

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

Minutes of the Payson City Council and the Redevelopment Agency of Payson City held at the Payson City Center, 439 West Utah Avenue, Payson, Utah on Wednesday, September 17, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Mayor Rick Moore; Councilmembers: JoLynn Ford, Kim Hancock, Mike Hardy, Scott Phillips, and Larry Skinner; City Attorney Mark Sorenson, and City Recorder Jeanette Wineteer.

PRAYER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Prayer offered by Councilmember Skinner and Pledge of Allegiance led by Councilmember Phillips.

CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION by Councilmember Phillips to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of approval of September 03, 2014 City Council Minutes, and Resolution approving a Revolving Loan Fund loan for a Bucket Truck for the Electric Department. Motion seconded by Councilmember Hancock. Motion carries.

PUBLIC FORUM

Ross Huff presented a prototype of a sculpture of Troy Lerwill fighting a bull; he would like the Council to consider purchasing it and putting it in the Peteetneet along with the other world champion sculpture. He said that Mr. Lerwill wasn't included in that sculpture, but he is also a six-time world champion. Mr. Huff will donate his time, so the cost would be about \$1850.

Councilmember Hancock felt it was a good idea and the Council could be considered under the budget amendment item.

Darcie Cook is concerned with the intersection at 800 S and Main because crossing 800 S has no cross walk for kids to walk. She said there is no marking for cars to stop behind, so if walking the children would have to go around the stopped car and possibly into Main Street traffic.

Councilmember Ford thought that we talked about the vegetation in the berm on 800 South and needing trimmed. Recreation Director Teemant said that it has been trimmed.

Ms. Cook agreed but said that the vegetation has nothing to do with this crossing.

Councilmember Ford said that we are not talking about a crossing guard, and Councilmember Skinner felt like it was just a bucket of paint.

Mayor Moore said we could give this to Superintendent Fowden to paint a line.

Walt Johnson said he attended the August 27th Planning Commission meeting and he wondered how the city would address sewer coming down 2300 so development could occur. We spent 3 years working on the East side development plan. He thought Payson could work with Salem and the County and do a regional sewer.

Councilmember Phillips said the sewer in the area will be development driven. Councilmember Ford noted that there are meetings being held for a regional plant with surrounding communities. Mayor Moore said we are waiting for studies and Salem hasn't decided what they want to do.

COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

Recreation Director Teemant reported that they are monitoring the pool leakage after the lights were sealed. We are wrapping up soccer and starting flag football, so another month of outside sports.

Councilmember Phillips asked if the ball park sprinkling had been turned off on Sundays and Mr. Teemant said that they have and all sprinklers have been turned down.

Public Works Director Jockumsen noted that the PI water will go off at the end of the month in conjunction with Highline.

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

Councilmember Hancock said we have exceeded our amount with Highline, and Councilmember Phillips wondered how that would happen because the numbers we received a month ago said we would have enough water and we have still received rain.

Mr. Jockumsen reported that some of the storm drain basins were sprayed today by Parks Superintendent Mark Hyland.

Councilmember Hardy wondered about the fencing of storm drain pond and Mr. Jockumsen said that Superintendent Fowden is off this week but he will find out when he gets back.

Chief Runyan reported that we have hired new officers: Glen Carlson and Daniel Peterson. He also reported on an incident that happened in Payson today: he explained that there was a kidnapping in Provo/Orem area this week and this was the last person they were searching for. He was apprehended in Payson.

Chief Spencer reported on some legislation their association is working on concerning Medicare/Medicaid payments and State lands.

He noted that they are still trying to maintain coverage during the daytime in both fire and ambulance.

Councilmember Phillips said they have been working on some lane leveling on 600 East and working on 300 North.

He also noted that there needs to be dust control if they have the truck rides during Onion Days in the future, the homes around that area suffer because of all the dust.

Councilmember Hancock wanted to commend the Police Department and Chief Runyan for how our officers are being trained.

He attended the UTOPIA meeting last week and nothing much has changed. As of now, Macquarie still has not shown us Milestone 2.

Councilmember Skinner said that the governor is interested in attending Onion Days and Salmon Supper next year but is not allowed to get free tickets to the Salmon Supper. He suggested having the Governor be a guest server or something so he can get tickets.

Mayor Moore said he attended the League of Cities and Towns and felt there was a lot of good training. One item he was interested in was on budgets, some cities are budgeting for multiple-years. He also attended a class on after-school programs.

