

1 **NORTH OGDEN CITY BUDGET RETREAT AND CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

2
3 May 8, 2014
4

5 The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on May 8, 2014 at 12:40 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 May 8, 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 James Urry Council Member
17
18 Eric Thomas Chairman
19 Don Waite Vice-Chairman
20 Scott Barker Commissioner
21 Joan Brown Commissioner
22 Blake Knight Commissioner
23 Dee Russell Commissioner
24 Phillip Swanson Commissioner
25
26
27 **STAFF PRESENT:** Ronald F. Chandler City Manager
28 S. Annette Spendlove City Recorder/ H.R. Director
29 Bryan Steele Finance Director
30 Kevin Warren Police Chief
31 Gary Kerr Building Official
32 Tiffany Staheli Parks & Recreation Director
33 Stacie Cain Comm. Dev. Coord./Deputy City Recorder
34

35 **VISITORS:** Phillip Swanson
36

37 Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance. City Recorder Spendlove provided the invocation and
38 led the pledge of allegiance.
39

40 Mayor Taylor requested that the agenda be rearranged by moving item four behind item six
41 pertaining to the budget for the Public Works Facility project. He also recommended that item three
42 be heard ahead of item two.
43

44 Council Member Urry reported that the Supreme Court has ruled it legal to have prayers during City
45 Council meetings. Mayor Taylor stated that is correct.
46
47

48 **BUDGET RETREAT/PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY MEETING - NOON - 5:30 P.M.**
49 **AGENDA**

50
51 **1. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

52
53 There were no public comments.
54

55 **3. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER THE MISS NORTH OGDEN**
56 **PAGEANT**

57
58 Mayor Taylor provided a brief history of the organization of the Miss North Ogden Pageant and
59 reminded the Council that they heard a request during their April 22 meeting to offer financial
60 assistance to the organizers of the pageant for the upcoming event.
61

62 Hannah Goodrich reported that those working to organize the pageant were able to secure a
63 major sponsor that will provide \$2,500, which will cover the cost to rent the pageant venue as
64 well as the franchise fee from the Miss America organization. There will be additional money
65 left over to contribute to the scholarship budget for the pageant participants. She stated she has
66 worked very hard to find other various sponsorship and scholarship opportunities. She reviewed
67 the scheduling for the pageant and noted organizers have settled on June 28.
68

69 Council Member Urry asked why the Council is considering this issue. Mayor Taylor noted the
70 City must sanction the pageant and accept donations that will be passed through to the pageant
71 organizers for their use to cover costs for the pageant. The City will also pay the fee to the Miss
72 America organization. Council Member Urry asked if the Council is being asked to provide
73 money to the pageant, to which Ms. Goodrich answered no. There was a general discussion
74 regarding the scheduling of the event, with a focus on whether other cities should be included in
75 the pageant since the event will occur so close to heritage days celebrations for other cities.
76 Council Member Bailey stated it may be difficult to do that this year with such short notice.
77 Mayor Taylor agreed and stated the Council is being asked to vote to support the pageant and
78 noted he will direct staff to confer with other cities to determine whether they would like to
79 participate in the pageant next year.
80

81 **Council Member Urry moved to sponsor the Miss North Ogden pageant with no financial**
82 **contribution from the City. Council Member Bailey seconded the motion.**

83
84 **Voting on the motion:**

85
86 **Council Member Bailey aye**
87 **Council Member Satterthwaite aye**
88 **Council Member Stoker aye**
89 **Council Member Urry aye**

90
91 **The motion passed unanimously.**
92
93

94 **2. DISCUSSION ON SOLID AND GREEN WASTE CONTRACT**

95
96 City Manager Chandler reviewed the options available to the City following the recent request
97 for proposal (RFP) process relative to the City's garbage and recyclables hauling services. He
98 noted the first option is to maintain the current program and stay with the current vendor, Waste
99 Management, which would result in a \$1.11 annual increase per household. If the City opted to
100 contract with Republic Services the result would be a \$3.63 annual decrease per household. The
101 total annual savings for the entire City would be \$26,000. The second option for the Council to
102 consider is a program that offers weekly trash and recycling collection; in this case the monthly
103 increase from Waste Management would be \$1.43 per household per month (\$17.11 annually)
104 and the increase from Republic Services would be \$0.87 per household per month (\$10.46
105 annually). The total increase to the City would be \$95,159 for Waste Management or \$58,181
106 for Republic Services.

