

Town of Leeds

Agenda Town of Leeds Town Council Wednesday, March 10, 2021

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the Town of Leeds Town Council will hold a **PUBLIC MEETING** on Wednesday, March 10, 2021 at 7:00 PM. This will be an electronic meeting. Wayne Peterson is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Leeds Town Council

Time: Mar 10, 2021 07:00 PM Mountain Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81287747260?pwd=Q3NINW9GcGhZKY9zSjJIZjAwWU9kdz09>

Meeting ID: 812 8774 7260

Passcode: 040878

One tap mobile

+16699009128,,81287747260#,,,,*040878# US (San Jose)

+12532158782,,81287747260#,,,,*040878# US (Tacoma)

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 812 8774 7260

Passcode: 040878

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81287747260?pwd=Q3NINW9GcGhZKY9zSjJIZjAwWU9kdz09>

Regular Meeting 7:00pm.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Declaration of Abstentions or Conflicts
4. Consent Agenda:
 - a. Tonight's Agenda
 - b. Meeting Minutes of February 24, 2021
5. Citizen Comments: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. (Three minutes per person).
6. Announcements:
 - a. Silver Mining Marketplace now known as Leeds Outpost
7. Public Hearing: None
8. Action Items:
 - a. Discussion and Potential Action Regarding Sending Out Request for Proposals for General Plan and Master Transportation Plan Update

9. Discussion Items:
 - a. Beekeeping Ordinance
 - b. Navigation Hazards in Public Rights-of-Way
10. Citizen Comments: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. (Three minutes per person).
11. Staff Reports
12. Closed Meeting: A Closed Meeting may be held for any item identified under Utah Code section 52-4-205.
13. Roll Call Vote to close electronic meeting

The Town of Leeds will make reasonable accommodations for persons needing assistance to participate in this public meeting. Persons requesting assistance are asked to call the Leeds Town Hall at 879-2447 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

The Town of Leeds is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Certificate of Posting; The undersigned Clerk/Recorder does hereby certify that the above notice was posted March 8, 2021 at these public places being at **Leeds Town Hall, Leeds Post Office, the Utah Public Meeting Notice website <http://pmn.utah.gov>**, and the **Town of Leeds website www.leedstown.org**.



Asmath Sreed
Acting Clerk/Recorder

Town of Leeds

Electronic Town Council Meeting for Wednesday, March 10, 2021

Regular Meeting 7 PM

1, Call to Order:

Mayor Peterson called to order the regular meeting of the Leeds Town Council at 7 PM on Wednesday, March 10, 2021. This was an electronic meeting.

2. Pledge of Allegiance: Mayor Peterson

3. Declaration of Abstentions or Conflicts: None

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Councilmember Roberts moved to approve tonight's agenda and meeting minutes of February 24, 2021. 2nd by Councilmember Hunsaker. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

| | Yea | Nay | Abstain | Absent |
|----------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|--------|
| MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: ALAN ROBERTS | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |

5. Citizen Comments:

Kohl Furley said the February totals for HVFD were 3 medical transports, 5 refusals and 2 fire responses. As of now, we (HVFSSD) are at 692 calls. This is a little ahead of last year's total. The Fire District has made employment offers for an IT Specialist and a Fleet Mechanic.

6. Announcements:

Mayor Peterson said he received a letter stating that Silver Mining Marketplace is now known as Leeds Outpost, owned by Jim Coleman. Mr. Coleman said that the name Leeds Outpost has been registered with the State. Mayor Peterson read an excerpt from Mr. Coleman's letter. We welcome the new owner.

Mayor Peterson said as of about a half hour ago, there are still Covid vaccination appointments available. They will be administering the Johnson & Johnson vaccination to those age 50 years and older and those with specified health conditions.

