

Heber City Corporation
City Council Meeting
03/06/2008

6:30 p.m.

WORK MEETING

The Council of Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah, met in **Work Meeting** on March 6, 2008, in the City Council Chambers in Heber City, Utah.

Present:	Mayor	David R. Phillips
	Council Members	Jeffery Bradshaw Elizabeth Hokanson Eric Straddeck Nile Horner Robert Patterson
Also Present:	City Manager	Mark K. Anderson
	City Engineer	Bart Mumford
	City Planner	Allen Fawcett
	City Planner	Tony Kohler
	Chief of Police	Ed Rhoades

Utah League of Cities and Towns Midyear Conference – St. George – April 9-11, 2008:

Mayor Phillips reminded the Council of this Conference. Anderson said the Council had rooms reserved for Wednesday, Thursday and Friday nights. Mayor Phillips talked about the atmosphere of the conference and felt the new Councilmembers would enjoy the experience. It was indicated the Council went to dinner together one night. Councilmember Hokanson indicated she was staying at the Fairfield and would pay any difference in the cost of that room and the one at the Abby. Councilmember Horner indicated he did not need a room but wondered if he could be reimbursed the cost of the room since he was providing his own. Councilmember Bradshaw indicate he would not be attending the Conference due to work pressures.

Schedule Budget Meeting for Department Head Presentations – Preferred dates March 24-

26: Mayor Phillips indicated the Budget Meetings generally started in March and Anderson had some proposed dates he wanted the Council to consider. Anderson commented one evening would be spent listening to presentations by the department heads. After that, he would spend time talking about benefits, insurance, etc. He indicated he would not have the final numbers until April 1, but would like the Council to consider two of the proposed three nights to start the process. Anderson said he was to get the requests from the department heads by the 17th. He would review those items and get the information to the Council later in that week. The Council decided on March 24 and March 26 starting at 6:00 p.m. Dinner would be provided.

Review Draft Scope of Work for Citizen Committee – Heber City Office Building Project:

Anderson indicated the Council should have received a draft Scope of Work last evening that he and Mumford had worked on. He said the biggest question was whether or not the Council wanted the Citizen's Committee to be the one to select the consultant or if the Council wanted to do that. He said past experience on these types of projects would be that if the City was happy with the work product they got out of the master plan document, they would most likely continue with that architecture group for the actual design. Anderson said he felt the Council had already seen some good groups and was not anxious to start that process over completely.

Councilmember Hokanson wanted the Council to be the body that picked the architect. Councilmember Horner agreed. Mayor Phillips felt that getting input from the Citizen's Committee was fine but that any final decision should be up to the Council. Anderson indicated the purchasing requirements had to be looked at before engaging anyone. He said his preference would be to encourage the Council to short list two or three of those that had already made presentations because there was a lot of cost involved in putting the presentations together. Discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of having the group that did the design also do the building versus two different groups. Discussion about architects and if they were qualified to make a determination of whether or not building onto the current building or building a new building was best. Mumford explained that going with a consultant specialized in programming would take more time than going with an architect who also had programming people. He said going with the consultant did not tie the City to anyone, but that going with an architect probably did tie the City to them for the additional work. Councilmember Horner suggested a third party be involved and also did not want to limit the choice to those that had already made a presentation. Councilmember Patterson wanted to look at all avenues but wanted the current building given priority. The Council wanted to be sure whatever was done allowed for the needs of the City for 30 years. There was additional review and discussion concerning this issue.

Councilmember Horner pointed out the item under discussion was the Draft Scope of Work for the Citizens' Committee. He agreed with Mumford that the "need" had to be determined and then discussions held about the kind of team the City wanted to finish the project. Fawcett felt that the people to go to for the needs assessment were those that actually worked for the City and did not think an architect needed to be involved at that point. He suggested the Citizens' group could put those kind of facts together. Councilmember Hokanson said she felt the "participation with consultant selection" be taken out of the proposed Scope of Work, the Council decide what kind of control they wanted, and then the group come together and lead it. She continued the City didn't necessarily need an architect but rather someone to do a needs assessment--someone who would come in, maybe a specialist, and they could lead out with the group and what the group was going to do. She felt the Committee would be lost without a consultant. Anderson suggested staff develop the Scope of Work for the consultant and put out the bid for that. He didn't know who would bid—maybe architects and maybe consultants. Councilmember Horner felt two members of the Council needed to be on and chair the Citizens' Committee to keep it going in the right direction. Councilmember Straddeck summarized: 1) Finalize the scope for the Citizens' Committee that would be comprised of both citizens and a facilitator; 2) Scope out the facilitators work so an RFP can be sent out; 3) While waiting for RFP's, determine the members of the Committee by doing interviews or by some other means and select a facilitator; 4) Then the scope of the entire project could be put together. Mumford was asked to put together the

Scope of Work for the consultant for the needs assessment phase so the Council could approve it. The Council did not want to fill obligated to work with the same group for the design and the build. Additional names were suggested for the Citizens' Committee.

