

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
RETREAT HELD WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2020, AT 10:00 A.M. IN THE  
COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK ROOM LOCATED AT 2277 EAST  
BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS, UTAH**



**Present:** Mayor Mike Peterson, Council Member Scott Bracken, Council Member Tali Bruce, Council Member Christine W. Mikell, Council Member Douglas Petersen

**Staff Present:** City Manager Tim Tingey, Records Culture and Human Resources Director Paula Melgar, Finance and Administrative Services Director S. Scott Jorges, Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson

Mayor Peterson called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m. and welcomed those present.

**1. Welcome and Introductions.**

Mayor Peterson introduced those present and commented that he considers the Annual Retreat to be the most critical meeting they have each year.

**2. Policies and Procedures Review.**

City Manager, Tim Tingey reviewed the Policies and Procedures and explained that under Media Relations, the Mayor is the official spokesman for the Council and the City. Exceptions to this policy are law enforcement situations, which are primarily within the purview of the Police Department and City Manager. Interactions with staff referenced the Code section that specifies that the Council does not interfere with the performance of the City Manager and his subordinates.

Committee assignments were discussed. Mr. Tingey stated that time will be provided quarterly at City Council Work Sessions. The Liaison to City advisory committees should limit the Council Members' involvement to observation, facilitation, and information exchange rather than control or direction of the committee.

Procedures for public comment at City Council Meetings were next reviewed. The importance of the comment cards being filled out was emphasized as they enable the City to respond and provide feedback.

Mr. Tingey explained that the Mayor is charged with setting the agenda for City Council meetings. One Council Member with the consent of at least one other Council Member may request an item be added to the agenda for an upcoming Council meeting. Comments about the performance of an appointed official or staff member should only be made to the manager.

Mr. Tingey described his role in conducting the Retreat.

### **3. Review of Past Year Strategic Initiative Progress.**

Mr. Tingey reviewed the past year's strategic initiative process and stated that these items were previously prioritized. Land use planning redevelopment and transportation were considered. The Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan provided additional input, finalized change, and was considered for adoption. The road improvement five-year funding was implemented through the budget process and also completed. Staff was in the process of revising the General Plan and submitted grant applications that were not funded. The Planned Development District ("PDD") is also in process. Staff worked with the consultant and provided updates.

Mr. Tingey reported that developing a CRA plan for the gravel site has been completed. Collaboration with UTA on services to Cottonwood Heights had also been completed. Developing the Community Reinvestment plan for the Fort Union area was investigated and was moving forward. Budgeting capital improvements, compensation, and preparing a strategic land acquisition strategy in conjunction with the budgetary process had not yet been done.

Council Member Mikell believed a strategic land acquisition strategy should be conducted as quickly as possible.

Mr. Tingey reported that the Storm Drain Capital Facilities Study investigating the implementation of the Storm Water Fee is in process and near completion. A plan will be presented at a future City Council Meeting. Employee compensation adjustments were in the final round of completion. Staff conducted a review of all fees in the City in conjunction with the budget process.

Items that have been accomplished were described. The Sustainability and Environmental initiatives included the adoption of an Outdoor Lighting Ordinance. The Council considered the adoption of a sustainability resolution and prepared a plan in conjunction with Rocky Mountain Power to implement sustainability elements and is ongoing. Work was also underway to investigate additional bike lanes throughout the City and the Tree Replacement Ordinance was in the draft stage.

The Council next discussed Parks, Trails and Open Space issues. It was noted that finalizing and considered for adoption the Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan should be ready for review in the spring. This is being done in house and Mr. Tingey emphasized he will have a firm completion date shortly. Staff has identified and secured \$1.5 million in funding for property acquisition related to the Bonneville Shoreline. The Ferguson Canyon funding was discussed. The dog park discussion will continue and have received recommendations from the Park, Trails and Open Space Committee.

Funding from Salt Lake County was discussed.

Mr. Tingey indicated that the Public Safety contract options have been evaluated and the City went through the process with the Unified Fire Authority ("UFA"). Throughout the budget process, they decided not to move forward with the hiring of a fourth firefighter. A revised communication plan and protocol for external use of Twitter, Facebook and other public information have been completed. Revised community relations goals pertaining to police had been also been completed.

De-escalation training with officers occurred and would be ongoing. Goals and benchmarks for implementation of emergency management will be worked on throughout the year. Mr. Tingey stated that General City Code Revisions are underway with additional work remaining to be done. Mr. Tingey presented the communication strategy and reported that changes had been made along with the completion of website modifications. He confirmed that the five-year Capital Improvement Plan will be detailed later in the meeting.

