

AGENDA
HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL MEETING
April 15, 2014

7:00 p.m. Regular City Council Session
Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland Utah 84003

7:00 P.M. REGULAR SESSION – CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Mark Thompson
INVOCATION – Mayor Mark Thompson
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Jessie Schoenfeld

APPEARANCES

- 1. Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments.**
(Please limit your comments to three minutes each.)

PRESENTATION

- 2. Highland Fling 2014 - Ron Jewett**

CONSENT

- 3. MOTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Regular Session – March 18, 2014**
- 4. MOTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Regular Session – April 1, 2014**

MAYOR/ CITY COUNCIL & STAFF COMMUNICATION ITEMS

(These items are for information purposes only.)

- 5. Library Funding Options – City Council**
- 6. ADHOC Committees – City Council**
- 7. Time has been set aside for the City Council & Mayor to make comments.**

Description	Requested/Owner	Due Date	Status
Funding plan for Capital Facilities Plan update and certified impact fee.	Nathan Crane		In Progress
Committee assignments for council members	Rod Mann Mayor Thompson		On Going
Handicap Parking/ Freedom Elementary School	Mayor Thompson		On Going
Elementary School Proclamation	Tim Irwin		In Progress
5 Year Road Maintenance Plan for FY 14-15 <i>Budget for Maintenance Plan</i>	City Council Matt Shipp	April 2014	Plan Complete
Parks Presentation	City Council Matt Shipp/ Nathan Crane	June 2014	In Progress
Road Capital Improvement Plan for FY 15-16 <i>Prioritize and Communicate to Residents</i>	City Council Matt Shipp	Fall 2014	
Economic Development <i>Create Highland Chamber of Commerce</i> <i>Create ADHOC Committee</i> <i>Create City Direction/Brand</i>	City Council		
Improve Resident to Council Communication	City Council		
Website Improvement <i>Ensure Information is up to date</i> <i>Organize and assign an "owner"</i> <i>Refresh the look</i>	City Council		In Progress

ADJOURNMENT

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned duly appointed City Recorder does hereby certify that on this **8th day of April, 2014**, the above agenda was posted in three public places within Highland City limits. Agenda also posted on State (<http://pmn.utah.gov>) and City websites (www.highlandcity.org).

JOD'ANN BATES, City Recorder

- In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, Highland City will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the City Recorder at 801-772-4505, at least 3 days in advance to the meeting.
- The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the City Council, the staff and the public.
- This meeting may be held electronically via telephone to permit one or more of the council members to participate.

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN ALL CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS.

MINUTES
HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, March 18, 2014

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland, Utah 84003

PRESENT: Mayor Mark Thompson, Conducting
Councilmember Brian Braithwaite
Councilmember Rod Mann
Councilmember Tim Irwin
Councilmember Dennis LeBaron

STAFF PRESENT: Aaron Palmer, City Administrator
Matthew Shipp, Public Work Director/ City Engineer
JoD’Ann Bates, Executive Secretary/ Recorder
Nathan Crane, Community Development Director
Gary LeCheminant, Finance Director
Tim Merrill, City Attorney
Shannon Garlick, Secretary

EXCUSED: Councilmember Jessie Schoenfeld

OTHERS: Randall Paul, Steve Broadbent, Steve Lund, Mary Lynn Johnson, David Johnson, Lucy Christensen, Lee Christensen, Stan Phillips, Susan Snell, Jeff Harvey, Kevin Gordon, Cayden Goeringer, Brett Goeringer, Kenny Murdock, Amy Cottle, Lance Greer, Burke Hill, Cindy Hill, Kent Loosle, Jim Golden, Jared Golden, Russ Larson, John Meadors, Doug Cunningham, David Clegg, Kenny Anderson, Dave Hall, Richard Henderson, Christy Henderson, Cassie Mosier, Truman Mosier, Jennie Robbins, Jen Christopherson, Kordon Vaughn, Colleen Jemmett, Daune Shumway, Shannon Shumway, Bob Vukich, Laurie Vukich, Steve Marx, Shawn Blanke, Kristy Vick, Shane Morris, Ed Dennis, Scott Smith

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Mark Thompson as a regular session at 7:00 p.m. The meeting agenda was posted on the *Utah State Public Meeting Website* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The prayer was offered by Brian Braithwaite and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Jared Golden, a scout.

SUMMARY

DRAFT

#	Description	Pass/Fail
1.	Motion: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Work Session 2/11/2014	P
2.	Motion: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Regular Session 3/4/2014	P
3.	Motion: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Work Session 3/4/2014	P
4.	Motion: Ratify Mayors Appointment of Roger Mickelsen to Open Space Committee	P
5.	Motion: Ratify Mayors Appointment of Ed Barfuss and Jim MacDuff to Tree Commission	P
6.	Public Hearing/Motion: Disposal of Surplus Property – Canterbury Circle Subdivision	F
7.	Public Hearing/Motion: Disposal of Surplus Property – Apple Blossom Subdivision	F
8.	Public Hearing/Motion: Disposal of Surplus Property – Chamberry Fields Subdivision	P
9.	Public Hearing/Motion: Disposal of Surplus Property – Beacon Hill, Plat I Subdivision	P
10.	Motion: Determination of Accessory Structure – Lund Property	P

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

DETAILED MINUTES

APPEARANCES:

There were no appearances at this time.

PRESENTATIONS:

- Randy Paul – Economic Development

Randy Paul, former member of the Economic Development Committee, stated the value of real estate is usually viewed from the street level by people passing through. He stated many years ago the City had very few trees, so it is amazing to see the growth of the trees today. He stated the City passed a Tree Ordinance a couple of years ago which states the appropriate size and distance between the trees along with having them be well maintained. He stated the fact that Highland is known as a “Tree City” is an important element of the City’s economic development. He stated the Economic Development Committee wanted to encourage the Council to create a trail system all the way up American Fork Canyon when the time is right and there are the appropriate funds at the County level. He mentioned it is an expensive proposition, but if it is spread throughout the County, it could be a wonderful asset to Northern Utah County. He stated the study from the Urban Land Institute shows that trail systems are considered very high value for real estate. He stated the third element is the physical structure. He explained the City has an architectural control plan for the Town Center and if the plan is implemented with landscaping then the property should have sincere growth within 15 years. He stated Highland is extremely friendly and has a wonderful social aspect that is a great asset to the community. He explained the social aspect can be amplified if the retail activities create restaurants and areas to hang out, which would also create a higher economic value to the City. He mentioned if there are restaurants surrounding an office park it gives the office park greater value. He stated there are

DRAFT

1 already major retail centers along with office space down by the freeway, so the City does not
2 need to focus on big box retail. He explained the office spaces in Highland will appeal to
3 companies serving local people or if the boss lives nearby. He stated economic development in
4 the City is spurred by the quality of residential development and local service retail. He
5 explained the retail frontage left for Highland is very minimal, so the retail tax base will not
6 provide a lot of revenue. He encouraged the City to be friendly towards retail that fits the
7 community well. He stated the next element of commercial growth is apartments. He explained if
8 the City would zone high-end apartments, developers would buy the land and build them right
9 now, because the demand is there. He thanked the City Council and Mayor for their service and
10 encouraged them to be realistic and support good development in the City.

- 11
- 12 • Kent Loosle – IASIS Healthcare, Mountain Point Medical Center
- 13

14 Kent Loosle, Representative of IASIS Healthcare, stated construction has already begun for a
15 new hospital at the point of the mountain called Mountain Point Medical Center. He mentioned
16 their other facilities are Jordan Valley, Pioneer Valley, Salt Lake Regional, and Davis/Layton,
17 but this is the first one in Northern Utah County. He explained they are part of the community
18 and intend on hiring a lot of employees from the area. He stated the hospital will be located
19 directly across the freeway from Thanksgiving Point and it is easily accessible. He mentioned it
20 will have 40 beds, 4 operating rooms, a catheterization lab, and 14 emergency room bays. He
21 stated they are trying to bring other alternatives for healthcare to the area and provide more
22 options for the community. He stated they are working to partner with local physicians and will
23 have a medical office building attached to the hospital. He presented a video to the Council
24 regarding the hospital and stated they are excited to be part of the community.

25
26 Rod Mann questioned if the hospital will focus on a specialization.

27
28 Kent Loosle replied it will be a full service hospital, but the beginning volumes will probably be
29 more for surgery, obstetrics, and emergency services. He explained the closest cath lab is
30 currently in Orem, so having that lab will be very beneficial, because time is extremely important
31 when it comes to heart issues.

32 CONSENT:

33
34
35 *MOTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Work Session – February 11, 2014.*
36 *Pulled by Rod Mann for further discussion*

37
38 *MOTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Regular Session – March 4, 2014.*

39
40 *MOTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Work Session – March 4, 2014.*
41 *Pulled by Rod Mann for further discussion*

42
43 *MOTION: Ratification of the Mayor’s Appointment to the Open Space Committee – Roger*
44 *Mickelsen.*

DRAFT

1 MOTION: Ratification of the Mayor's Re-Appointment to the Tree Commission – Ed Barfuss
2 and Jim MacDuff.

3
4 **MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the consent items on the agenda.**

5
6 **Dennis LeBaron seconded the motion.**

7 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

8
9
10 *MOTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Work Session – February 11, 2014.*

11 *Pulled by Rod Mann for further discussion*

12
13 Rod Mann stated in the beginning of the minutes it talks about the recommended ratio of officers
14 to residents. He stated he believed the original ratio was approximately .85 officers and asked
15 Chief Brian Gwilliam for some clarification.

16
17 Brian Gwilliam stated the original percentage was .88 in 2008; the police department is now
18 down to .74 and would like to get back up to that .88.

19
20 Rod Mann stated he would like the minutes to be adjusted to reflect that sentiment. He stated on
21 page 4, line 17 it should read the Council would like to *know*, not how. He explained he brought
22 up zero based budgeting during the meeting and the reply from staff was if the City does that
23 they lose all of the history. He explained history is more important for zero based budgeting,
24 because they have to look at the history and rethink the services going forward.

25
26 **MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the Meeting Minutes for City**
27 **Council Work Session – February 11, 2014 as amended.**

28
29 **Rod Mann seconded the motion.**

30 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

31
32 *MOTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes for City Council Work Session – March 4, 2014.*

33 *Pulled by Rod Mann for further discussion*

34
35 Rod Mann stated on page 20, line 19 there is a section which reads Mayor Thompson stated
36 budget all balances annually, but should read *balance* all *budgets* annually.

37
38 Mark Thompson stated he is comfortable with that change.

39
40 Rod Mann stated on page 22, line 2 under Parks and Open Space and it reads the Council could
41 explore different alternatives to building and maintaining the parks; but should read alternative
42 ways of *funding* the maintenance and building of parks.

43
44 **MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the Meeting Minutes for City**
45 **Council Work Session – March 4, 2014 as amended.**

DRAFT

1
2 **Rod Mann seconded the motion.**
3 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**
4

5
6 **ACTION ITEMS:**
7

8 PUBLIC HEARING/MOTION: Disposal of Surplus Property – Canterbury Circle Subdivision.
9

10 ** Mayor Mark Thompson opened the Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m. **
11

12 Dave Hall, resident of Canterbury Circle, stated he has lived there for 11 years and served on the
13 Open Space Committee for four years. He stated the Committee went through all 18 different
14 subdivisions and looked at the challenges those subdivisions faced. He explained all the
15 subdivisions cannot be treated the same, but the majority of Canterbury Circle residents are in
16 agreement with surplusing the property. He explained a lot of the residents have already begun
17 doing the maintenance on their own, but this would allow some finality on the issue. He
18 mentioned this is not an attempt to do a land grab on public parks. He stated this property is land
19 locked with the exception of a small access point not wide enough to drive back to the property.
20 He explained this land is not developable and there is already is a beautiful park in front of the
21 homes. He stated he is in strong support of liquidating the property.
22

23 Shane Morris, Original Developer and resident of Canterbury Circle, stated he missed the notice
24 for the previous hearings. He mentioned he was never offered to purchase the property. He stated
25 the easement into the open space area is 30 feet wide and all the property connects so it could
26 hold a park. He explained the property was originally designated as open space for horse pasture.
27 He stated he would be willing to purchase the property himself and turn it into an open space
28 park. He stated he saw the State Ombudsman report and did not receive any prior information to
29 give input on the issue.
30

31 Nathan Crane stated the issue with this property is that there is a water line that runs all the way
32 through. He stated staff recommended 20 feet remains a track that the City owns for maintenance
33 and access to allow future connection to that water line if and when appropriate.
34