7. Public Hearing: None

8. Action items:

a. Discussion and Potential Action Regarding Sending Out Requests for Proposals for General Plan and Master Transportation Plan Update

Mayor Peterson said this particular document we had at the meeting on February 24th. What I sent to Council are lists that were provided by Rural Planning Group, which is an entity that is part of the State of Utah. They offered up different candidates who could provide planning assistance as consultants. The Dixie Metropolitan Planning Organization provided a list of transportation planners that they have had experience with. My suggestion would be to send out requests for proposal to all of the entities that are on the two lists and give them a month to get back with us. If we send out the requests by next week, we will have their responses by mid-April. Possibly, we could take a look at these at our April 14th meeting. I suggest that we set the deadline for a response as April 12th so that we would be able to move this forward, if appropriate, at our meeting on April 14th.

Councilmember Hunsaker said I have a question. The list that we received just for transportation, wouldn't it be in our better interest to get someone from the big list who can do both the transportation and the general plan instead of dealing with separate entities?

Mayor Peterson said I agree. We should put high priority on that. I expect some firms might have entities that they work with who could submit a coordinated bid on that. We can make sure to emphasize that in our RFP. We could indicate that we place high priority on someone who can provide both services.

Councilmember Hunsaker said I am good with it.

Councilmember Stirling made a motion to move forward with the RFP as presented at our last meeting modified to emphasize a preference for being able to provide both services and to send it out to the 2 lists provided by Rural Planning Organization and Dixie Metropolitan Planning. 2nd by Councilmember Hunsaker. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

| | Yea | Nay | Abstain | Absent |
|---|-----|-------|---------|--------|
| MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: ALAN ROBERTS | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON | x | _____ | _____ | _____ |

9. Discussion Items:

a. Beekeeping Ordinance

Mayor Peterson said this is something that was brought up in public comment at our last meeting and it was an issue last year. The draft that I forwarded to Council is from our Town Attorney who happens to be a 12-hive keeper of bees. He is very familiar with the language. He provided it from another

community in the State of Utah. I modified it slightly just to reflect our other ordinances and how the process would work. It is something that very closely follows State requirements when it comes to bee keeping. It does require that people register with the State, and at my most recent check, we have, I believe, 5 people in Leeds who have registered with the State of Utah. Importantly, it highlights the need for when keeping bees, we ask them to post signs with contact information, so if something does start going wrong with the hive, we know how to get a hold of them. It is the intent if they are properly maintained, you will not have any incidents. I think it could be and I think it would appropriately fall within the land use ordinance and as a result if we decide to go ahead with this along this line, send it to the Planning Commission so they can conduct a public hearing and to actually provide a recommendation to us. But we are not necessarily at that point and I open it up now for discussion.

Councilmember Hunsaker said this also looks like what I came up with from the State and from other towns in the State who have a lot more registered people than we do. I think it covers it all. We had people during quarantine who started to keep bees and I think a few of them did not get the information about registering. It was a free for all with the bees and it caused issues with the neighbors. I think the way this is written covers it all and it gives clarity on what to do. Having a sign out front would help a lot and would make the neighbors feel more comfortable with it. I like this ordinance.

Councilmember Stirling said I think this is a little bit too in depth for a beehive. I think anyone who wants to keep a beehive should not have to pay for a conditional use permit. How much is the conditional use permit?

Mayor Peterson said the lowest category we have would be Category 1 which is what I intended if I did not put it in there and that would be \$100. This would be a onetime fee, not an annual fee.

Councilmember Stirling said I went ahead and called Jared Taylor who is the main bee guy in Washington County. He has been doing bees for years and years. I asked him for his opinion on having beehives and he said we cannot live without bees. He said I do not believe that strict of an ordinance would be sufficient for anyone to have to jump through the hoops especially because in these days there is such a huge demand for keeping bees safe. He said most municipalities around here they have it in their nuisance ordinance, not necessarily as an ordinance. I did a little more research on a Utah law review Volume 2018 No. 1 called Backyard Bee Keeping in the Beehive State. She read an excerpt from this review. I understand that there can be nuisances, but I am not quite sure I agree with the \$100 fee for a conditional use permit and having to go to a Planning Commission meeting when this should be a right in a rural community that people should be able to have a beehive. I can forward this paper to the Council. I really think that in a sense of making it so difficult that they have to (1) pay \$100 and (2) have to take the time to go to the Planning Commission. I think this is a little bit of an overstep on the fact that we really should not be making money on someone who is helping the eco system.