SUSPEND AGENDA

MOTION by Councilmember Ford to suspend the agenda and allow the mayor to move at his discretion. Motion seconded by Councilmember Phillips. Motion carries.

CHAMBER BUSINESS OF THE MONTH

Lou Ballamis from the Chamber of Commerce noted that they appreciate the working relationship they have with the city. He reminded everyone of the Movie in the Park coming up this Saturday; wristbands are given out at the sponsoring businesses and the movie is being advertised on the internet and flyers around the city.

He introduced Rory Adams from Farmers Insurance and presented him with the Business of the Month.

Mr. Adams said he has been in Payson five years now and loves being here and thanked the businesses and citizens for this recognition.

PUBLIC HEARING – RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF A ZONE CHANGE FROM THE GC-1, GENERAL COMMERCIAL ZONE TO THE R-1-75, RESIDENTIAL ZONE

MOTION by Councilmember Hardy to open the public hearing to receive input regarding approval of a zone change from the GC-1 to the R-1-7t Zone. Motion seconded by Councilmember Ford. Motion carries.

Public hearing opened at 6:44 p.m.

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

Planner Spencer presented the following information:

In accordance with Section 19.2.8 of the Zoning Ordinance (February 19, 2014), it is proposed that the zoning designation for several parcels of land be changed from the GC-1, General Commercial Zone to the R-1-75, Residential Zone. The amendment to the Payson City Zoning Map will affect the following properties:

- Utah County parcels 30-029-0037 and 30-029-0044 located within the block bounded by 900 East and 1000 East and 200 North and 300 North. The parcels are currently owned by Payson-Utah Associates and Payson-Utah III Associates, respectively. The site is fully improved and accommodates fifty two (52) residential apartments in the Mountain View and Mountain View East apartment complexes.
- Utah County parcels 08-152-0005, 08-152-0006, 08-152-0007, 08-152-0008, and 08-152-0009 located near the southwest corner of the intersection of 200 North and 900 East. These parcels are owned by Edward & Valerie Monk, Barry & Vickie Nielsen, Ben & Kristy Litster, and Joseph & Amy Anson. With the exception of a vacant lot owned by Monk, the parcels are fully developed and used for residential purposes.

The zone change request is a joint effort of the applicants, Community Housing Services, Inc. and Yes Housing Inc., and Payson City staff. Staff is partnering with the applicants to rezone other parcels in the immediate vicinity.

The applicants are requesting approval of the zone change of the Mountain View and Mountain View East parcels to facilitate a substantial rehabilitation and modernization of the properties. Some of the proposed improvements cannot be completed because the residential units are classified as non-conforming uses in a commercial zone. The applicants are not proposing additional residential units on the site. However, if the zone change is approved, the applicants would like to construct a community building on the site to accommodate laundry facilities, a computer room, office space, and lounge area for the enjoyment of the residents of the apartment complex.

The Planning Commission has been evaluating the current zoning of several parcels along the 100 North and 100 West corridor to determine if changes in the zoning designation are necessary. Approval of this zone change, and others along the corridor, will more accurately reflect the number of acres designated for residential, commercial, and industrial uses. In many cases, approval of a zone change will also relinquish the non-conforming status of the parcel and remove any limitations imposed by that classification. On July 23, 2014, the Planning Commission reviewed the request and recommended approval of the zone change and directed staff to include the five (5) parcels north of the Moore Business Park if the owners are interested in rezoning their parcels from the GC-1, General Commercial Zone to the R-1-75, Residential Zone. Staff has reached out to the property owners and has concluded that there is support for the parcels to be included in the zone change request.

Approval of a zone change requires approval from the City Council and a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Both the Planning Commission and City Council are required to hold a public hearing and consider public input prior to reaching a recommendation or decision, respectively. Prior to forwarding a recommendation to the City Council, the Planning Commission held a public hearing in order to receive input from the public in relation to the proposal of the applicant. Property owners within five hundred (500) feet of the proposed zone change have been notified, the notice has been posted in appropriate locations, and the public hearing was advertised in the newspaper for a minimum of fourteen (14) days.

Analysis

Approval of a zone change is a legislative action of the City Council and the City Council is under no obligation to approve the zone change request. The applicants and property owners are entitled to use the property consistent with the requirements of the underlying zone, GC-1, General Commercial Zone. Because the parcels are fully improved and used for residential purposes it is unlikely that commercial uses will be accommodated in these properties. Moreover, the commercial zoning limits the improvements that can be completed to the residential uses because they are classified as non-conforming uses.

