



HIGHLAND CITY

HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL AND HIGHLAND OPEN SPACE SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT MINUTES

Tuesday, May 3, 2022

Approved June 21, 2022

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

VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION

 YouTube Live: <http://bit.ly/HC-youtube>

 Email comments prior to meeting: council@highlandcity.org

7:00 PM REGULAR SESSION

- Call to Order – Mayor Kurt Ostler
- Invocation – Council Member Brittney P. Bills
- Pledge of Allegiance – Mayor Kurt Ostler

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Kurt Ostler as a regular session at 7:03 pm. 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 Council Member Brittney P. Bills and those in attendance were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Mayor Kurt Ostler.

PRESIDING: Mayor Kurt Ostler

COUNCIL MEMBERS

PRESENT: Timothy A. Ball, Brittney P. Bills, Sarah D. Petersen, Kim Rodela (arrived at 7:48 pm), Scott L. Smith

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator/Community Development Director Nathan Crane, Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells, City Engineer Andy Spencer, City Attorney Rob Patterson, City Recorder Stephannie Cottle, Finance Director Tyler Bahr, Fire Chief Brian Patten, Police Chief Brian Gwilliam, Parks Superintendent Josh Castleberry, Streets Superintendent Ty Christensen, Facility/Fleet Roy Bond

OTHERS PRESENT: Jon Hart, Cathy Jolley, Jacob Carter, Rachelle Broadhead, Clayton Christensen, Eileen Miller, Marilee Christofferson, Adam Christofferson, Addison Smith, Sylvia Thompson, Jay Carter, Brian Braithwaite

Mayor Ostler welcomed several guests representing Highland Choral Arts; he invited Cathy Jolley, Conductor, to address the Council. Ms. Jolley reported the choir is made up of community members, mostly residents from Highland City. The Choir has been in existence since 2013 and membership has grown to 70 members. She announced upcoming Choir performances and invited the Mayor, City Council, and all residents to attend. The theme of the next performance is “Keep Singing”.

The Mayor and several Council Members thanked Ms. Jolley and the Choir for their efforts in the community.

1. UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Please limit comments to three minutes per person. Please state your name.

Eileen Miller stated she is with the Utah Valley Home Builders Association, and she discussed an audit alert from the State Auditor's Office. Her attention was caught by the item on tonight's agenda dealing with adoption of the tentative budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-2023, and namely building related revenue. The State Auditor has performed a random check of many cities and found that their building related revenue has not been used properly. She admonished the Highland City Council to follow audit rules to avoid a similar situation. She then noted that the Utah Valley Parade of Homes starts soon and there are three beautiful homes located in Highland this year; the grand prize winner in the parade is located in Highland and it is a \$7 million home built by Cambridge.

Addison Smith, Wasatch Wanderers Animal Rescue, approached the Mayor and Council to thank them for committing to not cull ducks at Highland Glen Pond. This action sets a great example for many other cities and promotes humane methods of dealing with animals. She presented the City with an award from Wasatch Wanders and Humane LI as part of the International Duck Defenders Project. This project has facilitated the rescue and adoption of over 400 rescue animals since September of 2021.

Council Member Smith inquired as to the manner in which the adoption program operates. Ms. Smith stated there are many community partners that assist in advertising the ducks for adoption through several social media channels.

2. PRESENTATIONS

a. Highland City Youth Council - Youth Council Representative

A representative from the Highland City Youth Council will report on recent events and upcoming activities.

Sylvia Thompson, Government Chair for the Highland Youth Council, reported on the recent meeting with Senator Mike Kennedy, who discussed the State's legislative process and facilitated a mock legislative action on a death penalty bill. She then noted that the Youth Council has volunteered to support tree planting events and will participate in the upcoming spring clean-up events.

Mayor Ostler then moved to item seven on the agenda.

7. PURCHASING PRE-ORDER: FISCAL YEAR 2024 PRE-ORDER OF SNOWPLOW TRUCKS *Administrative - Andy Spencer, Public Works Director/City Engineer*

The City Council will consider pre-ordering two (2) new Model Year 2023 snowplow trucks to be paid from FY2024 revenues and discuss the current order process from the manufacturer for future truck purchases. The Council will take appropriate action.

Public Works Director/City Engineer Spencer reported the City has been working for the past several years on updating the snowplow fleet. The reason for this update process is the age of the fleet. The average age of the fleet was approximately 20-years old when this process commenced. Snowplowing is very hard on the trucks. It both wears and rusts all the critical systems much quicker than a normal use. The trucks that will be replaced with the FY22 purchase are 23-years old (model year 1999). The proposed purchase will complete the renewal

of the fleet. To address the fleet issues, the approach has been to purchase two trucks every two years. New trucks were purchased in FY20 (2019 model year) and in FY22 (2021 model year) (delivery is still pending on the 2021 trucks). The next scheduled purchase would be in FY24. Currently there is an 18-24 month waiting list for new trucks. As such, to keep the replacement program intent, trucks need to be ordered at this time to take delivery in 2024. The City has been assured by the sales representative that there is sufficient demand in the market that if for some reason the City opts not to purchase the trucks, there will be no penalty. Another reason for ordering in advance of 2024 is pending changes in the truck manufacturer requirements. In 2024, the trucks will have a new emissions requirement and will include new, unproven systems. It is advantageous to order a model year 2023 truck that does not have the unproven equipment included. This will result in maintenance savings. These trucks will replace trucks that were purchased in 2003. As such, the City will have received 21-years of service from the trucks at the time of replacement. The 2003 trucks that are being replaced will be sold once the new trucks are available in the fleet. The cost of purchase for two trucks will be placed in the FY2024 budget to be funded from the Streets Capital account. Cost per truck is \$103,060 with a total cost of \$206,120. This cost does not include the plow and sander. Those costs will be determined at the time of 2024 budget preparation. As a reference for these costs, in June of 2021, the cost of a plow and sander for a single truck was \$ 79,461.00. As such, it is likely that with inflation, the total cost for the two plow and sander units for the two trucks will be over \$200,000. No expenditure will be necessary during the FY22 or FY23 budget year to order the two trucks; staff recommends ordering in 2022 to be in the queue for two 2023 International trucks for snowplow replacement.