**4. City Manager Topics of Discussion.**

**a. Compensation Study.**

Mr. Tingey reviewed the Compensation Study and emphasized that he was very sensitive to how the study was conducted. He was interested in facts relative to the market, job descriptions, and job comparisons. Staff researched and contacted surrounding communities to match up jobs and their descriptions within those communities. Placing all jobs into a grade element was a priority. They were looking at the average with the market study and their positions. The cost of bringing everyone into the market was in the range of \$400,000. Cost issues were discussed.

**b. City Manager/Council Communication Discussion.**

Mr. Tingey asked for input regarding communication. He confirmed that he will continue to send the weekly Council communication via email. That same information will then be placed in the Microsoft Teams program and additional training will be provided.

Mayor Peterson believed that the most valuable communication is the individual meetings held by the City Manager with the different Council Members. Addressing items individually makes Work Sessions and Business Meetings more efficient.

**c. City Sponsored Events Input.**

City-sponsored events were reviewed. Mr. Tingey wanted to focus on the CHBA events and asked if the Council Members were comfortable continuing to pursue them.

Mayor Peterson reported that there are items he believes are extremely valuable and others that he would like more feedback on.

Mr. Tingey commented on the quarterly events and stated that they have been successful. Council Member Bruce expressed support for the quarterly events and stated that the struggle has been with networking. She remarked that a consistent showing is needed.

Ribbon cuttings and email list educational opportunities were discussed. Mayor Peterson acknowledged that businesses are critical to the City. Mr. Tingey stated that on Monday nights in August there has been an event involving food trucks that has been successful. There had been talk of it going all summer long rather than just August. Mr. Tingey's concern was that it becomes a resource issue since City staff is present and involved in coordinating the event.

Mayor Peterson stated that conceptually he received a lot of supportive feedback. It was noted that the City of Holladay has a food truck area. A question was raised with respect to how it is managed. The thought was that the Holladay model would be the ultimate goal. Mayor Peterson explained that Holladay does not run the food truck park and they have a contract with an outside entity. A question was raised about how a contract works with food trucks to ensure that the trucks are present at the event.

The Council took a five-minute break.

Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson defined the role of staff with respect to food truck events. Because only City events can take place at parks, the policy is that staff must be present each night of the event. City Hall is considered the same as a City Park. No other events can take place at the park by private individuals other than renting a pavilion. Staff must be present at food truck events when they begin at 5:00 p.m. and again around 8:00 p.m. to make sure that the trucks leave at the conclusion of the event.

With regard to contracting with a food truck, generally, the City reaches out to the Food Truck League to report an event and indicate how many trucks will be needed. The League then puts out an announcement within their network and the first trucks to sign up will be present at the event.

Mr. Johnson addressed concerns regarding the issue of expansion. He explained that expanding requires a rotation of staff throughout the summer on a weekly basis. Mr. Johnson wanted to expand this rotation beyond the six people in his department to facilitate the demand for staff at these events. The idea of Public Works being involved in staffing was mentioned.

The potential of expanding to other parks beyond just Mountain View Park was discussed. The idea behind choosing Mountain View Park as a location was due to the splash pad being at that location and attracting people. The possibility of having food trucks at Golden Hills or Mill Hollow Parks on a rotating basis to serve those in different geographic areas was discussed.

The Council discussed the merits of expanding food truck events to every Monday during the summer from June to August. The topics discussed included the waning nature of summer activities beginning in August and the willingness of the food truck operators to participate without having a guarantee of a financial return in exchange for their time. One idea to keep public interest high was to hold the food truck event every other week. Again, it was mentioned that the City of Holladay has an event every week, which is the ideal.

A question was raised about the possibility of the City joining the Cottonwood Heights Business Association (“CHBA”) and what that would provide for the City. Mr. Johnson responded that the City also received a request from the Chamber of Commerce at a cost of \$5,000. Membership benefits were described. It would give the City a seat at the table for their meetings. The Chamber also works with the City in conjunction with the CHBA to tailor a program supporting the needs of the City in terms of business development and outreach. It would be a way for the CHBA to have a more well-defined role. They would be complemented by the Chamber and attend meetings with City representatives and represent the needs of the businesses in the City. It was noted that membership fees for area businesses are based on the number of employees.

Mayor Peterson expressed concern with the membership placing a financial burden on the City or small businesses. Mr. Tingey stated that potentially the City could pursue a one-year membership to determine if the South Valley Chamber can deliver on their claims. The topic was to be discussed further as a priority going forward.