The applicants, along with City staff, are requesting approval to rezone the seven (7) parcels to the R-1-75, Residential Zone. If the zone change is approved by the City Council, the property owners are eligible to develop/improve the property in any manner that satisfies the requirements of the designated zoning district and the other applicable development ordinances of the City. Therefore, any of the permitted, conditional, or accessory uses of the R-1-75, Residential Zone would be allowed.

Recommendation

The applicants, along with City staff, are seeking a recommendation of approval to change the zoning designation of Utah County parcel numbers 30-029-0037, 30-029-0044, 08-152-0005, 08-152-0006, 08-152-0007, 08-152-0008, and 08-152-

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

0009 from the GC-1, General Commercial Zone to the R-1-75, Residential Zone. Following a public hearing to receive public input, the City Council will need to determine if it is appropriate to modify the zoning designation of the subject parcels. If the City Council determines the uses are appropriate in this location and consistent with the land use goals and objectives of the City, the City Council should approve the request. Conversely, if the City Council determines the allowed uses are not appropriate in this location or inconsistent with the land use goals and objectives of the City, the City Council should deny the request.

Phil Carroll, President of Community Housing Services that is the purchaser of this property. He said that they are engaged in a complete rehab of this housing, inside and out along with the other improvements.

Receiving no public input MOITON by Councilmember Phillips to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Hancock. Motion carries.

Public hearing closed at 6:52 p.m.

Councilmember Hancock wondered about rezoning the single parcel.

Planner Spencer said we prefer to not spot-zone, but sometimes it does happen.

MOTION by Councilmember Phillips to approve Ordinance #09-17-14, An Ordinance Amending the Payson City Zoning Map and Changing the Zoning Designation of Utah County Parcels 30-029-0037, 30-029-0044, 08-152-0005, 08-152-0006, 08-152-0007, 08-152-0008, and 08-152-0009 located at Approximately 200 North 900 East, finding that it fits our needs and brings the property more in conformance. Motion seconded by Councilmember Hancock. Motion carries.

PUBLIC HEARING – REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL OF THE MORNING MEADOWS SUBDIVISION

MOTION by Councilmember Hardy to open the public hearing to receive public input regarding Morning Meadows Subdivision. Motion seconded by Councilmember Skinner. Motion carries.

Public hearing opened at 6:55 p.m.

Planner Spencer presented the following staff report:

The proposed Morning Meadows Subdivision includes seventeen (17) single family dwelling lots, one of which contains an existing single family dwelling. The project divides Utah County Parcel # 30-050-0085 located between 1250 East and 1300 East and between 230 South and 320 South. The property is included in the R-1-10, Residential Zone that allows, by right, single family dwellings on ten thousand (10,000) square foot lots with at least one hundred (100) feet of frontage on a public street. The lots in the proposed subdivision exceed the minimum zoning requirements (i.e. lot area, frontage) of the underlying zone and the subdivision is considered a traditional subdivision without any request for increased density.

Approval of a traditional subdivision is an administrative action of the City Council. In other words, if the applicant is able to satisfy the regulations of the land use ordinances, the applicant is entitled to approval of the subdivision. However, if the applicant is unable or unwilling to satisfy the adopted regulations, the City Council may deny the request of the applicant. The necessary applications, project drawings, and other required documents, except as noted herein, have been submitted by the applicant.

The applicant has prepared Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R's) that outline the architectural controls, exterior materials, construction expectations, and other details regarding the proposed subdivision. Because the subdivision is proposed as a traditional subdivision in the R-1-10 Zone, the City Council should refrain from requiring specific design elements for the dwellings in the development, unless specific provisions of the CC&R's are inconsistent with City regulations. The CC&R's are an agreement between the owners in the development and Payson City is not responsible to enforce the provisions of the document.

In order to obtain approval of a Preliminary Plan, the applicant must receive a recommendation from the Planning Commission and the City Council must grant approval. On August 27, 2014, the Planning Commission, following a public hearing, recommended approval of the Morning Meadows Subdivision contingent upon the satisfaction of staff conditions

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

and modification of the phasing plan. The City Council will need to conduct a public hearing before taking final action on the request. The public hearing has been properly noticed and courtesy notices have been mailed to the appropriate property owners.

Analysis

The proposed Morning Meadows Subdivision has been reviewed for compliance with Title 19, Zoning Ordinance (February 19, 2014), Title 20, Subdivision Ordinance (March 5, 2014), and other applicable requirements of the land use ordinances of Payson City. Following staff review, a list of items has been generated that will need to be satisfied prior to the recordation of the Final Plat or development of the property, as applicable.