35 Tim Irwin questioned how the City is currently maintaining the property. He questioned how the
36 City would maintain the 20 feet of land, if the residents acquire their property and begin to
37 improve their land.
38

39 Nathan Crane replied when the subdivision was approved it was maintained as pasture land so
40 there were no physical improvements made. He stated the Council would need to find the funds
41 for the City to develop the land however the Council would like; whether that is grating it as dirt,
42 laying rock, or landscaping.
43

44 Brian Braithwaite questioned if someone could develop the property under the current
45 Ordinances.

DRAFT

1
2 Nathan Crane replied a specific amount of density was granted for Canterbury Circle in
3 exchange for the open space, so there would not be any additional density allowed on those lots.
4

5 Brian Braithwaite questioned what the need is for the water line.
6

7 Matt Shipp replied it is a looping line which would be looped through the subdivision for volume
8 and pressure. He explained the line is looped in Canterbury with two access points as preparation
9 for future development. He explained if the City abandons this line they would have to put in a
10 new line somewhere else, but the City currently owns the property and already has the line.
11

12 Tim Irwin questioned regarding the difference in keeping an easement or keeping ownership of
13 the property.
14

15 Matt Shipp replied if there is just an easement, the land belongs to the property owner and they
16 can put up fences, a basketball court, sheds, etc. He stated once that happens, if the City needs to
17 do maintenance or expand the line, it would be a cost to the City to move those structures and
18 then replace them. He stated the easement just gives the City the right to put the line on the
19 property.
20

21 Brian Braithwaite clarified an easement is not like a setback where the resident cannot put
22 anything permanent in that area. He questioned if the property stated under the City's ownership,
23 if it would just remain a dirt road with weeds.
24

25 Dennis LeBaron suggested placing a trail on the property.
26

27 Matt Shipp replied it most likely would be just a dirt path for the time being. He stated there is
28 access on 9600 North that could allow for a trail if the City planned it that way. He stated staff is
29 just asking to protect the right of way for the water line.
30

31 Brian Braithwaite asked if the line is designated for the development of the properties behind the
32 area, if the developer would be responsible for figuring out a way to loop the line. He stated an
33 option would be to surplus the property and have the looping go through another property. He
34 explained he is trying to look at all the options, because keeping the property would create an eye
35 sore for the community, but it may be the best choice for the City.
36

37 Tim Merrill, City Attorney, stated the City could place restrictions on the easement with rights of
38 entry and access for maintenance, and to disallow any permanent structure. He explained if there
39 is an easement, the City is facing a lot of inconvenience and expense they will likely have to
40 bear. He stated the City could keep the property for access and maintain it at whatever level of
41 service the Council can fund.
42

43 Dennis LeBaron questioned what the probability is that the line would need to be serviced.
44

DRAFT

1 Matt Shipp replied currently the line is dry and inactive. He explained if the line goes through,
2 and then the line breaks, the City would like to have access. He stated the City would not need to
3 do regular maintenance on the line.
4

5 Rod Mann questioned what the cost would be to maintain the land with rocks or grass.
6

7 Matt Shipp replied the cost would be a pretty insignificant. He stated if the City were to lay
8 down weed barriers, place rocks, and spray the property; the impact would be very minimal. He
9 stated if they place grass, the cost would just be a couple hundred dollars a year to maintain it.
10

11 Brian Braithwaite stated the open space properties are a low priority, so they tend to get treated
12 at a lower level and are not well maintained.
13

14 Rod Mann explained the advantage for this property is that there is a park across the street that
15 the staff will already be mowing weekly or biweekly. He stated some of the other properties are
16 isolated and out of the way.
17

18 Matt Shipp stated he would like to keep 30 feet straight back, so there would be enough space for
19 the City has to put in a pressurized irrigation line if need be.
20

21 Stan Phillips, resident of Canterbury Circle, stated his lot is to the north and the former
22 homeowner to the south already landscaped approximately 14 feet of the property. He stated he
23 has lived there for 12 years and has sprayed the weeds himself and has been cleaning the garbage
24 on the property for years. He explained the weeds have not been taken care of by the City for ten
25 years. He stated the 30 feet will create an eye sore for the community. He asked that the City sell
26 the property to the residents because none of them have plans to put large structures back there.
27

28 Scott Smith, member of the Open Space Committee, stated the concept of open space is good,
29 but some of the neighborhoods were poorly designed. He stated he does not understand why the
30 central park was not made bigger to eliminate a lot of this unusable open space. He stated a park
31 could be placed on the property, but the City has a very limited budget and needs to be realistic.
32 He mentioned the City has a small staff and there is more land to maintain than can be
33 accomplished. He stated it makes sense in some of the neighborhoods where the trail is made
34 optional, to surplus the property and sell it to the adjacent residents. He stated he understands the
35 concern regarding the easement because he has the Central Utah Water Project Easement 30 feet
36 into his backyard. He explained he has a planter box that encroaches on the easement, but before
37 he built it he had to sign papers stated he is responsible to replace the box if the utilities need to
38 come in and access the easement. He stated there is precedent in easements, so the strip does not
39 need to remain in the City's ownership. He explained they are not asking to surplus the parks and
40 the trails, but some of the problematic areas, so he recommended the Council surplus the
41 property.
42

43 Ed Dennis, Chairman of the Open Space Committee, stated the Committee has been working for
44 four years to resolve issues where there have been small problematic parcels. He stated every
45 parcel in the subdivision has a utility easement surrounding the perimeter of the property. He

DRAFT

1 stated at the very least the City should maintain the easement, however, the water line was put in
2 to develop the property behind the homes and not to loop it to another subdivision. He
3 recommended abandoning the water line, since there will be no further development in the back.
4 He stated the cost of maintaining the property goes up substantially when it is just a small parcel.
5 He explained selling this property would mean additional revenue for the City and eliminating
6 the eye sore the open space creates.

7
8 Richard Henderson, resident of Canterbury Circle, stated he bought his property three months
9 ago and lives next to Stan Phillips. He stated his biggest concern is that they have a lot of land to
10 maintain, but not the privilege or right to maintain it. He expressed his concern with people
11 riding their four-wheelers on the property. He explained he does not need the added land, but
12 would like to keep the community looking beautiful.

13
14 Joe Atkin, resident of Canterbury Circle, stated he lives just south of Stan Phillips. He stated he
15 is in favor of purchasing the property. He explained because they cannot put up a fence, his kids
16 play in the street, which causes safety concern. He stated the residents would love to be able to
17 landscape and make the property beautiful. He stated if an easement is needed the residents can
18 work it out with the City, because none of the residents have plans to build a big structure, but
19 would just like to landscape the area. He stated hopefully there are not needed restrictions on an
20 easement, but if so, they can work out a solution.

21
22 Rod Mann asked Joe Atkin if the City decided to do an easement, if he would be okay with the
23 stipulation that nothing permanent could be placed in the easement and if there is something that
24 needs to be moved it would be at the cost of the homeowner.

25
26 Joe Atkin replied it is something he can discuss with Stan Phillips to make sure he is on board.
27 He stated the owner he purchased the property from already put grass halfway into the easement,
28 but there are no permanent structures.

29
30 Rod Mann stated grass would be okay in the easement, because it does not have a significant
31 impact.

32
33 Brian Braithwaite stated moving the grass has an impact, because there are sprinklers.

34
35 Rod Mann stated he would be in favor of the easement if the homeowner would bear the costs
36 associated with replacing whatever is in the easement.

37
38 Joe Atkin stated the only structure he can foresee would be a fence that divides the properties. He
39 stated he does not know if there are fences that are easily movable.

40
41 Matt Shipp replied that fences and grass are not considered permanent structures, but they are
42 costs that the City would incur if they needed to do work on the line.

DRAFT

1 Rod Mann stated Scott Smith is responsible for the cost of moving his planter box because it
2 encroaches on an easement. He questioned if the same rule could apply to a fence if the City
3 needed to remove a fence on an easement.
4

5 Tim Merrill stated the City could record an easement that runs with the land where if the
6 property is surplus and sold, that the owner would bear the entire replacement costs if work
7 needs to be done in the easement. He stated the issue will be enforcement, because people
8 encroach on easements and then complain regarding the injustice of the situation when utilities
9 need to access the easement. He explained as long as the Council is willing to enforce the
10 easement and make the property owner responsible for all of the costs in the future, then an
11 easement would be fine.
12

13 Joe Atkin stated the residents have not discussed a permanent easement, but the concern may be
14 why they have to bear the costs to put in water for the neighbor down the street.
15

16 Rod Mann replied it is what the residents would willingly know and understand when accepting
17 the surplus property with the easement. He stated the line is there and the City owns the land
18 right now, so the City would sell it with that stipulation.
19

20 Mary Lynn Johnson, resident of Canterbury Circle, stated all of the women on the circle are very
21 excited and hopeful that the property will surplus, so they can have the opportunity to beautify
22 the property. She stated the most prudent course is to plan for things that are likely and it does
23 not seem likely that someone will buy those parcels and put houses in there. She stated she is in
24 support of abandoning the water line.
25

26 Tim Morris stated he owns Lot 2 on the very west end. He stated there is some bias, because
27 selling the property would mean he is restricted from using the open space. He questioned what
28 the original intention of the City was when the land was designated for open space.
29

30 Brian Braithwaite stated in this subdivision, the original intent of that property as stated by the
31 developer was for horse pasture. He explained it was done so those who moved into the
32 subdivision could have horses behind the property.
33

34 Tim Morris questioned if that was an idea or the City's intention.
35

36 Brian Braithwaite stated the horse pasture was the proposal from the developer for this
37 subdivision. He stated he was on the Planning Commission, and what he understood was that
38 many people wanted smaller lots, so the City would take a piece of everyone's backyard and
39 create a park. He explained for a City that does not have a lot of parks or funds for parks, the
40 intent was that the open space would help create more parks and create a better living condition
41 for City residents.
42

43 ** Mayor Mark Thompson closed the Public Hearing at 8:22 p.m. **
44

DRAFT

1 Mayor Thompson stated this has been on the Master Plan as a water line for as long as the
2 subdivision has existed. He stated the City needs to deal with the unlikely. He stated larger lots
3 have been developed into smaller lots, because developers saw that they could do it and still
4 meet the Code. He explained there are five acre properties in the Ashby Lane area, and
5 development could occur at a higher density there in the future, so the City needs to be able to
6 loop water lines to those areas and appropriately handle the health issues of dead end water lines.

7
8 Brian Braithwaite stated he agrees with Mayor Thompson that there is no reason to abandon the
9 line, even if it will never be used. He stated it is wise of staff to look forward and try to find the
10 best options. He stated he does not know if the original plans expected the line to go back and
11 service the area or not, but a subdivision may come and need to be tied in, and the City needs to
12 take a look at what they currently have. He explained there is a subdivision two blocks southwest
13 of this area, where six or seven property owners took their backyards and created a whole new
14 subdivision, so it is possible. He stated Highland is a great place to live, so if all the other land is
15 gone, a developer may try to do something similar. He stated the line may not ever be used, but it
16 is prudent of the City to make sure they have access to the line. He stated the most valuable
17 option is to give the property to the residents, let them maintain it, and just put an easement.

18
19 Rod Mann stated he agrees with Brian Braithwaite.

20
21 Dennis LeBaron stated he believes having the easement is a good compromise between the City
22 and the residents.

23
24 Tim Irwin stated he is not in favor of abandoning the water line either. He clarified that no other
25 action needs to be taken by the Council after surplusing the land. He stated the Council needs to
26 indicate that there will be an easement and they need to indicate the size of the easement.

27
28 Rod Mann clarified that if any restrictions or stipulations are done on the easement, it does not
29 need to come back to the Council for approval; the legal team will just look over the restrictions
30 and make sure they are okay. He stated the point was made that surplusing this property is a
31 revenue generator for the City and questioned if the revenue the City receives for the property is
32 larger than the cost incurred.

33
34 Nathan Crane replied it is unknown; the City is required to receive fair market value for the
35 property, but they do not know what the appraisals will be. He stated based on what has
36 happened in the past, if the City receives enough in return, it will be minimal profit.

37
38 Brian Braithwaite stated the City has learned over time how to better organize the open space.
39 He stated some of the properties were so small a lawn mower would not fit back there. He stated
40 it would have been better to put more land in the park that everyone would have benefited from,
41 but the City needs to deal with what is there now. He stated he believes the overall benefit of
42 turning the property over is better than the cost of maintaining the land.

