

ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
August 9, 2011

TIME & PLACE
OF MEETING

This Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council, was scheduled for Tuesday, August 9, 2011, at 7:30 PM; this was preceded by a City Council Work Session at 6:00 PM & a City Council / Planning Commission Joint Work Session scheduled for 6:30 PM.
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 was provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E Utah Ave, Payson, UT, and to the members of the Governing Body, on August 3, 2011.

6:00 PM –

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA:

ROLL

Mayor: Ed Christensen; *City Council:* Julie Haskell, Erin Clawson, James Mayfield & Weston Youd (Absent: Sean Roylance); *Planning Commission:* Kelly Liddiard (Chair), Dayna Hughes, Debbie Cloward, Nelson Abbott & Randy Jones; *Building Official/Public Works:* Corbett Stephens; *Fire Chief:* Seth Wait; *Public:* Greg & Stephanie Pozernick, David Jean II, Lucretia Thayne, Brian Burke, Hal Shelley, Mitchell Wait & Cody Young; and the City Recorder, Janice Davis

MAYOR'S D

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Summer Help:

Mayor Christensen reported that of the two young men hired, one (Spencer Stuart) quit due to too much going on in his life at this time. The other one, Will Towse, is under 18 years of age and child labor laws prevent him from operating heavy equipment. He would like to hire a replacement, but require that he/she be 18 years old or older. He asked the Council to consider a higher wage for the new employee, since the work would be harder and have more risk involved. He proposed \$9 or \$10 per hour for this new position. He would like to hire this person through October, 2011.

He has had individuals call him that are interested in the job; they are older than 18; but would need at least \$10/hour. (Woodland Hills pays their part time help \$9/hr.)

The "heavy equipment" referred to by the Mayor: Pick-ups and sweeper.

Weston Youd: He suggested "up to" \$10/hr...start at \$9 and go up.

Erin Clawson: She informed the Council Members that the Mayor did approach her husband, Robin Clawson, to fill this position (he has worked for the City mowing weeds in the past). She is "abstaining from anything" associated with this decision; that would be completely up to the Council. She has had "no discussion" with the Mayor or anyone, except Council Member Haskell, regarding this and is not involved with this.

Mayor: The Mayor added that Robin Clawson did mow the weeds for the City last year.

Discussion of repairing he mower that belongs to Woodland Hills; the repairs will be split with them. Mr. Stephens is waiting for a price back from Johnson Tractor to see if the repairs are possible.

The Mayor said, "When we know, we'll get back to you".

00:05:20

2. Formal Declaration of Military Support. (Erin Clawson)

She had been unable to contact the correct person, Major Barnes. She did find out that the City can sign the contract without really being bound to any specific agreement; it simply offers a more formal way of supporting the program. Some cities have made the signing a more formal event. The National Guard is looking for a "point person" as a liaison between the City and the Guard...Council Member Clawson has already volunteered to do that.

Possible services to the City (road grading, etc.): She found out the name of the contact person: Lt. Huffington (She was not sure of the rank); he was not in to talk with her. She has left her contact numbers. It is quite common for them to work with communities. There is a Major Barnes who is over the whole Program. Council Member Youd offered assistance in this area. She felt the Program would be beneficial to all. The Declaration is not ready for signing.

3. Public Works – Certification Process (Rex Davis): He has been registered for the Certification Conference and Test. The Mayor wanted to know what the Council would recommend if Mr. Davis does not pass the Test the first time through. He wanted to know if more time could be granted him to re-test. Mr. Davis is working hard, studying hard and learning as much as he can with all that has been going on in the City.

Julie Haskell: She felt Mr. Davis should be given more time.

James Mayfield: He advised that those details should be handled by his (Mr. Davis') Manager (Corbett Stephens).

Erin Clawson: She added. "Even physicians get a second chance on their Boards."

Mayor Christensen: The Mayor understood that Mr. Davis was to have this certification done within 6 months; he requested the Council approve changing that to a year from the date of hire.

After discussion, it was decided not to put a time line on when he passes; simply that he needs to get it done as soon as he can. The Council wanted Mr. Davis to know that they have confidence in him.

SANITATION

**Council Member Roylance was unable to attend the Council Meeting that night; this item will be postponed until the next Council Meeting.*

00:13:15

The Mayor closed the regular Work Session at 6:20 pm.

