

47 Blake Welling, 1098 E. 3100 N., stated he is present to hear the discussion about the potential
48 Monroe Boulevard extension. He noted it has been a contentious issue in the past but he does
49 not understand a lot of the complaints expressed by other residents; many have suggested
50 improving Mountain Road or another easterly route rather than extending Monroe Boulevard,
51 but he does not feel that is a reasonable way to address the traffic issues in the City. He stated he
52 feels Monroe Boulevard is a good solution because it is located fairly close to Washington
53 Boulevard and can alleviate some of the traffic congestion on that road. He noted an additional
54 concern is how the road would impact elementary schools located along the corridor, but he does
55 not feel that concern is warranted because schools have been located on main roads for some
56 time and somehow they are functional. He stated he feels the project is a good choice and has
57 been kept on the long-range plan because it is a viable option to alleviate traffic on busier roads.
58
59

60 **2. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER ACCEPTING AN ANNEXATION**
61 **APPLICATION FROM GRACE HANCOCK AND BRENT H. GRIFFITHS TO START THE**
62 **PROCESS FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1853 N WASHINGTON**
63 **BLVD.**
64

65 A memo from City Recorder Spendlove explained Grace Hancock and Brent H. Griffiths submitted an
66 application petitioning for annexation for 1.560 acres located at approximately 1853 Washington Blvd.,
67 North Ogden, Utah. The annexation process requires the City Council to accept the petition for
68 annexation so that we can start the process. Weber County Surveyor has reviewed the annexation plat
69 map and made some minor changes (Exhibit A) and those were corrected on (Exhibit B). This piece of
70 property is within North Ogden City Annexation Declaration Policy (Exhibit C). The petitioner is
71 requesting a C2 (Commercial zone) which the Planning Commission will give a recommendation for at a
72 later date. The memo concluded by noting it is Ms. Spendlove's recommendation that the Council accept
73 the petition for further processing.
74

75 Ms. Spendlove reviewed her staff memo and used the aid of a map to identify the location of the subject
76 property.
77

78 **Council Member Urry moved to accept an annexation application from Grace Hancock**
79 **and Brent H. Griffiths to start the process for property located at approximately 1853 N.**
80 **Washington Boulevard. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**
81

82 **Voting on the motion:**
83

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

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

93 **3. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER ACCEPTING AN ANNEXATION**
94 **APPLICATION FROM LYMAN BARKER TO START THE PROCESS FOR**
95 **PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 850 E 2100 N**
96

97 A staff memo from City Recorder Spendlove explained Lyman C. Barker and Lonnie C. Barker submitted
98 an application petitioning for annexation for 0.274 acres located at approximately 850 E 2100 N North
99 Ogden, Utah. The annexation process requires the City Council to accept the petition for annexation so
100 that we can start the process. Weber County Surveyor has reviewed the annexation plat map and made
101 some minor changes (Exhibit A) and those were corrected on (Exhibit B). This piece of property is within
102 North Ogden City Annexation Declaration Policy (Exhibit C). The petitioner is requesting an RE - 12.5
103 (Residential Zone) which the Planning Commission will give a recommendation for at a later date. The
104 memo concluded by noting it is Ms. Spendlove's recommendation that the Council accept the petition for
105 further processing.
106

107 Ms. Spendlove reviewed her staff memo and used the aid of a map to identify the location of the subject
108 property. There was a brief discussion regarding the reasoning behind the proposed annexation, with a
109 focus on how the property will be incorporated into a six-lot subdivision located on property adjacent to
110 the subject property.
111

112 **Council Member Bailey moved to accept an annexation application from Lyman Barker to**
113 **start the process for property located at approximately 850 E. 2100 N. Council Member**
114 **Fawson seconded the motion.**
115

116 **Voting on the motion:**
117

118 **Council Member Bailey** aye
119 **Council Member Fawson** aye
120 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye
121 **Council Member Stoker** aye
122 **Council Member Urry** aye
123

