

1 **NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

2
3 December 2, 2014

4
5 The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on December 2, 2014 at 4:05 p.m.
6 in the North Ogden City Council Chambers at 505 East 2600 North. Notice of time, place and
7 agenda of the meeting was delivered to each member of the City Council, posted on the bulletin
8 board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on November 26, 2014.
9 Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on January 24,
10 2014.

11
12
13 PRESENT: Brent Taylor Mayor
14 Kent Bailey Council Member
15 Lynn Satterthwaite Council Member
16 Cheryl Stoker Council Member
17 Phillip Swanson Council Member
18 James Urry Council Member

19
20 STAFF PRESENT: Bryan Steele Acting City Manager
21 S. Annette Spendlove City Recorder/H.R. Director

22
23
24 VISITORS: Rachel Trotter

25
26 Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance.

27
28 Annette Spendlove offered the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.
29

30
31 **ACTIVE AGENDA**

32
33 **1. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

34
35 There were no public comments.
36

37 **2. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER ROAD GRANTS**

38
39 A staff memo from Mayor Taylor explained the Wasatch Front Regional Council is responsible
40 for administering six different programs that provide resources for local governments. These are
41 briefly described below, with additional detail for each in the attachment on timelines, eligibility,
42 etc. In order to increase awareness of these programs and to encourage collaboration among
43 applicants, the Regional Council is inviting entities to submit a letter of intent for any or all of
44 the first four programs. Also note that there is a minimum local match requirement of 6.77%.
45 These four programs have the same general application milestones: letter of Intent due October
46 30, 2014; and applications due January 15, 2015. Entities are also invited to learn about the last
47 two programs and participate in them as deemed appropriate.

- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65
- 66
- 67
- The Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides funding that may be used for projects on any Federal-aid highway, bridge projects on any public road, transit capital improvements and projects.
 - Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds are intended to fund transportation projects that improve air quality, except they are not eligible for through travel lanes.
 - The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds construction and planning of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
 - The local Planning Resource Program was recently established by WFRC to assist local communities in efforts to integrate land use and transportation plans, including use of the Wasatch Choice for 2040 Toolbox. Salt Lake County is a joint sponsor of this program for projects within the county boundaries.
 - The Community Development Block Grant Program provides funding for a variety of infrastructure improvements and community/economic development activities in Morgan, Tooele, and Weber
 - Counties and cities within (excluding entitlement cities) that principally benefit low to moderate income persons.
 - The Wasatch Front Economic Development District administered by WFRC assists cities in working with the federal Economic Development Administration and in coordination of other economic development activities.

68 The memo also included potential road projects to be completed in North Ogden City as follows:

- 69
- 70
- 71
- 72
- 73
- 74
- 75
- 76
- 77
- 2850 N/Elberta Dr./450 E (no regional priority)
 - Monroe Blvd. construction (Phase III priority, 2031-2040)
 - Western portion of Skyline Drive construction (Phase I priority, 2011-2020)
 - Eastern portion of Skyline Drive construction (Phase II priority, 2020-2030)
 - 400/450 E extension to Skyline Dr. (*no priority, request made to prioritize)
 - 400/450 E widening (Phase I priority, 2011-2020)
 - 2100 North round-about (No regional priority)
 - Reconstruction of 3100 North (no regional priority)

78 Mayor Taylor summarized his memo and noted the City has submitted a letter of intent to seek

79 \$8 million of STP funding for the 450 East/400 East widening project. He also summarized the

80 list of other projects that the WFRC has received letters of intent for, after which he facilitated a

81 discussion regarding the prioritization of the projects listed in the staff memo as well as the

82 funding sources the Council was interested in applying for. There was a focus on the fact that

83 the ability of an entity to provide matching funds for a grant award makes the grant application

84 more attractive, with Mayor Taylor noting the STP funding is not available until 2018 so the City

85 would have until that time to come up with matching funds.

