



# LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT MINUTES

Wednesday, February 10, 2021

7:30 am

Approved March 10, 2021

Highland City Hall, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland, Utah 84003

**PRESIDING:** Chair Brittney P. Bills

## **BOARD MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:** Rod Mann, Kurt Ostler, Troy Stout, Lon Lott

**STAFF PRESENT:** Highland City Administrator/Community Development Director Nathan Crane, Alpine City Administrator Shane Sorensen, Highland City Attorney Rob Patterson, Recorder Stephannie Cottle, Finance Director Tyler Bahr, Police Chief Brian Gwilliam, Fire Chief Reed Thompson, LPPSD Administrative Assistant Laurie Adams

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Darci Brunson

## **7:30 AM REGULAR MEETING**

Call to Order: Brittney P. Bills, Chair

Invocation: Troy Stout

The meeting was called to order by Chair Brittney P. Bills as a regular meeting at 7:30 am. 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 Troy Stout.

### **1. UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES**

There were no public appearances.

### **2. DISCUSSION: LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT FINANCIAL STRUCTURE AND FY21/22 BUDGET PROCESS – Tyler Bahr, Finance Director**

Finance Director Tyler Bahr gave background of creation of District. District was created in 1996 with an interlocal agreement between Highland and Alpine. Agreement has been amended multiple times, most recently in March, 2020. Amendment includes changes in structure of the District and budgetary limits. Mr. Bahr clarified that the District's expenses are broken into three areas, Administration, Fire, and Police. Expenditures have been relatively constant over the last 3 years at about 7 million. FY2019 was the last year that Cedar Hills participated in the District and Mr. Bahr pointed out that FY2020 expenses are just Highland and Alpine.

Funding for the District comes primarily from assessments from the two cities. This covers 95%. Assessments for Administration and Police are calculated strictly on population. The Fire assessment is calculated with a base rate of 10% split 50/50 between the two cities, 45% on population, and another 45% on equivalent residential units (ERU's).

Total Assessments for FY2020/2021 shows Alpine's assessment at \$2,380,601 and Highland's assessment at \$4,176,551.

The top budget priority is providing services to residents. We accomplish this by focusing on the people who provide services by offering competitive wages and benefits. We must also provide resources to do their jobs as well as maintaining facilities and fleets.

Property tax will be an important consideration in the budget process this year. The amended interlocal agreement requires approval from both City Councils if the change in the District budget is going to exceed the increase or decrease in property tax. Mr. Bahr anticipates this provision will come into effect with this next year's budget. The property tax revenues over the last 2 years has increased \$66,000 compared to the estimated increase of wages and benefits at \$185,000. These are preliminary numbers, as we don't have final numbers on benefits. This number was presented so the Board has time to factor in any discussions that will need to take place in the budget process.

The budget timeline would allow the District to adopt a tentative budget by the end of April before the City's adopt their tentative budgets at their first meetings in May. This will require two meetings in April, one on April 14<sup>th</sup> and another on April 28<sup>th</sup>. The Districts approved budget would be approved on May 26<sup>th</sup>, so both cities can adopt their budgets at the beginning of June.

Board Member Kurt Ostler asked about timing with cities budgets, and questioned if this is adequate time since we need to work with both City Councils. Finance Director Tyler Bahr explained it's a balance trying to provide enough information primarily with medical benefits which don't come through until May. We will have a working draft at the end of March and then two more iterations over the next two months.

Executive Director Nathan Crane stated, it's a challenge. In year's past, we have tried to move forward the public safety budget to get them done before the cities have to adopt their budgets. We are trying to do that this year. This timeline will have them done before final budgets. It's always a scramble at end because of the dynamics of Board and Councils and alternating meetings with the two cities. We have been able to meet this goal for the last 3 to 4 years.

Board Member Rod Mann asked if once we agree on a budget, are the cities obligated.

Executive Director Nathan Crane answered in the affirmative. With the new interlocal agreement, if it doesn't require council approval then yes, but if it requires Council approval then it goes back for council approval. If you stay within the guidelines then, yes. The assessment would be assigned. With this provision, the Council would take action as a separate agenda item prior to the final budget of the District; the Board would adopt the final budget. That has been built into this schedule.

Board Member Lon Lott asked about the interlocal agreement on page 2, item k and wanted clarification as to why the District might exercise its right of eminent domain? Also, as the District exercises this right, why this action requires only approval by 2/3 of the governing body, when on the next page over requires a majority vote, unless specified by the agreement. Why would we exercise eminent domain? Executive Director Nathan Crane responded if the District as a whole needed to acquire property for a station.

Board Member Lon Lott questioned if we have one city where we need that property, wouldn't that city want to use their City Council to make that decision? Nathan Crane clarified that this is language left over from the old agreement in 1997.

Board Member Lon Lott asked if we really need this property, why would we just have a 2/3 vote. If we really need it that bad, why not a majority like other items.