43
44 **MOTION: Rod Mann moved the City Council to approve the surplus of the open space**
45 **property in Canterbury Circle Subdivision and include a 30 feet easement around the**

DRAFT

1 water line including the stipulation that the easement would contain restrictions
2 prohibiting any permanent structures and that any land disturbance costs for maintenance
3 or servicing on the water line would be borne by the property owner.
4

5 **Tim Irwin seconded the motion.**

6 **Those Voting Aye: Brian Braithwaite, Dennis LeBaron, Tim Irwin, Rod Mann**

7 **Those Voting Nye:**

8 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**
9

10
11 PUBLIC HEARING/MOTION: Disposal of Surplus Property – Apple Blossom Lane
12 Subdivision.
13

14 Nathan Crane stated this is a request to dispose of a portion of the Apple Blossom Subdivision
15 open space. He mentioned the Council discussed the issue last fall. He explained the surplus
16 would allow the development of the Robinson property and allow them the additional frontage
17 onto 9700 North. He stated the property will be surveyed to get the exact square footage. He
18 explained there is a trail on the proposed land to be purchased which will need to be relocated, so
19 staff is recommending that the buyer be responsible for the relocation.
20

21 Discussion ensued regarding where the trail would be relocated
22

23 **** Mayor Mark Thompson opened the Public Hearing at 8:37 p.m. ****
24

25 David Clegg stated he is the one working with the City to acquire the open space and build on
26 the Robinson property. He stated he understands that they will be responsible for the relocation
27 of the trail. He explained the open space to the west is very nice, but this area has not been
28 maintained, so not only would it help them with the frontage requirement to build their home and
29 come in from the north, but also help beautify the area. He stated it is their goal to live on the
30 property to the south and help Pat Robinson maintain her animals and property.
31

32 **** Mayor Mark Thompson closed the Public Hearing at 8:40 p.m. ****
33

34 Brian Braithwaite questioned if after receiving the petitions, the staff goes back to verify any of
35 the signatures.
36

37 Nathan Crane stated staff spot checks them at best, but does not go through each individual one.
38 He stated the staff notifies everyone in the subdivision based on an address list the applicant
39 gives the City. He explained if those addresses bounce back, the staff knows something is wrong.
40

41 **MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the surplus of the open space**
42 **property in the Apple Blossom Lane Subdivision.**
43

44 **Dennis LeBaron seconded the motion.**

45 **Those Voting Aye: Dennis LeBaron, Tim Irwin, Rod Mann, Brian Braithwaite**

DRAFT

1 **Those Voting Nye:**
2 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

3
4
5 PUBLIC HEARING/RESOLUTION: Disposal of Surplus Property – Chamberry Fields
6 Subdivision.

7
8 Nathan Crane stated this property has a slight complication. He stated there is approximately 735
9 feet in length with a 24 inch water line within a 30 foot corridor on the open space property
10 which causes a significant issue. He stated if this property is sold the City will not have access to
11 the water line. He explained the City also has future plans to build a pressurize irrigation line in
12 the 30 feet corridor. He stated staff recommends that the Council dispose of the property on the
13 north side, but not the property on the east.

14
15 Dennis LeBaron questioned if an easement could be done in this situation.

16
17 Nathan Crane replied because it is a 24 inch line, a longer distance, and much harder to get to,
18 staff does not recommend doing an easement.

19
20 Rod Mann questioned if the staff discussed the issue with the residents. He clarified that a
21 pressurized line will definitely be added in the future.

22
23 Nathan Crane stated the residents were informed the previous week regarding the situation. He
24 stated the residents asked about easements and staff expressed their long term concerns.

25
26 Dennis LeBaron questioned what the difference is in servicing a 24 inch line as opposed to an 8
27 inch line.

28
29 Matt Shipp replied one of the main differences between this line and the one discussed for
30 Canterbury Circle is that this is an active line. He stated this is the main feed to the City's water
31 tank, so any work or construction going on in the corridor causes serious concern. He stated it is
32 a bigger line, so if something happened there would be more work to do and staff would need
33 more space to dig. He explained the Master Plan shows an 18 inch pressurized irrigation line
34 going in there. He stated both of those will be main lines to service over half of the community.
35 He stated a break or small nick in the line will cause a big catastrophe. He stated he strongly
36 disagrees with surplusing the property on the east.

37
38 ** Mayor Mark Thompson opened the Public Hearing at 8:46 p.m. **

39
40 Lance Greer, resident of Chamberry Fields, stated he lives on the east side and believes it is
41 crazy that the City's 24 inch main water line which is elevated five and a half feet above his yard
42 is in his backyard. He stated if something were to happen to the line, it would flood the whole
43 neighborhood before the City would be able to shut it off. He expressed his concern that they
44 have been working on the process for a year and then a week before the meeting the GIS system
45 discovers there is a main line on the property. He stated this is not much different than the plats

DRAFT

1 discussed previously. He explained if the Beacon Hill Subdivision behind them fences in their
2 yard and the residents in Chamberry Fields fence in their yards as well, it will create a long
3 narrow corridor that will be an eye sore for the community. He stated the property on the north is
4 a no brainer, but the property on the east should be surplus as well. He stated he understands
5 the risk, but the risk will not change by putting a fence on the property. He mentioned people
6 have already planted things on the water line. He stated if the City would put in a trail there and
7 maintain it then they should keep the property, but if not the City should grant an easement and
8 surplus the property on the east.

9
10 Ed Dennis stated when the Master Trail Plan was updated; the area to the east was designated as
11 a neighborhood option trail which made it eligible to be surplus. He encouraged the City
12 Council to move forward on the Master Trail Plan as approved and move forward with the
13 surplus, including an easement with the necessary restrictions to allow the City access, but allow
14 the residents to maintain and improve the property.

15
16 Kristy Vick, former member of the Open Space Committee, stated she has spent a lot of time
17 reviewing these maps. She stated she is disappointed that the land to the east will not be
18 surplus and asked the Council to reconsider that option. She stated the Committee was
19 originally formed to deal with all of the open space concerns and help make the City a better
20 place. She explained the City is stretched to its limits and does not have the funds to maintain all
21 of the open space. She stated she does not understand how allowing the citizens to purchase or at
22 least lease the land would do anything but benefit the City. She stated if the property is not
23 surplus it will be nothing but an eye sore and a corridor to nowhere.

24
25 Scott Smith clarified they are not responsible to maintain the pipe, but are responsible for the
26 cost of replacing any structure placed on the easement. He stated with his property, he has lived
27 there for 25 years and the Central Utah Project has not yet come in. He explained it is important
28 for the City to be able to access the line, but if the City is insisting on having it remain a
29 permanent piece of City property, then the Council needs to find the funds to maintain the land in
30 a manner that is satisfactory to the residents that live there. He suggested having an easement
31 that the residents will have to replace any structures at their own cost, and surplus the property so
32 the residents can properly maintain it.

33
34 ** Mayor Mark Thompson closed the Public Hearing at 8:58 p.m. **

35
36 Rod Mann stated he understands the residents' view, but he would not entertain making that
37 property an easement at least until after the pressurized irrigation line has been laid. He stated the
38 City knows it is a project that will happen, so the City could discuss surplus the land at that
39 time. He questioned what the time frame is for the pressurized irrigation line to go in and how
40 much separation is needed between the two lines.

41
42 Matt Shipp replied he expects the line will go in within the next three years depending on growth
43 and funding. He stated they like to keep at least ten feet horizontally between the two lines, but
44 given the size of the lines it would probably be more. He stated he thinks the culinary line is

DRAFT

1 approximately six feet deep, but the pressurized irrigation would be approximately three feet
2 deep.

3
4 Brian Braithwaite stated if the property were to stay with the City there may be value in creating
5 a trail and maintaining the property. He stated he would love to hand the property over to the
6 residents so they could beautify it, but there is also the balance of meeting the City's needs. He
7 stated one of the main duties of the City is to deliver utilities and that is where the pipe is and it
8 is not going to change. He stated having a trail has some benefit and questioned why it was
9 considered an optional trail.

10
11 Nathan Crane stated the trail was removed when the City did the Master Trail Plan, but he does
12 not know why it was removed.

13
14 Brian Braithwaite stated he agrees with Rod Mann that it does not make sense for the City to
15 move forward with the surplus without having the pressurized irrigation laid and relooking at
16 how the property will be taken care of. He stated he would like to discuss the issue with staff
17 some more and better understand the impact. He stated the City's priority needs to be providing
18 utilities, but the residents are the ones who have to deal with the land, so there needs to be a
19 balance. He stated he does not support moving forward with the surplus of the property on the
20 east at this time.

21
22 Lance Greer stated he fully supports having a trail there, but expressed his concern that it will not
23 actually happen. He stated the surrounding subdivisions are no longer open space oriented, so
24 this would create a northbound trail to nowhere. He stated the residents understand the line is
25 there and the City only needs two or three fence panels wide to access the line. He stated the
26 residents know the risk of putting something on that property, if the City needs to access the line
27 in the future. He stated at the very least, the residents should be able to maintain the property
28 under a lease. He stated if the plan is to have a trail on the open space then the plats to the north
29 and east should continue the plan, but they currently do not as approved.

30
31 Shawn Blanke, resident of Chamberry Fields, suggested further discussing a trail there, because
32 the City needs to leave the area open so they have access to the line. He explained it does not
33 have to be nicely paved, but could just be a gravel trail. He stated currently it turns into a mud
34 hole when it rains, so there would be benefit in having the neighbors take ownership and
35 maintain the property. He suggested having a gravel trail up to the water tank to give the City
36 access along with the residents, and put an easement up to the trail so the residents could
37 maintain the property.

38
39 Brian Braithwaite suggested the City Council go visit the area with staff, the Open Space
40 Committee, and the residents. He stated it would be extremely beneficial because it gives
41 everyone a personal view. He explained they can walk beyond this subdivision, so they can
42 discuss the full length of the line and what the real need is for future residents.

43
44 Mayor Thompson stated he agrees with Brian Braithwaite.

45

DRAFT

1 **MOTION: Dennis LeBaron moved the City Council to approve the surplus of the open**
2 **space property on the north and defer the surplus of the open space property on the east in**
3 **the Chambrery Fields Subdivision until further information is gathered by the Council.**
4

5 **Rod Mann seconded the motion.**

6 **Those Voting Aye: Tim Irwin, Rod Mann, Brian Braithwaite, Dennis LeBaron**

7 **Those Voting Nye:**

8 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**
9

10 Brian Braithwaite asked that within the next 60 days a time is set with the Open Space
11 Committee and the residents in the subdivision for the Council and staff to go and talk a look at
12 the property.
13

14 Ed Dennis volunteered to be in charge of organizing the visit.
15
16

17 **PUBLIC HEARING/RESOLUTION: Disposal of Surplus Property – Beacon Hill Subdivision,**
18 **Plat I.**
19

20 Nathan Crane stated this property runs adjacent to the Pfeifferhorn Trail, and the residents were
21 able to submit affidavits from three of the owners to reach their 80%.
22

23 **** Mayor Mark Thompson opened the Public Hearing at 9:14 p.m. ****
24

25 Doug Cunningham, resident of Beacon Hill Plat I and member of the Open Space Committee,
26 stated he lives up against the trail and clarified that this surplus is not removing the Alpine Trail.
27 He explained this discussion is just regarding the 20 feet on the Highland side of the border. He
28 stated most of the homes have already landscaped into the area and several already have
29 maintenance agreements in place with the City. He stated the Highland portion was designated as
30 a neighborhood option trail last year by unanimous vote from the Council, which now allows the
31 surplus of the property. He stated the residents are excited to be able to landscape the area and
32 put up fences if necessary. He explained they have an issue with illegal motorcycles along the
33 trail and the homeowners would like to be able to protect their children and their property.
34

35 Bob Vukich, resident of Beacon Hill Plat I, stated he does not live adjacent to the open space, but
36 lives just south of the property. He stated once the City takes ownership of open space according
37 to the Development Code they are required to give it to a duly designated conservation group for
38 disposal. He stated one of the requirements for this space is that the majority of the residents
39 have to put up a fence at the same time to avoid a patchwork of fences. He stated the homes on
40 the Alpine side have already put up fences and his biggest concern is that he has lived in cities
41 that have alleys and this would create a long narrow channel which could potentially turn into an
42 alley. He stated it is a trail, so it is supposed to be open, and when the residents moved in they
43 knew the trail was there. He stated he moved in three months ago and lives on a corner with a
44 very steep driveway and explained there is open space on the corner that he would love to buy
45 and build a driveway, but he just has to accept the way things are. He stated he understands the

DRAFT

1 concern with people using illegal vehicles on the trail, but it is not going to change by selling the
2 property. He stated it will just encumber the properties so the trail is less beautiful and takes
3 away value from the trail. He stated if the money being raised does not cover the costs of
4 maintaining the open space, then the City needs to raise the costs to have those appropriate
5 funds. He explained he does not care if he is paying \$20 or \$40 a month if the City has a lack of
6 funds as long as it has a positive impact on the community. He stated he is not in support of
7 surplusing the property to the homeowners.

