

Heber City Corporation
City Council Meeting
May 15, 2008

6:30 p.m.
Work Meeting

The Council of Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah, met in **Work Meeting** on May 15, 2008, in the City Council Chambers in Heber City, Utah.

Present: Mayor David R. Phillips
Council Members Jeffery Bradshaw
Elizabeth Hokanson
Eric Straddeck
Nile Horner
Robert Patterson

Also Present: City Manager Mark K. Anderson
City Recorder Paulette Thurber
City Engineer Bart Mumford
City Planner Allen Fawcett
Chief of Police Ed Rhoades

Others Present:

Update on Recommendation of Personnel Policy Committee Regarding Health Insurance:

Health Insurance – Select Health (IHC Product)
Dental (Dental Select)
Disability (Guardian) Can't meet URS requirements - Broker now recommending Lincoln
Vision Care (Guardian) Broker now recommending EyeMed (48 month premium guarantee)
Life & AD&D (Guardian) Broker now recommending Lincoln Financial
Long Term Care (PEHP)
Voluntary Life (PEHP or ULGT) Lincoln Financial is willing to meet ULGT rates

Anderson said the Personnel Policy Committee had met and were making the above listed recommendations. He continued that because of Guardian's inability to meet the requirements of the Utah Retirement Systems, the broker suggested the City go with Lincoln. Since the City can't use Guardian for disability, the City probably wouldn't use them for Vision or Life or AD&D either. Anderson said he wanted to meet one more time with the Personnel Policy Committee and would bring additional recommendations back to the Council.

Update on the Purchase of Police Vehicles: Anderson reminded the Council that last meeting there had been discussion about the purchase of vehicles for the Police Department. Some of the information on pricing was wrong and Sgt. Bradley had asked to bring back different/correct information.

Sgt. Bradley explained the truck was a single cab truck rather than double cab. So he wanted to talk to the Council about Explorers which would deal with the mobility and size issues the Department faced. He said the mileage was slightly better than the trucks. There was discussion about the differences in pricing between the truck, Explorer and the Crown Victoria. Councilmember Horner had a concern with Explorers and high speed chases as they had a tendency to roll. Sgt. Bradley agreed SUVs did have that drawback. He said, though, he had experience with them and if a person was not reckless, they were still a capable vehicle. Councilmember Hokanson said she wanted the 4-wheel drive vehicles to be the vehicles that stayed in town because of the gas costs. Councilmember Horner recalled one reason the Council decided to purchase trucks was the difference in price. He suggested maybe now, with this additional information, the Council should go with the Crown Victorias instead. Councilmember Straddeck said he was still in favor of going with the Explorers. Councilmember Hokanson and Councilmember Bradshaw agreed. Councilmember Patterson said he preferred to purchase two of each. Councilmember Horner said he could concur with that. The vote was three Councilmembers in favor of Ford Explorers and two Councilmembers for two Ford Explorers and two Crown Victorias. The final decision, then, was to order Ford Explorers.

Review Proposed Costs of Animal Control Livestock Equipment: As the hour was late, the Council asked Anderson to take care of this issue.

Discuss Policy on Covering of Ditches that the City uses for Storm Water Purposes:

Mumford said he wanted to get clarification from the Council on covering of ditches as he had gotten some requests. An overhead was shown of the most recent ditch request which was on property owned by Paul Shelton. Mumford pointed out on the map the ditch, its route around the Activa Plaza, the school, Paul Shelton's property, Country Meadows Subdivision, etc. He said one of the few open areas left with this ditch was the piece that ran through the Shelton's property. Mumford said Shelton wanted that area piped; thus, the question to the Council about policy. Mumford said the water users down stream had not used their water for a number of years and, as far as the Irrigation Company, the ditch was no longer needed for them. However, the ditch could not be abandoned because of the storm water usage.

Paul Shelton said this was not a Heber City ditch or a Wasatch Irrigation Company ditch. It was a stock holders' ditch and wholly owned by them. He said that since the Water Efficiency Project had come on line in 2000, there was no longer any stockholders that used the ditch. Shelton discussed more history of the ditch and said that when Heber City took it upon themselves in the 1970s to discharge water in that ditch, they did not get permission from Wasatch Irrigation, because it wasn't their ditch, and they didn't get permission from the stock holders. He said he got all the Heber City Storm water dumped onto his property. Shelton said he would provide the labor, excavation and installation and the backfill material to cover the ditch if Heber City would provide the pipe. He said, too, if Heber City wanted to maintain that ditch as their ditch, he had

no problem allowing Heber City to run water through his property, but he did not feel it was his responsibility to pipe Heber City's storm drain.

Anderson said the standard irrigation policy was that if the property owner wanted to cover a ditch, it was at their expense, and with the City doing an inspection to make sure the right sized pipe was used and placed properly. Since this was storm water use only and not an active irrigation ditch, it was a somewhat different situation.

It was estimated to cost about \$7,000 for the pipe. Councilmember Hokanson wondered if the City had an easement to run the storm water in that ditch. Anderson said the City would only have a Prescriptive Right based on usage. Mayor Phillips thought if it was a benefit to pipe the ditch and take advantage of free labor, it should be considered. Councilmember Hokanson felt there was a benefit into looking at this especially since impact fees could be used for the cost of the pipe. Councilmember Bradshaw felt, too, the City ought to take care of the cost of the pipe. Councilmember Horner thought Shelton doing the labor was a good solution to this. He did see some benefit to going to a 24-inch pipe but if 18" was big enough, he was O.K. with it. Anderson suggested staff would evaluate impact fees to see if they could be used for this purpose.

Discussion on Canal Easement Encroachment: An overhead was shown of someone encroaching on the City's easement with a fence. The property owner had been told that he was encroaching on the City's easement with his fence and he chose to put the fence up anyway. The Council asked that Smedley send a letter to the property owner.

Schedule a date for a Budget Workshop: May 21 at 4:30 was decided upon and dinner would be provided.

Discuss Scheduling a Date to Review the Proposed PCMU Zone: June 3 at 6:00 p.m. was decided upon with sandwiches being provided.

Councilmember Horner asked that Impact Fee discussion be placed on the June 5 agenda.

As there was no further business to discuss on the May 15, 2008, Heber City Council Work Meeting, the Meeting adjourned.

Paulette Thurber, City Recorder