

Heber City Corporation
City Council Meeting
December 1, 2020

4:15 p.m. Work Meeting
6:00 p.m. Regular Meeting

The Council of Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah, met in **Regular Meeting** on December 1, 2020, in the City Council Chambers in Heber City, Utah

Due to the Wasatch County COVID-19 high-level transmission index, this meeting was held virtually.

I. WORK MEETING-4:15 P.M.

Present: Mayor Kelleen Potter
Participating Remotely: Council Member Heidi Franco
Council Member Wayne Hardman
Council Member Mike Johnston
Council Member Rachel Kahler
Council Member Ryan Stack

Staff Present: City Manager Matt Brower
City Planning Director Tony Kohler
IT Specialist Anthon Beales
City Recorder Trina Cooke
Deputy Recorder Robin Raines-Bond

Staff Participating Remotely: City Attorney Mark Smedley
City Engineer Bart Mumford
City Planner Jamie Baron
City Manager Russ Funk
Finance Manager Wesley Bingham
Animal Control Officer Lisa Dinga
Administrative Assistant Carolyn Reeder
Public Works Director Matthew Kennard
Public Works Foreman Rance Echols

Also Present: Guy Hatch, Linda Hatch, and Oscar Covarrobias.

Also Joining Remotely: Ken Puncerelli, Pete Probst, Willie Holdman, Mike Petersen, Wes Johnson, Ron MacDonald, Randall Probst, Syndi Fitzgerald, Terry Diehl, Glen Lent, Richard Getz, Mike Strong, Ryan Starks, Maxx Cohen, Charles Zuercher, Melanie Seus, Jim Brown, Justin Crail, Christie Oostema Brown, Blake Walton, Jack Walkenhorst, Jennifer Lee, Mark Vlasic, Beth Price, John, Trudy and Dan Simmons, Bruce Barrett, Tracy Taylor, Ryan, RC, Susan Palmer, Kieth Rawlings, Sandra Brower, Jonathan McComb, Dennis, Jackie Booth, Paul Forster, Carol Clark, John Janson, K Ingols, Kaylen Nichols, Philip Jordan, Meshelle Kijanen, Pat Sweeney, Michael D Mills, Rick Miller, Harold Wilson, Howard Saldarini, Adam Long, Jennifer Lee, Dave Fuller, Brian Balls, Lindsay Cieslewicz, Johannes Kollman, Ron Winterton, Aaron Cheatwood, Deborah Trask,

Charleston Mayor Brenda Kozlowski, Barbara Boss, Liz Wilson, Armand Johansen, Erik Lappe, Paul Watson, Scott Heagy, Edwin Stevens, Mike Rossberg, Tracy Richardson, Marianne B Allen, Willa Motley, Barrett Peterson, Laurie Wynn, Bob Kowallis, Ileana Anderson, Bettina, Ktvillani, Russ Poulsen, Mike Strong, Stanford Lockhart, Chuck Z, J. Wann, Blake Walton, Max Covey, Justin Dietrich, and others whose names were not displayed.

Mayor Potter called the Work Meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. and welcomed everyone participating virtually.

1. Review of FOG Ordinance (Kennard) – 45 min

WM 1 FOG PowerPoint Presentation

WM 1 FOG Ordinance

Matthew Kennard, Public Works Director, presented the FOG (Fats, Oils, and Grease) Ordinance. He relayed that information for the FOG Ordinance was posted on the City website. Eighty Heber City businesses had been invited to a public information meeting. Dairy Keen was the only business to attend the FOG meeting. The ordinance would require businesses to provide biannual FOG training for all employees. The Health Department would check for informational FOG signage and equipment during regular inspections. Fines for noncompliance was proposed.

City Manager Matt Brower stated that the County Health Department had worked diligently with the City's Public Works. Mr. Brower indicated that businesses would have two to three years to install a FOG compliant interceptor. Council Member Kahler inquired the cost to install new FOG interceptors. Mr. Kennard replied about \$10,000 - \$15,000. Mrs. Kahler referred to Mrs. Call's Candy Company leaving Heber City for Lindon due to the installation cost of \$30,000 for the installation of the equipment. Mr. Kennard stated that Mrs. Call's had additional equipment to reach that cost.

Council Member Kahler inquired who would be responsible for the costs for business owners who rented buildings. Council Member Franco suggested new buildings be required to be FOG compliant. Mr. Brower stated new buildings should include grease interceptors. Council Member Stack inquired how other cities had implemented FOG compliancy. Mr. Kennard reported Cities they had visited had expressed surprise that Heber City proposed to allow two to three years to for businesses to become compliant with the FOG Ordinance. Discussion continued regarding the education of business owners, the timeline for compliance, inspections, processes, and the implementation of the FOG Ordinance.

Council Member Johnston supported the ordinance as written. Mr. Brower indicated the Ordinance would return for Council action in the first quarter of the following year and asked Council to reach out to Staff with any concerns prior.

2. Presentation of Heber Water System (Kennard) – 10 min

WM 2 Heber City Water Source and Tank Sites

Public Works Director Matthew Kennard presented a map of Heber City's water system. He shared the different zones and locations of wells within City Boundaries and described how the culinary water system worked. He offered a ride-around for Council Members who cared to tour the culinary treatment plant and tanks.

3. Discussion Regarding Charleston Town and Twin Creeks SSD Sewer Service and Agreement (Mumford)
– 45 min

WM Item 3

Mayor Potter explained that Heber City had been approached by Charleston Town and the Twin Creeks Special Service District with a request for the provision of sewer services. Max Covey, representing Twin Creeks Special Service District, and Charleston Mayor Brenda Kozlowski were present.

City Engineer Bart Mumford provided the details of what the project would entail should the Council decide to grant the request. Mr. Mumford explained the sewer capacity. Charleston Town would use the Cities existing lines to get to the sewer treatment plant. The City would replace existing lines with larger capacity lines if needed in the future. He explained the process to determine a dollar-amount to charge Charleston. Mr. Mumford presented a list of pros and cons if the City chose to help Charleston. Details included with the attached PowerPoint.

Council Member Stack felt Heber City should be a good neighbor but expressed concern that the risk for the City to absorb additional costs was too high. Council Member Johnston agreed, but the felt the City should consider the entire valley's best interest. He expressed concern with the City paying for the project and not getting a return and there were many issues to work through but felt the City should approve the project. Council Member Kahler expressed concern about Charleston losing it rural culture. Council Member Franco reminded council that Charleston's options were limited. Council Member Hardman desired Charleston Town pay for cost incurred.

Meeting went into Recess at 6:00 p.m.

II. REGULAR MEETING-6:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order

Mayor Potter called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance (Mayor Potter)

Mayor Potter led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Prayer/Thought by Invitation (Default: Council Member Hardman)

Council Member Hardman shared a prayer.

III. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE:

There were no conflicts of interest disclosed.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

V. ACTION ITEMS:

1. Thank you to the Envision Heber 2050 Steering Committee for their Role and Assistance in Guiding the City through Plan Development and Adoption of an Award Winning General Plan (Mayor Potter)

Mayor Potter read the names of the Envision Heber 2050 Steering Committee, thanked them for their contribution to help guide the award winning General Plan.

2. Mayor's Award to Recognize Animal Services Officer Lisa Dinga (Mayor Potter, Booth)

Item 2 Staff Report Mayor's Award

Chief of Police Dave Booth recognized Lisa Dinga for her exemplary performance. He explained half of the animal control staff was out for health reasons and noted Ms. Dinga had covered three different positions in the weeks the department had been shorthanded. Mayor Potter shared her experience with Ms. Dinga and noted her enthusiasm for her job.

3. Update Regarding Heber City's Ongoing Response to COVID-19 (Brower)

City Manager, Matt Brower informed Council of Health concerns and that the City's Old Fashioned Christmas was going to be modified, but still take place.

4. Public hearing Regarding the Proposed Highlands Annexation, Located at Approximately 2500 North Highway 40 (Kohler)

Item 4 Highlands Annexation

City Planning Director, Tony Kohler, presented the information for the proposed Highlands annexation. He listed the steps in the process including twenty-five public meetings. He provided details of the annexation property including aerial vicinity maps and a concept plan. All annexation exhibits were included in the meeting materials attached to the agenda item on the City website www.heberut.gov. Mr. Kohler reviewed the proposed densities.

Ken Puncerelli, development planner presented the land use plan, shared their vision boards, and explained the development plan. He noted the walk-ability promoted by the design.

Mayor Potter opened the Public Hearing for comments at 6:43 p.m.

Tracy Taylor, resident, felt the proposed development should adhere strictly to the density restrictions as set by the County, Heber City should not allow bonus density, and the City needed to uphold the annexation MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) agreement with the County. She asked the Council to look at the NVOZ in its entirety before granting density to any development. She asked the Council to move more carefully, slow the NVOZ adoption, and not move forward with annexations prior to the adoption of the NVOZ.

Dan Simmons, Wasatch County resident asked the following:

1. Would storm-water be handled on-site or exported – if so, where.
2. How much traffic the proposed development would generate and what the traffic study showed.
3. Where would all the parking be for the thousand plus units.
4. Where would the amphitheater parking be located.

Mr. Simmons felt academia was heading to a more online platform and questioned how much growth was needed and anticipated for the University.

