

**CITY COUNCIL MINUTES**  
**SEPTEMBER 25, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Maile Wilson-Edwards; Councilmembers: Ron Adams; Paul Cozzens; Terri Hartley; Craig Isom; Scott Phillips.

**STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Paul Bittmenn; City Engineer Kit Wareham; City Attorney Tyler Romeril; Executive Assistant Onjulee Pittser; Finance Director Jason Norris; Police Chief Darin Adams; Fire Chief Mike Phillips; Leisure Services Director Ken Nielson; Airport Manager Nick Holt; Economic Development Director Danny Stewart.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Karter Imlay, Kadin Imlay, Brayden Robinson, Brittanie Parry, Grayson Breinholt, Aurie Breinholt, Ken Stevens, Tom Jett, Don Oswald, Tyler Melling, Jared Harrington, Anthony Colasuono, Collin Justis, Scott Allen, Jacob Smith, Jennie Hendricks, Johanna Garavito, Jared Barnes, Mary Fox, Ryan Marshall, Grady Holm, Brynnlyn Sillito, Jace Jackman, Justin Davidson, Kate Abbott, Hadlie Visser, Lindsey McMillon, Sidelvir Avila, Wallace Limb, Adam Hahn, Hillary Ellsworth, Jeff Richards, Tate Womack, Phil Schmidt, Anders Henningsson, Dave Staheli, Krista Staheli, Samuel Stewart, Alyssa Fain, Chad Fain, Kerry Fain, Bo Fain, Luke Fain, Miles Fain, Paul Rhodes III, Adrienne Badger, Tim Watson, Teri Kenney, Dallin Staheli, Abby Geddes, Cheri Stinson, Andrea White, Riley White, Katelynn Stinson, Jonathan Baker, Mike Golden, Kellsey Keener, Diana Elliott, Laura Anderson

**CALL TO ORDER:** Pastor Jim Vasquez of Sunrise Christian Church gave the invocation; the pledge was led by Councilmember Terri Hartley.

**AGENDA ORDER APPROVAL:** Councilmember Isom moved to approve the agenda order; second by Councilmember Hartley; vote unanimous.

**ADMINISTRATION AGENDA – MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS; STAFF COMMENTS:**

**Scott Phillips:** Next Saturday October 5<sup>th</sup>, the downtown economic committee will be sprucing up downtown and putting up harvest decorations from 9 a.m. to noon. We're still looking for volunteers. We'll have all the supplies and we ask anyone who can come and join us, please do so and bring gloves and pliers if you have them. **Mayor:** We can get that information and get it out on social media. **Scott:** We have a PDF flyer for it as well. **Mayor:** Remember this weekend is SUU homecoming, so, Saturday, there'll be the parade, a football game and everything around the university will be super busy but exciting and fun. **Scott:** Forever Red is Friday night. Lots of music and fireworks.

**Dave Evans:** The Chief asked me to comment on some research he was asked to do on the intersection of Cove and Meadow. I don't have the material or research he has done, but it had to do with lighted stop signs. The price tag he's found are anywhere from \$1,350 to \$1,450 per sign depending on features. He asked me to notify you of that price tag and give any direction you can provide to him. **Paul Bittmenn:** The conversations were that councilmembers would look at that intersection the feeling is that a lot of folks are not seeing the stop sign. The conversations we've had internally are they're expensive for stop signs. We're trying to look for some guidance as to where they would go, so we don't have to replace every stop sign in town with them. If we do want to use them, we need to make it