## **5. Review of Five-Year Financial Projections and Capital Improvement Plan.**

Finance and Administrative Services Director, Scott Jurges displayed past actual financials from previous years. He first addressed fiscal year 2016/2017 where they began with a fund balance of \$2.3 million and budgeted revenues of \$18 million. That year they had transfers in from the Capital Projects Fund. At that time the Debt Service Fund had not yet been established. In more recent years, the outgoing fund transfers were predominantly for the Debt Service Fund to service the debt on the City Building and the Public Works and police vehicles. Mr. Jurges explained that to get to the budgeted ending fund balance, they must start with the beginning fund balance, add in revenues, subtract expenditures, and take away the transfers out. There is always a variance between what is budgeted because the City cannot spend every dollar received. In fiscal year 2018/2019, the operational budgets were reduced.

In response to a question raised about the length of the debt service on the City Building, Mr. Jurges reported that it is 25 years and ends in 2039.

Mayor Peterson noted that the tax increase occurred from 2018 to 2019 and is included in the future projections. The projected budget includes the on-going five-year plan for roads and infrastructure.

Mr. Jurges commented on police vehicles and equipment and stated that every two years there is a flip because they purchase equipment for the vehicles every two years and use them for four years. The current vehicles were leased for two years. In the future, one year they will include equipment replacement in the bond debt service. The next two years they will not include it. The result will be for the allotted amount to decrease in future years. Mr. Jurges stated that in 2024 or 2025 there are two separate leases on Public Works equipment and one of the expenses totaling \$34,000 will go away. With respect to fire vehicles, the annual increase will be approximately \$156,000 or 4%. That amount was included in addition to a net of \$100,000 in unidentified costs to cover other increases.

Mr. Jurges clarified that the expenses for COLA, health, and dental costs are estimated at \$477,000. He reported that the City is spending approximately \$995,000 of fund balance per year. The next year that will increase to \$1,436,000. It was reported that the City's expenses are growing at a rate of about \$400,000 a year above revenues, which is not uncommon. With regard to potential property tax increases, Mr. Jurges stated that a 1% property tax increase would equate to \$80,000 in new revenue.

Mr. Jurges noted that if there is a variance from the budget projection of \$400,000, he will report that there will be a \$300,000 or \$350,000 so as to provide a buffer. A question was raised as to whether a 3% annual property tax increase would cover the \$400,000 variance shown. Mr. Jurges

responded that it would be very close and the City would need to watch expenditures and not spend money where it is not necessary. Major capital expenditures have not been ongoing are not accounted in these projections. The new costs would require new revenue streams.

A question was raised as to whether compensation changes are included in the projections. Mr. Jorges pointed out that it was included. He confirmed that the projections include potential upgraded salaries for City employees. This was done with a \$400,000 placeholder since this cost is still in the early phases and will hopefully be clarified shortly. The Cost of Living Allowance (“COLA”) was not included in the \$400,000 placeholder.

A question was raised about whether the unfunded police benefit from last year’s Legislative Session was included in the projections. It was reported that that will not impact the City negatively because the difference between Tier 1 and Tier 2 rates are covered with a 401(k) contribution. If the Tier 2 rate changes, the City changes what the 401(k) contribution is. Roughly \$1.8 million needs to be reserved for a combination of the 6% minimum and the PTO vested. This number varies from year to year but is close to \$1.8 million.

Based on experience from his background, Mayor Peterson mentioned that the most important number is the unrestricted fund balance. This means that the Council has the discretion to use the funds. The number the Council has true discretion over this year was estimated at \$2.4 million.

Council Member Mikell inquired about the possibility of requiring all City employees to use their PTO and eliminate the option of a buyout. She described the health benefits of taking vacation as well as the added benefits to saving money in the budget. There is a cap on the number of PTO hours employees can be paid for unused time. Concerns were expressed about employees not being able to use PTO when they need it. Some entities do not budget the payment of PTO as a liability, but Cottonwood Heights does so to be more conservative on the budget.

It was noted that an additional factor to consider with the budget projections is the regional Consumer Price Index (“CPI”) percentage increase. The legislature looked at potentially building in a property tax increase tied to CPI. Approximately one-third of the City’s revenue is tied to property taxes, which does not allow for much new growth. The growth in sales tax is healthy. There are a variety of fees and other taxes, such as energy that are regressing. To make up for that regression, funds must be taken from other sources of revenue, so the net revenue is 1.2%. These projections assume that the revenue from sales tax will continue to increase.

