

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
June 9, 2009**

1
2
3
4
5 TIME & PLACE
6 OF MEETING

This Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council, was scheduled for **Tuesday, June 9, 2009, at 7:00 PM**; this was preceded by a **City Council Work Session at 6:30 PM**. The meetings were held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

7
8
9 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 June 2, 2009.

10
11
12 **6:30 PM –**

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

13
14 ROLL

Mayor: Dennis Dunn; City Council: Raymond Brown, Nelson Abbott, Julie Haskell, Sean Roylance & Derrek Johnson; Planning Commission Member: Weston Youd; and the City Recorder: Janice H. Davis

15
16
17 BUDGET UPDATE

City Recorder: The hope was that the suggested tax rate for the 2009 Tax Year would be in and the Council could discuss the projected tax rate; the figures from the County were not in at that point. There was no discussion.

18
19
20
21 BOUNDARY LINE
22 ADJUSTMENT

Proposed Boundary Line Adjustment between Payson City & Elk Ridge (north side of the Golf Course)
Mayor Dunn: The Mayor asked Jill Spencer (Payson City Planner) what needs to be done at this point in time. He asked for a copy of the document passed by Payson City and what Elk Ridge needs to do to progress forward. Ms. Spencer said she would pas this information on to Elk Ridge's Planner, Shawn Eliot. Mr. Eliot is in Washington at this time. Ms. Spencer assured the Mayor that the time elements with the Public Hearings and the approvals are still oaky.
Julie Haskell: She asked what the difference is between this proposed adjustment and the request the City made of Payson regarding the boundary declaration area on 1600 West. That area used to be within Elk Ridge's Urban Growth Boundary.
Nelson Abbott: It is different in that:
1. Payson City owns the ground they want to adjust into their boundaries.
2. There are private property owners on 1600 West that could request that Elk Ridge annex them into our boundaries.
Mayor Dunn: As a major property owner in the area of 1600 West (Elk Ridge Drive), the Haskell's could get the neighbors together and request annexation into Elk Ridge. There is an agreement with Payson wherein Elk Ridge agreed to not annex west of Elk Ridge Drive (1600 West).
The land that is involved with the proposed Boundary Line Adjustment (north of the Golf Course) includes all of the fairway of hole #2...it is a "clean-up" proposal to adjust the boundary to the north of the fairway. Payson has owned this property.
Nelson Abbott: Will this adjustment leave a "peninsula", which the County does not like.
Mayor Dunn: Actually this whole area north of Goosenest Drive and west of 1600 West was the area that Elk Ridge asked Payson about. Jill Spencer told the Mayor that Payson's staff and Council may be in favor of this request.
Raymond Brown: It would be difficult for Payson to service that area (west of 1600 West). It is actually in the County.
Mayor Dunn: Payson's main concern would be the density...they prefer a lower density in that area.
**The Mayor will make sure Ms. Spencer got the necessary information to Shawn Eliot.*

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 CITY CELEBRATION

Derrek Johnson:
- Fliers are done and out to the public
- He has not gotten much cooperation from volunteers
- He wanted to be sure the Council is aware they are scheduled to be in the Parade and/or the Mayor's dinner

50
51
52
53
54
55 NON-AGENDA ITEMS

1) The mayor put together a "Volunteer Day" (in the Newsletter); the first one will be the following Saturday (6/13) and a family came in to sign up and was asked to weed the flowers in Park. This could be a monthly event.
2) An anonymous letter was included in the packets; it was directed to the Council. It was concerning a complaint that the City needs to enforce the Codes and force residents to clean-up the Community. Though there are some points that the Council agrees with; those who write letters should identify themselves.
3) Zip Line: One of the Elk Ridge residents (Troy Richardson) has invented a portable zip line that he has been demonstrating it in Spanish Fork. Mayor Dunn went to try it out and said it was a "blast". Payson and Spanish Fork are interested in it to use in their Celebrations. Councilmember Johnson and the Mayor have talked about it, but they are unsure as to where it could be set up.
Mr. Richardson will set it up as either a lease or to charge for rides; he is also considering selling the apparatus for about \$15,000. Some cities are currently generating revenue with this type of activity. Mr. Richardson thought about charging \$15 per ride, which seems competitive.

