Meeting.

Lari Fitzgerald: They still get a lot of mail with the wrong address (old address). She contacted the Post Office and she said they told her that she could be either address, since she is located at the center of town. She asked if they could post #3 or #4 on their mailbox.

Mayor Dunn: No. You can post #4 on your house...he suggested letting important people know of the change.

Sean Roylance: He has changed his address; and he believes all of his mail gets to him.

Mayor Dunn: He has contacted the Payson Post Office; there is a new and temporary manager and he does not know much about the issue and does not really want to know much, since he is temporary.

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
February 24, 2009**

TIME & PLACE
OF MEETING

This Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council, was scheduled for **Tuesday, February 24, 2009, at 7:00 PM**; this was preceded by a **Public Hearing at 6:00 PM**, on a proposed amendment to the 2008/2009 fiscal year Budget; and **City Council Work Session items**. The meetings were held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

Notice of the time, place and Agenda of these Meetings were provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E Utah Ave, Payson, UT, and to the members of the Governing Body, on February 20, 2009.

7:25 PM -

CITY COUNCIL MEETING – REGULAR SESSION AGENDA ITEMS

ROLL

Mayor: Dennis A. Dunn; *City Council*: Nelson Abbott, Raymond Brown, Julie Haskell & Sean Roylance & Derrek Johnson; *City Planner*: Shawn Eliot; *Public*: Scouts: Tyrel Carter, Tyler Christensen, Ryan & Garrett May; Rodger Hardy (Deseret News), Margaret Leckie, Rob & Lari Fitzgerald, Ed Christensen; and the *City Recorder*: Janice H. Davis

OPENING REMARKS
& PLEDGE OF
ALLEGIANCE

An invocation was offered by City Recorder, Jan Davis and Scout Tyler Christensen led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance, for those willing to participate.

AGENDA TIME
FRAME

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY SEAN ROYLANCE TO APPROVE THE AGENDA TIME FRAME; ADJUSTING THE START TIME TO 7:25 PM
VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)

FAIRWAY HEIGHTS,
PLAT "C" –
EXTENSION REQUEST

The Fitzgerald's submitted a written request for the Council to consider granting an extension for their portion of the Fairway Heights Subdivision; this would be for the Preliminary Approval, which terminates April 9, 2009. (Letter from Fitzgerald's...read by Mayor Dunn)

"Dear Elk Ridge City Council Members,

The Fairway Heights plats C & D was pre-approved by you on April 9, 2008. Since that time the United States economy has entered into a recession, causing an undesirable environment to develop and sell lots for both the city and the developer.

As developers of the Fairway Heights plat, we request an extension of one year from the original final approval date (this was for Preliminary Approval, not Final), resulting in a deadline of April 9, 2010.

The extension request is for the following reasons:

- The current economy has decreased the interest of potential buyers
- Unpurchased new lots are less desirable than pristine raw land
- Decreased land values have caused an unsuitable economic environment in which to develop land
- Empty building lots are not aesthetically pleasing to the residents, city or developer.
- For some time now, there have been more lots available within Elk Ridge City Boundaries than there have been buyers.

We feel it would be in the best interest of Elk Ridge City and its residents to consider and approve this extension.”

(Discussion on whether this is considered Plat C or Phase 1...it was decided that Plat C is more correct. It was also determined that RL Yergensen's portion of the development goes with this Plat.)

Mayor Dunn asked if the Fitzgerald's had anything to add...they declined.

Nelson Abbott: When the Council spoke to Brian Ewell, he had all of his water rights and was ready to go, if the economy were to turn around in the next few days; Is the purpose of this request to buy more time in hopes that the economy will turn around? Are you ready to go at this point?

Rob Fitzgerald: The funding has been arranged, he has a realtor ready to go with the deal; in fact this same realtor recommends holding off on this.

Raymond Brown: (Same question he asked of Brian Ewell) Councilmember Brown asked about the requirement to convey water rights to the City in conjunction with development.