8
9 Ed Dennis stated the Open Space Committee was unaware of any provision that the open space
10 property must be sold to a conservation group. He questioned if they overlooked the issue when
11 looking at the Development Code.

12
13 Tim Merrill stated he cannot speak for what was referenced, but the Development Code
14 mentions conservation easements. He stated to his knowledge, the City has never recorded any
15 conservation easements.

16
17 Ed Dennis stated that would be consistent with the understanding of the Committee. He stated
18 the issue may need additional clarification, but it may just be a misunderstanding. He stated the
19 Open Space Committee strongly recommends the trail be surplused.

20
21 Brian Braithwaite stated one of the key issues is that the property is parallel to a trail. He
22 explained the City has already put money into the trail that is to be built, so there would be
23 duplicate trails there. He stated one of the considerations with surplusing this property is that the
24 trail in Alpine would remain.

25
26 John Meadors, resident of Beacon Hill Plat I, stated the trail has some significant dangers and he
27 has called the police on multiple occasions. He explained there are ATVs, jeeps, and motorcycles
28 going 50 mph and up on the trail, along with dump trucks driving on the trail as well. He stated
29 he lives by the park where there is an access, so vehicles drive across his front lawn, over his
30 side yard, and onto the City property to access the trail. He stated the residents would like to be
31 able to put up a fence for the safety of their children. He stated it is a nature trail, not a road, but
32 it's a trail that goes behind houses, so if someone actually wanted to walk through nature they
33 would go up the canyon or to a park. He stated the other issue is that all of the homes on the
34 Alpine side have fences and they do not maintain anything behind their fences, so he has to
35 maintain his property, Highland property, and Alpine property. He stated he is in support of the
36 surplus and thanked the Council for their consideration.

37
38 Dennis LeBaron questioned if surplusing the property will solve the problem with illegal
39 vehicles.

40
41 John Meadors stated it will be much harder for them to drive on a 15 foot trail. He stated
42 narrowing the trail may help reduce speeding. He stated the residents would like to at least be
43 able to put up fences to keep the motorcycles out of their yards and keep their families safe.

44
45 Dennis LeBaron questioned if Alpine City allows motorcycles on the Alpine Trail.

DRAFT

1
2 Doug Cunningham replied the Alpine Ordinances do not allow motorcycles on the trail.
3

4 Colleen Jemmett, resident of Beacon Hill Plat I, stated she lives on the other side of the park and
5 has the same problem with people driving on her lawn. She stated they have an Open Space
6 Agreement with the City and have maintained the property by putting down grass and planting
7 trees. She stated people have hit her trees and knocked them over. She explained she has a three
8 year old and caught her just before she was run over by a motorcycle. She stated they were told
9 when they moved in that it would be a paved trail that would be maintained by the City and it
10 was never done. She stated she does not mind that it was not done, as long as she is able to put
11 up a fence to protect her children. She stated they are already maintaining the property and she is
12 in strong support of surplusing the property.
13

14 Steve Broadbent stated he owns one of the lots in Beacon Hill Plat I adjacent to the open space
15 property. He gave his support for the surplusing of the land and clarified that the property owners
16 adjacent to the property would have the first right to purchase the land.
17

18 Scott Smith stated the Pfeifferhorn Trail is officially in Alpine and there is an easement in Alpine
19 for the trail. He explained the property under discussion is just west of that easement in an
20 easement for Highland. He stated if the two easements are put together it is 40-45 feet of
21 easement in some areas. He stated the width of the easement is a contributing factor to the dump
22 trucks and vehicles going up the trail. He stated approximately three years ago the City of
23 Highland appropriated \$17-18,000 dollars to build this trail in conjunction with Alpine. He stated
24 the trail has never been built, and suggested the City contact Alpine to see if they are planning on
25 building the trail. He explained another issue is that some of the homeowners in Alpine have
26 built their fences on the trail easement making it narrower in some areas. He stated he would
27 support surplusing the property to the residents, while working with Alpine to build the trail and
28 asking them to enforce their easement.
29

30 Steve Marx stated he owns one of the properties that backs up to the open space and stated he is
31 in full support of surplusing the property. He stated the land will be beautified and maintained so
32 it not only benefits the residents, but the community as a whole. He stated right now it is not
33 maintained, so it easy for illegal activities to go on, because no one is looking after the property.
34 He stated he does not believe the fee should be raised to \$40 a month, because it would just
35 cause further complaints from the residents. He stated everyone he has spoken to was willing to
36 pay fair value for the property. He explained he talked to basically everyone on the street and
37 tonight is the first time he has heard objections.
38

39 ** Mayor Mark Thompson closed the Public Hearing at 9:34 p.m. **
40

41 Tim Irwin gave full disclosure that he lives in the neighborhood. He stated this has been an issue
42 since he moved into the area, and stated it makes sense to do something that protects families. He
43 stated putting up a fence probably won't stop the motorcycles, but at least they will be able to
44 protect their children. He stated he supports the disposal of the open space.
45

DRAFT

1 Rod Mann stated two of the residents have problems with vehicles driving on their property to
2 reach the trail. He questioned if once the City surpluses the property, the City needs to put up a
3 fence on the park to avoid access for vehicles. He stated he believes something needs to be done
4 to prevent illegal vehicles from utilizing the trail.

5
6 John Meadors stated there is currently a metal post, but vehicles just drive around the post. He
7 explained they go into his yard to avoid the area near the posts. He suggested the City put up a
8 couple more posts to block the access.

9
10 Tim Irwin stated as some of the construction is finished, the dump truck problem should be
11 reduced. He stated he does not understand how people could drive over someone else's property,
12 and agreed that something needs to be done regarding the issue.

13
14 Rod Mann and Brian Braithwaite asked that the access issue be an action item for the Council to
15 discuss at a later date.

16
17 Dennis LeBaron questioned if the Alpine Trail dead ends on the north or is planned to continue.

18
19 Brian Braithwaite replied it currently dead ends, but the trail will be continued.

20
21 Dennis LeBaron questioned if the City needs to discuss the surplus with Alpine because it affects
22 them as well.

23
24 Brian Braithwaite stated the Council walked the trail and one of the things they discussed is that
25 Alpine has encroached on the easement. He stated it is not a full width trail because some of the
26 places are more than 40 feet and some areas are quite a bit smaller. He stated they need to make
27 sure there is enough width for a reasonable trail. He stated it is not Highland's responsibility to
28 cover the additional space because Alpine's residents have built on the easement, so the City
29 needs to discuss the issue with Alpine.

30
31 Doug Cunningham stated the Alpine Corridor is 20 feet wide and the Highland Corridor is also
32 20 feet wide. He stated the Committee has looked at the trail standards for neighboring cities and
33 there is no city that has a trail standard exceeding 20 feet. He stated they believe the 20 feet is
34 sufficient to be a traffic calming measure. He stated the trail does not dead end, it goes all the
35 way up to Draper. He stated the residents love using the trail, but they wish to narrow the trail
36 with hopes that it will help with the motorcycles and vehicles. He stated they are also hoping that
37 paving the trail will help with the illegal vehicles issue.

38
39 Brian Braithwaite questioned if there are any areas on the trail where surplus all of the
40 Highland property leaves less than 20 feet.

41
42 Matt Shipp replied he does not believe so, but he would need to go out and look at the property.

43
44 Brian Braithwaite stated there is no restriction for anyone to put up a fence, so any of the
45 residents could put up a fence at any time. He stated the fencing is not the issue, but the issue is

DRAFT

1 that there is a piece of property behind it that was not being maintained by the City. He stated
2 now the issue is allowing the residents to enclose the property they have been maintaining. He
3 stated if the City can get rid of the cost and the eye sore, which it would benefit the residents and
4 the community, then that is what the City needs to do.

5
6 Nathan Crane stated the cross sections that were approved for the Pfeifferhorn Trail state they
7 need a minimum of 20 feet, and if it is less than 20 feet on the Alpine side then it needs to be
8 taken from the Highland side.

9
10 **MOTION: Brian Braithwaite moved the City Council to approve the disposal of the open**
11 **space property in the Beacon Hill Plat I Subdivision.**

12
13 **Dennis LeBaron seconded the motion.**

14 **Those Voting Aye: Rod Mann, Tim Irwin, Dennis LeBaron, Brian Braithwaite**

15 **Those Voting Nye:**

16 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

17
18 **DETERMINATION OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURE: Lund Property – 11116 N 5500 W.**

19
20 Tim Merrill stated the issue with the Lund Property is that four years ago a variance was granted
21 by the previous Appeal Authority allowing an accessory apartment which is not permitted under
22 the Development Code. He stated it turns out that the variance granted was illegally, so now that
23 the variance has expired; it has put the property into legal limbo. He explained there are three
24 options the Council has; one, they can allow the variance to stay expired forcing the Lund family
25 to convert the structure to another use. He stated the second option would be to amend the
26 Development Code to permit accessory apartments citywide. He stated the third option is to
27 allow the accessory apartment to remain in its current state under the legal theory of equitable
28 estoppel, which means that based on the previous Appeal Authority's decision to allow that use,
29 the City by resolution is not going to enforce the Zoning Ordinance on that property, because of
30 the detrimental reliance the Lund's made upon the Appeal Authority's illegal variance. He stated
31 staff has no recommendation; it is purely a decision for the Council.

32
33 Mayor Thompson questioned what the risk is of going forward with the third option.

34
35 Tim Merrill stated there would be no risk, because the City would be acting in good faith. He
36 stated essentially it is allowing the Lund's to maintain the accessory apartment based on a legal
37 principal. He stated all three of the options are legally defensible, so there is not any liability the
38 City faces. He stated this is a unique circumstance with a previous Appeal Authority granting a
39 use variance and now the circumstances of the Lund's son passing away. He stated the Council is
40 within its rights by resolution to not enforce the Zoning Ordinance on this property.

41
42 Dennis LeBaron questioned what kind of changes would be made to the Development Code in
43 Option 2.

DRAFT

1 Nathan Crane stated the City cannot write an Ordinance for one property, so it would have to be
2 written for everyone. He stated the City would have to allow everyone in the City to have the
3 opportunity to rent out a detached accessory structure.
4

5 Rod Mann questioned if the Lund's were to sell their home, if the new owner would be able to
6 rent out the accessory structure or if the variance ends when they sell their property.
7

8 Tim Merrill replied that if the Council chooses Option 3, it would pertain to every subsequent
9 land owner. He explained if they decide to rent the property out, they would have the ability to
10 do so indefinitely. He stated the City cannot give preferential treatment to the Lund's, so if the
11 Council chooses not to enforce the Accessory Apartment Ordinance on this property it will run
12 with the land. He stated if the Council does not want the accessory structure rented out in the
13 future, they would need to choose Option 1.
14

15 Rod Mann clarified that under Option 1 no one would be allowed to live in the accessory
16 structure.
17

18 Mayor Thompson questioned what the desire is of the Lund family.
19

20 Steven Lund replied it would be their desire to rent out the property. He stated the extended
21 family was donating money to pay for his brother's rent so the Lund family could meet their
22 financial obligations with the mortgage. He stated they had planned to take care of his brother for
23 thirty or so years, and now they are not financially able to support the structure without renting it
24 out.
25

26 Mayor Thompson clarified that there is adequate off street parking to accommodate the facility.
27

28 Brian Braithwaite stated he is not in favor of opening the option up to the whole City. He stated
29 in this situation the family built this accessory structure in good faith, it has sufficient parking,
30 and the intent was for the right purpose. He stated the City cannot create an amendment to the
31 Code that pertains to just the Lund family, so the best option would be to adopt a Resolution
32 specific for this property. He stated the Lund's believed they would have the structure for Scott
33 Lund for quite a few more years. He stated although the variance that was given was illegal, it
34 was appropriate for the circumstances that were there. He stated he is in favor of passing the
35 Resolution found in the agenda and moving forward with the proposal.
36

37 Dennis LeBaron stated he is in favor of Option 3 based on the conditions that have been
38 discussed.
39

40 **MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the Resolution of the City of**
41 **Highland for the purpose of recognizing and confirming a prior land use decision by the**
42 **Highland City Appeal Authority as indicated in the Resolution written in the Amended**
43 **Agenda.**
44

45 **Rod Mann seconded the motion.**

DRAFT

1 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

2
3 ** Mayor Thompson called for a recess at 10:04 p.m., meeting reconvened at 10:12 p.m. **

4
5 **CITY COUNCIL/MAYOR & COMMUNICATION ITEMS:**

6
7 Rod Mann stated the Ordinance was passed at the previous meeting which restricted the building
8 use for the City Hall until nine Monday-Fridays or six on Saturdays. He stated he would like to
9 have it amended so if there is a Council or staff member in a meeting, they would not have to
10 leave when the library leaves. He stated he wanted to use the multi-purpose room for a caucus
11 meeting and they could not because of the nine o'clock rule.

