

1 NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING

2
3 June 26, 2014

4
5 The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on June 26, 2014 at 6:33 p.m. in
6 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 June 20, 2014. Notice of
9 the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on January 24, 2014.

10
11
12 PRESENT: Brent Taylor Mayor
13 Kent Bailey Council Member
14 Lynn Satterthwaite Council Member
15 Cheryl Stoker Council Member
16 Phillip Swanson Council Member
17 James Urry Council Member

18
19 STAFF PRESENT: Ronald F. Chandler City Manager
20 Jon Call City Attorney
21 Bryan Steele Finance Director
22 S. Annette Spendlove City Recorder/H.R. Director

23
24 VISITORS: Joan Brown Patrick Lowry
25 Joanna Lowry Jordan Talbot
26 Anita Talbot Kenneth Rowe
27 Vicki Droogsma Jason Droogsma
28 Jeanne Droogsma Blake Welling
29 Carol Campbell Bob Campbell
30 Kurt Illum

31
32 Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance.

33
34 Council Member Urry offered the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

35
36 **CONSENT AGENDA**

- 37 **1. Consideration to approve the minutes of the May 8, 2014 City Council Meeting**
38 **2. Consideration to approve the minutes of the May 13, 2014 City Council Meeting**
39 **3. Consideration to approve the minutes of the May 27, 2014 City Council Meeting**

40
41 **Council Member Bailey moved to approve the consent agenda. Council Member**
42 **Satterthwaite seconded the motion:**

43
44 **Voting on the motion:**

45
46 **Council Member Bailey aye**
47 **Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

48 Council Member Stoker aye
49 Council Member Swanson aye
50 Council Member Urry aye

51
52

53 **ACTIVE AGENDA**

54

55 **1. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

56

57 Jason Droogsma, no address given, spoke about the crosswalk behind Bates Elementary on 3200
58 North; there are many people that drop their kids off at the school and the crosswalk needs a
59 crossing guard to provide safety for the kids using it. He has seen some cars stop on the
60 crosswalk rather than on either side of the crosswalk. He asked the City to look into his request.
61 Mayor Taylor thanked Mr. Droogsma for his comments and stated the City will take his request
62 under advisement. He added the City is currently working to restripe the roads on 3100 North
63 around Bates Elementary.

64

65 Blake Welling, 1098 E. 3100 N., referenced the agenda items relating to the garbage collection
66 contract and the City's consolidated fee schedule; the agreement indicates residents will be
67 charged \$5.45 per month for a garbage and recycling can, but the fee schedule includes a fee of
68 \$11.57 for the service. He stated that indicates the City will generate a profit on the service.
69 City Manager Chandler stated the City does not just pay a fee to the collection company; the City
70 also pays tipping fees to Weber County for dumping at the local landfill. The administrative
71 charge included in the fee is very minimal.

72

73 **Council Member Stoker moved to amend the agenda by moving item six ahead of item two.**
74 **Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

75

76 **Voting on the motion:**

77

78 Council Member Bailey aye
79 Council Member Satterthwaite aye
80 Council Member Stoker aye
81 Council Member Swanson aye
82 Council Member Urry aye

83

84

85 **6. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO APPOINT STEVEN PRISBREY AS A**
86 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER**

87

88 Mayor Taylor provided a brief summary of the process undertaken to select a resident to be
89 appointed to the North Ogden Planning Commission. Steven Prisbrey applied for the position
90 and after a long interview the Mayor felt he would be a great member of the Planning
91 Commission.

92

93 Council Member Satterthwaite stated that he has spoken to Mr. Prisbrey on a few occasions and
94 he is comfortable appointing him as a Planning Commissioner. Council Members Bailey,
95 Stoker, and Urry stated they have also spoken to Mr. Prisbrey and are comfortable with this
96 nomination. Council Member Swanson stated he has not spoken to Mr. Prisbrey, but indicated
97 he is comfortable with the nomination as well.
98

99 **Council Member Bailey moved to appoint Steven Prisbrey as a Planning Commission**
100 **Member. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

101
102 **Voting on the motion:**

103
104 **Council Member Bailey** aye
105 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye
106 **Council Member Stoker** aye
107 **Council Member Swanson** aye
108 **Council Member Urry** aye
109