Board Member Troy Stout stated that eminent domain is a very emotional topic. He thought that we would need to prove that a vast majority of board members would approve. There are a number of items that require a 2/3 majority vs. a simple majority. Those are the items that have the highest degree of repercussion or the highest impact.

Board Member Rod Mann speculated that this was there because of the 7-member board that existed before the current 4-member board. Now any majority vote is a 75% vote. This was language probably left over from the previous agreement.

Board Member Kurt Ostler agreed that in the event of eminent domain, it should probably be the City Council of the effected city that decides about that property. Assistant Executive Director Shane Sorensen stated that ultimately it would go back to both of the City Councils to get the funds for the purchase.

Board Member Troy Stout clarified that the District is a taxable body and we can impose taxes. Even though it requires participation of each city, it has its own powers and jurisdiction. Shane Sorensen responded that if the District went to a taxing district, it would have to go back to the City Councils.

Executive Director Nathan Crane recalled that in the past there was discussion about the District owning buildings rather than independent cities owning the buildings. Board Member Troy Stout asked if that would require the District to become a taxing body, to which Mr. Crane responded it may or may not.

### **3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: JANUARY 20, 2021**

Board Member Lon Lott questioned why his name was listed as a board member when he was not needed in that capacity during that meeting. Recorder Stephannie Cottle responded that she would remove his name from the Board Members and list him only as present. Mr. Lott also requested that we remove a duplicate sentence on page 9, item 10 regarding voting.

*Board Member Troy Stout MOVED that the Lone Peak Public Safety District approve the amended meeting minutes of January 20, 2021. Board Member Rod Mann SECONDED the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.*

Chair Brittney P. Bills thanked Laurie Adams for her years of service to the Lone Peak Public Safety District.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*Board Member Rod Mann MOVED to adjourn the regular meeting and Board Member Troy Stout SECONDED the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.*

*The meeting adjourned at 7:53 am.*

I, Stephannie Cottle, Recorder, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on February 10, 2021. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Lone Peak Public Safety District Board Meeting.



Stephannie Cottle  
Recorder



## LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT FINANCIAL STRUCTURE & FY21/22 BUDGET PROCESS

*DISCUSSION*

Item 2 – Discussion  
Presented by – Tyler Bahr, CSM, DLSSBB, Finance Director

## Background

- Lone Peak Public Safety District (LPPSD) was created in January 1996 by interlocal agreement between Alpine & Highland
- Latest amendment to the agreement occurred in March 2020




## Historical Expenditures

By Dollar Amount (\$):

	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021* (Budgeted)
Administration	215,586	228,735	231,207	187,033	186,311	235,294
Fire	3,050,256	3,190,112	3,072,376	3,642,084	3,314,465	3,181,181
Police	3,096,095	3,059,296	3,238,863	3,106,573	3,559,250	3,524,278
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,361,937</b>	<b>6,478,143</b>	<b>6,542,446</b>	<b>6,935,690</b>	<b>7,060,026</b>	<b>6,940,753</b>

\*FY2021 figures above reflect FY21 approved budget pending finalization of mid-year adjustments

By Percentage of Total Expenditures (%):

	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021 (Budgeted)
Administration	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%
Fire	48%	49%	47%	53%	47%	46%
Police	49%	47%	50%	45%	50%	51%

## Financial Structure

Primary funding source = assessments:

Administration & Police

- Population

Fire

- Base rate split equally (10%)
- Population (45%)
- Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs – 45%)

## Assessments – FY2020/2021

	Admin/Police	Fire
<b>Alpine</b>	35.3%	37.7%
<b>Highland</b>	64.7%	62.3%

  

	Admin	Police	Fire	Total	Overall %
<b>Alpine</b>	79,146	1,209,123	1,092,332	<b>2,380,601</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>Highland</b>	155,648	2,216,155	1,804,749	<b>4,176,551</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 234,794</b>	<b>\$ 3,425,278</b>	<b>\$ 2,897,081</b>	<b>\$ 6,557,153</b>	

## Budget Priorities

- Salaries & benefits
- Maintaining Operational Facilities & Fleet

## Property Tax

*Budget increase/decrease beyond change in property tax requires approval of both Councils*

Change in Property Tax Revenue FY18/19-FY19/20				
	FY2019	FY2020	Increase	Net of Property Tax Increase
Alpine	1,376,927	1,880,712	503,785	79,785
Highland	2,131,342	2,184,173	52,831	52,831
<b>Average</b>				<b>\$66,308</b>

  

Anticipated Increases in Personnel Costs	
3% Salary	105,000
10% Medical Benefits	80,000
<b>Total Anticipated Increase</b>	<b>\$185,000</b>

## Budget Timeline

FY2021 Working Draft Distributed & Individual Briefings - late March

↓

Work Session - April 14

↓

Tentative Budget Adoption - April 28

↓

FY2021 Final Amendments & FY2022 Budget Adoption - May 26

*\*Schedule adjusted to align with Cities' budget timelines & is subject to change*