12
13 Tim Irwin stated he is working on the Proclamation for the school class that took first at State in
14 their First Lego League and is very close to having it finished. He stated he did not see it on the
15 "To Do List" and questioned if it needs to be placed there.

16
17 Jody Bates stated she has it on a "To Do List" on an agenda, so she is keeping track of it and is
18 just waiting for the information from Tim Irwin.

19
20 Dennis LeBaron stated he believes the Council and staff made a lot of progress at the last work
21 session. He questioned if visible due dates should be set for the goals and if so, where an
22 appropriate place would be to make them visible.

23
24 Rod Mann stated he would be okay with any of the goals that had action items tied to them being
25 placed on the "To Do List" as well.

26
27 Brian Braithwaite stated he agrees with Dennis LeBaron. He stated one of the nice things with
28 the current agenda is that it has a clear description of what items the Council is waiting on, who
29 owns the item, and the status. He stated he is in favor of having the goals pulled out and if they
30 don't have a due date, then leave it blank, and get a due date and owner for those items.

31
32 Jody Bates stated she will put what she has on the "To Do List" and then the Council and staff
33 can continue to add to the list.

- 34
35
 - Haskett Setbacks – Nathan Crane, Community Development Director

36
37 Nathan Crane stated Tim Irwin asked that this item to be replaced on the agenda. He asked the
38 Council what they would like staff to do with the issue.

39
40 Tim Irwin stated he was looking at all the background material, but did not see anything that
41 differentiated between a normal lot and a corner lot.

42
43 Nathan Crane replied when it is a corner lot both the side and front yards need to meet the front
44 yard setbacks.

DRAFT

1 Tim Irwin stated the City has already made some setback changes that the Haskett family could
2 fall into.

3
4 Dennis LeBaron stated the Haskett family fell into the 25 foot setback, but they are asking for 22
5 feet. He stated from a 50,000 foot viewpoint, he is not in favor of changing the setbacks for the
6 whole City. He questioned if there was a way to legally grant a variance for the family.

7
8 Tim Merrill stated the Council does not have the ability to grant a variance. He stated they would
9 have to go to the Appeal Authority, which the Haskett family did and were denied. He stated
10 even though it is just a three foot difference, if the City sets minimum setbacks and then makes
11 exceptions, those setbacks no longer set a standard. He stated the Appeal Authority can issue a
12 variance and reduce the setback requirement if five standards are met, for example, unique
13 circumstances and undue hardship. He stated the Appeal Authority went through the criteria and
14 found that the Haskett's did not qualify for a variance.

15
16 Dennis LeBaron questioned who the Appeal Authority is and clarified that the Council has no
17 jurisdiction over the Appeal Authority.

18
19 Nathan Crane stated his name is Vaughn Pickell and he is a City Attorney and specialized in land
20 use. He stated State law defines how a City can and cannot grant variances. He stated Vaughn
21 Pickell takes what the State law outlines and analysis their request and sees if it complies with
22 State law. He stated if it does, he will grant the variance, and if it does not, he cannot grant the
23 variance.

24
25 Tim Irwin clarified that because their frontage is 110-130 feet, they are required to have a 25 foot
26 setback. He questioned why a 25 foot setback is good and a 20 foot setback is bad.

27
28 Nathan Crane replied that those are the standards the Council chose to make at that time. He
29 stated it is a community value issue that deals with open space between houses, distance between
30 structures, how big yards are, etc.

31
32 Tim Irwin stated this is a family that has a home and needs an extra three feet for an addition that
33 does not negatively impact anyone and they cannot do it because the Council loves to control
34 everyone's behavior.

35
36 Dennis LeBaron stated it could impact people because the Council would have to change the
37 Setback Ordinance for the whole City.

38
39 Tim Irwin stated there are areas that have 10 foot setbacks and it works, but because the
40 Haskett's have a larger lot, they need to have 25 feet.

41
42 Brian Braithwaite questioned why the City would change the Development Code for the open
43 space areas, but not for everywhere else in the City. He stated there are homes in the R-1-40
44 Zone that have 110 foot frontage, so it would have the same rational as the open space. He stated
45 he is not interested in changing the setbacks for the whole City for an immediate decision. He

DRAFT

1 stated if the Council would like to spend some time and go over it and have the Planning
2 Commission go through it, that's fine. He explained the family could do the addition today, but
3 they are choosing not to build, because they do not like the way the City told them they could
4 build it.

5
6 Tim Irwin stated it is their property so they should be able to build it the way they like.

7
8 Brian Braithwaite stated the City does not allow them to put a gas station or a 200 foot building
9 on their property. He stated the City has a lot of restrictions to benefit the City as a whole. He
10 stated the City has regulations to keep people from abusing things that would impact their
11 neighbors, their health and safety, and they are community standards that make Highland look
12 the way it does.

13
14 Tim Irwin stated some open space lots can have a 10 foot rear setback and some require a 30 foot
15 setback. He questioned why it is appropriate to have a 10 foot setback on a smaller lot, but not on
16 a larger one.

17
18 Nathan Crane stated they did that because the lots in those subdivisions are smaller than what the
19 Haskett's have. He stated it is a style of development to have smaller setbacks on smaller lots.
20 He stated Highland Hills has very small setbacks and there are decks that go almost to the
21 property lines. He stated it creates a lot of issues for the City in enforcement and keeping decks
22 out of the public utility easements.

23
24 Mayor Thompson stated there has to be separation between the homes for fire safety during
25 windy conditions.

26
27 Tim Irwin questioned if it a safety reason, then why it is not 30 feet everywhere.

28
29 Mayor Thompson replied if it was up to him it would be 30 feet throughout the City. He stated
30 the distance requirements used to be set up so there would be 25 feet between homes, 15 on one
31 side and 10 on the other. He stated the City adopted the County's Ordinance and did not follow it
32 so some subdivisions were letting them build 15 feet away on either side. He stated if it is not
33 strongly enforced it causes serious problems. He explained if the City starts reducing the
34 easements they will continue to be reduced until homes are built up against the property lines. He
35 stated the lot needs to accommodate the size of the home.

36
37 Rod Mann stated he is fine with relooking at the setbacks in general and have the Planning
38 Commission take a look at the setbacks as a whole, but not as an immediate decision for one
39 family.

40
41 Brian Braithwaite stated he is okay with discussing why the City has the setbacks it does, but
42 stated he is not interested in dealing with an open space discussion when it is something that
43 might as well be done everywhere. He stated if it is going to be done everywhere then the
44 Council needs to have a Master Plan discussion.

DRAFT

1 Tim Irwin stated he believes it is an issue that applies more to open space subdivisions, rather
2 than the rest of the City, because they have the smaller lots. He stated when there are bigger lots
3 people do not want to put their houses up against the property line.
4

5 Brian Braithwaite stated the Haskett's lot could easily fit within an R-1-20 Zone.
6

7 Mayor Thompson stated the City sets standards and everyone has to live with the standards and
8 make those standards available to everyone else.
9

10 Tim Irwin stated the Council needs to make sure that the standards they set are based on reason.
11 He stated the City will set standards and control other people's behavior, but it is just a matter of
12 how far the City goes.
13

14 Brian Braithwaite stated that is half of it, but the other half is when rules are set and someone
15 chooses to live under those rules, and then decides they want to change the rules, even though
16 everyone else likes the rules. He stated the Haskett family chose to purchase a home under those
17 rules.
18

19 Nathan Crane stated the City owns two parcels on the way up to the American Fork Canyon and
20 the adjacent parcel is owned by a private property owner. He stated the property owner has asked
21 the City if they would be interested in accepting the property for no cost other than paying the
22 property tax. He stated he owes almost \$10,000 in property taxes and the City would be
23 responsible for the taxes if they want it. He stated there is very limited development potential for
24 the property and he is also talking to Cedar Hills regarding the donation. He questioned if the
25 Council has any interest in having further discussions regarding the parcel.
26

27 Discussion ensued regarding where the parcel was located.
28

29 The Council stated they were not in favor of accepting the property.
30
31

32 ADJOURNMENT

33
34 **MOTION: Brian Braithwaite moved to adjourn.**
35

36 **Rod Mann seconded the motion.**
37 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**
38

39 Meeting adjourned at 10:42 p.m.
40
41
42

43 _____
44 JoD'Ann Bates, City Recorder
45

Date Approved: April 1, 2014

DRAFT

MINUTES
HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, April 1, 2014

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland, Utah 84003

PRESENT: Mayor Mark Thompson, Conducting
 Councilmember Brian Braithwaite
 Councilmember Rod Mann (via Telephone)
 Councilmember Tim Irwin
 Councilmember Dennis LeBaron
 Councilmember Jessie Schoenfeld

STAFF PRESENT: Aaron Palmer, City Administrator
 Matthew Shipp, Public Work Director/ City Engineer
 JoD'Ann Bates, Executive Secretary/ Recorder
 Nathan Crane, Community Development Director
 Gary LeCheminant, Finance Director
 Tim Merrill, City Attorney
 Shannon Garlick, Secretary

EXCUSED:

OTHERS: Vickie Pincock, Larry Pincock, Ammon Smith, Mitchell Martin, Nick Eldredge, Drew Aarnold, Marcus Graham, Matthew Hoffman, Jim Tullis, David Koch, Nick Koch, Sawyer Adams, Jaxon Smith, Doug Graham, Steve Arnold, Ethan Flitton, Marty Beaumont, Neal Fraser, Ed Barfuss.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Mark Thompson as a regular session at 7:03 p.m. The meeting agenda was posted on the *Utah State Public Meeting Website* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The prayer was offered by Dennis LeBaron and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Ammon Smith, a scout.

SUMMARY

#	Description	Pass/Fail
1.	Motion: Ratify the Mayors Appointment of Kristi Vick to the Open Space Committee	P
2.	Motion: Ratify the Mayors Appointment of Scott Smith to the Library Board	P
3.	Ordinance: Amend Municipal Code 15.04.010, Adopting State Construction Code	P

DRAFT

4.	Motion: Final Plat Approval for Pincock Estates	P
5.	Ordinance: Amend Chapters 12.30 & 13.31, Removal of Neighborhood Trails	P

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

APPEARANCES:

There were no appearances at this time.

CONSENT:

MOTION: Ratify the Mayor’s Appointment of a member to the Open Space Committee – Kristi Vick.

MOTION: Ratify the Mayor’s Appointment of a member to the Library Board – Scott Smith.

ORDINANCE: Amend the Highland City Municipal Code 15.04.010 – Adopting the State Construction Codes.
Pulled by Tim Irwin for further discussion.

MOTION: **Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the consent items on the agenda.**

Jessie Schoenfeld seconded the motion.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.

ORDINANCE: Amend the Highland City Municipal Code 15.04.010 – Adopting the State Construction Codes.
Pulled by Tim Irwin for further discussion.

Tim Irwin stated the City needs to approve the codes, but he would like to understand what the impact would be to the City when adopting those codes before approving them.

Nathan Crane stated every three years the International Code Council amends the codes to address issues that have risen over the last three years. He stated the Utah State Legislature has identified these codes as the ones they want the cities to use. He explained they go through a process where they review it and apply State amendments that apply specifically to the state and are adopted statewide. He stated most of the builders the City deals with are already following the code, because all of the other cities are requiring this as well. He stated there is not a huge impact; it does not change the fees or anything along those lines. He stated there may be some minor differences in construction standards to make the buildings safer.

Tim Irwin questioned if the Code Council highlights the specific changes when they give the code amendments to the cities. He stated if so, he would like to have the changes presented to the Council.