Review UDOT's Recommended Improvements for Boyer Project and Associated

Correspondence: Mumford passed out information. Anderson explained that a week and a half ago a meeting was held with Boyer discussing the Daniels' connection and what participation Boyer should be responsible for. He said it was pretty clear they were not anxious to take any responsibility for that. He asked them to put into writing what their position was so that could be shared with the Council and analyzed. The information distributed by Mumford now included a letter from the City Attorney and excerpts from a legal brief on Takings. Mumford said in the last three days, there had been all kinds of e-mails flying around. He said there were people speaking to the City, Boyer was speaking to the City, the County speaking in terms of what they thought the City was thinking and others voicing their opinions on what should be done. To bring the Council up-to-date, Mumford said the Planning Commission had recommended approval to Boyer for their plat conditioned upon getting a plan for a new connection to Daniels Road. The next step would be approval from the City Council. He said the piece not worked out was the installation of a new connection to replace the old connection to Daniels Road. He said that plan had not been worked out yet which was why Anderson had Boyer respond to and determine their position on the issue after last's weeks meeting. Discussion about the proposed road changes. Mumford said UDOT had finally taken a position on the issue. He discussed the different needs/wants/requirements of the different entities/groups. Mumford said Boyer was willing to participate as long as it could be proved there was impact from their development. Mumford also wanted input from the Council on the six medians proposed by UDOT, as well as the Daniels Road connection. Anderson felt it was the City's responsibility to show, based on data, what portion of the cost was who's. He said Boyer would fight against being illegally taken advantage of by a community. He said they were willing to pay their fair share but no more than that. He felt the City wanted to be fair, too. He asked if the Council was comfortable with staff pursuing an analysis of what participation Boyer should be responsible for. He said there were going to be those that said the entire responsibility was Boyer's (Wasatch County's position) but he thought that would be a tough sell. Additional discussion about impact to Main Street businesses, the school district bus garage, businesses on Highways 189 and 40, traffic lights, etc. Councilmember Horner indicated he wanted to see the studies made by MAG and UDOT. Discussion about whether the Planning Commission should have made the recommendation to the City Council as they did. The Council decided a special work meeting was needed. Mayor Phillips discussed the fact that there were some traffic problems associated with the development but that the people had spoken, the developer had a lot of money tied up in the project, and the City needed to find a way to solve the problems-not Shawn Seager, not Kendall Crittenden, not Al Mickelsen, not Mike Kohler. The City had heard what they and others had to say, but it was the City that now had to solve the problem and keep the project going. Discussion as to who should attend.

Discuss Airport Manager Office Options: Anderson indicated the new manager for the Airport, Lee Ivie, would be starting on Monday and he felt strongly he needed to have a presence at the Airport. He wanted to discuss with the Council possible office locations for him. He said there were two options for him 1) the Lloyd Building which the City acquired in the mid 90's or

2) leasing space in Hangar 1 in which the Airport Museum was located. He indicated he had met with Myra Strauchen, the owner of Hangar 1, to see what space they could make available. An area (6' x 5') would be made available to Ivie at a cost of \$500 a month which would include all the utilities. A slide was shown of the interior of the Lloyd Building. It was explained the water was off, there may be a leak under the building, fixtures that would have to be replaced, new restrooms would have to be installed, carpets would need to be replaced, missing light fixtures, etc. Anderson said he had Greenhalgh looked at it and he felt it could be functional but may not be the look the City wanted from that office. He said, too, he was trying to get FAA funding to demolish the building and build another building for equipment with an office attached. That may not happen for a couple years. Consequently, whatever money put into the Lloyd Building may not be long term. Because the building had not been used as an office in the past, it would have to be brought up to code to be used for such. Discussion about the availability of the Airport Manager after the access cards were put into place. Councilmember Bradshaw wanted the Hangar 1 building used rather than the Lloyd Building. Additional discussion in relation to Hangar 1 about the owner wanting to sell, the City possibly purchasing that and renting it to businesses starting out, or purchasing it and then selling it later, FAA funding, etc. It was decided the City should negotiate a lease at this time and possible purchase at a later time. Councilmember Straddeck said he wanted the Council to have a "vision" discussion/meeting in relation to the Airport. Anderson talked about a budget amendment to make this work.

Review of Agenda Items: It was indicated a representative of CAMS would be reporting as well as requesting help from the City for Main Street beautification items. Mayor Phillips indicated it was unusual to get three requests in one evening for extensions of time to complete projects but that was the case tonight. As far as Ordinance 2008-05, Councilmember Straddeck asked if this was part of the amendment to the ordinance relating to public and private infrastructure and that he had not seen some of this language in the Code being modified. Mumford explained the City Attorney had inserted language that changed the meaning and which should not have been inserted. So this ordinance was pulling that back out.

Chief Rhoades reminded the Council that last year in April a strategic planning meeting was held by the Police Department. He said he was planning to hold another one this year on a Saturday, probably the 5th. He invited those Councilmembers that wanted to attend to do so and asked if there was anyone in particular, citizen or business person, the Council wanted invited. Mayor Phillips asked Chief Rhoades what he wanted the citizens to input on. The Chief explained this was really a public relations tool which provided information to the public and explained what the Police Department was really about. The first half of the day was to show the different elements of the Department, another hour or so was then getting input from the participants on what the Department could do better to bridge the gap between the community and the Department. Discussion about how to inform the public of this meeting. Mayor Phillips asked that when a firm date was decided upon, he and the Council be made aware of it so they could participate, if possible. He also suggested that the types of citizens invited be varied so the Department could get input from those various types.

Paulette Thurber, City Recorder