110 **The motion passed unanimously.**
111

112
113 **2. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN AGREEMENT WITH**
114 **REPUBLIC SERVICES FOR THE DISPOSAL AND PICKUP OF SOLID WASTE**
115 **RECYCLING**
116

117 A staff memo from City Manager Chandler provided a brief summary of the proposed agreement
118 for solid waste disposal as follows:
119

120 Term:

- 121 • Three years agreement with a three year extension. Additional three year terms may be
122 added. (Section 1)
123

124 Fees:

- 125 • First trash can = \$3.30 per month per residential unit
126 • Second trash can = \$1.20 per month per residential unit with second can
127 • Recycling Cans = \$2.15 per month per residential unit. (Same price for first and second
128 cans.)
129 • City's front load dumpsters (10) = included in monthly cost fee so no extra cost.
130 • Cherry Days = no extra charge for a dumpster.
131 • All other roll-off hauls for the City organized events = \$79 per haul. (Section 3.e)
132 • Price adjustment = annual based CPI. Begins on July 1, 2015. (Section 3.f)
133 • Fuel Adjustment = a fuel surcharge will be added if the price of fuel reaches \$4.21 per
134 gallon.
135 • Tipping Fee: City pays tipping fees directly to Weber County.
136

137 Recycling Rebate:

- 138 • The City receives 100% of the recycling rebate.

139 Pick-up:

- 140 • Weekly trash pick up
- 141 • Every other week recycling pick up.
- 142 • (Section 3)
- 143 • Republic plans to keep the same schedule that is currently used.

144

145 Acceptable Waste:

- 146 • Residential household waste
- 147 • Waste Yard waste
- 148 • Waste associated with household pets including carcasses of dead animals 10 pounds or
- 149 less.
- 150 • Waste associated with City facilities.
- 151 • Sundry waste or debris as long as it can be accommodated in the garbage cans. (Section
- 152 2.a.i)

153

154 Non-Acceptable Waste:

- 155 • Hazardous waste including radioactive, volatile, corrosive, highly flammable, explosive,
- 156 biomedical, infectious, biohazardous. (Section 2.a.i.6)
- 157 • Waste that cannot be accommodated in the garbage cans. Lids must be able to be closed.
- 158 • Hot ashes, ammunition, toxic chemicals, chemical agents, heavy/jagged metal, oversized
- 159 concrete, rock material, large stumps, large accumulations of human or liquid waste, sod,
- 160 or dirt.
- 161 • Industrial waste (Section 2.a.ii)

162

163 Acceptable Recycling:

- 164 • Corrugated cardboard
- 165 • magazines
- 166 • Catalogs
- 167 • Newspapers
- 168 • Plastics 1-7
- 169 • Office paper
- 170 • Paperboard
- 171 • Phone books,
- 172 • Aluminum
- 173 • Small metal and steel cans
- 174 • Junk mail
- 175 • Paper bags
- 176 • Plastic grocery bags that are bound in a bail or tied in another bag (Section 2.b.i)

177

178 Non-Acceptable Recycling:

- 179 • Glass
- 180 • Styrofoam
- 181 • Large or heavy steel/metal items
- 182 • Yard waste including leaves, limbs, etc.
- 183 • Food Waste

184 Drop Off Location:
185 • Weber County transfer station for both trash and recycling. (Section 2.a). Another
186 recycling drop-off location may be used if approved by the City and Republic. (Section
187 2.b)

188
189 Payment:
190 • Monthly

191
192 Mr. Chandler summarized his staff memo.

193
194 Reese DeMille, Republic Services representative, thanked the City for this vote of confidence.
195 He then reviewed the pick-up schedule, which will result in a change of the garbage collection
196 day for half of the City that previously had their garbage collected on Wednesdays. The
197 residents will receive a flier communicating the schedule change and noted that if some
198 households do not receive the flier their can will be tagged for up to two weeks to inform the
199 resident of the schedule change. Republic Services will do everything possible to inform
200 residents of the change. There was a brief discussion regarding the format of the flier that will
201 communicate the schedule change, with Mr. DeMille indicating contact information for Republic
202 Services will be included on the flier so that the City would not need to deal with the issue.

203
204 City Attorney Call stated that he has reviewed the agreement in depth; he noted the negotiation
205 between the City and Republic Services was very easy.