DRAFT

1
2 Nathan Crane replied staff has a version that highlights the changes that they can provide for the
3 Council. He stated the changes only apply to new construction.
4

5 Tim Irwin suggested the item be continued to the next meeting, so the Council has time to read
6 over the changes.
7

8 Nathan Crane stated the Council can continue the item to the next meeting, but the City is
9 obligated to pass the item. He stated staff is happy to provide the changes to the Council, but
10 stated he does not understand what the City gains from waiting. He stated in this case, there is a
11 State Committee, made up of building officials that go through the code and make the
12 appropriate changes.
13

14 Tim Irwin stated he is not opposed to the changes; he would just like to understand them before
15 approving it.
16

17 Brian Braithwaite stated the Council is responsible to help the individual residents understand
18 the changes. He stated in an effort to be more transparent, the City needs to make sure the
19 residents know where they can get access to the updated information. He stated the residents
20 have to hire someone who follows these changes or build a home with these changes, so they
21 need to know how to access them. He stated there is currently a copy in the library and explained
22 he talked to staff to see if the City could get an electronic version.
23

24 Nathan Crane stated staff is looking into the possibilities of an electronic version. He stated the
25 Public Codes Website has the information, but he would like to make sure it has everything and
26 then the City can post a link to the website.
27

28 Brian Braithwaite stated part of the motion needs to have a publication on the website pointing
29 the residents to the State. He stated the City is adopting these changes, because the State
30 approved them, so the City needs to give the residents access to where the State approved the
31 changes. He stated the residents can get the Code from to the library, from City staff, or from an
32 electronic version on the website. He stated Jody Bates has put the Code on the website, so any
33 resident of Highland can get access to those books. He stated they need to fix how the residents
34 reach the information on the website, because there has been confusion with the residents, but at
35 least the information is there. He stated he is in favor of accepting the amendments, because if
36 there are things the City does not agree with, they can make amendments when need be.
37

38 Tim Irwin clarified the changes apply to all new construction, including remodels and new
39 homes.
40

41 Brian Braithwaite clarified the Council does not need to change the Ordinance every time there
42 is a revision. He clarified that whatever is adopted by the International and the State is
43 automatically included in the Ordinance.
44

DRAFT

1 **MOTION: Brian Braithwaite moved the City Council to approve Ordinance O-2014-*** as**
2 **written as an Ordinance of Highland City amending Title 15 Building and Construction of**
3 **the Highland City Municipal Code by Amending Chapter 15.04 Construction Codes to be**
4 **adopted; as well as direct staff to clearly identify where the Code can be found at the State**
5 **through a link on the website, and direct any resident that they can get access to the Code**
6 **in the City Library or through City staff, and if possible, the City will put a link to a**
7 **electronic version on the website.**

8
9 **Jessie Schoenfeld seconded the motion.**

10 **Those Voting Aye: Brian Braithwaite, Dennis LeBaron, Jessie Schoenfeld, Rod Mann**

11 **Those Voting Nye: Tim Irwin**

12 **Motion carried.**

13
14
15 **ACTION ITEMS:**

16
17 **MOTION: Final Plat Approval Pincock Estates – 10215 North Alpine Highway.**

18
19 Nathan Crane stated this is a request for final plat approval for a five lot subdivision just off Sr-
20 74 and 100 East. He stated the subdivision was originally approved in 2008 and it has since
21 expired, so it is now being brought back to the Council for approval. He stated it meets all of the
22 City's standards and requirements and staff is recommending approval with the stipulations
23 specified in the staff report.

24
25 Dennis LeBaron questioned what the current wall requirements are against the Alpine Highway.

26
27 Nathan Crane stated they currently require a theme wall, which is up to the applicant to design.
28 He stated the wall must be concrete or another durable material.

29
30 Brian Braithwaite stated he is in favor of approval. He stated they have already gone through a
31 lot of scrutiny with the process and he does not see any further changes being made. He stated
32 this will be a great addition to the City and the stipulations were well thought out.

33
34 **MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the Final Plat for Pincock Estates**
35 **– 10215 North Alpine Highway.**

36
37 **Dennis LeBaron seconded the motion.**

38 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

39
40
41 **ORDINANCE: Amend Chapter 12.30 & Chapter 12.31 of the Highland City Municipal Code –**
42 **Removal of a Neighborhood Option Trail and Designation of Open Space Property for**
43 **Disposal.**

DRAFT

1 Nathan Crane stated this is a request from the Open Space Committee to clarify the requirements
2 for the disposal of open space property and removal of a neighborhood option trail. He stated
3 there are two sections that the amendment addresses. He explained it removes the lease
4 agreement option that was originally built into the Ordinance and makes one other minor
5 correction.

6
7 Brian Braithwaite explained that because of the ruling from the legal team and the ombudsman,
8 the City can move forward with selling the property. He stated the proposed changes are just to
9 clear out any question of leasing the property and things that would cause confusion. He stated
10 the intent is to have the Open Space Committee members go to each of the subdivisions and talk
11 to the residents, show them the code, and show them the steps in a clean easy process.

12
13 **MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the amendment to Chapter 12.30**
14 **& 12.31 of the Highland City Municipal Code – Removal of a Neighborhood Option Trail**
15 **and Designation of Open Space Property for Disposal.**

16
17 **Jessie Schoenfeld seconded the motion.**

18 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

19
20
21 **MAYOR/CITY COUNCIL & STAFF COMMUNICATION ITEMS:**

- 22
23 • Appraisal Methodology Discussion – Nathan Crane, Community Development Director

24
25 Nathan Crane stated he wanted to discuss the methodology the appraiser is proposing to use for
26 the disposal of open space property. He stated it is different than appraising a home, because they
27 do not have comparables. He stated the City is trying to establish a base price for land, regardless
28 of which house is built on the land. He explained the appraisal will be visiting each site looking
29 for surrounding properties to use as comparables. He stated they are trying to determine how
30 much extra a person is paying for extra square footage on a lot to determine the value of the extra
31 land.

32
33 Brian Braithwaite questioned if the appraiser is going to look at the land as useable or not
34 useable property or just set a flat price.

35
36 Nathan Crane stated yes, the appraiser will look at how well they can utilize the property. He
37 gave an example: Lot 1 and Lot 2 are vacant land and have slightly different square footage, so
38 they will look at what the sale price was for each, what the difference was, and what the marginal
39 price is for square footage. He stated the Beacon Hill Subdivision should be easy, because there
40 are vacant lots that have been purchased recently. He stated the City may have to go back into
41 the history for some of the subdivisions, like Canterbury, that have existed for quite some time.
42 He explained the appraiser will try to get as many examples as they can from the subdivision and
43 then take the mean and medium figures from the comparisons to establish a fair price. He stated
44 they are going to throw out outliers and try to deal with today's numbers, instead of numbers at
45 the peak of the market. He stated the reason he wanted to bring the methodology before the

DRAFT

1 Council, is in case someone wants to get another appraisal for the property, then everyone
2 understands the appraiser is doing the same approach.

3
4 Brian Braithwaite questioned if this is a common methodology for an appraisal.

5
6 Nathan Crane stated when the City did this two other times because they were trying to establish
7 a right-of-way value and establish the value for additional property, it was hard because there
8 was no vacant land to compare the property to. He mentioned farm land has a different value
9 than this, so this approach actually reflects the true value of the land, based on a comparable that
10 is reflected in reality.

11
12 Dennis LeBaron questioned if there were any weighing factors the staff considers, for example,
13 the type of land.

14
15 Nathan Crane replied yes, the appraisers will weigh those factors when doing their site
16 inspections. He stated out of the four properties, Apple Blossom will probably weight the lowest,
17 because it is just adjacent to the right-of-way. He stated in Canterbury Circle there may be values
18 that are a little higher, because people can add an acre to their property as opposed to adding
19 1,000 square feet.

20
21 Dennis LeBaron questioned if they are averaging the cost across the subdivision or across all of
22 the subdivisions.

23
24 Nathan Crane stated the appraisals will just be done on a subdivision basis. He stated the City's
25 portion of the appraisal costs will be \$500 per subdivision.

26
27 Tim Irwin questioned if the appraisals will be given to the Council.

28
29 Brian Braithwaite stated the Council will have to approve the sell price which is based upon the
30 appraisal.

- 31
32
33
 - Road Maintenance Presentation & Discussion – Matt Shipp, Public Works Director/City
34 Engineer

35
36 Matt Shipp stated they are doing a presentation on where the City currently is on the Road
37 Maintenance Plan. He stated at the end of the presentation staff is going to ask for some
38 direction. He stated the City was going down a certain path with the plan and then it was slightly
39 diverted at the goal setting meeting. He stated they are going to explain the two options the
40 Council has and then let the Council decide how they would like to move forward. He stated
41 approximately four years ago, the Council directed staff to do a road inventory on all of the roads
42 in Highland. He stated the road inventory was completed, which resulted in a number that has
43 been continually tossed around. He explained the road inventory gathered all of the data and then
44 staff was asked to prioritize the roads based on the information. He stated staff has been asked
45 for the report on numerous occasions, but the original report is just a spreadsheet of numbers

DRAFT

1 generated through engineering formulas. He stated staff is trying to prioritize a five year plan and
2 the City has adopted a program where roads rotate on an annual basis as they are completed. He
3 stated every year the City will have an updated five year plan in hand. He stated staff also
4 decided to break the City into zones, but that is subject to change. He explained the Council will
5 need to decide if they want to choose a number, whether it is \$500,000 or \$700,000 and decide
6 which roads the City will do with that amount or have staff inform the Council how much it
7 would cost to maintain the roads at a C grade and above, and then find the appropriate funds. He
8 stated the Council would then have a budget number and a plan, but the Council has also asked
9 for a Pavement Condition Index (PCI). He stated there is an average PCI for all of the roads in
10 the City, but the Council would like to know what it would cost to keep the roads at the
11 appropriate PCI level.

12

13 Rod Mann questioned how often the City needs to reevaluate the road conditions.

14

15 Matt Shipp replied the staff would evaluate the roads on an annual basis. He explained it would
16 not be as intense as the original evaluation, but the City would evaluate them based on the work
17 done the previous year. He stated they would update and evaluate the overall Pavement
18 Condition Index for the City annually, but every five years the City would need to do a full
19 evaluation of the roads that were not treated within the last five years. He stated there may be
20 something that could come up and change the plan, for example, the weather, traffic, etc. He
21 explained the Council would see those results during the yearly review. He explained the
22 ordinance the Council passed requires the City do an annual assessment.

23

24 Dennis LeBaron questioned how much it cost for the original road evaluation.

25

26 Matt Shipp replied that the original evaluation was approximately \$25,000. He stated the original
27 report had a lot of desk work and setting up the models, etc. He stated once those things have
28 been set up it is not as intense and staff can evaluate based on what has been done.

29

30 Rod Mann questioned if the City is just inputting data based on what roads the City has worked
31 on every year, but only physically looking at the roads every five years.

32

33 Matt Shipp replied the computer model the City has built for this Road Maintenance Plan takes
34 into account road degradation over time. He explained the closer the roads are to the C and lower
35 grade levels, the faster the roads degrade, which the model picks up. He explained every five
36 years staff goes and does a physical review of the roads.

37

38 Brian Braithwaite questioned how staff appropriately models the roads without looking at them
39 to some degree. He questioned if there is any physical evaluation to make sure the degradation
40 has not happened quicker than planned in the model.

41

42 Matt Shipp replied every five years there is an actual study done, but the staff is out on the roads
43 daily. He stated as things come in staff updates the model, for example, as cuts in the road come
44 in for a new subdivision, the model is adjusted. He stated when the model is built; they test it,
45 and physically check the numbers to make sure they match.

DRAFT

1
2 Marty Beaumont, Representative of JUB Engineering, stated the Road Condition Inventory was
3 done in 2011. He stated there is 81.6 miles of Highland City road, both local and collector
4 streets.

5
6 Brian Braithwaite clarified the 81.6 is not lane miles, but center line miles or lengths of road.
7

8 Marty Beaumont stated there is a standard practice under the American Society of Testing
9 Materials, which JUB Engineering uses when evaluating the roads. He explained there are 19
10 total distresses of a road which one can evaluate, and they decided to only use the 12 that apply.
11 He stated they evaluated the 12 distresses over all of the roads in Highland. He explained all of
12 the roads within a subdivision should likely be the same type, same condition, and have the same
13 use. He stated the standard told them how many test sections they needed to do in that area in
14 order to come up with the PCI for those roads. He stated if there are ten test areas within a
15 subdivision, they would review each individual one, measure all of the distresses, and then
16 populate all of the data into GIS. He stated they had 170 different sections of road that were
17 tested and there were 550 different locations that were evaluated, which gave the Road Condition
18 Inventory for the City. He stated they decided to rate each of the roads in Highland with a letter
19 Grade from A-F, so they now essentially understand the road conditions for the whole City. He
20 stated based on the inventory, 70% of the City's roads were a grade C and above, 20% were
21 poor, and 10% were failing. He stated the Pavement Condition Index helps determine the grade
22 of the road and how much work needs to be done. He stated the 30% of roads that are in severe
23 distress would take up a substantial, if not all, of the funding put towards roads. He stated they
24 would never catch up, because the good roads are not being addressed. He explained another
25 approach is to look at what the City can do to maintain good roads, because as intermediate
26 pavement practices are done, they are able to maintain the roads at a cheaper cost. He explained
27 after approximately 25 years a road needs to be fully reconstructed, which is expensive, but a
28 necessity. He stated another process would be to come in at year two and put down a sealant to
29 keep the water out and then at year ten applying a minor overlay. He explained although the City
30 needs to deal with their bad roads to some degree, maintaining the good roads keep them from
31 falling into the poor and failing conditions. He explained they are just focusing on the C and
32 above roads at this time.