1. An application for Final Plat approval will need to be submitted and review fees paid before the plat is forwarded to the City Council for review and approval.
2. Documentation will need to be submitted that indicates that all current and past property taxes, including Utah Farmland Assessment rollback taxes have been paid for the property included in the proposed subdivision. This information must be provided before the Mylar is recorded in the office of the Utah County Recorder.
3. The applicant will need to resolve any boundary line discrepancies to ensure that the required improvements are installed as indicated on the project drawings.
4. The applicant is proposing to complete the project improvements in three (3) phases. Approval must be obtained from the City Council for any project phasing. At a minimum, the following items related to the phasing plan will need to be addressed:
 - a. Approval of a phasing plan must be ratified in a Deferral Agreement and recorded in the office of the Utah County Recorder. Phasing must be arranged in a manner that provides for adequate access and circulation, efficient delivery of municipal services, and provision of effective public safety access. Any changes to the phasing plan must be approved in writing by Payson City.
 - b. All required improvements must be completed by the applicant, and inspected and approved by Payson City prior to the issuance of a building permit in any phase.
 - c. The applicant may request approval of a Utility Extension Agreement for the infrastructure installed beneath 1300 East. Any arrangements for reimbursement must be finalized before recordation of the Final Plat.
 - d. The Planning Commission recommended changes to the proposed phasing plan. It is suggested that all improvements (i.e. utilities, roadway) along 1300 East street be completed with Phase 2 and any other infrastructure improvements that may affect the delivery of services in Phase 2.
5. As required by Title 20, Subdivision Ordinance, the applicant is responsible to complete the utility and roadway improvements for all lots in the proposed subdivision, including the installation of infrastructure in 1300 East and the connection of the existing dwelling on Lot 17 to all City services (drinking water, pressurized irrigation, and sewer). The dwelling is already connected to Payson Power, but the service will need to be provided underground. The connections will need to be completed prior to the issuance of any permits in Phase 3 of the subdivision. The applicant is responsible for the payment of connection and impact fees, transfer of water, disposal of septic tank, and other items associated with the connection to city services.
6. The applicant is requesting approval from the City Council to waive the requirement for installation of the sewer main line in 1300 East. The sewer system has not been designed for the growth area east of the proposed subdivision (area commonly referred to as Haskellville) and a suitable depth of the sewer line is unknown at this time. The applicant is willing to install the drinking water main and the pressurized irrigation main, but would request that the City Council waive the requirement for installation of the sewer main. In accordance with Section 20.22.1, the City Council could grant this request if it is determined that the installation of the sewer main is not necessary at this time.
7. The applicant will need to adhere to the recommendations identified in the geotechnical report prepared for the project. The report indicates shallow groundwater within the project boundaries and recommends that the top of the lowest floor slab be located four (4) feet above the measured groundwater. Additional groundwater level studies must be completed by a licensed Soils Engineer if the lot owner designs the dwelling with a basement. Moreover, the lot owner must demonstrate how the basement will be connected to the shallow sewer system in this area.
8. A storm water plan must be submitted that addresses the storm water storage and discharge limitations for the twenty-four (24) hour twenty-five (25) year storm event. Storm water system details including easements, drainage basins and storm calculations will need to be provided. It is proposed that the storm water generated in the development will discharge into an existing basin located north of the development. An analysis will need to be completed to determine if there is enough capacity in the existing basin to handle the additional storm water.
9. The applicant will need to work with the Payson Power Department on the layout of electrical facilities for the lots in the proposed subdivision. Payment of all fees associated with labor and materials provided by the Payson Power Department

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

are the responsibility of the applicant and will need to be submitted prior to issuance of any building permit in the proposed subdivision.