targeted. **Paul Cozzens**: The ones I'm thinking of are on Cove Drive and Meadow. I see cars just blow through that intersection and someone's going to get hurt. I think it's worth the money. It's gotten so busy. I would like to see us do it. **Scott**: I don't know how bright these lighted signs are and see what it does to the neighborhood and the effects it will have. **Paul**: I looked of that and I've looked at a couple thinking of that and I don't think it will be glaring through windows. It may be a bit of a nuisance. **Scott**: Do you think there'll be any difference once the stop light goes in there? **Paul C.**: I think it will be the same. **Mayor**: Is there a direction from the council? **Paul C.**: I move to approve the purchase of them to put on Cove Drive and Meadow. **Scott**: Would this be an experimental situation to try it and see how it goes before we try to do this all over town? **Paul B.**: Just think about how the folks in South Mountain about traffic control issues and prior to them coming in there's folks in Fiddler's by the elementary school. It moves around town. If we put them in, we'll get more requests. So far, we've been unable with staff to come up with ideas as to how we can program if we put them in if certain criteria are met. **Scott**: Based on traffic count, how many accidents are there. **Paul B.**: We've had a lot of folks coming in screaming at us. **Terri Hartley**: I think the issues on the other two you named other two issues are speeding and not a lack of visibility but a lack of what direction we need to control traffic on South Mountain. I think this is a visibility issue of the stop signs. I'd be in favor of putting them there. I've seen the same thing. I'm not saying we shouldn't go forward and develop a plan, but I think visibility is an issue with a lot of traffic. **Mayor**: I think if the majority are in favor. We have a motion. Councilmember Hartley seconds. All in favor for unanimous decision.

**Dave Evans**: Officer DeMasters has been selected as the September Employee of the Month. I'm grateful to present this to him tonight. This is a note from one of our patrol sergeants, Officer Ludlow: "Orlas DeMasters is a hard worker and is willing to do any work that is asked of him. He is driven to excel in pro-active police work. He takes it upon himself to know and communicate with citizens of this community. If an officer is ever looking for someone in question, he is a good source to know where to find people. He is a great watchman for the City, he always keeps a close eye on the troubled areas of the City. I appreciate Officer DeMasters and his positive attitude. When you work with Officer DeMasters, his famous saying is "Let's go get into something." He respects his job and does his best to be the best. He is diligent in staying active and working. Another attribute that Officer DeMasters has brought to this department is his willingness to build relationships with other officers and their families. He is welcoming to all and he spends personal time getting to know several of the officers and their family. He truly treats others as a brother." I'm thankful and proud of Officer DeMasters. I appreciate the effort and the work he makes to serve in our community. **Mayor**: Any other staff comments?

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**: **Tom Jett**: I'd like the City to consider putting a stop sign at the corner of 800 W. and 400 N. It's Ahern tool rental is on one corner and some apartments on the other 3 corners there. It's an area being renewed with young families that are walking to North elementary. It's scary to watch those kids walk across 800 W., because the buses don't pick the kids up that close to school. There must be 100 kids that live on the West side of 800 W. from the trailer parks into Brook Street. I know there's engineering things that have to be done to qualify. **Paul C.**: Did you say a 4-way stop or streetlight? **Tom**: A 4-way stop. **Scott**: Right now, it's a 2-way stop, correct? **Tom**: It runs East-West. They seem to be going double the speed there. **Scott**: Does that have any effect on the fire station on 800? **Mike Phillips**: If we're running code, we'll run through it. It shouldn't affect as far as responding, but it will slow traffic going up and down that road.

**CONSENT AGENDA: (1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES DATED SEPTEMBER 4 & 18 (ACTION), 2019; (2) APPROVAL OF BILLS DATED SEPTEMBER 20, 2019; (3) APPROVE AMENDING A MINING RIGHTS LEASE WITH PHIL SCHMIDT. TYLER ROMERIL; (4) APPROVE BID FROM WESTERN ROCK IN THE AMOUNT OF \$64,917.95 FOR THE CEMETERY COLUMBARIUM ROAD PROJECT. TREVOR MCDONALD:** Councilmember Isom moved to approve the consent agenda items 1 through 4 as written above; second by Councilmember Hartley; vote unanimous.