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
72

6:30 PM -

JOINT WORK SESSION – CITY COUNCIL / PLANNING COMMISSION:

ROLL

Mayor: Ed Christensen; *City Council:* Julie Haskell, Erin Clawson, James Mayfield & Weston Youd (Absent: Sean Royslance); *Planning Commission:* Kelly Liddiard (Chair), Dayna Hughes, Debbie Cloward, Nelson Abbott & Randy Jones; *Building Official/Public Works:* Corbett Stephens; *Fire Chief:* Seth Wait; *Public:* Greg & Stephanie Pozernick, David Jean II, Lucretia Thayne, Brian Burke, Hal Shelley, Mitchell Wait & Cody Young; and the City Recorder, Janice Davis

SINGLE ACCESS
CODE

Mayor Christensen introduced the Planner, Adam Castor.
Adam Castor: (Power Point Presentation) Mr. Castor explained that his intent was to pull language from the General Plan, the Development Code and the Fire Code that directly relates to “single access”.
The history is “long” on this matter and the associated issues; it spans several years, one Code amendment Application and a recommendation from the engineering firm of LEI.
Update on the Code amendments:
1. *Developer Application:* At the request of the applicant, it was pulled from the Planning Commission agenda in January, 2011. Since that time, he did not believe there has been any work of moving forward on their part.
2. *LEI Recommendation:* It is currently “un-tabled” by the City Council to be able to move forward with it; with the recommendation from the Planning Commission to approve (there could be issues with the Planning Commission’s recommendation).
His intent was to gather all the information to everyone and to review it.

Power Point:
General Plan: Mr. Castor pointed out that the language in the General Plan is very strong regarding dual access to the HR-1 Zone. The Development Code should support the General Plan as much as possible.
Land Use: Implementation: Enforce the need for multiple access points for City services and transportation to grow areas, discouraging leapfrog development (Pg 21)
Transportation: Objective B: Dual access to areas in the higher hillside areas must be obtained. (Pg 36)
Policy 1: New development must create multiple access points to Urban/Wildland Interface Area. (Pg 36)
Implementation: DO NOT ALLOW ANY DEVELOPMENT in the upper part of the City without dual access. (Pg 36)

Parks, Open Space & Environment: Policy 5: Require dual access points to areas above High Sierra Dr. prior to any homes being constructed. (Pg 54)

Question: What is a safe length for a single access road; as well as being good for developers? There has been a lot of discussion on this topic. When LEI came into the issue, it seemed there was little agreement between the City Council and the Planning Commission as to the amendment applied for.

Municipal Code: The first section in the Municipal Code that addresses “single access”; it is in the Building regulations. (Title 9: Chapter 3) *Mr. Castor felt this might be the best written of all the applicable codes because it supports the General Plan regarding dual access...*

00:19:11

9-3-4 Roads:
A. “Access: All developments in the Urban/Wildland interface area shall have more than one access route which provides simultaneous access for emergency equipment and civilian evacuation. The design of access routes shall take into consideration traffic circulation and provide for looping of roads as required ensuring at least two (2) access points. Looped roads with a single access are not allowed.”
B. “Exceptions: Where terrain features or other physical obstacles make provision of a second access impractical, a single access may be approved by the City Council after obtaining the recommendation of the Fire Chief and the Planning Commission.”
C. “Specifications: All roads shall conform to the city development code, subsection 10-15C-2A of this code, streets and roads.”

Adam Castor: This wording should be in the HR-1 Zone regulations, but it isn’t. This is the wording that generates the recommended amendment.

00:19:48

Comment:
Nelson Abbott (Planning Commission): He sought clarification regarding where the code would be applicable.
Mr. Castor:” This falls within the Urban Wildland area; the HR-1 Zone falls within that area...the wording in this section is stricter. The wording, as it appears in Title 9 does not appear in the Development Code.

Municipal Code: (Title 10 – Development Code: Chapter 9 – Residential & Environmental Conservation Zones: Article A. HR-1 Hillside Residential Zone
10-9A-13-9: Cul-de-sacs:”

Mr. Castor: He feels this section does help support the General Plan regarding single access. It simply states that cul-de-sacs and temporary “dead end” roads must have the approval of the planning commission. The lengths permitted are listed.

10-9A-13-11 – Secondary Access: This states that “any development over sixteen (16) building lots must have a secondary access street.

00:22:52

Mr. Castor: The challenge was trying to recognize the criteria of the Fire Code and then mesh that with the Development Code and the Municipal Code so they would all be consistent.