Trudy Simmons asked if the amenities proposed in the development, such as the pool and playgrounds, would be private or open to the public to benefit the existing community.

Bethe Price noted the Heber and Wasatch County affordable or attainable housing plan. She asked with the addition of the proposed commercial development, condominiums, and hotel, where the employees would live. She felt a resolution to tie developers to employee housing was needed. Ms. Price asked to have a standard definition of an ERU that applied to all developments.

Aaron Cheatwood noted most of the public improvement amenities were in phase four and asked what would happen if phase four was postponed. His second concern was the integration with the existing trail systems and pointed out a few errors of trail locations on the map showing incongruences.

Marianne Allen wished to echo concern with public amenities going last. She indicated the need for more land dedicated for schools that would be needed with the increased density.

Mayor Potter read the public comments received via email. [attached] Council Member Kahler read the comment submitted by email from Dan Simmons. [attached]

Council Member Franco suggested holding another public hearing for the proposed annexation.

Mayor Potter clarified that everything in the North Village had already been given density and entitlements from the County. She explained the City Council now had to consider whether the densities should be within the City. She noted one reason to allow the properties to annex into the City was that they would be required to pay municipal taxes but revenue was not the driving force. She stated the land would be developed whether it was annexed into the City or remained in the County. She wanted everyone to understand that if the Heber City Council denied the annexation, the land would still be developed. By allowing it to be annexed into the City, the land would be developed according to the Envision Heber 2050 Master Plan.

The public hearing was closed at 7:23 p.m.

5. **Public Hearing Regarding the Proposed Crossings Annexation, Located at the Southeast and Northeast Corners of River Road and Highway 40 (Kohler)**

Item 5 Staff Report Exhibits 1-18

Item 5 Crossings Exhibits 19-23

Item 5 Crossings Exhibits 24-28

Mr. Kohler presented the information as included in the Staff Report. He noted the annexation process was regulated by the State and was driven by property owners, not the City. He shared a timeline for the Crossings annexation and vicinity maps. He provided the current versus the proposed zoning maps. Mr. Kohler reviewed the studies, which had been done for the proposed annexation including geotechnical, traffic, wetland delineation, and drainage studies. Mr. Kohler then reviewed the proposed development summaries for the annexation.

Petitioner Bruce Barrett shared further details for the development. He noted the properties had held entitlements with the County since 2002. Mr. Barrett stated their plan complied with the Envision Heber 2050 General Plan and shared the due diligence they had done. He reviewed the financial benefits to the City including the developer's intent to assist with the lake-to-lake trail from Jordanelle Reservoir to Deer Creek Reservoir. He described the Resort design, which would include a hotel, movie theatre, and aquatic center. Mr. Barrett provided examples of development mitigation. He explained the storm-water mitigation plan would exceed State requirements. He listed the numerous benefits the Resort could potentially offer the City and public.

Mayor Potter opened the Public Hearing for comment at 7:39 p.m.

Ron MacDonald introduced himself stating he lived and worked in the Moulton Neighborhood. He expressed concern with increased capacities placed on utilities and roads, with increased traffic on Moulton Lane, and increased property taxes.

Trudy Simmons read a letter from her husband Dan submitted by email for Public Comment. [attached]

Mayor Potter read additional public comments received via email for the Public Hearing. [attached]

Tracy Taylor wanted to repeat she was glad the Council was willing to work through the adoption of the NVOZ before approving annexations. She felt the adoption of the zone running parallel to the annexation process was complicated and might be confusing for most citizens. She asked to have the record reflect that the same conversation had been held on July 7, 2020 and that she had left the meeting feeling assured the Resort portion of the annexation was dead. She stated she had the impression the Council had wished to make a motion at that point to amend the annexation policy plan map and had been discouraged from doing so. She said the public had been told the Council would not consider the Resort annexation and she was very disappointed to be back in less than four months discussing the Resort. She was also very concerned about the environmental impacts and the preservation of the quality of life for Heber Valley residents.

Maxx Cohen introduced himself as a resident of Moulton Lane and wished to echo Tracy Taylor's comment that he had been under the impression the surrounding density would be much lower than proposed. He stated he had moved to the Heber Valley the past summer because it was a beautiful land, with beautiful views and lots of open space with low density. He had moved to his dream home and loved waking to the views of the North Fields every morning. He encouraged Council to adhere to their previously set density. He felt the Council should consider lower density.

Beth Price felt the Wasatch Back was a gem. She stated the things that drove the tourism and reasons people wished to live in the Valley such as the pristine middle Provo River with blue-ribbon fly-fishing, mountain recreation, scenery and clean air. She felt the Council needed to protect the natural resources and amenities. She noted that Instagram reflected the middle Provo with "fly-fish Park City". She stated a Resort development would require the housing or commuting of potentially thousands of employees. She wanted the record to show she felt the Resort should pay the full property tax amount as it would not be a primary residence for anyone and the City or County should never offer a tax incentive to build or develop in the Valley. She suggested parking lots not be allowed to be included with the open space requirement. Ms. Price felt developers wanted to build in the Valley because it was profitable but it adversely affected existing residents. Additionally, she thought commercially designated areas should not be rezoned for residential development.

Ileana Anderson asked if the developer would be directly responsible for paying higher impact fees in exchange for more density or whether the fees would be passed along to the buyers.

Mr. Michael Mills, Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission, wanted the Council to be aware that there was no current agreement for storm-water processing with either of the developments. He said there were ongoing discussions between developers and the Commission and they were willing to work with the City and the County in order to identify a solution.

Mayor Potter closed the public hearing at 8:29 p.m. She explained the Council was currently trying to determine whether annexing the proposed areas was in the best interest of Heber City. She clarified that the Council had discussed density and developer's entitlements were with the County.

6. Consider Motion to Initiate Process to Amend Heber City's Annexation Policy Plan by Removing the North Village Resort and Heiner Property (Kahler)

Item 6 Annexation-Policy-Plan

Council Member Kahler recommended removing the Resort area and the Heiner property from the City's Annexation Policy Plan and asked for Council discussion.

Council Member Stack stated he had been considering the issue for several months. He was not supportive of the Resort plan but pointed out the property was cost prohibitive for purchase due to the entitlements it had from the County. He was supportive of the lake-to-lake trail and noted he had held a discussion with the County Trail Coordinator Don Taylor with MAG (Mountainland Association of Government). He had learned the lake-to-lake trail was on their long-term plan and the developer was not needed in order to obtain or complete the trail. He indicated he did not wish to continue to work with the developer of the Resort area. Additionally, he did not support removing the area from the Annexation Policy Plan based on the entitlements it still held with the County. He felt it was in the City's best interest to retain the area in the Annexation Policy Plan Map in order to maintain some control of the inevitable development.

Council Member Johnston indicated he was adamantly against removing the Resort area from the Annexation Policy Plan for the reasons stated by Council Member Stack. He did not wish to see the City give up its only bargaining position for the site. He reiterated that development of the property was inevitable and felt the City should maintain its position to negotiate.

Council Member Hardman indicated his agreement with Council Member Stack in order for the City to maintain a negotiating position adding he would never vote to approve the proposed Resort concept plan.

Council Member Franco felt the risk and liability to the City was too high. She did not believe the City was prepared to undertake such a project. She supported removing the Resort area from the City's Annexation Policy Plan.

Council Member Kahler felt it was important to listen to the people and expressed appreciation for those who had weighed in on the discussion. She stated the citizens did not support the Resort development.

Motion: Council Member Kahler moved to remove the North Village Resort and the Heiner property from the Heber City Annexation Policy Plan. Council Member Franco made the second. Council Member Stack acknowledged the merit of the concerns expressed by Council Members Kahler and Franco but reiterated the importance for the City to maintain its negotiating position. **Voting Aye:** Council Members Franco, Kahler, and Hardman. **Voting Nay:** Council Members Johnston and Stack. **The motion carried three to two.**

Council Member Johnston pointed out that changes to the City's Annexation Policy Plan required a Public Hearing. Mayor Potter clarified there was an entire process to be followed and the motion was to confirm direction from Council to Staff to begin the process.

7. Consider Preliminary Plat Approval for the Kimball Villas Subdivision, Located at 650 South 1200 West (Vlastic, Kohler)

Item 7 Staff Report Kimball Villas.

Item 7 pp

City Consultant Mark Vlastic presented the information as attached in the meeting materials. He reviewed the project details, background of the process, and the Planning Commission recommendations.

Council Member Kahler inquired why the issue was once again before Council without the approval of the canal company when direction from Council had been to return only when the developer had said approval for the plan. City Planning Director Tony Kohler explained the City's Counsel and petitioner's Counsel had corresponded and determined it was more appropriate to require final approval from the canal company at the final plat approval stage with the City.

Petitioner Barrett Peterson clarified state statute 73-1-15.5 indicated irrigation companies were required to consent to a relocation of a ditch as long as an equivalent was provided at the landowner's expense. He said the canal company had been provided with all necessary documents. He noted the development had complied with all the City and canal company requirements and was respectfully requesting Council consent to proceed.

Council Member Johnston stated he was very familiar with this type of situation. He explained the point of preliminary plat approval was to give the applicant confidence that the layout, density and street plan was accepted in a two dimensional plan in order to move forward with the details and expense of the engineering process. He felt the Council should not hold back the development based on approval from the canal company, which should be required at the final plat approval stage.