**CONSIDER PAYMENT PLAN REQUEST FOR A WATER BILL. WALLACE LIMB: Scott:** We heard this information last week and Mr. Sevy was gracious enough to step forward and work with you on the principal that's owed, but there's still the penalty side of it that has to be paid. I don't know if there's any options we can offer. I feel like we can do something. There are people every month that end up in arrears on their water bill. We got pages of them today. It puts us in a tough situation. I'm really in a quandary. **Craig Isom:** I wonder what other avenues you've pursued. Do you have a circle of family, friends or others that I would naturally reach out to in times of need? **Wallace Limb:** I have nobody at this time. That's why I'm here to see if there's something I could do. I've been talking to the local bishop and by the time I'd gotten to that point, the amount was just so far out of hand. I'm not trying to get out of any fees. I'm trying to figure out what I can do to get the water established. **Terri:** We had a lot of discussion trying to figure out a way and we've seen a lot of people on social media that create a GoFundMe account, we have a generous community with our lack of being able to do anything from a City standpoint, because of what Councilman Phillips mentioned. I don't know if you've considered doing that or have some fiends. Do you have a Facebook account? **Wallace:** I don't know how to set that up. **Terri:** I'd be willing to help you set that up. If you don't have a friend that can help you, please contact me and I'd be willing to. I would personally donate to help you in that cause. **Scott:** I as well. I think that's the direction we have to go. We can't waive anything; we can't forgive it. We've got to make sure we get the account completed before moving forward. **Wallace:** I wasn't trying to get any money taken off. I know it needs to be paid. I understand it's a bill; it's a debt that's owed. I just need to figure out if there's a way to make a partial payment or I can pay my bill and pay more towards the back due. I'm trying to get water established and get that taken care of and maintain water at the premises. **Terri:** We recognize that, and we want to help you to be able to move forward and get on top of that. **Wallace:** I appreciate that. Thank you. **Mayor:** Can we get an official motion? **Scott:** A motion would be that we can't waive the fees or undo the penalties. They must be paid in full. Thanks to the generosity of a community member who's willing to step forward on the principal and now you need to step forward and find a way to pay the penalties off before we can move forward and the water can be turned back on. **Terri:** I'll second that. **Adam Hahn:** In 2018, the IRS reduced penalties to 400,000 taxpayers. You cannot tell me that our City is more strict than the IRS. There is a way to waive penalties. The amount due is what was used and it's the cost accrued to the water department. The fee is not a cost that's accrued. That fee can be waived. It's common practice in business when you issue a bill and that bill accrues fees over time. Most times business will waive fees upon payment of invoices. I know my business has done it. I've requested waivers for penalties from the IRS and I've received them. You can't tell me this City is harsher to its citizens than the IRS. **Scott:** I would agree with you. That's the dilemma we're all faced with. The fees are established after the original cost. Just today, we have 10 pages of them, so do we do it for everybody and where do you stop? That's the question. We've got to look out for humankind. **Adam:** You don't waive the debt that's owed which is the actual bill, but you can waive the fee upon full payment of that bill. **Terri:** We're not saying that there's not a physical way to do it. It's just like Scott said: Where do you begin

and end? **Adam:** I understand that you're saying it sets a precedence. The precedence is if you come with full payment of your bill to the City, they will waive your fees. That's fair because those fees have no actual cost to the City. The City did not accrue a cost for those fees. The City did accrue a cost by the bill that needs to be paid. That water was used; those services were used, but the fees are arbitrary. **Terri:** They are also earned. We have personnel that have to physically shut off water, turn on water, collections, etc. All those things are an actual cost. **Adam:** If there are collections fees, and I don't know if this man's bill has gone to collections, I can understand those. **Terri:** I'm not talking collections. I'm talking our billing systems and our personnel that have to manage. **Adam:** It's very arbitrary in my opinion, because the City employees are already working and already getting paid. It's not like it was a special trip for them to go out there. It's all wrapped up in the water bill. The bill he needs to pay is what was due. All fees that are place on that bill are arbitrary. It's a penalty that keeps stacking up. Let him pay it off. Waive the fees. Make that the precedent that if you come in with full payment, the City will waive your fees and you can get back to square one. **Mayor:** We do have a motion on the table. All in favor for unanimous decision.