International Fire Code:
(How many lots should be allowed on a single access road? The current Code says 16 lots and the applicant wanted to get up to 30 lots...this greatly affects the length of the road when the frontages are applied in the HR-1 Zone.

The Fire Code does allow up to 30 units; if the units are all fire sprinkled; but frontages are not taken into account, so to get 30 units on a single access road in the HR-1 Zone, the length would be close to ½ mile.

Comments:

Chief Seth Wait: RE: 30 dwelling units: The way he understands the Fire Code is that it could also mean dual twin homes or apartments; that is another facet that the City does not even allow. He pointed out that if the Fire Code is applied to New York City, it would be very different from the application in a small Utah community. Example: 30 units could be placed on a specific length of road; but it may be 5 stories high. The number of people to be those dwellings must also be a consideration

Mr. Castor: He said he had some pictures and images to share that go hand-in-hand with the information and may help clarify some of the issues.

Code Amendment Recommendation ((from LEI) :

10-9A-13-11 Secondary Access:

- They took the Code as it is written in the Building Regulations; access would remain the same.

- “B” Exceptions: “Where terrain features or other physical obstacles make provision of a secondary access impractical, a single access of not more than 750 feet in length, and which is in accordance with the provisions of the IFC, may be approved by the city council after obtaining the recommendations of the fire chief and the planning commission.”

So, their recommendation would be to amend this code in the building regulations and then carry the same language over into the HR-1 Zone regulations.

This was the recommendation that went before the Planning Commission and is now before the City Council.

Mayor Christensen: (To the Planning Commission) He wanted to know if the Members agreed with MR.

Castor’s summary. (They agreed.)

Diagrams& Maps (included in the Power Point Presentation):

1. He showed various lengths of cul-de-sacs & how many lots would be allowed:

- A. 450’ = 8 building lots
- B. 750’ = 12 building lots
- C. 1,000’ = 14 building lots
- D. 2,100’ = 30 building lots

There were also diagrams of various alternatives for turnarounds.

2. Potential Road Alignments:

Map showing the area south of the City with:

- A. Current “Transportation Plan” for a road connecting Elk Ridge Drive and Canyon View Drive
- B. Proposed road connecting High Sierra Dr. and Hillside Drive (part of the Elk Haven proposal)

Mr. Castor advised that, to provide dual access, he feels these are likely the best two road alignments for this particular area, to make those connections from one side of the City to the other. He wanted both the Commission and the Council to see this while considering how best to develop in the area south of the City. *The next few maps demonstrated the various lengths of dead end roads already noted.*

Discussion:

Mr. Castor: Without requiring dual access, that part of town would develop one “stub” road at a time.

Corbett Stephens: He pointed out that High Sierra is already a “stub” road and any addition would only add to the length...and it is already too long.

Weston Youd: He discussed Oak Lane to the south end of Hillside... it would be about 200’ that would add onto any stub road connect.

Erin Clawson: Getting fire apparatus up to a fire: it must be taken into consideration that residents would be evacuating at the same time. A “clogged” road would hinder the ability of equipment getting to a fire. She saw this demonstrated in California. She related how her father (a fire fighter) watched as 15 homes went up in flames because the fire dept. could not get to the homes...if it happened in California, it could happen here in Elk Ridge...why take that chance?

Mr. Castor: The first sentence of the code in the building regulations states that it must be taken into consideration evacuation as well as fire apparatus coming up. That is where road lengths come into play; as well as width of the road.

The proposed extension of Hillside, to get 30 homes on it, due to the topography, would be more like about 3,000’ long. This area of town bring with it some challenges.

He went on to say that he did not agree with writing code for this part of town, based on a certain number of lots. He felt the code should support the General Plan as best it can; and should require dual access.

The Fire Code does allow for exceptions.

Dayna Hughes: She wanted to know what happened to the “Concept Plan” that was passed by the City Council some time ago that had dual access.

(Explanation by the City Recorder) That concept was passed by a previous Council, even though concept applications rarely go before the Council. Due to the sensitive nature of the area to be developed, the Council reviewed this concept. The motion actually stated that this road would have to connect through prior to any lots being developed.

Mrs. Hughes continued: She wanted to know why stub roads are being considered.

The map that shows the black line of the proposed connection of High Sierra to Hillside Dr.: The planning commission has been working with that road configuration for years.

Question: (Recorder) Can one developer be held up, if the rest of them cannot move forward?