Council Member Franco questioned the 40% open space. Mr. Peterson assured that they had been working closely with the Planning Department to ensure the open space requirement was met. Mr. Kohler clarified the areas included in the open-space calculation. Kaylen Nichols, plan designer, further assured Council the 40% open space requirement had been met.

Council Member Kahler asked if the developer still intended asking price for the units to be in the mid-\$400 thousand market-rate. Mr. Peterson confirmed the intended price point. Council Member Stack asked for confirmation there would be a deed restriction designating the development as a 55 and older community. Mr. Peterson confirmed. Council Member Stack inquired whether the uncertainty over the canal relocation had any impact on whether the applicant had met the code requirements. Mr. Kohler responded it did meet City Code and further expanded upon the preliminary approval requirements versus final plat approval requirements. Council Member Stack clarified the preliminary plat approval was administrative and recommended approval by Council with the condition of canal company approval.

Motion: Council Member Johnston moved to approve the preliminary plat for Kimball Villa Estates located at 650 South 1200 West with the condition that they meet the 40% open space requirement and get the canal realignment drawn out in final drawings and obtain approval from the canal company as well as all the conditions listed in the Staff Report. Council Member Hardman made the second. Council Member Franco asked for the motion to include the condition of approval from CUP for pressurized irrigation. Council Member Johnston stated that was a requirement for final approval. **Voting Aye:** Council Members Franco, Hardman, Johnston, and Stack. **Voting Nay:** Council Member Kahler. **The motion passed four to one.**

8. Discussion Regarding the Incorporation of the Earnshaw and Forest Service Properties into the Sawmill Development (Baron) - continued

Item 8 Staff Report Sawmill

Council Member Johnston recused himself from the discussion of agenda item eight, as his company was involved in the project.

City Planner Jamie Baron presented the information as included in the Staff Report. He explained the policy question was whether the City should permit the Forest Service property and former Earnshaw property to incorporate into the Sawmill Development project. He shared maps to illustrate the locations of the properties. Mr. Baron explained the development had been granted density for up to 622 units and the development plan was for only 607. The additional properties would add an additional seven units. Mr. Baron reviewed the affordable housing agreement and planned amenities.

Council Member Franco asked whether the two-year timeframe had expired for the land set aside for civic building use. Mr. Baron advised the timeframe began upon execution of the development agreement therefore was expired. Council Member Franco expressed concern for the need for the civic building space to be preserved for future government building, school, or church as needed. She proposed the possibility of designating the Earnshaw property or Forest Service property for civic building use if needed.

Council Member Kahler asked whether there was a contract with the Forest Service for the property purchase. Property owner Susan Palmer advised they had been in contact with the Forest Service and were currently having the property appraised. Council Member Kahler said she had reached out to the Forest Service as well and had spoken with the district manager. She indicated he had expressed interest in a property exchange with Heber in order to leave the property as open space. She asked Council to consider alternate opportunities for the property. Council Member Stack expressed appreciation for Council Member Kahler's insight and agreed to hold off on a decision until further discussion with the Forest Service could be held.

Council Member Stack indicated he would be willing to consider approving development for the Earnshaw property in exchange for extending the designation of the civic building space indefinitely. Council Member Hardman agreed. Council Member Kahler expressed concern with negotiating that night as she felt there were many things to still be considered.

Motion: Council Member Kahler moved to continue the item to a future work meeting in order to work out additional details. Council Member Franco made the second. Council Member Stack asked Staff to open a dialogue with the Forest Service and report their findings before the item returned for further discussion. **Voting Aye:** Council Members Franco, Hardman, Kahler and Stack. **None opposed.** Council Member Johnston was recused. **The motion passed unanimously.**

9. Consider Approval of The Springs at Coyote Ridge Final Plat (Baron)

Item 9 Staff Report - Springs at Coyote Ridge

Item 9 CoyoteRSpr SubAg 201201

Item 9 Affordable Housing Agreement

Consultant for the City Mark Vlasic presented the project details, background of the process, and the findings and conditions of the Planning Commission as included in the attached meeting materials. He stated the development had met all the necessary requirements for approval.

City Planner Jamie Baron explained the developer was requesting a waiver of building fees for the affordable housing units. He asked whether Council would like to have the Housing Authority be the deciding entity regarding the determination for a need to finish basements for larger families. Discussion turned to the architectural design and colors.

Council Member Kahler indicated she was not in favor of waiving building fees. Council Member Franco expressed concern with access for construction. Glen Lent, development representative, informed Council of an agreement with Ivory homes to build roads through their property if needed. Council Member Franco asked for the term "rustic" to be defined in the development agreement for the rustic fences. She asked for the agreement to include the privacy fence would be completed with phase one.

City Manager Matt Brower proposed Staff work with the developer with regard to the architectural designs, coloring, and fence style and return to a future meeting. Council offered additional style suggestions for the building design. Mr. Lent agreed to draft a new design for Council approval. Council Member Franco asked to have the development agreement include language indicating the construction access would not be from Highway 40 and the staging area would be removed from the City park land.

Mr. Lent shared the estimated timeline to begin underground infrastructure in February, 2021, road completion by July-August, 2021, then to begin building vertically.

Motion: Council Member Stack moved to continue the agenda item for Staff and the Applicant to work on the issues discussed. Council Member made the second. **Voting Aye:** Council Member Franco, Hardman, Johnston, Kahler, and Stack. None opposed. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Council Member Franco asked Staff to reach out to the Lloyds in order to clarify the fence-line.

10. Consider Concept Approval of Old Mill Village (Kollman Farms) (Johnston)

Item 10 Staff Report - Old Mill Village_Kollman Farms

Item 10 9.1.20 Plan - Old Mill Village

Item 10 PC Recommended Plan - Old Mill Village

Item 10 PP

Discussion of item number ten on the agenda was postponed.

11. Discuss Proposed Amendment to Title 17 Regarding Development Approval Processes (Baron)

Item 11 Staff Report Land Use Authority

Discussion of item number eleven on the agenda was postponed.

12. Discuss Proposed Amendment to Chapter 18.72 of Heber City Code, Parking Regulations (Kohler)

Item 12 Staff Report Parking

Discussion of item number twelve on the agenda was postponed.

13. Discussion Regarding Proposed Amendment to Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations (Kohler)

Item 13 ADU

Discussion of item number thirteen on the agenda was postponed.

14. Consideration to Approve Resolution 2020-10 Implementing Ranked Choice Voting for the 2021 Municipal Election (Mayor Potter, Smedley) - continued

Item 14 Staff Report

Item 14 Resolution

Mayor Potter clarified, for the record, she did not make money if the City were to adopt Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) system, but that she did work as a consultant for the National Ranked Choice Voting Resource Center, an educational non-profit. She provided her background experience with elections and shared there was not negative information posted regarding RCV because she had none. She noted Mr. Stan Lockhart, representing Utah Ranked Choice Voting, had been invited to provide insight and answer questions.

Council Member Johnston stated he liked the system and expanded upon the system's process. Council Member Stack shared that he had thoroughly looked into the system and was in support of its implementation but feared the public may be suffering from election fatigue and he would be more comfortable waiting until the following year to implement to system. Mayor Potter felt Council Member Stack's statement provided the reason to implement the RCV system, as it would eliminate a primary and alleviate some of the election exhaustion.

Public comment from Tracy Taylor suggested the City have a trial run of the Rank Choice Voting system.

Mike McComb, Heber City resident, felt RCV was a solution in search of a problem. He believed if it wasn't broken, don't fix it. The current system of one person one vote was how it should be as the Country's founding fathers intended. He stated the system had been tested and rejected in numerous jurisdictions over the past decade. It reinforced a two-party system with mediocre candidates. It was confusing and opaque to voters. It reduced political accountability by diluting the vote of those who held strong opinions through multiple do-over votes. The end result reduced the power of the voter to have a strong voice in the manner of their governance. Any consideration of cost should be secondary to preserving the right of the citizens to definitively express their

will through elections. Mr. McComb referred to the current alleged election fraud, the growing public concern for election integrity at the national level, and felt now was the least appropriate time to change the election system. He quoted President Lincoln “of the people, for the people, by the people” and asked if Council believed RCV was the best process, it should be put on the ballot and voted for by the people. He provided a list of jurisdictions which had tried and rescinded the system and cited the reasons for doing so.

Mr. Lockhart shared that many of the cities who had previously rejected the system had done so in the very early days (2000's) of the system, before municipalities had the proper equipment to tabulate. He stated it produced a more educated and civil voting process and noted the importance of eliminating polarization.

Council Member Johnston thought it would be good for democracy. Council Member Stack agreed with the benefits but worried citizens were tuned out from election fatigue. Council Member Kahler felt the City should wait a year and discuss further. Mayor Potter shared the feedback she had received was very positive. Council Member Franco thought the public needed the opportunity to provide more input. Council Member Hardman wanted to implement the system.

Motion: Council Member Hardman made the motion to approve Resolution 2020-10, a resolution to implement the Ranked Choice Voting system. Council Member Johnston seconded the motion. **Voting Aye:** Council Members Hardman and Johnston. **Voting Nay:** Council Members Franco, Kahler, and Stack. **The motion failed two to three.**

15. Consider Approval of Life-Size Elk Statue to be Placed in the 600 South 300 West Roundabout (Carolyn Reeder)

Item 15 Staff Report Elk Statue

Administrative Assistant Carolyn Reeder shared the information for the proposed elk statue to be located on the roundabout with water wise landscaping. She shared the bids from three sources, two of which were significantly higher than the Staff recommended selection. She provided pictures of final products and details of the quality. City Manager Matt Brower indicated he had seen a statue by the artist in Jackson Hole and attested to the quality and information provided by Ms. Reeder.

