

**REGULAR SESSION OF THE
BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL
October 18, 2012**

PRESENT:	Dennis Fife	Mayor
	Scott Ericson	Councilmember
	Ruth Jensen	Councilmember
	Brian Rex	Councilmember
	Mark Thompson	Councilmember
	Tyler Vincent	Councilmember
ALSO PRESENT:	Rick Bosworth	Human Resource Coordinator
	Paul Larsen	Director of Community & Economic Development
	Bruce Leonard	City Administrator
	Jason Roberts	Finance Director/Deputy City Recorder
EXCUSED:	Mary Kate Christensen	City Recorder

Mayor Fife called the meeting to order. The Reverence Period was given by Bishop Flint Hollingsworth from the LDS 12th Ward. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Approval of Minutes: Councilmember Jensen noted that in the September 27th minutes, page 3, “make” should be “made.” On page 4, her comments regarding subsidies and welfare were not included. Also on page 4, line 25 “proof” should be “prove.” On line 46, Seventh Day Evangelist should be *Adventist*. In the October 4th minutes, some of her statements were not included during the discussion of the bond resolution. She asked how the City Recorder determines what is pertinent to put in the minutes and what is not. She requested that the City Recorder review the recording and add these comments. A motion to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2012 and October 4, 2012 Council meetings as corrected was made by Councilmember Jensen, seconded by Councilmember Rex and unanimously approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bonnie Germer – Ms. Germer discussed the meetings held on October 9 and 10 on the Forest Street railroad crossing. The Council and Mayor were not in attendance on October 9, with the exception of Councilmember Jensen. On Wednesday night Councilmember Vincent and Councilmember Ericson were not there and Councilmember Thompson left early. She asked why they did not feel it was important to come to the meetings. It is a big issue. She requested a copy of the overpass options that were presented. It is important that the citizens have the opportunity to study the options. During both meetings, the citizens were told that the West Forest property owners were met with personally and others were sent a notification and it was in the newspaper. She asked what happened and why that did not happen because she has proof that these letters were not sent and it was not in the newspaper. The media was not notified so they were not in attendance. On October 10 the News Journal reporter was in attendance, but only because he was called after the Tuesday meeting. She also requested that the citizens have an open forum once a month, similar to the meetings held on October 9 and 10. It is important that the public have the right to be involved in everything. These are huge issues and she felt the citizens have been passed over. The Council owes the public a chance to be involved.

Councilmember Jensen for Deanna Hardy – Councilmember Jensen said she received a call from Deanna Hardy and asked her to convey that every time we grow government, we take money from citizens. She is referring to the Utah State University project. The City cannot afford projects because we are growing too much. She would rather see the City pay down debts and restore limited government.

There were no further comments from the public.

Mayor Fife responded to Ms. Germer’s comments. He stated that the City is looking at better ways to communicate with the public. There is a tentative meeting scheduled for November 28 to have an open forum to talk about the community development cluster analysis and any other issues the public would like to talk about.

The Mayor added that there was a big misunderstanding about the railroad meetings. This is in its initial phase. These meetings were supposed to be for the property owners of those who would be affected. Notices were sent to all of these property owners; however, most of the owners of Forest Street did not receive their notices. There was a miscommunication on how these were mailed out and procedures have been changed.

Mr. Larsen further explained that these meetings were not intended for the general public. The City is paying the consultant to do this study and rather than go with the consultant individually to every property owner, it was felt it would be better to get the property owners together in one meeting. It was perceived to be a public hearing/community at large meeting, but that was never the intent. The mailing list and labels were prepared, but it is unsure where the breakdown occurred. The owners that are part of the Perry relocation alternative received their notices. The ones that are affected owners for the overpass alternative did not receive notices. Staff is working on a checklist to check off each item of the mailing procedure. Mayor Fife added that there is not a good way to certify that mailings are sent. The checklist will verify this. Mr. Larsen said the City could do certified mailings but it increases the cost of postage 3-4 times. Since the meeting, staff has met with 75% of the property owners personally.