Commissioner Hunsaker said I respectfully disagree. I want this ordinance to protect the bees because when they are throwing stuff out of the hive onto the ground it causes the colonies to mix. It can spread disease from one colony to the next and then you lose colonies. I do think they need to be responsible. The \$100 fee is a lot, but I think if you need to have a little bit of money on the line and you have some guidelines to follow. One person in particular set up their hive right on the fence line next to the neighbor's pool and then they did not put any water out. All of the bees ended up in the neighbor's pool. Why do you think we got so many calls last year? They went to the pool because they needed water. I do not have a problem with having to go to the Planning Commission. They should be registered. When everyone wants to get hives, but they do not understand how the bees are going to react and how to keep

them safe, I think a little guidance is not a bad thing. I do not have a problem with the \$100 being less, but keep the Planning Commission part. They do need some direction and they do need to be registered with the State and that is for the safety of the bees and this is for the protection of the neighbors as well.

Councilmember Wilson said I think it is good to have a system. The \$100 is probably too much. I am not sure about the distance on the water. Is it 25 feet from the property line?

Mayor Peterson said it is my understanding that the water source is supposed to be in reasonable proximity to the hive, but not right on top of the hive.

Councilmember Wilson said is it supposed to be 25 feet from the hive?

Councilmember Hunsaker said yes and then the hive should be 25 feet from property lines.

Councilmember Wilson said so the water source could be right on a property line?

Councilmember Hunsaker said no, it has to be 25 feet.

Councilmember Wilson said okay so both have to be 25 feet from a property line.

Councilmember Hunsaker said that is the way I understand it after researching it at the State level.

Mayor Peterson said I think we may need to add language that makes it clear. The other things that we could do are (1) we could waive a portion of the fee and (2) we could also rebate the fee at the end of one year if there have been no issues. And it needs to be the right balance for comfort of neighbors.

Councilmember Roberts said I am not in favor of charging an enormous fee for some kind of permit for a bee keeping license. Are we looking at a separate ordinance here or are we wanting to combine this with an animal ordinance? It appears this is a separate ordinance standing on its own.

Mayor Peterson said I think it would logically be part of the land use ordinance and I do not think it lines up with all of the other different types of animals.

Councilmember Roberts said I would not be in favor of a standalone ordinance. I think it should be grouped in with other animals. I lean more towards in favor of the owner of the beehive ... How do you mitigate a potential problem to the public? You are not sure how the bees will react. When we look at trying to resolve things for health, safety and welfare, I am not sure of the best way to put conditions on hives. Probably a setback or a distance from a property is reasonable, but I do not know what the magic number is. The State of Utah regulates it saying you have to make application for a license depending on the number of colonies that you have. I do not think it is unreasonable to state that we would require to show proof of having a bee keeping license at the State level. It is regulated by the Utah Department of Agriculture. How do you deal with causing individuals to be responsible for their hives? How do we go about making sure that they do have adequate water and the hives themselves are not left in a disarray or an abandoned hive that might entice a different group of bees to come into? When we talk about individuals who might enter someone's property, and I know we are talking about a trespass here, it would be simple to put in that individuals have to put some signage up. If you have allergies or something to these bees, it would be a notification. What I do not want to do, and I do not think the body of politic should be policing this. I am more in favor of allowing owners more latitude, but holding them

responsible for what their hives will do. I am not sure how you would place that in there. I am definitely opposed to a conditional use permit for a beehive and any type of a fee. I would require them to show an active license from the State of Utah.

Councilmember Hunsaker said the State does an Apiary Inspection of Beekeeping at no charge. The County would send them out. Would it be like once a year?

Councilmember Roberts said I do not think that would be unreasonable. When it comes to livestock, especially any breeding livestock, it is governed by the State regulations. I do not think an annual thing would be unreasonable. You need to have someone come out and check it, not only for the welfare of the hive, but for the general public and any other hives that may be out there.

Councilmember Stirling said I shared the finding and I think it would be advantageous for everyone to read it. Some of the points that Alan brought up are documented in this law review. A bee cannot be considered a trespasser. It is an interesting review. Maybe we should table this until the next meeting. It might give us time to look at what has already been found in other areas. It appears that Salt Lake City has this included in their nuisance ordinance. The bee is not the nuisance, the owner of the bees is the nuisance. There are a lot of things that have already been decided by the courts.