Council Member Kahler proposed an opportunity to tap into local philanthropy for citizens to help with the installation. Council Member Johnston felt the City was obligated to complete the roundabout. Council Member Stack agreed with both points.

Mr. Brower proposed using a previously donated sum of money that the City had in reserve to be dedicated to the statue. Consensus of the Council was to move forward with the project.

Motion: Council Member Franco made a motion to negotiate a contract with Jonathan Labenne of The Bear Man to commission the elk statue for the cost of no more than \$14,800. Not to exceed \$25,000 for the project in its entirety. Council Member Hardman seconded the motion. **Voting Aye:** Council Member Franco, Hardman, Johnston, Kahler, and Stack. None opposed. **The motion passed unanimously.**

16. Finalize Council Strategy for Allocating General Fund Discretionary Money (Brower)

Item 16 Slide

Item 16

Motion: Council Member Franco moved to continue the item to the next meeting. **The motion failed for lack of a second.**

City Manager, Matt Brower asked Council for input for the distribution of discretionary funds. Council Member Kahler suggested front-line City employees needed to be included in the list. She approved of the list excepting Encircle and proposed to redirect that portion to front-line employees as hazard pay. Council Member Stack agreed. He proposed \$125,000 to the Children's Justice Center and \$50,000 to City employees for hazard pay. Council Member Franco asked how the division of the money among the employees would be handled.

Council Member Johnston felt better about giving the money to residents who had lost their jobs or otherwise suffering severe hardship due to the pandemic.

Council Member Hardman was in favor of supporting the Staff.

Motion: Council Member Kahler motioned to allocate the CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security) money that had been moved to the General Fund as follows:

- Wasatch Community Center \$120,000
- People's Health Clinic \$5,000
- Children's Justice Center \$50,000
- Heber City Employees \$50,000
- Heber Branch Christian Center \$75,000
- Park City Peace House \$10,000
- For a total of \$310,000.

Council Member Stack seconded the motion. **Voting Aye:** Council Members Franco, Kahler, Stack, and Hardman. **Voting Nay:** Council Member Johnston. **The motion passed four to one.**

VI. COMMUNICATION:

1. Staff Follow-Up Reports from City Council Requests
2. Designate Date(s) for 2021 Annual Council Retreat (Brower)

City Manager Matt Brower recommended the annual retreat have a dinner with a presentation on Friday night, and training all day on Saturday. The retreat would be January 8-9, 2021.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Council Member Franco motioned to adjourn. Council Member Stack seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.




Trina Cooke, City Recorder

- **The following are public comments submitted by email for the December 1, 2020 City Council Meeting Public Hearing agenda item 4:**

From: Suellen Winegar

Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 3:32 PM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) Heber Annexation of Properties along Hwy 40

Heber City Council,

We implore you please to be very careful about proposed developments along Highway 40. It is tempting as leaders to be lured into approvals by developers that seemingly promise revenues. Please remember once Heber Valley is ruined, the golden goose of tourism and recreation dollars will die. We are already experiencing air pollution in the valley along with a current algae bloom in Deer Creek shorelines. Further development will further increase air and water pollution beyond what the valley can bear and still maintain the beauty of our environment. It may seem appealing to build hotels and resorts, but if "Oremize" Heber Valley, people will not be drawn to come here. Tourism thrives here because of our clean air and water and recreation opportunities. They come for the open spaces. The North Fields are the jewel of the Heber Valley. Runoff from these thousands of housing/commercial units will poison surface and groundwater. Good bye to premier fly fishing, water sports, drinking water, and quality of life

This stretch of Highway 40 and especially the junction with River Road are priceless scenic corridors for entry into the Heber Valley. Development at the River Road junction at all is untenable, but if it must happen, we beg you to do so carefully with a plan and vision for the future. Certainly NOT a resort/commercial/water park. Seriously???? Heber Valley has long been a bucolic treasure, and the thought of turning it into Orem or Draper is heartbreaking.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Suellen & Brad Winegar
1181 W Lime Canyon Rd
Midway UT 84049

From: Carolyn Schneider

Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 12:37 PM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) Annexation of land into Heber City

Councilors. I am opposed to this annexation. A moratorium on development should be enacted until we have proper infrastructure and impact studies on air pollution are done.

Regards.,

Carolyn R Schneider

From: Melanie Seus

Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 12:26 PM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) North Village Crossings and Highlands Development

Dear City Council Members and Mayor Potter,

I am writing to express my opposition to any efforts to increase density in areas of new proposed developments in Heber City, specifically with regard to the North Village Crossing and Highlands developments which are on the agenda for today's meeting. I believe they will have a tremendous negative impact on our already overburdened resources and infrastructure. They will also ruin the iconic open spaces for which the Heber Valley is known. Please honor the decisions of residents who already voiced their opinions and set zoning limits decades ago, rather than be lured by the promises of outside developers who will sacrifice this place (to which they have no personal connection) in order to make a dollar.

While I find the specifics of how developers are trying to work around the established zoning limits confusing (perhaps this is intentional), I oppose any changes to annexation practices, annexation zones, or interpretation/definitions of ERU, that will help the developers' attempts to squeeze in more square footage.

Thank you,

Melanie Seus

-----Original Message-----

From: Emily Willardson

Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 5:46 AM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) New Developments

To Whom it may concern,

Both my husband and I are very concerned with the number of proposed multi-unit housing developments. We do not feel that these types of housing, especially in large quantities are good for our community.

The Old Mill Village has already been turned down multiple times, please do not allow for the property's MDA to be changed. This greatly affects the traffic especially in this area, not to mention the burden placed on the schools. We feel that the land in Heber is already being developed too quickly, but of special concern is large amount of proposed high density housing that does not keep the community feel. Please do not allow these companies to come in and place permanent structures in our city that are not in the best interest of the people of the city.

The proposed Highlands Development is of even greater concern to us. We feel it will detract from the restaurants and other great things we have going for our city. Once again, the high density housing will change the feel of our town. We already have too many cars and trucks on Main Street, we do not need to invite more. Please do not allow these developments change our city! Once we give away the small town community feel, we can never get it back!

Thank you!

Rob and Emily Willardson

-----Original Message-----

From: Meredith Salmon

Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 10:24 PM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) Vote NO to Annexation!!!

Dear Heber City Council Members,

As the parents of four young children, my husband and I are very troubled by the news that Heber City plans to tremendously increase the population of Heber by allowing development of thousands of units of new housing, much of it high density. We see this as a very negative thing for the quality of life in Heber. Schools will become very overcrowded, traffic will be horrendous (it's already bad enough!), crime will increase and access to medical care and other services will decrease. We love living here and raising our children here because of the rural, small-town atmosphere, clean air and natural beauty. Now all that is about to be taken away.

Annexing these areas will primarily benefit developers, and not the people who already live in Heber. The resort planned for the "North Village" area will be an absolutely horrible blot on the landscape that will create noise, pollution and more traffic, and isn't even for the benefit of those who live here.

There are other ways for the city to generate revenue than by ruining everything there is to love about this place for the sake of tax dollars. Please consider the well-being of the citizens before the demands of developers! Please vote against annexation!

Sincerely,
Meredith Salmon

Sent from my iPhone

From: naTe Knight
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2020 3:56 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) North Village Overlay Zone

Hello,

I'm a concerned citizen regarding the North Village Overlay Zone. I'm writing to ask you to end this project and protect Heber as a rural community. The high density proposition will rob Heber of it's charm and character. The low cost housing will attract an entity to Heber we don't need. The environmental concerns are overwhelming as well as the pressure on the City's infrastructure. Please do not turn Heber into Park City or Provo. Keep Heber rural!

Thank You,
Nate Knight

From: Dave Misiak
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2020 2:57 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) North Village Crossings, Highlands Development

I am against ANY high density developments West of Route 40. Especially that will negatively affect the Provo River and/or North Fields. We do not need a resort in Heber - Mayflower development is enough.

I am against expanding Highlands' 393 ERU's on 113 acres approved by Wasatch County Council in 2015. 1469 units should not be approved.

I am for impact fees for all new developments in Heber City to go for the preservation of the North Fields, open spaces, clean water, etc. - but NOT as a trade for increased ERU density.

I am for maintaining the open space and rural character from the Envision 2050 General Plan - not large commercial development near sensitive areas.

Dave Misiak, Heber City

From: Daniel Pokorny
Sent: Saturday, November 28, 2020 10:12 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) North annexing.

Heber City Council:

I disagree with the high density proposals that are being presented on December 1st. This should be put to a vote. Our beautiful valley's charm is being lost to over development.

More 5 store developments is ridiculous.

Please respond.

Dan

From: Katie Noble

Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 8:04 PM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) NVOZ Changes Comments

Dear City Council,

I recognize I'm coming late to the party here but I don't believe the revisions to the NVOZ have been well enough thought out to be voted on this evening. When I reviewed the map being presented this evening, the zones are not clearly delineated. Delineating each lot is crucial to determining value of lots within a zone.