86

87 Council Member Urry asked where any matching funds offered by the City would come from.

88 He stated he has asked Acting City Manager Steele to create a spreadsheet including information

89 about all grants the City has applied for and indicate if those grants require any match from the

90 City. He stated he needs to understand where any matching funds would come from because it

91 would be too easy to spend the City into bankruptcy without having that information. Council

92 Member Satterthwaite echoed Council Member Urry's question and noted five percent of \$8

93 million is \$400,000. He stated he wants to move ahead with pursuing funding sources for the

94 City's roads, but he wants to see some information illustrating where any matching funds would
95 be coming from. Mayor Taylor stated he has the same concern about matching funds, but was
96 simply indicating that if the City can offer a match, any grant application submitted would be
97 more attractive. Council Member Bailey echoed the same concern regarding the funding source
98 for the City's matching portion of any grant. He stated he would like to have more detailed
99 discussion regarding any road or trail grant application the City may be submitting before such
100 applications are submitted.

101
102 Mayor Taylor reported the City is only seeking funding for one road project at this time. He
103 noted the City has been awarded grants for Skyline Drive and Washington Boulevard projects,
104 but he has asked the County if all funds can be rerouted to the Washington Boulevard project in
105 order to complete the project that makes the most sense for the City at this time. There was a
106 general discussion regarding the scope of the Skyline Drive project for which the City received a
107 grant award, with Mayor Taylor noting the City's match for the project is 10 percent of \$2.4
108 million, which equates to approximately \$180,000. He then noted he would like to have a
109 focused discussion regarding funding for road construction; he would like to have a dedicated
110 funding source for grant matching funds such as a portion of the City's utility fees or a sales tax
111 specific to roads, which is currently being promoted by the Utah League of Cities and Towns
112 (ULCT). This led to a discussion regarding the legislation being promoted by the ULCT relative
113 to a sales tax dedicated to road projects, after which Mayor Taylor stated he would like for the
114 Council to consider a funding mechanism in the event that the State Legislature does not pass a
115 sales tax to be dedicated to road projects.

116
117 Council Member Urry then stated he does not feel comfortable voting to support the current
118 grant applications until he understands the amount of money the City needs to offer as matching
119 funds and where that funding will come from. Council Member Satterthwaite stated this is an
120 opportunity for the Council to ask questions of staff regarding the grant applications and those
121 questions can be answered to facilitate further discussion at the next work session meeting.

122
123 Mayor Taylor then continued his review of the grant programs managed by the WFRC and the
124 grant applications the City would like to submit for additional grant funding. He noted the City
125 submitted a letter of intent in August for TAP funding for the Pleasant View Trail Connection
126 project. He noted the estimate for the project is \$85,000 and the City has indicated it has the
127 ability to provide 50 percent matching funds, which could be satisfied by a successful RAMP
128 grant award. He noted Pleasant View City has offered support for the project and he believes the
129 chances that the City will receive the grant are fairly good.

130
131 Council Member Urry asked when funding will be made available in the event the City is
132 awarded the grant. Mayor Taylor stated the funds would be available in 2016. Council Member
133 Urry asked if that means the City would need to come up with the matching funds in the current
134 fiscal year or the next fiscal year. Mayor Taylor noted grant years typically span multiple fiscal
135 years and the City would likely have the option to split the matching funds between two years.
136 Council Member Urry wondered if the estimated project amount could increase by the time the
137 City is ready to proceed with the project. Mayor Taylor stated there is a chance that the project
138 cost could increase due to inflation. Council Member Satterthwaite asked if the City commits to
139 a dollar amount or percentage amount for matching funds, to which Mayor Taylor answered a

140 percentage amount. Parks and Recreation Director Staheli noted that if the City is successful in
141 securing the TAP and RAMP grants, the project can be completed in the next fiscal year.

142
143 The Council had a general discussion regarding the various granting programs managed by the
144 WFRC, with a focus on the competitiveness of the application process.