Weston Youd: Shulers would not be able to develop their land (connects to High Sierra) unless the road goes all the way through (High Sierra is already a long dead end). In fact every road from Park Drive up (Elk Ridge Drive) is a single access; so there should not be any other development in that section of the City.

Safety should apply to every zone.

City Recorder: The only reason the City considered single access again was due to an application from a developer, in an attempt to move forward with Elk Haven, Plat E...without the other plats.

00:28:42

When Mr. Eliot wrote the proposed code, it was simply in response to the application to amend the code text; this was not instigated by the City...the City came forward at a later time with the proposed Code change that is currently before the Council, with a recommendation to approve from the Planning Commission. The original developer application has been dropped...by the developer.

Mr. Castor: There is no development driving this amendment...there are no applications submitted for any development in this area...it is in the City's court to determine what we want.

00:41:27

Dayna Hughes: "It is easy...it is whatever General Plan says. We are worrying about what is in the best interest of this land owner or that land owner...this is in the best interest of Elk Ridge." She felt that any developer should adhere to the General Plan..."it is not our problem." The Planning Commission worked on the proposed map (black line) for years and finally got the two access points connected in the best way possible. "I say, leave it the way it is...and let the developer figure it out." She felt the proposed road is in the best interest of the City and should be in the General Plan.

00:42:33

Mr. Castor: He felt Mrs. Hughes made a good point...the City spent a great deal of time re-writing the General Plan...it clearly defines the direction the City should go in this area...the wording is very strong against single access roads.

Dayna Hughes: She added that High Sierra (stub road) has been in for a long time...though it was meant to continue on.

Erin Clawson: When she and the Council voted to accept the General Plan, it was approved as written...with the direction for dual access in the HR-1 Zone. She agreed that the Code should support the General Plan. When a developer comes in, though he/she may have the right to request a change...it does not mean it has to be approved.

Weston Youd and Mrs. Hughes: Both reviewed the history of the Elk Haven Plats and the plan for a connecting road that was produced after much time, engineering and a great deal of cost on the parts of both their and the City's engineers. The road concept was approved.

Council Member Youd continued with a review of the application from Elk Haven, Plat E (more recent) and their desire to amend the code...using the cul-de-sac code. He wanted to make the point that cul-de-sacs and stub roads should be separated in the code...they are different and should be handled differently.

Plat E was attempting to move forward alone, because the other developers had allowed their applications to expire. At the time of the application for code amendment, there seemed to be contradictions that had to be dealt with: the Fire Code allowed 30 units on a single access and the City Code allowed 16 units. The applicant wanted to know which to go with.

Erin Clawson: It seemed as if there was an attempt to change the Code to suite her; rather than, as Mrs. Hughes pointed out, to stick to the General Plan.

Chief Seth Wait: The applicant (Plat E) wanted to go with the Fire Code; which is good...but, when one accepts the Fire Code, one also has to refer to the other Appendix that deals directly with this issue. ...that is the part the applicant did seem to read, as it was not referred to in the proposed amendment. This Appendix limits the length of the road. If we accept the Fire Code, we accept it in its entirety; which will limit the length of the road to 750'.

00:48:02

Mayor Christensen: He asked the Planner if the proposed code goes along with the General Plan. *(The planner answered that it does.)* The Staff Report from January, 2011 reads, "On December 9, 2010, the proposed code amendment was presented to the Planning Commission; which voted to recommend approval of the code amendment, as written by LEI, without further exceptions." He asked Mr. Liddiard (Planning Commission Chair) if he agrees with the proposed code, as it left the Planning Commission to go to the Council. *(Mr. Liddiard agreed with the code amendment and the Fire Chief's explanation.)*

Erin Clawson: She asked if there were any Planning Commission Members who feel "duped" into agreeing with the recommendation to the Council.

Kelly Liddiard: "No; because it goes with the General Plan and goes with the International Fire Code. I think we are protected everywhere we need to be."

(Dayna Hughes also responded, "No" to the question by Council Member Clawson.)

Comments:

Weston Youd: He would like to see the City separate "stub" roads from the code regulating cul-de-sacs; they are not the same and the issues will come up again.

Lucretia Thayne: Since the developers of the proposed Elk Haven Plats, who came up with the road plan, are not involved any longer; does the City fall back to the Master Plan...or is the City under obligation in some way to accept their proposed road plan?