Mayor Peterson said I think it is reasonable for us to move this discussion to our next meeting. The one thing that I picked up on, and it made sense to me, is the idea that you do not want the bees to have a flight path to the hive that would be heavily focused on neighboring properties just for the safety of all involved. I would be very interested to read the document that Councilmember Stirling mentioned, and I think we could pick-up this discussion at our next meeting, if that is acceptable with Council.

Councilmember Wilson talked about a problem he is having with bees sucking the juice out of his grapes. He said this has been hard to deal with. The bees wiped out about 2/3 of my grapes.

Councilmember Roberts said what kind of distance are you looking at? I know bees will travel a long way.

Councilmember Wilson said I would guess 75 feet from the hives to my grapes.

Councilmember Roberts said how do you deal with extremes? This is an extreme. How do you make the determination of what is the proper amount of space? I know what this drafted ordinance is looking at when it talks about acreage size. I do not know what the magic number is on size. I know you have to come up with a number because that is what people want. And there has to be a number. You would not want someone who lives in a high-density area to have a beehive. It would not be practical.

Mayor Peterson said I know I would like to do some more reading on this.

b. Navigation Hazards in Public Rights-of-Way

Mayor Peterson said I do not know if Councilmembers have been contacted, but we have been proliferating in Town the number of boulders within rights of way off of the paved surfaces. I think they are a problem, and they are a growing problem as a result of this proliferation. In the past, we have included things in the quarterly newsletter. I realize that not everybody reads that. I think there are some properties where it would be appropriate to send a direct letter to them informing them of the need to move the boulders and navigation hazards, but I did want to get Council's input

on this because I know there will be some people who are going to push back, and I know there will be people who have a tendency to say what about this person or that person. My intent would be to do this on a consistent basis. It is something that the landscaping extends up to the edge of the paved surface. The thing that I would put out there on the positive side of those who do have small rocks or crushed rocks and other landscaping is those sections tend to be the areas where the edges of the road are by far the best. The area that are just totally natural are the ones where we tend to lose more of the edge of the road to cracking and breaking off. I wanted Council's input on this before I get involved in a campaign to try to address the issue in Town and make sure it is viewed by Town Council as being something that needs to be addressed.

Councilmember Roberts said we have dealt with this in the past, Wayne, shortly before you moved here. We had a few incidences where individuals had accidents because of large boulders in the encroachments. Individual property owners have placed them there. What it has really come down to is in a lawsuit the Town is going to be held responsible for that if they are not actively doing something to remediate that or mitigate that in some way. Those things placed there become a potential accident. I am not talking about gravel spaces out in front of their property between their property and the actual roadway. That does not become an accident. As you mentioned, a lot of times it is beneficial for the upkeep of the asphalt itself if it is placed at the same elevation. I am not sure how you are going to go about getting people to be responsible for the encroachments they made. Some of these people have complained about a number of things when they walk up and down certain roads.

Councilmember Stirling said when I first read this, I was thinking how can we look outside of the box and what can we do to make these roads better. Instead of having people put rocks on there, what can we do to start making these roads last a little longer. What are the options for putting in curbs and gutters? It will take a while, but why not start looking into doing curb and gutter along some of these roads and making it a 3-year, 5 year or 10-year plan, but at least it would help our roads last longer. I would like to know if there is any way we could use the road funds to put in curb and gutter on some of the roads having this problem.

Mayor Peterson said with the curb and gutter on Main Street, we were able to get UDOT to pay for 70% or slightly more of the cost. The sidewalks are under separate grants that we also utilized. Grants and the support of UDOT would not be available for elsewhere. When I first got involved with Town Council, I remember that a road study was done by an outside consulting firm. What I took away from it was the good news that we did receive sufficient funds to maintain our roads. The bad news was we had no additional monies to improve our roads. The maintenance budget would consume pretty much all of the monies that we would receive from B&C road funds on an annual basis. I do not have anything against curb and gutter. I think some people prefer that it not be there. I think it does a couple of things. It will generate runoff issues if we are capturing the water for extended stretches of road and needing to deal with it when it comes to the end of that curb and gutter.