10. The applicant will need to work with the Payson City Fire Chief to prepare a public safety plan that identifies any required fire-fighting facilities (i.e. fire hydrants, turn-arounds, fire flow) and satisfies the requirements of the adopted fire code. All fees associated with fire hydrant testing and inspection will need to be submitted to the City.
11. There are irrigation facilities operated by the Salem Canal Company adjacent to or traversing the proposed subdivision. The applicant will need to coordinate with the irrigation company to properly address any potential impacts the proposed development may have on the existing irrigation system.
12. There is an elevation difference along the southern boundary of the subdivision (lots 4-7) and the lots in the Curtis Meadows Subdivision. Special attention must be taken to address lot to lot drainage and stabilization of the slope. Retaining walls or other acceptable stabilization methods may be required during the construction phase if more than a 2:1 slope exists.
13. The project drawings will need to be modified to indicate the following:
 - a. The street cross-section will need to indicate 3½" of asphalt. A note will need to be provided that states that 2½" of asphalt is required at time of construction with a 1" overlay following the construction of 90% of the dwellings or a period of two years from the initial placement of asphalt, whichever occurs first.
 - b. The location of the community box unit (CBU) for the post office will need to be identified. The location of the CBU must be approved by Payson City.
 - c. A cleanout will need to be provided every one hundred (100) feet of the sewer lateral for the existing dwelling on Lot 17.
 - d. The electrical plan will need to indicate that the power service for the existing dwelling on Lot 17 will be provided underground.
14. The Final Plat must be consistent with the regulations of Chapter 20.29 of the Subdivision Ordinance and the approval of the City Council. The Final Plat(s) will need to include the following:
 - a. The project notes indicated on the Preliminary Plan (i.e. retaining walls and basement construction). The note regarding basement construction will need to be modified to indicate that additional groundwater level studies must be completed by a licensed Soils Engineer if the lot owner designs the dwelling with a basement.
 - b. The "Acceptance by Mayor" should be changed to "Acceptance by Legislative Body". The Mayor signs in behalf of the legislative body (City Council), but the approval is granted by the legislative body.
 - c. The "Community Development Director Approval" should be changed to "Planning Commission Approval" and a signature line provided for the Chair of the Planning Commission.
 - d. A signature block will need to be provided for the Payson City Fire Department with a signature line for the Fire Chief.
 - e. A signature block will need to be provided for Questar Gas that includes the standard text required by the natural gas company.
 - f. The plat will need to indicate the use of each lot (i.e. residential – single family dwelling).
 - g. The plats for each phase will need to be referenced as Plat A, Plat B and Plat C.
15. A summary statement of the proposed subdivision will need to be provided that includes total project acreage, total area of each lot or parcel, the total number of units, sizes and lengths of utility piping, and lane miles of road.
16. The following items will need to be addressed prior to recordation of the Final Plat or during the construction phase, as required by City ordinance.
 - a. Complete the transfer of adequate amount of water to serve the development in accordance with Title 10, Water Ordinance of the Payson City Municipal Code.
 - b. Provide a performance guarantee in the form of a cash bond or irrevocable letter of credit in an amount equal to one hundred twenty (120) percent of the engineer's cost estimate for completing project improvements. The applicant will also need to submit, in cash, an amount consistent with the fee schedule of Payson City that will be used to complete public works inspections.
 - c. Provide, in cash, the amount necessary to complete the one (1) inch asphalt overlay for all roadways in the proposed subdivision once ninety (90) percent of the dwellings in the subdivision have been constructed.
 - d. Schedule and conduct a pre-construction meeting with the City Engineer prior to the installation of project improvements.
 - e. The applicant will need to be aware that prior to excavation and installation of public improvements, the Final Plat must be recorded, and prior to the issuance of a building permit, all required infrastructure, including the installation of asphalt and private utilities will need to be completed, inspected and approved.
 - f. The landscaping requirements of Section 20.17.13 or the Subdivision Ordinance will need to be implemented prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any new residential structure.

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

- g. Prior to the improvement of the site and construction of any structures, all debris and waste, including unused construction materials and asphalt will need to be removed from the site and may not be used as fill material.

These items represent the concerns City staff has identified following a review of the Preliminary Plan and Final Plat. In general, staff had no major concerns with the proposed project if the conditions of this staff report are satisfied. The City Council may require additional information in order to make a well-informed decision.

Recommendation

This staff report identifies items that are not in compliance with the land use ordinances of Payson City. It was the intent of the staff to complete a thorough review and identify all items that do not satisfy the requirements of Title 10, Water Ordinance; Title 19, Zoning Ordinance; Title 20, Subdivision Ordinance; the Design Guidelines and Standard Specifications; and any and all other development requirements of the City. However, failure of the staff to identify an inconsistency with any City requirement does not release the applicant of the obligation to satisfy all development requirements of the City. If an item is identified at a later date, the applicant will be responsible to satisfy the relevant development requirements.