Kelly Liddiard: The shape of the road (represented by the "black line" on the maps) was dictated by the terrain.

Corbett Stephens: Since development in that area is possible, he asked if it might not be in the City's best interest to adopt the "black line" (proposed road alignment) as a portion of the General Plan. *(The Planner agreed with that suggestion.)*

There was discussion that was in agreement with this idea.

Erin Clawson: She felt the City (City Council, Planning Commission and the Planner) should follow Mrs. Hughes' suggestion and stay with the General Plan.

Mrs. Hughes: She recommended not trying to re-think all of the work and engineering that went into the road alignment of the proposed road concept. If an applicant comes in with a proposed code change, the Members of both bodies need not feel "bullied" into considering anything but dual access. She felt the code should reflect the consensus of all parties present at the Work Session.

00:51:59

Adam Castor: Considering the topography, it is a good alignment. Considering the contour lines, he feels there may be the potential for a connection coming north toward Salem Hills Drive.

Summary: LEI's intent was to pull the wording out of the building regulations and put in into the HR-1 code. it allows an exception.

Since the General Plan calls for dual access for any development in that area, is the exception necessary?
Dayna Hughes: The “exception” was discussed at length because of the negative state the economy was in at the time; and growth is good for the Community. The Planning Commission felt under pressure to work with the developer; but not with dual access and the issues that go along with that.

Weston Youd: He recalled the developer agreeing to install a pipeline as part of what they were willing to do.
Corbett Stephens: What was offered was already a requirement; fire flow has to be provided and upsizing the pipe was the only way to do that.

Discussion of possible terms that may or may not have been associated with the application for code change.

Adam Castor: He agreed with Mrs. Hughes that the General Plan has some pretty strong, direct language in it; and the code needs to support it. It may be reasonable to offer some exceptions; but if the General Plan is to be held as the guiding document, perhaps the exception should be removed.

Kelly Liddiard: He felt the exception should be removed from the proposed code.

Nelson Abbott: IF the exception is left in, there is room to negotiate; if it is removed, “it is done”. He felt it should be taken out.

Mayor Christensen: The Mayor expressed appreciation for the Planner and his preparation and presentation. He asked for any further discussion.

Erin Clawson: The City has a good General Plan; “we voted for it because it is good”.

After thanking the Planning Commission for being present, he closed the Joint Work Session.

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
August 9, 2011**

TIME & PLACE
OF MEETING

This Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council, was scheduled for **Tuesday, August 9, 2011, at 730 PM**; this was preceded by a **City Council Work Session at 6:00 PM & a City Council / Planning Commission Joint Work Session scheduled for 6:30 PM**.

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 was provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E Utah Ave, Payson, UT, and to the members of the Governing Body, on August 3, 2011.

7:12 PM -

REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA ITEMS:

ROLL

Mayor: Ed Christensen; *City Council*: Julie Haskell, Erin Clawson, James Mayfield & Weston Youd (Absent: Sean Royslance); *Planning Commission*: Kelly Liddiard (Chair), Dayna Hughes, Debbie Cloward, Nelson Abbott & Randy Jones; *Building Official/Public Works*: Corbett Stephens; *Fire Chief*: Seth Wait; *Public*: Greg & Stephanie Pozernick, David Jean II, Lucretia Thayne, Brian Burke, Hal Shelley, Mitchell Wait & Cody Young; and the City Recorder, Janice Davis

OPENING REMARKS
PLEDGE OF
ALLEGIANCE

An invocation was offered by Lucretia Thayne; and Scout Cody Young led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance, for those willing to participate.

AGENDA TIME
FRAME

WESTON YOUD MOVED, SECONDED BY JAMES MAYFIELD, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA TIME FRAME, ADJUSTING THE START TIME TO 7:15 PM
VOTE: YES (4) NO (0) ABSENT (1) SEAN ROYLANCE

00:59:02

PUBLIC FORUM

1. Greg & Stephanie Pozernick: Water Run-off Problems:
They live on the corner of Escalante and Alpine drive; they experience flooding from the run-off that collects from Astor Lane and Alpine Drive. They know that the City is considering repairs. But will the City help with that.

Corbett Stephens: A sump will be installed at the north end of Escalante; with curbing and gutter; if the residents agree.

