

**Tooele City Council and Tooele City Redevelopment
Work Meeting Minutes**

Date: Wednesday, December 15, 2021

Time: 5:30 p.m.

Place: Tooele City Hall, Council Chambers
90 North Main Street, Tooele, Utah

City Council Members Present:

Melodi Gochis

Ed Hansen

Justin Brady

Maresa Manzione

Tony Graf

Planning Commission Members Present:

Chris Sloan

City Employees Present:

Mayor Debbie Winn

Jim Bolser, Community Development Director

Adrian Day, Police Department Chief

Darwin Cook, Parks and Recreation Director

Roger Baker, City Attorney

Shannon Wimmer, Finance Director

Jamie Grandpre, Public Works Director

Paul Hansen, Tooele Engineer

Michelle Pitt, City Recorder

Holly Potter, Deputy City Recorder

Jared Stewart, Economic Development Coordinator

Minutes prepared by Katherin Yei

1. Open City Council Meeting

Chairwoman Gochis called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Tony Graf, Present

Melodi Gochis, Present

Ed Hansen, Present

Justin Brady, Present

Maresa Manzione, Present

3. Mayor's Report

Mayor Winn stated she received an email from a resident thanking the City for clear roads. She stated her appreciation to the staff for working in the snow plows all night and her appreciation for the residents for being patient as they clear the roads. She stated they have received and signed four Certificate of completions including, Providence at Overlake phase 5, End of warranty for Young two lot subdivision, Perry Homes, Overlake Estates, 1L, and the tank building. She stated she joined the Chamber of Commerce in the Carvana ribbon cutting, hiring over 100 employees already. She stated the Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity will be providing incentive for the KCC in their expansion and investment in the community. She stated Tooele City was awarded as a Development Ready Community. She stated a site selector comes to an area to see if it is a site that is ready for further development. She stated Tooele is ready to partner with other entities to bring in growth. She stated Mr. Stewart has also put together a strategic plan. Tooele City has an assessment put together for further development as well.

4. Council Member's Report

Council Member Hansen stated he met with the Downtown Alliance and will be asking for money for a couple of projects including having life size buffaloes that will be rented to businesses. They need a \$25,000 investment up front for that project. He stated they will be putting more murals on the southern end of town related to Tooele's history and heritage, and will be adding a budget for downtown alliance. He stated he met with the Community Resource Center about the Harris project, attended the meeting regarding the GTM well, and the meeting for 'Crown Homes' with the Tooele Housing Authority.

Council Member Brady stated he attended the Christmas Concert with Joshua Creek, the RDA meeting regarding the developer moving forward on 1200 North project, Special RDA meeting, and the Carvana Ribbon cutting.

Council Member Graf stated he attended the Carvana ribbon cutting, Arts Council Meeting remotely, special meeting for Planning Commission remotely, special RDA meeting, and shared his appreciation for the City snow plow drivers.

Council Member Manzione stated her appreciation for the staff for helping in the snow. She attended her final economic development class online, Tooele Christmas Concert, meeting about the GTM Well, RDA meeting, Planning Commission meetings, the Carvana ribbon cutting, Chamber of Commerce luncheon, and the Pre-Development meetings.

Chairwoman Gochis stated her appreciation to the snow plow drivers. She stated she attended the Arts Council Christmas Concert, Arts Council Meeting with preparation in grant writings, Carvana ribbon cutting, and the special RDA meeting.

5. Discussion on the City Website

Presented by Shilo Baker, Executive Assistant to the Mayor/Web Specialist

Ms. Baker stated they have worked with a local web designer for the Tooele City website. She stated there were updates within the site platform that did not work with the current website. They are not able to continue the Tooele City Website through that site platform. She stated they needed to look at parting with the current developer and moving in another direction. The City put out for bid and received three back. She stated the lowest bid was another local contractor. As they started building the new site, the developer stated he was not able to handle the workload by himself. She stated the new company they would be going with is Revise. She stated she was impressed with their work. She stated the initial cost is \$17,700, but it is not in this year's fiscal budget. She will come back for a budget adjustment in the near future. She stated they will be asking for a \$2,000 contingency because they will transfer up to a certain number of pages and documents. They would also like to have professional video & photos to launch the new site. She stated there will be an adjustment for the current developer because there were additional costs with the update. She stated they will be asking for the funds to come from the fund balance. Additional features for the site include mobile functionality, searchable site, better site map, and an engaging site that makes available a text & email alert for any topic. She stated it will be \$3900 fee per year. After four years, they will do a redesign at no additional cost. The expected timeline to relaunch the new site is by early summer.