107
108 Council Member Urry inquired as to the average number of delinquent accounts each month. Mr.
109 Chandler stated that number ranges from 48 to 52 each month. He then stated the third option is
110 a program for weekly trash collection, bi-weekly recycling collection, and green waste recycling
111 during the months of April to October, the increase for Waste Management would be \$2.85 per
112 household per month (\$34.20 annually) and the increase for Republic Services would be \$1.91
113 per household per month (\$22.88 annually). The total increase to the City would be \$190,273
114 for Waste Management or \$127,286 for Republic Services. He noted the third option does not
115 include the cost to purchase receptacles for the new services being provided and it would be
116 necessary to build that cost into the rates charged to users. He then reviewed the final option of a
117 weekly trash and recycling collection and weekly green waste collection during the summer
118 months. The increase for this option for Waste Management would be \$4.18 per household per
119 month (\$50.20 annually) or \$3.08 per household per month (\$36.97 annually) for Republic
120 Services. The total increase to the City would be \$279,260 for Waste Management or \$205,647
121 for Republic Services. This option also does not include the needed investment of the purchase
122 of new collection receptacles. He then added that he spoke to Weber County officials regarding
123 the County's ability to accept the City's green waste; they are not capable of doing that at this
124 time, but they are expanding their facility and may be able to handle it next year. He then
125 reviewed the City's current utility rate fee structure; the total monthly charge per household is
126 \$46.61, which includes water, central weber sewer district fees, garbage collection, and storm
127 water fee. He reviewed a proposed rate structure that includes increases to various utility fees to
128 cover depreciation costs, but noted he did not make any changes to the garbage fees because that
129 amount will change depending upon the contractor selected by the Council and the type of
130 program that is ultimately implemented. He stated during the last discussion regarding garbage
131 and recycling programs there was a focus on incentivizing residents to use a recycling can rather
132 than a second garbage can and he noted the City currently charges a considerably lower rate for
133 recycling cans than second garbage cans. He then reviewed the manner in which some of the
134 proposed rates could change depending on reduced tipping fees or the ability to sell recyclables
135 to other recycling vendors. He discussed the current tipping fees for garbage as well as a
136 proposal from the County to begin charging tipping fees for green waste delivered to the landfill
137 by commercial haulers; this cost would be \$26 per ton, which is a \$6 per ton savings over the
138 tipping fee currently paid for garbage tipping fees. Mayor Taylor stated he has been surprised to
139 learn of the additional costs associated with a green waste recycling program and noted the

140 program is almost not worthwhile because it will not provide a great cost savings to the City or
141 the residents. Mr. Chandler agreed and noted that if the City generated 900 tons of green waste
142 annually the savings would only be \$5,400. He then led a general discussion regarding the
143 participation in the City's recycling program and noted he would like the Council to consider the
144 program that offers weekly garbage collection and bi-weekly recycling collection with the
145 implementation of an aggressive public relations marketing campaign regarding the recycling
146 program.

147
148 Council Member Bailey stated he would recommend that the City contract with Republic
149 Services to realize the savings included in their proposal, opt for the program that offers weekly
150 garbage collection and bi-weekly recycling collection, and do some things to incentivize or
151 encourage more recycling City-wide. He stated he feels the green waste program is too large a
152 gamble at this time, but he believes there are options for considering a green waste program in
153 the future. Council Member Urry stated that he knows a resident that used to live in California
154 and one thing they did to incent recycling was provide small garbage cans to residents so they
155 were forced to recycle more. Council Member Bailey stated something like that may be possible
156 in the future depending on the investment that would be required. He stated at this time it may
157 be more appropriate to charge more for garbage cans and less for recycling cans. There was a
158 general discussion regarding an appropriate rate structure with a continued focus on incentivizing
159 recycling in the City.

160
161 Mr. Chandler stated the decision before the Council today is which carrier to select and what
162 level of service they should provide.

163
164 **Council Member Bailey made a motion to select Republic Services as the City's garbage**
165 **hauler and to opt for a program that provides the same level of service the City is currently**
166 **experiencing. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

167
168 Mayor Taylor stated the City could either use the savings that will be realized by contracting
169 with Republic Services to purchase additional recycling cans or to decrease the rate charged to
170 residents. Mr. Chandler stated he would recommend the Council make that decision during the
171 discussion later in the meeting regarding the entire utility rate structure. He added that he would
172 like to ask Republic Services to amend their proposal to include the cost to transport recyclables
173 to Rocky Mountain Recycling, the company that has offered to purchase the City's recyclable
174 materials.

175
176 **Council Member Bailey amended his motion to include a request that Republic Services**
177 **amend their proposal to include a cost to transport the City's recyclable materials to Rocky**
178 **Mountain Recycling. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

179
180 Council Member Urry stated he would like the City to consider exploring possibilities for
181 incentivizing recycling in the City. Council Member Bailey agreed and noted the fee schedule
182 can be considered at a later date when the total budget is considered. There was a general
183 discussion about use of and fees associated with the City's green waste pit, with Mr. Chandler
184 stating staff can be tasked with considering ways to improve the efficiency and availability of the
185 green waste pit.

186
187 The Mayor then called for a vote on the motion.
188

189 **Voting on the motion:**

190
191 **Council Member Bailey** **aye**
192 **Council Member Satterthwaite** **aye**
193 **Council Member Stoker** **aye**
194 **Council Member Urry** **aye**

195
196 **The motion passed unanimously.**

197
198 **4. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING**
199 **THE NORTH OGDEN CITY TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014-2015**
200

201 A staff memo from Finance Director Steele explained State Statute 10-6-111 requires that the
202 City Council adopt the tentative budget at the first scheduled Council meeting in May. The
203 tentative budget includes a budget message that provides a highlight of some of the components
204 of the budget. Even though the Tentative Budget is being adopted, changes can still be made
205 before the Final Budget is adopted in June. Any changes that Council decides to make will be
206 documented and included with future budget discussions. Items that still need to be addressed
207 include:

- 208 • Street Lighting Fund
- 209 • Street Construction Fund
- 210 • Public Works Building
- 211 • Utility Rate increases – (From the last budget retreat, I got the impression that Council
212 wanted to fund depreciation in the Enterprise Funds at 75%. So the following rate
213 changes are included in the Tentative Budget):
 - 214 ○ Water rate increasing \$1.67
 - 215 ○ Sewer rate unchanged
 - 216 ○ Storm Water rate increasing .75¢
 - 217 ○ Solid Waste rate decreasing .30¢
 - 218 ○ Total rate increase would be \$2.12
- 219 • Other items may come up that the Council wants to take action on.