Rob Fitzgerald: There are some sources they have available to them; their realtor has been looking for them. We could buy some from the same realtor, or others to purchase.

Raymond Brown: He pointed out that water transfers are taking a year or more to go through the process at the State.

City Recorder: SUVMWA is willing to still sell some of the water rights that were available to the City until last November. The price would have to be negotiated once a developer decided how much they needed. These rights are already transferred and ready for conveyance. Ms. Davis pointed out that the requirement to convey water rights is with Final Plat Approval, so the Fitzgerald's are not "behind" by not having them now; but it should be addressed so they have time to transfer, if needed.

Raymond Brown: *(Reading from the minutes where Brian Ewell came in with his request for an extension)* Councilmember Brown went over the time line of approvals if the request were not granted. They would still have ample time to get all the things done to develop.

Rob Fitzgerald: He feels that an extension would give more time for the economy to turn around. They are being counseled that selling lots may not be possible until 2012...he agrees with this estimate.

Mayor Dunn: He has spoken to developers that have other properties across the State and the demand seems to be for "entry-level" homes, which this development would not allow. He was told that anything over \$300,000 is not selling. The Mayor of Santaquin said that their City had over 22 building permits a year ago; this last year they only has 25 permits. The ratios are quite similar throughout the communities.

Raymond Brown: *(Directed to Shawn Eliot)* There are 16 lots included in this proposed Plat; what would the new code do to this number? As has been mentioned previously, if there are substantial changes, the Council may or may not approve the extension.

Shawn Eliot: There are two issues:

- The code would have to be amended to allow for an exception: The minimum acreage wherein they would be able to do ½ acre lots is 20 acres; it would probably not be too difficult to amend the code to say that an exception could be made for contiguous open space...in the code, that open space can be anywhere. Also, If adjoining developments are smaller lot development; then an exception could be made to that 20 acre requirement. The total development (both Plats) is about 19.8 acres.
- The other issue is the 40% open space; they are currently at 30%.
- On the other side, the code does allow for up to 30% more density...where they could do more than ½ acre lots...in return for amenities (flatter open space, natural space mixed with park space, "street furniture")
- When he looked at the differences before for Plat D, he found that Plat C would go from 16 lots to 12 lots...that would have to be reviewed further.

Mayor Dunn: *(Further explanation of SUVMWA water rights)*

- Another advantage is that you would not lose any of the rights in the transfer process.
- He spoke to an individual (Mark Rindlesbach) who, along with Randy Young, purchased water rights and went through the transfer process. He said to the Mayor that he would "love to sell it". There is a lot of water there. The Mayor suggested he deed it to the City and sell it to developers here in Elk Ridge. It was brought in for some of the phases of the Elk Meadows PUD; which is a ways out from developing.

Nelson Abbott: If this extension is granted to the Fitzgeralds; "this is it. This is the final...there will not be another, because this is how our code is written, right?"

Shawn Eliot: The Code says that the Council can grant up to a one year extension.

Mayor Dunn asked for any other questions, from the Council and from the Fitzgerald's...there were none...except that no one was willing to make the motion at this point.)

Sean Roylance: On the one hand...similar to the last request by Brian Ewell...according to our code, an extension should not be granted if circumstances have substantially changed. On the other hand, the Council did grant the extension two weeks ago. Up until two weeks ago, this has been presented as one combined project; he did not see, at this point why they should be split apart and treat them differently...with opposite outcomes.

Raymond Brown: You cannot split out RL Yergensen's portion of this Plat C. So the Council would have to approve Mr. Yergensen's portion along with the Fitzgeralds' portion...all one Plat.

Sean Roylance: (Question to Fitzgerald's) Two week ago the Council was presented with a written request that had the Fitzgerald's names on it, but not their signatures; were the Fitzgerald's intending to be included in this previous discussion and request to extend?