Council Member Graf asked what the monthly cost is.

Ms. Baker stated \$3,900 a year. That fee breaks down monthly.

Chairwoman Gochis asked if it includes tech support.

Ms. Baker stated that fee includes everything including tech support.

Chairwoman Gochis asked if the website will have the ability to have a bill pay feature.

Ms. Baker stated they will still continue the third-party link for bill pay.

Council Member Manzione stated she is in support of the new platform.

Ms. Baker stated she welcomes all feedback and suggestions.

Chairwoman Gochis stated her appreciation to Ms. Baker for putting it together.

Ms. Baker stated they specialize in government sites and do not lock the City into an agreement pass the first year. She stated they can always move the site to have it hosted elsewhere.

Council Member Manzione asked for links to see their portfolio.

Ms. Baker asked for a verbal agreement from the Council.

Chairwoman Gochis asked when the agreement would be ready.

Ms. Baker stated they could have the agreement ready by the first week in January.

6. Discussion on the Golf Fee Schedule

Presented by Darwin Cook, Parks & Recreation Director

Mr. Cook stated the golf staff has recommended an increase on the Golf fee schedule. He stated the proposal show the current fees, what is recommended for increase, and a comparison for local City fees. He stated they added military with the senior discount. The season pass for a family was listed as a couple pass and is now worded as a family pass.

Council Member Hansen stated it is funded with the tax money and asked if the out of towners help pay some charges.

Mr. Cook stated the players pass covers that a bit, but not to the full extent. He stated those fees could be incorporated.

Mr. Baker stated his recollection that the cemetery fees eliminated the distinction between resident and non-resident fees, and that doing so might be even easier in this context.

Mr. Cook stated it does cause logistic issues.

Council Member Brady stated it could be good to have out of towners at the golf-course.

Council Member Graf asked if other counties have resident verses non-resident fees.

Mr. Cook stated they use a similar fee schedule with some out-of-towners fee being slightly more. He stated they encourage people to purchase punch passes and season passes.

Council Member Graf stated his appreciation and encourages the raise in fees.

Mr. Cook stated they don't want to match the other golf-courses but still make it feasible for residents.

Council Member Brady asked when the last time the fees were updated.

Mr. Cook stated they were updated in 2017 and the player pass was updated in 2019.

Chairwoman Gochis asked what the two-person family pass was.

Mr. Cook stated a two-family pass is a \$1000 with a \$100 child fee. The verbiage is changing from couple to family. A regular green fee is currently \$11 and they are proposing \$12.

Council Member Brady asked if the golfers use the golf-cart storage.

Mr. Cook stated it is used with maybe a quarter space available.

Council Member Hansen asked what the difference between a gas and electric golf-cart was.

Mr. Cook stated one takes gas and the other charges. They provide outlets to charge their golf-carts.

Council Member Brady stated the prices seem fair and they have done their due-diligence.

Council Member Graf stated he highly encourages people to take advantage of the golf-course.

Chairwoman Gochis stated the carts are great as well.