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
June 9, 2009**

1
2
3
4
5
6 TIME & PLACE
7 OF MEETING

This Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council, was scheduled for **Tuesday, June 9, 2009, at 7:00 PM**; this was preceded by a **City Council Work Session at 6:30 PM**. The meetings were held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

10 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 June 2, 2009.

13 **7:00 PM -**

CITY COUNCIL MEETING – REGULAR SESSION AGENDA ITEMS

15 ROLL

Mayor: Dennis Dunn; City Council: Raymond Brown, Nelson Abbott, Julie Haskell, Sean Roylance & Derrek Johnson; Planning Commission Member: Weston Youd; and the City Recorder: Janice H. Davis

18 OPENING REMARKS
19 & PLEDGE OF
20 ALLEGIANCE

An invocation was offered by Mayor Dunn and the Mayor also led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance, for those willing to participate.

22 AGENDA TIME
23 FRAME

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY NELSON ABBOTT TO APPROVE THE AGENDA TIME; ADDING A POLLED VOTE TO RELEASE THE DURABILITY RETAINER FOR NORLUND SUBDIVISION, PLAT A, TO THE POSITION ON THE AGENDA BEFORE #1 ITEM
VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)

27 PUBLIC FORUM

1. Weston Youd (Planning Commission Member) he was present to discuss and answer questions regarding the proposed animal control code. This will be on the agenda July 14, 2009.

2. Sean Roylance: Asked about the tennis program proposal that was discussed at the previous Council Meeting.

Mayor Dunn: He responded that:

- A. Two new nets were ordered at \$195 each, rather than \$450. They were ordered from MVP Sporting Goods in Spanish Fork.
- B. The Mayor contacted the coaches that proposed the program and they were willing to do a 70 X 30 split to share the profits with the city.

The City will provide:

- Court
- Electricity for ball machine

For the above, the coaches would submit 30% of the profits to the City. It will be done as a City program.

The Mayor spoke to two different agents at the Trust regarding liability insurance.

The announcement for classes could go into the City newsletter.

3. Mayor Dunn (RAD Kids) The course has been well-attended and successful. There will not be a second course in August, as was anticipated. There may be another one offered in one of the local schools in the fall.

47 NORLUND
48 SUBDIVISION, PLAT A –
49 RELEASE OF
50 DURABILITY
51 RETAINER

The improvements have been inspected and Corbett Stephens has written a letter recommending acceptance of the improvements and release of the Bond.

(Since this was placed on the agenda at the beginning of the meeting, the vote will have to be a polled vote; to be ratified at the next Council Meeting.

MAYOR DUNN TOOK A POLLED VOTE TO ACCEPT THE SUBDIVISION IMPRVEMENTS AS COMPLETE FOR THE NORLUND SUBDIVISION,PLAT A; AND, AS PER RECOMMENDATION, TO RELEASE THE DURABILITY RETAINER TO THE DEVELOPER

POLLED VOTE: DERREK JOHNSON-AYE, JULIE HASKELL-AYE, RAYMOND BROWN-AYE, NELSON ABBOTT-AYE & SEAN ROYLANCE-AYE NAY (0)

Passes 5-0

58 ELK RIDGE
59 DEVELOPERS –PUD
60 DISCUSSION

Mayor Dunn: Chris and Rick Salisbury are to have a meeting with the Mayor one week from the date of the meeting (6/16) at 2:00 PM. They wish to discuss Phase 4 of the PUD and their plans to develop.

1. Surety Bond: David Church should have the letter to the surety company sent. The Mayor faxed the contact information to him.

(From memo to the Council from the City Planner)

The original memo was for the City Council Meeting on March 24, 2009; there was additional information for this Council Meeting:

*****New Information****

At the last council meeting, staff was asked to look into costs associated with Shuler Park. The table below looks at annual costs charged to the parks department. Currently Shuler Park has 1.82 acres of grass area; the Elk Ridge Meadows Park has 4.35 acres. Water costs were projected to the new park based off Shuler Park costs at the higher acreage and is shown under Utilities. Maintenance was the other large cost assumed to double for a new park.