33
34 Brian Braithwaite stated the road is really the base underneath and the asphalt is just a cap on
35 top. He explained the point of the asphalt is to protect the underlying base, so when it begins to
36 crack they fill them or else water gets down into the base making it soft and breaks it up. He
37 explained at that point it does not matter how much asphalt is put on top, it is going to crumble,
38 because it is sitting on top of something soft. He explained that is why they need to do
39 everything they can to protect the water from going down inside. He stated once it is destroyed to
40 a certain point it is cheaper to tear the whole thing out and start over, rather than keep patching.
41 He stated it is important for the Council to understand how the maintenance works.

42
43 Marty Beaumont stated what the public does not understand is when there is a good looking road
44 and they are putting a sealant on it while there are other roads seem extremely bad. He stated
45 they want to keep the road surfaced sealed so the water and the frost does not get into the base.

DRAFT

1 He stated there can also be oxidation of the asphalt if it is not sealed properly, which can cause
2 quicker failure of the asphalt.

3
4 Rod Mann stated he did not see any indication of the level of a road in the road information,
5 which would impact how fast it would degrade. He questioned if there are things the City can do
6 for roads in the D and F categories to help them last a little longer rather than ignore them
7 completely.

8
9 Matt Shipp stated the spreadsheet is just raw data numbers. He explained the Transportation
10 Advisory Committee came up with a formula that took into account road type and traffic loading,
11 which came into the equation for prioritizing the roads. He replied the City is patching together
12 the D and F roads, trying to keep them glued together. He stated they have also been tasked by
13 the Council to bring a plan towards the end of summer on the poor and failing roads. He stated
14 they will be going through a similar exercise on those roads. He explained that plan will be more
15 difficult on the Council because it will require the Council to find ways to fund the program.

16
17 Rod Mann stated he believed the staff would tell the Council the amount in order to do the plan
18 in a reasonable amount of time and if Council cannot get the amount, they would need to
19 prioritize the work.

20
21 Marty Beaumont stated the road base is well graded material that locks together so it is not a
22 porous surface. He explained it will hold the moisture in, freeze, and then it will heave and cause
23 damage during the expansion when it is cold. He stated one option the City has is to put down a
24 dollar amount and decide the best way to approach the roads with that amount. He explained the
25 model looks at the current pavement condition, the funding available, and the types of treatments
26 that can be applied to a road and tries to optimize the best use of the funds. He stated they put in
27 the information from the Road Condition Inventory and aged the roads because it has been three
28 years. He stated they then took the model and tested it if they received \$500,000 for the five
29 years to see how it would be best utilized. He explained it makes more sense to best use the
30 funds on all of the roads rather than focusing on zones. He stated they would not just rely on the
31 model, but the model gives the base to move forward. He stated they could put together a five
32 year plan that states we can anticipate a certain amount of budget for the next five years and
33 these are the roads that the City will do. He stated after they do the first year's roads, they would
34 update the model and start with year two and do another five year plan.

35
36 Brian Braithwaite stated if the City does not inform the residents of what kind of deterioration
37 would happen if enough money is not applied. He stated there would be roads falling off and
38 then in ten years it will cost a lot more, as opposed to putting in little more money now and fixed
39 the roads. He stated the residents of Highland may turn around and say they don't care, so then
40 the City will have to take what they have to work with and apply it. He stated it is critical to take
41 the information back to the residents and explain the need.

42
43 Marty Beaumont stated over a ten year time period with no funding, the PCI would start out at a
44 71.5% and drop down to a 55%, which would be a poor road average.

DRAFT

1 Brian Braithwaite clarified that these are just the good roads discussed in the example, not all of
2 the roads.

3
4 Marty Beaumont stated if the City took \$300,000 a year over a ten year period, they would go
5 from the 71.5 down to a 62.28. He stated this allows the City to see how much funding they
6 would want to put in to maintain a reasonable average PCI value. He stated with \$500,000 it
7 drops to a 66; \$700,000 would drop it to a 68 and \$900,000 would drop it to approximately a 69.
8 He stated they want to try to maintain a good average which would be approximately a 65-70
9 PCI. He stated they do not want the roads that are down in the 60's to drop off into the poor
10 category, because then the costs go up. He stated they recommend the City maintain an average
11 PCI value around the 68 with the criteria of not letting any roads fall into the poor range.

12
13 Brian Braithwaite clarified that would be an average of a C+/B- type road.

14
15 Marty Beaumont explained it would still be a good ten year road, so there may be some cracking
16 and wear on the road, but as a whole they are maintaining a decent average. He stated a good
17 road should be sealed within 2-4 years of when it is placed and a lot of people put the sealant on
18 right after it is placed. He stated they would then have to do an overlay or micro-surfacing or a
19 different kind of treatment based on the road's grade.

20
21 Neil Fraser, Representative of JUB Engineering, stated if they are trying to maintain an average
22 over ten years, then the model states over the first few years they spend less money, but still have
23 the same budget. He explained then over the last few years, they spend more money because the
24 roads have further degraded, but you have the money already saved in the budget.

25
26 Marty Beaumont explained if they are going to have \$700,000 applied and they use it every year,
27 the PCI value will be slightly higher at the end of the ten years, rather than reserving some of the
28 funding every year and trying to apply it at the end. He stated they do a better job if they can
29 utilize all of the funding available over the ten years.

30
31 Dennis LeBaron stated there is a big difference between the \$500,000 a year as opposed to the
32 \$300,000. He stated at \$500,000 they are still getting a decent average.

33
34 Marty Beaumont stated at the \$300,000 level they are mainly just focusing on the bottom roads
35 and trying to keep them from falling off the chart. He explained if they have more money they
36 can start focusing more on the higher grade roads like A and B. He stated if they continue to just
37 put \$300,000 in then the curve drops in the Year 15, as opposed to still looking good at Year 10,
38 because they are not addressing the needs of the roads.

39
40 Tim Irwin questioned if there was an estimate in how much work would be done by current
41 employees as opposed to contract work.

42
43 Matt Shipp stated it is an average cost and the staff costs are built in. He stated the costs that are
44 plugged into the model are costs that the City has seen over the last few years. He mentioned it
45 takes into account inflation as well. He stated the staff are crack sealing, but they are not able to

DRAFT

1 crack seal everything and they prep the crack sealing for projects coming up. He explained the
2 amount it costs for City staff to do these things is minuscule in comparison to the amount the
3 City allots for roads.

4
5 Marty Beaumont stated the actual treatments that are going to be done on the roads will be
6 contract work. He stated the City crews will still be doing the crack sealing and prep for those,
7 but the City does not have the equipment to do the actual seal coat or micro-surfacing.

8
9 Brian Braithwaite stated it is the lack of equipment that prevents the City staff from doing all of
10 the work on the roads. He stated the City does not have enough roads to justify purchasing their
11 own equipment.

12
13 Dennis LeBaron questioned how long the crack sealing lasts before it needs to be sealed again.

14
15 Matt Shipp stated it depends on how good the sealant is and how large the crack is. He stated
16 they will last anywhere from 3-5 years, because there are a lot of different factors involved. He
17 stated typically when they crack seal, they are crack sealing ahead of a project, like micro-
18 surfacing. He stated they typically crack seal in the spring and fall when the weather is cooler
19 and the cracks are wider and then in the summer the cracks close up.

20
21 Marty Beaumont stated to not be surprised when a crack seal is done one year and then they have
22 to go back and do another crack seal the next year, because roads continue to crack over time. He
23 stated they would like some direction on a plan from the Council.

24
25 Matt Shipp questioned if the Council would like to fund a specific amount every year and find
26 the best way to utilize those funds or if the Council would like staff to come back with a report
27 showing what it would take to maintain the roads at a C grade and better, and then the Council
28 would need to find the appropriate funds.

29
30 Tim Irwin stated if the Council was to select the number, then they need to decide if they have
31 the money to do that. He stated part of that process may mean the City needs to tighten their belt
32 in other areas or raise property taxes or a road fee.

33
34 Matt Shipp stated the roads are very difficult to model, so at the end of the ten years the model
35 will no longer work, because the C grade road falls off quickly.

36
37 Brian Braithwaite stated Marty Beaumont had stated if they maintain a consistent amount of
38 funds over time they will end up with a higher PCI and over time it will not drop off as quickly.
39 He stated the longer the life of the road the more it will cost to maintain the road. He explained
40 they are just discussing a ten year time period, but if the City lets them go from where they are
41 currently at down to a lower level, then it will cost even more the next ten years to keep them at
42 that level and even more to bring it back up to a higher level. He stated he wants to communicate
43 with the residents that if the City does not have the money, they don't have the money, but it is
44 reasonable to put in a little bit more money in now, so they aren't paying a whole lot more in the
45 future. He stated if he cannot get support from the residents, then they will need to decide what

DRAFT

1 money the City does have and apply it the best they can. He stated he needs to know both of the
2 scenarios to help residents decide what choice they want to make. He stated the Council cannot
3 pick one option, because both parts are critical. He stated they want to know what the right
4 amount is to keep the roads at a certain level so it does not drop off and once the City decides
5 what money they have, they can decide how to apply those funds.
6

7 Tim Irwin stated keeping the moisture out of the base is a huge issue with preserving the roads.
8 He questioned if the City could crack seal a lot of roads without going over them with a surface
9 coat and still preserve the roads or if the City always has to immediately follow up with a surface
10 treatment.
11

12 Matt Shipp stated the City does not have to follow up with a surface treatment, but it is good
13 practice to do so. He stated crack sealing buys time, but the idea behind asphalt maintenance is
14 starting with the least expensive, crack sealing, and then moving to the next one, like a seal cost
15 or slurry seal, but the roads may continue to fall off. He explained they cannot stop degradation
16 of the asphalt; they can crack seal all they want, but at some point they are going to need to put a
17 surface treatment on the road. He stated a rule of thumb is if they have to chip seal the road more
18 than twice, they need to grind it down and put on a new surface. He explained when they reach
19 the D grade roads they need to grind off the top and put on an overlay.
20

21 Brian Braithwaite clarified that the surface treatments are approximately \$1 per square foot, but
22 when they have to overlay the asphalt it is approximately \$3-4 per square foot, and when they
23 need to go into the base to do reconstruction it is approximately \$7-8 per square foot.
24

25 Matt Shipp stated they are protecting the base the whole way through. He stated at some point in
26 time the asphalt degrades so far that the little things are no longer effective, so they need to grind
27 everything off, put on a new surface, and start all over.
28

29 Brian Braithwaite clarified that the base on the D grade roads may or may not be intact, but it
30 generally has some degradation. He stated at that point they are seeing a lot of cracking that
31 introduces a lot of water into the base.
32

33 Marty Beaumont stated with D grade roads they are seeing a lot of cracking that introduces water
34 into the base. He stated the lower grade D roads need the full reconstruct; the small things have
35 little impact because the road is already cracked. He explained even a surface treatment will
36 begin to crack fairly quickly if the road is already in a failed state. He stated they can still
37 maintain the C levels with the less expensive treatments. He stated a C grade road has a PCI of
38 55-70, a B grade road has a PCI of 70-85, and an A grade road has a PCI of 85-100. He stated
39 just crack sealing to keep the water out will not work, because over time pavements degrade by
40 oxidation as well as traffic. He stated crack sealing does not deal with the oxidation which then
41 introduces micro cracking and so forth. He explained the seal coats are very important in the
42 early years to maintain the flexibility of the pavements.
43

44 Tim Irwin stated there are roads in the City that are between 5-10 years old that have cracks,
45 which can cause serious problems because it allows water into the base.