145
146

147 **3. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER PARK GRANTS**

148
149 A staff memo from Acting City Manager Steele explained in this year's initial budget, Parks and
150 Recreation Director Staheli has proposed completion of three park restroom renovations:
151 Oaklawn, Orton, and Lomond View. She applied for RAMP Grants to help for the renovation
152 funding. We were only awarded a grant for one of the restroom renovations and Tiffany had
153 prioritized the restrooms with Oaklawn being the one we ended up budgeting for.

154 The renovation of the Oaklawn park restroom was bid out but the lowest bid came back at
155 \$100,000 more than what we had budgeted; the original budget was \$226,000. The main reasons
156 for the bids coming in higher were:

- 157 • Site work needs to be done on the parking lot and area where the restroom will sit.
158 This includes bringing in fill and a lot of curb and gutter work.
- 159 • The sewer line connection from the restroom to the nearest sewer main was more than
160 expected
- 161 • There are more stalls in the new restroom. The current restroom has one stall per side
162 and this park is used heavily from spring to fall mainly due to youth sport leagues
163 holding games at the park
- 164 • Construction prices are more than what they were when the cost was estimated.

165
166 A few weeks ago Ms. Staheli presented a list of projects she would like to apply for RAMP
167 Grants for next fiscal year. Based on the discussion Council had that night, the direction she was
168 given was to pursue RAMP grant funds for were: 1) Completing the trail from Bi-Centennial
169 Park to the North Ogden/Pleasant View border and; 2) Restroom renovations at two parks. Ms.
170 Staheli had originally presented Orton and Lomond View park restrooms to be renovated with
171 next year's RAMP grant funds, but since the bids for Oaklawn came in higher than expected we
172 decided to do Orton Park this year instead of returning the RAMP grant funds and then put
173 Oaklawn on next year's schedule. In the meantime, Building Official Kerr found out that there
174 are CDBG funds available for next year and that the City could apply for CDBG funding to help
175 with the restroom renovations. The renovations fall under CDBG funding eligibility because of
176 ADA requirements. The only part of the restrooms that wouldn't qualify for CDBG funding
177 would be the storage portion of the restroom, which can be up to \$75,000. However we can use
178 RAMP Grant money for that amount. With the CDBG grant we can apply for the total amount of
179 the restroom renovation (less the storage portion), but Mr. Kerr said that the likelihood of us
180 receiving the grant increases the more the city contributes to the project. Staff is asking council
181 to approve the go ahead for application for RAMP and CDBG grants for the remaining two
182 restroom renovations. We have \$147,000 on our Capital Improvement Plan for next year for
183 these projects so our recommendation would be to seek grant funding for the remainder of the
184 costs of the projects. We are in a unique position, where there is a possibility we could build a
185 majority of the two park restrooms with grant funding. The Fund Balance of the Capital Projects

186 fund is estimated to be around \$466,000 at the end of this fiscal year which is where the funding
187 would come from.

188
189 Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo.

190
191 Council Member Urry stated that in previous discussions regarding the Oaklawn project, the
192 Council was informed there is a \$75,000 portion of the project that could not be covered by grant
193 funding. Mr. Steele stated that is the storage portion of the project and it cannot be covered by
194 CDBG funds, but could be covered by RAMP funds. After a short discussion regarding funding
195 guidelines for the CDBG program, Council Member Bailey concluded the City would be
196 responsible for half of the storage portion of the project, or approximately \$38,000. He inquired
197 as to what types of items the City stores in the storage facility. Ms. Staheli stated that various
198 recreation equipment items are stored at the facility and she indicated there are storage facilities
199 at other City parks. She then led a discussion regarding the breakdown of the grant funding
200 opportunities for the project, reiterating that if both the RAMP and CDBG grants are awarded,
201 the City will be responsible for \$37,000 for the project.