Council Member Smith inquired as to the number of snow plows the City needs, to which Mr. Spencer answered six; the City has two new plows and four pickups and one dump truck for the cemetery, with two plows. One pickup and plow were delivered, and the rest are on order. Once all deliveries are received, the fleet will be new and there will be no need to purchase additional equipment for a few years. Council Member Smith inquired as to the budget line item that is being used for the trucks. Mr. Spencer stated that is a policy decision for the Council to make, but he recommends using B&C Road monies and capital reserves. The fund balance for streets capital is healthy. Finance Director Bahr noted that funds have not been specifically set aside and the Council will need to determine whether to use fund balance or fee revenues at the time they adopt a budget for the FY in which the purchases will be made.

Council Member Scott L. Smith MOVED that the City Council direct staff to place an order for two (2) 2023 International trucks for snowplow replacement program, and direct staff to include the cost of purchase in the fiscal year 2024 budget preparation documents.

Council Member Sarah D. Petersen SECONDED the motion.

Mayor Ostler asked if the two vehicles that are part of this action will be four-wheel drive or two-wheel drive. Mr. Spencer stated they are two-wheel drive.

The vote was recorded as follows:

<i>Council Member Timothy A. Ball</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Sarah D. Petersen</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Council Member Scott L. Smith</i>	<i>Yes</i>

The motion passed 4:0.

Mayor Ostler then moved to agenda item 9.b

b. Highland Glen Park Trail Update – Andy Spencer, Public Works Director/City Engineer

Public Works Director/City Engineer Spencer provided an update on the Highland Glen Park/Trail project; the project was broken into smaller parts to make it easier for contractors to fit certain components of the project into their schedule. He was able to secure bids to complete the entire project and the cost is approximately \$90,000 less than expected. He asked for communication of support from the Council for the contractor to order materials for the project. There was brief high-level discussion among the Council and Mr. Spencer regarding the scope of the project and efforts to adjust landscaping plans to conserve water. Mayor Ostler asked if the Council is supportive of proceeding with the project, to which the Council answered yes. Mayor Ostler stated there will be a formal action item on the next business meeting agenda to award the contract.

3. PUBLIC HEARING: FY2023-2023 (FY2023) TENTATIVE BUDGET *Legislative - Tyler Bahr, Finance Director*

The City Council will consider the FY2023 tentative budget. The Council will take appropriate action.

Finance Director Bahr explained the City is required by State law to approve a tentative budget no later than the first regularly scheduled Council meeting in May ahead of adopting the final budget no later than June 22. Approval of the tentative budget does not preclude the Council from making changes to the final budget. The Council has previously discussed the FY2023 budget in work sessions and regular council meetings on April 12 and 19, as well as in individual briefings with staff. The proposed tentative budget maintains or reduces most areas of spending, except for critical items, to address staff wage and benefit needs. A number of items have been identified for consideration, but not included in the tentative budget; they have been presented as a separate list entitled “Unbudgeted Items for Consideration in FY23 Budget” and the Council may choose to include as much as \$400,000 of them in the final budget without exceeding forecasted ongoing revenue. The following highlights from the tentative budget are worth noting:

- General Fund:
 - Revenue
 - General Sales and Use Taxes (10-31-30) – projected at \$3,600,000, an 8.3% increase above the \$3,325,000 budgeted in FY2022
 - Current Year Property Taxes (10-31-10) – projected at \$1,900,000, a 4.1% increase above the \$1,825,000 budgeted in FY2022
 - Building-related revenue – building permit fee revenue (10-32-21) is projected at \$700,000 and building plan check fees (10-32-22) at \$200,00; although these projections represent significant increase over FY2022 budget (67% and 110%, respectively), these are one-time revenues that should be used for building-related expenses.
 - Public Safety Fee
 - Based on feedback from the Council during the April 19 work session and regular council meeting, the tentative budget includes a \$212,00 increase in revenue generated by increasing the monthly public safety fee from \$11.50 to \$15.25
 - This increase is necessary as the City’s assessments to fund Lone Peak Public Safety District are increasing by \$681K to \$4,955,512 to address salary and benefit cost increases for the Police and Fire departments
 - The public safety fee increase represents 31% of the additional revenue needed to fund the increase in assessments – the remainder will come from other General Fund sources (i.e., projected sales tax increase)
 - Garbage collection
 - Garbage collection fees are projected to generate \$1,148,834, an increase of \$159K over FY2022 budget, based on a proposed fee revision to address the increasing cost of the contract with the City’s third-party garbage service provider

- Without this increase, the General Fund would have to subsidize garbage collection

Council Member Smith noted the North Point Waste Management Transfer Station has increased their tipping fee by \$1 per ton and this will cost approximately \$9,000 to continue to deliver solid waste to that facility. Mr. Bahr stated that will need to be considered as part of the adoption of the final budget; it is not included in the tentative budget document.

Mr. Bahr then presented a chart illustrating net revenue in the General Fund. Council Member Smith stated that he is uncomfortable adopting a tentative budget that is not balanced; General Fund revenue is \$13.3 million, and expenses are 10.7 million and, therefore, income and expenditures are not equal to one another. Mr. Bahr stated that the revenue minus expenditures is \$2.7 million and the list of unbudgeted items for consideration in FY23 budget totals \$400,000; based upon a planned for increase to the public safety fee from \$11.50 to \$15.25, an additional \$400,000 in revenue would be generated. The budget also includes the City's American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding and other one-time revenues; these will need to be allocated by the end of the FY.

Council Member Rodela arrived at the meeting at 7:48 p.m.

Discussion then focused on various ongoing funding sources in the City, with Council Member Smith asking what will happen to the City's building revenues when the City reaches buildout. City Administrator/Community Development Director Crane indicated that the City will still have some building revenue from various building projects; there will be a need for clerical staff and permit technicians in the Building Division and if the revenue from ongoing building projects does not cover those costs, it will be necessary to consider a reduction in force or reassignment of existing staff.

Mayor Ostler asked if the budget can include a surplus amount at the beginning of a FY. Mr. Bahr answered yes, but funding must be allocated before the end of the FY. He stated that he would like for the Council to make decisions regarding unbudgeted items with the goal of balancing the budget. Council Members Smith and Peterson stated they would like to make those decisions before adopting the final budget.

Mr. Bahr then continued his review of the highlights of the tentative budget:

- Library:
 - Revenue – The Library's primary source of funding is property tax, which is projected to increase by 2.7% consistent with the General Fund projection
 - Grant revenue and expenses are anticipated to decline as grant opportunities are returning to pre-COVID levels
 - Overall, the Library is projected to roughly break even, with revenues estimated at \$374K and expenses at \$371,000

Council Member Smith asked if the Library Foundation pursues grants to provide funding for the library. Ms. Cardon stated the Foundation has not been very aggressive in pursuing grant funding or private sponsorship/fundraising. She would like to provide some training for the Foundation to educate them on access to various funding programs.