220
221 Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo as well as the budget message, with a focus on the financial
222 implications of potential salary increases. Council Member Bailey asked if it is correct that the
223 baseline of the budget will be increased by \$250,000 annually to cover the increased costs
224 associated with wage increases. Mr. Chandler answered yes.

225
226 Mayor Taylor acknowledged the extensive amount of time and effort Mr. Chandler, Ms.
227 Spendlove, and other staff have put into developing a pay plan that offers a compromise to the
228 recommendations of the Employee Compensation Committee. The recommendation is fair to
229 the tax payers and good for the employees. Council Member Bailey stated he supports fair
230 compensation for employees wholeheartedly, but he simply wants the Council to be aware that
231 this will be an ongoing expense rather than a one-time cost to the City. Mayor Taylor agreed,

232 but noted the City employees provide a great service with minimal funding and this investment is
233 a good, solid proposal. The Department Heads have been very involved in determining the
234 amount of money each employee should receive.
235

236 Council Member Satterthwaite asked if the funding will be included in the final budget, to which
237 Mayor Taylor answered yes. Council Member Satterthwaite stated \$25,000 is a lot of money
238 and he hopes the employees will see it as a vote of confidence with the understanding that the
239 Council will continue to expect great performance from them.
240

241 Mr. Steele continued the review of his staff memo and budget message. Mr. Chandler provided
242 the Council with a brief summary of the proposal to hire a part-time code enforcement officer in
243 the Police Department and Mayor Taylor offered some historical data about the position, noting
244 it was full-time until 2008 when the former employee left her employment and the position was
245 not filled. Council Member Urry stated he is appreciative of the City hiring a code enforcement
246 officer because it is something that is needed in the City. Mr. Chandler then provided
247 information regarding the proposal to hire a part-time mechanic in the Public Works Department.
248

249 Mr. Steele continued the review of the budget message highlighting motor pool funding and
250 special revenue funds including the aquatic center budget. There was a general discussion
251 regarding debt service for the aquatic center bond and Mr. Chandler reported revenues generated
252 by the aquatic center cover 97 percent of operating costs, but no debt service or depreciation for
253 the facility. Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would like to develop a plan to increase
254 revenues at the center to cover all costs. Council Member Bailey stated he feels a more
255 attainable goal is to cover operational costs with revenues generated by the facility. There was a
256 discussion about different programs that can be offered at the pool to increase user-ship or
257 generate additional revenues, with a focus on the amount of facility rentals. The Council asked
258 for a cost benefit analysis for constructing an additional bowery at the facility with the goal of
259 increasing revenues. Mayor Taylor asked that at the next budget meeting the staff provide a
260 graph highlighting operating expenses and the percentage of which are covered by revenues
261 generated at the City as well as a graph that includes debt service and depreciation costs. There
262 was a general discussion regarding tax revenues that fund the aquatic center via debt service;
263 debt service monies come from property taxes for properties in the specific redevelopment
264 agency (RDA) commercial area surrounding the facility and there are still monies left over.
265

266 Council Member Urry suggested that marketing material regarding the aquatic center be placed
267 at the visitor's bureau in Weber County.
268

269 Council Member Bailey stated there have been some fairly major expenses associated with the
270 aquatic center over the years and he asked if those were expensed or capitalized. Mr. Steele
271 stated he believes they were capitalized, but he would need to confirm that. There was a general
272 discussion regarding the depreciation budget for the aquatic center and Mr. Chandler stated the
273 City has not used RDA funding for ongoing maintenance or repairs at the facility. Council
274 Member Bailey stated it is important for the Council to understand the economic life of the pool
275 and if depreciation is not adequately funded it would be necessary to issue another bond to
276 replace it at some point in the future. Mr. Chandler stated staff can work to determine those
277 figures and report back at a later date. Council Member Bailey stated the Council needs to make

278 a decision about how and whether to fund depreciation of the facility. He added that he is
279 concerned about the fashion in which the Council has isolated discussions about specific issues
280 and it is difficult to make global decisions.