206
207 **Council Member Swanson moved to approve Agreement A16-2014 with Republic Services**
208 **for the disposal and pickup of solid waste recycling. Council Member Stoker seconded the**
209 **motion.**

210
211 **Voting on the motion:**

212
213 **Council Member Bailey aye**
214 **Council Member Satterthwaite aye**
215 **Council Member Stoker aye**
216 **Council Member Swanson aye**
217 **Council Member Urry aye**

218
219 **The motion passed unanimously.**

220
221
222 **3. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE**
223 **CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE**

224
225 A staff memo from Finance Director Steele explained at the last City Council meeting, the
226 Council asked for more information on the fee for administration time added to the Annexation
227 Fee the City charges. Staff has added clarification to the proposed fee schedule which reads:

228 “Hourly charge may not exceed the salary of the lowest paid employee who, in the
229 discretion of the City Recorder, has the necessary skills and training to perform the
230 request.” (The wording comes from Utah State Code 10-2-403).
231

232 The memo explained the City Recorder has indicated she spends on average about 4 hours on
233 Annexation preparation. Her salary is \$27.69 (benefit costs cannot be recouped) so the average
234 amount we would charge is \$110.76. She said she has spent up to 10 hours on annexation
235 preparation, (The Cove), so the amount charged for that transaction would have been \$276.90.
236

237 Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo.
238

239 Council Member Satterthwaite stated he thought the concerns of the Council related to the
240 uncertainty of engineering fees for subdivision approval. Mr. Chandler stated his recollection is
241 that the Council had questions about the administrative fees associated with annexations; staff
242 has recommended mirroring the State Code language for administrative fees for other types of
243 duties carried out by the City Recorder, such as fulfilling Government Records Access and
244 Management Act (GRAMA) requests.
245

246 Council Member Bailey stated there is also a fee dealing with City Engineer review and there
247 was some discussion regarding the amount of time the Engineer could spend reviewing various
248 types of applications. He added, however, that the clarification in the language dealing with
249 administrative time associated with an annexation application is good.
250

251 There was a brief discussion regarding the annexation process and the various fees associated
252 with that process, after which Council Member Satterthwaite stated he is still concerned about
253 the fee associated with the City Engineer review of a subdivision application. Ms. Spendlove
254 stated staff offers an approximation of the costs for engineering costs associated with any
255 application, but that fee is somewhat a ‘moving target’ and it would not be appropriate to include
256 it in the fee schedule.
257

258 Council Member Bailey inquired as to the average cost for an annexation. Ms. Spendlove stated
259 the biggest cost for an annexation is public notification in the local newspaper; the average
260 publication cost is \$900. The County also charges review fees of approximately \$400. After her
261 administrative cost is included, an average annexation can cost approximately \$1,500.
262

263 Council Member Urry referenced park impact fees and noted the City only has six years to spend
264 revenues associated with impact fee collections and he asked Mr. Steele if he tracks the revenues
265 to ensure they are spent in the appropriate timeline. Mr. Steele answered yes. Council Member
266 Urry then addressed fire service impact fees and asked why the City charges that fee. Mr. Steele
267 stated the City collects the fee and passes the revenues on to the Fire District. Council Member
268 Urry suggested the City charge the District an administrative fee for collecting the impact fees.
269 Mr. Steele stated that may be appropriate. Council Member Urry then referenced the annual fire
270 inspection fee of \$15 and asked why the City has that fee when the inspection is completed by
271 the Fire Marshall, who is no longer an employee of the City. Mr. Steele stated the City no longer
272 collects that fee and it can be eliminated from the fee schedule. Council Member Urry
273 referenced the administrative hearing fee for civil penalty appeals and he asked if the