A graph was shown to highlight where Cottonwood Heights falls compared to other cities in terms of taxation of its constituents. The City of Cottonwood Heights is mid-range. It was mentioned that the Council must remember that there are other taxes on residents that are not through the City, such as those through the Service District. Constituents will often look at the overall tax and think the City is getting all of the revenue from those taxes. In the past, the City held an open house to have constituents get educated about this issue. That was helpful to inform comments from constituents.

Financial aspects of surrounding areas were discussed. A question was raised about how adding on the tax from the Service District made Cottonwood Heights comparable to Herriman. Herriman

City is unique in terms of taxation for their Recreation District. It was noted that although Herriman does receive funds from the County. The City of Holladay utilized a bond for their road work.

The Public Works Department prepared information regarding projects that have been pending for a number of years. The needs include razing buried storm drains and manholes, which will cost \$180,000. Another need is the cleaning the system, which will cost \$900,000. The total cost of these projects is \$24 million, which will be over several years. If a Storm Water fee is implemented, it would cost \$5 to \$13 per month per resident and vary depending on how quickly the projects are completed.

Other projects still pending in the City included Danish Road. This is a project that failed to be funded by grants. The potential solutions included building a sidewalk or widening the road, both of which are costly. Help with funding from the Wasatch Front Regional Council was not a plausible option because Danish Road does not fit the category of a “regional amenity.” Other projects include the City Hall Solar Project. Council Member Mikell commented that the numbers projected on that project seem high. The Public Works Building was estimated to cost \$5 million. The current Public Works Building will house vehicles and provide office space for staff and administrative employees. Council Member Mikell asked where the snowplows have been stored since the City took over plowing.

A new development at 1700 East and Fort Union Boulevard was discussed. It was noted that children walk to school on this road and there is no sidewalk. This was an area of concern that many residents have contacted the City about. There was uneasiness that those on the west side will be reluctant to give up property to build a sidewalk. The dollar amount of the project was estimated at \$409,000, which includes engineering, construction, and right-of-way acquisition costs.

Mr. Jurges reminded the Council that the retreat was intended to provide information on revenues and expenses.

There was brief discussion on survey constituents who recently participated in rate services provided by the City. Some residents expressed concern that the Council would consider not funding the storm water improvements. When it was discovered that the project would not incur additional costs to public, there was overwhelming support for it. If the project were to incur additional cost, 67% of those surveyed still supported it.

A clarification was made about the section of the survey dealing with contacting City officials. In the survey, 39% responded that they had contacted the Cottonwood Heights City Offices in the past year while 61% had not. Of the 39% who had contacted the City offices, 75% felt somewhat satisfied by their experience. Street maintenance, snow removal, renewable energy sources, and parks and open space were the issues most constituents desired the City to spend money on.

Information was provided relative to how often citizens ride bikes on the streets, as well constituent input on how to make streets safer. Ideas included dedicated bike lanes and improved signage of crosswalks. A large percentage of constituents believe that parks, trails, and open space should be a high priority in terms of spending. The percentages were nearly even for those constituents who

were for and against fencing off an area of the park for a dog park. Mr. Jurges provided highlights and an overview.

**6. Break/Lunch.**

Those in attendance took a lunch break.

**a. Budget Committee.**

Mr. Jurges reported that a Benefits and Compensation and Budget Committees were formed. The previous evening, they outlined the meeting schedule.

The City's Mission Statement was briefly discussed. It was made available to the public.

It was reported that the Budget Committee will meet at least once per month at 4:00 p.m. prior to Regular Council Meetings. The next Council Meeting was scheduled for February 18 and will consist of the Compensation Committee Meeting. Calendar invites were to be sent to those involved. The goal was to review the budget documents and Compensation Study with recommendations from the committees to the City Council. The intent was to make a report during a Work Meeting when the budget is discussed. Mayor Peterson commented that this was an opportunity for the Council to have direct input on the budget and address questions and concerns before decisions are made. It was suggested that the Council reschedule the Committee Meeting scheduled for February 18 due to conflicts.

**7. Survey Review/SWOT Analysis.**

Mr. Tingey provided a summary of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats ("SWOT") analysis performed the previous year. He highlighted some of the strengths found in the study. The issues included citizen engagement, diversity, tax base, commercial related to fund balance, geographical location, transportation, parks and recreation, open space, innovation, and schools.

A question was raised about where the 82% voter turnout came from. It was reported that the figure was from the previous year.

