MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL BUDGET RETREAT
MEETING HELD MONDAY, MARCH 20, 2018 AT 3:00 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD
HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK ROOM LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGA
BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS, UTAH

Members Present: Mayor Mike Peterson, Council Member Mike Shelton, Council Member
Scott Bracken, Council Member Tali Bruce, Council Member Christine
Mikell

Staff Present: City Manager John Park, Assistant City Manager Bryce Haderlie, City
Recorder Paula Melgar

1.0 BUDGET RETREAT

1.1 Mayor Peterson called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m. and welcomed those present.

1.2 MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to close the Open Session and open the
Closed Session to discuss personnel issues. Council Member Shelton seconded the motion.
The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

1.3 The Council moved to Closed Meeting at 3:08 p.m.

2.0 Closed Meeting to Discuss Litigation, Property Acquisition and the Character and
Professional Competence or Physical or Mental Health of an Individual.

2.1 MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to close the Closed Meeting and resume the
Budget Retreat meeting. Council Member Shelton seconded the motion. The motion
passed unanimously.

2.2 The Budget Retreat meeting resumed at 3:17 p.m.

3.0 Budget Retreat

3.1 Mayor Peterson led a discussion on fiscal year 2018-2019 individual budget priorities and
available and potential budget revenues.

3.2 Council Member Shelton was of the understanding that when individual budget items are
scored, each Council Member’s top 10 items will be present. The factor that was most
important to him was affordability. He confirmed that 35% of his items are weighted
toward affordability. He suggested the Council define their priorities since several are not
mandated services he still cares about. He explained that this is not a budget but a core set
of projects that determine a mission. A strategic plan then maps over into a budget.
Columns were reviewed from a strategy rather than a budget point of view. It was their
intent to rank items by priority from 1 to 100. There were several non-mandated services
that were still important to him. He scored priorities high if they have to be handled by the
City with no alternative such as snow plowing.
Council Member Bracken stated that 45% of the City’s finances are weighted toward dollars and he suggested that current resources be expanded to a physical definition. He asked if the City has the manpower and additional financial resources available to do them.

Council Member Shelton indicated that they have two items that are high priority. The first is to maintain City roads at a certain PCI. The second was to rebuild the Old Mill. He asked that both be ranked in terms of affordability of one versus the other. In a long-term view, paying for roads now cost much less than paying for them in five years and is an affordability component that works over time. Top priority items were reviewed with the top 15% being depicted in green with the lowest 15% depicted in blue. Council Member Mikell asked that definitions be emailed once completed. The Council discussed mandated core items at length.

Positive impact was next reviewed. Council Member Shelton considered it to be two dimensional. The first was based on the good of the impact and the second asks what percentage of the people it actually impacts.

Sustainable priorities and the path to becoming sustainable were described. City Manager, John Park, stated that is the responsibility of staff to review items long term and ask if the taxes taken off those items will continue to sustain that particular area of the City.

Council Member Shelton noted that public support to him was the survey question that asked if they were to survey the public, where would they land.

The Council next reviewed the City’s Mission Goals and Accomplishment Statement. Finding a median of priority scores between Council Members was suggested. Priority items were discussed at length and duplicate items that ranged in the top 100 were eliminated.

Council Member Bruce recommended developing a strategy specific to communication. If the Council projects something to be voted on in the future, she recommended it be included in the newsletter as soon as possible. This would eliminate the public from feeling like they are not given adequate notice.

Council Member Mikell stated that there are different forms of communication and asked for alternate ways that others can become informed.

Unified Fire Station 116 and maintaining the existing level of expenditure for fire services was detailed. It was agreed that this was not a personnel issue as much as it was a budget issue. Council Member Shelton stated that the Cottonwood Heights Police Department (CHPD) has a tremendous response time and if they were to cut constant manning staffing, they would potentially save a lot of money and increase response times. He suggested both budget and service levels be reviewed.