274 Administrative Hearing Officer receives that fee. Mr. Steele answered no and stated that when a
275 civil penalty is issued for a public nuisance the violator can request an administrative hearing
276 before the Justice Court Judge and that is the fee for that hearing. Council Member Urry focused
277 on annexation fees and asked why an annexation applicant would be required to pay a fee to the
278 County. Ms. Spendlove stated the State of Utah has an annexation process and the County
279 Surveyor must review the annexation and they charge a fee for that review. There was a brief
280 general discussion regarding the annexation process and the associated County fees. Council
281 Member Urry then referenced the section of fee schedule including rental fees for the Senior
282 Citizen Center; he asked if the City keeps those fees, to which Mr. Steele answered yes. The City
283 owns and maintains the building and handles all scheduling for the building. Council Member
284 Bailey stated he would like to review those fees further in a future work session because he feels
285 the fees are too high and are deterring usage. Council Member Urry stated he would also like to
286 have a discussion regarding the breakdown of recreation participation fees so the Council can
287 understand what the fees cover. He also referenced fees for the North Shore Aquatic Center and
288 there was a short discussion regarding the resident discount for the facility. He also asked Mr.
289 Chandler to talk to the County about animal impound fees; the cost for euthanasia is only \$2
290 more than the cost for someone to retrieve their animal from the impound facility. He then
291 concluded that he appreciates the work Mr. Steele and Mr. Chandler do on the fee schedule.
292

293 **Council Member Urry moved to adopt Resolution 11-2014 amending the consolidated fee**
294 **schedule upon removal of the annual fire inspection fee. Council Member Bailey seconded**
295 **the motion.**
296

297 **Voting on the motion:**
298

299 **Council Member Bailey** aye
300 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye
301 **Council Member Stoker** aye
302 **Council Member Swanson** aye
303 **Council Member Urry** aye
304

305 **The motion passed unanimously.**
306
307

308 **4. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER APPROVING AN ORDINANCE**
309 **AMENDING THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014**
310

311 A memo from Finance Director Steele explained each year amendments to the current fiscal year
312 budget are necessary to cover expenditures not accounted for in the original budget. The packet
313 included a detailed list of the recommended budget amendments.
314

315 Mr. Steele summarized the staff memo and provided a brief review of the proposed budget
316 adjustments.
317

318 Council Member Bailey asked for more information regarding amendment three relative to
319 donations received for various City events. Mr. Steele stated the donations are accounted for as a

320 revenue, but those revenues were unbudgeted so in order to account for the money to be
321 expended it is necessary to increase the line item for the expenditure that the donation will be
322 used for. The donations are spent on the events for which they are donated. Council Member
323 Urry asked what would happen if the City received a donation of \$2,500, but the program for
324 which the donation was made only cost \$2,000. He asked if the remaining \$500 would be
325 deposited into the general fund. Mr. Steele answered yes and noted the money would become
326 part of the fund balance. There was a brief discussion about the City's fund balance; Mr. Steele
327 stated the fund balance is currently at 22 percent of the total City budget, but after transfers are
328 completed at the beginning of the new fiscal year the fund balance will be closer to 17 percent.
329

330 **Council Member Bailey moved to adopt Ordinance 2014-14 amending the budget for Fiscal**
331 **Year 2013-2014. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**
332

333 **Voting on the motion:**
334

335 Council Member Bailey	aye
336 Council Member Satterthwaite	aye
337 Council Member Stoker	aye
338 Council Member Swanson	aye
339 Council Member Urry	aye

340
341 **The motion passed unanimously.**
342
343

344 **5. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING**
345 **BOUNDARIES FOR FIREWORKS, ETC. IN NORTH OGDEN CITY**
346

347 A staff memo from City Manager Chandler explained North View Fire District requested that
348 North Ogden City allow and prohibit fireworks according to the attached map. Utah Code
349 Annotated 15A-5-202 allows local jurisdictions to do this by ordinance or resolution.
350

351 Mr. Chandler summarized the staff memo and provided a brief review of the proposed
352 resolution. He also reviewed a map to highlight the areas of the City where fireworks will be
353 prohibited. He suggested that the proposed resolution be amended to remove the expiration date
354 so that the resolution can be used each year. There was a discussion regarding the
355 recommendation, with a focus on the fact that the State of Utah permits fireworks on New Year's
356 Eve each year and if the resolution does not have an expiration date fireworks would be
357 prohibited in the specified areas of North Ogden on that holiday. Mayor Taylor stated the
358 expiration date should be left in the resolution.
359

360 Council Member Swanson inquired as to how the resolution will be enforced. Mayor Taylor
361 stated the Fire District is responsible for enforcement. Mr. Chandler agreed and stated they will
362 actually patrol the areas where fireworks are prohibited.
363