124 **The motion passed unanimously.**
125
126

127 **4. PROCLAMATION FOR MAYOR'S SERVICE DAY ON APRIL 1, 2014**
128

129 Mayor Taylor reported the Center for National and Community Service in cooperation with the National
130 League of Cities and Towns and the Utah Commission on Volunteerism and Service sponsors an annual
131 National Day of Service; the State Office of Volunteerism has asked the City to adopt a proclamation
132 recognizing the volunteers in the community that do so much for the City, schools, and other important
133 institutions. He summarized the intent of the proposed proclamation.
134

135 Ms. Spendlove read the proclamation for the meeting record. Mayor Taylor then stated he has talked
136 about his desire to create a volunteer committee during past meetings and he has met with several
137 community members regarding their ability to participate in such a committee that would provide positive
138 benefits and impacts to the City and the community as a whole. He again asked the Council to think of
139 people that may be willing to serve on the committee and provide oversight and management of the
140 members and some of the potential volunteer project opportunities.
141

142 Council Member Fawson stated he sees volunteerism as a critical component to the success of the City; it
143 allows the City representatives to focus on the proper role of government while giving the volunteers an
144 opportunity to serve. Mayor Taylor agreed and stated volunteerism helps to create or improve community
145 pride. Council Member Satterthwaite agreed and stated people take ownership of a project when they
146 volunteer to assist in bringing a project to completion. He noted volunteerism is a hallmark of the Utah
147 culture and he used the Salt Lake Olympics as a great example of a time that volunteerism in the State
148 was very successful.
149

150
151 ****Council Member Fawson was excused from the meeting at 7:06 p.m.****
152

153 154 **AGENDA – WORK SESSION**

155
156 Mayor Taylor reported this meeting has been organized to discuss transportation issues in the City; the
157 format of the meeting will facilitate the discussion of current and future transportation needs of the City
158 and he thanked City Manager Chandler for his work to assemble the agenda for the meeting and for
159 inviting representatives of other transportation agencies to participate in the discussion. He then briefly
160 reviewed the agenda for the work session and provided a brief explanation of the intent of each agenda
161 item.
162

163 **1. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

164
165 Val Halford, representing the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), provided the Council with a
166 summarized version of the WFRC 2040 plan, which includes a focus on population growth along the
167 Wasatch Front through 2040. He noted the plan is updated every four years and a comprehensive update
168 will be completed by May 2015. He then referenced Utah's Unified Transportation Plan and stated it
169 includes all transportation plans and projects for the entire State of Utah.
170

171 Mayor Taylor inquired as to the North Ogden transportation projects that are included in the regional
172 plan. Mr. Halford referenced a phasing map to identify planning for projects including the connection of
173 Mountain Road to Interstate-15 and the Monroe Boulevard project. He also indicated there are plans to
174 continue the Front Runner line from North Ogden further north to Brigham City. WFRC has met with
175 representatives of North Ogden to identify specific transportation needs. Mayor Taylor explained the
176 prioritization and phasing of transportation projects in the City and clarified that the projects are
177 dependent upon available funding.
178

179 Council Member Stoker asked if Mountain Road will be widened. Mr. Halford answered yes and noted
180 widening the road south of North Ogden City is an improvement specified in the project description.
181 There was a brief discussion regarding the sections of the road that will be widened, with a focus on the
182 operational improvements that will be made to Mountain Road on the portion of the road that runs
183 through North Ogden.
184

185 Council Member Bailey inquired as to the City's current representation on the WFRC. Mayor Taylor
186 stated the WFRC is composed of elected officials of the cities and counties that participate; there are four
187 representatives in Weber County – two Mayors and two County Commissioners. Each year the Mayors
188 and County Commissioners determine who the County's representatives should be so there is regular
189 turnover in that representation. He added there are sub-committees that are made up of a bigger group of
190 representatives and they meet to discuss specific transportation issues.
191