I know the owners of 360 Moulton Lane and when they purchased early in the summer, they abutted the T3 Zone. That light density T-3 zone was designed to abut a residential area and it was supposed to be 3 ERU's that were single family homes. It was supposed to provide a buffer of lower density between the very dense area and the residential area. It was in the Code for a reason. That zone now appears to have gone from 3 2 story ERU's per acre to the twice as dense NV Zone that allows high building heights if setbacks are increased and unlimited uses. This change completely eliminates the lower density buffer between a high density use and a low density residential use that was carefully thought out and part of the T-3 zone.

I don't believe that changing a zone from 3 ERU's single family to upzone so severely to 6-8 ERU's with almost unlimited uses and unlimited heights depending on increase in setback is appropriate or – the manner in which it has been done - legal. I don't believe this complies with the General Plan, I don't believe the numerous changes have been properly noticed to abutters, and I believe citizens should be able to justifiably rely on zoning that abuts residential areas without having it change drastically at the whim of Council. Changing zoning this drastically will put a chilling effect on sales of properties abutting any vacant land in Heber because buyers won't be able to rely on the existing zoning.

Having said that I believe the following should happen:

1. Residential abutters who are impacted by this rezone should have the ability to annex their property into the NV Zone to offset the devaluation of their residential property due to the zone change. It isn't fair to devalue properties by surrounding them with a hugely dense upzoned commercial or mixed use properties without allowing those residential owners to benefit from that upzone by having their properties become part of it. Once a bucolic home surrounded by open space is surrounded by high buildings and big parking lots, it loses its value. It's value should then be in the land which can be granted to it by virtue of allowing it to be upzoned.
2. Any new construction abutting a lot with an existing residence should have a setback of 50-75 feet. Right now the proposal is for 30 feet which is insignificant;

3. The provision allowing the height to increase 1 foot for every 1 foot of setback should be deleted in areas that abut existing single family residences. Heights should be limited to 28 feet along any property line that abuts a presently existing residential lot with a single family home on it.
4. Any new property abutting an existing residence should be required to have landscaping in the area between the residence and the new home and should be finished in the rear so that residences aren't facing an untended lot and the blank back of a building.

Thank you for your time.

Katie Noble, JD
Real Estate Sales Associate
Summit Sotheby's International Realty

From: Trudy Simmons
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 4:42 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Public Comments from Daniel Simmons for 1 December Council Meeting

Council:

Please see attached comments, submitted for the public record, for the City Council meeting on 1 December 2020.

Thank you.

Dan Simmons

As a PhD biochemist and oncologist, I feel that the huge annexation of the North Village Overlay Zone, coupled with the Sorenson annexation, creates overwhelming environmental, social and traffic problems that have not been adequately addressed by the City in their rush to annex and accommodate Developer demands.

Virtually neglected by the Heber City Council is serious discussion of the environmental impacts of its extensive annexation plans, with water and air receiving only cursory and dismissive treatment.

The North Village "Resort" is the worst of the planned annexations for potential environmental and traffic problems. These two problems are linked.

Facts clearly predict a huge increase of traffic into the Valley, particularly by the "Resort." A 2015 Engineering estimate showed the "Resort" generating 22,894 daily automobile trips. Much of this is not from residents of Heber Valley.

Air and water pollution will both significantly increase. Toxic gasses and particulates are present in vehicular exhaust. Particulates penetrate deep into lungs. Gasses have been linked to cancer, and other negative effects on the body. These gases will impact the whole valley. Asphalt from new roads and asphalt roofs will release similar types of pollution.

Increased traffic and roads will not only adversely affect our air, but importantly, our water. Studies have shown that high density areas create polluted stormwater. These pollutants are chemically very complex and include toxic metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, phosphorus and nitrogen. The complexity and sheer number of pollutants makes this challenging to remediate.

Stormwater pollution is also a major source of polycyclic aromatic compounds that can cause birth defects, cancer, and affect the immune system. This wide array of adverse chemicals includes endocrine disruptors, affecting the reproductive system.

Even “reclaimed” stormwater used for irrigation is a source of exposure to endocrine disruptors. Detection of all of them is expensive and difficult to perform.

Thermal pollution is a particular problem for cold water fisheries like the Provo River, which was designed to produce optimal cold water temperature and oxygenation for a trout fishery.

Construction is a huge source of pollution.

Parks, lawns, landscaping, and illicit dumping produce their own pollutants.

Snow storage from parking lots is polluted stormwater in the making.

Large concentrations of humans and pets can cause microbial contamination of stormwater by potentially dangerous pathogens.

SUMMARY

Chemical complexity of stormwater pollution from a huge network of developments, particularly the “Resort,” is enormous. It is tied not just to population density but also to greatly increased traffic. Discharging “reclaimed” stormwater into the pristine Provo River system is unacceptable. This will NOT have zero impact as represented by the Developers and the City. It will have a very serious negative impact. For the City to commit to these high density developments without clear plans for traffic and pollution is negligent. Once granted annexation, developers will hold the City to its density commitments, regardless of impacts on environment and quality of life. The end result will be litigation and irreparable harm to the place we all love – Heber Valley.

-
- **The following are public comments submitted by email for the December 1, 2020 City Council Meeting Public Hearing agenda item 4:**

From: Trudy Simmons

Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 4:42 PM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) Public Comments from Daniel Simmons for 1 December Council Meeting

As a PhD biochemist and oncologist, I feel that the huge annexation of the North Village Overlay Zone, coupled with the Sorenson annexation, creates overwhelming environmental, social and traffic problems that have not been adequately addressed by the City in their rush to annex and accommodate Developer demands.

Virtually neglected by the Heber City Council is serious discussion of the environmental impacts of its extensive annexation plans, with water and air receiving only cursory and dismissive treatment.

The North Village “Resort” is the worst of the planned annexations for potential environmental and traffic problems. These two problems are linked.

Facts clearly predict a huge increase of traffic into the Valley, particularly by the “Resort.” A 2015 Engineering estimate showed the “Resort” generating 22,894 daily automobile trips. Much of this is not from residents of Heber Valley.

Air and water pollution will both significantly increase. Toxic gasses and particulates are present in vehicular exhaust. Particulates penetrate deep into lungs. Gasses have been linked to cancer, and other negative effects on the body. These gases will impact the whole valley. Asphalt from new roads and asphalt roofs will release similar types of pollution.

Increased traffic and roads will not only adversely affect our air, but importantly, our water. Studies have shown that high density areas create polluted stormwater. These pollutants are chemically very complex and include toxic metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, phosphorus and nitrogen. The complexity and sheer number of pollutants makes this challenging to remediate.

Stormwater pollution is also a major source of polycyclic aromatic compounds that can cause birth defects, cancer, and affect the immune system. This wide array of adverse chemicals includes endocrine disruptors, affecting the reproductive system.

Even “reclaimed” stormwater used for irrigation is a source of exposure to endocrine disruptors. Detection of all of them is expensive and difficult to perform.

Thermal pollution is a particular problem for cold water fisheries like the Provo River, which was designed to produce optimal cold water temperature and oxygenation for a trout fishery.

Construction is a huge source of pollution.

Parks, lawns, landscaping, and illicit dumping produce their own pollutants.

Snow storage from parking lots is polluted stormwater in the making.

Large concentrations of humans and pets can cause microbial contamination of stormwater by potentially dangerous pathogens.

SUMMARY

Chemical complexity of stormwater pollution from a huge network of developments, particularly the “Resort,” is enormous. It is tied not just to population density but also to greatly increased traffic. Discharging “reclaimed”

stormwater into the pristine Provo River system is unacceptable. This will NOT have zero impact as represented by the Developers and the City. It will have a very serious negative impact. For the City to commit to these high density developments without clear plans for traffic and pollution is negligent. Once granted annexation, developers will hold the City to its density commitments, regardless of impacts on environment and quality of life. The end result will be litigation and irreparable harm to the place we all love – Heber Valley.

From: Terri Goodall
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 3:48 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Annexation

Dear Council Members,

On the matter of the proposed development at the southwest corner of the US 40 and River Rd intersection, please do not approve the development or annex that area into Heber City

This type of development would not be good for this area, especially considering the proximity to the Provo River.

Regards,

Terri
Midway, UT 84049

Goodall

From: noreply@granicusideas.com <noreply@granicusideas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 2:44 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) New eComment for City Council Meeting - AMENDED

New eComment for City Council Meeting - AMENDED

Grey Caley submitted a new eComment.

Meeting: City Council Meeting - AMENDED

Item: 5. Public Hearing Regarding the Proposed Crossings Annexation, Located at the Southeast and Northeast Corners of River Road and Highway 40 (Kohler)

eComment: I am commenting on the north village overlay zone. I have been fishing the Provo river for 15 years and am very concerned about more development near the river. We need to preserve the river corridor and keep it as wild as possible. There has been enough development in the north fields in the last decade, river road south area. We need to preserve the natural beauty of the heber valley, especially when it could impact our most important resource, the clean cold water of the Provo river.

