

**Consent Agenda**  
**Sept 8, 2021 Alta Town Council Meeting**

<u>Pages</u>	<u>Document</u>
2 - 12	7/14/21 Work Session and regular Meeting Minutes
13 - 22	8/11/2021 Work Session and Regular Meeting Minutes
23 – 26	Treasurer’s Report Summary
27 - 41	Treasurer’s Report Detail
42	Town Administrator Report
43 - 45	Assistant Town Administrator, Chris Cawley
46	E Force Summary
47	Marshal’s Office Report, Mike Morey
48	Clerk’s Office Report, Piper Lever and Jen Clancy

**MINUTES**  
**ALTA TOWN COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Wednesday, July 14, 2021, 3:00 PM**

Alta Community Center, 10351 E. Highway 210, Alta, Utah

**PRESENT:** Mayor Harris Sondak  
Council Member Margaret Bourke  
Council Member Cliff Curry  
Council Member Sheridan Davis  
Council Member Elise Morgan

**STAFF PRESENT:** John Guldner, Town Administrator  
Chris Cawley, Assistant Town Administrator  
Piper Lever, Town Clerk  
Jen Clancy, Deputy Town Clerk  
Mike Morey, Town Marshal  
Polly McLean, Town Attorney

**WORK SESSION**

[0:00:16]

Mayor Sondak called the virtual work session to order at 3:00 p.m. per a submitted declaration.

**1. PATSEY MARLEY/SHRONTZ ESTATE**

[00:2:17]

Doug Ogilvy introduced this item. He noted that the property in question was a 20 acre site. He provided his understanding of a historical overview of the site. The new proposal for the property would include 40 townhomes, 40 hotel rooms, and a parking structure. Mr. Ogilvy explained that this plan was an alternative to a prior proposal of developing 10 single-family homes on the same property. A 3D rendering was then shown to depict the layout of the development.

Mayor Sondak stated that the Estate had approached the Town of Alta about developing a project that was more aligned with the community's best interests than the current 10 home plan. In order to move forward with the plan, a rezone would be needed. He stated that a more concentrated development with open space would be better for the Town than 10 houses spread across the hillside. Mayor Sondak stated that the original plan for this land was a hotel.

Mayor Sondak asked Mr. Ogilvy to clarify where road access would be located. He answered that a few options had been explored; one option showed ~~ultimately~~, the road access ~~wc~~ould avoid the Summer Road, thereby avoiding interference with current recreational use.

John Guldner, Town Administrator, stated that we talk about a parking structure but the only thing the development settlement agreement laid out was 20 parking spots basically in that location, which may be covered. The United States Forest Service would not approve a parking structure on USFS ground; the Estate would need USFS approval to plowed and paved access to parking on the Summer Road. The condo/hotel plan would eliminate the proposed parking structure which would be four stories and 45,000

~~square feet, because all of the parking would be onsite. He stated that anything they could do to get access from down below—which would be in working with the Forest Service and the Ski Area—would be ideal. He further explained that per the development settlement agreement, whatever was done with access could not interfere with existing uses such as parking at the end of the paved road, osv's at the beginning of the summer road just beyond the gate and people skiing, hiking pulling kids on sleds and so on. per the development settlement agreement, 20 parking spots were required in that location. The United States Forest Service would not approve a parking structure; however, they would approve a plownd paved access to parking. The condo/hotel plan would eliminate the parking structure which would be four stories and 45,000 square feet, because all of the parking would be onsite. He stated that anything they could do to get access from down below—which would be in working with the Forest Service and the Ski Area—would be ideal. He further explained that per the development settlement agreement, whatever was done with access could not interfere with existing uses.~~

Mayor Sondak explained that a hotel would be eligible for tax-increment funding and generate sales tax revenue. There was continued discussion on changes to the commercial core zone, as well as water use. He explained that this structure would require more water than a development of 10 single-family homes.

Council Member Morgan stated that she was open to this idea but would like to hear more from the U.S. Forest Service, Alta Ski Area, and Salt Lake City Water. Mayor Sondak concurred. Wade Budge stated that Alta Ski Area indicated its support for the project.

In response to a question from Council Member Bourke, Zach Hartman explained that public bathrooms would be included in the project plan.

## **2. BUSINESS LICENSE ORDINANCE AND PERUVIAN ESTATES PARKING PROVISION**

[00:27:59]

Mr. Guldner introduced this item and explained that at one point the Town had rezoned the area from single family use to allow rentals and small, separate caretaker units; Later, owners wanted to be caretakers with larger sized units. This was allowed, however, the parking provision was not amended with that change. He provided a brief historical overview of the issue, and explained that there was not as much access on the weast side as on the weast side of the Peruvian Estates neighborhood. Therefore, there was not enough room for winter parking on the west. Mr. Guldner explained that at one point the Town Marshal assigned specific parking spots for each individual unit. This worked well up until recently.

Polly McLean, Town Attorney, noted that the parking requirements in the Peruvian Estates neighborhood were unique to Alta, and that no other neighborhoods in the Town had these same requirements.

## **3. TOWN PARKING**

[00:36:49]

Mike Morey, Town Marshal, stated that staff had hired a contractor to help the Town in the winter North Side Permitted Parking Plan Development. Staff was anticipating the Town would manage parking on the areas of the north side of State Road 210 from the Shallow Shaft restaurant continuing east to the easternmost edge of the Grizzly Gulch overnight parking area. The area in question was in the Alta Ski Area's special use permit area, provided the Town transitioned to a permitted system. Mr. Morey stated that the Alta Ski Area was willing to allow the Town control over that area, provided the Town transition to a permitted system. Meetings with UDOT and the USFS were scheduled for later that week to discuss

details further. Mr. Morey stated there would be 250 parking spaces to manage—information which was provided by Alta Ski Area through its various surveys. He stated that staff was seriously considering having a third party assist in initiating the program of an automated permitting system. It was important that this system be user-friendly and easy to understand.

Chris Cawley, Assistant Town Administrator, presented a graphic that identified the area where the program would be implemented. He explained the importance of community engagement, and stated that Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) agreed to help the Town engage the public in submitting comments and identifying needs of the entire community. Mr. Cawley also noted that the Town had received grant funds from the WFRC to pay for consultants to help develop this parking plan. Staff was anticipating having a plan ready to implement by mid-November.

Mr. Morey discussed several goals to consider with the program, including the many people and uses of parking, and the accommodation of historical uses. Mayor Sondak agreed with him; however, he also pointed out that it might not be possible to accommodate all historical use patterns. Mr. Morey added that ride shares and carpooling would also likely be encouraged.

Council Member Bourke mentioned reaching out to all concerned people who would be affected by this plan. Staff assured her ~~that this was the plan~~ would be to publicly invite comments. Marshal Morey said the Town's goal was to preserve historical parking for home owners, caretakers, resident employees and commercial work force. He did not want to be exclusionary. However, all historical uses and patterns would likely not continue. Council Member Davis also asked about Snowbird's parking plan and how that would affect Alta's plan. There was a brief discussion on the matter.

*The Work Session ended at 4:00 pm and Mayor Sondak called for a short break.*

## **REGULAR MEETING**

### **1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER AND DECLARATION**

[01:01:03]

Mayor Sondak called the meeting to order and noted that all Council Members were present.

### **2. CITIZEN INPUT**

[01:01:30]

Piper Lever, Town Clerk, read Randhir Jhamb's email into the record as follows:

*Alta Mayor and Town Council Members:*

*For the upcoming Alta Town Meeting, I would also like to weigh in the discussion and vote on the re-worked business license for our neighborhood: Peruvian Estates. Since a parking plan was originally required for each of our homes in order to get a building permit, an additional requirement added to the business license seems to be unnecessary and onerous. If a parking requirement is not requirement of all Alta business licenses, it should not be a requirement for just the western end of Peruvian Estates or all of Peruvian Estates. Therefore, I would suggest and support a business license application with no parking requirements for our neighborhood. Please consider what we as the residents who affected by this ordinance want when it comes to time to vote on Wednesday, July 14<sup>th</sup>.*

Regards,  
Rhandir Jhamb

Roger Bourke ~~spoke favorably~~~~spoke~~ about the treatments made to the Summer Road, stating they had improved the Grizzly Gulch area significantly. He also noted having attended a UDOT meeting regarding the EIS the night prior, and he was impressed with how the citizens had united themselves together to address the issue. He suggested that the Town of Alta rally together similarly to speak with one voice.

Karen Travis noted she had submitted the following comment via email:

*Alta Mayor and Town Council Members:*

*For the upcoming Alta town meeting, I would like to weigh in on the discussion and vote on the reworked business license for our neighborhood, Peruvian Estates.*

*Since a parking plan was required for each of our homes in order to get a building permit, a new requirement added to the business license seems to be overkill. If a parking requirement is not a part of ALL Alta business licenses, it should not be a requirement for just the western end of Peruvian Estates (or all of Peruvian Estates).*

*Therefore, I would suggest and support a business license application with NO PARKING REQUIREMENTS for our neighborhood. Please consider what we as the residents who are affected by this ordinance want when it comes time to vote on Wednesday (July 14).*

*Sincerely,  
Karen Travis*

Mac Brighton addressed the Peruvian Estates parking issue. He said that eliminating any requirement for parking would seriously denigrate the neighborhood and cause even greater parking problems. He explained that if the Ski Area moved to paid parking, there would be even more pressure on the neighborhood's parking. He was in favor of reducing the business license requirement to two spots.

Ginny Marie Leines was invited to comment; she stated she was present to listen and had no comments to add.

Penny Heatley was invited to comment; she stated she had no comments to add.

Del Draper asked the Town of Alta to consider extending its remote access to Town Council meetings. He stated that Zoom provided a lot of flexibility to listen to portions of meetings that were of special interest. It also saved time spent traveling to and from meetings. He also stated that he was in favor of the Shrontz Estate hotel plan.

Mayor Sondak stated that he had asked the staff to investigate the possibility of continuing to allow for electronic participation even if/when an anchor location becomes a possibility again.

Mark Levin stated that he was a new homeowner in the Peruvian Estates neighborhood. He was in favor of having no requirement for parking spots in the neighborhood.

### **3. BUSINESS LICENSE STUDY – ~~SUSIE BECKER AND~~ AARON MONTGOMERY**

[01:13:56]

Jen Clancy, Deputy Town Clerk, introduced Zions Bank representative Aaron Montgomery to present the Business License Study. Mr. Montgomery stated that he was with Zions Public Finance which specialized in municipal studies. The purpose of the Business License Study was to ensure the Town complied with Utah Code 10-1-203:

*Fees charged reflect the amount necessary to reasonably regulate business activity, including the costs of disproportionate or enhanced levels of municipal services required by some business classes, geographic locations, etc.*

~~Additionally, the study also evaluated business licensing categories for disproportionate costs, as well as evaluated enhanced service costs for specific business categories.~~

Mr. Montgomery explained that the total business licensing cost included base administrative costs, disproportionate service costs, and enhanced service costs. Factors to consider included:

- Percentage change to current fees
- Dollar amount of change in fees
- Correlation between proposed fees and the actual cost of services
- Recognition of revenues generated by some business types (such as sales tax)
- The comparative/competitive fees in neighboring cities

Base administrative costs included employee labor, indirect/direct overhead, training, supply, and study costs. Mr. Montgomery noted that the total base administrative fee was calculated as \$62.27.

Mr. Montgomery presented the disproportionate service costs which were calculated based on need for City services (such as police, fire, EMS). The total 2021-2022 Police Budget was \$1,004,050. The estimated percentage of time spent on responding to police calls was 2.08%. The amount of annual police calls was 175.5, and the cost per police call was \$119.00.