Mr. Bahr then continued his review of the highlights of the tentative budget:

- Utility Enterprise Funds:
 - PY Carryover
 - Sewer, storm sewer, and pressurized irrigation funds will make use of funds accumulated in prior years for the purpose of completing capital projects included in impact fee and utility rate studies
 - Culinary water fund will use approximately \$111K of existing fund balance to fund necessary meter purchases

- Culinary water capital projects - As construction costs have increased and depleted the culinary water fund balance, planned projects will have to be postponed
- Utility rates –
 - As directed by the Council, staff has engaged a consultant to review the utility rate study completed in 2021 to assess the immediate shortfall in culinary water and ensure sustainability in all of the enterprise funds
 - Report to Council on the rate study is planned on May 17; rates for the typical residential customer are anticipated to increase \$15-20 overall
- Salaries and Benefits:
 - Salaries – An increase of 6% is included for salaries, which will be administered through cost-of-living adjustments and merit increases
 - Benefits – Pending receipt of renewal bids, rates are projected to increase by 10%

The Council then discussed the items included in the unbudgeted items chart. Mr. Crane noted that the decisions on these items will effect the decision on the Public Safety fee increase. Council Member Peterson stated that she would like to discuss the items in greater detail during the May 17 work session meeting. Mayor Ostler stated he will include that on the agenda for that meeting, but it may be helpful for the Council to perform a preliminary ranking of the items included on the chart. The Council participated in an exercise to rank the items included in the unbudgeted items chart.

Mayor Ostler moved to item four on the agenda and indicated discussion on item three will resume after Administration has tabulated the Council’s ranking of items included in the unbudgeted items chart.

4. PUBLIC HEARING: FY2022-2023 OPEN SPACE TENTATIVE BUDGET

Legislative – Tyler Bahr, Finance Director

The City Council, acting as Highland Open Space Special Service District Board, will consider the FY2023 tentative budget for the Highland Open Space Special Service District. The Board will take appropriate action.

Finance Director Bahr explained the Highland Open Space Special Service District was created in September 2000, establishing the City Council as the governing board of the District. Staff has recently determined that the City Council, acting as the Board, must consider the budget for the Open Space Special Service District separately from the rest of the City’s budget. A tentative budget must be approved no later than the first regularly scheduled Council meeting in May ahead of adopting the final budget no later than June 22. Approval of the tentative budget does not preclude the Board from making changes to the final budget. The Open Space budget is included in the full City budget for reference and the following highlights are worth noting:

- Revenue for open space totaling \$577K is generated primarily from two sources:
 - Open space fees estimated at \$295K
 - Transfer from the General Fund at \$270K
- Expenses
 - Personnel
 - Salary increases are budgeted at 6%
 - Seasonal wages are again budgeted at \$140,000, along with an increase of \$20,000 to \$100,000 in the General Fund seasonal wages to address recruitment and retention needs
 - Benefit cost increases are budgeted at 10%, pending renewal bids
 - Overall, salaries and benefits are decreasing compared to FY2022 as the prior year included a temporary position to train a replacement for the sprinkler technician who retired
 - Fertilizer and weed killer increasing by \$30,000 due to rising chemical costs

- Other expenses have been held generally consistent with prior years to allow for personnel increases
- Playground – playground replacement at Mitchell Hollow Park is included in a list of items for Council/Board consideration at an estimated cost of \$150,000; funding would be from sale of open space property

Mr. Bahr concluded the proposed tentative budget makes full use of anticipated ongoing revenue increases, as well as a transfer from the General Fund; staff recommends the Board hold a public hearing, approve the FY2022-2023 tentative budget, and set the time and place of a public hearing to consider its adoption in accordance with State code.

Council Member Rodela stated that she found different revenue sources in the budget but could not find a line item for revenue generated by renting out fields. Mr. Bahr stated he will look into that.

Council Member Smith stated that City parks are in open space areas and are open to the public and he asked if they are accounted for in the City’s general budget or in this budget. Mr. Bahr stated he will need to look into that as well.

Mayor Kurt Ostler opened the public hearing at 8:34 p.m.

There were no public comments.

Mayor Kurt Ostler closed the public hearing at 8:34 p.m.

Council Member Brittney P. Bills MOVED that the Board approve the FY2022-2023 tentative budget for the Highland Open Space Special Service District and schedule a public hearing on Tuesday, June 21, 2022 at 7:00 pm in Highland City Council Chambers to consider its adoption.

Council Member Scott L. Smith SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

<i>Council Member Timothy A. Ball</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Sarah D. Petersen</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Council Member Scott L. Smith</i>	<i>Yes</i>

The motion passed 4:1.

Council Member Rodela indicated she voted no because she would like Mr. Bahr to look into the revenue associated with field rentals.

5. DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT: PETER CHRISTENSEN REPRESENTING ALPINE LIVESTOCK, LLC. *Administrative - Nathan Crane, AICP, City Administrator/Community Development Director*

The City Council will consider a Development Agreement with Peter Christensen regarding the development of approximately 6.6 acres located at 4670 West 11200 North. The Council will take appropriate action.