Lari Fitzgerald: She explained that they (the Fitzgerald's) had received an email with the statement on it...they reviewed it and called Brian (Ewell) and said it sounded great; they would be out of town...and for them to represent them.

Raymond Brown: Mr. Ewell said that he had tried several times to contact you and could get no response.

Lari Fitzgerald: Because we were out of town...we did not know for sure what date this would be presented; "when he tried to contact us, we were already gone. He typically does try to get a hold of us a day or two or the day of a meeting that he wants us to be at".

Mayor Dunn: The Planner designed these as two plats that would provide for being separate...in case one moved faster than the other. There have been many issues involved. He feels perhaps keeping them separate would be good.

Lari Fitzgerald: "That's good. Does that mean that we need to go ahead and to "that" with Trane Engineering? That has not been done. We have discussed it multiple times with Brian (Ewell) and with Trane Engineering...we have not paid money to have that separated...? We had decided that we would not do that, as far as the engineering goes."

Shawn Eliot: They did not submit two separate plats; it was all one map. "We asked them to do two separate maps; but there was concern about one being approved and one not being approved. So, they kept them that way stating that it would be separated at Final. I think going forward that Final would be separated." He did not feel they would have to go back and have them separated at this point.

MOTION WAS MADE BY DERREK JOHNSON AND SECONDED BY NELSON ABBOTT TO GRANT A ONE YEAR EXTENSION TO THE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL FOR FAIRWAY HEIGHTS, PLAT C; FROM APRIL 9, 2009 TO APRIL 9, 2010

VOTE (POLL): DERREK JOHNSON-AYE, JULIE HASKELL-AYE, SEAN ROYLANCE-AYE (3) RAYMOND BROWN-NAY & NELSON ABBOTT-NAY (2)

Passes 3-2

Derrek Johnson: Asked for an explanation why Councilmembers Brown and Abbott were willing to grant an extension to Plat D, but not to Plat C.

Nelson Abbott: Mr. Ewell would have lots one lot...this Plat would be affected by four lots or 25%...that's why.

Derrek Johnson: Mr. Ewell would have lost more than one lot...he would have lost all of the lots on top of the hill (three lots).

Raymond Brown gave no explanation.

PLATTING FEES –
HORIZON VIEW
FARMS

Shawn Eliot: A series of emails between the City Planner and the City Recorder revealed brought up a question regarding the status of Horizon View Farms (Elk Ridge Meadows PUD, Phase 4) and applicable fees.

Brief History:

This has been considered the "town home project" within the PUD, which had received Preliminary & Final on their previous project; they had never bonded nor recorder the plat. The project has since changed; and the new owners came in October or November, 2008, with Preliminary & Final on their altered plat. They came in with both due to having already received Final previously. They were required to pay the fees for Final Approval. They went to their Technical Review meeting, then on to Planning Commission, where the plat was denied based on the open space issues. Since then, it was discovered that there is a small notation on the one of the Concept Plat maps for the entire PUD that states that there is no open space required for Phase 4. None of the Planning Commission, the Planner, the engineers nor the developers themselves noticed this note. At the time of Concept, the details for Phase 4 were nebulous because there were no available details at the time. When Randy Young was questioned on the open space, he responded that it would be a part of the individual plat's Preliminary when it comes forward. The notation basically says that all the other phases have enough open space together to leave Phase 4 out of needing any on its own. Since that time, the Planner has met with the developer and corrected this misunderstanding. Now a new Concept has been submitted that adjusted some of the buildings; now they will come back in with Preliminary and Final Plats.

The Planner felt that they had paid their fee in November and had one Technical Review before going before the Planning Commission, where they were denied. The reasons they were denied were invalidated by the note on the Concept Plat. The Policy has been that if a developer submits for both Preliminary and Final together, and there isn't much work to be done on it; that Final Fees would apply. The Final Fee allows for two Technical Review Meetings. He felt that an additional fee did not have to be charged due to:

- The Planning Commission's input changed the plat
- They have not had two Technical Reviews

There was a difference between this project and another (Dean Ingram plat) because they had many meetings with Mr. Ingram, and he was charged both Preliminary and Final application fees.