Mr. Montgomery presented the disproportionate service costs which were calculated based on need ~~for~~ per business categories. He showed a chart that included 10 different categories which included hotels >20 rooms, hotels 10-20 rooms, hotels <10 rooms, property management, transportation, business and personal services, retail and general services, restaurant, cafeterias and bars, day cares, ski lifts, temporary, and non-profits.

Mr. Montgomery presented enhanced service costs for business categories and explained that municipalities were allowed under Utah Code to collect a fee reasonably related to the cost of the following municipal services: police, fire/EMS, storm water runoff, traffic control, parking, transportation, beautification, and snow removal. The annual cost of police parking patrol for the Alta Ski Area was approximately \$6,457.53 and \$1,291.51 for the lodges with 20 or more rooms. A one-time fee was assessed annually though ~~but~~ was labeled as a “one-time” fee because it only applied to the first business license issued to entities with more than one business license in the same category.

Mr. Montgomery presented a graph depicting the maximum business license fee calculation (first application). The graph listed the aforementioned business categories and calculated the following fees: base administrative, disproportionate service, enhanced service, and first application – maximum.

Businesses would only be charged this fee for their first application. All additional business licenses would only be charged the base and disproportionate service costs. Mr. Montgomery then presented the maximum business license fees for additional applications. Alternate fees would be assessed to business licenses when the licensee had already applied for a previous license under the same license name. The fees calculated in the study were then compared to the Town's current fees.

Lastly, Mr. Montgomery presented a chart depicting business license fee comparisons between Alta and five other Utah municipalities: Springdale, Huntsville, Heber, Cottonwood Heights, and Sandy.

Council Member Davis asked if Park City was considered as a comparable municipality to Alta. Additionally, she asked about the Town's method for documenting its calls based on current software usage and improvements underway. Mr. Morey ~~and~~ stated that it was somewhat difficult to extrapolate data. He stated that on average they documented 1,100 to 1,200 case numbers issued per year by the police department. Therefore, to assist in the survey staff looked at dispatch calls. He stated that with the Records Management system recently purchased, staff would be better able to provide more usable data.

#### **4. ALTA SKI AREA UPDATE – MIKE MAUGHAN**

[01:48:21]

Mike Maughan, Alta Ski Area, gave a report. He thanked the Town Marshal's office for their support in making this past ski year a calmer one than the year before. He stated they were moving along as expected. The Ski Area continued to work on an improved parking system for next year, stating they were on target for a parking reservation system to be up by October 1.

Last week, Alta Ski Area met with the Forest Management Team to discuss the management plan, diseased trees, and other hazards. Alta Ski Area may try to plant some blue spruce, as it was more resistant. Mr. Maughan stated he had attended the UDOT open house. Some alternatives that were suggested were that busses could have more than two lanes in the canyon, and that there could be snow sheds; however, the Alta Ski Area would be more supportive of a gondola. Mayor Sondak said his only real aversion would be to a train. Mr. Maughan acknowledged the challenge of managing the area in such a way that they could continue offering high quality skiing to all the people who want it.

Mayor Sondak recalled a recent trip to Glacier National Park in Montana at which time they were unable to reserve parking in the park due to its reservation system, and were only able to enter before 6 a.m. or after 5 p.m. He was concerned about that possibility for Alta Ski Area.

Mr. Maughan stated they had no plans for expansion or to actively get more folks to Alta, just plans to manage those who come. There were plenty of people who wanted to come to Alta, but they would prefer to manage that number rather than to expand. He stated support for transportation improvements such as ~~some of their ideas were~~ traction laws, and to putting a traffic light and an extra lane at a key intersection which would better separate the traffic that was going to Alta rather than to Snowbird.

Mayor Sondak asked that the next meeting Mr. Morey give an update on his office's involvement at Alta Ski Area. Mr. Morey agreed.

#### **5. UNIFIED FIRE AUTHORITY – SCOTT GARFIELD, CAPTAIN**

[02:00:40]

Scott Garfield, UFA Captain, joined the meeting via Zoom from Station 113, stated that Chief Jay Torgerson was on vacation, and had given him several bullet points to share in the meeting.

Mr. Garfield discussed drought conditions. He outlined the plan for the chippers and wild land guides that were due to be in the area July 26-29 to remove fuels from defensible space. Citizens could go to the UFA website, prevention tab, to schedule that for their properties.

Next, Mr. Garfield talked about fireworks restrictions, stating they were still in place, and that hopefully there wouldn't be any incidents associated with Pioneer Day on July 24. Citizens could go to the website to learn of the exact restrictions.

Next on his list was announcement of a free pancake breakfast being planned for August 4, sometime in the morning, at a place yet to be determined. Mr. Garfield noted they hoped to keep this breakfast for local citizens, staff, employees, and ski people—so advertising had to be carefully approached. He noted that Chief Torgerson would confirm all those details when he returned from his vacation,

Mayor Sondak asked if they had crews fighting fires elsewhere. The answer was yes, but they also had a crew locally.

## **6. UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (UDOT) WITH ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) UPDATE**

[02:07:00]

Josh Van **J**ura, Vincent Izzo, and Bri Binnebose, each of UDOT, presented the EIS update for transportation options being considered for Little Cottonwood Canyon~~the Alta Ski Area~~.

Mr. Van **j**Jura stated that the purpose and need of ~~an~~**this** EIS was to substantially improve safety, mobility, and reliability on the tract from the mouth of Big Cottonwood on through the Town of Alta. If something wasn't done there, it was projected that the expected travel time up the canyon would rise to 80 minutes at least 50 days a year. As UDOT had studied this inevitability, they had determined that there were two almost equally desirable alternatives: 1) Enhanced bus system; and 2) Gondola B from La Caille.

The reason UDOT's research team chose two rather than one was because the bus met the mobility goal better, but the gondola met the reliability goal better. Therefore, they proposed getting public input whereupon the draft EIS would change based on the comments submitted; but noted it was not a democratic process with citizens deciding~~to tip the scales toward a decision~~. Next, he gave additional details to the Council.

### **Time Spent to Utilize Service**

**Bus:** Total time from parking a car to arriving at the ski resort would be 36 minutes. (This included 24 minutes actually in the bus.)

**Gondola:** Total time from parking a car to arriving at the ski resort would be 57 minutes. (This includes 34 minutes actually on the 35 passenger gondola.)

Another consideration was that buses with dedicated lanes could potentially pass cars in the other lanes, which may affect both the travel time and the behavior of those in the cars. Also, the study was done in dry weather, whereas actual conditions were usually snowy with adverse situations possible, thus slowing down the travel times.

**Capital Cost**

**Bus:** \$510 million start up, plus a winter operation cost of \$11 million annually. The widened road would be used for cycling and foot traffic in the summer.

**Gondola:** \$592 million start up, plus a winter operation and maintenance cost of \$7.6 million. The gondola cabins would be removed and stored during the summer.

Mr. Van Jjura estimated that for a 30-year span, the costs come pretty close to being identical for either system.

**Visual Impact**

**Bus:** Cuts and fills along the road would be visible.

**Gondola:** Towers were anywhere from 50-70 meters tall, [approximately 164-229 feet]~~and would be visible.~~

Mr. Van Jjura stated the EIS comment period ~~he felt the only way to decide~~ was to gather public input. Council Member Bourke asked for an open house in Alta, to which Mr. Van Jura ~~He~~ briefly discussed both the benefits and constraints of holding open houses. The comment period extended to September 3, 2021, which would be the Friday before Labor Day.

Mayor Sondak asked for clarification to determine if the costs were presuming winter operations only, and the answer was yes, though they were being cleared for summer operations, too. The problem would be the cost of the service in the summer. Each trip would cost \$25-\$28, but they would be subsidized in the winter for affordability.

Mr. Van Jjura commented on the type of public input they were hoping for. After the 2021-2022 skiing season, a final decision would be made.

Council Member Davis asked if comments were part of the public record. Mr. Van Jjura explained that it depended on if they were made as part of a public process, and then they became public record. He noted that voicemail phone messages were considered public comments.

**7. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

- May 12, 2021 Minutes
- June 16, 2021 Minutes
- Treasurer's Report
- Staff Reports
- Budget Committee Reports

[02:25:24]

Mayor Sondak noted changes to be made to the June 16, 2021 minutes.

**MOTION:** Council Member Davis moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda as modified. Council Member Curry seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**8. QUESTIONS REGARDING DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS**

[02:37:54]

Council Member Bourke commended the person who had raised the Lower Albion Basin signs. She also asked if the time was right to ask Rocky Mountain Power to put a line up the canyon as a back-up.

Mayor Sondak said yes, explaining that their franchise agreement will expire in February 2022. With the current five-year franchise agreement, they had an opportunity to work back and forth more frequently than when it was on a 10-year cycle. Rocky Mountain Power, though it was the only supplier, had pledged its commitment to good faith engagement. Administrator Guldner suggested Alta make a list of “wants,” to work through with RMP, the only service in town.

## 9. MAYOR’S REPORT

[02:43:33]

Mayor Sondak expressed gratitude to staff that had been working hard on several complicated issues such as the budget, the water rate study, the business license fee study, and permitted parking.

Mayor Sondak expressed concern that COVID was not over. The case rate had recently gone up to 173/100,000. Eighty percent of those cases were the Delta variant. He mentioned that wearing masks indoors in areas of high density and low rates of vaccination was advised.

Mayor Sondak announced that Pathways Associates would be conducting the community center fundraising feasibility study, and that he would be meeting with them the next day.

Mayor Sondak mentioned briefly the parking, business license, and the UDOT EIS studies that had been previously discussed. He then stated he wanted to raise an additional concern about the UDOT study. He felt they hadn’t taken climate change into full account, as they were relying on a decades-old analysis technique. He referenced information that had come from Robert Gillies of Utah State University. He urged those who would make comments to give this some thought.

Mayor Sondak referenced his own property tax statement on which the UFSA was the fourth most expensive item, at \$400. The UFSA had notified the public of the new tax rate. He also mentioned that ~~they~~ Town could expect about \$40,000 from the Rescue Act Fund, down from the \$70,000 they thought they would receive. The budget would need to be adjusted for that.

Mayor Sondak then reported on several meetings he had attended recently, and he outlined the meetings coming up. From the meetings he had attended, he commented on the importance of a visitor capacity study prior to UDOT’s EIS analysis. However he noted the large cost of a visitor capacity study being done by the CWC, and his belief that it would produce little useful data as he had concerns about techniques for gathering “social experience” data. He also discussed fireworks; homelessness in Utah; and the problem of scooters. He stated that Utah was not doing as well as they used to do on the homelessness issue. He also acknowledged that Alta doesn’t seem to have a scooter problem, but that if anyone noticed abandoned scooters in Alta, to please let him know.

He then ended his report with a listing of temporary dog licenses issued with a start date between 6/15/21 and 7/8/21.

1. George Fett 10 days 6/17
2. Penny Heatley 12 days 6/19
3. Tanner Bowman 1 day wedding 6/26
4. Sarah Goodson 30 days 7/1

5. Talley Goodson 30 days 7/1
6. Kevin Dennis 8 days 7/1
7. Noelle Byrne 19 days 7/6

## **10. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2021-O-5 BUSINESS LICENSE ORDINANCE AND PERUVIAN ESTATES PARKING PROVISION**

[02:57:15]

Mayor Sondak introduced this agenda item by stating that he had Polly McLean, Town Attorney, draw up two versions of this, ~~so he could better understand it.~~ In talking to Council Member Curry, he suggested he make a motion on the one they had talked about.