Councilmember Wilson said I know we have a lot of properties who have rocks on them. They are placed there for 2 reasons ... (1) the dirt was washed away there and made a pretty steep gully there and (2) people were parking right in front of these properties. I am not necessarily in favor of placing rocks there either because I think it poses a hazard. Somehow, we need to address this because it creates a hazard for cars. Some of these areas are too steep to pull off.

Councilmember Hunsaker said you are talking about the west side of Valley, right?

Councilmember Wilson said yes.

Councilmember Hunsaker said rocks are pretty much a standard out there now. I agree with Councilmember Roberts, the Town is now aware of it and I totally think that we need to get that wash fixed on the west side of Valley. The rocks being placed on the east side of Valley just because cars are parking there, they are parked legally. I would love if that was not the case, but as long as they are off the pavement, they are allowed 24 inches on the pavement, they are legal. I think the rocks will cause an issue for the Town. I think we need to find some other solution, but I do not think we can landscape it out there because that will still be a navigation hazard. People need a place where they can pull off. I am not exactly sure about the solution.

Mayor Peterson said I do think that from a standpoint of concern about somebody driving off the road and going into a drainage ditch type of thing, that we could use reflector type of signage that is not very tall and would not do damage in a battle of car versus a reflective sign, but would provide a caution to people, especially in the dark, that they should not be wandering beyond that particular line of reflectors. I share the view that there is a liability out there. In New York, the city was responsible for damage cause by a reported pothole, but not responsible for an unreported pothole. I would suspect there is a similar type of situation here, that once we know about a situation, we become obligated to address it or run the risk of being liable for something that goes wrong.

Councilmember Stirling said I have a question about vehicles parking in front of homes. Do we have anything about loitering? I do not think that is fair to the individual in any way shape or form that someone is parking for an extended amount of time in front of your home just because they do not want to pay for storage. I do not think that is anything that someone should have to tolerate. Is there a loitering ordinance that we have, and can we address that?

Mayor Peterson said it is my understanding from the Sherriff's Department that a licensed vehicle is entitled to be parked on a public right of way. They will investigate if it is unmoved for a period of more than 2 weeks. That does not mean they will make it move, but they will investigate to make sure there is nothing wrong going on. I do not get the understanding from them that they can move it if they find out it is just parked there.

Councilmember Stirling said if someone goes up to Silver Reef and decides to park in front of your home for 2 weeks there is nothing you can do about it. Is that what you are saying?

Mayor Peterson said I am saying if you are not more than 24 inches on the paved surface, that is correct. There is not anything that can be done. Our ordinance as it reads is that it is discouraged in areas and highly discouraged in other areas. That is the language that has been used. About 6 months ago, we did talk about if you banned overnight parking you would then force people to do something with the vehicle between the hours of, say, 2 AM and 6 AM. We did send it on to the Planning Commission and they did not particularly warmly receive the idea about an overnight parking ban. That would certainly address the issue about vehicles being left for an extended period of time.

Councilmember Roberts said on Valley, I am assuming, let us call it a ditch or drainage, that was the original irrigation that came through there. Stephen, do you know that off hand?

Councilmember Wilson said I am not positive it was the original irrigation ditch. No, it is not. It is just a drainage area.

Mayor Peterson said we have done some work here recently to try to make sure we are maintaining that drainage and I would agree that I do not see it as being an irrigation ditch.

Councilmember Wilson said there are several property owners along the west side of Valley who have put in their own pipe in front of their yard. It is actually on Town property because the property line does not come up all the way to the road. You might double check this.

Mayor Peterson said I think you are correct. I believe it is a culvert underneath and in some cases the pipe may be the width of the property, but I have seen several that are through a driveway type situation.

Councilmember Roberts said I think we need to look at that differently than individuals placing rocks and/or some type of landscaping that encroaches on their line. When I say that, I am not saying it is not a hazard. It is not a hazard that was placed there by a property owner. It is something that the Town should, whether it is with reflectors or some type of signage, indicate there is a drop off or something is there. Even though it has some of the same potentials, it really is different. And that should be handled through a trespass. If someone places something there that is a trespass in the public right of way. That should probably be handled in that direction, as a trespass.