DRAFT

1
2 Dennis LeBaron stated there is approximately \$350,000 in the budget, but not all of it goes to
3 roads. He clarified the graph is showing the actual amount of money needed to repair the roads.
4

5 Brian Braithwaite stated in the roads budget there is money allocated for taking care of light
6 poles and road signs, etc. He stated how much of the \$500,000 or so is going to the roads and
7 how much is actually going to other things.
8

9 Dennis LeBaron stated he wanted to make sure if they say they are going to spend \$500,000 per
10 year, then it is actually \$500,000 spent on road maintenance.
11

12 Matt Shipp stated it is spent only on road maintenance, not on fuel or sidewalks or street lights.
13 He stated there are two portions in the budget; one is an operating budget and one is a capital
14 budget.
15

16 Rod Mann questioned how much was spent on the roads last year.
17

18 Matt Shipp stated they are still in this fiscal year, and they have approximately \$140,000
19 remaining out of the \$500,000 that was allocated. He stated the \$140,000 will be spent on
20 projects the City has already signed agreements for in May and June.
21

22 Rod Mann stated he supports the process Brian Braithwaite stated he would like to follow. He
23 stated it would be appropriate to assume the City will have \$500,000 for roads the following
24 fiscal year. He explained they need to know what the additional cost would be to maintain the
25 roads in good condition, so they can explain the idea to the residents. He stated the City needs a
26 plan for the money they will have in the fiscal year 2014-15, along with a target of how much
27 more money would be beneficial in the long term.
28

29 Matt Shipp stated the Council had asked the staff to come up with physical roads the Council can
30 then take to the residents to let them know what the plan is. He stated they can publish the
31 information so everyone knows why the roads are chosen. He stated he would like to give the
32 Council a list of roads and what treatments will be done on those roads during fiscal year 2014-
33 15. He stated they now have a hybrid between the two options. He stated some residents will not
34 do things no matter what, but there is another group that would like to do things as long as they
35 understand what they are paying for, so there will be a lot of education done with the plan. He
36 stated they will give the Council a five year plan with \$500,000 and see what level of
37 maintenance that will create and what will happen at the end of a ten year period. He explained
38 they will let the City know how much it will cost to maintain a certain PCI and stated they feel
39 66-68 is a good number to try to maintain.
40

41 Brian Braithwaite questioned how much more work would it be for staff to give the Council the
42 cost to maintain a PCI of 75, 72, 68, etc. He stated he would like to help the residents understand
43 that it could be a higher number, but the Council has chosen to do something in the middle to be
44 conservative.
45

DRAFT

1 Matt Shipp stated it would be easy because the information is already there; they just need to
2 plug it into the model.

3
4 Brian Braithwaite explained if they don't keep it at a higher level today, then the road will just
5 drop off in the next ten years. He stated if they maintain the current level it postpones the
6 reconstruction of the roads.

7
8 Dennis LeBaron stated they are just trying to keep a level of maintenance that will last them until
9 more funds are made available. He stated the City may be able to pay their debt off by then and
10 have more money to give to the roads.

11
12 Brian Braithwaite stated the City does not know what funds will be available in ten years or what
13 costs are going to come up. He stated everything is a risk and sometimes it is wise to push some
14 expenses off now. He explained he would like to have a 20 year look at the road maintenance,
15 because the lower the PCI number is at the ten year mark, the more expensive it will be the next
16 ten years and so on.

17
18 Marty Beaumont stated the model is taking in a curve and every road reacts differently to the
19 curve depending on the traffic, the speeds, etc. He stated when the model is put in for a 20 year
20 cycle, it starts to get a little erratic after the 10 years and starts to make incorrect assumptions and
21 becomes unpredictable. He stated they could look at the PCI after spending \$500,000 and try to
22 predict the added value of putting in \$700,000. He explained if they are spending an additional
23 \$200,000 a year for ten years it is \$2,000,000, but the added value could be closer to \$7,000,000.

24
25 Tim Irwin stated the Council would like to spend as much as they can to protect the roads, but
26 the real question is how much money they can spend and how much they can tighten their belt
27 enough to get into that range. He explained the Council has put the roads as a top priority, so
28 they need to put their focus on trying to reach that number.

29
30 Mayor Thompson stated the model work is model work, but good record keeping tells the City
31 whether it exceeds or falls short of the model. He explained the staff needs to keep good records
32 so they have good data to rely on, if not, they are just making assumptions. He stated if the water
33 eventually gets into the base it does not just disappear, it is absorbed somewhere and begins
34 causing degradation. He stated if there are big cracks in the road and they still want to save the
35 surface, then they need to crack seal, and if they are going to protect the crack seal then they
36 need to do a surface treatment. He stated the City needs to get to a point of keeping really good
37 records in order to diminish the amount of guessing. He stated the report is good because it gives
38 the Council the option of paying now or paying later; the science explains paying more now
39 saves more money, but it is a decision the Council needs to make it. He stated they need to look
40 at what is real and what is not, and thanked the staff for their information.

41
42 Matt Shipp clarified they are going to take a set number and give the Council a five year plan,
43 but state in order to keep it at a certain PCI level we need to fund it at a certain amount, and then
44 give a couple of options on the graphing so there is education for the residents.

DRAFT

1 Tim Irwin stated as Matt Shipp goes along with the process he can give some of the Council
2 members a call and make sure he is following the right path. He stated the Council wants the
3 same thing as staff and wants to make sure their direction is clear, so if they can communicate
4 and work with Council if they have questions or concerns.

5
6 Dennis LeBaron stated he is in favor of the direction staff is taking and clarified staff will have a
7 list of the specific roads they are fixing with the allocated funds.

8
9 Matt Shipp stated he will have a report ready for the Council by the end of April, so the public
10 has time to comment, and then the Council can say yes or no and implement the plan.

11
12 Brian Braithwaite stated it is really important for the Council to have the report within that time,
13 because they are beginning the budgets and will be doing the Open House. He stated they want
14 to be able to communicate the information with the residents as best as possible.

15
16 Tim Irwin stated as the City accomplishes things within the plan it would be helpful for the
17 Council to know those things are being done.

18
19 Matt Shipp replied he will let the Council know when those things are being done.

20
21 Tim Irwin questioned what the City is doing to communicate with the residents that water
22 conservation is still an issue. He stated they want to start the education early, so they are not
23 worrying about not having enough water in July.

24
25 Matt Shipp stated the Mayor's message in the newsletter brought the issue up. He stated the
26 Mayor's Water Proclamation is still in effect, so the staff will be communicating that information
27 through the utility bills, the newsletters, and the website. He stated the City is starting out okay,
28 but it depends on what the spring will bring and they have not yet heard anything on water cuts
29 this year.

30
31 Tim Irwin stated the City lives in a desert and needs to conserve water as much as possible. He
32 stated the conservation efforts that were put in place last year had a good impact.

33
34 Matt Shipp stated the efforts did have an impact. He explained this year there will be more
35 conservation, because they are starting earlier. He stated the continued discussion from last year
36 along with the education should help the City conserve more. He stated they had quite a few
37 neighbors' calling regarding their neighbor's water usage last year, but there were no fines given
38 out. He stated this year after the education portion; the City may need to begin giving out fines
39 for homes that do not comply.

40
41 Tim Irwin stated there are may be a few residents that resist, but most residents in the City that
42 really want to do the right thing.

43
44 Mayor Thompson stated they need to handle the water conservation like any other emergency.
45 He explained as it gets more drastic, they will use the same level as they would with another

DRAFT

1 emergency; by giving the information out to stakes and wards to get the information to the
2 residents. He stated the residents have signed a contract with the City to justify to the lenders that
3 they could come up with the money to repay the debt and the contract states they give a certain
4 amount of water for their property, either through water they already had and conveyed to the
5 City or they purchase water from the City. He stated they cannot penalize someone for using too
6 much if the City does not reward the people that don't use all of their water. He explained the
7 City is simply a water distributor for the water they already have attached to their properties. He
8 stated the people dedicated a specific amount of water, so on a year that only yields 80%
9 snowpack; they get 80% of the shares they distributed for their property.

10
11 Tim Irwin stated if he is entitled to fifty gallons a month it does not hurt him to conserve more
12 water.

13
14 Mayor Thompson explained the City is still expanding, so the water rights they have are going to
15 be reduced by 40% simply because the snowpack is what feeds the underground sources is
16 145,000 acre feet on average per year. He explained the allocation for underground water rights
17 in that same drainage is 245,000 acre feet, so wells that are yet to be drilled will reduce the
18 City's abilities by 40%. He explained the surface flows will not be different and the storage
19 rights will not be different, but the underground component is already over adjudicated by 40%.

20
21 Tim Irwin stated it would be helpful if the Council could have the staff presentations ahead of
22 time.

23
24 Nathan Crane stated they usually do not have the presentations ready until the day of, but staff
25 will see what they can do.

26
27 Tim Irwin questioned what the next steps are for the budget.

28
29 Aaron Palmer stated the next step is for Gary LeCheminant and him to go over the budget with
30 the Department Heads and then getting the budget out to the Council members for their review.
31 He stated after their review they can review it with staff and then have it ready for the Budget
32 Open House. He stated they are hoping to have the budgets done by the end of the following
33 week.

34
35 Dennis LeBaron questioned if the Council or staff would like to meet on the fifth Tuesdays for a
36 question and answer session with the residents, if there were an interest in addressing a certain
37 issue like the roads or the budget. He stated there is a fifth Tuesday in April, July, and
38 September. He stated it would be more of a relaxed atmosphere for open communication with the
39 residents.

40
41 Brian Braithwaite stated he thinks it is a great idea and there ought to be a subject to focus on at
42 each session and then the Council can answer questions. He stated some people may want to
43 come in and listen on a specific subject, rather than hearing people talk about other things. He
44 stated it would not have to be mandatory, just a voluntary meeting of the Council. He explained
45 it would have to be published in case more than two Council members show up.

DRAFT

1
2 Mayor Thompson stated it would be a reasonable time, but agreed picking the subject may allow
3 the meeting to focus on something relevant. He stated they would need to set a time, because he
4 does not know that the fifth Tuesdays would be the best time to do it. He suggested they
5 schedule a time close to something they would like to discuss.

6
7 Brian Braithwaite stated he had a chance to talk with Gary LeCheminant regarding the budget.
8 He stated if the City is going to hold the Open House in May, the Council needs to have time to
9 look at the budget beforehand.

10
11 Aaron Palmer stated he is hoping to have the budget to the Council no later than the following
12 Thursday.

13
14 Brian Braithwaite stated the value of having the Open House is having the Council prepared so
15 they can discuss the budget with the residents.

16
17 Aaron Palmer stated staff was thinking they could hold a budget workshop on the fifth Tuesday
18 of April.

19
20 Dennis LeBaron stated it would be fine to do that instead of the question and answer session,
21 because the budget is the number one priority right now. He stated if it a work session then the
22 residents could come and listen in.

23
24 Tim Irwin gave his appreciation for getting the agenda electronically a couple days prior.

25
26 Jessie Schoenfeld stated she has been working on forming another Beautification Committee and
27 getting volunteers. She stated she is trying to get it together so the Committee is approved in two
28 weeks. She stated the Beautification Committee would be set up to help plant flowers, weed, and
29 build friendship with citizens. She stated they pick a yard every month in the summertime for the
30 “Best Yard of the Month” and give them a small prize. She stated they just help out the Public
31 Works with maintaining the parks.

32
33 Tim Irwin stated he really appreciates that the Public Works crews have gotten out earlier this
34 year.

35
36 Dennis LeBaron stated there is some interest from citizens to start an ADHOC Economic
37 Development Committee. He stated he does not know what it takes to get it going, but asked
38 how the Council feels about it.

39
40 Mayor Thompson stated they have already started the process so the applications they have on
41 file are some of the individuals that served previously. He stated they will see if those members
42 are still interested in participating and stated the City is ready to put the Committee back
43 together.

DRAFT

1 Jessie Schoenfeld asked that the City put the Committee out for other people to apply. She stated
2 she has not heard anything about the Committee.

3
4 Mayor Thompson stated the City is open to applications anytime and the statement in the
5 newsletter is if they want to come in and get involved they can. He stated if the Council knows
6 someone then they can send them to the City or direct them to the application online. He stated it
7 would be helpful for staff to send out the same packet for the Water Committee to the Council.

8
9 **ADJOURNMENT**

10
11 **MOTION: Jessie Schoenfeld moved to adjourn.**

12
13 **Brian Braithwaite seconded the motion.**
14 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

15
16 Meeting adjourned at 9:31 p.m.

17
18
19
20

JoD'Ann Bates, City Recorder

21
22 Date Approved: April 15, 2014

Web and Social Media Committee:

Goal: Improve Web & Social Media experiences and
Increase level of engagement between residents and city.

Committee: 3-5 resident volunteers willing to work approximately 1-2 hours a week.
Committee must have a Chairman and a Secretary

Direction: Website: Recommend and implement changes to website to improve usability and appearance. Web usage reports should be used to help inform decisions and measure improvement.

Social Media: Focus on content links for the following:

Meeting Minuets

Meeting Agendas

City Announcements

City Events

City Calendar

Photos related to City activities, events and residents.