**MOTION:** Council Member Curry moved to pass version 5.1 of the business license ordinance, which completely strikes the old section that indicated a business must provide a certain number of spots for parking before a license could be issued. Council Member Morgan seconded the motion.

Councilwoman Davis framed her comments in terms of privilege and fairness, pointing out that renting a home zoned as a single family dwelling is a privilege that comes with expectations which the parking requirements of the current Peruvian Estates business license ordinance makes clear. If consistency is the goal, then change the ordinance to require two year round parking spaces rather than three. But why should the Town change or strike an ordinance that has been in place for over two decades? Because it is receiving some pushback from full enforcement now? As parking becomes even more coveted within the Town of Alta this does not seem the time to weaken private property owner's rights or loosen expectations around parking if operating a business here.

~~Council Member Davis asked why this was important to do, and offered an example of how it could negatively affect tenants. She explained that if the owner of a house rented it out, and they were a business owner, then the person who lived in the house had a right to expect parking spaces. She also asked why the time was now to be changing an ordinance that had been unchanged for many years.~~

Several key points emerged during this discussion:

- Private land and parking issues must be worked out among private landowners and their tenants
- The Council needed to find out what worked for the whole community
- The business license was not the appropriate place to have wording regarding parking
- Zoning documents should have wording regarding parking
- Planning Commission made a recommendation for zoning, then the Town Council determined whether to adopt, amend, or reject
- There were glitches in what was dictated in zoning documents, and what actually happened—especially in the winter when snow covered access to parking spaces.
- 2 parking spots is a zoning requirement, but year round parking is not specified.

Mayor Sondak stated that the Town of Alta was about to consider parking in a more general way. When people's private parking was unavailable or exceeded by numbers of cars, they parked elsewhere. Alta had a parking problem they had to address anyway. These issues would be coming up, and parking for rented homes may be one of those things they will have to address.

As Council members discussed this, it was ~~suggested~~noted that ~~perhaps~~ the Town Council should wait to make changes until they knew where the more general parking question was going to go.

Mayor Sondak CALLED the Question.

**Ayes**

Sondak

Curry

Morgan

**Nays**

Davis

Bourke

**The motion passed.**

**11. NEW BUSINESS**

[03:18:00]

This time was used to discuss how to best funnel to UDOT comments about the EIS. The idea of having a town hall meeting to gather Alta citizens and hear their ~~collect~~ comments, was discussed. Mayor Sondak stated that such a method would not produce a consensus and could potentially be used simply as an emoting session. As the group discussed the options, Mayor Sondak stated that a town hall meeting could be valuable if the word got out for people to study all the angles first and to come prepared to make meaningful comments on what would work better, or to offer support for the plans as written. He said he was willing to facilitate such a meeting with help, and would potentially invite representatives from UDOT and the Forest Service—but he did not want it to turn into a comment writing workshop. It would be critical for citizens to send their comments directly to UDOT.

The Mayor and Council discussed the agenda for the August meeting. One suggestion was to address the TOA ethics pledge language. Further discussion regarding the public hearing process for the EIS ensued.

**12. MOTION TO ADJOURN**

[03:34:57]

**MOTION:** Mayor Sondak moved to adjourn. Council Member Morgan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED by the Town Council on Sept 8, 2021

Piper Lever, Town Clerk

**MINUTES**  
**ALTA TOWN COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Wednesday, August 11, 2021, 3:00 PM**

Alta Community Center, 10351 E. Highway 210, Alta, Utah

**PRESENT:** Mayor Harris Sondak  
Council Member Margaret Bourke  
Council Member Cliff Curry  
Council Member Sheridan Davis  
Council Member Elise Morgan

**STAFF PRESENT:** John Guldner, Town Administrator  
Chris Cawley, Assistant Town Administrator  
Piper Lever, Town Clerk  
Jen Clancy, Deputy Town Clerk  
Mike Morey, Town Marshal  
Polly McLean, Town Attorney  
Jay Torgersen, Chief UFA

**WORK SESSION**

Mayor Sondak called the virtual work session to order at 3:00 p.m. per a submitted declaration.

**1. BUSINESS LICENSE STUDY**

[00:24:00]

Deputy Town Clerk Jen Clancy highlighted the study and outlined the path moving forward. She told the council that as they consider changing any of the business license fees it was important to think about the percentage of change from current fees, and the correlation between proposed fees and the actual cost of services. She said that the study primarily looked at base administrative costs which apply to all licenses issued, disproportionate service costs, and enhanced service costs. She explained that there is a maximum application fee that legally cannot be exceeded.

Council Member Bourke sought clarification regarding secondary application fees, asking if they needed to be within the same category. Town Attorney Polly McClean said that that was how it was laid out in the study, but the Town has discretion.

Ms. Clancy explained that the situation only really applies to one category, Category 8: Ski Lift Company, but that the ski area applies under the joint license provision. They have multiple businesses in the same building, and apply for a joint license for each building. In this situation they are charged the maximum license fee for any single business in the joint license. She has not yet seen a combination of a joint license and multiple license applications. Council Member Morgan corroborated that in the past each ASL physical building had a joint license and paid the max license fee for whichever business in the building had the highest fee. She asked if, under the proposed plan, the first building would be charged the first application fee, and each additional building would pay the second application fee. Ms. Clancy said yes,

that's exactly how it would work. She said the reason is because the disproportionate services fee is included only in the first application fee and the town doesn't want to charge a business multiple times for the same location because there's no additional effects on the Town and its resources to manage it and the goal was to not overcharge businesses in that situation.

Mayor Sondak and Council Member Bourke both asked about hotels with other businesses inside. Ms. Clancy explained that a lodging license already included the hotel's restaurant, as this was a common business practice. If a hotel had a spa and owned the spa, it could use the joint license provision. However, if the spa was owned by a separate entity that leased the space from the hotel, it would need its own license, which would be considered a first application.

Council Member Bourke asked about the joint license provision. Ms. Clancy read from the Town Code §3-1-12 regarding joint licenses.

Mayor Sondak pointed out that they weren't talking about changing any procedures, only fees. Ms. Clancy explained that the current system did not have a second application fee, it was a new idea, because the study went into more depth and was able to provide data for disproportionate services and enhanced services that had not been calculated into previous business license studies. She clarified that each building with multiple businesses could still use the joint license provision for that building, but that each additional building would count as a second application.

Council Member Davis asked if other ski town communities like Park City allocate their fees similarly. Aaron Montgomery of Zion's Public Finance answered that, to his knowledge, they don't have a similar system, but that the Town of Alta was in a unique situation. He said that the study showed that certain types of business—specifically Categories 1 and 8—bring more commuters to the town, requiring increased patrols. The Enhanced Services fee was an attempt to capture some of those additional costs to the Town. Ms. McClean added that Park City uses protected information as part of their fee calculation, so it was difficult to determine their breakdown, but that their business license fees were significantly higher.

Ms. Clancy presented the proposed fees to the council. She said that based on the study, most categories were currently being charged more than the maximum license fee allowed, based on the cost to the Town for regulating those licenses. Under the staff proposal, m~~M~~Most categories would be set to 100% of the allowable amount. Categories 1 and 8 would see a significant increase in fees, but she explained that the proposed fee is only 35% of the maximum amount that *could* be charged. These proposed fees were calculated based on the number of applications in 2020 and the minimum amount necessary to cover the budget. The rationale for not charging the maximum allowed was threefold: first, they felt like it would be too big of an increase initially; second, these businesses do provide in-kind services to the community; and third, these businesses also provide a large portion of sales tax to the community.

Council Member Cliff Curry disclosed a conflict of interest as an employee of Alta Lodge and asked what the difference was between the previous Zions study and the current study that resulted in such an increase for Categories 1 and 8. Mayor Sondak pointed out that the existing fees only show what fees were adopted, not what the previous study determined was the maximum allowable. Mr. Montgomery said that the proposed fee for Category 8 was just over 10% of what the previous study determined was the total maximum fee. He also said that efficiencies have caused base administrative costs to go down, there's more data about disproportionate services costs than was previously available, and that some data the previous study relied on is no longer relevant.

Mayor Sondak explained that the police department comprises a large part of the Town's budget, and that the impetus for the study was largely to try to understand the disproportionate costs associated with policing. Council Member Morgan worried that Category 1 and 8 business were being penalized to meet a budget dollar amount. Mayor Sondak pointed out that these businesses aren't being penalized, they're just getting less of a percentage decrease relative to the actual marginal costs for these services that are being incurred by the Town. He said the study makes it clear how these numbers were generated, and beyond that it's a policy question of how to move forward.

Council member Davis expressed concern about the methodology of the study, how it compared to the previous study, certain data that were included in the previous study but not the current study, and desired more time to analyze and digest all the data. Mayor Sondak retorted that one of the main points in the study was to avoid externalities and simply calculate the actual cost to the Town for staff time and policing.

Council Member Bourke noted that the study used data from April 2019 through March 2021 and expressed concern that the data might not accurately reflect non-pandemic costs. Ms. Clancy responded that as far as business licenses were concerned, the previous two years were fairly average, that only one business wasn't operating, and that other fluctuations were normal. Ms. Bourke also wanted more detail about how the costs were calculated and asked whether other costs should be included in addition to law enforcement costs, i.e. recycling and legislative costs.

Mayor Sondak ended the discussion by saying that the Council has been involved in this process for some time, and if there were concerns regarding the methodology or scope, those concerns should have been raised previously. He commended staff for their hard work so far.

## **2. LISTENING SESSION RECAP/REVIEW: LCC UDOT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

[00:53:45]

Assistant Town Administrator Chris Cawley debriefed the council about the Environmental Impact Survey listening session. He said there was nearly 40 people on the call, and that it was a well-engaged discussion. Mayor Sondak said he received positive feedback that people were happy to express their opinions and hear their fellow citizens' opinions as well. He said his first major takeaway was that proceeding on a construction project to change transportation in the canyon without considering the implications of bringing more people into the canyon was putting the cart before the horse. He would like to see the Visitor Use Study that the Central Wasatch Committee had commissioned before proceeding. He also said that it seemed like a plurality of people thought that simply increasing the number and frequency of busses on the existing road was sufficient.

Council Member Davis shared that she thought the listening session was very fruitful and that people were thoughtful and gracious toward each other. She said that many of the constituents believe that a human capacity survey is long overdue. She has also heard from many people that the Alta Town Council and leadership should reflect the interests of the homeowners as well as the many constituencies that they serve.

Mr. Cawley reviewed the components of a letter he's been drafting from the Town of Alta to UDOT regarding milestones in the EIS and what the comments would focus on. He had already provided letters on the Purpose and Need chapter and the Alternatives chapter. He said the letter will include comments about the need to understand capacity, support for incremental improvements, and that Council will have

a chance to look at the draft before anything is submitted. Mayor Sondak said that the purpose of sending these responses to UDOT was to continue to have standing in the process as it moves forward.

*The Work Session ended at 4:02 pm and Mayor Sondak called for a short break.*

## **REGULAR MEETING**

### **1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER AND DECLARATION**

[01:26:32]

Mayor Sondak called the meeting to order at 4:04pm and noted that all Council Members were present.

### **2. CITIZEN INPUT**

[01:28:00]

Roger Bourke, Alta resident, joined the virtual session and said that he thought the EIS listening session was wonderful. He wanted to comment on the visual impact of the proposed gondola. He said the terminal had a very large footprint, and the proposed towers in Alta are 130 feet tall and 230 feet tall. The EIS described the visual impact as high. He said that's an understatement, that the visual impact is extraordinary, and asked the Council if using the words of Dan Schilling from the listening session of having the gondola become the iconic image for the Town of Alta is what they wanted.