Mr. Pozernick: The collector box between the LDS Chapel and their house fills up almost immediately and does little good. Since the City is going to overlay Alpine Drive, could they also install curb & gutter at the same time? (*Mrs. Pozernick asked if the City had considered a sump at the north end of Astor Lane.*)

The Pozernicks are willing to do their part; but they need assistance in finding a solution to the problem.

There is a sump that was installed by the LDS Church; that is what is between the Chapel and the Pozernick lot...it needs to be cleaned out as it is full. The “vac” truck is being modified to be able to extend farther down into the sumps.

Mayor Christensen: There are several “hot spots” across the City. The Storm Drain Fund has no money to do anything with. Letters need to go out to the residents on Escalante for curb & gutter. If approvals are in place, then the 1st thing next spring, Escalante could be torn up and improved.

1:06:54

SINGLE ACCESS CODE
- ACTION

Adam Castor: The Council, in taking action, should decide if the exception shall remain in the proposed code.
Comments:

James Mayfield: He was in favor of taking the “exception” out of the code. (*The Mayor concurred.*)

Weston Youd: He agreed that, “for this situation, it is okay” to eliminate the exception. The development plan could request an exception, if the developer wishes.

Erin Clawson: She felt that taking it out of the code allowed the City to be able to fall back on the code, and that protects the City.

Julie Haskell: She agreed with Council Member Clawson.

Further discussion and clarification as to how the code will be written.

Weston Youd: He also recommended removing reference to the Fire Code.

1:11:57

Chief Wait: (Directed to Mr. Castor) He wanted to know if it Section D: 107 (Fire Code) had been taken into consideration; it talks about exceptions granted due to fire sprinkling and road widths.

Adam Castor (and Council Member Clawson): The developer would need the approval and recommendations of the Planning Commission and the Fire Chief.

ERIN CLAWSON MOVED, SECONDED BY JAMES MAYFIELD, TO ACCEPT AND ADOPT THE PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT TO 10-9A-13-11 “SECONDARY ACCESS”; TO BE BLENDED WITH 9-3-4 “BUILDING REGULATIONS”; REMOVING THE “EXCEPTION”

VOTE (POLL): JULIE HASKELL-AYE, JAMES MAYFIELD-AYE, ERIN CLAWSON-AYE, WESTON YOUD-AYE (4) NO (0) ABSENT (1) SEAN ROYLANCE

1:14:03

CORBETT STEPHENS:

1. Storm Drain Dept.

The Mayor asked that the City Recorder address funding for the sumps.

City Recorder: The contribution from the General Fund (Fund Balance) would go to the Storm Drain Fund to cover the cost of the sumps. The Finance Director was contacted and he said it can be done as a one-time “contribution”. It does not have to be paid back; but this should not be planned on year after year; the Storm Drain Fund should be able to sustain itself. There is enough Fund Balance in the “Capital Projects Fund / Future Improvements”; it is for capital improvements in the City.

There are certain legal requirements in transferring money from one Fund to another:

- A Public Hearing
 - Public notification of the proposed transfer and Public Hearing (it can go out on the utility bills)
- The Mayor approved a Public Hearing at the next Council Meeting, at 6:00 PM. Notice will come out in the Daily Herald as well as on the bills. Action does not have to take place that same night; but the legal requirements will have been met. The Public Hearing will be for an Amended Budget for the current fiscal year.

The 2010/2011 fiscal year ended with a substantial balance being transferred out of the General Fund; bringing the total in that Capital Projects Fund of about \$750,000. She advised that the City utilize that money for what it was intended...capital improvements.

The Storm Drain Fee must be reviewed and adjusted to be able to sustain the operating expenses necessary to handle the issues.

Erin Clawson: She observed that grass and plants, when planted to the edge of the easement, absorb the water. Would this be a temporary solution? Should the Council encourage this of residents until long-term solutions can be applied?

Mayor Christensen: There has been discussion of an “incentive” program to encourage citizens to grass that easement area. (*James Mayfield: He recommends a long term plan.*) The Mayor added that there is a proposal being readied by LEI to conduct a Study to be able to adjust the fee and perhaps add an impact fee. Corbett Stephens: There are various parts to the proposal; the Council will need to decide which parts to do at this time...the costs would vary according to the parts.

Weston Youd: He feels that the Council needs to address the issue of the Storm Drain Fee and a long range plan; any action to approve a transfer from the General Fund is simply a “band aide”. A decision needs to be made. He feels the Council should be held to a time line to make those decisions.

Julie Haskell: She felt the Finance Director should be consulted regarding where the fee should be.