The question: Do we charge them for a whole new plat due to the changes from the previous project description? Or, do we say that this can be considered the second Technical Review, which is provided for by the Final Fee?

City Recorder: Ms. Davis asked if the previous plat was considered "null & void" based on the changes on the plat. As it was re-submitted? The previous Final was based on a different concept.

Shawn Eliot: Yes, according to the City Attorney; the time allotted to having the plat recorded was up; but they were postponed due to the denial in November by the Planning Commission, which denial was based on an erroneous assumption.

1
2
3 Recorder: She was under the impression that it was considered void because they changed the plat’s concept.
4 What was approved is no longer applicable.

5 Shawn Eliot: When they re-submitted back in October, 2008, and paid their fees; that would have started their
6 “clock” again. They were still within their year for Preliminary.

7 Recorder: She felt that Preliminary time periods do not apply when the Final is granted at the same time...the
8 process has simply “fast forwarded” past Preliminary to Final and the time period for Final (six months)
9 applies.

10 Shawn Eliot: He feels that the denial that put the developers off was the Planning Commission’s mistake
11 regarding the required open space. He is treating it as the same application turned in the fall of 2008.

12 The project can be treated either way; but it has gone back and forth...and David Church also said we should
13 be working in a spirit of cooperation to encourage development; particularly in the attempt to get this PUD “out
14 of the hole”.

15 Raymond Brown: He expressed his concern that the City may not be meeting expenses with regard to fees
16 charged to the City related to this proposed development (planning, public works, engineering, staff, etc.).

17 Shawn Eliot: The reason for allowing Preliminary and Final together was that there wasn’t much review
18 needed. We were at fault due to requiring the open space, which was not the case because of the note on the
19 Concept Plat. Phases 1 & 2 filled the requirement for open space for Phase 4.

20 Recorder: Is the Planning Commission close to solving the existing problems? Will there be further reviews?
21 Will those be covered by the one fee?

22 Shawn Eliot: Since the open space in Phase 2 is tied up with the Bank, a solution needs to be arrived at
23 between the developer and the Bank. The City needs to know what is to be done with this. (The open space is
24 the park located east of Phase 2.)

25 Recorder: With the City in a deficit situation in the General Fund, she is simply concerned that there will be
26 one more cost not covered by revenue coming in; then tax payers would be covering what should be
27 developer costs.

28 Shawn Eliot: The previous Preliminary and Final was with different developers; it could be looked at as having
29 changed enough to warrant Preliminary and Final being separate. Perhaps the dynamics of the project have
30 changed enough to warrant separating the two approvals off.

31 The changes are not to the infrastructure; but to the arrangement of the town homes, with single family units
32 included (actually, there are now more single family dwellings, with a few town homes). The Planning
33 Commission has asked the developer to locate all of the town homes along the open space and do “zero lot
34 lines” in the back yards...the open space would be a “common area” for their development. If they cannot
35 secure that open space, then they will have to come back and propose a different idea. The “zero lot lines”
36 allowed more open space in the middle of their development.

37 So, it must be decided which direction this development should take.

38 Raymond Brown: Though he is not in favor of burdening the City with any extra costs; he also does not want to
39 burden the developer with the City’s mistakes, if this could be thought of as a “mistake”.

40 Shawn Eliot: The developers were also unaware of the notation on the plat...so everyone was responsible for
41 this situation.

42 Mayor Dunn: Perhaps there is “equity” in the fees paid due to services un-rendered...they had not had both
43 the Technical Reviews allowed. Salisbury picked up the project from Pangea (former developers) and picked
44 up the process from them. He did not believe that Mr. Salisbury had paid anything as yet.

45 Shawn Eliot: He believes that Pangea was trying to market the development and trying to get Mr. Salisbury to
46 purchase it. Mr. Salisbury’s name is not on the project at this time.