364 **Council Member Bailey moved to adopt Resolution 12-2014 designating boundaries for**
365 **fireworks, etc. in North Ogden City as written. Council Member Swanson seconded the**
366 **motion.**

367
368 **Voting on the motion:**

369
370 **Council Member Bailey** **aye**
371 **Council Member Satterthwaite** **aye**
372 **Council Member Stoker** **aye**
373 **Council Member Swanson** **aye**
374 **Council Member Urry** **aye**

375
376 **The motion passed unanimously.**

377
378

379 **7. DISCUSSION REGARDING A DOG PARK**

380
381 A staff memo from City Manager Chandler explained staff was asked to consider possible
382 locations for and the creation of a dog park. Our review considered the use of existing facilities,
383 ease of construction, access, and minimal maintenance. Staff considered all City property and
384 looked at the short and long term improvements. The memo identified a few potential locations
385 for a dog park as well as cost estimates for completing improvements that would allow for the
386 dog park.

387
388 Mayor Taylor summarized the staff memo, but indicated the Council is not asked to make a
389 decision this evening and he requested that additional discussions be held at future meetings in
390 July.

391
392 Mr. Chandler also reviewed the staff memo and noted the most suitable location for the dog park
393 is the detention basin located between 2550 and 2700 North across the street from the Aquatic
394 Center. He discussed some of the features of the basin.

395
396 Council Member Bailey inquired as to the type of water that runs through the basin. Mr.
397 Chandler stated it is ground water. He then reviewed commonalities among other existing dog
398 parks, including shade, benches, and exercise areas. He reviewed the areas of the basin where
399 some of these features would fit best, after which he focused on the funding mechanism for the
400 park. He stated it seems most appropriate for the users of the parks – dog owners – to pay for it
401 and staff has considered recommending the Council add a surcharge to dog licensing fees and the
402 revenues from that surcharge could be used to fund the park. He reviewed current dog licensing
403 fees and noted last year the City registered 1,682 dogs and that number has been fairly steady
404 over the past few years.

405
406 Mayor Taylor noted there are no uses adjacent to the basin that would be negatively impacted by
407 the dog park and the existing grass would accommodate dogs well; it may be possible to enhance
408 the property in the future as funding becomes available, but it is an option at this time to offer the
409 property for a dog park at this time for those that have requested such a space.

410 Council Member Urry asked if staff has considered hours of operation at other local dog parks
411 and whether the parks are seasonal in their operation. Mr. Chandler stated that he has spoken
412 with representatives of Roy City and the dog park there is closed during the winter season, but he
413 does not recall hours of operation during the summer months. Council Member Urry stated that
414 if the City proposes to add a surcharge to dog licensing fees there will be a public outcry.
415

416 Council Member Satterthwaite asked if the parking area for the park is adequate. Mayor Taylor
417 stated the parking area could easily accommodate 10 to 15 vehicles at one time. Council
418 Member Satterthwaite asked if there is any other location in the City where dogs are permitted to
419 run off-lease. Mayor Taylor answered no.
420

421 Council Member Bailey inquired as to who would clean the park. Mayor Taylor stated that the
422 patrons of the park would be responsible to clean up after their own dogs. Council Member
423 Bailey indicated that is somewhat concerning to him.
424

425 Council Member Stoker asked if there is a sidewalk on the south side of the basin. Mr. Chandler
426 answered yes.
427

428 Council Member Swanson stated that he has lived in several communities that have dog parks
429 and it has been his experience that the less responsible dog owners do not use the dog parks and
430 those that do use the park are very responsible and are self-policing and will clean up after their
431 dogs. He added dog owners from the entire area will use the park, not just North Ogden
432 residents; it will be quite a draw and he wondered if there is any way to request financial
433 participation from other communities. Council Member Urry stated North Ogden representatives
434 could request participation from the other local cities. There was then a general discussion
435 regarding funding mechanisms as well as amenities to eventually be included at the park.
436 Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would like to assess the citizens' comfort level with an
437 increase in licensing fees for this purpose. Mayor Taylor stated that is a good idea. Council
438 Member Swanson agreed and added he would like to let the citizens know that upon the opening
439 of the dog park the City's enforcement of off-leash dogs will be increased because there will now
440 be a place for dogs to legally run off-leash.
441