### **3. ALTA SKI AREA UPDATE – MIKE MAUGHAN**

[01:13:56]

Mike Maughan, Alta Ski Area, reviewed progress on summer projects: work was almost done on Nina's Curve, revegetation coming next, snow fence going in above Devil's Castle, footings have been poured for avalanche control towers, just waiting for the towers to arrive. He said they're in the planning process to potentially replace the Albion and Sunnyside lifts next year. Council Member Bourke asked if a new EIS would be needed for that project. Mr. Maughan said the replacement of Sunnyside was included in a 2017 study, but the removal of Albion would be analyzed using a categorical exclusion.

Mr. Maughan said they've been reviewing the 1000-page EIS report and preparing a response. They support anything that can improve transportation and reduce congestion, and pointed out that the primary cause of congestion was weather. Their preference is for a gondola over busses, but recognize the concerns associated with both, and hope for interim solutions. They will be testing their new parking reservation system software over the next few weeks, and appreciate the Town's cooperation with the parking issues. He said season pass sales are trailing, but multi-resort passes are up 30-40%, signaling a trend.

Council Member Bourke asked for clarification if an MOU for parking needed to include the US Forest Service or was just between the ski area and the Town of Alta. Mr. Maughan said the Forest Service doesn't see a need to be involved in the agreement. Ms. Bourke also asked if about how employers were communicating with their commuting employees about parking needs and the survey. Mr. Maughan reported they were taking care of their employees and assumed other businesses were doing the same. Mike Morey, Town Marshal, responded that they were still trying to capture that data from employers.

### **4. UNIFIED FIRE AUTHORITY – JAY TORGENSEN**

[01:47:25]

Jay Torgersen, UFA Chief, reported that it's been a busy summer focused on wildland fire fighting and prevention. They've sent fire crews to California, Montana, Oregon, Michigan, and Florida. He said these are great training opportunities. He thanked the Council for their cooperation and engagement with the outdoor fire restriction and fireworks ordinances this summer.

He reported that their pancake breakfast was a success, there were approximately 120-150 participants who were able to engage with UFA and partners and learn about wildland fire and prevention. He said they have crews available to assist with fuel reduction and site inspection to help home and business owners reduce risk.

He said they responded to an injured hiker call on Devil's Castle; it was a minor injury and the hiker was safely extracted, but any calls to those remote areas require a lot of time and personnel. He said they're working on a system to better notify the Marshal's office when calls come directly to them and not through Alta Central.

From July 1<sup>st</sup> through August 11<sup>th</sup>, there were five total calls, all five were medical calls.

## **5. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

- **June 30, 2021 Council Meeting Minutes**
- **July 14, 2021 Council Meeting Minutes**
- **Treasurer's Reports**
- **Staff Reports**

[01:56:46]

**MOTION:** Council Member Bourke moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Council Member Davis seconded the motion.

Council Member Davis moved to strike a paragraph from the July 14<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting ~~draft M~~minutes regarding the Peruvian Estates parking ordinance and have it replaced with ~~her language~~representation of her perspective, which she had submitted to Town Clerk Piper Lever. Mayor Sondak asked Ms. Lever if the correction submitted by Council Member Davis was consistent with the audio recording. Ms. Lever had not had sufficient time to review and compare the two.

Council Member Davis expressed that she feels that many minutes are heavily redacted and rarely accurately reflect not just her perspective but sometimes other citizens as well.

**MOTION:** Mayor Sondak moved to amend the motion on the table to drop the July 14, 2021 Council ~~M~~meeting ~~M~~minutes from the approval of the Consent Agenda. Council Member Morgan seconded the motion. All were in favor.

**VOTE:** Mayor Sondak called for a vote on the original motion to APPROVE the Consent Agenda as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

## **6. QUESTIONS REGARDING DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS**

[02:00:50]

Council Member Bourke asked for an update on the progress of the traction control laws. Town Marshal Morey said he spoke with their contact at UDOT who didn't have any forward progress to report, that it seems to be tied up in the administrative rules committee. Mayor Sondak said that there seemed to be significant forces in favor of it passing. Marshal Morey agreed. Council Member Bourke suggested enlisting the help of some state representatives.

## **7. MAYOR'S REPORT**

[02:03:58]

Mayor Sondak reported on COVID case rates and encouraged people to submit comments to the County Council in support of Salt Lake County Health Department Director Angela Dunn's request to have schoolchildren wear masks.

He thanked everybody who participated in the listening session, he appreciated the good turn out and good dialogue. He thanked Steve McIntosh and Mike Morey for their quick response to a water leak at the Rustler Lodge. He expressed his concern that a gondola might make an Olympic event more likely and suggested that the Town take a stand against any future Olympic events in Little Cottonwood Canyon as they did in the past.

Mayor Sondak then reported on several meetings he had attended recently, and he outlined the meetings coming up. From the UFA meeting he attended, he shared that a fraud risk assessment concluded that the UFA is in the low risk category for fraud.

He then ended his report with a listing of temporary dog licenses issued with a start date between 7/9/21 and 8/5/21:

1. Ellie Johnson 14 days
2. Amy Richardson 1 day
3. Trisha Petzold 14 days
4. Amy Youngstown 6 days
5. Kevin McDonald 2 days
6. Holly Henry 1 day
7. Julia Heighmark 7 days

Council Member Bourke asked Mayor Sondak to review and expound on the social aspects of the visitor use study he mentioned from his recent CWC meeting. He explained that, as proposed, the visitor use study had two phases. The preliminary results of phase one supported moving forward with phase two, but he expressed his skepticism about the usability of the data for the Commission's purpose and mission, and whether or not the social aspects of the study would be successful. In response to these concerns, the CWC sought to coordinate with the Forest Service who is doing a study that includes several similar variables, which could reduce the cost of the study significantly. In addition, the Commission decided to seek funding from other entities, like Save Our Canyons, before moving forward with the study. He added that the social study was problematic because sentiments are subjective and ever-changing. He agreed that the information would be interesting, but his impression was that the community was more concerned with the physical and ecological impacts.

## **8. TOWN PARKING REPORT, CHRIS BENDER – FEHR AND PEERS**

[02:21:45]

Mr. Cawley explained that the scope of the project was to collect data, study parking permit programs in peer municipalities, get public input, and present it for Council consideration. He introduced Chris Bender, a transportation engineer at Fehr & Peers, who presented preliminary findings to the Council.

Mr. Bender made it clear up front that the goal of the parking study was to preserve some of the historical use for parking throughout the town; early survey results revealed that residents were concerned that they would lose access to parking. The study reviewed the existing parking supply and the projected demand moving forward. He said that any managed parking plan would require a special use permit from the US Forest Service, whose main priority was equity. UDOT had no objections to the Town developing a parking plan as long as it didn't impact traffic operations or safety along SR210.

Mr. Bender outlined the parking plan in Springdale, Utah, at the entrance to Zion's National Park, that's proven successful. He explained that Springdale has three tiers of visitor parking zones with daily, flat-rate fees that vary by location. Residents can apply for two residential parking permits to park in resident-only parking zones. He compared that to the parking plan in Breckenridge, Colorado, where visitors must park in visitor parking zones and fees vary based on length of time. Breckenridge also has resident-only zones, for a cost. Mayor Sondak asked if either of these locations managed parking on federally owned land. Mr. Bender said he hadn't been able to determine that yet, but was coordinating with Springdale to find out.

Mr. Bender shared that the data collection was still in progress, but some things were already clear, namely that the demand for parking along SR210 will continue to increase and exceed supply. Survey results showed that businesses tended to be in favor of encouraging carpooling and ridesharing among employees. He expected to have the survey results wrapped up by next month's Council meeting. He said the next steps were to compile the data, draft a parking plan, determine fees, meet with potential parking vendors, and plan the community outreach.

Council Member Curry commented on the survey that was sent out and requested to be able to see all of the questions in advance before completing the survey. Mr. Cawley said he would follow up with him.

Council Member Bourke asked for clarification on transportation demand management. Mr. Bender explained that TDM included managing the mode choices that make traveling to a location easier—if you can't just add more lanes, making bussing easier and cheaper will incentivize people to choose those alternative options.

Council Member Davis asked if any other comparable locations were studied. Mr. Bender responded that a couple other communities were looked at, but Breckenridge and Springdale had the most similar circumstances to Alta.

Council Member Morgan said businesses can get a UTA rideshare van for their employees. She said UTA makes it very easy and very cost effective. Council Member Davis added that now was the time to communicate with the UTA about it.

## **9. ETHICS POLICY – COUNCIL MEMBER BOURKE**

[2:45:38]

Council Member Bourke introduced the agenda item by suggesting that, as public servants, it was important for the public to have confidence in them, and therefore a town ethics policy was worthwhile. However, in reviewing the various ethics documents (employee code of ethics, conflict of interest policy, ethical behavior pledge, etc), she discovered potential contradictions and inconsistencies, particularly in their definitions. Her hope was to review the ethics policies as a Council and ensure they are being addressed in a consistent manner. She outlined several items to be addressed: to whom should the policies apply; definitions of employee, sometimes meaning elected officials, appointed official, etc.; proper conflict of interest disclosure and what duties could/couldn't be performed in a conflict of interest situation; secondary employment; how the policies apply to spouses/partners and family members; any other situations that may give rise to criticism or suspicion that would damage the public trust. She sought to discuss and determine what was the main ethical stance of the Council and ensured the ~~current~~ policies going forward accurately reflect and address that.

Ms. McClean explained that many of the definitions and recommendations came from the State Code and suggested that she and Council Member Bourke meet with someone from the State Auditor's office to understand the State's requirements, make sure the Town is complying, and then move forward with potential amendments to the current policies. Council Member Bourke thought that was a good solution but added that the Town's mission was to have a higher standard than the State and they should keep that in mind through this process. Marshal Morey advised that they be careful in crafting their policy, that it not only had to be compliant, but it also had to be attainable.

#### **10. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2021-R-13 PERTAINING TO WATER RATES**

[2:57:10]

Ms. Clancy introduced this agenda item by explaining that a member of the public discovered a typographical error in resolution 2021-R-9 which allocated the incorrect rate for commercial water users. It was determined corrective action was necessary and that a resolution to repeal and replace all prior versions was a better solution than an amendment.

**MOTION:** Council Member Curry moved to APPROVE Resolution 2021-R-13. Council Member Morgan seconded. The motion passed 4-1, with Council Member Bourke opposing, reiterating her objection to the different metric in applying rates to commercial versus residential users. -

#### **11. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2021-O-6 PERTAINING TO ADOPTING THE BUSINESS LICENSE STUDY AND AMENDING TITLE 3 CHAPTER 1 RELATED TO BUSINESS LICENSE, DISPROPORTIONATE COSTS, AND ENHANCED FEES**

[3:02:25]

**MOTION:** Council Member Davis moved to APPROVE Ordinance 2021-O-6. Mayor Sondak seconded.

Council Member Curry opened the discussion by reiterating his conflict of interest as employee of the Alta Lodge which pays business license fees to the Town of Alta. He requested on behalf of Alta Ski Area that they have more time to evaluate what in-kind contributions the ski area makes to the Town that should offset some of the proposed fee increase. He objected to the quantification of police service calls as a disproportionate service and felt that public safety benefits all, and the cost should not be assigned to any specific business category. He lauded staff for their diligent, careful, thoughtful, hard work compiling the report, and appreciated the 65% mitigation, but felt that the fees were disproportionately applied across business categories.

Council Member Morgan agreed that more time was needed to review the study and worried that Category 1 & 8 businesses were bearing the brunt of a large increase while all other business categories would see a decrease in license fees.