Other issues would be would the city need a trailer to haul the mower down to the new park, a new mower (current mower is wearing out), or could build a shed on site and keep a mower at new park. Another option is to contract out for landscaping which would take away the need for the new large mower(s) or shed. This cost is shown under Contracted Services for 2009/10 and the annual cost for the additional park.

Annual 4-Way Split of General Costs

	Park and Recreation Annual Costs					Additional Park	
	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2009/10*	Ann. Cost	Assumed
Salaries	\$ 402	\$ 1,634	\$ 1,834	\$ 1,949	\$ 2,049	\$ -	na
Benefits	\$ 31	\$ 151	\$ 197	\$ 227	\$ 234	\$ -	na
Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	na
Equip. Maint.	\$ 2,596	\$ 4,030	\$ 2,345	\$ 1,669	\$ 2,660	\$ 266	10%
Facilities Maint.	\$ 2,178	\$ 2,017	\$ 3,766	\$ 708	\$ 2,167	\$ 2,167	100%
Fuel	\$ 651	\$ 1,711	\$ 1,518	\$ 2,327	\$ 2,240	\$ 224	10%
Utilites	\$ 1,025	\$ 1,467	\$ 1,218	\$ 757	\$ 1,116	\$ 2,855	Acreage
Telephone	\$ 521	\$ 423	\$ 343	\$ 366	\$ 413	\$ -	na
Contracted Serv.	\$ -	\$ 825	\$ 125	\$ 1,140	\$ 1,415	\$ 3,000	Mowing
Special Projs.	\$ 1,605	\$ 6,137	\$ 2,438	\$ 2,278	\$ 2,000	\$ 3,115	Misc.
Recreation	\$ 2,510	\$ 1,181	\$ 5,135	\$ 5,074	\$ 5,000	\$ -	na
4th of July	\$ 1,614	\$ 5,634	\$ 7,708	\$ 1,528	\$ 3,000	\$ -	na
Supplies	\$ 1,881	\$ 983	\$ 1,109	\$ 385	\$ 1,090	\$ 545	50%
Land	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	na
Equipment	\$ 2,741	\$ 2,186	\$ 209	\$ 3,363	\$ 2,125	\$ 212	10%
Transfers	\$ 4,094	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,750	\$ 10,000	\$ 5,461	\$ -	na
Total	\$ 24,346	\$ 35,878	\$ 30,697	\$ 31,771	\$ 30,971	\$ 12,385	

*estimate

Recommendation

If it is decided enter into an agreement with Centennial Bank to take over the park the following should happen:

1. Amend the developer agreement to requiring the owner of the park to restore it to the approved landscape plan.
2. Amend the developer agreement to require that the owner keep the park for a prescribed time period (2 to 4 years) or until a percentage of certificates of occupancy (30 to 50%) is reached. It should also include that the city shall approve the acceptance of the as per the landscape plan prior to transfer.
3. Amend the developer agreement to require that a mix of homes and siding types be preserved as per the current CC&Rs. This can guarantee that future builders do not build all the homes alike with cheaper outside materials."

2. Park: It still needs to be decided if the City is going to work with Centennial Bank to salvage the landscaping In the park within Phase 2 (options presented in the discussion on March 24).

Park of the proposal is for the City to waive all or part of the Park Impact fees for this development.

The Mayor pointed out some benefits to this idea:

- Park Impact Fees can be used to install improvements in a park like, the rock wall, benches, playground equipment and altering the land.
- If Impact Fees are waived and the bank gives the City the park, then the City controls what happens to this land.
- Additional park space would add to the overall quota of park space per capita (1.5 acres per 1,000 population)

City Recorder: Councilmember Roylance had made the point that this would actually be costing the City about \$350,000 in impact fees for this land...this is about the original asking price for the park when it was offered to the City by Elk Ridge Managers.

Mayor Dunn: If the City gets the park, it remains as open space. When looking at open space and possibilities, there are some maps to consider; they are from the City Planner. Mr. Eliot submitted plans that showed the city property and how the projected buildings could be arranged.

The maps represented a rough site plan for the proposed City Center...with ball parks, parking lots, Public works buildings and a City Building. Lee Haskell owns some adjoining land that, at one time was offered to the City for purchase. It would be beneficial to negotiate for part of his land as additional access to the City land.

The Bond money could be used to purchase part of Mr. Haskell's property.