Council Member Mikell commented that one of the strengths was that they are creative and can adapt to the needs of constituents. The comment was made that any successful organization is continually changing and adapting. It is important to be flexible. The quality of citizens was mentioned, as well as fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Tingey reviewed weaknesses. It was noted that there have been complaints about communication and the City's website.

Mr. Tingey reviewed opportunities that included repairing weaknesses, enhancing quality of life, providing alternate transportation choices, and improving local government effectiveness through

transparency of communication. Potential threats were identified as natural disasters, public safety threats, state legislation impacts, economic downturn, affordable housing, and litigation.

## **8. Strategic Initiative Discussion – 2020.**

Mr. Tingey addressed Revenue Priorities, Funding Priorities, Legislative Initiatives, and other discussion items. The list was provided on the second page of the agenda. Mr. Tingey reported that the list includes items that have come up over the last four to six months. He explained that making a decision on an issue that is a priority does not mean it is final. It means that work will be done by staff to make that project come to fruition. Choosing priorities gives staff guidance on what they should work toward. If there is a priority, it needs to be decided upon now so work can begin. The example of dog parks was addressed as well as what due diligence staff could do to work toward accomplishing that goal.

### **a. Categories.**

#### **i. Revenue Options.**

##### Increase Fees:

There was an option identified that would involve increasing fees such as building permits, business licensing, land use permits, facilities fees, and other day-to-day operations. Changes were made to facility fees this past year, so likely that will not be revisited. If changes were made to building permits or business licensing, State law requires that an analysis be done. Significant revenues will not come from that area. Mr. Jurgens estimated that between \$25,000 and \$100,000 could be yielded by utilizing this option. Staff was willing to pursue this option in preparing for the upcoming budget. A question was raised clarify what is yielded from the fees and if the City has higher fees compared to other cities. Business license fees were dropped recently, and they currently are in line with most communities. Building permit fees have not been studied for some time and a study would be useful to determine the impact. It would be helpful for the Council to have input from staff regarding fees, as this is an area where little is known. It was noted that the City is relatively high in terms of sign permit fees.

##### Storm Water Fee Implementation:

Mr. Tingey reported that \$24 million is the preliminary cost of the work to be done to the facilities. If a Storm Water Fee is to be implemented, staff will present various scenarios. A five-year plan could result in high fees to citizens, for example. Other communities in the area charge \$3 to \$13 per month in fees for similar projects. If the City plans to complete this project in 20 years, they could look at roughly a \$7 fee for all residents, which could fluctuate.

A comment was made that there are federal requirements the City is not meeting regarding storm water and this project has been delayed. The federal implications were unclear but would be investigated further.

It was noted that the age of the stormwater system varies depending on geographic location. A few years ago, cameras were placed in every drain to assess the situation. About 800 manholes were razed but there are still a few hundred that are covered.

Mr. Jurgens clarified how funds would be allocated for the project. \$180,000 would go toward razing covered manholes and \$900,000 would go toward cleaning. A camera system would part of the five-year plan. \$23 million would go toward the actual facility upgrades. What was presented were preliminary numbers. Additional detail was to be added when it is finalized.

A question raised pertaining to whether the \$24 million puts the City into compliance with federal regulations and if any pieces of the projected plan are under federally mandated time limits. The proposed Storm Water Fee is a major step and it would be advantageous to understand the details. Mr. Jurgens explained that with the proposed plan, the federal requirements will be met. A few years earlier, a similar plan was presented. It was overwhelming to the City Council at that time. Many cities are in the same predicament and it was thought that some State or Federal assistance should be offered, however, that was not the case. Mr. Jurgens reiterated that many cities have stormwater fees ranging from \$3 in Lehi to \$13 in Pleasant Grove. The fee is not a tax so it is not tax-deductible. The City would need to work with a third-party on the collection and ascertain the costs involved. The Council determined that budgeting for this quarterly would be the most ideal.

The risks associated with deferring maintenance were addressed. It was noted that a great deal had been spent on the work over the past two years. It was important to consider the costs and regulations as well as the implications if the work is continually put off.

The repairs on Keswick Road were resolved but were not in the budget. \$50,000 was allotted for stormwater repair annually, which was much lower than the \$24 million needed for the project. Proactive steps, similar to those that have done on roadwork, need to be taken. The importance of a strategic three-to-five-year plan was mentioned. It was noted that road work is more easily noticeable by constituents and has become a significant funding priority to the public.