**MOTION:** Council Member Morgan moved to POSTPONE possible action on Ordinance 2021-O-6 until the next Town Council Meeting. Council Member Curry seconded. All voted in favor. The motion to postpone passed unanimously.

Ms. McClean pointed out that the Council could order a new study to be completed, but that in her professional experience, Zions Public Finance and their methodology was very well regarded. She recommended that they reach out to their representative, Mr. Montgomery, with questions and concerns.

Ms. Clancy offered to answer any questions the Council had, as she was very involved with the study and could clarify and explain any of its contents.

## **12. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 2021-R-14 PERTAINING TO THE BUSINESS LICENSE STUDY AND FEE SCHEDULE**

**MOTION:** Council Member Bourke moved to POSTPONE the agenda item until the next Town Council Meeting. Council Member Morgan seconded. All voted in favor.

## **13. CAPITAL PROJECTS PLAN – CHRIS CAWLEY**

[03:19:30]

Mr. Cawley explained that when money is put in a capital account with the Public Treasurer's Investment Fund, there had to be a plan in place to allocate those funds to various projects. A list of projects was included in the agenda packet for the Council's review and approval, mistakenly placed into the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Lever pointed out that the Council could not approve the capital projects plan at this at-time because it was not listed as an action item on this agenda. She, but asked the Council to review it in preparation for next month's meeting when it would be listed as a discussion and action item.

## **14. NEW BUSINESS**

[03:21:32]

Council Member Davis shared that she's received questions from citizens regarding the town park not being as robust as it once was. Mr. Guldner explained that the metal slide was removed because it posed a burn hazard when heated by the sun. Ms. Lever added that the swings had to be removed because the surrounding ground area was not large enough to comply with safety codes. Both were insurance liability issues. Mr. Guldner said he would look into options for installing new equipment.

## **15. MOTION TO ADJOURN**

[03:25:11]

**MOTION:** Council Member Morgan moved to adjourn. Council Member Bourke seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED by the Town Council on Sept 8, 2021

Piper Lever, Town Clerk

FUND SUMMARY  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	VARIANCE	PCNT
<u>REVENUE</u>					
TAXES	37,814.57	40,010.39	1,610,906.00	1,570,895.61	2.5
LICENSES AND PERMITS	15,032.74	17,314.11	46,100.00	28,785.89	37.6
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE	.00	8,409.83	79,558.00	71,148.17	10.6
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	12,829.95	13,718.09	11,390.00	( 2,328.09)	120.4
FINES AND FORFEITURES	6,825.00	14,690.00	23,000.00	8,310.00	63.9
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	1,261.00	24,104.18	76,600.00	52,495.82	31.5
CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS	.00	.00	170,000.00	170,000.00	.0
	<u>73,763.26</u>	<u>118,246.60</u>	<u>2,017,554.00</u>	<u>1,899,307.40</u>	<u>5.9</u>
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					
LEGISLATIVE	1,509.90	3,019.80	20,300.00	17,280.20	14.9
COURT	458.36	4,529.90	24,735.00	20,205.10	18.3
ADMINISTRATIVE	31,378.43	74,212.51	512,687.00	438,474.49	14.5
MUNICIPAL BUILDING	1,441.88	4,600.33	74,750.00	70,149.67	6.2
NON-DEPARTMENTAL	.00	.00	30,519.00	30,519.00	.0
TRANSPORTATION	.00	32.20	29,200.00	29,167.80	.1
PLANNING AND ZONING	.00	3,639.59	21,675.00	18,035.41	16.8
POLICE DEPARTMENT	58,712.55	135,151.45	1,004,050.00	868,898.55	13.5
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	.00	.00	42,000.00	42,000.00	.0
POST OFFICE	1,478.91	3,808.54	35,128.00	31,319.46	10.8
BUILDING INSPECTION	.00	2,788.43	10,300.00	7,511.57	27.1
STREETS - C ROADS	.00	.00	41,000.00	41,000.00	.0
RECYCLING	.00	650.00	21,800.00	21,150.00	3.0
GIS	.00	.00	3,833.00	3,833.00	.0
SUMMER PROGRAM	969.66	2,132.41	54,510.00	52,377.59	3.9
IMPACT	.00	10,000.00	21,000.00	11,000.00	47.6
LIBRARY - COMMUNITY CENTER	182.35	804.96	10,650.00	9,845.04	7.6
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	543.60	543.60	.00	( 543.60)	.0
TRANSFERS	.00	.00	59,417.00	59,417.00	.0
	<u>96,675.64</u>	<u>245,913.72</u>	<u>2,017,554.00</u>	<u>1,771,640.28</u>	<u>12.2</u>
	<u>( 22,912.38)</u>	<u>( 127,667.12)</u>	<u>.00</u>	<u>127,667.12</u>	<u>.0</u>

Council Agenda  
 FUND SUMMARY  
 FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

CAPITAL PROJECT FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	VARIANCE	PCNT
<u>REVENUE</u>					
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	.00	178.64	500.00	321.36	35.7
CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS	.00	.00	164,417.00	164,417.00	.0
	<u>.00</u>	<u>178.64</u>	<u>164,917.00</u>	<u>164,738.36</u>	<u>.1</u>
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					
DEPARTMENT 90	.00	.00	164,917.00	164,917.00	.0
	<u>.00</u>	<u>.00</u>	<u>164,917.00</u>	<u>164,917.00</u>	<u>.0</u>
	<u>.00</u>	<u>178.64</u>	<u>.00</u>	<u>( 178.64)</u>	<u>.0</u>

Council Agenda  
 FUND SUMMARY  
 FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

WATER FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	VARIANCE	PCNT
<u>REVENUE</u>					
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	.00	45,896.95	242,564.74	196,667.79	18.9
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	.00	91.45	1,999.99	1,908.54	4.6
CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS	.00	.00	25,600.00	25,600.00	.0
	<u>.00</u>	<u>45,988.40</u>	<u>270,164.73</u>	<u>224,176.33</u>	<u>17.0</u>
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					
EXPENDITURES	<u>3,256.70</u>	<u>13,721.84</u>	<u>270,164.73</u>	<u>256,442.89</u>	<u>5.1</u>
	<u>3,256.70</u>	<u>13,721.84</u>	<u>270,164.73</u>	<u>256,442.89</u>	<u>5.1</u>
	<u>( 3,256.70)</u>	<u>32,266.56</u>	<u>.00</u>	<u>( 32,266.56)</u>	<u>.0</u>

Council Agenda  
 FUND SUMMARY  
 FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

SEWER FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	VARIANCE	PCNT
<u>REVENUE</u>					
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	110.00	31,250.98	125,000.00	93,749.02	25.0
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	.00	128.20	2,400.00	2,271.80	5.3
SOURCE 38	.00	.00	70,770.00	70,770.00	.0
	<u>110.00</u>	<u>31,379.18</u>	<u>198,170.00</u>	<u>166,790.82</u>	<u>15.8</u>
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					
EXPENDITURES	400.61	4,195.65	198,170.00	193,974.35	2.1
	<u>400.61</u>	<u>4,195.65</u>	<u>198,170.00</u>	<u>193,974.35</u>	<u>2.1</u>
	( 290.61)	27,183.53	.00	( 27,183.53)	.0

REVENUES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEARNED	PCNT
<u>TAXES</u>					
10-31-100 CURRENT YEAR PROPERTY TAXES	644.31	644.31	243,000.00	242,355.69	.3
10-31-200 PRIOR YEAR PROPERTY TAXES	.00	.00	5,568.00	5,568.00	.0
10-31-300 SALES AND USE TAXES	32,357.09	32,357.09	1,251,697.00	1,219,339.91	2.6
10-31-310 4TH .25 TAX	1,166.06	1,166.06	33,818.00	32,651.94	3.5
10-31-400 ENERGY SALES AND USE TAX	2,989.85	5,185.67	70,312.00	65,126.33	7.4
10-31-410 TELEPHONE USE TAX	657.26	657.26	6,511.00	5,853.74	10.1
TOTAL TAXES	37,814.57	40,010.39	1,610,906.00	1,570,895.61	2.5
<u>LICENSES AND PERMITS</u>					
10-32-100 BUSINESS LICENSES AND PERMITS	.00	210.00	18,000.00	17,790.00	1.2
10-32-150 LIQUOR LICENSES	50.00	50.00	4,500.00	4,450.00	1.1
10-32-210 BUILDING PERMITS	14,357.74	15,999.11	9,600.00	( 6,399.11)	166.7
10-32-250 ANIMAL LICENSES	625.00	1,055.00	14,000.00	12,945.00	7.5
TOTAL LICENSES AND PERMITS	15,032.74	17,314.11	46,100.00	28,785.89	37.6
<u>INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE</u>					
10-33-200 SALT LAKE CITY	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
10-33-275 SLC TRAIL SIGNS	.00	.00	23,000.00	23,000.00	.0
10-33-276 SLC TRAILHEAD KIOSKS	.00	.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	.0
10-33-400 STATE GRANTS	.00	6,589.00	5,000.00	( 1,589.00)	131.8
10-33-560 CLASS "C" ROAD FUND ALLOTMENT	.00	.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	.0
10-33-580 STATE LIQUOR FUND ALLOTMENT	.00	.00	4,708.00	4,708.00	.0
10-33-600 SISK	.00	.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	.0
10-33-650 POST OFFICE	.00	1,820.83	21,850.00	20,029.17	8.3
TOTAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE	.00	8,409.83	79,558.00	71,148.17	10.6
<u>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</u>					
10-34-240 REVEGETATION BONDS	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.00	100.0
10-34-430 PLAN CHECK FEES	8,829.95	9,718.09	6,340.00	( 3,378.09)	153.3
10-34-550 PLANNING COMM REVIEW FEES	.00	.00	300.00	300.00	.0
10-34-760 FACILITY CENTER USE FEES	.00	.00	750.00	750.00	.0
10-34-810 IMPACT FEES	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.00	100.0
TOTAL CHARGES FOR SERVICES	12,829.95	13,718.09	11,390.00	( 2,328.09)	120.4
<u>FINES AND FORFEITURES</u>					
10-35-100 COURT FINES	6,825.00	14,690.00	23,000.00	8,310.00	63.9
TOTAL FINES AND FORFEITURES	6,825.00	14,690.00	23,000.00	8,310.00	63.9

REVENUES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEARNED	PCNT
<u>MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE</u>					
10-36-100 INTEREST EARNINGS	.00	415.68	7,500.00	7,084.32	5.5
10-36-210 AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT	.00	22,427.50	.00	( 22,427.50)	.0
10-36-400 SALE OF FIXED ASSETS	.00	.00	45,000.00	45,000.00	.0
10-36-700 UDOT- ALTA CENTRAL	.00	.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	.0
10-36-810 METERING	.00	.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	.0
10-36-820 4X4 ENFORCEMENT	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
10-36-900 SUNDRY REVENUES	1,261.00	1,261.00	4,000.00	2,739.00	31.5
10-36-910 REFUNDABLE SALES TAX	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	1,261.00	24,104.18	76,600.00	52,495.82	31.5
<u>CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS</u>					
10-39-100 CONTRIB FROM PRIVATE SOURCES	.00	.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	.0
10-39-400 TRANSFERS FROM OTHER FUNDS	.00	.00	105,000.00	105,000.00	.0
10-39-410 TRANSFERS FROM IMPACT FUND	.00	.00	21,000.00	21,000.00	.0
10-39-430 TRANSFERS FROM WATER FUND	.00	.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	.0
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS	.00	.00	170,000.00	170,000.00	.0
TOTAL FUND REVENUE	73,763.26	118,246.60	2,017,554.00	1,899,307.40	5.9