Nelson Abbott: He suggested that "trading" land could be an option, as well.

The acreage that was purchased by the City was for several reasons:

- To join the separate parcels that the City owned at one time that were not contiguous.
- To obtain more open space

Mayor Dunn: Shawn Eliot was thinking about all this and made these maps; he is going to make smaller versions of the maps for each of the Councilmembers; the Council can work with these maps to come up with suggestions for a site plan, as well.

The Mayor reviewed the maps with the Council: He discussed the proposed round-about...Mr. Eliot pictured it being partially on City property and moved to the south of the current intersection of Goosenest Drive and the eventual Elk Ridge Drive (as it will cut through Phases 5 & 6 of the Elk Ridge Meadows PUD). The Mayor suggested that the round-about be moved further north on the future Elk Ridge Drive; it would be easier to install and Goosenest Drive will not be used as much, once Elk Ridge Drive cuts through on the diagonal.

Elk Ridge City Council Meeting - 6-9-09

There are many possibilities that could be done a bit at a time. The future of this area should be considered.

1 A work session dedicated just to working through some of these suggestions. There are 10.7 acres to work
2 with.
3 City Recorder: Do we really want to give up \$350,000 worth of Park Impact Fees that could be used to build
4 out a park area around the land we already own?
5 Mayor Dunn: That is a question to consider carefully.
6 Nelson Abbott: He feels that the developers, or the Bank in this case, will have to do something with that park
7 if they want to sell lots. He feels this will happen whether the City takes ownership, or not. If they retain
8 ownership, they are the ones to maintain it.
9 Raymond Brown: Fixing the park up is another selling point for those lots. The park looked good when it was
10 installed.
11 Sean Roylance: He speculated on whether or not the City could get a "discount" on the Park. Perhaps waiving
12 a certain number of Impact Fees with the first 1/2 of the development would be enough to obtain the park.
13 (*Mayor Dunn felt this was a good suggestion.*)
14 City Recorder: (Question) Can the PUD dissolve the open space and develop lots instead; when the open
15 space is involved with more than one phase in the PUD, as a whole?
16 Mayor Dunn: He advised that this could be done; if the HOA fails, they can absorb the open space. He heard
17 about a PUD in Park City where this happened: the original developer got the open space back and he went
18 back to the City and declared that he wanted to re-develop the open space because it was not being paid for
19 by any home-owners and he did not want to deed it to the City. He wanted to develop the open space to make
20 some money off it, and he was allowed to do so. The Mayor was on the Planning Commission when Randy
21 Young came through with the PUD and it was suggested to Mr. Young to put the City on the open space
22 (within the development agreement) so that if/when the HOA dissolved, the City gets the open space. That did
23 not happen. Mr. Young told Mayor Dunn that he would, but it did not happen.
24 City Recorder: Phase 4 is dependent on the open space within Phase 2 to meet their requirements. It does not
25 seem that the open space could simply be eliminated, if other Phases are dependent on it.
26 Sean Roylance: Things can change. If the park can be obtained for 1/2 of what the developers are asking for,
27 that would place the park space within the City's control. That would be a space big enough for 2 soccer fields;
28 the park space around the City Center could be used for baseball fields. He would be inclined to consider this
29 type of arrangement for the park in Phase 2.
30 The City rejected the offer from Elk Ridge Managers to purchase the park with bond money, but this is a bit
31 different in that it is not cash the City would have to come up with.
32 Julie Haskell: The Council still needs to consider the cost of operations of another park and whether we can
33 afford another park.
34 City Recorder: There isn't much land that could be used as park space; it would be good if the City could
35 obtain this land as a public park.
36 Mayor Dunn: The land the City purchased for City Center property is the best flat land in the Elk Ridge area.
37 The developers of Phase 2 in Elk Ridge Meadows PUD spent a great deal of money in leveling off the land
38 they used as park space...about \$700,000. The improvements like landscaping cost about \$320,000. There is
39 a lot of investment in that park. If the City had sloped ground, we would be looking at similar costs to flatten
40 out.
41 **3. Open Space:** Mayor Dunn: (This is where the trail is now that comes north from the park and runs north to
42 11200 South) The natural grass and wild flowers have not worked...they are basically "weeds". There is a
43 chance that Phase 4 has a plan to keep up the landscaping on this park. The Mayor will be meeting with Mr.
44 Salisbury and this will be one of the topics of discussion. The point will be stressed that the open space be
45 kept up and possibly used as a "buffer" to the single family homes Mr. Salisbury has planned.
46 Trails System: The possibility of a public easement should be addressed.
47 Part of the open space trails system goes south of Salisbury's property and down the east side of the park to
48 the end of that development; it goes down and turns west and ends up over where the street would be for the
49 proposed school...then it runs north, across 11200 South (County Rd.), which has no legal crossing (and it will
50 not have in the future). The County does not want signs, or a crosswalk..."basically, you cross at your own
51 risk". The trail does extend through Phase 1 and "T's" on the south side of the Canal and goes east & west into
52 that development. It is important to remember that future development should extend that trail east and west.
53 It would be important to get a public easement so citizens can use the trail.
54 **4. Impact Fees:** Developers are requesting that the City waive Park Impact Fees to assist in making their lots
55 "more marketable". They feel this is fair since the development is providing park and open space...this has
56 already been discussed.
57 Woodland Hills waives the impact fees until the time of occupancy, rather than at the time of the issuance of a
58 building permit.
59 Nelson Abbott: Salem City is doing the same thing. We ought to contact Salem to see if it is making a
60 difference. The Council has often discussed that we need to get innovative in ways to generate revenue.
61 Raymond Brown: He liked Councilmember Roylance's idea of waiving perhaps 50% of the Park Impact Fees;
62 that is \$175,000 rather than \$350,000.
63 Nelson Abbott: Perhaps this is being tied to the idea of the City taking ownership, once they have a certain
64 number of lots sold.
65 Raymond Brown: If the figures of about \$1,000,000 for the installation of the park (Phase 2) are correct, then
66 the City would be getting this for \$175,000 (1/2 of the Fees)...the City would be taking this burden off of the
67 developers to maintain the park. This sounds like a "win/win" situation. He feels this is a good solution.
68 (*Mayor Dunn agreed.*)