281
282 Mr. Steele then reviewed additional special revenues funds, including the street lighting fund and
283 street construction fund. Council Member Urry stated that he wants to know if there is
284 community support for fees for street repairs or street lighting. He stated he has a problem with
285 funding a lacrosse field for \$63,000 when that same amount of money could be used to fund
286 street lighting for the next two years. The Council had a general discussion regarding the intent
287 of the street lighting and street construction fees, with Mr. Chandler stating the question before
288 the Council tonight is whether to increase utility fees by \$1.00 for new street lighting and
289 whether to increase utility fees by \$3.00 to set aside money to be used for new road construction,
290 including the round-about on 2100 North, the Elberta Drive project, or the widening and
291 extension of Washington Boulevard. Council Member Satterthwaite stated he is concerned
292 about the possibility that the City will spend a large amount of money to covert to LED street
293 lights only to see the cost of LED lights decrease over the next couple of years as they become
294 more widely used. Mayor Taylor stated that it is his opinion that if the Council does not dedicate
295 money to things such as street lighting or new road construction projects, it will not be possible
296 to complete those projects when they are needed; the new utility fees are a mechanism to
297 dedicate that money and is much easier to do than pull money from the general fund. Council
298 Member Urry stated that he wants to be up front with the public so they understand what the
299 Council is considering and the reason the new utility fees are needed. Council Member
300 Satterthwaite stated it is his understanding that the utility fees are used in other cities that
301 implemented the fees to avoid the need to bond for needed projects. Council Member Urry
302 agreed and stated that simply needs to be explained to the citizens. Mayor Taylor referred to the
303 new utility fees, specifically the street construction fee, as a “pay as you go” funding program.
304 Council Member Bailey stated there is a high degree of cynicism among the residents regarding
305 these types of things. He then noted that in the past the City was putting \$100,000 per year of
306 enterprise funds into an account to be used for the public works facility project; that practice was
307 stopped, but he has not seen any changes to the City’s utility rates that fund the enterprise funds
308 and he inquired as to where the \$100,000 has gone. He asked if it is used to fund depreciation, to
309 which Mr. Chandler answered yes. Council Member Bailey stated that means the City was
310 robbing from depreciation funding to fund the new public works facility rather than actually
311 saving any money. Mayor Taylor refocused the discussion on need to educate the citizenry
312 regarding the need for the two new utility fees. Council Member Bailey stated his biggest
313 frustration is that the Council has not adequately dealt with the budget for the public works
314 facility and he does not feel that he can, in good conscience, vote to increase utility fees without
315 determining the exact funding of the public works facility project and depreciation issues. He
316 stated he is tired of stealing from depreciation funding to fund other projects. He noted he would
317 rather determine the actual budget for the public works facility and the amount of money needed
318 to fully fund depreciation and then determine how to structure the City’s fee schedule to fund
319 those things. Mayor Taylor stated it is important to prioritize the discussions the Council needs
320 to have relative to various funding issues; he suggested the Council focus on capital funding and
321 funding of the Public Works Facility project prior to discussing the fee schedule.

322
323 The Council took a break at 2:40 p.m.

324 The meeting reconvened at 2:50 p.m.

325

326 The Council's discussion regarding the importance of funding depreciation continued and
327 Council Member Bailey stated that from a public policy standpoint it may be more important to
328 fund replacement costs rather than depreciation.

329

330 Mr. Chandler then reviewed a spreadsheet that included information regarding capital project
331 and enterprise funds, but it did not include the motor pool or RDA fund. In the capital project
332 fund the project fund balance in 2014 is \$3.5 million and the estimated revenue in FY2015 is
333 \$799,000 which leaves the City with \$4.3 million to spend. Council Member Bailey asked if that
334 figure is based upon dividing revenues in half between capital projects and the general fund
335 balance. Mr. Chandler answered yes. He added the City has \$3.7 million in needed capital
336 project funding, which leaves \$573,000 left over. He reviewed the formulas used to create the
337 table and stated the Council can edit it in real-time during this meeting. He also briefly reviewed
338 the capital projects that are included in the spreadsheet and stated it is his hope that the Council
339 can prioritize the projects this evening; the project list includes the Public Works Facility and the
340 cost for that project is based on the base bid including site work and revenues that may be
341 generated by the sale of top soil and the existing building. There was a discussion regarding
342 whether the cost for the Public Works Facility includes the covered fuel station and Mayor
343 Taylor stated that component of the project can be added to the list.

344

345 Mr. Chandler then refocused the discussion on the capital projects included on the excel
346 spreadsheet, with a focus on utility infrastructure. Council Member Bailey asked how the
347 replacement or repair needs are being projected using the iWorks system; he wondered if the
348 projections are based on the age of the infrastructure or on actual leak data. Public Works
349 Director Giles stated forecasting can be done using age information and leak data. Mr. Chandler
350 noted it will ultimately be up to the Council to make a policy decision regarding the parameters
351 that must be present in order for a pipe to be replaced. He then continued reviewing the capital
352 projects list and he offered a brief justification for each project. There was general discussion
353 regarding the components of some of the projects, with a focus on estimated costs and contractor
354 selection for the projects. Through the discussion, four projects were removed from the list: two
355 in the capital projects fund and two from the storm drain fund, which increased the funds
356 available to spend to \$615,000.

357

358 Mr. Chandler then started the discussion regarding the budget for the Public Works Facility
359 project. He noted a representative of Lundahl would be joining the meeting soon. He began by
360 discussing the potential wetlands on the site and noted a large portion of the perceived wetlands
361 has been eliminated and he identified the area on the site that is still considered to be wetlands.
362 He identified the location of the detention basin and road on the project site; he also identified
363 the current property boundaries and updated the Council regarding negotiations with the
364 neighboring property owners to adjust the property boundaries slightly. He then reviewed a
365 worksheet including costs for various components of the project. Council Member Bailey asked
366 why it may be necessary to pay for imported fill dirt for the site at a cost of \$180,000. Mr.
367 Chandler stated Lundahl is making the assumption that there will be enough dirt available for the
368 project, but if not it will be necessary to import fill at the cost of \$180,000. Council Member
369 Bailey expressed his concern about this component of the project and noted that it has not been

370 discussed previously. Mr. Chandler stated it was included on the bid sheet that was reviewed at
371 the last meeting. He continued reviewing the bid sheet and identified the items that would be
372 added to the base bid amount, including the \$180,000 to import fill dirt; the sale of top soil
373 estimated at \$100,000; and land sale revenues and demolition costs. The final cost is \$4,139,927
374 and Public Works Director Giles has provided input regarding his priorities for the project,
375 including the fuel station, salt storage shed, and storage area under the administration building.
376 Mr. Chandler encouraged the Council to have an open dialogue with the Lundahl representative
377 to get their questions about various components of the project answered and then go through the
378 process of elimination to reduce the price of the project.