47 Mayor Dunn: If it is not in Mr. Salisbury’s name, then perhaps we are still obligated by the previous fee
48 schedule.

49 Shawn Eliot: There have been a lot of changes; depending on the perspective, it could be thought of either
50 way. Since they had to re-submit Concept, perhaps it is appropriate to work through the entire subdivision
51 process.

52 Raymond Brown: He suggested splitting any overages with costs between the developer and the City. He
53 does not have the answer.

54 Shawn Eliot: Doing Preliminary & Final together will cut the costs. The hard part is; we are not doing as much
55 work, but it keeps coming back time and again. The Planning Commission has had a hard time with the
56 concept of small, single-family homes...they liked the town homes better. It is the single-family homes that
57 have “eaten up” much of the open space; so it wasn’t just the lack of open space that was the issue, but a
58 combination of things.

59 Raymond Brown: Even though the perspective could go either way, Councilmember Brown asked the Planner
60 what his recommendation is.

61 Shawn Eliot: After talking through the issues, he felt that the plat should be put back through the entire
62 process, with Preliminary and Final separated off. There has been a great deal of work that has gone into the
63 multiple times that this has come back for adjustments. If questions arise, he said he would just have to deal
64 with them.

65 Nelson Abbott: If they are allowed to “come back through again”, he thinks the City needs to be clear that they
66 will not be allowed another “go around” after this time. If they attempt to come back through, they need to
67 understand that they will be paying all fees. He does not believe they are finished even yet.

68 Mayor Dunn: (In the attempt to clarify the guidance to the Planner) The direction is to go ahead and “push
69 them through” with Preliminary and Final together at this time; however, if they re-submit, they will have to start
70 over with the entire subdivision process...subject to all applicable fees.

Raymond Brown: He is still concerned that the City could be covering fees for the various reviews by the Planner, Engineer, etc.

2008/2009 AMENDED
BUDGET –
ADOPTION

The question remained regarding the replacement of the water line on Canyon View Dr.)

Nelson Abbott: He preferred to postpone the replacement until next fiscal year and hope that the cost of materials continue to decrease. If costs hit a low, he would consider amending this year's budget to do the replacement in 2008/2009.

Mayor Dunn: Perhaps we should keep an eye on costs and get an estimate of what materials would be needed for the project. The estimate was about \$105,000.

Raymond Brown: That estimate was on the high end of costs 6 months ago.

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY JULIE HASKELL TO ADOPT THE AMENDED BUDGET FOR THE 2008/2009 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET FOR THE OPERATION OF ELK RIDGE CITY; AS PRESENTED

VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)

Mayor Dunn: He counseled that the Dept. Heads should keep close watch on expenditures to see where things could be adjusted; both in considering the final amended budget for the current fiscal year and in looking to the next fiscal year.

Nelson Abbott: He added that it may be prudent to schedule a City Council Closed Session for the purpose of discussing personnel.

(A discussion of what makes up a quorum on the City Counsel took place...simply for information.)

RATIFY POLLED VOTE
RE: SCHEDULEING
PUBLIC HEARING FOR
IMPACT FEES

Amy Thatcher needed a date to be able to notify various entities that would be required by law to be included.

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY SEAN ROYLANCE TO RATIFY THE PREVIOUSLY POLLED VOTE TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING TO ADDRESS UPDATED WATER, SEWER AND ROAD IMPACT FEES, ON MARCH 10, 2009; AT 6:00 PM

VOTE (POLL): DERREK JOHNSON-AYE, JULKIE HASKELL-AYE, RAYMOND BROWN-AYE, NELSON ABBOTT-AYE & SEAN ROYLANCE-AYE (5) NO (0)

Passes 5-0

SCHEDULE PUBLIC
HEARING – DEFAULT
FOR ELK RIDGE
MEADOWS PUD,
PHASE 2

Brief history of issues (Memo from Recorder to Council, dated 2-24-09)

“During the meeting with Centennial Bank representative to determine responsibility for Phase 2...the Bank does not want to claim responsibility for any of the work to be done...only the impact fee re-imbursements to be collected. He was informed that the City's Attorney advised paying the money to a third party, namely the court system, and the courts could determine who ultimately gets the money.