**CONSIDER A ROAD DEDICATION AT HOVI HILLS AND 900 NORTH. WATSON**

**ENGINEERING: Tim Watson:** Are there any more questions about the road dedication plat that we have presented for you tonight? **Terri:** I guess they're estimating there are some costs to move the T-boxes, the irrigation, there's main water line. Who pays for that? Does the developer pay for that or does the City? **Paul B:** As far as conduits under the road to facilitate moving water lines, the developer would put those in when they put the road in. My understanding is that Cedar City's know that this road was going to go through the golf course for a very long time and we have been prepared to move the T-box to facilitate that road going through the golf course. We would not ask the developer to move the T-box. But a sleeve for the conduit and water, that would be great. **Tim:** That's different than what we talked about it and I'm fine with that. **Terri:** I'll be curious to see how you design the drainage on that road. **Tim:** We'll have to figure that out. There'll be a stretch of that road that will be very difficult. **Scott:** I want to make sure that we continue to work closely with the golf course personnel in this process. I appreciate what you've done thus far, and I want to continue that dialogue and make sure we're all on the same page. **Tim:** At this point we've learned quite a bit from the process at Libertad. Mr. Barnes was the first one I contacted. I think he saw it before Kit did. **Jared Barnes:** Just to echo what Tim said, we learned a lot after the Libertad project. The original plan we saw, the golf course did not like, and we were able to get together and work out a solution. There's a little more irrigation than a main line conduit, I'm assuming that's similar to the T-box situation. We've known it was coming. The laterals and other things we need to move. I'm assuming that's lumped in with moving the T-boxes. We've known about this for a long time. Probably the biggest concern is that is a real low spot and drainage will be an issue. So, we'll look forward to seeing how that will be remedied. **Scott:** I think it will be helpful on your staff's part to be proactive in this. I'm already hearing some rumblings that the golfers are being pushed out and the developers coming in. It's imperative to work together on this. **Ron:** You have plenty of room to protect that green, right? **Jared:** Yes. Tim and I walked it off and moved it to where it won't affect play at all. They won't hit on the road because of a design flaw.

Councilmember Hartley moved to approve the road dedication at Hovi Hills & 900 North; second by Councilmember Phillips; vote unanimous.

**CONSIDER A RESOLUTION TO RENEW A RIGHT-OF-WAY GRANT FOR THE SPILSBURY SPRINGS PIPELINE WITH THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.**

**JONATHAN STATHIS: Tyler Romeril:** We currently have a Right of Way agreement with the BLM, but that expires January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020. If this were to pass, it would pass this resolution and authorize the Mayor to sign an application allowing us to renew this to keep these water lines in place. **Scott:** And a 3<sup>rd</sup> line is also being added into the application, correct? **Tyler:** Yes.

Councilmember Cozzens moved to approve the resolution renewing a right-of-way grant for the Spilsbury Springs pipeline with the BLM; second by Councilmember Phillips; vote as follows:

AYE:     5      
NAY:     0      
ABSTAINED: 0    

**CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE VACATING A WATERLINE EASEMENT IN LOT 5, BLOCK 10 OF THE HIGHLAND PARK SUBDIVISION. KIT WAREHAM:** Councilmember Cozzens moved to approve vacating a waterline easement in Lot 5, Block 10 of the Highland Park Subdivision; second by Councilmember Adams; roll call vote as follows:

Ron Adams - AYE  
Paul Cozzens - AYE  
Terri Hartley - AYE  
Craig Isom - AYE  
Scott Phillips - AYE