1 **5. Fire Sprinklers:** (Update) Developers and builders have resisted and blamed the City for requiring fire
2 suppression systems; but the IBC has adopted the requirement that fire suppression is not an option. The
3 process follows that each state will ratify this code with each state' building code...then it filters down to each
4 community to follow the state mandate. In a couple of years, sprinklers will not be an option.

5 *Option:* It has been discussed to perhaps require fire sprinklers in the "wild land interface" zone, in the
6 Goosnest area (no hydrants), and in homes over 4,000 sq. ft. The Planner also recommends that multi-unit
7 buildings also be required.

8 **6. Rambler Size:** The developers want to take the rambler size from 1,400 sq. ft. to 1,200 sq. ft. The City
9 already has the requirement of 1,200 sq. ft. Mr. Tom Henriod is trying to get the other property owners in the
10 PUD to respond to getting together to amend the CC&R's for the PUD; he has not has a good response.

11 **7. Water Impact Fees Reimbursement:** The issue of who gets the reimbursement will likely be settled in a
12 court of law; the City will simply pay the reimbursement to a 3rd party (courts or possibly into an escrow
13 account). Both parties, Elk Ridge Managers and the Bank, feel they should get the money.

14 Mayor Dunn: Perhaps it would be beneficial to have another meeting of the property owners to discuss the
15 issues. Centennial Bank would be invited as well as Mr. Salisbury and other property owners. It would be good
16 to see how the various issues have progressed.

17 *(Regarding how the development proceeds with things like varying home styles, siding types, street trees, etc.)*

18 The Mayor has had a conversation with Mark Rindlesbach (one of the principle developers in Phase 3 of the
19 PUD): he owns property in many states that he uses for development...he was talking about "post recession
20 development": he is sorry he purchased the land in the PUD because of the economy. He does not see Elk
21 Ridge Drive going in as planned; but the Mayor reminded him of the Development Agreement that is still in
22 place...any changes would be discussed at the Planning Commission level and at the Council level. Perhaps it
23 will change, but the Mayor made the point that the City still wants that road cutting across that
24 Phase...perhaps the width could be reviewed. Mr. Rindlesbach was saying that "starting over" might be in
25 order...while the Mayor kept on track with the Agreements in place currently...perhaps altering the terms a bit.
26 The round about is a good example of how the original plan could be altered; but not eliminated.

