

Heber City Corporation
City Council Meeting
February 5, 2015
5:30 p.m.

WORK MEETING

The Council of Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah, met in **Work Meeting** on February 5, 2015, in the City Council Chambers in Heber City, Utah

I. [Call to Order](#)
[City Manager's Memo](#)

Present: Mayor Alan McDonald
Council Member Robert Patterson (arrived at 5:35p.m.)
Council Member Jeffery Bradshaw
Council Member Erik Rowland
Council Member Heidi Franco (arrived at 5:50p.m.)
Council Member Kelleen Potter

Also Present: City Manager Mark Anderson
City Recorder Michelle Kellogg
City Engineer Bart Mumford
City Planner Anthony Kohler
Police Officer Ken Jones

Others Present: Brent Kelly, Mary Kelly, George Bennett, Todd Drennan, Suzanne Hansen, Travis Price, Ryan Starks, Robert Adair, Derrick Anderson, Mike Johnston, Shawn Morrow, Amy Tuddenham, Rachel Kahler, Wes Bingham, Mark Olpin, Byron Horner, Joshua Horner, Karen Tozier and others whose names were illegible.

1. [Jon Springmeyer, Bonneville Research, Discuss Financing Options for Public Improvements in the Downtown Area](#)
[Bonneville Research Presentation](#)

Jon Springmeyer stated there were a few possibilities in Utah to fund redevelopment projects. He presented a PowerPoint presentation that reviewed the options, and indicated he would focus on tax increment financing for this discussion.

Council Member Patterson arrived at 5:35 p.m.

Springmeyer continued that when a property was redeveloped, it would increase in value, of which value would then be reflected in higher property tax revenue. The difference in property taxes would be a tax increment.

He defined an Urban Renewal Area (URA) and stated blight would be found in these areas. To rid cities of blight, eminent domain could be used, but new laws with regard to this option would make it difficult to enforce this option. Springmeyer also stated that under the URA requirements, 20% of the collected increment must be used for housing.

Council Member Franco arrived at 5:50 p.m.

After blight was identified, a budget must be approved, a plan for redevelopment must be approved and the taxing entity committee must approve the tax increment proposal by a super majority. This committee would be comprised of eight different members, and the voting makeup would be: two votes from the city, two votes from the county, two votes from the school district, one vote from the State Board of Education, and one vote from the collective group of special service districts. To move the process forward, six of the eight members would have to vote in agreement. The school district would effectively have veto power, so it would be important to have their support.

Springmeyer also spoke on the Economic Development Area (EDA) and the Community Development Area (CDA) tax increment options. When asked what types of commercial entities would qualify as an EDA, Springmeyer noted that everything but retail would qualify as an EDA. He added that supportive businesses, such as a copy center or deli could be in the business center, but no incentives could be given to them.

Springmeyer stated a CDA was a voluntary interlocal agreement between a city and a county or a city and a school district, etc. The other party in the interlocal agreement would agree to give the city a certain percentage of its new tax revenue for a certain number of years. It was indicated that CDAs were the quicker track for tax increment financing. They were easier and there would not be a 20% housing requirement. CDAs could also use sales tax proceeds for redevelopment purposes. It was noted that any incentives given to businesses to locate within the city limits would need to have conditions attached to the incentives. Council Member Rowland asked if the city would solicit businesses to relocate or would the city wait for businesses to come and request help moving to the city. Springmeyer stated both would occur. The city could build a project area and market it, as well as be ready when an opportunity came looking for space.

Council Member Franco asked for examples of money flows. Council Member Rowland felt the Council needed to first determine an area that should be redeveloped, and decide on the vision for that area. He asked if this concept would work for revitalizing Main Street since there were multiple owners and not everything along Main Street was considered blight. Springmeyer thought Main Street would be an excellent candidate for redevelopment. The Council was interested in seeing examples of other cities that redeveloped their Main Streets. Springmeyer stated he would come back and share examples, but noted that each project would be very unique. He suggested that the Council identify specific areas in Heber that could qualify for tax increment funding so brainstorming could occur when he returned. Mayor McDonald added that the Planning Commission should be involved in this decision as well.

2. [Ryan Starks and Rachel Kahler, Presentation of Heber Valley Tourism and Economic Development 2015 Strategic Plan and Results from the 2014 Cowboy Poetry Gathering](#)

Heber Valley Tourism Strategic Plan 2014 Cowboy Poetry Gathering

Ryan Starks commented on the prior presentation and stated Wasatch County had engaged Zions Bank Public Finance to do a feasibility analysis with regard to the North Village, and depending on the outcome, the County might pursue a CDA. He then proceeded to give a PowerPoint presentation on the state of the valley. It was noted that unemployment was very low. Starks also showed a promotional video of the Chamber of Commerce and discussed the new role of the Chamber and new fees for its members.