**CONSIDER A RESOLUTION REVISING THE 2019-2020 BUDGET TO PARTIALLY FUND THE GLACIER ICE RINK. DALLIN STAHELI:** **Scott:** Do we need to revise the budget? If it's coming out of capital improvement, it still needs to be a revision to the budget, correct? **Paul B:** You need to budget the money, so Jason knows how much you want to have moved out of capital and into an account for this purpose. **Isom:** Jason, is this a process of appropriation? You're not moving money into any designated account? **Jason:** When Dallin and I discussed his request, he requested that the City, in the immediate budget within the next few weeks, we allocate \$100,000 for design and architecture that be made available immediately. Then we talked about the remaining \$2.75 million he's requested be potentially put in escrow. So, the total budget revision would be \$2.85 million with \$100,00 towards design fees. The other would be authorized to be put in escrow, potentially, but we're looking for direction on that, and that was loosely what we talked about. There's also an option of doing it budgetarily as \$2.85 million. There are a few options in terms of the revision depending on the motion. **Scott:** I still think there's all kinds of issues that need to be outlined in any kind of lease agreement that we come up with for the property. The terms, the years and those kinds of things. What we need to look at tonight in my mind is if we do this, what are we going to do and how much money are we going to do this for? And is it set up as a contribution? As a private-public partnership? Because we've been bantering back and forth for months now. I think the project is worthy and needs to happen. I want to support it. I still question the amount of money. I think the City has a role to play in it, but I think other private entities and other government agencies need to step forward and help. So, the City's not carrying 50% of the bulk of the project. I don't know if you're ready to entertain a motion now or have further discussion. **Craig:** I want to acknowledge the passion that Dallin has put into this project. I, like councilman Phillips, see this as a wonderful project. I told him we'd get there. I too have a concern with the total number of \$2.85 million, but I see ways to raise that and involve other entities. I particularly

think that the county needs to step up. I think because the County will benefit as much as, if not more than, the City with tax infusion and constituents of the County being able to use the facility. We need a fairly significant contribution from them. That's my starting point for going out and finding additional funding. So far, this process has been an "us" and "them" kind of proposition and I want to make it more of a partnership as we move forward from this point in raising funds and other things. I can't commit city resources, but I can commit my time, and effort and my connections to put this together in a way that we share the load and get the project done. **Terrri**: I would echo exactly what these two have said. I'm in support of the rink and I've sat across from Dallin many hours and made the commitment that I would do what I could. I'm not in favor of the City fully funding the \$2.85, but I am in favor of working with Dallin and using my personal resources and contacts and time to help find places where we can fund that. I feel like we should be working as a partnership. Maybe we don't form this as a true public-private partnership in the term, but it needs to be a community partnership for us to work together. I would like to do support on some level. I'm more in favor now as there's been a lot of things get kicked around. I would like to see if we get to the fundraising level, we do this where Staheli's enter a long-term lease on the property and they keep ownership of the building. We'll make a contribution of the land, the parking lot. These are all City taxpayer assets that we're committing to this project along with whatever cash number that we can agree to come to. I would like to make that personal commitment. I would like to make it happen. I told Dallin from the beginning that I didn't want this to compete with a gym. We needed to try and find a way to raise both these projects at the same time. Not to compete with which one is more popular than the other, because there's passion in the community for all of it. We also had the taxpayers vote in 2011 or 2012 when we built the aquatic center. They voted for a master plan that included this multiactivity center with a gym in the spot where the ice rink is currently. We did an extensive study in June where we decided the gym needed to stay there and we needed to help move the ice rink to a new spot across the street. The cost just escalated a lot more than we thought it would be. We anticipated it was going to be \$1 million - \$1.5 million that we wanted to contribute to that, so, the ask came in a little higher than we felt comfortable in doing. They're asking for \$2.85 million out of the current \$4 million that we have in our capital budget. That's not just the recreation fund. Our staff have worked diligently over the years. They were given a direction that we were to build a gym after 2021 when we had some bonds that were to pay off. They've been diligent in putting money away and I feel at this point, the ice rink would be leap frogging over all of this planning and we need to continue to work on that. **Paul C**: As far as the county goes, I can't commit my colleagues to anything. We had Dallin present to the County commission on Monday and I said in that meeting that I would abstain from that vote, because I'm too close to it in the City capacity. I did talk to Maria Twitchell to see what TRCC could provide, but that's tricky. It could be a 3-year contribution, and someone would have to carry the last 2 years to use that money. **Craig**: I hope you can at least talk this up. **Paul C**: I've done nothing but talk this up for 6 years. **Craig**: I expect you to carry it to the commission. **Paul C**: I've done that. I didn't recuse. I abstained. I could voice my opinion, which I did. I had Jason run some numbers for me. Recreation in Cedar City is expensive. We've made a commitment to provide recreation for our citizens. Some say we shouldn't do any of that. I guess that's debatable. We have a lot of facilities that we own and run. As you look at the ask of \$2.85 million and really look at it in the perspective to everything we provide, by the year 2036, we'll have spent \$21 million dollars on the aquatic center. This is an ask of \$2.85 million one-time and if you compare that to the aquatic center \$21 million, by the time that bond is paid, which doesn't include the major expenses we'll incur. We just saw the liner go bad. It's \$132,000 and that's with them picking up part of the tab on part of the warrant. We don't know when the boilers will go out. We don't know when the components within the swimming pools will rust. I'm not trying to be negative. I'm just