City Administrator/Community Development Director Crane reported on April 17, 2018, the City Council approved the Preliminary Plat for Stoney Brook Plat B. The approval was after much discussion regarding a connection to the south. This connection gives road and utility access to the Maddox (previously Fehr) and Christensen properties. The developer for Stoney Brook was required to stub the road to the south for Stoney Brook and any other properties that were accessed solely through the Stoney Brook road to have a second independent point of access, as the road Stoney Brook was building exceeded 600' (Development Code Section 5-8-105.4c). As part of that approval, the City Council approved a concept plan for the future development of the properties to the south of Stoney Brook that required the continuation of the stub street. Recently, the owner of the property to the west of the Christensen's, the Maddox property, sought development approval. The proposed plat for the Maddox property prevented the Stoney Brook stub street from connecting through to 11200 N. The City and the Maddox applicant disputed the need for the road, and whether it was cause for a denial of the subdivision plat. On January 18th, 2022, the City Council moved to continue the item to get an advisory opinion from the Ombudsman's office. On April 19, 2022, based on the opinion from the Ombudsman's office, the City Council approved the proposed plat. Since construction of the stub street that was part of the previously adopted concept plan has been prevented due to the approval of the Maddox subdivision plat, Peter Christensen has requested a Development Agreement for the future development of 6.6 acres located at 4670 West 11200 North in order to clarify the continued applicability of the concept plan and obligation to extend the Stoney Brook stub street. The Christensen property is designated as Low Density Residential on the General Plan Land Use Map and zoned R-1-40 Single Family Residential. The proposed development would include seven lots between 31,000 and 43,000 square feet. The develop would meet all requirements of the R-1-40 District. The proposed agreement recognizes that the proposed development meets code and zoning requirements and clarifies that the City will no longer require that the Stoney Brook stub street be extended. The proposed agreement allows the Christensen's (or the future owner of the property) to present alternative plans for the development of their property, allows the City to require that the utilities in the Stoney Brook stub be extended by the Christensen's if necessary for their future development, and still requires that the Christensen's apply for City approval of any development of their property through the normal development review and approval process. Mr. Crane concluded that this action will not have a budgetary impact in the current FY and staff recommends that the City Council approve the agreement and authorize the Mayor to execute the necessary documents.

Mayor Ostler asked why the Council is considering a development agreement before approval of a preliminary plat. Mr. Crane stated the Christensen's are not sure of their development plans; they just wanted some assurances from the City that the road will not be required on their property. City Attorney Patterson added that the City typically enters into development agreements in cases where there are unique circumstances, such as this situation.

Marilee Christopherson stated she lives on the property north of the Christensen's; she purchased the property in late 2018 and when she did purchase, she was told that the road would eventually go through. She stated she does not oppose the Christensen's proposal, but she does oppose the reason that the Christensen's were forced to come up with this proposal and that is the approval that was given to the Maddox's at the last meeting. She stated she received a notification that the Maddox application would be heard during a meeting in September of 2021 and she and a few neighbors attended that meeting and were told that the item had been pulled and would not be put back on an agenda without notice being provided. She stated that she did not receive notification of the City's consideration of the Maddox application. It appears that it was approved without discussion or opportunity for public input. She stated she understands the purpose of the Christensen's proposal is to protect their property interests, but her concern is what this means for the end of the street. She believed it would be a dead end for a time but would eventually be continued and she does not believe that burden should be placed on the Christensen's. She is concerned about public safety, garbage truck access, and beautification of the dead-end. She asked that consideration be given to the residents of Stoneybrook, namely the safety of having two access points into the neighborhood. She concluded that what is being done by the Maddox's is creating a problem for many and she hopes the Council will give consideration to all property owners and their understanding of the future of their neighborhood.

Mr. Crane asked Mr. Patterson to summarize the Ombudsman's opinion. Mr. Patterson stated the City's initial position was to deny the Maddox two-lot subdivision unless they could provide for the continuation of the Stoneybrook stub road and utilities. The reason for their position was to benefit the Maddox and Christensen property as well as the entire Stoneybrook subdivision by providing a second access. This position was opposed by the applicant as they did not feel that a two-lot subdivision necessitated a second access, and the City could not exact the stub street connection from them. As the Council debated the matter, the City submitted a request for an advisory opinion from the State Ombudsman and he agreed with the Maddox's. The City has complied with the Ombudsman's recommendation; though the future connection may be needed for the area, the City cannot require this applicant to complete those improvements.

Mayor Ostler referenced the existing dead-end street in the Stoneybrook subdivision and asked if the requirement to extend the street will be placed on the property owner to the south. Mr. Patterson stated that is unknown at this time and it may depend on what the Maddox's intend to do with their remnant parcel of land. There are several matters to consider, but final decisions cannot be made until the City understands future plans in the area.

Clayton Christensen stated he is Peter Christensen's grandson; his grandfather was unable to attend tonight. He stated that while there are no current development plans for the Christensen farm property, the family would like to enter into a development agreement with the City to protect their future plans for consideration. The development agreement will protect the Christensen's interests while also protecting the City. The Christensen's will be required to navigate all City approval processes if, and when, they decide to proceed with development of their property. The issues associated with past proposals have placed various burdens on the land and the Christensen's are seeking approval of the agreement to provide clear expectations to both parties.

Rochelle Broadhead stated she is opposed to what has happened. She asked why the City does not have a regulation regarding dead-end roads in the City. This would provide protection for other areas of the City against something similar to what happened in the Snowflake neighborhood. She asked why the City cannot require completion or extension of the road; property owners have been told that the dead-end would eventually be improved or that the road would be extended and when that does not occur, it is very disappointing. She stated those who live at the end of a dead-end street constantly deal with people turning around in their driveway. She indicated the Maddox proposal is unfair and places the entire burden on the Christensen's; the new plan that has been proposed allows the dead-end to remain rather than having a road continued as promised to other property owners. She stated she is very concerned that residents did not receive notification of the Council's action on the Maddox application.

Mr. Crane stated that the City Code does have regulations regarding dead-end streets, cul-de-sacs, and eventual continuation of roads. However, the City has heard an opinion from the State Ombudsman and has decided to honor that opinion. Mayor Ostler stated that does not necessarily mean that the dead-end will never be eliminated; there may be another access point off of 4800 West, depending upon the distance between other access points. Mr. Patterson stated that is correct but noted that the City does not have formal plans regarding those possible improvements. Essentially, it will be necessary for the City to take property for the road or wait for continued development in the area that would require the road extension.

Council Member Ball asked why the Christensen's cannot proceed with a preliminary plat application in order to allow the City to determine the location of the road; the Christensen's would not be required to proceed with execution of the plat, but it would provide some clarity to the City and other property owners. Mr. Patterson stated that preliminary plats are only good for one year. Council Member Ball asked if the construction of the road is contingent upon development. Mr. Patterson stated that is not necessarily the case, but developers typically do not want to develop roads until they are ready to develop the land on the road because roads are very expensive and do not generate a return.

General discussion among the Council and staff centered on the specifics of the Maddox application and the Ombudsman’s opinion, with Council Member Ball stating he feels that the opinion restricts the City’s ability to plan for the future. Mr. Patterson agreed, but noted the Ombudsman disagreed based upon the fact that the Maddox family was only seeking approval of two lots and the requirement to build a road would be the same of a property taking or exaction. Mayor Ostler stated that the City would have been assuming some level of risk if they would have ignored the Ombudsman’s opinion and required the road to be built; if the matter were litigated and the City lost, the City would have been required to pay the fees of the Maddox attorney.