It was suggested we withhold building permits while all the patch work + overlay work gets done...I called David Church in the middle of the meeting and he said we cannot do that, besides we want building to get going! He advised we get started on the default process, since it takes a while...so we can start the paperwork to tap into the Surety Bond...if the developer fails to install the needed improvements. The developers are responsible for the work (not the Bank), since it is they who have the bond in place. The Surety Bond is up in September, 2009; so we haven't much excess time to draw on it.”

(Also included in the packets: letter from Craig Neeley regarding the process to draw upon a bond.)

Raymond Brown: This has been discussed in a previous Council Meeting; we have a certain amount of money set aside in a Surety Bond. We want to have this Public Hearing to:

- Let the developers know that we are going to finish the project (roads, gutters and whatever else needs to be done)
- Allow them the opportunity to complete the list; if not, then the City can simply draw on the bond.

Councilmember Brown submitted a bid from Staker Paving (they did the original work) for \$91,388. This would take care of the 1” overlay and would also repair the entrance where the sewer pipe went in and has caved in.

A 2 1/2” asphalted trail would also be finished where the electrical pole were removed (4,280 sq. ft. of asphalt). He feels the estimate is a good one and that we should proceed with the Public Hearing process.

We are not contracting with Staker at this time; this is just a bid. The City will not proceed until the money is available, since it can be a bit difficult to draw on that bond, according to Mr. Neeley.

He was told by Ron Knight (Staker) that he would hold to these prices.

MOTION WAS MADE BY NELSON ABBOTT AND SECONDED BY RAYMOND BROWN TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE DEVELOPERS OF ELK RIDGE MEADOWS PUD, PHASE 2; ELK RIDGE MANAGERS, IN DEFAULT; ON MARCH 24, 2009, AT 6:00 PM

VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)

FUTURE OF CITY-
OWNED PROPERTIES

Raymond Brown: *(Memo to Council)*

“Due to excessive manpower used to maintain the flow of salt distribution in our snowplow spreaders, less effective distribution, loss of salt due to the elements and leaching of salt in private property, it has been proposed to spend funds to prevent this loss of road salt and the extra expense associated with same. The savings would be re-occurring and would essentially amount to a one-time expense. Over a period of time, the realized savings will pay for this expenditure.

This proposal is to build a shelter on City property to protect the road salt from weather conditions that dissolve and destroy the road salt. This unit will consist of a roof and containment walls of concrete (4 foot pony wall) in an area of about 22' X 26'. Also there will be additional protection on the sides through the two extra sheets of steel panels. Electricity will be needed for the purpose of lighting and to heat diesel engines, i.e.: front loader. Most of the electrical, foundation or prep work, road base work and concrete prep/finish, will be accomplished by the City Works Department and City volunteers. Below is the estimated cost, less buyer furnished equipment and labor:

- 22' x 26' enclosures would be	*base price:	\$2395.00 (12 gauge)
- Two additional side panels	\$85 each:	\$ 170.00
- Vertical roofing vs horizontal		\$ 500.00 (additional)
- 4 ft pony concrete wall		\$ 2000.00 est.
- Road base flooring		\$ 500.00 est.
- Electrical		<u>\$2000.00</u>
	Approximate cost:	\$7565.00

*Price includes delivery, prep and assembly (on level ground) clean up and haul off"

Councilmember Brown reviewed his memo with the Council. Many cities have their salt in enclosed areas so they do not have these problems. Vertical roofs are more expensive, but he does not think that is needed.

This would be located on the property the City already purchased.