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>LEGISLATIVE</u>					
10-41-110 SALARIES - MAYOR AND COUNCIL	1,400.00	2,800.00	18,000.00	15,200.00	15.6
10-41-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
10-41-131 EMPLOYER TAXES	109.90	219.80	1,300.00	1,080.20	16.9
10-41-230 TRAVEL	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-41-280 TELECOM	.00	.00	200.00	200.00	.0
10-41-330 EDUCATION AND TRAINING	.00	.00	200.00	200.00	.0
TOTAL LEGISLATIVE	1,509.90	3,019.80	20,300.00	17,280.20	14.9
<u>COURT</u>					
10-42-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	425.00	850.00	13,015.00	12,165.00	6.5
10-42-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	.00	.00	125.00	125.00	.0
10-42-131 EMPLOYER TAXES	33.36	66.72	995.00	928.28	6.7
10-42-230 TRAVEL	.00	.00	600.00	600.00	.0
10-42-240 OFFICE SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-42-310 PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
10-42-330 EDUCATION & TRAINING	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-42-480 INDIGENT DEFENSE SVCS	.00	.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	.0
10-42-481 VICTIM REPARATION SURCHARGE	.00	3,613.18	6,000.00	2,386.82	60.2
10-42-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
TOTAL COURT	458.36	4,529.90	24,735.00	20,205.10	18.3

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>ADMINISTRATIVE</u>					
10-43-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	19,216.94	38,581.64	253,783.00	215,201.36	15.2
10-43-111 PERFORMANCE BONUS	.00	.00	9,000.00	9,000.00	.0
10-43-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	50.00	110.00	2,000.00	1,890.00	5.5
10-43-131 EMPLOYER TAXES	1,461.62	3,698.73	20,900.00	17,201.27	17.7
10-43-132 INSUR BENEFITS	5,780.78	11,941.57	71,600.00	59,658.43	16.7
10-43-133 URS CONTRIBUTIONS	3,387.85	8,456.81	46,504.00	38,047.19	18.2
10-43-210 BOOKS, SUBSCRIPT & MEMBERSHIPS	.00	1,709.33	3,400.00	1,690.67	50.3
10-43-220 PUBLIC NOTICES	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
10-43-230 TRAVEL	.00	.00	1,600.00	1,600.00	.0
10-43-240 OFFICE SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE	.00	104.21	5,000.00	4,895.79	2.1
10-43-245 IT SUPPLIES & MAINT	567.78	961.76	12,000.00	11,038.24	8.0
10-43-250 EQUIPMENT/SUPPLIES & MNTNCE	400.00	800.00	2,200.00	1,400.00	36.4
10-43-280 TELEPHONE	127.14	410.40	5,800.00	5,389.60	7.1
10-43-310 PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL/SERVICE	.00	462.50	5,000.00	4,537.50	9.3
10-43-315 PROF CONSULTANT SERVICES	.00	.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	.0
10-43-320 PROF/TECH/SERVICES/ACCOUNTING	.00	.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	.0
10-43-325 PROF SERVICES - LEGAL	137.67	1,929.05	35,000.00	33,070.95	5.5
10-43-330 EDUCATION & TRAINING	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-43-350 ELECTIONS	.00	.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	.0
10-43-440 BANK CHARGES	.00	139.39	1,500.00	1,360.61	9.3
10-43-510 INSURANCE AND SURETY BONDS	.00	4,219.74	5,500.00	1,280.26	76.7
10-43-515 WORKERS COMPENSATION INS	136.76	410.28	1,400.00	989.72	29.3
10-43-610 MISCELLANEOUS SUPPLIES	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
10-43-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	111.89	277.10	3,500.00	3,222.90	7.9
TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE	31,378.43	74,212.51	512,687.00	438,474.49	14.5
<u>MUNICIPAL BUILDING</u>					
10-45-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	988.32	1,828.02	17,000.00	15,171.98	10.8
10-45-111 PERFORMANCE BONUS	.00	.00	600.00	600.00	.0
10-45-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-45-131 EMPLOYER TAXES	71.55	57.68	1,200.00	1,142.32	4.8
10-45-132 INSUR BENEFITS	.00	.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	.0
10-45-133 URS CONTRIBUTIONS	227.36	486.76	3,000.00	2,513.24	16.2
10-45-260 BLDGS/GROUNDS-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	.00	89.50	4,000.00	3,910.50	2.2
10-45-265 TOM MOORE BLDG/MNTNCE	.00	.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	.0
10-45-270 UTILITIES	154.65	310.73	4,450.00	4,139.27	7.0
10-45-310 INSURANCE AND SURETY BONDS	.00	1,827.64	2,500.00	672.36	73.1
10-45-610 MISCELLANEOUS SUPPLIES	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-45-740 CAPITAL OUTLAY-EQUIPMENT	.00	.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	.0
TOTAL MUNICIPAL BUILDING	1,441.88	4,600.33	74,750.00	70,149.67	6.2

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>					
10-50-330 TOWN EVENTS	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
10-50-340 CENTRAL WASATCH COMM / CWC	.00	.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	.0
10-50-350 SLC COMM RENEWABLE ENERGY PROG	.00	.00	219.00	219.00	.0
10-50-610 MISCELLANEOUS SUPPLIES	.00	.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	.0
10-50-620 AUDIT	.00	.00	11,000.00	11,000.00	.0
10-50-640 MISC SERVICES	.00	.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	.0
10-50-910 REFUNDABLE SALES TAX PAID	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	.00	.00	30,519.00	30,519.00	.0
<u>TRANSPORTATION</u>					
10-51-631 CECRET LAKE TRAIL SIGNS	.00	.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	.0
10-51-632 TRAILHEAD KIOSKS	.00	.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	.0
10-51-633 TWIN LAKES TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS	.00	.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	.0
10-51-635 MEDIAN	.00	32.20	2,200.00	2,167.80	1.5
10-51-638 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	.00	.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	.0
10-51-645 ALTA RESORT SHUTTLE	.00	.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	.0
10-51-810 METERING TOA SHARE	.00	.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	.0
TOTAL TRANSPORTATION	.00	32.20	29,200.00	29,167.80	.1
<u>PLANNING AND ZONING</u>					
10-53-120 COMMISSION REMUNERATION	.00	.00	4,125.00	4,125.00	.0
10-53-220 PUBLIC NOTICES	.00	.00	250.00	250.00	.0
10-53-230 TRAVEL	.00	.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	.0
10-53-240 OFFICE SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE	.00	.00	150.00	150.00	.0
10-53-310 PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL	.00	.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	.0
10-53-325 PROF & TECH SERVICES - LEGAL	.00	75.00	8,000.00	7,925.00	.9
10-53-330 EDUCATION AND TRAINING	.00	.00	400.00	400.00	.0
10-53-510 INSURANCE & SURETY BONDS	.00	3,564.59	4,450.00	885.41	80.1
10-53-610 MISCELLANEOUS SUPPLIES	.00	.00	400.00	400.00	.0
10-53-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
TOTAL PLANNING AND ZONING	.00	3,639.59	21,675.00	18,035.41	16.8

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>POLICE DEPARTMENT</u>					
10-54-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	35,601.95	72,100.39	525,000.00	452,899.61	13.7
10-54-111 PERFORMANCE BONUS	.00	.00	14,850.00	14,850.00	.0
10-54-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	520.48	941.52	7,000.00	6,058.48	13.5
10-54-131 EMPLOYER TAXES	2,776.27	7,101.25	42,000.00	34,898.75	16.9
10-54-132 INSUR BENEFITS	11,165.80	22,944.60	146,150.00	123,205.40	15.7
10-54-133 URS CONTRIBUTIONS	5,617.35	14,109.89	81,000.00	66,890.11	17.4
10-54-210 BOOKS/SUBSCRIP/MEMBERSHIPS	.00	.00	9,000.00	9,000.00	.0
10-54-230 TRAVEL	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-54-240 OFFICE SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE	.00	2.14	4,000.00	3,997.86	.1
10-54-245 IT SUPPLIES AND MAINT	878.78	1,574.78	11,000.00	9,425.22	14.3
10-54-250 EQUIP/SUPPLIES & MNTNCE	.00	.00	1,500.00	1,500.00	.0
10-54-255 VEHICLE SUPPLIES & MAINTENANCE	31.12	133.07	15,000.00	14,866.93	.9
10-54-260 BLDGS/GROUNDS-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	926.96	1,128.02	18,800.00	17,671.98	6.0
10-54-270 UTILITIES	225.95	451.11	7,500.00	7,048.89	6.0
10-54-280 TELEPHONE	127.14	500.88	7,500.00	6,999.12	6.7
10-54-310 PROFESS/TECHNICAL SERVICES	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-54-325 PROF & TECH SERVICES - LEGAL	275.33	803.95	8,000.00	7,196.05	10.1
10-54-330 EDUCATION AND TRAINING	.00	.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	.0
10-54-470 UNIFORMS	180.00	360.00	4,000.00	3,640.00	9.0
10-54-480 SPECIAL DEPARTMENT SUPPLIES	.00	.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	.0
10-54-500 INSURANCE DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-54-510 INSURANCE AND SURETY BONDS	.00	11,902.17	14,000.00	2,097.83	85.0
10-54-515 WORKERS COMPENSATION INS	273.52	820.56	4,250.00	3,429.44	19.3
10-54-610 MISCELLANEOUS SUPPLIES	.00	.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	.0
10-54-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	111.90	277.12	4,500.00	4,222.88	6.2
10-54-740 CAPITAL OUTLAY - EQUIPMENT	.00	.00	56,000.00	56,000.00	.0
10-54-810 METERING	.00	.00	9,000.00	9,000.00	.0
10-54-820 4X4 ENFORCEMENT	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
TOTAL POLICE DEPARTMENT	58,712.55	135,151.45	1,004,050.00	868,898.55	13.5
<u>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</u>					
10-55-310 ACVB CONTRIBUTION	.00	.00	42,000.00	42,000.00	.0
TOTAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	.00	.00	42,000.00	42,000.00	.0

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>POST OFFICE</u>					
10-56-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	1,854.58	3,670.42	24,870.00	21,199.58	14.8
10-56-111 PERFORMANCE BONUS	.00	.00	750.00	750.00	.0
10-56-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	20.00	20.00	300.00	280.00	6.7
10-56-131 EMPLOYER TAXES	145.58	356.09	1,902.00	1,545.91	18.7
10-56-230 TRAVEL	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
10-56-240 OFFICE SUPPLIES & EXPENSE	.00	.00	300.00	300.00	.0
10-56-250 EQUIP/SUPPLIES AND MNTNCE	74.21	148.42	1,000.00	851.58	14.8
10-56-260 BLDGS/GOUNDS-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	.00	.00	1,200.00	1,200.00	.0
10-56-270 UTILITIES	59.94	116.94	2,000.00	1,883.06	5.9
10-56-280 TELEPHONE	132.66	140.45	1,400.00	1,259.55	10.0
10-56-480 SPECIAL DEPARTMENT SUPPLIES	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
10-56-510 INSURANCE & SURETY BONDS	.00	565.62	606.00	40.38	93.3
10-56-515 WORKERS COMPENSATION INS	25.33	75.99	400.00	324.01	19.0
10-56-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	.00	.00	200.00	200.00	.0
10-56-635 POST OFFICE INVENTORY	( 833.39)	( 1,285.39)	.00	1,285.39	.0
TOTAL POST OFFICE	1,478.91	3,808.54	35,128.00	31,319.46	10.8
<u>BUILDING INSPECTION</u>					
10-58-120 PLAN CHECKS	.00	.00	3,500.00	3,500.00	.0
10-58-310 PROFESS/TECHNICAL INSPECTIONS	.00	2,157.30	5,000.00	2,842.70	43.2
10-58-325 PROF SERVICES - LEGAL	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-58-481 BUILDING PERMIT - SURCHARGES	.00	.00	300.00	300.00	.0
10-58-510 INSURANCE & SURETY BONDS	.00	631.13	1,000.00	368.87	63.1
TOTAL BUILDING INSPECTION	.00	2,788.43	10,300.00	7,511.57	27.1
<u>STREETS - C ROADS</u>					
10-60-260 BLDGS/GOUNDS-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	.00	.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	.0
10-60-265 FLAGSTAFF LOT PAVING	.00	.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	.0
10-60-310 PROFESS/TECHNICAL SERVICES	.00	.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	.0
TOTAL STREETS - C ROADS	.00	.00	41,000.00	41,000.00	.0
<u>RECYCLING</u>					
10-62-260 BLDGS/GOUNDS-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	.00	.00	1,500.00	1,500.00	.0
10-62-310 CONTRACT SERVICES CARDBOARD	.00	650.00	20,000.00	19,350.00	3.3
10-62-610 MISCELLANEOUS SUPPLIES	.00	.00	300.00	300.00	.0
TOTAL RECYCLING	.00	650.00	21,800.00	21,150.00	3.0