trying to put this into perspective compared to the other forms of recreation we provide. The Heritage Center is subsidized about \$290,000 per year with a total loss since inception of \$4,119,000. A new gym/rec center was estimated to cost between \$4-\$4.5 million. When Mayor Burgess went to Washington County, they told him the rec center was about \$150,000 on O&M to maintain that facility. If we do vote to build a gym and rec center, not only is it going to cost us \$4-\$4.5 million, you also have to add \$150,000 over 20 years, so that's another \$3 million. That went from \$4-\$4.5 to up over \$7 million. Cross Hollows arena loses \$129,000 annually with a total loss of \$1 million since it was built. The ball diamonds at Fields at the Hills were about \$2.8 million to construct. As I look at other things we've built, those are things we continue to pay O&M on. The ice rink is a one-time ask that we have no other liabilities as City. Staheli Recreation Management agrees to pay all repairs and expenses, labor, materials, everything moving forward. We've never had, in the history of our City, a private entity be willing to come forward and offer to pay half of the bill or raise the money to construct a building and donate it to the City. I think this could be a model of public-private partnership. Terri, if it's not a public-private, what are you thinking as far as a community partnership? **Terri:** I want it to be a true public private partnership as a definition of a P3 that they refer to it in the State. It doesn't meet the criteria of that. There has to be equal risk and reward. Craig and I attended a training in Salt Lake on this. It's a public-private partnership, but not in the true legal sense of the word. **Paul C:** We've been talking about this for years. Why hasn't this up come before that this isn't legal? **Terri:** I'm not saying it's not legal. I'm just saying it doesn't meet the criteria. **Paul C:** Who's criteria? **Terri:** The State of Utah Economic Development Department. **Paul C:** Is that law or is that their opinion? **Terri:** No. I'm not saying that it's law. I don't know what your point is. I want a partnership between the Staheli's. It is a public-private partnership community project. We're going to come together instead of us against them. And that's what you've pitted it to be, as the City against the Staheli's and I'm tire of it. **Paul C:** I am too, Terri. I'm tired of the vitriol. I'm sorry that I didn't use reverse psychology and come out against this because I think you would have all voted for it. **Terri:** That's absolutely ridiculous that you would state that in a public meeting. I am personally offended by that. **Paul C:** You brought it up, Terri. **Terri:** No, I didn't. **Mayor:** Enough between the 2 of you. Let's get back on topic. **Paul C:** Going back to the public-private partnership, I don't know why we didn't bring this up a long time ago. We've been very clear about how this would work and operate. Why bring this up now? **Terri:** Because we're trying to figure out a way to make it work. **Paul C:** When we built the animal shelter there was some talk about fund raising. How much was actually raised on that project? **Scott:** About \$100,000. **Paul C:** Are you optimistic that we could raise more than that for this? **Craig:** If he's not, I am. **Scott:** I think there are people out there that are willing to and I think they need to step forward. If it's something important to the community and have a passion and not just ice. We need to remember this is going to be for roller skating in the summer, pickle ball, volleyball. For me, to make it work, it's got to be a year-round facility. I think there are entities out there that are interested in it. I can't guarantee that, but I do think there's folks that would be interested. **Paul C.:** Would you all be willing to do towards this new facility? Would you do \$1.5 mill? **Scott:** I would. **Paul C.:** Would you be willing if I made a motion for the City to do \$1.5 million and pay utilities because that's the only way they can do it. **Terri:** That's the same amount. **Paul C:** But it's not taking it out of the capital improvement fund at once. If you look at the amounts we subsidies these other venues, \$150,000, \$300,000, \$400,000, \$85,000 for utilities. It's a lot of money but if it allows us to make this happen, why can't we get creative? Do \$1.5 million, do the utilizes so the Staheli's can borrow more money. I think we could make that work that way. And then you're not pulling all that money out of the capital improvement fund if that's what you're so worried about. **Scott:** If I were to make a motion, we offer on behalf of the City \$1.5 million. I think that's fair, sizeable contribution to this project with the