Mr. Larsen explained that the drawings of the various options are a snapshot in time. This will continue to change. This will be posted on the website and will be published in the local paper this Wednesday.

Mayor Fife stated that at this point, the City is trying to find out how the alternatives will affect property owners and if they have particular concerns. The alternatives will be adjusted based on these concerns. They will then get cost estimates. After that, there will then be enough information to have public hearings. Mr. Larsen added that this is the beginning of the process; it is not even close to the end of the process. Mayor Fife continued that the City is not trying to keep a secret. The study needs to be done so the City has something valid to present to the public.

Councilmember Jensen agreed with Ms. Germer. One of the City's Focus Areas is responsive government, but it should also be interactive government. She and the Mayor have discussed meeting every six months or quarterly to be able to get more information from the citizens.

Mayor Fife said it is difficult to be more open on some projects, such as Project Cogburn. This has been in the news, but there has not been one agreement made with the City or the State. There has been some initial conversations with the State, but no agreements have been made. The only thing that has been done is the annexation of the Reeder property. The City is trying to be very open. Some citizens have felt that the City is hiding the prospective hotel, but that is not the case. The City is trying to get to the point where some agreements can be made.

The Mayor added that the City has talked about having an open forum, maybe the fifth Thursday would be a good date to do that, or at least quarterly.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW EMPLOYEE

Mayor Fife introduced Austin Szerszen, the new Grounds Maintenance Worker 1 in Public Works.

CONSENT

Request to Write-off Accounts Due to Bankruptcy or Being Sent to Collections

A list of accounts totaling \$5,390.71 was presented to be removed from the City's billing system due to customer taking out bankruptcy or being sent to collections.

MOTION: A motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented was made by Councilmember Rex, seconded by Councilmember Ericson and unanimously carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Request for Approval of Change in City Contribution to Health Saving Plans

Mr. Roberts reported that the City received good news this year; there is no health insurance cost increase in the coming year because claims were lower this year. This is due in part to the changes made last year and offering the Health Savings Account (HSA) option.

Mr. Roberts continued that 51% of employees signed up for the HSA plan and 49% for the traditional plan. The contribution for the initial year of the HSA was:

Single - \$1,200
Two Party - \$2,400
Family - \$3,000

In the current budget there is \$900 budgeted for single; \$1,800 for two party; \$2,400 for family. There was concern that some employees would drop the HSA plan if the City contribution was lowered to the budgeted amount. Since the HSA is a savings to the City, it was felt the City's HSA contribution should be raised from the budgeted amount to:

Single - \$1,200
Two Party - \$2,400
Family - \$2,700

The reason the two party increased more than the other two groups is to give employees incentive to go to a two party plan if they are eligible rather than stay on the family plan.

The total amount in the current budget for the HSA contribution is \$119,100. If the proposed contribution is approved, it would increase \$20,700 to \$139,800. The additional \$20,700 could come from the \$59,049 budgeted in anticipation of an increase in medical insurance.

Total Budgeted Increase in Medical Insurance	\$ 59,049
Proposed Increase in HSA Funding	(20,700)
Projected Increase in Dental Cost	<u>(21,828)</u>
	\$ 16,521

Staff has not completed the final analysis of the dental plan. The City went out for bid for dental coverage because of the proposed increase of 45% from Assurant, the current provider. MetLife offered a 25% increase. TDA proposed a plan that gives the employee two options. The TDA PPAO Plan A is similar to the current coverage, except the deductibles are a little higher. Their proposal is an increase of \$21,828, or 25%. TDA also offered a second plan, the TDA Elite Choice. This is a lesser benefit but the cost is significantly less. Staff proposed that the City pay 90% of the contribution, rather than 80%. This would still be less for the City than 80% of the other plans. Mr. Greg Schmidt from Sterling Benefits explained that this would essentially put the City at a revenue neutral position from the current budget year. It would also be a savings for the employees. The premium for a family would be \$9.30/month vs. \$26/month. However, the Elite program does not cover orthodontia, only a discount. There is no deductible with this plan and it has a \$5,000 maximum compared to a \$1,500 with the other plan.