192 Mr. Chandler asked Mr. Halford to discuss the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). Kip
193 Billings, WFRC Representative, provided a brief overview of the makeup of the STIP and noted it is
194 reviewed annually and cities have the opportunity to recommend needed transportation projects for
195 inclusion in the plan. He noted there are three funding sources for projects included in the STIP: surface
196 transportation program (STP); condition mitigation and air quality (CMAC) funding; and transportation
197 alternatives program (TAP) funding. Mr. Chandler noted that in order for the City to receive federal
198 transportation funding, a project must be included in the STIP. Mayor Caldwell inquired as to the length
199 of time it could take for the City to receive approval of funding for any given project. Mr. Billings stated
200 some projects have been seeking funding approval for 10 to 15 years while others receive funding the first
201 year a request is made. He noted the STIP is updated each year and funding is programed for eligible
202 projects each year; cities could expect to wait at least five years for funding of a project.
203

204 Council Member Urry inquired as to the committee that oversees the STIP. Mr. Billings stated the
205 TransCom committee works on the STIP and forwards it to the WFRC for final approval.
206

207 Mr. Chandler then provided the Council with information on various transportation project funding
208 options, with a focus on the comparison of state funding versus federal funding sources.
209

210 Pleasant View Mayor Toby Mileski then provided the Council with information regarding their
211 transportation plan and their plans for funding their portion of the Skyline Drive extension
212 through their City. Pleasant View has received \$300,000 for the environmental impact report
213 and they have worked on the alignment design for the project; funding is anticipated in 2015 and
214 2016 for right-of-way acquisition. He then identified the three phases of the project and noted
215 there is the potential for land on either side of the road to develop, which could assist in paying
216 for the project. The road will consist of an 80-foot right-of-way, which will provide for one lane
217 in each direction and a center or turn lane; it will also contain a wide shoulder with a six-foot
218 bike lane and pedestrian access. There was a general discussion regarding the coordination of
219 the Pleasant View portion of the project and North Ogden's Mountain Road and 2600 North
220 improvement project. Council Member Bailey asked if the project is a high priority for Pleasant
221 View, to which Mayor Mileski answered yes and he reiterated that the City has more funding
222 potential because of the opportunity for vacant land along either side of the road to be developed,
223 which will provide impact fee revenues and other funding sources.
224

225 Council Member Bailey asked if the northern portion of 450 East was designed and engineered
226 to accommodate the kind of widening that is needed in the future or if it will be necessary to
227 acquire property to preserve that corridor. City Engineer Hartvigsen stated an 80 foot corridor
228 has been preserved, but the widening project will require more space than that and it will likely
229 be necessary to acquire additional property. Council Member Bailey stated that any future
230 development along that street should be done with the future project in mind.
231
232

233 **2. NORTH OGDEN'S 2008 TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

234

235 Vern Keeslar, whose firm prepared the 2008 Transportation Plan, provided the Council with an
236 overview of the components of the plan and the issues that were considered in development of
237 the plan, with a focus on the projected growth of the City as well as the prioritization of projects
238 included in the Plan. He noted Washington Boulevard is a challenge from a safety perspective; it
239 should have an accident rating of 2.5, but the actual rating is somewhere between 5 and 7

240 depending on the segment under consideration. He stated Washington Boulevard is a State road
241 and the State should definitely be considering upgrades to the road. He then reinforced some of
242 the suggestions made regarding including a road project in the WFRC 2040 Plan as well as the
243 STIP. He stated Monroe Boulevard needs to be connected throughout the City to alleviate traffic
244 issues in the City. He briefly reviewed needed intersection improvements throughout the City as
245 well as functional classification of the City's roads. He used the aid of a map to identify the
246 location of arterial, major collector, collector, and local streets throughout the City. There was a
247 brief discussion regarding orienting development in a manner that limits the number of lots that
248 front a main street. There was also a discussion about the multiple street projects included in the
249 plan, with a focus on the need for a strict street maintenance program in the City to ensure that it
250 is not necessary to increase the number of projects. Mr. Keeslar referenced street maintenance
251 fees and transportation impact fees charged by other government entities. He concluded he will
252 be happy to help the City enhance or update its current plan to focus on new or additional
253 transportation needs. The Mayor and Mr. Keeslar then engaged in a conversation regarding
254 limitations on impact fee collection, comparing the funding source to other funding sources like
255 transportation utility fees. Mr. Keeslar stated the City is likely not allotted a sufficient amount of
256 B&C Road fund to complete needed capital projects in the City.