379
380 Mayor Taylor addressed Justin Robinson, Lundahl representative, and inquired as to the
381 likelihood of needing to import fill to the project site and where the fill will be used. Mr.
382 Robinson stated that if needed the fill will be used around the structures and the parking area to
383 raise the elevation of the site. He stated he will know within 30 days of beginning earth work
384 whether he will need to import fill, but he is fairly comfortable that it will not be necessary to
385 spend the entire \$180,000 for fill.

386
387 Council Member Satterthwaite asked if it is necessary to cover the fuel station and how much
388 money would be saved if the cover were removed from that component of the project. Mr.
389 Robinson stated that a quarter of the cost for the fuel station would be eliminated if the cover
390 were removed. He noted the cover is important because it helps to prevent rainwater from
391 entering the fuel containment system and he provided an explanation of the design of the
392 containment system. He added, however, that it is not absolutely necessary to cover the fuel
393 station and the station used by Lundahl is open and has not experienced any problems. The
394 Council opted to remove the cover for the fuel station. There was then a general discussion
395 regarding the needed space for vehicle storage on the site and Council Member Bailey stated he
396 would prefer to only complete the basic and essential components of the project with the idea
397 that other components can be added in the future as the City has the financial means to complete
398 such projects. Mr. Chandler identified the location of the covered materials storage building as
399 well as the covered storage area that would be used to store trash cans and dumpsters and he
400 asked the Council if they felt it is worth \$117,000 to complete that aspect of the project. Mr.
401 Robinson stated that there are other options for storing garbage cans outside and screening them
402 from public view. Mr. Chandler stated he feels the \$117,000 would be better spent on a back-up
403 generator, crane, furniture, and upgrading the air conditioning units at the facility, which would
404 total \$77,975. There was a general discussion regarding a compromise that would accomplish
405 screening of the garbage cans and Mr. Robinson noted that the building would also serve as earth
406 retention at the site. There was a general discussion regarding other retaining wall options that
407 would save some money in the project cost. Mr. Chandler edited the cost sheet by reducing the
408 cost for covered storage by \$50,000, eliminating the cost for the back-up generator and replacing
409 it with the cost to run conduit to the various buildings on the site to accommodate the future
410 addition of a generator. There was then a general discussion regarding the \$31,000 cost for
411 furniture for the project and Mr. Chandler noted it is an allowance and City staff will actually
412 purchase the furniture from another vendor.

413
414 Mr. Chandler then reviewed the funds available for the project and stated based on the projected
415 cost of the project there is a shortfall of \$205,000. There was a general discussion regarding the

416 contingency amount built into the project and Council Member Bailey stated he would like the
417 Council to have oversight regarding the use of the contingency. Mr. Chandler stated the Council
418 could place limits on the contingency and there was a general discussion about what would
419 happen if the total project cost exceeded the amount approved by the Council. Mr. Robinson
420 stated that he wanted to assure the Council that it is very important to him that the City gets the
421 most 'bang for their buck' with their project and that is why he recommended a design that was
422 different than anything recommended by any other bidder. He stated there will be flexibility in
423 the project costs and he will not do work that is not sensible or functional for the Public Works
424 Department.

425
426 Mr. Chandler briefly reviewed the changes to the cost sheet, including the elimination of
427 landscaping costs, and the changes to impact fees for the project and noted the funding shortfall
428 is now \$150,000. Mayor Taylor stated that means the Council will need to determine where the
429 contingency amount will be taken from if necessary. Council Member Bailey recommended that
430 the money be taken from the capital projects fund if necessary.

431
432 Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would like to identify a tool that will allow the City to
433 save money to construct the vehicle storage building on the site in the future. Mayor Taylor
434 stated the best practice would be to save a specified amount of money every year to accumulate
435 the amount needed to construct the building. Council Member Bailey suggested that the project
436 be included on the capital projects list to vie for funding like every other capital project in the
437 City. Mr. Chandler agreed that would be appropriate and would allow for the project to be
438 ranked against other needed capital projects.

439
440 **Council Member Bailey made a motion to direct staff to prepare a contract between North**
441 **Ogden City and Lundahl for the construction of the Public Works Facility based on the**
442 **project cost (\$2,952,000) determined this evening. Council Member Stoker seconded the**
443 **motion.**

444
445 Mr. Chandler stated if the motion is approved the City can issue a notice of award to Lundahl
446 and after the contract is finally approved the notice to proceed will be issued. The budget
447 available for the project is \$3,350,000, which leaves money available for contingency items if
448 necessary. Mr. Robinson stated that the cost may still change through the design/build process if
449 the Council chooses to change the scope of the project.

450
451 Mr. Chandler contacted City Attorney Call via telephone; Mr. Call indicated that the Council can
452 give Lundahl authority to proceed based on the price determined tonight with the understanding
453 that the final contract will not be approved until next Tuesday.