Mayor Peterson said I think in some instances, people have placed these rocks on areas of the road that are not directly adjacent to their own property. As a result, I think we may need to say that these types of things are subject to removal by the Town. And then have Antonio work very consistently to do so in situations where there are navigation hazards. I do not know where we collect the rocks and have all of them. I do think we need to make it clear that, and I will confirm with our attorney, I believe if it is in the right of way it is not something we are obliged to try to find out who owns them and we can just remove them. Moving them may be a challenge because some are pretty big.

Councilmember Roberts said there is a heavy piece of equipment placing it there.

Mayor Peterson said I agree. I want to make sure Council is in agreement on this because I suspect there will be some push back, but I do think it needs to be consistent and it needs to be enforced where we have right of way that is being occupied by navigation hazards. There could be major issues as a result of it.

Councilmember Stirling said I agree 100% that it could be a potential hazard. But I think we are missing the point. What is going on on these roads causing individuals to feel like their rights are being taken away. If something is in front of their home maybe that is what we need to address more so than removing the rock. Maybe we need to address the rock in the road. I think we need to listen to the individuals who are having this problem and maybe have anyone having these problems come to the open forum and discuss those problems and maybe we can find a solution instead of just removing the rocks and pretending that the problems do not exist.

Councilmember Hunsaker said Danielle, they have been spoken to in person and they have been listened to. I have tried and I have called out the Sherriff. I have gone to the RV parks. The one in

particular has 4 vehicles. The RV park does not have overflow parking and I did confirm this. She discussed this particular situation. The Sherriff stated that we do not have an ordinance that covers this, so they are totally legal to park as long as they want and wherever they want in a right of way. It is not that we have been ignoring them. It went to Planning Commission and that is where it stayed. I do not want it to sound like we have not been listening to them or trying to work with them. I do not know what else to do since we do not have an ordinance to back it up.

Councilmember Stirling said I appreciate you talking to these people. Maybe we do need to go ahead and do the ordinance that will protect our own citizens for the right of way problems. I see that there has to be a problem if these rocks are all over the place. I think if the Planning Commission is not going to bring it up then what options do we have?

Mayor Peterson said we have a Planning Commission that is a recommending body. I think we could recommend more strongly to them that we would like their input and involve a Public Hearing if we are going to incorporate it into our land use. People here do not like their views obscured and now we have some issues coming up with parking. If we made it no parking for certain areas or certain zones, those vehicles are still going to park in the Town. We should not just try to make it selective areas where we prohibit parking. So, we are not going to be choosing. It has been suggested that trailers with off road vehicles should be forced to park on Main Street instead of elsewhere in Town. I do not think the Main Street residents would be treated fairly if we say that is where we are going to make everyone park. We have not been able to work out anything that would provide a Town parking area for those types of vehicles. But once you start posting no parking signs, you are moving the problem around and everyone will want a no parking sign in front of their home. I do not think it is that easily addressed that way. No overnight parking forces people to find an off-road home for either their 4th vehicle or their 1st vehicle. If you just make it that you are going to specify certain areas of no parking, you will just be pushing the parking around Town to someone else's front yard. I am open to ideas to solve the parking problem. I do not think the economics of trying to do the curb and gutter, I think we would make such a miniscule amount of progress on that and, then again, it would be up to selecting who will be first on that. Our most recent project on Main Street was just under \$200,000 with about \$30,000 in sidewalks, but the amount of money we would be spending on roads in Town would be meaningful. I would like to know guidance-wise, do you want to address the rocks because of the potential liability? I do not know. I think it is separate. I have not come up with a better idea than no overnight parking. There are some people who routinely overnight park that would be put out by it, but I looked at the situation where I have seen cars very late at night parked on the street. I believe everybody has an option. It may be an option of car bingo. This would be an inconvenience, but I do not think it would be an impossibility. Maybe others have better solutions, but I am concerned about the navigation hazards.