Mayor Ostler then asked why residents did not receive notification of the Maddox family’s application for the minor subdivision. Mr. Crane stated that residents within a 500-foot radius would have received notification of the Planning Commission’s consideration of an application.

Ms. Christofferson re-approached and stated that the notification she received was for the City Council meeting. She stated it is her opinion that if the City is considering anything that would impact other property owners, those property owners should be notified. She stated when actions are taken as they were, it feels secretive to residents. She tried to follow the item and never saw it on an agenda again. Mayor Ostler stated he understands the residents’ frustration, but the original action was to continue the agenda item and continuation does not require an additional notice. The item was ultimately placed on a consent agenda, for which there is typically no discussion.

Council Member Smith stated that he understands and agrees with the frustration expressed by residents; however, staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council were truly trying to provide connections for the Stoneybrook neighborhood by requiring certain improvements associated with development. The City has encountered issues with an individual developer and still has not received plans from that developer. When plans do come forward, he hopes the residents’ concerns will have been taken into consideration. He added he would like for staff to ensure that Stoneybrook neighbors are notified of future actions regarding this subject.

Council Member Scott L. Smith MOVED that the City Council approve the development agreement with Peter Christensen and authorize the Mayor to execute the contract documents.

Council Member Kim Rodela SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

<i>Council Member Timothy A. Ball</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Sarah D. Petersen</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Scott L. Smith</i>	<i>Yes</i>

The motion passed 5:0.

Mayor Ostler then returned to item number three:

Mr. Bahr reported on the results of the Council’s exercise to rank unbudgeted projects as follows (in order of top priority to bottom priority):

General Fund items:

1. Fire station exhaust system, 90% grant funded
2. Radar Speed & RRFB Sign
3. Texting system

4. Tree replacement
5. General Plan update \$75K, Alt Trans Plan Match \$3.4K
6. Christmas lights
7. Fix Council Chambers AV and add broadcasting ability
8. \$18K Council appropriations - \$3K per Mayor and Council Member
9. Traffic Control Toolbox study
10. Vehicle for Inspector
11. 2nd variable message sign
12. Additional gardening bed care fore City Hall, LP buildings.
13. Skid steer (Cemetery).

Mayor Ostler stated that if the cost for the AV system were lowered to \$80,000 it would be possible to fund everything. He added that in order to include items 10 through 13, it will be necessary to increase taxes and the Public Safety Fee. Mr. Bahr stated that is correct; the City has \$188,000 available to allocate to the various items on the list without a Public Safety Fee increase. There was then general discussion regarding the cost estimates for various items on the list, after which Council Member Peterson noted that any item that is not funded this year will come before the Council again next year. She stated she is in favor of a smaller Public Safety Fee increase this year in order as she has stated in the past. Council Member Rodela noted that many of the expenses listed in the chart are one-time expenses, but an increase to the Public Safety Fee would be ongoing. Council Member Smith stated that is correct and he is concerned about relying on Public Safety Fee revenues for items not related to public safety. Mayor Ostler stated that the costs associated with providing Public Safety continues to increase and it has been necessary to dedicate some general fund monies to cover those costs; the proposal is to raise the Public Safety Fee to cover those costs so that general fund monies can be used for general needs in the City.

Council Member Peterson stated she is not sure it is necessary to increase the Public Safety Fee to \$3.75; she is more comfortable with an incremental increase this year. Council Member Bills stated she understands that viewpoint and she is very conflicted about what type of fee increase is appropriate and more tolerable for residents. Council Member Smith stated that his concern is that once the City's utility rate study is complete, the City will be considering raising other utility fees; additionally, some of the City's other fees may be challenged following a final court decision on similar fees charged in other cities. He would prefer to not raise the Public Safety Fee this year, fund items one through six on the list, and wait to see what happens with the Supreme Court regarding fees charged by other cities, and possibly consider a property tax increase next year if necessary. Council Member Rodela stated that she understands Council Member Smith's recommendations and she agrees that a property tax increase is the most transparent way to increase revenue for the City. She added she wants to use as little general fund money as possible for public safety needs; the City is already operating very lean, and she believes the expenses requested by City Departments are needs rather than wants. She would support a Public Safety Fee increase this year or a property tax increase next year.

Council Member Bills asked Mr. Bahr to provide additional information about the \$900,000 in one-time revenues and what types of expenditures that money can be used for. Mr. Bahr stated it is one-time money associated with building services; it can be used to cover vehicles and equipment as well as salaries and benefits in the Building Division. It should not be used for items not related to building services in the City.

Council Member Bills inquired as to the health of the City's General Fund Balance if \$400,000 is taken from that account to fund items being discussed tonight. Mr. Bahr stated that \$400,000 amounts to roughly four percent of the City's Fund Balance. Council Member Peterson stated that would reduce the City's Fund Balance to 31 percent, which she feels is a good trade-off compared to raising fees or taxes.

Council Member Ball asked if a decision made by the Supreme Court regarding certain fees could be imposed retroactively. Mr. Patterson stated that the ruling should only apply to revenue collection going forward. He clarified that Highland City is not a party to the court case, but the City will consider case law when determining

fee policies going forward. Council Member Ball added that the \$3.75 Public Safety Fee proposal is rational and can be construed as being reasonably related to Public Safety needs. Mr. Patterson stated that is correct. Council Member Ball stated that given the volatility of the economy, the City needs to fortify its position; he likened the City to a family that is living paycheck to paycheck and relying upon future income that may never come to fruition. For this reason, he recommended increasing the Public Safety Fee to \$3.75.

Mayor Ostler asked if the Council can increase the Public Safety Fee at any time or if there are restrictions upon fee increases similar to those for a property tax increase. Mr. Bahr answered yes but noted that the fee increase should be considered in conjunction with consideration of an annual budget in order to communicate the justification of the fee increase as being associated with increased costs.

Mayor Kurt Ostler opened the public hearing at 9:38 pm.