202
203 Council Member Urry noted it is hard for him to believe the total cost of a restroom project is
204 \$250,000. Council Member Bailey asked if the City has sought other bids for the project; he
205 asked if Lundahl (contractor for the Public Works Facility) has provided the City with a bid for
206 the project. Ms. Staheli indicated the City did receive other bids for the project and Lundahl
207 actually bid approximately \$350,000. There was then a discussion regarding the potential or re-
208 engineering and re-designing the project with the goal of reducing the overall cost.

209
210 Mayor Taylor encouraged the Council to continue to consider the proposed grant applications,
211 keeping in mind that the application deadline is mid-January. He noted discussion regarding the
212 issue can continue during the January 6, 2015 work session meeting. He reiterated his previous
213 comments regarding his feeling that the City needs to consider providing a dedicated funding
214 source for grant matches. He stated he would like to discuss that issue in more detail during the
215 January 6, 2015 work session meeting as well.

216
217

218 **4. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A PLANNING RESOURCE**
219 **GRANT**

220
221 A staff memo from City Planner Scott explained the Wasatch Front Regional Council has opened
222 a second round of Local Planning Resource Grants; form based code development is an eligible
223 activity. North Ogden City has submitted a letter of intent which was accepted. The next step is
224 to submit a formal application that is due January 15, 2015. The General Plan Update project is
225 going to give directions regarding North Ogden's future. In order to implement the amended
226 General Plan the next step will be to amend and update city zoning ordinances, e.g., to write a
227 form based code. Staff has researched the cost of developing a form based code. It is
228 recommended the city hire a consultant to develop the code with an approximate cost of \$55,000.
229 A match is required for this application; a minimum of 10% is required and a minimum of 25%
230 is suggested. In a previous application the City committed a 50% match or \$27,500. The memo
231 offered the following summary of potential City Council considerations.

- 232
- Does the City Council want to pursue a Local Planning Resource Program grant to write a form based code?
- 233
- What percentage of match does the City Council want to include in the grant proposal?
- 234
- 235
- 236

237 The memo concludes staff recommends submitting a final Local Resource Planning Grant
238 application to develop a form based code and to include a percentage match that the City Council
239 is comfortable with.

240

241 Mr. Steele reviewed Mr. Scott's memo and Mayor Taylor provided a brief description of the
242 meaning of the term "form based code", with a focus on the fact that the City's code would
243 basically mirror or seek to implement the City's General Plan. Council Member Satterthwaite
244 stated that he would like to have a detailed discussion regarding the process to transition to a
245 form based code. Mayor Taylor stated that would be an important discussion topic.

246

247 Council Member Swanson stated that he appreciates the recommendation from Mr. Scott, but
248 noted he would like to see the spreadsheet requested earlier by Council Member Urry detailing
249 the grants the City would like to apply for and the amount of matching funds the City would
250 need to come up with. He stated it is very important to know where those matching funds would
251 come from. He concluded he cannot vote to support any of the grant applications at this time for
252 fear of overcommitting the City. Council Member Bailey supported Council Member Swanson's
253 request and added that it would also be valuable to look at the matching fund requests in
254 conjunction with the City's Capital Improvement Plan. Council Member Satterthwaite suggested
255 that grant match request actually be considered with totality of the entire City budget in mind.

256

257

258 **5. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION ON THE MIDPOINT PAYMENT TO BETTER** 259 **CITIES FOR THE SMITH'S BLOCK REVITALIZATION**

260

261 Mayor Taylor asked that this item be moved to the December 9, 2014 meeting agenda as a
262 representative of Better Cities is not present this evening to answer questions. He noted that he
263 will not be present for the discussion, but indicated he will provide his recommendation
264 regarding the proposed action and is available to answer any questions regarding the issue via
265 email prior to the meeting.

266

267

268 **6. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO A RESOLUTION APPOINTING BRYAN** 269 **STEELE AS THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR**

270

271 Mayor Taylor reported he would like to appoint Bryan Steele as the City Administrator, which
272 would be accompanied by a temporary pay increase of \$10,000 per year while Mr. Steele is
273 acting in the position. He provided a brief summary of the additional duties Mr. Steele will be
274 performing while serving as the City Administrator.