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>GIS</u>					
10-66-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
10-66-111 PERFORMANCE BONUS	.00	.00	50.00	50.00	.0
10-66-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	.00	.00	130.00	130.00	.0
10-66-131 EMPLOYER TAXES	.00	.00	153.00	153.00	.0
10-66-240 OFFICE SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE	.00	.00	1,500.00	1,500.00	.0
TOTAL GIS	.00	.00	3,833.00	3,833.00	.0

SUMMER PROGRAM

10-70-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	161.00	281.36	4,500.00	4,218.64	6.3
10-70-111 PERFORMANCE BONUS	.00	.00	150.00	150.00	.0
10-70-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	.00	.00	60.00	60.00	.0
10-70-131 EMPLOYER TAXES	.00	17.06	400.00	382.94	4.3
10-70-250 EQUIP-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	808.66	1,617.32	3,000.00	1,382.68	53.9
10-70-255 VEHICLE SUPPLIES & MAINTENANCE	.00	.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	.0
10-70-260 BLDGS/GROUNDS-STORAGE UNIT	.00	.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	.0
10-70-320 USFS RANGER	.00	.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	.0
10-70-470 CECRET LAKE TRAIL SIGNS	.00	.00	23,000.00	23,000.00	.0
10-70-474 TRAILHEAD KIOSKS	.00	.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	.0
10-70-480 SPECIAL DEPARTMENT SUPPLIES	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
10-70-510 INSURANCE AND SURETY BONDS	.00	216.67	600.00	383.33	36.1
10-70-515 WORKERS COMPENSATION INS	.00	.00	700.00	700.00	.0
TOTAL SUMMER PROGRAM	969.66	2,132.41	54,510.00	52,377.59	3.9

IMPACT

10-72-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
10-72-310 PROFESS/TECHNICAL SERVICES	.00	10,000.00	18,600.00	8,600.00	53.8
10-72-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	.00	.00	400.00	400.00	.0
TOTAL IMPACT	.00	10,000.00	21,000.00	11,000.00	47.6

LIBRARY - COMMUNITY CENTER

10-75-250 EQUIP-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
10-75-260 BLDGS/GROUNDS-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	122.41	122.41	7,000.00	6,877.59	1.8
10-75-270 UTILITIES	59.94	116.94	2,400.00	2,283.06	4.9
10-75-510 INSURANCE & SURETY BONDS	.00	565.61	650.00	84.39	87.0
10-75-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
TOTAL LIBRARY - COMMUNITY CENTER	182.35	804.96	10,650.00	9,845.04	7.6

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## GENERAL FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u>					
10-78-260 BLDGS/GROUNDS-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	543.60	543.60	.00	( 543.60)	.0
TOTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	543.60	543.60	.00	( 543.60)	.0
<u>TRANSFERS</u>					
10-90-550 TRANS TO CAPITAL PROJECT FUND	.00	.00	59,417.00	59,417.00	.0
TOTAL TRANSFERS	.00	.00	59,417.00	59,417.00	.0
TOTAL FUND EXPENDITURES	96,675.64	245,913.72	2,017,554.00	1,771,640.28	12.2
NET REVENUE OVER EXPENDITURES	( 22,912.38)	( 127,667.12)	.00	127,667.12	.0

REVENUES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## CAPITAL PROJECT FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE</u>					
45-36-100 INTEREST	.00	178.64	500.00	321.36	35.7
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	.00	178.64	500.00	321.36	35.7
<u>CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS</u>					
45-39-100 TRANSFER FROM GENERAL FUND	.00	.00	59,417.00	59,417.00	.0
45-39-250 USE OF RESERVED FUNDS	.00	.00	105,000.00	105,000.00	.0
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS	.00	.00	164,417.00	164,417.00	.0
TOTAL FUND REVENUE	.00	178.64	164,917.00	164,738.36	.1

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## CAPITAL PROJECT FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>DEPARTMENT 90</u>					
45-90-200 CONTRIB TO FUND BALANCE	.00	.00	59,917.00	59,917.00	.0
45-90-540 TRANS TO GENERAL FUND RESERVE	.00	.00	105,000.00	105,000.00	.0
TOTAL DEPARTMENT 90	.00	.00	164,917.00	164,917.00	.0
TOTAL FUND EXPENDITURES	.00	.00	164,917.00	164,917.00	.0
NET REVENUE OVER EXPENDITURES	.00	178.64	.00	( 178.64)	.0

TOC Agenda  
 REVENUES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
 FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## WATER FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</u>					
51-34-100 WATER SALES	.00	43,316.06	222,564.74	179,248.68	19.5
51-34-101 WATER SALES - OVERAGE	.00	2,160.89	.00	( 2,160.89)	.0
51-34-102 WATER SALES - OTHER	.00	420.00	20,000.00	19,580.00	2.1
TOTAL CHARGES FOR SERVICES	.00	45,896.95	242,564.74	196,667.79	18.9
<u>MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE</u>					
51-36-100 INTEREST EARNINGS	.00	91.45	1,999.99	1,908.54	4.6
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	.00	91.45	1,999.99	1,908.54	4.6
<u>CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS</u>					
51-39-200 USE OF WATER RESERVE/PTIF BAL	.00	.00	11,800.00	11,800.00	.0
51-39-300 OTHER FINANCING SOURCES	.00	.00	13,800.00	13,800.00	.0
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS	.00	.00	25,600.00	25,600.00	.0
TOTAL FUND REVENUE	.00	45,988.40	270,164.73	224,176.33	17.0

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## WATER FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					
51-40-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	209.00	399.00	6,635.87	6,236.87	6.0
51-40-111 PERFORMANCE BONUS	.00	.00	200.00	200.00	.0
51-40-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	.00	.00	2,040.86	2,040.86	.0
51-40-131 EMPLOYEE TAXES	.00	.00	600.00	600.00	.0
51-40-210 BOOKS/SUBSCRIP/MEMBERSHIPS	.00	.00	600.00	600.00	.0
51-40-230 TRAVEL	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
51-40-240 OFFICE SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
51-40-245 IT/ACCTG SOFTWARE SUPPORT	89.00	178.00	4,000.00	3,822.00	4.5
51-40-250 EQUIP-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	137.69	1,982.17	3,500.00	1,517.83	56.6
51-40-255 VEHICLES-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
51-40-260 BLDGS/GROUNDS-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	.00	32.37	2,800.00	2,767.63	1.2
51-40-270 UTILITIES	887.05	1,740.40	17,000.00	15,259.60	10.2
51-40-280 TELEPHONE	204.56	204.56	2,200.00	1,995.44	9.3
51-40-305 WATER COSTS	531.41	531.41	7,500.00	6,968.59	7.1
51-40-310 PROFESS/TECHNICAL SERVICES	.00	2,300.00	27,600.00	25,300.00	8.3
51-40-315 OTHER SERVICES/WATER PROJECTS	.00	.00	2,800.00	2,800.00	.0
51-40-320 ENGINEERING/WATER PROJECTS	.00	.00	1,972.00	1,972.00	.0
51-40-325 PROF & TECH SERVICES - LEGAL	.00	.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	.0
51-40-330 EDUCATION AND TRAINING	675.00	675.00	200.00	( 475.00)	337.5
51-40-480 SPECIAL DEPARTMENT SUPPLIES	.00	.00	500.00	500.00	.0
51-40-490 WATER TESTS	308.00	308.00	5,500.00	5,192.00	5.6
51-40-495 WATER TREATMENT SUPPLIES	169.40	338.80	22,192.00	21,853.20	1.5
51-40-510 INSURANCE AND SURETY BONDS	.00	1,254.84	6,024.00	4,769.16	20.8
51-40-515 WORKERS COMPENSATION INS	45.59	3,746.81	600.00	( 3,146.81)	624.5
51-40-610 MISCELLANEOUS SUPPLIES	.00	.00	200.00	200.00	.0
51-40-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	.00	30.48	1,200.00	1,169.52	2.5
51-40-650 DEPRECIATION	.00	.00	58,000.00	58,000.00	.0
51-40-740 CAPITAL OUTLAY	.00	.00	27,600.00	27,600.00	.0
51-40-810 DEBT SERVICE - PRINCIPAL	.00	.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	.0
51-40-830 INFRASTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT	.00	.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	.0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	3,256.70	13,721.84	270,164.73	256,442.89	5.1
TOTAL FUND EXPENDITURES	3,256.70	13,721.84	270,164.73	256,442.89	5.1
NET REVENUE OVER EXPENDITURES	( 3,256.70)	32,266.56	.00	( 32,266.56)	.0

REVENUES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## SEWER FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</u>					
52-34-100 SEWER SERVICES	110.00	31,250.98	125,000.00	93,749.02	25.0
TOTAL CHARGES FOR SERVICES	110.00	31,250.98	125,000.00	93,749.02	25.0
<u>MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE</u>					
52-36-100 INTEREST EARNINGS	.00	128.20	2,400.00	2,271.80	5.3
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	.00	128.20	2,400.00	2,271.80	5.3
<u>SOURCE 38</u>					
52-38-800 AMERICAN RECOVERY ACT	.00	.00	70,770.00	70,770.00	.0
TOTAL SOURCE 38	.00	.00	70,770.00	70,770.00	.0
TOTAL FUND REVENUE	110.00	31,379.18	198,170.00	166,790.82	15.8

EXPENDITURES WITH COMPARISON TO BUDGET  
FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDING AUGUST 31, 2021

## SEWER FUND

	PERIOD ACTUAL	YTD ACTUAL	BUDGET	UNEXPENDED	PCNT
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					
52-40-110 SALARIES AND WAGES	237.52	475.04	6,218.81	5,743.77	7.6
52-40-111 PERFORMANCE BONUS	.00	.00	200.00	200.00	.0
52-40-130 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	10.00	10.00	1,410.82	1,400.82	.7
52-40-131 EMPLOYEE TAXES	38.77	104.68	471.00	366.32	22.2
52-40-240 OFFICE SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE	.00	.00	100.00	100.00	.0
52-40-245 IT/ACCTG SOFTWARE SUPPORT	89.00	178.00	4,000.00	3,822.00	4.5
52-40-250 EQUIP-SUPPLIES/MNTNCE	.00	.00	200.00	200.00	.0
52-40-305 DISPOSAL COSTS	.00	.00	61,142.00	61,142.00	.0
52-40-310 PROFESS/TECHNICAL SERVICES	.00	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	.0
52-40-325 PROF & TECH SERVICES - LEGAL	.00	.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	.0
52-40-510 INSURANCE AND SURETY BONDS	.00	3,281.85	4,000.00	718.15	82.1
52-40-515 WORKERS COMPENSATION INS	25.32	75.96	400.00	324.04	19.0
52-40-610 MISCELLANEOUS SUPPLIES	.00	.00	300.00	300.00	.0
52-40-620 MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	.00	70.12	2,000.00	1,929.88	3.5
52-40-650 DEPRECIATION	.00	.00	20,563.00	20,563.00	.0
52-40-740 CAPITAL OUTLAY	.00	.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	.0
52-40-830 INFRASTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT	.00	.00	34,164.37	34,164.37	.0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	400.61	4,195.65	198,170.00	193,974.35	2.1
TOTAL FUND EXPENDITURES	400.61	4,195.65	198,170.00	193,974.35	2.1
NET REVENUE OVER EXPENDITURES	( 290.61)	27,183.53	.00	( 27,183.53)	.0



Administrators overview for the September 8, 2021, Town Council Meeting:

- **Building Overview**, to date we've issued 14 new permits collecting \$35,637 in fees based on stated construction value of \$2,425,935. There are still a number of projects looking at moving forward this year. It seems the first project to take advantage of the one time 250 gross square foot expansion allowance for noncomplying structures in the Albion Basin has dropped off the list.