Brian Braithwaite stated that he served as a City Council Member in the past and during that time he felt it most important to consider actual Public Safety costs separate from other costs in the City. The City's public safety needs were growing, but there was no way to properly fund it. This is why the Public Safety Fee was implemented; it provided a clear and distinct line for residents as to how their money was being spent. The fees should be 'black and white', and all revenues generated by the fee should be used to fund Public Safety needs. As soon as the City starts co-mingling funds, the fee should be eliminated. If the City needs more money for Public Safety, the fee should be increased. If the Council chooses to use General Fund money to fund Public Safety, this will cause problems in other areas of the budget. He stated he feels that Highland City is in a better position than Pleasant Grove in their court battle regarding fees; Highland challenged the concern of fees by treating it just like a tax increase. The City held a hearing similar to the required truth in taxation hearing that must be held prior to considering a property tax increase. Pleasant Grove conversely charged their fee arbitrarily and provided adjustments to certain businesses. He stated he feels the purpose of Highland's fee is clear and that the City would win a lawsuit if one were brought. He asked that the Council use the revenues of the Public Safety Fee as intended and, if not, the fee should be eliminated.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and Mayor Kurt Ostler closed the public hearing at 9:45 p.m.

Mayor Ostler inquired as to the total revenue to be generated by the Public Safety Fee. Mr. Bahr stated the tentative budget includes revenue totaling \$681,000. Council Member Peterson inquired as to the amount the fee would need to be increased to in order to cover all Public Safety operational increases, to which Mayor Ostler answered \$11.50.

Council Member Smith addressed Mr. Braithwaite and stated he understands his position, but he feels that things are much different now than when the fee was first implemented. Citizens are dealing with extreme inflation and economic uncertainty. He is not as worried about those that have disposable income, but he is worried about those on a fixed income who are experiencing very small increases in their income. He was supportive of increasing the Public Safety Fee until he learned there will also likely be a recommendation to increase utility fees. The City will be increasing fees a great deal, and this will be very hard on residents. He does not feel it is necessary to have a 35 percent fund balance as he feels the City could operate just fine on a 25 percent fund balance.

Council Member Rodela stated that she understands the concerns about impacting those on a fixed income; she added that it is important to take into consideration that a set fee is the same for all households in the City while a property tax increase affects everyone differently based upon their property value. Mayor Ostler agreed; the intent of the fee is to cover the cost of providing Public Safety service to the residents. This is a difficult issue this year because costs of providing Public Safety has increased dramatically since last year. Mr. Bahr agreed and added that in terms of ongoing expenses, Public Safety accounts for approximately 47 percent; the Public Safety

Fee included in the tentative budget would generate approximately \$862,000, but the total Public Safety budget is nearly \$4 million.

Mayor Ostler allowed additional input from Mr. Braithwaite.

Mr. Braithwaite stated that he does not disagree with Council Member Smith, but he is suggesting that the fee be considered independent of other revenue sources; if the fee is increased to cover all Public Safety costs, and there is still general fund money available, the Council could actually decrease property taxes to reduce general fund monies. He stated that when the fee was first implemented, the Council understood it would not fully fund Public Safety and there would be some outstanding deficits; but he is supportive of increasing the fee appropriately now and offering a tax decrease elsewhere. He stated he feels residents support fees more than tax increases because it is clearer as to how fee revenues are being spent.

Council Member Smith stated that he is concerned about the needs to increase other utility fees; he asked if money can be transferred from the General Fund to fund utility costs. Mr. Braithwaite stated that utility fees should be covering actual operations and maintenance costs; if the Council is not supportive of increasing fees for those needs, certain capital projects will need to be delayed.

Mayor Ostler asked the Council if they need additional time to contemplate this issue. The Council answered yes and noted they would like to hold a work session to discuss the issues raised tonight in greater detail. Council Member Smith stated he would prefer to wait to make a decision on the Public Safety Fee until the Council understands the outcome of the utility fee study and whether it will be necessary to increase other fees. Council Member Bills stated she would like to go back and research all data that informed the Council's original decision to implement the Public Safety Fee. Council Member Peterson agreed and stated that she would like to understand all costs that are being considered when determining whether to increase fees.

Mr. Patterson stated the Council can continue their public hearing and action on the tentative budget; the State Code on budgeting indicates that a tentative budget must be filed with the Council on May 1 and that requirement as been met. The Council can vote on whether to approve the tentative budget in two weeks. Assistant City Administrator Wells added that Administration was planning to discuss all utility fees during the May 17 work session, which may be helpful to the Council in making the decision regarding the Public Safety Fee.

Council Member Kim Rodela MOVED to continue the public hearing and the tentative budget to the May 17, 2022 City Council Meeting.

The motion was SECONDED by Council Member Sarah D. Petersen.

The vote was recorded as follows:

<i>Council Member Timothy A. Ball</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Sarah D. Petersen</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Scott L. Smith</i>	<i>Yes</i>

The motion passed 5:0.

6. DISCUSSION: PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP WITH USAC *Administrative - Nathan Crane, AICP, City Administrator/Community Development Director*

The City Council will review a proposed lease agreement with Utah Surf Athletic Club (USAC) for a Public/Private Partnership for the construction and use of the soccer fields at Mountain Ridge Park. This item is being presented for information and direction only.

City Administrator/Community Development Director Crane stated that the Park Committee has been working with USAC regarding a lease agreement for the construction and use of the planned soccer fields at Mountain Ridge Park. He reviewed highlights of the agreement as follows:

General:

- Length - 11 years with an option for 5-year renewals. The contract would be renegotiated after seven years.
- Termination – termination occurs if an agreement to renew/extend cannot be reached, Surf Soccer provides a one-year notice, or either party defaults on the agreement.

USAC Obligations:

- Within two years build three competition level fields. Sprinklers and other improvements would meet city specifications.
- Maintain the fields.
- Provide a storage shed for maintenance equipment.
- Provide two portable toilets until permanent restrooms are completed.

City Obligations:

- Within one year provide the rough grading of the site.
- Post signage stating that the fields are not to be used for scrimmage or pickup games and provide enforcement.
- Provide parking and utilities for the field. The fields will not be lighted.

Mr. Crane also summarized the section of the agreement that details a schedule for USAC's use of the property, City use of the property, and public access to the property.

Council Member Ball asked if the one-year termination clause can only occur after the seven-year period. City Attorney Patterson stated that USAC can terminate with one year notice, but the City cannot; USAC can choose to stop holding events and walk away from one year notice. Council Member Ball asked if the City would need to reimburse the USAC for the improvements they have made. Mr. Patterson answered no. Council Member Ball asked if USAC would be released from the requirement to maintain the fields if they terminate, to which Mr. Patterson answered yes. Mayor Ostler stated it may be necessary to adjust the language to communicate that termination is only an option after the fields are built and USAC has two years to build the fields. Mr. Patterson stated that may be helpful.