View and Analyze eComments

From: Willie Holdman

Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 8:58 AM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) North Village Crossings

Driving into Heber Valley on hwy 40 from Jordanelle is breathtaking! Open fields, horses, cattle, meandering streams, the Provo River, timpanogos towering above. It sets the precedent for who we are and what we represent. When I first saw the artist rendering of the North Village my heart snaked deep! I've talked with thousands of people from all over the country and world who envy the beauty that Heber Valley portrays. Infact, the very rural setting that they portray is exactly what this development takes away. The county's vision statement is this:

Through thoughtful planning and zoning, that manages the impacts of growth, The County strives to balance the preservation of the area's highly valued rural and agricultural character with the promotion of clean and sustainable economic, residential, recreational, and tourism development opportunities.

The new master plan from 2020 pays attention to the beautiful open spaces and rural settings that makes Heber City and the county what it is.

Heber City Vision Heber City is nestled in a green valley, brimming with historic agricultural uses, the beautiful Provo River, and unmatched views of the Wasatch Mountains. Our residents value this beautiful and unique setting and are committed to preserving its character while growing and nurturing our City. Together, we desire to:

- preserve the beautiful open lands that surround us;
- create friendly neighborhoods and centers that focus homes, jobs, shopping, and recreation into places where we gather and interact regularly;
- enhance and strengthen downtown—the heart of our community; and
- grow, promote and diversify our recreational opportunities.

By focusing our growth in specific areas, we foster a vibrant community and a quiet countryside—a place residents and visitors alike will enjoy for generations to come

Yes, We ALL value this land and want to "Preserve the beautiful open lands that surround us". This is a key location that sets the precedence for what we value. I hope you would represent the public in this matter and not

let this development take away from such. This land is the gateway and entrance to our homes and also for those coming to visit and spend money in our lovely valley.

Lets not erase this:



For this:



Thank You for your service!

Willie



Willie Holdman Photographs Inc.
Park City Utah

The best way to receive flowers is to grow your own garden.

From: Richard Getz Gmail
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2020 6:37 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) North Village Crossing Annexation Request

To The Heber City, Utah City Council:

The proposed developments along Highway 40 and River Road are inconsistent with and simply do not belong in the Heber Valley.

Certainly not in the manner in which they are currently proposed, especially the North Village Resort and its Water Park or "Cambodian Village" as I understand it has been themed.

I understand that development is inevitable and that many residents may feel that these types of development are beneficial due to the tax revenues generated. Sadly, this thinking is short sighted at best.

The negative impact on the water and air quality and the significant increase in traffic on our already congested roads is simply unsustainable.

I am not well versed in the laws and rules of real estate development. So the point of my message, and I believe my opinion is shared by an overwhelming majority of the residents of Heber City, is that we are opposed to the annexation of these developments and property into the city boundaries.

In addition, if there is anything that the city council and planning commission can do to stop, delay or significantly reduce the scope of these projects, you must do so.

The only way anyone could support these projects being within the city limits, would be because the city would be able to constrain the scope and magnitude of these projects as designed, whereas Wasatch County would or could not.

There is no turning back once the shovels start digging, the Provo River and valley become more polluted and the associated increase in crime, accidents, vandalism, light pollution and overall decrease in quality of life are upon us.

Regards,

Richard Getz

Heber City, UT 84032

From: Justin Crail
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 6:18 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Comment

The recent results of Envision Heber highlighted the communities desire to protect open space. Why is the City entertaining higher proposed densities requested by developers?

The South and North Fields are some of the last open rural space and the City is approving massive developments in these areas without urban/rural transition or other values defined in Envision Heber.

From: Kelley Ingols
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 5:32 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Northfields and Developers

Dear Heber City Council,

The Heber and Midway Valley is a beautiful place that has a quality life of clean air and water. I understand the desire for people to want to move here and call it there home. Many more people are arriving on a daily basis. This is when the city can and I would like to request for them to step in and take control of the vision and growth. I personally rent and probably will never own here. I love living here and have seen growth take over without the vision and mindfulness of the local community from other places I have lived. That is why I feel it necessary to be a voice for the land and beauty here. We are feeling the trickle down of people not being able to sustain a life in Park City through their growth and the amount of money that pours into the area with many second homes. The feeling that once was felt with local friendly faces has shifted. I would love to see that Heber City council truly considers how sustainable it is for this community to bring in large developments. I know you have all the information so I don't need to go there. I would love to see a vision of growth that is sustainable, works on the quality of air, water and creates resources for recycling along with open space for ALL to access. We cannot get the land back ever once it is developed. But we can lead the way in bringing forth and leading the way in Utah that attracts people here for the right reasons. That is to be a community of locals. We need to serve those who desire to make a living here and not cater to those who come and go. It is such a beautiful valley and would hate for it to become just another extension of a ski resort town.

Thank you,

Kelley Ingols

From: noreply@granicusideas.com <noreply@granicusideas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 4:13 PM
To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) New eComment for City Council Meeting - AMENDED

New eComment for City Council Meeting - AMENDED

Lindy Reieux submitted a new eComment.

Meeting: City Council Meeting - AMENDED

Item: 5. Public Hearing Regarding the Proposed Crossings Annexation, Located at the Southeast and Northeast Corners of River Road and Highway 40 (Kohler)

eComment: I only support to give Heber City more control over the project. However, I am adamantly opposed to the proposed increase in units from the original approval. There have been way too many other projects approved that will be taxing our water and sewer systems to the max. We need to be protecting the natural resources in our valley. Run-off is already damaging the pristine Provo river, inversion and air pollution is on the rise and water is becoming more of an issue every year.

[View and Analyze eComments](#)

-
- **Following is the chat log from the virtually held City Council Meeting:**

Chat Log Council Meeting 2020_12_01 23_31.rtf

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 3:59 PM: Hello All!!

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 3:59 PM: Good afternoon Heidi

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 3:59 PM: Trina, Thank you for your incredible effort to get all of the agenda materials assembled and available!

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 4:00 PM: et al ... okay I have this figured out ... sorry Wes

Trina Cooke (to Everyone): 4:03 PM: The meeting does not begin until 4:15pm

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 4:03 PM: I will be back

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 4:16 PM: Thank you for joining us, Max!

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 4:35 PM: Mark needs to come closer to the mic.

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 4:37 PM: I don't think that mic is working in front of Mark.

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 4:50 PM: Erin Hicken, Frog Bottom Irrigation and Landscaping

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 4:51 PM: Certified to test your backflow preventer, 435-671-7214

Trina Cooke (to Everyone): 5:06 PM: Would everyone who is not part of the discussion please turn off your cameras? I believe it is slowing down the meeting program. Thank you.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 5:14 PM: Welcome to Charleston!

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:11 PM: Thank you, Committee! We do appreciate all of your time and effort!!

Ryan Starks (to Everyone): 6:12 PM: We have a great city and I appreciate all of your service--it doesn't go unnoticed.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:12 PM: HI Ryan! Great to see you! Hope you are well!

Matt Brower (to Everyone): 6:12 PM: Ryan, thank you for your great work. Great to see you tonight.

Kieth Rawlings (to Everyone): 6:14 PM: thanks to everyone !!! you are all awesome care takers of our city !!!

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:15 PM: Thank you, Kieth!!

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:16 PM: You've served the City for many years.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:17 PM: Great job, Lisa!!

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:17 PM: Thank you for your great effort!

Lisa Dinga (to Everyone): 6:17 PM: Thank you! I love serving my community.

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 6:30 PM: Sound is garbled

Bethe Price (to Everyone): 6:30 PM: we can't hear Terry

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:30 PM: Very garbled.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:30 PM: Did the Empire intercept the transmission?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:30 PM: Sorry, watching Star Wars lately.

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 6:30 PM: still cannot hear Ken

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 6:31 PM: Well played, Heidi!

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 6:31 PM: turn off your speaker on your computer

Bethe Price (to Everyone): 6:31 PM: he needs to his computer

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:32 PM: Actually, not much time watching because of the amount of info in the agenda. :)

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 6:32 PM: There is still an echo

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 6:32 PM: Your computer speakers are being picked up on your phone

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 6:33 PM: turn down the computer speakers and then use the phone

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 6:36 PM: On the top of your screen, you should have a gear icon. If you click on that and choose phone audio instead of joining the meeting from both the computer and the phone, that should work.

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 6:40 PM: What does 14-30 du/ac mean?

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 6:42 PM: dwelling units per acre

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 6:42 PM: That note of Sorensen trail at top left is the UPPER riverview trail. Lower riverview under the PA-6, O-7 and PA-7 zones. Correct?

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 6:48 PM: i'll email it to you right now.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:49 PM: Concerned that impervious surfaces lead to greater stormwater needs.

Richard Getz (to Everyone): 6:51 PM: This is a thoughtful design, but completely incompatible with The Heber Valley.

Richard Getz (to Everyone): 6:53 PM: Certainly not appropriate for this location.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:54 PM: How much of this proposed park will be paid for by Developer versus the City?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:54 PM: Will it be maintained by HOA or City?

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 6:55 PM: Sorry, that purple line says it "connects to existing trail" but the existing trail is not below (west) of the canal, the lower riverview trail is on the east side of the canal. So, on the south side of the development, where it says "rejoins the canal trail" it will actually be on the wrong side of the

canal.

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 6:55 PM: Heidi, those details aren't worked out yet. Open for discussion.

Richard Getz (to Everyone): 6:55 PM: What is the plan for turning southbound Hwy 40 /eastbound traffic (coming into Heber from Park City) into the development?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:55 PM: How long is the proposed cul-de-sac's that he's showing now?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:56 PM: It seems the Clubhouse would be HOA maintained? Not City?