7. Discussion on the Proposed Canyon Springs Annexation

Presented by Roger Baker, City Attorney

Mr. Baker stated annexation is a legislative function. It is deciding what land the Council wants to be considered under the City jurisdiction and on what conditions. He stated the Council is tasked with exploring these legislative policy issues, and the staff, while primarily administrative, is tasked with understanding the policy issues so they can advise the Council. He stated the Mayor has consulted with the staff and provided her recommendation regarding the annexation. He stated the City Administration's first recommendation to the Council is to not consider the annexation, because Tooele City has ample undeveloped land in Tooele City, with already limited resources. By bringing in new land, it will make developing land in the existing City limits that much harder because of the limited resources. He stated the staff suggests if the Council does consider the annexation, that the Council first answer the fundamental policy question: What about this annexation makes it good for Tooele City? The answers to this question should be based not just on personal opinion but substantiated with professional studies and recommendations. For example, City staff have looked at the question of parks and trails, but the annexation development concept shows no detail about parks. He stated he sent the City Administration recommendation to the petitioner last week, to be transparent and fair, and received a letter in response this afternoon, which he provided to the Council by email. He stated in regards to parks in an annexation, the Council can take the opportunity to require green space. The petitioner has asked to give a donation instead of incorporating green space into the development. The Council's opportunity is to discuss the policy issue of whether the proposed donation of \$150,000 will make a meaningful difference to another park, whether a donation would make a difference to the residents of the proposed development, and whether the development should be required to provide its own green space instead of making a contribution to another green space. These are the difficult policy questions with which the Council must wrestle and decide. He stated the petitioner has proposed a strip of property on the South side be provided to the City as a trail. He stated he does not want to discount it, as it will provide a trail amenity, but in the opinion of the City Administration it will not be an optimal trail amenity. He stated it would be outside the development, on the back property line of development, and not connect to any future county trails. He stated the railroad would be a big impediment.

Council Member Hansen asked about the railroad with the trails.

Mr. Baker stated he had misspoken about the railroad, meaning to refer to Erikson Road, as well as the triangle of intervening property not contained in the annexation boundary. Mr. Baker stated from a trail and amenity stand point, it would be better for the community and development concept to move the trail to be a part of the interior of the community and incorporate the storm

drain detention facilities. He stated the storm water detention basins are not integrated to effectively perform their storm drain function and could be developed as an amenity.

Mr. Baker stated the Council can make recommendations about the mix of lot sizes and zoning districts and how it can contribute to the development. He stated the response they received today from the petitioner indicates that they have done most of what the City Administration has suggested. He stated there is an opportunity for the Council to address the standard right of way land scaping. He stated they suggest widening the park strips which would use the same amount of water more efficiently, or move away from high water park strips with xeriscape where they can incorporate beauty into the visual corridor of the road with less water usage. He stated they would be professionally designed and incorporate drip systems maintained by the development's HOA. He stated they do not have from the petitioner any meaningful information regarding water, sewer, and transportation.

Mr. Hansen stated the petitioner provided a series of utilities studies that address storm water and sewer. He stated the statements included in the packet should be considered by the Council but the staff believes it should be the responsibility of the developer to measure that impact rather than be an impact on the City. He stated as you go through the different statements they all say a similar thing including does not include off site evaluation, need to be considered by the City. He stated there is a coupled statement that says it could be covered by impact fees. He stated that statement is not a correct statement to base their decision on. He stated the property is not included within the master plans and not eligible for impact fee consideration. He stated if it were necessary to update some impacts, they would have to do a master plan amendment and the Council would have to decide if the fees could be included in the impact fees. He stated he appreciates the initiative but does not provide information to provide an opinion to the Council without doing additional studies.

Council Member Hansen asked when they asked them to do studies, were they general studies. Mr. Hansen stated he wasn't involved in the process so he is unaware of what was asked. They have pre-development meetings and discussions to decide the impact and figure out what studies may need to be done. He stated specific elements can be discussed with the applicant.

Council Member Hansen asked if the application needs to be done differently.

Mr. Hansen stated the design professional will come in and say they have been requested to provide a study, but in this case, they have not asked the City first. He stated it is decent start but to make recommendation need to go broader and say this is the impact.

Mr. Baker stated an area that needs to be explored, for example, is sanitary sewer. The City needs to know how much capacity is in interceptor C today, how much will be utilized by this development if annexed, and how much will be left for additional development. He stated, following the interceptor to the plant, the petitioner needs to figure out the impact upon the plant and know how they may need to expand the plant in the future. He stated the response they received stated they are looking more deeply into the transportation and fiscal impacts.

Mr. Cook stated the city limit would end at the west side of property. Residents would have to go to the corner of smelter and Droubay to access England Acres.

Council Member Hansen asked if it would connected with Erickson Road.

Mr. Cook stated the map shows it could go throught here, but they don't own that part of the property.