27 **Park Space:**

28 *The Mayor reviewed the "new information" listed on page 2 & 3 of these minutes, including the chart showing*
29 *costs to run the park as compared to the possibility of a new park.*

30 Water charges: The City could continue to charge itself water at a discounted rate or just not charge itself for
31 water.

32 Raymond Brown: Can Impact Fees be used to purchase equipment to keep up the parks? The mower needs
33 to be replaced with a machine that is higher quality and will last longer and do a better job. The cost is more
34 initially, but it would be worth it. A heavier-duty mower would also be needed for this other park in Phase 2, if
35 the City ends up taking ownership of it.

36 City Recorder: Example of equipment that can be purchased with Impact Fees: a pump for a well...if it needs
37 to be repaired, it is simply an "operating" expense; however, if it is replaced, it is a "capital" expense...she
38 believes that Impact Fees could be used in that case. She suggested checking with the Finance Director.

39 The limit is not less than \$2,000 to capitalize a purchase.

40 Mayor Dunn: Years ago the Council approved the purchase of a 4-wheeler for the City; the purchase did not
41 take place. A 4-wheeler is needed for maintenance on the ball field and for meter reading. There is also
42 discussion of getting rid of the snow mobile.

43 Julie Haskell: She questioned the need for a 4-wheeler when reading meters, with auto-read, she thought that
44 the reader simply drives by.

45 Mayor Dunn: He responded that some of the meters are still "touch-read". *(This will change after the first of the*
46 *new fiscal year, when all the meters will be converted over to auto-read.)*

47 Julie Haskell: The snow mobiles will be needed to get up to the upper well and tank. *(The Council generally*
48 *agreed that the City needs the snow mobiles.)*

49 *(Further review of Park Budget figures, presented in the memo from the City Planner)*

50 Sean Roylance: He wondered if the \$12,385 is a realistic amount or should it be higher?
51 *(Costs could vary somewhat, it was felt that this is a fair amount.)*

52 Mayor Dunn: He reviewed the "new information", specifically the "recommendation".

53 1. Amend the developer agreement to requiring the owner of the park to restore it to the approved landscape plan.

54 *(The Bank said they are willing to do this.)*

55 2. Amend the developer agreement to require that the owner keep the park for a prescribed time period (2 to 4 years) or until a
56 percentage of certificates of occupancy (30 to 50%) is reached. It should also include that the city shall approve the acceptance of
57 the as per the landscape plan prior to transfer.

58 *(He feels this means that the land stays in the equation for open space for the 3 Phases of the PUD.)*

59 3. Amend the developer agreement to require that a mix of homes and siding types be preserved as per the current CC&Rs. This
60 can guarantee that future builders do not build all the homes alike with cheaper outside materials."

61 The mayor feels that the one part that will require input from the Bank would be the time period in keeping the
62 park...and giving it up.

63 Raymond Brown: This could be a negotiating point: if they are willing to take less money for the park, then they
64 would not have to bring it up to the previous standard of landscaping. That could another incentive for
65 accepting ½ of the Park Impact Fees they had requested.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71

Sean Roylance: He would prefer do as Councilmember Abbott suggested: when the Bank gets 50% occupancy, then the City would take ownership of the park, and the Impact Fees would then be kept by the City. He may be willing to consider taking the park over right away to have access to the park.

Mayor Dunn: (Regarding the trees that have died in the PUD park) Many of the trees in the current City Park have been planted and replaced through various methods:

- Arbor Day Grants
- Eagle Projects
- Donations

Sean Roylance: He feels there is room to negotiate.

Nelson Abbott: He feels the Bank should be responsible for “bringing the park back” to its original standard of landscaping before the City take it over. He would prefer to have the Bank hold onto the park for a few years; perhaps the economy will improve by then.

Raymond Brown: Perhaps the City could offer 50 X 50 on the first ½ to be able to re-landscape the park.

Mayor Dunn: The “bottom line” is that the Bank will want the park to look good to facilitate the sale of lots.

Julie Haskell: She agreed with Councilmember Abbott; that they (Bank) should be the ones to “bring that back”; which will be a lot of work and expense.