442 There was a general discussion regarding the properties surrounding the basin property and
443 Council Member Bailey asked if the proposed dog park use is consistent with the future potential
444 development of the surrounding properties. Mayor Taylor stated the detention basin cannot be
445 relocated anywhere nearby.
446

447 Council Member Swanson stated he feels dog owners can make donations to improve the park,
448 such as purchase and plant a tree. Council Member Urry agreed and suggested that local
449 veterinarians may even make donations. Council Member Swanson suggested that those that
450 make donations could be recognized with a placard at the park. City Attorney Call stated that it
451 would be appropriate to determine whether such signage would comply with the City's sign
452 ordinance.
453

454 Council Member Bailey stated he likes the idea of charging the users of the park with funding it;
455 he feels that is the most appropriate way to move forward.

456 Council Member Stoker worried that some members of the community may be upset that the
457 City is willing to dedicate funding to a dog park – even if it is funded through donations or by the
458 users – but, yet, the City is ‘dragging its feet’ when it comes to constructing a sidewalk for kids
459 in the same area to walk to school. Council Member Urry summarized some of the many options
460 for transporting kids to the school other than constructing a new sidewalk. Mayor Taylor added
461 City Administration has met with representatives of the school and he will discuss some of the
462 ideas he has about the request during an upcoming meeting.
463

464 The Council then had a general discussion regarding the appropriate way to reach out to the
465 community to gauge their comfort level with the proposal. Suggestions were made regarding
466 including information regarding the park in the newsletter and waiting to have an additional
467 discussion until the August 12 meeting. Mayor Taylor added it may be a good idea to create a
468 committee of citizens that could focus on improvements to and funding for the dog park.
469

470

471 **8. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

472

473 Jon Call, 1895 N. 300 W., stated he feels the plan that was laid out for the dog park is stellar; he
474 added, however, that the Council may get a better response from the community if they were to
475 consider setting aside the property for a dog park in July and then ask for support and funding for
476 the park from the community. He stated it is a great idea to raise the dog license fees, but noted
477 that the park will not only benefit the dog community and, instead, will benefit the entire
478 community by helping to remove off-leash dogs from the streets. He agreed that responsible dog
479 owners will use the park and they are self-policing. He added it may be a good idea to stipulate
480 that a dog must be licensed in order to use the dog park. He stated he likes the idea of a water
481 feature, but stated the lack of shade at the park is not good. He stated he likes the idea of
482 approaching the other cities in the area to request assistance in funding the project. He added
483 that one issue that was not discussed was the need for a small, fenced-off area that would better
484 accommodate smaller breed dogs to keep them segregated from larger dogs.
485

486 Council Member Urry asked if Mr. Call would be willing to participate in a committee for the
487 dog park. Mr. Call answered yes.
488

489 Jeanne Droogsma, 3377 Mountain Road, stated that she is new to the community; she has a
490 background in the insurance industry and she has a couple of concerns about the dog park. She
491 asked if anyone has studied the water that would feed the park to determine what the water
492 contains; it may be water that some pet owners would not like their pets to drink because of the
493 things that could be contained in it as agricultural run-off. She asked what will be done to
494 protect the City in the event that an aggressive dog bites a person while on the City’s property;
495 the City Attorney should research waivers or hold-harmless agreements to protect the City. She
496 then asked if the City will provide lighting at the park in the event that it will be open from dusk
497 to dark. She stated the park is a great idea, but it is important to protect the City and the people
498 that will use it. She stated there may be odor and noise issues for nearby property owners and
499 the City should look into those issues before proceeding.
500

501 Joan Brown, 2010 N. 775 E., stated that in order to increase usage of the park it will be necessary
502 to create an area that will accommodate smaller dog breeds. She added that some of the small
503 dog breeds also like to run as much as larger dog breeds and the space for them should be able to
504 accommodate that.

505
506 Carol Campbell, 3679 Lakeview Drive, stated she would be willing to chair the dog park
507 committee. She stated she is very excited about the possibilities of the creation of a dog park in
508 the City. She stated she has two dogs that are not very big and she would like to partition off an
509 area for smaller dog breeds or implement a schedule for use of the park by different sized breeds.
510 She stated the water feature is a great idea and she is supportive of an increase in the dog license
511 fees to pay for the park; she would also be happy to help clean the park and encourage other
512 users to clean the park and license their dogs. She would be happy if the City's animal control
513 officer could work to enforce the rules regarding dog licensing. She added that it would be great
514 for the park to be open during the winter months as well because dogs need exercise during that
515 time of year as well.