Mr. Baker stated they don't know the possibility of a connection. It would need to be explored.

Council Member Brady asked if the top triangle is owned by the County.

Council Member Hansen asked if there could be a purpose and loop to the other trails.

Council Member Brady asked if it is in a part of an HOA, if can anyone use it.

Mr. Baker stated they could require the trail to be open to the public.

Council Member Manzione stated she runs there without trail. There is a dirt road that goes down to 1000 North.

Council Member Brady asked if they would not require an HOA on the double-frontage lots off of Droubay because of the storm drainage.

Mr. Baker stated that would need to be explored more. There are three disconnected detention areas on Droubay Road that do not integrate with one another.

Council Member Graf stated every time they here criminality it brings up concerns. He asked if the trail that runs on the back side would be unlit and behind fences.

Mr. Baker stated the trail is represented only conceptually in the plan. He stated how staff sees the proposed trail, City staff are concerned about functionality, usability, and safety.

Council Member Graf asked how much residential, developmental land is in Tooele City.

Mr. Baker stated he does not have the answer at this time.

Mayor Winn sated they will send that information to the Council.

Council Member Brady stated the developer would add trees, lights and benches. He stated he is not concerned about the trail. He stated the devleopers mentioned zero-scape and had an understanding they would have to HOA for west side.

Mr. Baker stated the City Administration recommends that the features be maintained by an HOA.

Council Member Brady asked if they could require benches, lights, and trees.

Council Member Hansen stated there are trail plans and asked if they are going to have lighting.

Mr. Baker stated that is something the Council needs to discuss and decide.

Council Member Brady stated he thought there was an agreement between the Council that they would take a contribution for a park within the City instead of building a new park in this development.

Mr. Baker stated the Council has to decide if \$150,000 is a meaningful contribution.

Council Member Manzione stated there are mixed messages. They want to take care of the parks they have already, but would like to add a park in every part of the City. She stated the feedback was more parks become harder to maintain. She asked if it is better to have larger regional parks or to have smaller parks.

Mr. Baker stated it is a good policy question. They need to decide what is best for the City by building a park into this development or making it available elsewhere.

Council Member Manzione stated she knows her opinion, but they are receiving different answers at presentations.

Mr. Baker stated putting a park into this development would increase City costs and suggested asking for a study to determine those costs. He stated increasing City costs to maintain new green spaces is not necessarily a bad thing. He stated the City Administration isn't saying don't put a park there, but the Council needs to find a balance between investing in new amenities and increased general fund costs.

Council Member Graf stated he understands the discussion. He stated a development needs big green spaces. He stated he is thinking of the future, and a contribution of \$150,000 to a park is not super useful for 10 years down the road and disagrees with the donation concept. He stated green space is a needed thing for a good development of this size and nature.

Mr. Baker stated his opinion that it is not selfish for a Council member to consider what they want for their family and community, and as an elected official, they were elected to express their personal opinions about what is best for the community and make those decisions.

Council Member Brady stated it brings up a broader topic. Do they not require a green space or open space in any ordinances?

Mr. Baker stated that in developments located within the City limits, the City can require parks to be built, but the City has to buy the land and pay for the improvements with impact fees.

Council Member Brady asked with annexation, they could require it instead of buying it. He asked if they have updated the sewer yet and why it would be different with annexation.

Mr. Hansen stated they have a sewer model and water model and it just needs to be used.

Council Member Brady stated it is more than just giving a number.

Mr. Hansen stated there is a cost and analysis to be added in to see the impact.

Council Member Manzione stated there is a long list of steps in the annexation process. She asked for a reminder of where they are in the process.

Mr. Bolser stated step two is a discussion and the next process would be formal decision.

Chairwoman Gochis stated the stipulation is a trail. She stated it is not owned by the developer, it is vague and unclear. She stated she likes having a trail and the option is viable.

Mr. Baker stated that the petitioner has expressed a willingness to acquire the land and give it to the City, and is at some point in that process, but it is not finalized.

Chairwoman Gochis stated she likes the suggested to have it incorporated in the development. She stated there is a benefit to having a park inside the development instead of a one-time fee.