275

276 Council Member Bailey asked if it will be as simple to reverse the appointment of Mr. Steele as
277 the City Administrator in the event that becomes necessary. Mayor Taylor noted City Attorney

278 Call is not present to address the legality of that issue. Discussion regarding the proposed action
279 ensued, with a focus on the appointment process for a City Administrator or Manager as defined
280 by State Code.

281
282 **Council Member Swanson moved to adopt Resolution 21-2014 appointing Bryan Steele as**
283 **the City Administrator. Council Member Urry seconded the motion.**

284
285 Mayor Taylor asked the Council if they wanted to clarify in the motion that the appointment is
286 temporary in nature. Council Member Bailey reiterated he is concerned that it may be more
287 difficult to reverse the appointment; he suggested that the Council table the action until the next
288 meeting when the City Attorney is available to respond to questions about the action.

289
290 **Council Member Swanson withdrew his motion. Council Member Urry concurred with**
291 **the withdrawal of the motion.**

292
293 **Council Member Bailey moved to table this item until the December 9, 2014 meeting.**
294 **Council Member Swanson seconded the motion.**

295
296 **Voting on the motion:**

297
298 **Council Member Bailey** aye
299 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye
300 **Council Member Stoker** aye
301 **Council Member Swanson** aye
302 **Council Member Urry** aye

303
304 **The motion passed unanimously.**

305
306 Council Member Urry inquired as to the duties of the Mayor Pro Tem in the Mayor's absence.
307 Mayor Taylor noted the City Administration cannot enter into contracts for the City and the
308 Mayor Pro Tem would assume that responsibility in the Mayor's absence. Council Member
309 Bailey noted the action to appoint a City Administrator does not impact the duties of the Mayor
310 or Mayor Pro Tem.

311
312
313 **7. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A CHANGE ORDER FOR THE**
314 **UPSIZING OF THE DETENTION POND AT THE NEW PUBLIC WORKS SITE**

315
316 Mayor Taylor noted there is insufficient time to address this item and he indicated it will be
317 added to the agenda for the December 9, 2014 Council meeting.

318
319
320 **8. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

321
322 There were no public comments.

323

324 **9. COUNCIL/MAYOR/STAFF COMMENTS**

325
326 Mayor Taylor stated that he would like to discuss the City’s winter parking ordinance with the
327 Council, with a focus on offering flexibility to Police Officers in enforcing the parking rule.
328 Council Member Bailey suggested it be on the next work session agenda. Council Member
329 Swanson stated that he would like to discuss parking in general including parking in a side yard.

330
331 Mayor Taylor reported that during the last City Council meeting Council Member Urry
332 discussed the need for a street light near the Smith’s Marketplace development and noted that
333 Mr. Kerr has visited with Smith’s and they have indicated they have ordered the part needed to
334 make the light operable once again. He added the City is also working with the Utah Department
335 of Transportation (UDOT) to determine if a street light can be added at the intersection of 2600
336 North and Washington Boulevard.

337
338 The Council had a brief discussion regarding the format of the Christmas Lighting Ceremony
339 scheduled for December 6, 2014 at 5:00 p.m.

340
341

342 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

343
344 **Council Member Satterthwaite motioned to adjourn. Council Member Stoker seconded the**
345 **motion.**

346
347 **Voting on the motion:**

348
349 **Council Member Bailey aye**
350 **Council Member Satterthwaite aye**
351 **Council Member Stoker aye**
352 **Council Member Swanson aye**
353 **Council Member Urry aye**

354
355 **The motion passed unanimously.**

356
357 **The meeting adjourned at 5:26 p.m.**

358
359

360 _____
361 Brent Taylor, Mayor

362
363
364 _____
365 S. Annette Spendlove, MMC
366 City Recorder

367
368 _____
369 Date Approved