257 258 259 **3. CORRIDOR PRESERVATION** 260 261

262 Doug Larsen, representing Weber County, noted he has been asked to discuss corridor preservation and
263 he noted his office manages the local transportation funds for Weber County, which is comprised of two
264 funding sources – one is corridor preservation funding and the revenues for that funding are generated by
265 the \$10 fee each resident pays when registering or renewing the registration for a vehicle; the second
266 funding source is a percentage of sales tax revenues. Right-of-way or corridor preservation funds can
267 only be used for that purpose, while sales tax funds can be used for construction, design, engineering, and
268 right-of-way acquisition. The funds are held by UDOT and they have limited oversight relative to how
269 communities acquire rights-of-way and that is good because it reduces the liability of the City. Corridor
270 preservation funds have been generated in Weber County since 2008 and the local Council of
271 Governments (COG) prioritizes how the funds may be spent; the only projects funds can be distributed to
272 are those on the long range plan. He reviewed the application process a City must follow when
273 submitting for funding for corridor preservation. North Ogden applied for corridor preservation funds for
274 Monroe Boulevard a couple of years ago and the \$2 million has been programmed through 2015; the
275 County needs to understand the progress of the project in order to continue the funding into the future.

276
277 Mayor Taylor asked Mr. Larsen to discuss how corridor preservation funds can be used. Mr. Larsen
278 stated there is a requirement that the City contract with a certified acquisition agent and that the City only
279 use UDOT approved appraisers; if a title company is used, they must be UDOT approved as well. He
280 stated these requirements are in place because of some difficult lessons the County has learned over the
281 past several years. There was a discussion about some liabilities the City would assume if these policies
282 and procedures are not followed relative to corridor preservation. Mr. Larsen then noted the consultant
283 will ensure that the property owner is provided with all information relating to their property rights and
284 they prepare an acquisition package that is ultimately presented to the County for submittal to UDOT,
285 who will then issue the check for the property acquisition. Council Member Urry asked who negotiates a
286 purchase price for the acquisition of a property. Mr. Larsen stated there is no negotiation and, by law,
287 funding is authorized up to appraised value of the property. The funds cannot be used for imminent
288 domain. The property owner has the right to reject an appraisal and request an additional appraisal. The

289 property owner could also escalate the issue to the State Property Rights Ombudsman and request a third
290 appraisal. The consultant presents the initial offer based upon the appraisal. There was a discussion
291 regarding the process for selecting a consultant and appraiser, after which there was a discussion
292 regarding whether entities are required to provide matching funds for projects for which they are seeking
293 corridor preservation funding.
294

295 Mayor Taylor asked if a landowner is allowed to continue to use their property after the right-of-way
296 acquisition. Mr. Larsen stated those issues can be negotiated upon the purchase of property. The
297 acquiring entity is legally obligated to maintain the property after it is purchased, but it is possible to enter
298 into an agreement relative to the landowners continued maintenance of the property. There was a
299 discussion about the properties the City would need to acquire in order to complete the Monroe Boulevard
300 connection project, with a focus on developable portions of property that are within the potential corridor
301 and whether a property owner would be required to dedicate a portion of their property to the construction
302 of the road with no compensation. This was followed by a discussion regarding the manner in which a
303 property is appraised and Council Member Bailey asked what would happen if a given property refuses to
304 sell their property for corridor preservation. Mr. Larsen stated the project may be halted by that situation,
305 though there are options in the State of Utah for property taking and different funding sources would be
306 needed for that type of option.
307