understanding that the rest of the money must be raised through other sources, whether it's private companies or government entities. At the time it's raised or pledged, that's when you begin construction and not before. **Mayor:** Are either of these actual motions? **Scott:** We're still discussing it. The other thing I think is important is whatever the ultimate gift finally comes to the project we should put a time frame that in 24 months, if construction hasn't commenced, then the gift would revert back to the entity offering it. I've spoken to Dallin about this. I don't think they want to go past 24 months. I think we need to have other players in the field, and I think there's a possibility to make that happen to get to the \$5.7 million. \$1.5 million on behalf of the City is still a very substantial contribution to this project, along with the land the City's providing for the complex. **Craig:** I sat with Mark Wilson after our last meeting; I've sat down with Dallin to understand the cost of equipment, so the \$5.7 million is a good number. I feel comfortable with that number. If we put in \$1.5 million of City funds and we got a similar contribution from a variety of sources at the County and other entities that will benefit from the facility then down, then that number is down to \$2.7 million. You start factoring in what can be received by in-kind contributions and I was overly optimistic there, but if that's another million, then we're at \$1.7 million that we need to go out and find donations from foundations and others. That's a big number. I was raised to be an optimist and I believe that's do-able and get there by the end of March so you can turn a shovel and begin that process. **Scott:** He's a little more optimistic than I am. I think if you can get to that number by March, that's pretty optimistic. I think within a year we can be there. **Mayor:** Overall tonight, we'll need a number, we'll need an account, capital or wherever, any other type of things that we need, there'll be a lease with those other types of items that you brought up. All of this will need to go in the resolution, which will need to be in a motion. While you're all thinking, I want you to be formulating what all of that will be. **Dallin:** I don't have a lot to say. Not only did the cost on your end go up but it went up a lot on our end. I've been quite discouraged and confused of how everything's transpired. How we've been asked to do certain things, asked to adjust and adjust again. I felt like we were doing everything that the City was asking us to do and now us being asked to accept half of where we needed to be at is a pretty big deal for us. I want to understand where everyone's at, so I thought of a few questions. Jason, the capital fund has \$4+ million. What is the exact amount that's in there? **Jason:** There's over \$9 million in the fund and there's \$5 million in budgeted projects. We'll do a year-end transfer when we close out the audit over the next few months, so there'll be more funding than the uncommitted balance of \$4 million. We have a budget window starting in January and there'll be numerous projects for that. **Dallin:** Of uncommitted things at the end of the year there should be \$5 million or \$6 million you're saying? **Jason:** Probably. **Dallin:** There's also a bond that will be expiring, so that's a \$1 million per year bond, right? **Jason:** Two budget cycles from now. It's \$960,000 bond on this building, the parking structure and the Heritage Center. It will mature. **Dallin:** I just want to know personally. I don't want to feel like we're demanding something that is putting the City at great risk to meet its current obligations and continue to function well as a city. Your opinion as the bean counter of the City, if the council was to approve what we've asked, does that put city at an extreme risk of not meeting its imminent or upcoming obligations? **Jason:** No, it would not be an extreme risk of not meeting its current obligations. **Dallin:** And it's imminent/upcoming obligations? **Jason:** The City has funding to meet all of its debt service obligations and our current budgeted projects. Obviously, any funding that we use for other purposes affects the timing of future requests. **Dallin:** Those are decisions that need to be made, but the decisions that have been made this will not put the City into pay it, I guess. **Paul C:** Jason, there's been a lot of talk about a new fire station. Can you say how long until we need a new fire station? **Jason:** As you're aware we have a spring budget process with myself and the Mayor, it is the Mayor's budget, and the City Manager, Paul. All departments submit a current year capital request as well as a 5-year estimate. None of our staff are economists, so they guesstimate where the