It was mentioned that most surrounding cities are not in compliance with federal regulations, although Cottonwood Heights should strive to be.

#### Telecom Franchise Tax:

A potential Telecom Franchise Tax was discussed. It was reported that many communities have implemented the tax. If implemented, the projected additional revenue would be roughly \$400,000 per year. This comes from a percentage of cell phone bills for citizens. The Council could set the tax rate, which is typically between 4% and 6%, which could result in the \$400,000 figure varying. It was unclear which percentage was calculated to achieve the \$400,000 figure. No revenue from the tax would be lost in collection. Most cities that are similar in size to Cottonwood Heights collect this tax and all collect the maximum. Typically, small rural cities do not collect revenue from the Telecom Franchise Tax. Most cities that collect a Storm Water Fee do so through utilities. Different possible third-party companies were identified to collect the fee. It was suggested that residential and business aspects be considered. A decision would be made as to whether the City would charge for undeveloped land.

### Increase Taxes:

The option of a Property Tax increase was discussed. As previously mentioned, a 1% increase in the tax yields approximately \$80,000, 3% yields roughly \$240,000 and so on. There was a comment that when taxes were raised two years earlier there was a perceived commitment that the increase would last for multiple years.

### Bonding and Grants:

Bonding and grants were discussed. It was reported that grants have been and are continually pursued for road projects and in other areas. A revenue stream needs to exist to pay for the bond, but the City could be more aggressive with its stormwater projects. They could bond for a portion and get upfront money to do extensive work. If there was a liability issue and a larger amount was needed soon, bonding was an option. It was noted that roads can only be bonded for 10 years, although stormwater is permitted to extend beyond the 10 years. Other options involving bonding were discussed including a revenue bond where revenues are pledged, and a general obligation bond. A few cities along the Wasatch Front utilize a general obligation bond. These cities have taken the issue to the constituents and moved forward if it is the will of those they represent by using property taxes for that issue. There is not necessarily a maximum amount of years for a stormwater bond, though going fewer years is better for lower interest payments. \$5 million over 20 years equates to approximately \$335,000 per year. Over 10 years it would be in the \$650,000 \$700,000 per year.

Mr. Jurgens reported that the State of Utah has funds available for storm water-specific bonding where cities are able to get a lower interest rate. This takes a little longer, as an analysis is required pertaining to the City's needs need. The principle and interest of potential bonds were discussed as well as how much could potentially be saved with the help of a lower interest rate from the State.

The Council agreed to come back to the potential revenue priorities and make decisions after funding is discussed.

#### **ii. Funding Options.**

Funding options and priorities were discussed. Staff compensation and the Public Works Building were briefly addressed. The concern with not having a Public Works Building pertained to the depreciation in the value of any equipment that is not properly housed and stored outside.

#### **iii. Funding Priorities;**

### General Operations:

- **Staff Compensation.** Mayor Peterson wanted to see detail on the Compensation Study but stressed that staff compensation is critical.

- Public Works Building. Council Member Bracken reported that when they get to the point of needing to purchase new vehicles, the next batch should be better protected. Mayor Peterson recommended the Council look at the Master Plan and determine what phase of the Public Works Yard is being proposed. He also questioned whether it can be phased over time. More information was also desired on depreciation and timing issues. The consensus was to not proceed but have staff come back with more details at a future work session.

#### Transportation/Infrastructure:

- Road Improvement Funding was ongoing. \$1.8 million was built into the budget. The consensus of the Council was not to reduce that amount.
- Stormwater Investment was next addressed. Staff was directed to present the Council with the details and evaluate it during the budget process.
- Bike Lane barriers along Bengal Boulevard were discussed for bike safety and to enhance the Safe Routes to School. Support was expressed for the \$30,000 option.
- Staff was directed to evaluate funding options for the Danish Road Reconstruction Project.
- Sidewalk improvements on 1700 East. The cost was reported to be \$409,000. Connection issues were discussed. The consensus of the Council was for staff to conduct additional research.

#### Land Use Planning:

- Secure funding for a New General Plan was recommended as well as to put out a Request for Proposals (“RFP”), secure consulting services, and begin the public input process. The cost was determined to be \$80,000.

#### Parks Trails and Open Space:

- Support was expressed for pursuing the development of a Dog Park with the County.
- Cameras and WIFI at Parks. WIFI was desired but cameras were determined not to be a priority.
- 7200 South Target/Hillside Trail. Mr. Tingey reported that it would be built into the Trails Master Plan.
- Consider County proposal to obtain ownership of two parks. Staff was directed to look into the issue with the possibility of obtaining additional land for a Dog Park. It was determined to be a leverage point with the Dog Park. Annexation and maintenance issues were discussed. The Mayor reported that once the County divests themselves of municipal

parks, of which there are nine, it gives them the opportunity to focus in greater detail on the regional parks.

