

PERRY CITY COUNCIL RETREAT
WORK SESSION

PERRY CITY OFFICES
February 13, 2021

8:10 AM

OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mayor Kevin Jeppsen presided and conducted the meeting. Andrew Watkins, Blake Ostler, Esther Montgomery, Toby Wright, and Nathan Tueller (arrived at 9:00 am)

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Robert Barnhill, City Administrator
Shanna Johnson, City Recorder

OTHERS PRESENT: None.

ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Jeppsen welcomed everyone and called the City Council Retreat to order.

ITEM 2: DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. 2020 Year End Review

Bob Barnhill reviewed what took place in the year 2020, which included the adventure of truth in taxation, refinancing the sewer revenue bond, capital planning, corridor preservation, processed some multifamily housing developments and related code changes, maneuvered through the COVID-19 pandemic, and worked with the implemented general plan for the full year.

Bob reviewed achievements in 2020, which included planning for the years ahead, an affordable sewer rate increase, obtaining the land at the gun range and other improvements (pistol venue, and storage building), we completed some right of way and road improvements, made some positive changes with staff, and updated sections of the city's municipal code.

Bob stated we also looked to the future regarding city hall and water needs.

Bob reviewed the top priorities identified in the 2020 council retreat:

- 1 1. Roads
- 2 2. Water
- 3 3. City Hall
- 4 4. Staff
- 5 5. Parks
- 6 6. Cemetery
- 7

8 He stated that three of these areas (road, water and parks) fall under public works. He said he
9 feels that Tyler Wagstaff has been great and moving forward we will see a little bit more vision and
10 planning regarding these projects. He said we have talked a lot about City Hall, we made some
11 changes with staff, and we will be talking about cemetery and some other things today.
12

13 **B. Multi-Family Housing Density Map (agenda item C)**

14 Bob noted that there has been a lot of discussion regarding the Multi-Family Density Map and
15 asked the council for any thoughts that they have.

16
17 Council Member Ostler suggested making the multi-family density map a layer on the electronic
18 map of the City.

19
20 Council Member Montgomery reviewed the current multi-family density along the highway, which
21 is in quadrants and has four grids per square mile. She stated that she has spoken with Mr.
22 Mackley who was frustrated with the zoning in his area and the number of units currently allowed.
23 She said she thinks that the Planning Commission's recommendation of 44 units makes sense and
24 she would like to help Mr. Mackley because of his situation and figure out more of a guideline so it
25 is not a case-by-case ruling.

26
27 Council Member Watkins said the general plan indicates keeping the south section of the city as
28 agricultural but he has a new thought of making design standards that set the feel they desire and
29 easing restrictions on the south end of town. He stated the City should not infringe on property
30 rights and using creativity for the area in the future.

31
32 Council Member Wright said he agrees with Council Member Tueller that the less restrictions on
33 property rights the better. He said that when the multi-family density grid was set up the intent
34 was to give the council the freedom to adjust the number of units as needed. He said we need to
35 set what is too high i.e. 50 units and then let the public make comments if they do not agree with
36 the grid adjustments being considered.

37
38 Both Council Member Montgomery and Council Member Wright expressed that they like the grid
39 system. Council Member Montgomery said that Bob Barnhill suggested leaving density map
40 decisions on a case-by-case basis, looking at each development and whether or not it has Perry's
41 best interest in mind.

42
43 Council Member Wright noted that the State Legislature might tie our hands regarding these
44 decisions.

45
46 Council Member Ostler said he does not remember what went into setting the initial numbers on
47 the multi-family density grids and why it is good. He feels that flexibility is the perk and the enemy
48 and asked why we do not just set all the grids to zero. He stated that he feels uncomfortable
49 deciding which developments go where. He is interested in seeing policies and guidelines to assist
50 in decisions regarding exceptions i.e. the developer will be donating land for a park or other
51 amenities in the best interest of the city. Council Member Ostler referred to definitions for multi-
52 family housing in the general plan, which seem a bit unclear and conflicting:

- 53 • 'R' Zone: states there should be an intermixing of multi-family housing and alternative
54 housing types
- 55 • 'NC' Zone: states there should be commercial uses with multi-family residential uses
56 scattered throughout
- 57 • The General Plan states that Multi-family housing should be near regional transportation;
58 and
- 59 • Multi-Family housing should be built to compliment neighborhoods and be met with green
60 space beautification.