Recorder: In speaking to Mr. Roberts, he said it all comes down to how much the City plans on doing each year...and having a 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan. The fee can be calculated off of that...taking depreciation into account.

*Contact Mr. Roberts about where exactly the Fund is in regards to depreciation as compared to the infrastructure already installed...for the last 5 years. Council Member Youd was to contact him with his questions. He will be at the City Offices on 8/12 to get ready for the audit.

Erin Clawson: In a 5-year plan, what can the Council do to alleviate some of the pressing issues for residents now? Temporary solutions should be considered.

Julie Haskell: They need to have the breakdowns of the projected costs of the sumps and a comparison of the sizes vs. costs. The Council needs to have those figures on paper to review.

Corbett Stephens: The engineering would determine the size and design of the sumps and where they should be located. He can quote prices on sumps according to the various sizes; but the optimal benefit will come from engineering. Do we simply over-size all the sumps?

Weston Youd: He would need all the information to be able to make a recommendation as to where the fee should be.

*The Mayor will email the proposal from LEI for the Study so they can review it. They can address it at the next meeting or even vote by poll vote.

Weston Youd: He is in favor of borrowing from the General Fund right now to “get these things fixed”. (*Council Member Clawson agreed.*)

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
72

1:30:59

Mayor Christensen: He brought up the possibility of selling some of the land around the Oak Lane Booster to one of the neighbors (Browns). They would like to buy some of that land; perhaps the sale could help off-set the cost of at least one of the sumps. He wanted to know if the Council would be in favor of selling some of that property. *(They were in favor of the Mayor continuing his negotiations with the Browns.)*
Further discussion on sizes vs. costs and locations.
Corbett Stephens: It is not cost effective to do an isolated section of curb & gutter (Pozericks); we need to get as much done at one time as possible.

1:34:51

The possibility of an SID (Special Improvement District) was discussed; if all residents on Escalante are not in agreement to having curb & gutter installed. That is not the preferable way to handle negotiations.

2. Road Repairs:
The Mayor said the Council had given approval to accept the bid from Geneva for road repairs; postponing Escalante Drive until the spring so letters top residents can go out and arrangements made for the entire project.
Roads on schedule: Alpine Dr. (overlay), Fairway (overlay), Canyon View Dr (install) & fix parking lot at the City Hall.
- Canyon View Drive: The curb & gutter assessment needs to be settled with Doug Pace.
- Alpine: Mahogany to Canyon View

1:39:49

3. Loafer Canyon Building (Funding):
Comments:
Erin Clawson: (Concern) Originally the approval was for \$30,000 *(Mayor: That was for a 30X40 building, which would do us no good)*. So, now we are at \$69,000...how much will this help the Fire Dept? When some of the Council were 1st elected, the Fire Chief asked for money for the Fire Dept expansion and was denied due to the condition of the economy at the time. She feels there should be considerations both ways.
Mayor: The plan is to get the Public Works equipment out of the current bay area of the City Hall and dedicate the extra space to the Fire Dept. so they can expand the parking space for the Fire trucks.
Chief Wait: They are currently saving fund balance from their Fund to go toward expansion of the Fire Station; with the doors to the north for easier access on the street. Expansion would also allow for an ambulance and extra storage. There were rough drafts of the proposed building.
Erin Clawson: There are two issues; any action with the Public Works should carry with it the idea of assisting the Fire Dept. as well.