The applicant is requesting preliminary and final approval of the Morning Meadows Subdivision, a traditional subdivision consisting of seventeen (17) single family dwelling lots in the R-1-10, Residential Zone. The City Council, following a public hearing to receive public input, may:

1. Remand the Preliminary Plan back to staff for further review. This action should be taken by the City Council if it is determined that there is not enough information provided by the applicant in order for the City Council to formulate a well-informed decision.
2. Approve the Preliminary Plan as proposed. If the City Council chooses to approve the Preliminary Plan as proposed staff would suggest that an opportunity to require the applicant to satisfy the regulations of the Payson City development ordinances and the land use goals of the City will be missed.
3. Approve the Preliminary Plan contingent upon the satisfaction of staff suggestions. Staff would suggest that if the City Council approves the Preliminary Plan contingent upon the satisfaction of staff conditions, the applicant will be required to satisfy the regulations of the Payson City development ordinances and the land use goals of the City.
4. Deny the proposed Preliminary Plan. This action should be taken if the City Council determines that the applicant is unwilling or unable to satisfy the regulations of the Payson City development ordinances and the land use goals of the City.

The City Council may, but is not obligated to, grant approval of the Final Plat concurrent with Preliminary Plan approval. If the City Council is inclined to grant Final Plat approval, staff would suggest that the City Council include the following conditions.

1. The applicant must satisfy all conditions of Preliminary Plan approval and the regulations of Chapter 20.29 of Title 20, Subdivision Ordinance.
2. The Mayor may not execute the Final Plat and the Final Plat will not be recorded in the office of the Utah County Recorder until all conditions of Preliminary Plan and Final Plat approval are satisfied.

Staff would suggest that the proposed use of the property is consistent with the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Ordinance if the conditions proposed by staff are satisfied by the applicant. The City Council should include findings that indicate reasonable conclusions for their decision.

Councilmember Skinner noted this is a relatively small subdivision, but we are at a critical stage in our water situation, he wondered if there was water or just paper water. Planner Spencer said they are working with Salem Canal to use the irrigation shares on the property.

Brant Tuttle with Northing Engineering said it is a pretty unique project and blends in with the others in the area. The developers will also be the home builders, and plan doing high quality homes. The items that have been presented to us and we have resubmitted a set of plans that addressed all of those. However there is a property issue they are still working to get surveys.

Councilmember Phillips wondered if any of the water will go into the existing retention basin. Mr. Jockumsen said it does, so if Salem doesn't want any storm water then the city would have to do something different also.

Councilmember Phillips wondered if staff was ok with them not putting in a sewer main-line and Mr. Jockumsen said yes because there is no master plan.

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

Councilmember Hancock said there is a question on ground water and still a possibility of a per-lot decision or geo-technical decision. He believes the developer said that they would be responsible for the report on each of those lots. Mr. Tuttle agreed they would take care of that.

Walt Johnson 10497 S 2300 W which is 1300 East, right across the street from this development. He said he has no objection to the development. He also represents Salem Canal as a Board Member. He said that Salem Canal has never been presented to them by this developer. He wants the council to disregard the "gap" mentioned, he is doing due diligence to confirm where his property is.

Mr. Johnson clarified the lots are 1/3 acre. As far as Salem water being utilized, Salem City owns a lot of Salem Canal shares but Payson has not approached them about how the city's shares would be utilized.

He said that they have a big problem with the draining going into the canal.

Mayor Moore said that we would have Public Works Director Jockumsen get a hold of Bartell to work through some things.

Mr. Johnson said the sewer line was installed, so the City knows quite a bit about the sewer line.

He expressed concerns about speed allowed along city roads.

Carl Faulkner, Kestrel Construction and represents Cherry Scion, the property buyer. He said that regarding the issues the city brought up about storm drain, they had an engineer do a study and for a 25 year storm this subdivision would be accommodated by the pond that exists now.

Councilmember Phillis said that the problem is the high-water table doesn't allow the storm water to perk out.

Mr. Faulkner said they also studied the water table and feel that the sewer is the larger issue. It is their proposal as we excavate we will determine how to do that on a lot by lot basis. The lots are 1/3 acre and will be real nice homes. Obviously if we can't get the boundary issues resolved, we won't buy the property. They feel they have addressed the issues given to them and hope the Council considers this.

Justin Faulkner is one of the builders for this development, and said that Highline and Salem Canal are acceptable for the wet water required, so that is a non-issue as far as transfer of real water. The sewer is extremely shallow, so to advance any development to the east it will require a pump station.

Robert Zeeman, owns the property in the development. As they do the development, he would like to see the sewer and water lines put in the whole area. If they are not put in it will cost a lot more in the future.

Receiving no public input MOTION by Councilmember Phillips to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Hardy. Motion carries.