454
455 **Council Member Bailey amended his motion to approve a project cost not to exceed**
456 **\$2,951,847 and authorize Lundahl to proceed with the project with the understanding that**
457 **the official contract will not be fully executed until Tuesday, May 13, 2014. Council**
458 **Member Stoker seconded the motion.**

459
460
461

462 **Voting on the motion:**

463

464 **Council Member Bailey** aye

465 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye

466 **Council Member Stoker** aye

467 **Council Member Urry** aye

468

469 **The motion passed unanimously.**

470

471 Council Member Satterthwaite asked that the covered vehicle storage aspect of the project be
472 included in the capital projects list at a cost of 75 percent of the amount provided by Lundahl.

473

474 The Council took a break at 5:19 p.m.

475

476 The meeting reconvened at 5:44 p.m.

477

478 **CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION**
479 **ESTABLISHING THE NORTH OGDEN CITY TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FISCAL**
480 **YEAR 2014-2015**

481

482 City Manager Chandler stated there are only three additional budget items to cover: \$30,000 for
483 LED lighting; a request for additional temporary personnel; and fees. Mr. Steele provided a brief
484 overview of the purpose for each budget item and there was a focus on the \$30,000 for LED
485 lighting and whether it is wise for the City to proceed with that project at this point in time;
486 Council Member Bailey suggested waiting until LED is in wider use because he feels the cost for
487 the technology will decrease or there may be a better technology. Council Member Satterthwaite
488 stated it may be wise to monitor the power sources to the light poles to determine why lights are
489 burning out so quickly. Mr. Chandler stated staff can easily monitor the replacement patterns
490 and report back to the Council at a future date. Council Member Stoker stated upgraded lights
491 will improve the look of the gateway to the City. Mr. Chandler agreed and stated that would be
492 part of improving the aesthetics of the commercial corridor of the City. Council Member Urry
493 stated he understands residents get concerned about lighting problems, but the biggest issue for
494 him is whether this project will actually save the City money in the long run. The consensus was
495 to leave the funding in the budget, but to complete an analysis to determine the replacement
496 requirements and the payback period of the project. Mr. Chandler stated staff can include a line
497 item in the budget called "new light construction" so that it is not confused with traditional light
498 replacement.

499

500 Mr. Steele then discussed the request for a temporary, part-time employee to provide sprinkler
501 maintenance in the Parks Department of the City; the employee would work in the spring
502 months. Mr. Chandler stated if the Council is satisfied with the current operations in the Parks
503 Department, this request is not needed; the new employee would help the Parks Department get
504 out in front of sprinkler problems. Mayor Taylor stated it is more of a want than a need and the
505 consensus was to eliminate the \$25,000 request from the budget.

506

507 Mr. Chandler then led the discussion regarding potential changes to the City's utility rate
508 structure. Council Member Urry suggested that the Council reach out to the residents before
509 considering changes to the City's utility rate structure. Council Member Bailey agreed and
510 stated that he does not feel there is urgency to this issue; the Council and Administration need to
511 be very prepared to discuss this issue with the public. Mr. Chandler stated the recommended rate
512 structure would equal a total increase of \$2.42 per household per month. Mayor Taylor stated
513 there was a small increase last year and no one is very happy about a fee increase, but there were
514 no residents that attended the budget hearing to express their concerns regarding the increase.
515 Council Member Bailey agreed and stated that it is important to explain to the residents that the
516 City's debt is minimal and the City did not increase debt for the Public Works Facility project.
517 He added it is important to communicate that it is necessary to eventually fund depreciation.
518 There was then a discussion regarding the fees for garbage and recycling collection with a focus
519 on creating a fee structure that will incentivize use of a recycling can rather than a second
520 garbage can. Council Member Urry stated he feels it would be best to create a forecasting
521 document that will explain to residents how increased revenues will be used and which projects
522 will be accomplished.

523
524 Mr. Chandler concluded the Council needs to adopt a tentative budget and he suggested that a
525 motion be made to approve the tentative budget with the changes that have been discussed
526 tonight. He stated the motion should include a change to the special revenue funds for new street
527 light installation, the new street construction project, and associated fees; increasing second trash
528 can cost to \$18 and decreasing second recycling can cost to \$2.60; transfers of \$125,000 from
529 each of the general fund, water fund, sewer fund, and storm fund to the capital projects fund;
530 increasing the budget for the Public Works Facility Project to \$3,350,000; eliminating the
531 Oaklawn Park Capital Project; eliminating the Sidewalk Project; eliminating the Sleepy Hollow
532 Ditch Project; eliminating the 2550 North Inlet Project; eliminating funding for temporary parks
533 employee; changing \$30,000 street lighting expense from funding for LED lights to new street
534 light construction;

535
536 **Council Member Bailey made a motion to adopt Resolution 09-2014 adopting the 2014-**
537 **2015 tentative budget with the changes as mentioned by Mr. Chandler above. Council**
538 **Member Stoker seconded the motion.**

539
540 **Council Member moved to accept. Council Member seconded the motion.**

541
542 **Voting on the motion:**

543
544 **Council Member Bailey** **aye**
545 **Council Member Satterthwaite** **aye**
546 **Council Member Stoker** **aye**
547 **Council Member Urry** **aye**

548
549 **The motion passed unanimously.**

550
551
552

553 **RDA**

554

555 **1. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING**
556 **THE NORTH OGDEN CITY RDA TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014-**
557 **2015**

558

559 Finance Director Steele provided a brief overview of the RDA budget, noting the only
560 substantial change is transferring money to the aquatic center budget for debt service rather than
561 paying debt service directly from the RDA budget. He reviewed the projected revenues and
562 expenses for the budget and there was a brief discussion regarding potential economic
563 development projects that may be completed with assistance of RDA funding.