Council Member Smith stated that this situation detailed in the agreement is not 100 percent ideal, but it is close. He likes this type of public/private agreement because without support from the private sector, it may not be possible for the City to build these fields. This agreement will help to bring the park to fruition and the fields will be maintained very nicely. Mayor Ostler agreed; the only negative aspect of the agreement may be some limitations on other teams or clubs that may want to use the field space at the park. However, he feels there will be adequate public access to the park, and he is supportive of approving the agreement.

There was brief discussion about the terms of the agreement dealing with public use of the park and field space, with Council Member Peterson recommending that the City have the option to terminate as well as USAC; this could include some financial buy-out if the City were to terminate the agreement. Council Member Ball stated

that any buy-out should be prorated depending upon the amount of time that has lapsed after the fields are build.

Council Member Rodela inquired as to the amount the City would pay to build the fields and how much USAC anticipates spending to complete the improvements. Council Member Peterson added that the Council heard from residents in the past who indicated a willingness to donate to or fundraise for the project and she asked for more information about those commitments.

Mayor Ostler invited input from a representative of USAC and asked them to answer the questions asked by the Council.

Jay Carter indicated he is one of the founders of USAC and has volunteered in support of youth soccer for 15 years. He founded the Legacy Field Fund, which implemented a \$40 per year fee for all competitive soccer players. He has raised about \$1.2 million per year to be used throughout the State that can be used for field space. There have been many different cost estimates for the field space at Mountain Ridge Park, but USAC is committed to building the fields and maintain them and that is one of the reasons for the longer term in the agreement as it is necessary to have a significant amount of time to secure a return on the investment. He stated that this project will relieve the demand for field space at other facilities in the community.

Mayor Ostler addressed the language in the agreement that defines the type of activities allowed on the field space during public access times. Mr. Carter stated that the intent of that language was just to prohibit other organized sports teams or clubs from using the field space during public times. A group of residents could gather at the fields and play a pick-up football game, and this would not be concerning; USAC was trying to weigh the damage that could be caused by general use of the space versus an organized sport.

Mayor Ostler asked how many fields USAC currently rents in Highland City. Mr. Carter stated that USAC rents Mitchell Hollow park and Heritage Park; once upcoming tryouts are held and USAC understands the number of players and teams they will have, it will be possible to determine the total number of fields the club needs. He asked if it is possible to include some language in the contract that provides some level of comfort for USAC regarding ongoing renewal of the agreement. Mayor Ostler stated that he feels that the current Council supports renewal of the agreement in the future, but it is not possible for the current Council to make decisions that would encumber future Councils.

Brian Braithwaite stated that if another organization were to come to the City looking for field space, the only way to accomplish that would be for them to pay for it or for the City to pay for it. He stated he does not feel that the arrangement proposed with USAC will cost the City money. Rather, it will save the City money as USAC is essentially pre-paying to secure field space for the future. He stated he feels this agreement is a win-win arrangement for all parties and he recommended the Council vote to move forward.

Discussion then shifted to landscaping of the park space and efforts to conserve water.

Parks Superintendent Castleberry stated that he is concerned about the length of the agreement and the availability of water; there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding the amount of water that will be available to the City for maintaining open spaces and if it becomes necessary to restrict watering to one day per week, some of the field space may suffer.

Mayor Ostler thanked Mr. Castleberry for his input, and this led to discussion of landscaping of the park space and efforts to conserve water, after which Mayor Ostler noted that this is a discussion item only and the Council can discuss it further and take action on the agreement during the May 17 meeting.

8. RESOLUTION: AMENDING SECTION 19.3 HOLIDAY LEAVE AND SECTION 13.8 COMPENSATORY TIME OFF OF THE HIGHLAND CITY PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL *Administrative - Nathan Crane, AICP, City Administrator/Community Development Director*

The City Council will consider a request by Staff to amend Section 19: Leave of Absences related to the Juneteenth Holiday and Section 13: Employment Classifications /Compensation related to overtime compensation of the Highland City Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual. The Council will take appropriate action.

City Administrator/Community Development Director Crane stated in 2021, legislation was passed to declare Juneteenth as a Federal Holiday. During this last legislative session, legislation was passed to declare it as a State Holiday. Currently the Council has authorized eleven holidays as follows: New Year's Day, Human Rights Day, Presidents' Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Pioneer Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day and Christmas Day. There are also two floating holidays that are used from Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve as appropriate. If the two floating holidays are not used on Christmas Eve or New Year's Eve employees may use them from October through December. Through the UCMA Chapter, twenty-one cities have provided input on this issue as follows:

- Ten cities have already determined to adopt the day as an official holiday. Three of these cities are relocation existing leave to account for this holiday.
- Seven cities are planning on adding it.
- Two cities have not discussed it yet.
- Two cities will not be adding it.

Staff contacted the following cities to compare the number of holidays that are offered. This does not include the Juneteenth holiday:

- Lehi – 10 days
- American Fork – 11 plus one personal day
- Orem – 11 plus one personal day
- Provo – 10 holidays
- Sandy – 11 holidays plus one personal day
- Draper – 11 holidays
- Spanish Fork – 11 holidays
- Eagle Mountain – 10 holidays
- LPPSD – 11 holidays plus one personal day

With input from city staff, staff is recommending that one of the existing floater holidays be applied to the Juneteenth holiday and the other be assigned to Veterans Day. The proposal will not result in any additional holidays. Rather it reallocates the two existing floating holidays. Assigning the floater holidays to specific days will assist in use and administration of time off.

Mr. Crane then discussed the proposed amendments to compensatory time policies; the current policy reads as follows:

- A. Employees may receive compensatory time off in lieu of overtime pay if approved in writing by employee's supervisor. The City Administrator, or designee, reserves the right to schedule when an employee's accrued compensatory time will be used. Written employee requests to use their accumulated compensation time during specific dates and times must be approved by the City Administrator, or designee, who shall honor the requests unless granting the compensatory time off would create a substantial hardship for Highland City.
- B. The law requires that after nonexempt employees have accumulated the maximum amounts of compensatory time off during any work period, any additional overtime must be paid as set forth below:

- (1) Not more than two hundred forty (240) hours of compensatory time off may accrue.
- C. Compensatory time off will be accumulated at the overtime rate of one and one-half (1½) hours for all overtime hours worked.