Mayor Dunn: The Bank will either have to re-seed the park this fall; or till it up and put turf in.

BOUNDARY LINE
ADJUSTMENT –
PAYSON & ELK RIDGE

Mayor Dunn: Jill Spencer (Payson) was to supply Shawn Eliot with the necessary information; it is unknown if this has occurred.
**The Mayor will have to contact Ms. Spencer to see if everything is ready. It should be place on the Agenda for the next City Council Meeting.*

HEALTH INSURANCE –
AGENT PROPOSAL

Mayor Dunn: David Volelsberg contact Mayor Dunn regarding taking over as the City’s Insurance Agent. Currently he would deal with PEHP in behalf of the City. Mr. Vogelsberg was with Utah Local Governments Trust (ULGT) and was the City’s main contact for insurance. He has left ULGT and is now with “Gallagher Benefit Services”. He was the representative that the Council met with a few years ago. He knows municipal insurance. The Mayor also said that the Trust (ULGT) has worked well with the City for a number of years.

Nelson Abbott: The City is a member of ULGT and part of the benefit the City receives is the availability of health insurance...they derive some additional benefit at the State level for lobbying purposes. He has a hard time with this type of arrangement; because someone else has already done all of the “work” and has everything in place and someone else comes in and takes advantage of everything being “set up”. He feels the City needs to support the ULGT; if we “pull out” al the pieces, then there is not the same benefit for everyone still involved with ULGT. We need to stay unified as a group.

Julie Haskell: As an insured person (through her husband, Kent Haskell), she has been very satisfied with the service rendered by ULGT.

City Recorder: She questioned what would happen if the City decided to go with Mr. Vogelsberg and he made another career change and left this firm...would the City keep following him?

Mayor Dunn: If the Council all agreed, he would inform Mr. Vogelsberg that the Council decided to stay with ULGT. *(All agreed.)*

DOE HILL ESATATES –
REQUEST FOR
OVERLAY
EXTENSION

Raymond Brown: He had the developer write the letter requesting this overlay extension for the following reason: There is no building within this development. The Code states that they are supposed to overlay with 1 inch of asphalt now (with in this month)...then if they start building in a year or so...the road will be torn up with the construction. Councilmember Brown was asked if they could “put this on hold” until the end of their Durability time period (next year). He and Corbett Stephens felt this was a good idea to possibly preserve the overlay. Councilmember Brown asked Mr. Johnson (developer of Doe Hill Estates) to write a letter of formal request that would go before the City Council for a vote.

Councilmember Brown feels this would be in the best interest of the City. We may want to consider making this the standard.

Nelson Abbott: This will also help protect the road against settling.

MOTION WAS MADE BY JULIE HASKELL AND SECONDED BY RAYMOND BROWN TO DEFER THE REQUIRED 1” OIVERLAY OF ASPHALT FOR DOE HILL ESTATES SUBDIVISION, PLAT A; THE OVERLAY IS TO BE DONE PRIOR TO THE END OF THE ESTABLISHED DURABILITY RETAINER TIME PERIOD

VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)

CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES

1. City Council Minutes of 5-12-09:

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY JULIE HASKELL TO APPROVE THE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF 5-12-09, AS AMENDED

VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)

2. City Council Minutes of 4-14-09:

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAYMOND BROWN AND SECONDED BY NELSON ABBOTT TO APPROVE THE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF 4-14-09, WITH CORRECTIONS TO PAGE 5

VOTE: YES (5) NO (0) ABSENT (1) MAYOR DUNN

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

EXPENDITURES:

General:

1. Ball Field Dirt: (Discussed earlier in the Meeting)

Mayor Dunn: The dirt (60 tons or 3 loads) was paid for with Park Impact Fees; the approved amount (\$4,000) was for 90 tons or 3 loads.

City Recorder: That expense should be coded to the Special Revenue Fund – Parks; not the General Fund.

The Recorder did not think that there was a motion to approve this expenditure and the use of Impact Fees. *(The Council disagreed and felt the topic had been covered at the previous Council Meeting.)*

*Check on invoice from Staker-Parson for the dirt.

ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting was adjourned at 9:50 PM.

City Recorder – Elk Ridge City