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 6:56 PM: Do you have a timeline that goes with the phasing?

Bethe Price (to Everyone): 6:57 PM: Heidi - i don't think the clubhouse would be public. It sounded like it was for residents of the development.

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 6:58 PM: intended to be private I believe

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 6:58 PM: Do you have a sense as to timing for UDOT's installation of the traffic light at the main entry off 40?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:58 PM: This map doesn't seem to show the needed buffer and landscaping between Phase 1B, Phase 2 and existing resident. Shouldn't there be lower densities around existing residential to provide buffer to that existing density?

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 6:58 PM: Relative to your phasing?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 6:59 PM: The previous map also doesn't show needed cul-de-sacs next to existing residential on east side. The previous map seems to 'force out' the existing residential by putting streets to that border.

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 6:59 PM: Is that an HOA funded bus?

Bethe Price (to Everyone): 6:59 PM: And this development will fund the circular bus as well? If not, don't sell it

Justin Crail (to Everyone): 7:00 PM: What no splash pad?

DS (to Everyone): 7:00 PM: Where is the parking for all these buildings? The 1000 seat amphitheatre?

Lindsay Cieslewicz (to Everyone): 7:00 PM: How do so many multi-story buildings contribute to the small-town intent of the master plan for this valley?

Is that UVU's plan for expanding Wasatch Campus or the developer's plan? Especially now as UVU is turning more and more to a mission of online learning.

Is there sewer system infrastructure to support this large of a development? Will impact fees being paid by the developer be enough to handle this increase in sewer capacity needed?

mccombjm (to Everyone): 7:01 PM: Even if this were found to be a compatible project, public safety (Police, Fire, EMS) impact, stormwater/sewer/water usage, impact on local trails, traffic impact, hospital capacity would all need to be addressed. Additional air quality impact from increased traffic as well - inversion is a thing here now.

DS (to Everyone): 7:01 PM: Will the clubhouse, trails, playground/park be open to all Heber residents, or just those who live in the development?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:05 PM: What will happen to the 30 - inch culvert from Wasatch Commons that goes under Highway 40 to the North Fields? (Listed on pg. 87-88 in agenda materials) Will it's capacity be increased with this new development? Will the existing culvert be dedicated to the City? Will the developer or City assume liability for future stormwater permits for this culvert?

Glen Lent (to Everyone): 7:05 PM: Has LAI walked this property? There is a lot of slope. Lots of grading. How do you build single family homes on a 35' wide lot with slope? Retaining walls will take up the majority of the lot.

maxx cohen (to Everyone): 7:05 PM: I agree with Tracy. We should not rush into approvals. These decisions will really impact the future of our community.

Lindsay Cieslewicz (to Everyone): 7:09 PM: I second the concern about UVU. My husband is the director of the Master's of Accountancy Program at UVU. They are definitely leaning towards more distance-learning, not more centralized campuses. I really want to know how much UVU's growth is actually fueling this development.

DS (to Everyone): 7:11 PM: Amen to the comment about standard ERUs!

DS (to Everyone): 7:14 PM: In what format will the questions be addressed publicly?

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 7:18 PM: The Moulton neighborhood comprise of larger residential and business lots from the irrigation canal to I-40. The roads which comprise of public and private lanes service this low density area and cannot cope with an increase in traffic.

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 7:19 PM: sorry please ignore until crossing annexation public comment

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 7:24 PM: Tony - lots of mentions of both ERU's and units. Can we please have an apples-to-apples comparison of proposed ERU's in the Highlands proposal before us tonight with the proposed/contemplated ERU's in the county?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:24 PM: Thank you, Ryan!

Richard Getz (to Everyone): 7:27 PM: Would someone please explain how traffic is supposed to enter and exit this development off of hwy 40?

Richard Getz (to Everyone): 7:33 PM: Yes! Read the comments and questions

DS (to Everyone): 7:34 PM: Thanks, Heidi. Important to have more public hearings.

Barbara Boss (to Everyone): 7:35 PM: Well said, Mayor.

Richard Getz (to Everyone): 7:36 PM: Please Mayor, repeat what you just explained about annexation

DS (to Everyone): 7:36 PM: Isn't it true that the North Village Resort did not meet the deadlines imposed by the County, and those entitlements have expired?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:36 PM: I believe that the 1494 ERU's that Highlands is requesting has not been approved by the County. The County only discussed 393 ERU's. The difference is huge and still needs to be discussed and understood by the public.

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 7:36 PM: I agree with Heidi, it's the increase in density that the public has voiced concerns with.

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 7:37 PM: Thank you, Heidi!! You are correct.

Lindsay Cieslewicz (to Everyone): 7:37 PM: Thanks for that clarification, Heidi. That is a big difference.

Richard Getz (to Everyone): 7:37 PM: Please Mayor, repeat what you just explained about annexation

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 7:37 PM: Heidi I heard the 1494 number in reference to units and not ERU's, am I mistaken?

Kelleen Potter (to Everyone): 7:37 PM: Then we don't have to approve it. They are making a request and this council can decide what they want to approve.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:38 PM: I'm also concerned about the Wasatch Commons detention pond that the County required--which pond was to be turned into a park with a trail. It seems the current Highlands annexation proposal turns the detention pond into commercial development along highway 40? I'm very concerned about the high densities next to existing residential, or existing farms. There needs to be better buffers between existing residential and any higher density.

maxx cohen (to Everyone): 7:38 PM: Thank you mayor. We should not feel like we have to approve what the county may have one approved. All county approvals have lapsed. There are no current county approvals.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:39 PM: Ryan, I believe the 1494 ERU's was in Tony's initial presentation. We didn't see Tony's ppt slide in our agenda materials. I hope we can receive a copy of it to check.

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 7:39 PM: This is the first time I have heard about the homes.

Dennis (to Everyone): 7:41 PM: We need to honor the MOU.

Dennis (to Everyone): 7:42 PM: We need to make sure city is not on the hook with the storm water.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:44 PM: I am very concerned about the Resort's impact on the major transportation corridors in our County, especially since it was designed for year round tourism traffic. This will impact all citizens year round also.

APWA Utah Webinar1 (to Everyone): 7:44 PM: The geotech investigation for the Resort was completed during

a period of low groundwater table. It is critical that the groundwater table be evaluated based on historic high level and not the level during a low water period. Groundwater table fluctuations can be large and are dependent upon many factors.

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 7:44 PM: i can hear him

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:44 PM: @APWA: Can you verify what year the groundwater study was done? Thanks!

DS (to Everyone): 7:46 PM: Have those studies been provided for public inspection? How can they be accessed?

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 7:47 PM: Do the county approvals expire?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:48 PM: @DS: Many studies were provided in this meeting's agenda materials.

Anyone can view them at: https://heber-ut.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=1&event_id=843

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:49 PM: @Aaron, the County's agreement with the RESORT (only) is a 20+ year agreement.

DS (to Everyone): 7:50 PM: I looked at those studies from the agenda, but did not see the ones that Tony Kohler referred to.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:50 PM: @DS - ok, please mention this in the public comment part that is coming up. Thanks!

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 7:50 PM: they are combined into 3 files that combine exhibit numbers for item 5

Kelleen Potter (to Everyone): 7:50 PM: @Aaron - I believe they renewed the agreement within the last 5 years and gave a 25 year extension.

DS (to Everyone): 7:51 PM: Did Mr Barrett say that certain amenities would only be available to the public during shoulder seasons?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:52 PM: In the public comment time period you can ask that part to be repeated.

Richard Getz (to Everyone): 7:53 PM: UDOT Overpass? Huh?

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 7:54 PM: UDOT has a long term plan to install a cloverleaf at the intersection of River Road and 40. They already own the required land.

APWA Utah Webinar1 (to Everyone): 7:56 PM: The Resort getoech report is dated November 28, 2006. A geotech review by AGECEC was completed for Wasatch County in 2016.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 7:56 PM: Thank you

APWA Utah Webinar1 (to Everyone): 7:56 PM: The geotech review stated the following.

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 7:59 PM: Barrett already has 20 years entitled with the county.

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 7:59 PM: Ryan, you had asked how many ERUs are in the Highlands development. There are 786.2 ERUs, with an overall 5.5 ERU per acre density

APWA Utah Webinar1 (to Everyone): 8:00 PM: AGECEC 2016 geotech review: "The water levels at the site likely fluctuate a considerable amount over the year and from year to year. ... there is a concern that the water may rise above the proposed floor levels. An underdrain system and potentially land drains may provide some reduction ... "

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 8:01 PM: Thank you Tony. How many ERU's were proposed to the County?

Bruce Barrett (to Everyone): 8:01 PM: My number is 801-557-8237 and I am happy to answer any questions for Resort and Crossing.

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 8:02 PM: I can be reached in the planning office at tkohler@heberut.gov with questions.

Bruce Barrett (to Everyone): 8:03 PM: Dan, Trudy,

Bruce Barrett (to Everyone): 8:03 PM: I am happy to meet with you and your engineer on the stormwater system.