growth of the City will be and to what extent. Chief Phillips estimates the need for a facility depending on how that growth happens. We don't have a current request, in terms of the 2020 budget, for a new fire station, but again it's a 5-year projection. It's not something that the Council ratifies. My planning is based on staff's needs and the vision of the Mayor and City Manager. **Mike Phillips:** We'll look at the market and see where growth is and plan for stations. **Paul C:** What all funds the fire station? **Jason:** Chief can tell you what happened with the last project at the airport. **Paul C:** Was it strictly from the capital improvement or others? **Mike:** The airport fire station. That one came through a federal grant that paid \$1.3 million and we used gravel pit money to make up the difference to the \$1.7 million for the station cost. **Paul B:** That's general fund money from the City's perspective to pay for this type of operation. There are some impact fees available, but compared to the scope of fire station, not just the building; there's trucks involved and everything else where impact fees can help a little bit, but the majority of that money will be general fund money. The capital funds we're talking about are general funds money. **Mayor:** This one was a little bit different because it's at the airport. **Mike:** It provides service to the airport, so that's why we used gravel pit money from the airport for it. **Mayor:** That wouldn't be available for a different one. **Mike P:** There's no current funding for fire stations from the federal government anymore. **Craig:** In your opinion with growth to the South, how soon are we going to be in the need because of response time? **Mike:** Probably 3-5 years. The North station needs to be remodeled to be staffed. **Paul B:** The other part of the conversation needs to be what's the general fund budget? **Jason:** It's around \$19 million. **Paul B:** That's an ongoing operational expense that comes out of the same pool of funds every year. **Mayor:** We talk about the bond being paid off, but we have all of our building maintenance, roofs and heaters, in a number of the different buildings that we've been starting to do maintenance plans on. We've brought this up to council a number of times that we have the plans and we're looking at some of these maintenance projects happening once we get that bond paid off. That's been in our ongoing conversations for a few years. We're starting to figure out carpeting, painting. We've started to get measurements so we can have things planned, so once it does get paid off we can do some delayed maintenance on the buildings we currently have. **Dallin:** One of the big things I've been wrestling with throughout our discussions is that I feel like I've been open with where our request is coming from, why we're requesting that amount and how we feel we can move forward with that amount. And as we've discussed, that amount is too much and we need to do half that amount and something that comes up in all of those discussions is the City has 3 big wants for recreation: the ice rink, the gym and the future soccer complex. Those are all great things. I like recreation as much as you do. As far as I'm concerned, my feeling on recreation probably more than anything that you do is a rising tide does raise all ships when you start pitting groups against each other it's difficult to get public support for anything. As we've talked about it, it seems these are already somewhat pitted against each other. I'm trying to figure out how priorities are determined. It would be helpful to understand from you where you're sitting and what we're talking about the funds that we're asking for jeopardizes the viability for something in the future. I just want to understand how those priorities work. It will help us in our decision making on how you are looking at things. I wanted to ask you each a few questions about these projects and how you picture yourself supporting them at the time they come up. We're working out how you support the ice rink. I want to get a feel for how all of these other things are supported, and I want to feel like we're getting an equitable look compared to these other things. **Ron:** Can I try to answer a blanket statement that might address the question you're asking? That's the input I had because I didn't have anything to add to what my fellow councilmembers have said. I've been in discussions with you as well to help you understand that. Since one of my assignments is recreation, I've been involved with Leisure Services for 6 years and I think part of what you're asking I can help you understand that. As was mentioned the original aquatic center and the municipal center was sent out