564

565 **Board Member Urry made a motion to adopt Resolution 10-2014 adopting the 2014-2015**
566 **tentative RDA budget. Board Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

567

568 **Council Member moved to accept. Council Member seconded the motion.**

569

570 **Voting on the motion:**

571

572 **Council Member Bailey aye**

573 **Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

574 **Council Member Stoker aye**

575 **Council Member Urry aye**

576

577 **The motion passed unanimously.**

578

579 **2. ADJOURNMENT**

580

581 **BUDGET RETREAT/PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY MEETING – CONTINUED**

582

583 **5. DISCUSSION ON COMMITTEES**

584

585 Mayor Taylor distributed a packet of information to each Council Member regarding some of the
586 committees he would like to create or revitalize in the City. The packet included the proposed
587 makeup of each committee including requested participation from Council Members. The
588 Council voiced their desires to participate on the various committees.

589

590 **6. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER THE BUDGET FOR THE PUBLIC**
591 **WORKS FACILITY**

592

593 See above

594

595 **7. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

596

597 There were no public comments.

598

599 **8. CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR, AND STAFF COMMENTS**

600

601 There were no additional comments.

602

603 **9. ADJOURNMENT**

604

605 **Council Member Satterthwaite moved to adjourn. Council Member Stoker seconded the**
606 **motion.**

607

608 **Voting on the motion:**

609

610 **Council Member Bailey aye**

611 **Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

612 **Council Member Stoker aye**

613 **Council Member Urry aye**

614

615 **The motion passed unanimously.**

616

617 **CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION**

618

619 Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance. City Manager Chandler provided the invocation and
620 led the pledge of allegiance.

621

622 **1. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

623

624 There were no public comments.

625

626 **2. INTRODUCTION**

627

628 Mayor Taylor introduced those members in attendance to the intent of this meeting, which is to
629 begin the process of updating the City's General Plan. He provided a brief overview of the
630 process the City will follow and indicated this is a big opportunity for the Mayor, Council, and
631 Planning Commission to forecast the future development of the City.

632

633 **3. MUNICIPAL LAND USE, DEVELOPMENT, AND ANAGEMENT ACT/GENERAL**
634 **PLAN DIRECTION**

635

636 **4. GENERALLY**

637

638 **5. MANDATORY PLAN ELEMENTS**

639

640 **6. OPTIONAL PLAN ELEMENTS**

641

642 **7. WASATCH FRONT LOCAL PLANNING RESOURCE GRANTS**

643

644 **8. GENERAL PLAN SCOPE OF WORK**

645

646 **9. DOWNTOWN PLAN SCOPE OF WORK**

647

648 **10. NEXT STEPS**

649

650 **11. BRAINSTORM "TOPICS WANTING TO ADDRESS"**

651

652 **12. HOW TO INVOLVE PUBLIC INPUT**

645 Planning Director Scott used the aid of a Power Point Presentation to provide the Mayor,
646 Council, and Planning Commission with an overview of the intent and legal requirements for a
647 General Plan.

648
649 Council Member Bailey stated Utah Law indicates General Plans are advisory in nature, but he
650 asked if there are instances in the North Ogden City Code where the General Plan is codified and
651 legally binding. Mr. Scott stated he has not found those instances himself; the General Plan
652 establishes goals and a broad direction and the zoning ordinances of the City are the specific
653 laws that implement the goals of the General Plan. Council Member Bailey stated he has heard
654 of other cities 'getting in trouble' when they do not follow their General Plan and he asked how
655 that can be if the General Plan is advisory in nature. Mr. Scott stated it may not be illegal to act
656 contrary to the General Plan, but it is important to provide consistency in order to validate the
657 document.

658
659 Mr. Scott continued his review of his PowerPoint Presentation and concluded by indicating the
660 City has \$75,000 in the current fiscal year budget to complete General Plan updates and staff has
661 requested an additional \$50,000 to complete the Downtown Plan. He reviewed the goals and
662 strategies of the General Plan and stated the Mayor has asked him to have a strong focus on
663 stakeholder outreach and incorporating feedback into the Plan. Development of a General Plan
664 is ultimately a legislative process and the City Council has the responsibility to adopt the
665 document. He noted the land use inventory was last updated in 1997 and he provided examples
666 of land use used throughout the City and noted staff and the Planning Commission may be
667 recommending some new land use categories to the City Council in the near future. There was a
668 brief discussion regarding the trends in land use and Mr. Scott stated the land use inventory will
669 be a great tool the City can use to identify trends. Council Member Bailey started a discussion
670 regarding the type of software that will be used to track land use inventory and Planning
671 Commission Chairman Thomas stated there is a great software option for this purpose, but he has
672 looked into it and it is somewhat cost prohibitive. He stated that the actual Planning
673 Commission or City Council agendas or action documents can be used by a planning intern to
674 update the land use inventory weekly. Planning Commission Vice-Chairman Waite stated
675 building permits could be used for that purpose as well.

676
677 Planning Commission Chairman Thomas then noted that the intersection of 2600 North and
678 Washington Boulevard does not line up, but the City permitted Wells Fargo Bank to expand their
679 operation, which prohibits any potential for expanding the east side of the intersection to
680 accommodate population and traffic growth. He stated that it would be helpful to identify
681 critical issues like that for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider when dealing
682 with plan review for certain applications. Mr. Scott stated it is critical to identify those types of
683 issues in the General Plan.