Public hearing closed at 7:30 p.m.

Councilmember Phillips asked about the plan and pre-treatment of storm water and Public Works Director Jockumsen said we have already addressed pre-treatment and the plan would have to be submitted and approved by the State.

Councilmember Skinner understands that there is a boundary issue and it would have to be taken care of and Councilmember Phillips said that the discrepancy in the boundary has nothing to do with the city.

Planner Spencer said that the Planning Commission had some suggestions that they would like to be satisfied.

MOTION by Councilmember Phillips to table this until all the problems are all resolved (boundary line, water). Motion seconded by Councilmember Ford.

Councilmember Hancock said the reservations have nothing to do with the development, just resolution of the issues. It has been three weeks since this discussion has taken place with Planning Commission and he doesn't see anything that has happened.

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

Mr. Faulkner wondered what would be wrong with approval if it goes away if the boundaries are not resolved.

Attorney Sorenson said the County has done a survey; we just don't have the results.

Voting aye: Councilmembers: Ford, Hancock, and Phillips. Voting nay: Councilmembers: Hardy and Skinner. Motion carries.

DISCUSSION REGARDING A NEW DISPATCH CENTER

Chief Scott Spencer explained that Utah Valley Dispatch Special Service District has been approved by the Board of Trustees to continue to move forward with securing land and construction of a new dispatch center. The Board would like to have the agreements in place by the next meeting.

Our proportionate share is \$283,939.00 if we pay cash. A 12 year bond would be an annual payment of \$27,750.00 for 12 years (\$332,995.00). A 20 year bond would be an annual payment of \$21,926.00 (\$438,522.00). Most cities want to pay cash and not bond for the project. He presented the Facility Cost Assessments, Dispatch Building Agreement, and Site Plan.

He introduced Director Deborah Mecham from UVDSSD to provide a presentation on the new dispatch center:

Then and Now

- Dispatch has been housed in Utah County Sheriff's Security Center facility since 1996
- Console positions have grown from 4 to 10
- Office space/work area needs have increased
- Limited or inadequate spaces
- Storage
- Conference/meeting areas
- Training areas
- Technology/equipment space

Study

- Spatial Needs Assessment
- Staffing Study
- Technology Assessment
- Site Assessments
- Development Options
- Threat Vulnerability Assessment
- Recommended Construction Approach

Other Challenges

- Work environment (morale, health and comfort)
 - Lighting
 - Ergonomic matters
 - Air flow and ventilation
 - Areas for de-stress and meal needs
- Meeting and training space
- Secure parking

Facility Study

- Mission Critical Partners, Southlake, Texas
- Architects Design Group, Winter Park, Florida
- GOAL: Assess dispatch operational needs as it relates to space and technology requirements, for today and the next 20-25 years.
- Final report submitted November 14, 2013

Future Challenge: Growth

- Anticipated population growth
 - Doubled from 2000 to 2010 from 120,982 to 234,724
 - Anticipated to double again by 2030
- Estimated workload growth
 - Calls will also double again by 2030

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

Expansion vs Build + Site

- A subsequent expanded study was conducted to further consider expansion onto the sheriff's facility.
- Various sites were analyzed through both studies.
- Based on site viability and cost, a site on the same campus as the sheriff's facility has been proposed.

Facility Cost

- \$5,302,980 for Land, Construction and Technology
- \$1,802,980 from current fund balance
- \$3,500,000 member assessments based on current usage assessments
- Payson: 8.11% = \$283,939

Next Steps

- Each city to determine funding preference
- Cash payment
- Financing
- Review agreements
- September 25, 2014 Board of Trustees meeting
- Each cities method of funding
- Signed agreements
- Approve RFP for Architectural/Engineering Services
- Goal: Break ground Spring 2015

Mayor Moore didn't understand why we were scheduled for 11.8% and Eagle Mountain is only at 5.75% and we are basically the same size. We have a lot of mental health places and a hospital and a lot of the other cities are bringing patients here, so he wondered why we are we paying for them.

Ms. Mecham Said American Ford had the same type of comment because of their hospital. She said that the board decided it is just workload that the jurisdiction handles is how they based the percentages.

Councilmember Skinner asked what percentage the city's population is to the service area. Staff calculated and based on the 234,000 total population of the service area, and if Payson is 18,000 then it would be 7.7%

Chief Spencer said we are part of the Interlocal and because the cost of doing their own dispatch center, each city that has looked into it has decided to go along with it.