Land Acquisition:

- Identify and secure funding for property acquisition and capital expenditures for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail (“BST”). Mr. Tingey stated that the City needs to work toward obtaining more grant funding on the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, which is in process. Council Member Mikell emphasized that this is the year that there could be significant amounts of money available for open space at the State level. She stressed the importance of quickly identifying what the total amount would be to satisfy all of their needs and provide it to their two lobbyists. Mayor Peterson commented that the Governor’s budget includes \$40 million for open space. His understanding was that the Legislature has many trails and open space bills. Council Member Bracken stated that another potential use of funds would be the school access walkways that have fallen into disrepair. He estimated that \$100,000 in repairs would make the sidewalks better for children walking to school.
- Acquire land for Dog Parks.

Other:

- Electric Vehicle (“EV”) charging infrastructure investment. Council Member Mikell preferred to find the needed \$2,600 in the budget and take the solar panels out to bid again and see if that amount could be reduced. They could then approach Granite and ask for a larger portion. She pointed out that Rocky Mountain Power has grant funding they could pursue as well. They could then conduct an analysis of what the payback would be.
- Solar panels at City Hall were explored.
- Mr. Tingey reported that staff will finalize a draft on the Trails Master Plan in April.

**iii. Legislative Priorities;**

- The Code Revision priorities were identified as follows:
  1. Chapter 2 of the Code Revisions (Governance and Administration);
  2. Chapter 19 Code Revisions (19.51 Planned Development District Zoning);
  3. Chapter 19 Code Revisions (19.72 Sensitive Lands);
  4. Chapter 14 Code Revisions (Highways, Sidewalks, and Public Places);
  5. Chapter 5 Code Revisions (Business Licensing and Regulations);

6. Chapter 9 Code Revisions (9.05 Nuisances and Abatement);
7. Chapter 9 Code Revisions (9.62 Idling Vehicles) (Private Property – State Statute);
8. General Ordinance Recommendations – include Sustainability perspective; and
9. Tree Ordinance (in rights-of-way and on public properties).

Voting and term limit issues were discussed. Mayor Peterson stated that the desire was to get more people to run for office. Staff agreed to clarify situations where City employees are running for office.

#### **iv. Initiatives/Research;**

The priorities identified by the Council were as follows:

- Finalize the Community Reinvestment Areas (“CRA”) process.
- Finalize and consider adoption of the Parks Trails and Open Space Master Plan (inventory, priorities, implementation). It was being worked on and expected to be completed by April 1. Staff would verify the trail connection.
- The Environmental Sustainability Master Plan was being worked on with and for two other communities and was ongoing. Funding issues were discussed. Details were to be worked out with Rocky Mountain Power.
- Consider promotional events with the school district and encourage students to ride bikes to school.
- Funding was sought for the Fort Union Pedestrian initiatives and research.

#### **v. Other Discussion Items.**

- Mayor Peterson reported that the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) consists of eight or nine entities with the cost of participation being \$50,000 per year until the Council feels it is no longer advantageous to be part of. He suggested they reassess the situation each year. He had heard that questions were being raised by certain municipalities. Chris Robinson from Summit County serves as Chair with Salt Lake County Mayor Jenny Wilson serving as Vice-Chair. Mayor Mendenhall from Salt Lake City serves as the Treasurer and Mayor Peterson serves as Secretary. The Mayor has tried to be actively involved particularly with issues relating to Wasatch Boulevard and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.
- Senior Center Investment issues were discussed. Mr. Tingey stated that there is a group that has been proactive in communicating with staff. Mayor Peterson stated that they have met with Salt Lake County Aging Services who informed them that they are not looking to

build any more senior centers and are pursuing other programs with local recreation centers. They contacted the Sandy Senior Center who was able to provide some transportation. The Cottonwood Heights facility was built with the intention of having a senior component. The Mayor stated that senior programs and recreational centers do not always mesh well together. The new facilities are being referred to as “multi-generational”. One of the highest priorities of seniors is aquatics although they often don’t offer other types of classes to seniors. The importance of communication was recognized.