The dental plan options will be discussed further in the November 1st Council meeting.

Councilmember Ericson stated that long-term, it is beneficial to have employees on the HSA Program. This is a small increase to keep employees on this program, so he felt the increase as described above is a wise decision.

MOTION: Councilmember Ericson made a motion to approve the recommendation on the HSA as presented by Mr. Roberts. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Vincent. The voting was unanimously in favor.

Request for Approval of Incentive for Employees Who Have Access to Other Employer Insurance

Mr. Roberts stated that there has been discussion that if the City could give an incentive to employees who have access to insurance outside of the City, there could be a savings for the City. It costs the City approximately \$5,000 to provide insurance benefit coverage to a single employee and \$15,500 for family coverage. There would be a cost to the City for those that do not currently have the City insurance and have coverage through their spouse's insurance. There are currently eleven employees in this situation.

It was the staff's recommendation that \$2,000 be offered to any employee that drops the City's insurance. In order to break even, two employees with family coverage would need to drop the City insurance. If three people with family coverage go off, there would be a \$15,000 savings. This includes payment to the current employees who do not have City insurance.

There are three different areas of insurance provided at the City. Most employees are under the Peak Advantage Plan. This includes dental, gap and health insurance. If an employee drops the dental plan, they could receive 5% of the \$2,000; 10% for opting out of the gap; 85% for health insurance.

Mr. Bosworth came forward and added that the risk to the City is if there are not enough employees who opt out. The survey indicated that three would consider it and two others would consider it if it was at a higher dollar amount.

There was a discussion on whether this should be offered annually or offer it only one time and re-evaluate. If the City is only going to break even, it was not felt it should be done. If it is a cost savings, it should be done. Mr. Roberts said the numbers could change as employees leave and new employees are hired. Councilmember Jensen said the City could take away the \$2,000 incentive anytime in the future.

MOTION: Councilmember Rex made a motion to approve the incentive for one time only, and re-evaluate it in a year. Councilmember Vincent seconded the motion, unanimously carried.

Request for Approval of a Facade Grant at 92 South Main

Mr. Larsen came forward and reviewed a rendering of the proposed changes to the Village Dry Goods Store. They are moving into the building next to their current store and are asking for a grant to redo the facade at the new location. The grant is a reimbursable 50% match grant.

MOTION: Councilmember Vincent moved to approve the facade grant for 92 South Main, seconded by Councilmember Jensen and unanimously carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

Briefing on West Forest Street Corridor Plan and Zoning Overlay

Mr. Larsen explained that there was a charrette held in 2006 with the City's design consultant. The result of that was a concept plan. He indicated on a map the different zones in the overlay. The purpose of the overlay is to allow growth on West Forest that is complementary to the City's goals of providing a high quality business environment with a high ratio of jobs per acre and to provide an attractive gateway corridor.

Ms. Phylene Anderson, owner of Ellie's Pet Hotel on West Forest, stated that she does not know what is wrong with having her business on West Forest. No one wants to bring their dog to a kennel that is completely enclosed. In the charrette, the property owners did not feel that their voices were heard. That is why the City is not hearing from the property owners, because they all feel that no matter what they say it does not matter; the City will do what they want to do with their property and take it away from them. It is frustrating to her as a property owner because she has made improvements on her property. She has a nice looking building and does a great business. She brings in people from Ogden, Logan, Salt Lake, Idaho and Montana. She does not employ a lot of people, but she makes an impact.

Mayor Fife invited Ms. Anderson to talk to the Planning staff. She can always request a variance for what she wants to do.

The Council adjourned to a Redevelopment Agency meeting at 8:33 PM.