Mayor Peterson next reviewed creating a detailed budget process. List items were evaluated and he recommended the Council Members question how important it is that they keep them, cut them, or increase them.
3.13 Mr. Park pointed out that rebranding the City would include items such as adopting a new logo, changing letterhead, and updating the website. He noted that expenses associated with rebranding vary greatly. He recommended Council establish a level they are comfortable with.

3.14 Mr. Park next reviewed fee schedules and stated that modifying City fees to more closely match costs should be considered. Business license and development fees were among those needing further review. Council Members agreed to make this a priority.

3.15 The conversion of current street lighting to LEDs was next considered. Mr. Park described locations throughout the City where LED lighting would be beneficial.

3.16 Council Member Shelton identified park priorities including construction of the Crestwood Park Master Plan and Mountain View Park improvements, of which $100,000 is the responsibility of Cottonwood Heights. The east portion of the Golden Hills Park development of was also discussed as well as identifying an appropriate location for a City dog park.

3.17 Council Member Bruce reported that she had previously had preliminary discussion with the officials from the cities of Millcreek and Holladay regarding sharing a Sustainability Manager. Mayor Peterson suggested including language to include both public and City.

3.18 The Council next discussed the rebuilding and preservation of the Old Mill. Mayor Peterson stated that this issue could have an extremely large fiscal note and suggested creating a strategy, as he did not see funding as an option. This item would need partners or anonymous donors and he believed this could create a lot of interest. If nothing is on the books soon, it could disappear. He believed that it would be a mistake to ignore the issue.

3.19 Council Member Bruce reviewed the enhancement of the Police Department service level. Effective trainings and improvement of skill levels were discussed. The Council agreed that there is also a need to review the process for leasing vehicles. She expressed the need for data to make a more informed decision.

3.20 Mayor Peterson addressed potential Police Department reductions and how that will impact levels of service. He commented on the Impact Needs Analysis and feared that the Police Department feels that as a City, they are looking at contacting the Unified Police Department (UPD) and asking for a proposal to go back to using their services. He was more inclined to title this item as a need-based analysis.

3.21 Council Member Bruce asked that the City complete a cost-benefit analysis in order to compare similar levels of service with the UPD. It was her understanding, based on conversations with people throughout the valley, including a visit to Dispatch, that the City is known for having the premium Police Department. The public perception is that Cottonwood Heights pays more than any other city and has more officers per capita.

3.22 Mayor Peterson expressed concern with a comparison and suggested finding where their concerns are prior to doing an in-depth analysis. He felt strongly that they should start with
the analysis to determine deficiencies or surpluses. He believed a comparison stirs up an emotional fear that may not be founded before even having an internal analysis.

3.23 It was the consensus of the Council to conduct an internal service inquiry into each department and identify those they feel are too expensive, may not be providing the right service level, or the need to be eliminated altogether. Mayor Peterson believed a comparison between the CHPD and UPD was premature but was agreeable to a salary comparison with other municipalities. He stated that the UPD provides the best data seen and reviewing their department would be beneficial in terms of providing the information in question.

3.24 Council Member Shelton clarified that Council Member Bruce’s intention was to obtain data points to determine if they had set the budget properly in the CHPD.

3.25 The Council next discussed the UDOT and High-T intersection. Council Member Mikell asked that Public Works Director, Matt Shipp, provide information to the Council regarding this item.

3.26 Council Member Shelton commented that the priority of developing a long-term strategic financial plan also ties into truth and taxation. He confirmed that at this time, they had eliminated approximately 25% of the items on the list.

3.27 Mayor Peterson expressed gratitude for those present, their comments and willingness to provide input.

4.0 ADJOURN

4.1 Council Member Bracken moved to adjourn the Budget Retreat. The motion was seconded by Council Member Shelton. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Council.

4.2 The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.
I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights City Council Budget Retreat held on Monday, March 20, 2018.

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: July 10, 2018