Rachel Kahler stated she had come to share the results of the 2014 Cowboy Poetry Event. She indicated it was the 20th anniversary of Cowboy Poetry, and she considered it very successful from both financial and marketing standpoints. She also gave a PowerPoint presentation on Cowboy Poetry and discussed the different aspects of putting this event together. Kahler noted that local businesses benefited from the event being held in Heber City.

3. Shawn Morrow and Amy Tuddenham, Heber Valley Medical Center, Vision for the Future Presentation Heber Valley Medical Center Presentation

Shawn Morrow stated that Heber Valley Health Care had a unique vision. He reviewed the history which formed Intermountain Health Care and noted Heber Valley Medical Center (HVMC) had changed its vision statement. He gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding that vision. Council Member Franco asked if the anticipated construction and expansion was to accommodate future growth. Morrow stated that this plan was to catch up because it was six years overdue. He also indicated that HVMC performed \$1.5 million in charity care last year.

Mayor McDonald thanked Morrow and stated the hospital was a good partner with the City.

4. Bart Mumford, Review Phase II Traffic Study Results Heber City Phase II Traffic Study Report Engineering Staff Report re Phase II Traffic Study

Bart Mumford stated the first phase of the traffic study focused on getting stop signs installed in the core of town. Now phase two was completed, which included installing stop signs in the areas surrounding the downtown area. The study included traffic counts, crosswalks, and retro reactivity, which determined how reflective the signs were. Mumford stated there were a lot more stop signs in the City now. He was concerned with 1000 South, which was now a through road. The study proposed making 300 West a through street and installing stop signs on 1000 South. With regard to school crosswalks, the recommendation was to change the stripes and add signs to make the crosswalks more visible.

Council Member Franco requested that the stop sign at the top of Cottonwood Circle be removed. Mumford stated he would look to see if any signs could be converted to yield signs instead of stop signs, and explained that the signs were not placed there because of traffic, but were placed there because of lack of visibility. Council Member Franco also felt the two stop

signs at Ridge Drive and Valley Drive should be eliminated as well. Mumford agreed to look at the study in those areas.

5. [Discuss Reorganization of the Personnel Policy Committee
Personnel Advisory Committee](#)

Anderson explained that he had been discussing this reorganization for a couple of years. Kellogg had a PHR certificate and the knowledge that went along with that, and she would be an asset on the committee. Chief Booth had presented the makeup of the Summit County Personnel Committee to Anderson because he felt it worked well. Anderson stated he thought this new format would be best for the City, but acknowledged it would not be popular.

Council Member Patterson asked if the employees felt entitled. Anderson stated some employees used the committee to bring forth their pet peeves, and gave examples of such requests. Council Member Rowland was concerned about taking the voice away from the employees, and felt there should be a forum for employees to voice their concerns. Anderson agreed and noted there was an avenue for employees to come and present their concerns with the new format. Council Member Rowland favored leaving the committee as it was currently set up so employees could feel they had a voice. Council Member Patterson agreed. Mayor McDonald asked what level of the organization should be making decisions, and thought the decision making should move up a level, from employees to department heads. Council Member Rowland thought the checks and balances were in place since the Council would be making the final decision. Council Member Franco stated she appreciated the perspective of the employees, even though they might not know why the policy was set up that way. She felt employees needed to feel respected and that their opinion mattered.

Anderson stated he felt the Council was uncomfortable with the proposed change, but asked how they felt if he recommended that Human Resources have a permanent spot on the committee. Council Member Potter thought that Kellogg should sit on the committee, and suggested defining the scope of the committee. Anderson indicated this section of the policy should be refined before holding new committee elections.

6. [Review Proposed Amendments to Section 306 of the C2 & C4 and C3 Design Criteria
relating to Building Height
Building Height in Commercial Zones](#)

Kohler stated this height amendment was proposed because the current height restrictions were hindering economic development. It was noted the Planning Commission unanimously approved these amendments. This item was moved to the next regular meeting agenda.

7. [Review Proposed Amendment Repealing Chapter 18.87, Apartments, and Remove
Apartments as a Permitted Use in the R-3 Residential Zone.
Apartments and Permitted Uses in the R-3 Zone](#)

This item was moved to the next regular meeting agenda.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder

APPROVED 02-19-2015