Mr. Baker stated the City has not made any commitments to the development as of date. He stated everything the City is going to require will be incorporated into an annexation agreement. That document will be the guide to the development. He acknowledged that the process that the Council needs to undergo is a challenging one.

Chairwoman Gochis stated there was a discussion with administration at hospital and they would like to see step-up homes.

Mr. Baker stated part of what the Council will decide is the density and lot size the development will have.

Council Member Manzione stated the value adds to the City with the step-up homes. She stated she likes trails on the outside instead of through development. She stated she likes the development. It fits in and adds to the City. She stated she was under the assumption to take money for other parks. She asked what conversations need to happen for staff to be more comfortable.

Mr. Baker stated utilities and infrastructure conversation can happen with staff at any time. He stated the objective tonight is not for the Council to decide all these issues but to present options to consider and provide what information they still need to get from the petitioner in order to decide later. He expressed his confidence that with full information and more discussion, the Council will be able to come to a consensus on these issues. Mr. Baker did not want the Council to feel pressured to decide these issues tonight. He was just introducing these issues to the Council on behalf of Mayor Winn and the City Administration. More discussion by the Council should follow.

Council Member Brady asked how they will have these discussions because it is different with annexation.

Mr. Baker stated the Council could have a conversation with just with Council, or invite staff, or invite petitioner, or set up something for all parties. They have flexibility.

Council Member Brady stated each party is discussing these topics at different times and would like to see everyone involved come forward and meet to have the discussion.

Chairwoman Gochis stated they should set up a meeting for staff, applicant, and Council to discuss the annexation.

Mr. Baker stated if the petitioner heard the discussion, they might be prompted with some additional ideas they can propose to the Council.

8. Discussion on Test Well Drilling

Presented by Paul Hansen, City Engineer

Mr. Hansen stated they are always looking for culinary water for the City. In the past they have put out a program for developing test wells and finding a priority well. He stated they are developing two wells currently, but would like to propose another round of test well drilling. He stated in the past it has been \$300,000, but the cost has gone up to around \$400,000. He stated they are asking for authorization to put out for bid for the project to finalize areas for test wells. He stated the cost will come from water impact fees and would like to request an initial 1.2 million dollars. He stated once they do test wells, they would like to immediately move forward to drill wells.

Chairwoman Gochis asked if they can apply for grants to assist for costs.

Mr. Hansen stated the administration is having Mr. Stewart look at other money options. Tooele City is too wealthy for the grants, though loans are an option.

Chairwoman Gochis asked if there is money to use.

Mr. Hansen stated they had a meeting with an impact fee consultant and talked about the item. They have a surplus beyond what is being asked for.

Council Member Brady asked if the 1.2 million is just looking for 3 sites, but does not guarantee anything.

Mr. Hansen stated it is just for the testing. They have spent \$400,000 and had to walk away and close the well.

Council Member Brady asked what the cost was after testing.

Mr. Hansen stated it is between \$900,000 and a million dollars.

Council Member Brady asked if there is a time line to build after finding a good spot.

Mr. Hansen stated if they find good water, they want to drill immediately. He stated they will come back after the first of the year for a formal proposal.

9. Resolution 2021-119 A Resolution of the Tooele City Council Adopting the 2021 Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan

Presented by Jared Stewart, Economic Development Coordinator

Mr. Stewart stated this is relevant to a grant the City hopes to receive for emergency generator at wells in case the power goes out. The project price is \$980,000. He stated they have a plan in place that has expired, but the county plan is updated with a few pages that are Tooele City specific. It includes challenges/hazards they may face, structures that may be affected, a plan for each of those, and the relevant agency that will implement that plan. He stated it is very data heavy.

Chairwoman Gochis stated her excitement and asked if the deadline is the December 31. She asked if they needed anything from the Council to proceed.

Mr. Stewart stated there has been input from staff and the county and will be able to proceed.

10. Closed Meeting - Litigation, Property Acquisition, and/or Personnel

There is no closed meeting.

11. Adjourn

Chairwoman Gochis adjourned the meeting at 7:08 p.m.

The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.

Approved this 5th day of January, 2021

Ed Hansen, City Council Vice-Chair