He included prices and a diagram of the shed. The price of this would come from Roads (*or possibly the money designated for the City Center?*).

Nelson Abbott: (Vertical roofing vs. horizontal) Ed Christensen (resident) had a shed like this with the horizontal roof; the snow collapsed it.

Raymond Brown: He would order 12 gauge...

Discussion regarding sturdiness of the proposed shed.

It may cost a bit more for a vertical roof (about \$500 more), but perhaps it would be better, particularly with the amount of snow we get in Elk Ridge. (*Councilmember Abbott agreed.*) There are no options to increase the pitch of the roof.

Mayor Dunn: If this shed is a step-by-step project, where the salt shed is erected; later on perhaps a Public Works building; later on the park, perhaps...with the rate of growth, a City Center would not be needed for a while. But we are crowding the Public Works.

The brick to be able to load the trucks would have to be moved.

Question: What does the Council think about using some of the bond money to build this structure? The options for the bond money would include this modular type if building.

We still have 21 months left to utilize the bond money left (about \$600,000). Options include:

- Put it back onto the loan; it would not help to decrease the annual payments, it would be taken of the back end of the loan. We will still have to be creative about what the City does with the property in Loafer Canyon. It is already a lot, and it would need to be cleaned up. About 43 loads of fill were placed on the lot by the City.

Raymond Brown: He spoke to the two residents living just east of the City lot; they mentioned they were interested in buying that land. Councilmember Brown did talk to them about the City being interested in selling this land to them. They may not be in as good a position as when they initially proposed the idea.

City Recorder: Would the City be willing to finance the cost and carry paper on it?

Raymond Brown: He feels this would be a good option and the City could put this money toward the loan payments on the property on Goosenest Dr. If the bond money could be used, then the expense would not further deplete the General Fund.

Mayor Dunn: He is not sure how far the discussion on City owned property can go during this meeting; the Council does not have information like blueprints to examine, cost estimates, ideas about what to install first, etc. Perhaps the park needs to be addressed first.

City Recorder: Salem Recreation Dept. is not including Elk Ridge and Woodland Hills in their sports without the non-resident fees. Elk Ridge and Woodland Hills are trying to have our own younger league; additional park space would be great to be able to better accommodate sports.

Raymond Brown: He added that the City is way behind on the amount of park space we have per capita.

Russ Adamson (former Planning Commission Chairman) was very concerned about this lack of space for activities in the City. The survey was also much in favor of more park space.

Recorder: There should be sample plans that show the future of this land; we cannot just install a park without knowing the best location for it in relation to the rest of the future. The overall plan can be installed one phase at a time, as funding is available.

Mayor Dunn: Ken Harris (local architect) gave the City some plans to Eagle Mountain's City Center for review. Their Center is rustic and would fit beautifully here in Elk Ridge...perhaps on a smaller scale. He submitted others, but they would not be conducive to Elk Ridge.

Raymond Brown: He feels that the Council needs to sit down and review the plans and see where things should go and how much the costs would be, so there is a beginning point; of the Council could then decide not to move forward...but the decision needs to be an informed one.

-The Public Works supplies in the Canyon, stored on the City property, would be moved.

- Perhaps the City could look at the existing house on the City property, move it or sell it as is.

Mayor Dunn: It would take about \$30,000 to move the house; is the building worth moving?

Sean Roylance: He asked how many square feet the house is.

Raymond Brown: Maybe 2,800 sq. ft.; but that could include the basement. He thinks it could be about \$14,000 to move it.

Sean Roylance: The City could just lower the price of the house considerably, and try to just sell it.

Mayor Dunn: He suggested selling the house as it is; but the new owner would have to move it. The house did not cost the City anything; it was gifted, along with the property.

There may be some commercial opportunities to consider for the area.

Sean Roylance: We have talked about one option for the \$600,000...putting it back onto the loan:

1. There may be more years that would be taken off the end
2. Would it be impossible to re-finance the loan? Councilmember Abbott recalls Curtis Roberts explaining this and he thinks he said no to re-financing due to certain "strings" attached to the Sales Tax loan itself.