There have been questions and concerns about town buildings re: the condo collapse in Florida, we have a different situation here in so many ways but inspections and corrosion conditions are two relevant conditions as noted in this intro from a Florida publication...**Condo Collapse Report** The Miami-area condo building that collapsed in June had extensive signs of corrosion and improperly placed reinforcements...

- **Tom Moore Toilets**, Chris and I met with an officer of the Utah State Historic Preservation Office to discuss the proper way of preserving and restoring the Tom Moore Toilets. This will be an ongoing project and Chris is drilling down on the details and options. We will keep you informed.
- **Planning Commission**, set for September 28, moving forward with Climate Change after release of the UN's IPCC report, Dr. Gillies and Dark Skies with Dr. Daniel Mendoza
- **Subpoena** to provide documents for a Sugarplum Phase 11 Condominiums lawsuit against Dominion Energy and others related to the fire two winters ago. We produced over 150 pages of correspondence, permit reviews and plans from 2015 through 2020.
- **Utah League of Cities and Towns Annual Conference**, September 29-October 1



More info can be found here: [2021 Annual Convention | Utah League of Cities and Towns \(ulct.org\)](https://ulct.org)

Call the town office if interested in attending any of the sessions.

- **Watersmart**, our engineer is still working with Dominion Energy re: natural gas conversion for the mine entrance and the Grizzly system. Those are the last two remaining items for the grant. Construction is scheduled for this fall.
- **Rocky Mountain Power Franchise Agreement**, this office has been discussing the agreement, which expires in February of 2022, in an attempt to answer the service questions brought up five years ago. Those issues will be brought to the Council in the next couple of months so stay tuned.

## Alta Town Council

### Staff Report



**To:** Town Council

**From:** Chris Cawley, Assistant Town Administrator

**Re:** September 8 Town Council Meeting

**Date:** September 1 2021

**Attachments:**

---

### Council Meeting Agenda Items Regarding Parking

The September meeting agenda includes two items related to the Town of Alta Public Parking Management Program. The first is discussion and possible action related to an ordinance that would authorize the Town of Alta to create a seasonal permit-based parking management system. The ordinance would not determine a permit structure or fee schedule. The second is a presentation of work by Fehr and Peers to research parking utilization by key Town of Alta constituencies and develop options for the permit program itself.

We are still working on documents related to these agenda items, but they are not available for inclusion in the council packet as of publication of the agenda. Staff will distribute them as soon as they are available.

### Preliminary Town of Alta Census Population

The US Census Bureau released 2020 Census Redistricting Data on August 12 2021. Redistricting data is the data used to determine the boundaries of US House of Representatives districts, amongst other purposes, and it contains data on state, county, and local populations. [According to the University of Utah Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute](#), Alta's census population in 2020 was 228. This is about 40% lower than Alta's 2010 census population, which was 383. The Town has yet to receive official notice from the US Census Bureau about our 2020 census population, but we're not aware of any reason to assume the data provided by the Gardner Institute will change.

Alta's census population has been relatively stable over the past several decades. The dramatic decrease in our 2020 census population is most likely attributable to the timing of the 2020 census, which began on April 1, 2020, and the effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic on our local economy. When Alta Ski Area suspended operations on March 14, 2020, alongside almost every other ski area in the United States, most other Alta

businesses followed suit. We are confident these circumstances, which led to most employee housing residents and many private property owners leaving Alta for the season, caused our census population to decline.

The Town appears to have limited options for recourse at this point. I have contacted Census Bureau officials about ways to address an apparent undercount in our community. We may be able to correct 2020 data regarding occupied housing units through the Census Question Resolution Process, which could in turn provide an opportunity to obtain an updated population. There may also be an opportunity to pay the Census Bureau to conduct a special enumeration for Alta in 2025.

Being assigned a lower census population will have some ramifications for the Town of Alta, including but not limited to:

- the Town's sales tax distribution from the State of Utah, which is calculated using both point-of-sale and population, could be reduced
- the Town's influence in governing structures determined by a population-weighted vote, such as the Unified Fire Service Area (UFSA) Board of Directors and the Valley Emergency Communications Center (VECC), will be diminished, although it has never been particularly strong given our tiny population relative to other cities
- the number of dog licenses provided by the Town of Alta under the Town's dog license ordinance would need to be reduced, unless the Town Council decides to amend the ordinance

### **Alta Ski Area, Salt Lake City, Town of Alta Collaborations on Trailhead and Interpretive Signage**

I've been meeting with Alta Ski Area and Salt Lake City Public Utilities to move forward with two projects to improve trailhead and interpretive signage in key areas. The projects are funded by cash and in-kind contributions from Alta Ski Area, substantial cash contributions from Salt Lake City, cash contributions from the Town of Alta, and grant funds from the State of Utah and the Central Wasatch Commission. Alta Ski Area will be leading the development of content for four new trailhead kiosks at Wildcat and Albion Base Areas, Catherine Pass Trailhead, and Cecret Lake Trailhead, as well as five new interpretive signs along the Cecret Lake Trail to replace the existing signs. Alta Ski Area will hire an interpretive designer to develop content for the kiosks and the interpretive signs very soon, and we anticipate that all these signage elements could be installed early next summer.

### **Community Renewable Energy Agency**

The Community Renewable Energy Agency is the intergovernmental agency created under the interlocal agreement adopted by the Town of Alta in March of 2021, under which Alta will collaborate with other Utah communities to create a program of 100 percent renewable energy for local electric utility customers. The Agency has met three

times and has moved swiftly to elect board of directors officers, to establish and adopt bylaws and a procurement policy, and establish a program design committee that will lead negotiations with Rocky Mountain Power on the procurement of renewable energy resources. As of last meeting, Salt Lake City Council Member Dan Dugan will serve as president of the Agency Board of Directors. The next board meeting will take place Tuesday, September 1<sup>st</sup> at 9 AM, and following that, board meetings will occur the first Monday of the month at 1 PM. Agency meetings are noticed on the Utah Public Notice Website and are open to the public.

### **UDOT LCC Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Comment Period Closes September 3**

The public comment period on the Draft UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) closes on Friday, September 3<sup>rd</sup>. [Click here](#) to view the DEIS materials and for information on how to provide a comment. The Town of Alta submitted comments on the DEIS to UDOT earlier this week, and those comments are posted on the front page of the Town of Alta website.

# Department Incident Activity Report

9/8/2021 Alta Town Council

Consent Agenda

46 of 48

Date Reported: 08/01/2021 - 08/31/2021 | Show Subclasses: True



**ALTA MARSHAL'S OFFICE**  
PO BOX 8016  
ALTA, UT 84092  
801.742.3522  
AMO@TOWNOFALTA.COM

Classification	Events Rptd	Unfounded	Actual	Clr Arrest	Clr Exception	Clr Juveniles	Total Clr	Percent Clr
<b>AGENCY ASSIST</b>	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0.0
Assist Other Agency	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>CITIZEN</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
ASSIST	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>FIRE</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
Brush, Grass, Forest Fire	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>FOREST SERVICE</b>	53	0	53	0	0	0	0	0.0
PATROL	53	0	53	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>MEDICAL</b>	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0.0
EMERGENCY	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>MOTORIST</b>	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0.0
ASSIST	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>PROPERTY</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
Found Property	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>ROAD CLOSURE</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
SR-210 AT MOUTH	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>SEARCH/RESCUE</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
Search/Rescue, Mountain	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>SUSPICIOUS</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
Suspicious Activity	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>TRAFFIC</b>	35	0	35	0	0	0	0	0.0
VIOLATION	35	0	35	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>TRAFFIC ACCIDENT</b>	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0.0
Traffic Accident, Injury	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0.0
Traffic Accident, Vehicle Damage	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>VOID</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
CREATED IN ERROR	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>WATERSHED OFFENSE</b>	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0.0
ANIMALS	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0.0
OTHER	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.0
<b>Event Totals</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

September 01, 2021

**MARSHAL'S STAFF REPORT FOR AUGUST, 2021**

**Highlighted Activity:**

See attached department activity summary. Please note that "CLR" (clearance) codes only apply in arrest situations.

**Fire:**

A lightning caused fire occurred in the Peruvian Ridge area. The fire was attended to by Wildland teams and extinguished. Some property damage occurred to uncharged gas lines used in avalanche control.

**Parking**

Fehr and Peers has completed analysis of parking survey data. They will be advising on a range of permit distribution and fee options. As expected, demand for parking clearly outpaces the supply of parking the Town expects to have control over.

Major tasks remaining include, execution of a memorandum of understanding between the Town and the Alta Ski Lift Company to utilize lands under their Special Use Permit, obtaining a separate Forest Service Special Use Permit for areas outside the Alta Ski Lift permit boundary, construction and passage of a new parking ordinance, contract agreements with a parking vendor, signage, and the establishment of a civil hearing authority for permit violations.

The likely parking model continues to be the Town managing the north bank of SR210 for overnight, commuting employees, and possibly day use parking under a paid permit system.

## Alta Town Council

### Staff Report:

**September 8, 2021**



**To:** Town Council

**From:** Piper Lever, Town Clerk & Jen Clancy, Deputy Town Clerk

**Date Written:** September 1, 2021

---

#### **Finance – Piper**

- Took possession of two new police trucks. Scheduling installation of police-ready equipment such as radios/lights/stickers/covers, etc. Might take two months to transition the old and new vehicles.
- Closing FY2021 as retroactive bills are paid and tax revenue is received
- Completed insurance company financial audit

#### **Dog Licensing-Jen**

- A reminder to keep this on your radar: due to the updated census number the council will have to address the following provision our dog license ordinance:
  - Section [5-2-3: C “However, in no event shall the number of dog licenses exceed twenty five percent \(25%\) of the population of the Town as determined by the most recent census figure from the United States Census Bureau.”](#)

#### **Fundraising Feasibility Study – Jen**

- The Town has contracted with Pathway Associates for a feasibility study related to fundraising for a community center. We are preparing for the second phase of the project with confidential interviews being conducted.

#### **Alta Justice Court - Jen**

- The Alta Justice Court is in operation. Court is held monthly in a virtual setting.