- Fire station ownership issues were discussed. Mr. Tingey reported that the County has approached the City and is interested in giving the City ownership of one of the two fire stations. Mayor Timothy reported that the City should own Station 110. In other communities, most fire stations are owned by the individual cities. The Mayor did not want to take on the expense of creating a City-run fire department since the Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) is doing a great job. As a result, he saw no reason to take on that expense. The consensus of the Council was not to pursue potential ownership.
- The potential of holding Town Hall Meetings was discussed. Mayor Peterson expressed his support but asked if the intent was to hold a City-wide meeting or conduct them individually for each district. Council Member Bracken stated that in the past they have included in the budget the mailing, which is fairly expensive. Mr. Tingey’s preference was to not pursue the mailing. There was support for holding a City-wide Town Hall Meeting once the budget passes. Because a lot of public input has been taken, Mr. Tingey suggested that they be held individually within each district. Mayor Peterson agreed and thought that having smaller groups with greater interaction was more productive.
- There was discussion of the County Parks Proposal to obtain ownership of two parks. UTOPIA Fiber has contacted staff twice and is interested in having the City be a participating community. The cost was estimated at \$108,000 annually but depends on the number of subscribers. Mr. Tingey had concerns but presented it to the Council to get direction. Some other communities are partnering entities with UTOPIA, which has two different models. Those on the original model are paying about \$3 million per year for the next 60 years. Mayor Peterson wanted to get details on the new model. Council Member Bracken commented that they need 1,000 to 1,500 homes to subscribe with an ongoing commitment. Mr. Tingey explained that UTOPIA issues a bond and the \$108,000 paid annually is the City’s portion of the bond payment. As a result, the commitment is for a significant number of years.
- The Council discussed the Equal Rights Amendment in the State of Utah involving a resolution of support that encourages people to get out and vote. It was noted that 51% of the population is women. It was necessary for 38 states to ratify the effort. Virginia was the 38th state to adopt the resolution but did not meet the required deadline. There was expected to now be a challenge as to whether it will be accepted and ratified. If it’s not, the process will have to begin again in which case Utah’s vote would be significant. It is a Constitutional matter that specifies that cities cannot discriminate against women on the basis of sex. Council Member Bracken did not consider it to be the highest priority and preferred to stay focused on municipal matters. It was noted that a public survey showed

that 72% of Utahans are in favor of passing such a measure. There was interest among the Council of having someone address the matter further at a work session.

- It was reported that the cost to join the South Valley Chamber of Commerce is \$5,000. Mayor Peterson asked that more details be gathered and the matter be presented to the Business Association for their input.
- Mr. Tingey stated that the intent is to work toward benchmarks and implementation for emergency management efforts in the City.
- An ordinance regarding puppy mills was discussed. The comment was made that that type of activity should be discouraged in the City. Mr. Tingey explained that currently, the ordinance specifies that dog breeding activities are not allowed without a business license. A commercial permit is required as well. A puppy mill was defined as breeding on an intensive basis under conditions that are regarded as inhumane. Mayor Peterson stated that if research shows it is a problem in the City, staff should propose administrative language. Mr. Tingey stated that the use would have to be spelled out in greater detail in the Land Use Ordinance as currently there is no specificity in that regard. They are not presently defined.
- Indigenous People's Day was recommended as another popular movement. There was no consensus to move forward with this.
- Mr. Tingey offered to provide a typed summary of the issues addressed. Mayor Peterson stated that today the items were simply identified. The next step would be to prioritize them.
- Mayor Peterson's priorities were as follows:
  - i. Telecom Tax;
  - ii. Stormwater Fee;
  - iii. Identify which projects can be submitted to ZAP, TRAK, Wasatch Front Regional Council, or Corridor Preservation Funds and see how many can be funded with grants; and
  - iv. Bonding.

The Mayor clarified that he would not fund anything until more information is available.

Council Member Bracken stated that he would only consider a property tax increase if it were small. In lieu of that, the Telecom Tax serves a similar purpose. Various options were discussed such as doing a property tax increase only. Mayor Peterson commented that when going through the Truth in Taxation process, people get upset when property taxes are involved. User taxes, however, are more acceptable.

Council Member Mikell thought it was important to do something this year. She wanted her legacy to be to leave things better than she found them.

Mr. Tingey stated that the two priorities staff will look seriously at this year will be the Stormwater Fee and the Telecom Franchise Tax.

Mr. Tingey was thanked for his efforts.

**9. Adjourn.**

The City Council Retreat adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m.

*I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights City Council Retreat held Wednesday, January 22, 2020.*

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes  
T Forbes Group  
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: March 3, 2020