Mayor Dunn: He knows that the terms of the loan include the bond being “callable”; which means that it could be paid off early without penalty.

Sean Roylance: He would like to check into exactly how much time or how many payments would be taken off the end of the loan if the money were put back onto the loan.

(The Council reviewed the loan documents, specifically the payment schedule.)

- He would also like to explore the possibility of re-financing the loan
- He would like to see how much would be taken off the end

Under certain circumstances, it may be best to make use of the money rather than paying onto the loan; but he would like some answers to these key question before making that decision.

Mayor Dunn: He suggested getting an idea of the purchasing power the City would have by getting a ballpark some kind of a general plan to get an idea of the cost of materials.

Three years ago, former Mayor Dean Allen of Mapleton, took all of the Mayors in South County through the new City Center. Mayor Dunn asked him how a little town like Mapleton could afford such a nice building; he answered that they did it with three methods:

- Bonding
- Fund raising
- Donations

They got the whole community involved. That is what was expressed in a newsletter article to the citizens. There was an anonymous letter sent to the City, of which part said that the Mayor was unrealistic in this view *(in fact, the letter actually said his idea was “laughable”)*. Mayor Dunn comes from the background where neighborhoods would not only build chapels, but homes for sale to help in the costs of building the chapel themselves. Communities do come together...he has participated in this type of community effort. He does feel a City Center could be a community project. He does love this City and his objective is to assist in making it a lovely and comfortable place to live. He, personally, would be willing to donate time and effort into a project like this.

General Guidelines:

- Get some additional plans from Ken Harris for the Council to review in a Work Session
- He has a son-in-law that works at Sun Rock; he will have a materials list made up based on approximate sq. footage.
- He feels the Council should come up with a priority list, based on the survey that has mentioned. Perhaps the timing is not right for a City building, but other parts could still be considered and the Council should keep in mind the future need of the City and pass that information on to future Councils.

Julie Haskell: It does not cost anything to plan.

Mayor Dunn: It just costs “time”...and with building the way it is, the Council does have time. He feels if the Council can see a picture and turn it into a “puzzle”, with the modular types of opportunities that could present, then the decisions made would be based on a plan.

*Councilmember Roylance will check with Curtis Roberts.

There was a general discussion on the economy of the Nation.

Mayor Dunn: He apologized if he caused offense earlier in the evening; he feels that the Council needs to work together as a team to get through these difficult times. He hopes that the Council will be good stewards of the responsibilities designated to them. He would like to leave his term of office with the feeling that he did everything he could...and that he did it “honestly and fairly”. Even with the differences, he hopes that good feelings within the Council are possible.

Raymond Brown: There are certain realities that need to be considered:

- Fire truck (The Fire Chief says the City needs another one...where will it be parked?)
- The City needs another sweeper (the one we have does not work well...it just stirs up dust)
- The Public Works trucks are backing into one another

Mayor Dunn: The Fire Chief did suggest at one point, adding onto the bay area we have to make more room.

Derrek Johnson: These are all great ideas; but he can see the future...and with everything that is going on...he does not want to get into a situation where there are increases to taxes or fees. People are hurting. We have to make sure we do not go over the amount of the bond right now.

It may not make any sense to put the money on the back end of the loan.

Raymond Brown: With building costs down, it may be a good time to use that money to build part of the project.

Mayor Dunn: Volunteerism in the community builds unity. Citizens find “ownership” in that which they have helped build. The current City Hall was built that way.

EXPENDITURES:

General: None

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

A. City Council Meeting 1-13-09:

MOTION WAS MADE BY JULIE HASKELL AND SECONDED BY RAYMOND BROWN TO APPROVE THE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF 1-13-09

VOTE: YES (5)

NO (0)

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:20 PM, the Mayor adjourned the Meeting.

City Recorder