516
517 Kurt Illum, 805 E. 3300 N., stated he is supportive of the dog park and would be in favor of an
518 increase in licensing fees to cover funding of the park. He then referenced the garbage hauling
519 contract and asked when a fuel charge would be in effect; he asked if the surcharge is based on
520 pricing for diesel or unleaded fuel. Mr. Chandler stated the surcharge is \$.03 for every \$.10 over
521 \$4.20 for diesel fuel costs. The fee would be assessed monthly. Mr. Illum then stated that he
522 and his wife would be willing to participate on a committee for the dog park.

523
524

525 **9. CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR, AND STAFF COMMENTS**

526

527 Council Member Urry encouraged people to visit the dog park in Heber City to see the amenities included
528 at that park.

529

530 Council Member Satterthwaite thanked those Boy Scouts in attendance this evening and for their
531 participation in the meeting. He then stated he is excited about the ideas regarding the dog park; he is
532 excited to see there are residents that will support the project in the right way in order for it to move
533 forward.

534

535 Council Member Urry asked if the City has an ordinance prohibiting on-street parking for RV's. He
536 stated there has been an RV parked on 600 East for approximately three months and he asked that
537 someone from the City enforce the ordinance regarding that issue.

538

539 Council Member Swanson stated he is excited about the dog park and he thanked the residents that
540 volunteered to participate on a committee. He stated he would like to participate as well. He then
541 recognized Jason Droogsma for his comments earlier in the meeting and for staying for the duration of the
542 entire meeting.

543

544 Council Member Stoker also recognized Mr. Droogsma and stated she hopes he will stay involved in the
545 community throughout his entire life. She then stated that she finds it interesting that the City is finding
546 ways to accommodate the request for a dog park, but when the City heard a request from kids for a

547 Lacrosse park in the City, there were obstacles put up for them to jump over. She thinks the dog park is a
548 great idea and is glad citizens are willing to participate to make it happen. She then stated North Ogden
549 has worked very hard to become business friendly and she is hoping that the City is making it possible for
550 new businesses to succeed and not putting up impossible obstacles for them; she also hoped there is
551 consistency regarding what things are being imposed on certain businesses.

552
553 Mr. Chandler and Ms. Spendlove provided a report regarding the upcoming Cherry Days celebration and
554 reviewed the schedule of those events the Council is requested to be involved in.

555
556 Mayor Taylor then reviewed the “citizen’s guide to the budget” that has been developed for citizen use; it
557 includes a summary of the use of various funding sources and the budget for the Public Works Facility.
558 The document will be included in the July newsletter.

559
560
561 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

562
563 **Council Member Swanson moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Urry seconded**
564 **the motion.**

565
566 **Voting on the motion:**

- 567
568 **Council Member Bailey** aye
569 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye
570 **Council Member Stoker** aye
571 **Council Member Swanson** aye
572 **Council Member Urry** aye

573
574 **The motion passed unanimously.**

575
576
577 **The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.**

578
579
580 **RDA**

581
582 **1. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE AMENDING**
583 **THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014**

584
585 **Board Member Urry moved to adopt Ordinance 2014-15 amending the RDA budget for**
586 **Fiscal Year 2013-2014. Board Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

587
588 **Voting on the motion:**

- 589
590 **Board Member Bailey** aye
591 **Board Member Satterthwaite** aye

592 Board Member Stoker aye
593 Board Member Swanson aye
594 Board Member Urry aye

595
596 The motion passed unanimously.
597

598

599 **2. ADJOURNMENT**

600

601 Board Member Bailey moved to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Stoker seconded the
602 motion.

603

604 Voting on the motion:

605

606 Board Member Bailey aye
607 Board Member Satterthwaite aye
608 Board Member Stoker aye
609 Board Member Swanson aye
610 Board Member Urry aye

611

612 The motion passed unanimously.

613

614

615 The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

616

617

618

619

620 _____
Brent Taylor, Mayor

621

622

623

624 _____
S. Annette Spendlove, MMC
625 City Recorder

626

627

628 _____
Date Approved