308

309 **4. NORTH OGDEN PROJECTS**

310

311 **A. SKYLINE DRIVE**

312 **B. MONROE BLVD**

313 **C. WASHINGTON BLVD**

314 **D. FRUITLAND DRIVE AND 2100 NORTH INTERSECTION**

315 **E. ELBERTA DRIVE**
316

317

318 Mr. Chandler led a discussion regarding prioritizing the projects listed above, asking the Council to come
319 to a consensus regarding how to move forward on any of the given projects. He noted the Skyline Drive
320 project is on the City's transportation plan for completion by 2015, but it is in the STIP to be completed
321 by 2020 and that is much more realistic. He then referenced the Monroe Boulevard project and identified
322 the next steps in the construction process and stated the project is in the STIP to be completed between
323 2031 and 2040; it is in the City's plan to be completed between 2026 and 2040. He also referenced the
324 properties located along the potential Monroe Boulevard corridor and identified the land use designation
325 called for on those properties, noting the General Plan calls for low density residential development in the
326 area. There was then a focus regarding the point on the road where it would connect North Ogden to
327 Ogden City; Mr. Chandler referenced some features that can be added to the road that would serve as
328 traffic calming features. There was a discussion regarding the impact Monroe Boulevard could have on
329 schools near the corridor and Mr. Chandler stated the Council and Administration can consider all options
330 for getting students across the street when designing the project. Mr. Chandler then referenced the project
331 to improve the intersection of Fruitland Drive and 2100 North. There are three options for addressing the
332 problems at the intersection and he used the aid of a map to review the optional designs; the most viable
333 design is a round-about intersection. There was a general discussion regarding the potential impact the
334 project could have on properties and existing homes at the intersection, with Mr. Chandler noting this
335 project could be driven by development of the area. Council Member Stoker led a discussion regarding
336 safety issues and limited visibility at this intersection and at other intersections in the area with Fruitland
337 Drive and Mountain Road.

338

339 Mr. Chandler then referenced the Washington Boulevard, or 450 East, project; it calls for the widening of
340 the street between 2700 North and 3100 North; this would be a very expensive project because it would

340 require property acquisition on both sides of the road. The project is listed in the first or second phase of
341 the City's transportation plan. There was a general discussion about the financial and political
342 implications of the project and Mayor Taylor noted many of the other potential projects listed in the
343 transportation plan would create much less turmoil, while still alleviating traffic problems in the City.
344 Mr. Chandler then referenced a potential project to widen 3100 North; he stated he is not positive that this
345 project is necessary and noted it would also require a significant amount of property acquisition to
346 complete the project. He highlighted the current width and layout of the road and noted he believes it will
347 be possible to include a center turning lane in the road as it is presently constructed. He concluded the
348 final project listed on the project list for discussion this evening is the Elberta Drive project. Mr.
349 Hartvigsen provided an overview of the components of the project and there was a general discussion
350 about the various design projects that are geared towards improving safety in the area. Mayor Taylor
351 stated the design is purely conceptual at this point and noted there has not been a lot of discussion about
352 property acquisition. High level discussion regarding various design options ensued. Mr. Chandler
353 concluded the Administration is grateful for input from the Council regarding the needed transportation
354 projects in the City; the input will be used in proceeding with drafting an update to the transportation
355 plan. Mayor Taylor stated the Council should be thinking about options for funding some of the projects
356 they may view as high priorities. Mr. Chandler stated he would like to start the process to select a right-
357 of-way acquisition expert for the Monroe Boulevard project and he asked for permission to draft a
358 contract for the Council to consider. Council Members Stoker and Urry stated they felt that would be a
359 good idea. Mr. Hartvigsen noted it is also important to identify sensitive properties along the potential
360 corridor to ensure that the City is not purchasing property that the road cannot be built upon; these types
361 of properties include historical properties or properties with environmental issues, such as wetlands. He
362 stated he did not believe there are any of those properties in that area, but it is best to have a clear
363 understanding that is the case. Mayor Taylor stated he feels the most important transportation projects in
364 the City are the Monroe Boulevard project and the Washington Boulevard widening project; there are
365 many issues to consider, such as funding, but he is hopeful to receive direction regarding the prioritization
366 of the needed projects in the City. Council Member Bailey stated he believes the Skyline Drive project
367 will be completed as development occurs in the City and he feels the highest priorities are addressing the
368 intersection at 2100 North and Fruitland Drive as well as the problems on 2800 North. He stated the City
369 will ultimately be responsible for funding those projects independently. Mr. Hartvigsen agreed and noted
370 he feels the Washington Boulevard widening project will be very expensive and property acquisition may
371 be difficult; the City should seek grant funding for that project.