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 8:05 PM: Bruce can you send me your projected traffic plan through the Moulton neighbor hood. Thank you

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 8:05 PM: ron_macdonald_utah@yahoo.com

Bruce Barrett (to Everyone): 8:06 PM: Yes Ron I will

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 8:06 PM: thank you

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 8:15 PM: Like item 4 are we going to have more public reviews for the crossing annexation

Bruce Barrett (to Everyone): 8:16 PM: APWA, all of the constructed resort townhomes will be on top of 3 to 5 feet of compacted fill.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 8:16 PM: Ron, I will push for more hearings and hope the Council will support that.

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 8:16 PM: before further action will be taken by the council

Ron MacDonald (to Everyone): 8:17 PM: Thank you Heidi

RC (to Everyone): 8:20 PM: I don't hear much discussion on the impact these developments will have on the school district. Many more students will require more school buildings. Who will pay for those? Answer: Those of us who already live here and have already been paying property taxes to the school district. Can developers be required to help with the additional costs of more students and buildings?

Kelleen Potter (to Everyone): 8:21 PM: Utah law doesn't allow impact fees for schools but in annexations cities can ask for anything they want and land for schools is one of those things.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 8:23 PM: I would agree that the Resort or hotels should provide employee housing.

Bruce Barrett (to Everyone): 8:23 PM: I agree.

Trudy and Dan Simmons (to Everyone): 8:23 PM: WHY is the City committing itself to such high density development along North Highway 40 without solid, unbiased studies on how it will effect the quality of life in the Valley and on the environment? I haven't heard one person tonight (besides the developers) arguing for higher density.

Lindsay Cieslewicz (to Everyone): 8:25 PM: It seems that the central question on all of these developments is what has already been approved in the county and for what period of time for each project? We need to know if annexation into Heber City increases density for each project, compared to what the county has approved, keeps it the same, or decreases it. Our choices are limited because of what the county has already done, but we still have some choices.

Dennis (to Everyone): 8:25 PM: Densities should remain the same as the county. This is in the MOU.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 8:25 PM: Thank you, Beth. Currently the City does not give subsidies to businesses or new developments.

Bruce Barrett (to Everyone): 8:26 PM: Developer

Dennis (to Everyone): 8:28 PM: I have not heard one person say they are good with more density. When the use of the land changes, it becomes the responsibility of the community to manage. The stormwater needs to be addressed, water quality in the watershed protected and this must be done by the developers, who are proposing changing the land use.

RC (to Everyone): 8:28 PM: Exactly my point about the school impact fees. I will pay for these new students and someone else will receive the benefits. We are retired and have supported the schools for years. We are not opposed to funding the schools, just not interested in funding more and more.

DS (to Everyone): 8:29 PM: Mr Mills, have you had public meetings on this?

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 8:29 PM: Can we have the Provo River guy's contact info please?

Trudy and Dan Simmons (to Everyone): 8:30 PM: Good comment, Lindsay, there needs to be transparency about exactly what the County gave them.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 8:31 PM: Tracy, try this website: <https://www.mitigationcommission.gov/>

Mills, Michael D (to Everyone): 8:31 PM: Provo River Guy?? :) My email is mmills@usbr.gov

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 8:32 PM: Ha, Mike!! It's been a loooong night! Thanks for coming tonight.

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 8:34 PM: Entitlements with County, but with major CONDITIONS.

Trudy and Dan Simmons (to Everyone): 8:34 PM: Ryan, we need transparency on what exactly the entitlements were that the county gave for the "Resort." It seems to be shrouded in mystery. Why is this?

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 8:41 PM: Is there public comment on the annexation map???

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 8:51 PM: Can we see any documentation from the canal company on your remarks?

Justin Crail (to Everyone): 8:52 PM: This development is ridiculous and does not belong in a rural area.

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 9:02 PM: I sure hope the bypass goes in because if NOT, you have MAJOR density next to 5 acre lots in the County.

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 9:03 PM: No transition area of density from city to county.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 9:06 PM: very true.

Justin Crail (to Everyone): 9:08 PM: Was additional density allowed based on the property bordering a bypass road that may not happen?

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 9:13 PM: yes, Justin. I believe that's why previous city council's gave that higher density--in exchange for bypass road easement.

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 9:16 PM: Correction. The City didn't grant additional density for the bypass.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 9:16 PM: I stand corrected.

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 9:17 PM: The City purchased this portion of the right of way from the Giles family many years ago.

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 9:22 PM: But what IF the bypass doesn't get built. We're playing roulette on the density.

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 9:23 PM: If the bypass doesn't get built, there will be a beautiful 82.5 foot wide swath of pasture along the development's western boundary.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 9:24 PM: With a big powerline,

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 9:29 PM: Forest service property could have a few soccer/football fields there. With all this density, I'm amazed there are not fields. It will reduce many cars on the streets if the parents don't have to drive to soccer practice....

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 9:31 PM: Tracy, are you aware the County is looking at the Christensen Farms development to have soccer fields just to the east?

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 9:33 PM: one, right?

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 9:33 PM: not sure the number.

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 9:34 PM: I'll find out...

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 9:36 PM: FYI, the forest service land is 330' by 660'

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 9:38 PM: the Christensen Farms open space looks to be around 660' x 660'

Tony Kohler (to Everyone): 9:38 PM: Not sure of the requirements for a soccer field size

Trudy and Dan Simmons (to Everyone): 9:44 PM: In regard to turning decisions over to City staff, I thank the City staff for their hard work, and especially Bart Mumford, for a very professional and thoughtful conversation. The City staff is in an awkward situation in that they interface extensively with developers but not the public in general. Consequently, I have noticed that hugely impactful developments usually get a "two thumbs up" from City staff. But, as we have seen tonight, Council members and the public often have much more critical ideas and make substantive changes or recommendations. Please don't put Staff decisions under the radar of elected public servants' oversight and public knowledge and input.

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 9:48 PM: Not sure we want to waive impact fees for affordable housing. I understand the incentives to have them build affordable housing.... but on the backs of our elderly citizens on fixed incomes??

mccombjm (to Everyone): 10:25 PM: Public comment on this item?

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 10:28 PM: What about a trial run this year and you can rescind it after implementing it for ONE ELECTION?

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 10:28 PM: You learn alot by trying it out, as opposed to in theory.

Heidi Franco (to Everyone): 10:35 PM: Excuse me, I'll hurry to take a short break.

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 10:41 PM: I agree with Ryan

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 10:45 PM: As a fan of it, I agree with Rachel/Heidi and feel that you may

have an adverse reaction to "the man" changing things given the current post-election climate.

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 10:46 PM: Please wait

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 10:52 PM: February please

Ryan Stack (to Everyone): 10:52 PM: I would ask the City to resume messaging in January with Heidi's idea for the public opinion poll on our website, for a vote in late Feb or early March.

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 10:54 PM: My taxes are high enough, just landscape it

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 10:56 PM: Midway's roundabouts just have a few trees. Not sure people want to see bronze sculptures when they're having trouble paying their taxes, and you have to spend more money for actual infrastructure upgrades of sewer and water.

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 10:57 PM: You spend as if we are rich yet you talk of affordable housing

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 10:58 PM: Jackson Hole??? \$\$\$\$\$\$

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 10:59 PM: Please keep my housing affordable by not spending on such items

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 10:59 PM: I would donate a portion

Mark Smedley (to Everyone): 10:59 PM: With regard to the suggested revisions by Heidi, and discussed by Council, and seemingly supported, I would propose that we look to have the revisions submitted in the first meeting in January. I fear that with the numerous revisions, and getting developer approval, it may take more time than the two week time frame would allow. To have ready for the mid December meeting, the proposed language would need to be submitted by this Monday. Would the Council consider moving this item to the first of January Council Meeting?

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:01 PM: Mike can donate to the cause?

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:01 PM: Why not see if someone is willing to donate

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:01 PM: GOFUNDME?

Aaron Cheatwood (to Everyone): 11:02 PM: Can the public pay the funds back to the city?

Mark Smedley (to Everyone): 11:06 PM: I

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:07 PM: Thank you

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:10 PM: I would suggest you make sure that the Christian Center of Park City \$\$ goes to the HEBER BRANCH.

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:11 PM: What does the Wasatch Community Foundation spend the money on?

Trudy and Dan Simmons (to Everyone): 11:11 PM: Encircle is planning on creating a center in Heber

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:15 PM: CCPC coordinates with the Wasatch School District on finding needy families. And they FEED THEM.

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:16 PM: As much as I love and appreciate our local Frontline workers. This money should go to those that don't have any income and nowhere else to turn

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:18 PM: What does the Wasatch Community Foundation spend the money on?

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:20 PM: Please not the workers

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:21 PM: Not the ones still have an income

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 11:21 PM: WCF \$120,000, CJC \$50,000, City \$50,000, \$75,000 Heber Branch Christian Center

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:21 PM: 120K to anyone is a lot of money.

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 11:21 PM: And \$5,000 to people's Health Clinic

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:22 PM: Stick to the original, it seems fair

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:23 PM: They have insurance too though

Rachel Kahler (to Everyone): 11:24 PM: \$10,000 Peace House

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:25 PM: Can you give to the grocery workers, postal workers and everyone else working

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:25 PM: This should go to those who are desperate because of Covid

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:26 PM: You have insurance and sick pay

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:28 PM: What a shame!!

Deborah Trask (to Everyone): 11:29 PM: I feel you took the money and turned your back on those in needs

Tracy Taylor (to Everyone): 11:29 PM: Where is this retreat?