62 Council Member Tueller said that having a buffer between multi-family housing and single-family
63 dwellings is good, but questioned what to do with the Hargis Hill area, which does not allow for a
64 buffer because it is divided by two roads. He stated he would rather have more multi-family
65 housing along the highway than more dance studios and construction companies and noted that
66 Quail Point is a good example of buffering but this is not possible in the Hargis Hill area.
67

68 Council Member Wright expressed wanting to give as much flexibility as possible to Mr. Mackley
69 but wondered what the impact will be in 30 years i.e. to infrastructure, roads, etc.
70

71 In conclusion, the council indicated the following needs:

- 72 • Fewer exceptions and more guidelines to help approve exceptions;
 - 73 • Guidelines to help limit and scatter multi-family developments;
 - 74 • Different rules for Highway 89 multi-family Housing to help with intermixing;
 - 75 • More green space offsets;
 - 76 • Expiration on exception approvals after long periods of time; and
 - 77 • To ensure developments meet design standards
- 78

79 **Water Rate Study (agenda item B)**

80 The Mayor, Council and Staff reviewed the Water Rate Study results, capital improvement costs,
81 and operation and maintenance (O&M) needs. Bob noted that when the study was originally
82 brought to the council it indicated a \$60 rate would be needed to cover all O&M, Capital projects
83 and system replacement. He noted that after reviewing number of connections and making some
84 adjustments the needed rate suggested was \$48 per month. He stated that in the last council
85 meeting we left off with \$25 per month as a rate the council may be comfortable considering. He
86 asked for further thoughts from the council.
87

88 Council Member Ostler indicated that he feels the rate should cover the O&M and inflation should
89 be considered but he is uncomfortable with a \$10 increase and maybe more comfortable with a
90 \$20 rate which would be a \$5 increase and match inflation for increases going forward. Council
91 Member Wright disagreed with setting increases with inflation.
92

93 Council Member Ostler suggested possibly setting the rate at what is need to cover O&M plus a set
94 amount for capital projects. Shanna Johnson indicated that if capital project funds needed are
95 \$2.3M over a 30-year period this would equal \$3.69 a month and to cover O&M we would need a
96 rate of \$20.86 so a total rate of \$24.55 would be needed in order to meet this suggestion.
97

98 Council Member Tueller expressed concern with the tier rate for metered water overages and
99 would like to see an automatic increase on the rate each year after it is set.
100

101 The Mayor suggested a rate of \$18 a month, which would cover current operation costs.
102

103 Council Member Wright questioned how the rate change will affect high consumers and what it
104 will cost local businesses.
105

106 Council Member Montgomery said she is comfortable with a \$21 rate per month.
107

108 Council Member Ostler asked if there could be more detail on the water bill regarding metered
109 water usage. Shanna Johnson explained that there are codes on the bill that are used to outline

110 costs, and explanations of the codes on the back of the bill (MW = Metered Water). She said the bill
111 will list a number next to the code and that is the number of thousand gallons used.

112
113 Council Member Ostler recommended having a capital projects funds for water improvements and
114 asked if the O&M amounts listed in the study are sufficient. Bob and Shanna both indicated that
115 the O&M costs covered in the study is what is needed. Shanna noted that it does cover an
116 additional employee to increase efficiency.

117
118 The Council discussed not charging for water overages until a customer exceeds 10,000 gallons of
119 water usage. Then having three tiers, the first charging a \$1 each thousand gallons exceeding
120 10,000, the second tier increasing to \$1.50 per thousand gallons used when they hit 16,000 and to
121 \$2 per thousand gallons used beyond 25,000 gallons. They discussed increasing the base rate at
122 the same amount that the sewer rate was increased, or \$4.50, which would take the base rate to
123 \$19.50 per month and then having automatic increases each year. Shanna Johnson stated she
124 could run the numbers and provide a pro forma showing this going into effect for the 2022 Fiscal
125 Year.

126
127 **C. Cemetery**
128 Council Member Watkins stated that he has had many people expressing interest in a City
129 Cemetery.

130
131 Council Member Wright suggested surveying the public to see if they are interested in a cemetery
132 and if they would be willing to pay for one through their taxes. He said this can be done with a
133 postcard that would be sent to each resident with a QR code that would lead them to an online
134 survey or they could answer the questions on the post card and return this via mail to the city. He
135 indicated that the postcards would cost between \$500 and \$1,500 depending on the card stock
136 used.

137
138 Mayor Jeppsen noted that it is smart to avoid mailing these on the same day that junk mail and
139 other circulars are mailed.

140
141 The Mayor and Council agreed that the suggested post card method would be the best way to
142 gather input and they could come up with an action plan thereafter.

143
144 The Mayor and Council discussed survey questions with the main questions being whether the
145 resident is interested in a cemetery in Perry and the second being how much they would be willing
146 to pay on their annual tax bill for a cemetery.

147
148 Council Member Wright said he would work on something and get it sent out to the group.

149
150 **D. Other 2021 Goals** – No discussion

151
152
153 **ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE SESSION** – None.

154
155
156 **ITEM 4: ADJOURNMENT**

157
158 Council Member Watkins motioned to close the work session. Council Member Montgomery
159 seconded the Motion

160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177

Motion Approved. All Council Members were in favor.

The Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Susan Obray, City Recorder

Kevin Jepps, Mayor

Shanna Johnson, Chief Deputy Recorder