372
373 Mayor Taylor then summarized his understanding of the outcome of the discussion; the City will pursue
374 the addition of the widening of the northern portion of Washington Boulevard to the Regional
375 Transportation Plan; the City will pursue right-of-way funding for the Washington Boulevard and Skyline
376 Drive project; the City will explore possibilities to re-phase the Monroe Boulevard project and to fund it;
377 the City will work to identify funding options for the 2100 North and Fruitland Drive project as well as
378 the intersection of 2850 North and Elberta Drive (this project may be eliminated upon a final decision to
379 widen Washington Boulevard).

380
381 Council Member Bailey asked if Pleasant View City is using WACOG funding for corridor preservation
382 for their portion of the Skyline Drive project. Mr. Chandler answered yes, but the funding has not been
383 allocated yet. There was a general discussion about the project and the fact that truck traffic in Pleasant
384 View will be prohibited on Elberta Drive beginning April 15 and traffic will be routed to other major
385 streets in the area.

386
387 Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would like to have more detailed discussions regarding funding
388 for the various transportation projects in the future budget meetings. There was a general discussion
389 regarding potentially considering implementing a street maintenance fee that would be charged monthly

390 to each household in the City. Mr. Hartvigsen stated it is also important to reevaluate the City's impact
391 fees to determine if the transportation impact fee is appropriate.

392
393

394 **5. QUESTIONS**

395

396 There were no questions.

397

398 **6. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

399

400 A resident, no name or address given, stated he would recommend that the Council proceed with the
401 recommendation made earlier in the meeting regarding the relocation of the stop sign at the intersection of
402 1050 E. 3250 N. Mr. Chandler stated sign placement is regulated by municipal uniform traffic laws. He
403 noted the intersection is angled and the stop sign is located in a manner that complies with those laws.
404 There was a general discussion regarding the most appropriate orientation of the sign and Mr. Chandler
405 stated he will continue to research whether the relocation of the sign is permitted.

406

407 Duane Parker, 777 E. 3000 N., stated he understands the need for Monroe Boulevard, but personally he
408 objects to the road being constructed through his property; an 80 foot road would take the eastern 80-feet
409 of his property and a portion of his garage. He noted he would have serious doubts about selling his
410 property and he feels his neighbors to the south would feel the same. He stated he was interested to learn
411 that condemnation cannot be used for these types of projects. Mayor Taylor stated his plan is to be as
412 "above board" as possible throughout the entire project and landowners will be invited to be very
413 involved in the entire process to design and determine the location of the road.

414

415

416 **7. CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR AND STAFF COMMENTS**

417

418

419 **8. ADJOURNMENT**

420

421 **Council Member Urry moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Satterthwaite**
422 **seconded the motion.**

423

424 **The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.**

425

426

427

428 _____
Brent Taylor, Mayor

429

430

431

432 _____
S. Annette Spendlove, MMC
433 City Recorder

434

435

436 _____
Date Approved