1:45:13

Corbett Stephens: One has to precede the other; the space must be available before it can be used and expanded.
Mayor: He suggested getting bids for both and put the Fire Dept in the plans now.
James Mayfield: He cautioned the Council to be careful in spending too much money.
Erin Clawson: She agreed that the Council should watch what is being spent and keeping track of the savings.
James Mayfield: He suggested trying to save money.
City Recorder: She reminded the Council that the City has been saving for a long time and the General Fund has about \$750,000 in fund balance designated to "future improvements".
If the Council just used the fund balance from last fiscal year (about \$240,000), there would still be about ½ million dollars remaining; which is a good savings.
Erin Clawson: The City needs both; she feels she cannot approve one without the other.
City Recorder: She asked why the building is planned for Loafer Canyon where the space is less; why not utilize the 10 acres the City owns on the corner of Goosenest and Elk Ridge Drive. The original plan was to have the City Center and the Public Works Building in that area and perhaps a neighborhood park in Loafer Canyon. There is a site plan that was drawn up by Shawn Eliot for the City Center. At that time, the entire City Hall (as it is now) would eventually be turned over to the Fire Dept.
(Julie Haskell: She added that the bond money for that project had been turned back onto the bond.)
That is true, but the City still owns the land and perhaps the planned building would be better placed in that area.
Weston Youd: He wanted to get a clearer picture of what the building will look like.
Mayor: He thinks that eventually, the City will need both areas. The planned building will barely handle the equipment the City has currently. He does not care where the building is; we just need the space.
Erin Clawson: She suggested selling the land in Loafer and putting the money into the land where the City Center will be. *(The well cannot be sold.)*
Weston Youd: He was conflicted due to the size of the building and the fact that it is so close to his home; but it is not his property. He loved the idea of a City Park on the corner.
Julie Haskell: Either place would be fine; but she would prefer the area where the City Center was planned, if it is affordable.
Corbett Stephens: At one time Kent Haskell had designed the building to go in the "pit" down below (right by the Elk Ridge sign).
City Recorder: But then there is a Public Works building right at the entrance to Elk Ridge.
(It was pointed out that eventually, the Master Plan shows the entrance being further east by Cloward's driveway...with a round-about...and that would be right where the future City Hall would be located. Elk Ridge Drive would cut at a diagonal to the northwest toward the intersection of Elk Ridge Drive (1600 West) and 11200 South. The traffic going by the Public Works building would be minimal at that point.)
Corbett Stephens: He would rather have the building over by Goosenest. The other City property in Loafer Canyon (west of Shuler's and Youd's) could be sold as a building lot.

Mayor: He suggested postponing the approval for the money until the next Council Meeting; to give time to get a master plan for the Public Works building and get a plan for the Fire Dept as well. The site plan will be found. *They will meet with the Fire Chief and get some bids and designs for both.
Chief Wait: It is too much to take both projects at the same time; he advised doing one, then address the next.
Erin Clawson: But there must be a plan for both.
Julie Haskell: It does not cost anything for a plan to be reviewed.

1:54:54

ERIN CLAWSON

1. *Tank Access – National Guard:* In process; but the information was not available at that time.

2. *UVU CAP Program:* She was unable to attend the meeting to get more information. (September 2nd is the opening day for the Corn Maze.)

*Nest Meeting.

MAYOR CHRISTENSEN

1. *Summer Help:* An additional worker is needed (18 years or older) at a wage of up to \$10/hour. The Council was oaky with that.

2. *Military Support:*

City Recorder: The City has supported utility abatement for deployed military in the City (water bill).

Erin Clawson: She explained the process to go through the National Guard for these benefits.

JAMES MAYFIELD MOVED, SECONDED BY ERIN CLAWSON, TO ABATE THE CITY WATER BILL FOR ALL DEPLOYED MILITARY PERSONNEL IN ELK RIDGE

VOTE: YES (4) NO (0) ABSENT (1) SEAN ROYLANCE

3. *Public Works – Certification Process:* As per the Work Session discussion, the Council agreed that Mr. Davis could take more time to pass the certification exam. They felt these details should be handled by his Manager (Mr. Stephens) and they wanted Mr. Davis to know they had confidence in him.

1:58:25

SANITATION

(Postponed due to the absence of Council Member Roylance)

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

City Council Minutes of 7-12-2011:

ERIN CLAWSON MOVED, SECONDED BY JAMES MAYFIELD, TO APPROVE THE CITY COUNCIL MINUTE FROM JULY 12, 2011, AS PRESENTED

VOTE: YES (5) NO (0)

EXPENDITURES:

General: None

OTHER COUNCIL

A. *Playground Equipment:*

The quotes were not available.

AUDIT ENGAGEMENT

Ratify Polled Vote to approve:

LETTER –

ERIN CLAWSON MOVED, SECONDED BY WESTON YOUD, TO RATIFY THE POLLED VOTE TO APPROVE THE AUDIT FIRM OF JONES SIMKINS TO PERFORM THE ANNUAL AUDIT FOR THE 2010/2011 YEAR

JONES SIMKINS

VOTE: YES (4) NO (0) ABSENT (1) SEAN ROYLANCE

ADJOURNMENT

The Mayor adjourned the City Council Meeting at 8:15 PM.

(Suggestion: To give a show of appreciation to Shawn Eliot for his part in the City's General Plan. The Mayor approved dinner tickets.)

City Recorder