Councilmember Roberts said I think those hazards need to be addressed. You have to look at the hazards in front of the property owners whether they place them there or not. Once they are removed, there has to be some way of taking an action when someone places something else there. No, it does not fix the parking problem, but what they have created is a potential hazard to the public and increased liability to every citizen in this Town because it is an increased liability to the Town itself. It is irresponsible to do that. I understand why some people think they need to do it. We allow on-street parking. That is just the way it is. If you do not want that, go through the process to make the change.

Mayor Peterson said I do not think we need a new ordinance. I will confirm with our attorney that the right of way has been dedicated to the Town and we do not need to allow for navigation hazards in

particular. I think there is a benefit for those who have crushed rocks at the same level of the road right up to the edge and people can park on that, if they follow the 24-inch rule. This also preserves the edge of the road. We are not saying we want everything removed, but we are saying we want navigation hazards removed. If Council is in agreement with this, I will work with Antonio to get a list of addresses where there are clearly navigation hazards in the right of way and come up with a mailing that would be consistent with all of them and let them know that the Town sees it as a liability and that it needs to be rectified.

Councilmember Hunsaker said on the west side of Valley, where they already have some large drains going under the driveways and some the length of the property, how costly would it be for us to fill that in up to road level with gravel or some kind of rock? We could alleviate the flooding problem and also help save the road. Is this a possible thing?

Councilmember Roberts said I would say it is possible if we would want to maintain the ability to manage the runoff that goes through there. I think there are improvements that could be made to that. The condition that exists there is not the fault of any property owner. It is just the way it has become over the years. It is Town right of way so we do have the responsibility to make it better either by filling it in or by marking it appropriately that would let individuals know of the hazard that exists there.

Mayor Peterson said there was a storm water study that was done before I moved here. As I recall, it called for \$1.3 million, not including Main Street, to address what was viewed as existing areas that would benefit from the storm sewer type of set-up. In today's terms, that would require spending every penny of our property tax revenues for the next 20 years. This would be cost prohibitive.

Councilmember Roberts said now that would be 3 times that amount.

Councilmember Stirling said would it be okay if I look into a rural grant in order to be able to do something like this?

Mayor Peterson said yes, but one thing I would like to share is we did go to CIB for some grant money for the current project with UDOT on Main Street and we were turned down. I will look to work with Antonio on getting a list of navigation hazards throughout Town. Once we have that complete, we will contact those property owners to make them aware of the concerns that we have about it.

Councilmember Stirling asked Lorrie to share all of her parking information that was sent to Planning Commission.

10. Citizen Comments

Susan Savage said I think when you talk about parking, you are talking about people leaving vehicles there, not camping, is that right?

Mayor Peterson said you are not allowed to actually live in an RV trailer on the street. You have to be in one of the parks or you can for a period of 30 days be visiting a resident as a guest. That is 30 days in a calendar year total.

Susan Savage said Valley Road is the lowest point of the valley. I wonder how often there is drainage there. Is there something that could be planted along there just as a signal that there is a change in the terrain? Maybe a hedge or cable barriers just to show people there is an edge there to watch out for.

11. Staff Reports

Mayor Peterson said the meetings that I have had for the past year have now gone to every other week with the other Mayors and County Commissioners, and others. The numbers have moved very favorably. The Governor has indicated that if the conditions established remain satisfied, on April 10th they will be lifting the mask mandate in the State of Utah and other relaxations will take place at that time. It is my hope that if we continue on this path that we will be able to resume in-person meetings. I would also like to continue Zoom meetings for people who may not feel comfortable with in-person meetings at this time. I hope that once the Aril 10th date arrives, we will be able to be back in Town Hall for meetings. He gave an update on vaccination appointments.

12. Closed Meeting: None

13. Roll Call Vote to close electronic meeting

ROLL CALL:

| | <u>Present</u> | <u>Absent</u> |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON | x | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: ALAN ROBERTS | x | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING | x | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER | x | _____ |
| COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON | x | _____ |

Meeting was adjourned at 8:17 PM.

Approved this 24th day of March, 2021.



Wayne Peterson, Mayor

ATTEST:



Aseneth Steed, Clerk/Recorder