Councilmember Hardy wondered if this is a guarantee that this is all we will have to contribute. Ms. Mecham said it is the best estimate, but not a guarantee.

Councilmember Skinner wondered if this would reduce our annual cost and Ms. Mecham said it would not affect those costs.

Chief Spencer stated that some other cities have asked if they could split their amount over two budget years, so that could be considered.

PUBLIC HEARING – AMENDMENTS FOR THE FY2014-2015 MUNICIPAL BUDGET.

MOTION by Councilmember Ford to open the public hearing to receive public input regarding amendment to the FY 2014-2015 Municipal Budget. Motion seconded by Councilmember Phillips. Motion carries.

Public hearing opened at 8:18 p.m.

The following information was presented for Manager Tuckett:

“Looking at where we are, approximately \$5.6 million, I am comfortable spending \$500,000 of our fund balance for projects. My thoughts would be as follows:

1. As much as I don't like building a new dispatch center, it appears that it is going to happen. I would rather appropriate \$284,000 and pay for our portion rather than bond and pay interest.

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

2. I would like to appropriate \$65,000 to try and fix all of the broken meters in the water department. I think we would generate more revenue by fixing the problems.

3. I would like to seal the Peteetneet building. We have cut the sealing several years and it continues to deteriorate. \$125,000

Those would be my top three. I know we talked about never going below \$2.5 million, but I think with a potential reservoir, and well at the golf course, I think we should keep our fund balance closer to the \$4.5 to \$5 million level.”

Councilmember Hardy noted that the Economic Development committee wants to have UVU do a branding study for the city and they would do it for about \$2000.

Councilmember Ford would like to see new lighting for the two blocks downtown for around \$50K to \$75K.

Councilmember Hancock also noted to consider Mr. Ross’s sculpture at \$1850.

Councilmember Skinner would also like to see a fund started to save for a reservoir.

Receiving no public input MOTION by Councilmember Hardy to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Councilmember Skinner. Motion carries.

Public hearing closed at 8:22 p.m.

MOTION by Councilmember Phillips to approve the \$500,000 appropriation of Fund Balance for \$142,000 which is half the Dispatch Center, \$65,000 for water meters, \$125,000 for sealing of Peteetneet, \$2000 for the Branding Study, \$75,000 for downtown lights, \$1850 for the sculpture, and \$89,150 to put into a new Reservoir Fund. Motion seconded by Councilmember Hardy. Voting aye: Councilmembers: Ford, Hancock, Hardy, Phillips, and Skinner. Motion carries.

ADJOURN TO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MOTION by Councilmember Skinner to adjourn City Council and convene as Payson Redevelopment Agency. Motion seconded by Councilmember Hardy. Motion carries.

Council adjourned and convened into Redevelopment Agency at 8:30 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING - FY 2014-2015 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BUDGET

RECONVENE

MOTION by Director Hardy to open the public hearing to receive public input regarding FY 2014-2015 Redevelopment Agency Budget. Motion seconded by Director Ford. Motion carries.

Public hearing opened at 8:31 p.m.

Recorder Wineteer explained that even though our last year for Redevelopment tax increment was 2013, Utah County does not collect those taxes until 2014, which will be received by the Redevelopment Agency in our 2014-2015 Fiscal Year. She presented the FY 2014-2015 RDA Budget that includes projected revenues based on the November 2013 Report that the RDA approved last October, and expenses which include \$165,000 to reimburse to Dr. Clark, and \$15,000 to create a new CRDA.

Brian Hulet said the Economic Development Committee recommends doing the CRDA study. They have talked to Nebo School District about doing this. He suggested entrance signs for the Business Park as an additional project for the EDA money.

Receiving no further input MOTION by Director Phillips to close the Public hearing. Motion seconded by Director Hardy. Motion carries.

Public hearing closed at 8:35 p.m.

MOTION by Director Hardy to approve the Redevelopment Agency Fund FY 2014-2015 Budget as presented. Motion seconded by Director Phillips. Motion carries.

September 17, 2014 City Council Minutes

MOTION by Director Phillips to adjourn the Redevelopment Agency. Motion seconded by Director Hardy. Motion carries.

RECONVENE

Council reconvened at 8:34 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION

MOTION by Councilmember Skinner to adjourn to closed session to discuss land acquisition. Motion seconded by Councilmember Ford. Motion carries.

Council adjourned to Closed Session at 8:35 p.m. and reconvened at 8:50 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Councilmember Hardy to adjourn. Motion seconded by Councilmember Ford. Motion carries.

Council adjourned at 8:50 p.m.