At the end of last fiscal year, the City had a liability of \$48,865.80 in unpaid and unused Comp-Time. As a result, an employee committee was formed to address the issue of how to reduce this liability. The committee is recommending the following changes:

- B. The law requires that after nonexempt employees have accumulated the maximum amounts of compensatory time off during any work period, any additional overtime must be paid as set forth below:
 1. Not more than two hundred forty (240) hours of compensatory time off may accrue annually from January 1 to December 31. Any hours above two hundred forty (240) will be paid as overtime.
 2. Employees may accrue up to two hundred forty (240) hours of compensatory time from January 1 to December 31. If the employee’s compensatory time balance exceeds one hundred and sixty (160) hours on December 31, excess will be paid as overtime.
 3. Employees who have accrued compensatory time may:
 - i. Schedule the use of compensatory time by November 1.
 - ii. Request payment of compensatory time by December 1.
 4. Accrued compensatory time off must be paid out in full if change in job status/classification, including but not limited to a promotion, occurs before the effective date of the change.
 - i. Exceptions may be approved by the Department Head if prior arrangements have been made for the use of compensatory time.

There was brief discussion about the number of employees that currently accrue compensatory time and the reasons they are doing so; Mr. Bahr noted there are fewer than four employees that reach the maximum amount of time that can accrued. Council Member Smith asked how much money the policy adjustments could potentially cost the City. Mr. Crane stated that the cost may be the same, but the City’s liability will ultimately be reduced for compensatory time.

Council Member Timothy A. Ball MOVED that the City Council adopt the resolution revising the Personnel Policies and Procedures for Section 19.3 Holiday Leave, Section 13.8.B Compensatory Time Off.

Council Member Kim Rodela SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

<i>Council Member Timothy A. Ball</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Sarah D. Petersen</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Council Member Scott L. Smith</i>	<i>Yes</i>

The motion passed 5:0.

9. MAYOR/COUNCIL AND STAFF COMMUNICATION ITEMS

The City Council may discuss and receive updates on City events, projects, and issues from the Mayor, City Council members, and city staff. Topics discussed will be informational only. No final action will be taken on communication items.

- a. Council Committee Reports – North Pointe Solid Waste Special Service District**
– Council Member Scott L. Smith

Council Member Smith reported on his participation with the District; recently there has been a focus on the transfer station and hauling garbage to Bayview. This has led to a decision to increase tipping fees by \$1.00 per ton to cover hauling costs. Cities, businesses, and residents will experience these increases.

Council Member Bills noted that she understands that many cities and service districts increase their fees commensurate with consumer price index (CPI) increases.

Assistant City Administrator Wells noted that she expects there will be an additional increase proposed at the time that the City renews its contract in the coming January.

Council Member Smith then discussed the amount of time that elected officials spend on their assignments to special service districts; he suggested that Council stipends be increased to cover this time. Council Member Rodela stated she would be willing to have a discussion about that issue and she agreed with Council Member Smith's position.

c. Council Room Audio Visual - *Erin Wells, Assistant City Administrator*

Assistant City Administrator Wells discussed the reasons for the upgrade to the Court room audio visual system; the main reason for the change is a State mandate regarding audio visual requirements for court proceedings. The cost of the upgrades is \$14,000, which is the low bid after receiving four bids. Mayor Ostler stated he feels that cost seems high; the project includes cameras and a television, and he feels it could be accomplished at a lower price. Ms. Wells stated she understands that concern but feels that the bids were informed by the requirements in the State mandate.

Ms. Wells then facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the project to improve the audio-visual system for Council meetings; the tentative budget includes \$100,000 for the project, but that is the maximum that would be spent. The cost would be decreased depending upon direction from the Council. Three options for proceeding include immediate needs include improving microphones and the projector system; ongoing needs include improving the functionality of the system and its ability to broadcast audio and visual capturing during the meetings - currently remote participation is limited and recording quality is poor; and extra functionality including items like providing individual Council monitors, wireless microphones, on-screen countdown timer, annotation/touchscreen monitors, electronic button voting system, and an upgraded lectern. All bids that the City has received in the past have expired and it will be necessary to rebid the project based upon Council desires.

Throughout high-level philosophical discussion and debate among the Mayor and Council, they communicated their priorities to Ms. Wells, after which she indicated she will use their feedback to inform the request for proposals for the project.

d. Proposed Development Code Amendments - *Nathan Crane, AICP
City Administrator/Community Development Director*

Mayor Ostler indicated this item will be moved to the next meeting agenda due to the late hour.

e. Mountain Ridge Park Fundraising - *Nathan Crane, AICP
City Administrator/Community Development Director*

City Administrator/Community Development Director Crane discussed the remaining major elements to be funded at Mountain Ridge Park, after which he presented a draft of a donor program, which included the following donation levels:

- DIAMOND SPONSOR – \$50,000+
- GOLD SPONSORS – \$25,000 – \$49,000
- SILVER SPONSORS – \$10,000 – \$24,999
- BRONZE SPONSORS – \$5,000 – \$9,999
- FRIENDS OF THE PLAYGROUND – \$1,000 – \$4,999
- COMPONENT SPONSORS – Varies
- PLAY PLANTERS – \$500
- PARTNERS OF PLAY \$200 – \$499
- PARK FRIENDS – up to \$199

Donation/purchase ideas that could be communicated to the community include park amenities, playground amenities, and a gateway entry feature. He then presented images to serve as examples of the types of plaques or features that could be included at the park to recognize donors to the project. The Council stated they like the idea of individual plaques for larger donations or the purchase of a larger component at the park. They also liked the use of pavers to recognize donors as this attracts people to visit the park on a regular basis to find their name or the name of family members.

Mayor Ostler suggested that before advertising the opportunity to donate to the general public, he would like to approach long-term Highland residents about possibly donating. Council Member Smith stated he likes that idea and suggested that naming rights be offered to large donors.

There was then a brief discussion about the manner in which the opportunity to donate will be advertised to the public, with Assistant City Administrator Wells noting that the advertising materials will include information about donations being eligible as a tax write-off.

f. Future Meetings

- May 11, Lone Peak Public Safety District Board Meeting, 7:30 am, City Hall
- May 17, City Council Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall
- May 24, Planning Commission Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Scott L. Smith MOVED to adjourn the regular meeting and Council Member Kim Rodela SECONDED the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 pm.

I, Stephannie Cottle, City Recorder of Highland City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on May 3, 2022. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Highland City Council Meeting.



Stephannie Cottle
City Recorder