684
685 Mr. Scott continued his review of his PowerPoint Presentation and there was a general
686 discussion regarding job creation in the City and County at large as well as the requirement to
687 include a moderate income housing plan in the General Plan. He then discussed potential
688 development and planning for the downtown area of the City, specifically the area between 1700
689 North and 2700 North on Washington Boulevard; it is imperative to identify the geographic
690 boundary of the area that should be considered the downtown area. He reviewed the possible

691 next steps for proceeding with the update of the General Plan and invited discussion regarding
692 his presentation.

693
694 Mayor Taylor inquired as to how long a General Plan update typically takes. He also inquired as
695 to the role of consultant in the update process. Mr. Scott stated he projects it will take eight
696 months to complete the update once a consultant is hired. He noted there are a couple of local
697 planning firms that are very interested in working on the project and the work to be provided by
698 them would be defined in a contract.

699
700 Council Member Satterthwaite asked if Weber State University would have the capacity to work
701 on the General Plan update and he asked how much something like that would cost. Mr. Scott
702 stated the City has hired an intern from Weber State University to perform the land use
703 inventory.

704
705 Planning Commissioner Knight stated the biggest challenge in the update process is to advertise
706 it in a way that citizens are aware of what is happening and can become involved at the onset.
707 Mr. Scott stated there are many resources available to the City to get the word out to the citizens.
708 Planning Commission Chairman Thomas agreed it is difficult to inform the public of these types
709 of issues, mainly because most people are not paying attention to what is happening around
710 them. Council Member Bailey agreed and stated the key is to communicate to residents why
711 they should care what is happening around them. There was a general discussion regarding
712 communication with residents as well as the proposed timeline for completing the update.

713
714 Council Member Bailey asked how the City will determine the deliverables required of the
715 consultant that will be hired for this project. Mr. Scott stated those terms will be negotiated
716 through the development of the contract; staff will recommend a scope to the City Council, but
717 the City Council will make the ultimate decision regarding the responsibilities of both parties.
718 Planning Commissioner Knight stated there are some due diligence things the City can do on its
719 own without paying a consultant and it will be necessary to identify those things. Council
720 Member Bailey stated that throughout this process he would like to identify tools that can be
721 implemented that will prevent the City needing to go through this process again in the future. He
722 suggested that some portions of the Plan be codified and that the Plan is revisited on a more
723 regular basis.

724
725 Mayor Taylor facilitated a brainstorming session regarding prioritization for the goals and
726 strategies for the General Plan. The final list will be provided to the General Plan Update
727 Steering Committee for incorporation into the process.

728
729 The list included:

- 730 Access
- 731 Defined City Center
- 732 Transportation/effective roads and their impact on economic development
- 733 Aesthetically pleasing street designs, particularly on main corridors
- 734 Mixed use developments
- 735 Incorporation of parks and trails into new subdivisions (mandatory versus incentivized)
- 736 Incorporation of trail and park plans into the General Plan

737 Definition of North Ogden City now and in the future: vision statement
738 Home based businesses; neighborhood economic development
739 Job creation
740 Business community growth; business attraction
741 Connection to nearby recreation areas
742 Citizen involvement
743 City branding
744 Improvement of the gateway to the City
745 How much commercial space does the City need at buildout?
746 Implementation of manufacturing and production land uses and job creation – is there space for
747 it?
748 Focus on development of the entire region
749 Inclusion of gathering places in the community
750 High density or multi-family housing
751 Miscellaneous development plans and projects in other communities
752 Advertising and encouraging residents to shop local
753 Incorporation and encouragement of public transit
754
755 Council Member Bailey suggested a consultant may be able to facilitate the generation of a new
756 list with more focused goals or priorities. Mayor Taylor agreed and noted this information will
757 be used to draft the request for proposals (RFP) for a consultant.
758
759 Mayor Taylor asked the group for ideas for encouraging public input. The list of ideas included:
760
761 Town hall or neighborhood meetings in residential homes
762 Place greeting tables at grocery stores to communicate with patrons
763 Place meeting information and announcements at senior center and aquatic center
764 Place a North Ogden planning booth at the Cherry Days celebration
765 Mail-in survey with incentives to participate
766 Contests to encourage participation
767 Provide anonymity for responders
768 Engagement of citizens through the school system
769 Engagement of citizens through corporate community involvement representatives
770
771 There was a brief discussion regarding the timeline for developing the RFP and for holding the
772 next public meetings necessary.
773
774 Mayor Taylor then reported that he would like to schedule the ground breaking event for the
775 Public Works Facility on June 3 at the beginning of the work session meeting. He stated it will
776 be a public event and everyone is invited to attend.
777

778 **13. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

779
780 There were no public comments.
781

782

783 **14. ADJOURNMENT**

784

785 **Council Member Bailey moved to adjourn. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the**
786 **motion.**

787

788 **Voting on the motion:**

789

790 **Council Member Bailey aye**

791 **Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

792 **Council Member Stoker aye**

793 **Council Member Urry aye**

794

795 **The motion passed unanimously.**

796

797 **The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.**

798

799

800

801

802 _____
Brent Taylor, Mayor

803

804

805

806 _____
S. Annette Spendlove, MMC

807 City Recorder

808

809

810 _____
Date Approved