#### 1 NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MINUTES 2 3 January 8, 2013 4 5 The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on January 8, 2013 at 6:30 pm in the North 6 Ogden City Council Chambers at 505 East 2600 North. Notice of time, place and agenda of the meeting 7 was delivered to each member of the City Council, posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office 8 and posted to the Utah State Website on January 4, 2013. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was 9 published in the Standard-Examiner on January 30, 2013. 10 11 PRESENT: Richard G. Harris Mayor 12 Kent Bailey Council Member 13 Wade Bigler Council Member 14 Justin Fawson Council Member 15 Cheryl Stoker Council Member 16 **Brent Taylor** Council Member 17 18 STAFF PRESENT: Ron Chandler City Manager 19 HR Director/City Recorder Annette Spendlove 20 Bryan Steele Finance Director 21 Jon Call City Attorney 22 Craig Barker Community Development Director 23 Mel Blanchard **Public Works Director** 24 Bill Bernard City Treasure 25 26 **VISITORS:** Lyle Adams Spencer Reynolds 27 Kent Christensen Terry Reynolds 28 BJ Johnson Derrick Hadley 29 Kenneth Hubbard Brent Chugg 30 Phillip Swanson Joshua Mackley 31 Orion Walters Kenny Ross 32 Blake Welling Brian Russell 33 Rachel Trotter Dan Nixon 34 35 36 Mayor Harris welcomed those in attendance. 37 38 Mayor Harris offered the invocation and Derrick Hadley led the audience in the Pledge of 39 Allegiance. 40 41 42 **CONSENT AGENDA** 43 44

45

46

- 1. Consideration to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2012 City Council meeting.
- Consideration to approve the minutes of October 2, 2012 City Council meeting. 2.
- 3. Consideration to approve the minutes of December 11, 2012 City Council meeting.
- Consideration to approve the business licenses. 4.

47 48 49

Council Member Bailey moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Council Member Stoker seconded the motion.

**Voting on the motion:** 

Council Member Bailey aye
Council Member Bigler aye
Council Member Fawson aye
Council Member Stoker aye
Council Member Taylor aye

The motion passed unanimously.

### **ACTIVE AGENDA**

### 1. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

There were no public comments.

### 2. <u>DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO ACCEPT THE NORTH OGDEN CITY AUDIT.</u>

Kent Christiansen, City Auditor, reviewed the North Ogden City Audit. He explained page one and two of the report represents their opinion on the financial statements. He said they were able to issue the City a clean opinion. He said the Management Discussion and Analysis (MD & A) on pages three to 16 are prepared and presented by City staff. He said they do not audit the financial statements, but they do render an opinion on the remainder of the financial statements. He stated page 17 is the government wide financial statements, which list a full accrual concept. He said it shows you have a combined unrestricted fund balance of almost 11 million dollars. He said 3.5 million dollars of that is in the government funds and 7.2 million dollars is in the enterprise funds. He said page 18 is designed to show what City activities cost and how they are funded. He said it breaks the activities and functions into government type activities and business type activities. It shows the net cost of those activities and how they are financed. He went over those figures in the City Audit (included in the packet).

Kent Bailey said the RDA has enough funds so it could pay back the loans. He pointed out the general fund balance is under the 18% requirement. He said each of the enterprise funds has a substantial cash balance, which gives operating assets for the future. He said from a net operating perspective the water fund had a loss of about \$200,000, sewer utility had a loss of about \$100,000, storm water fund had a loss of about \$158,000, and solid waste had a net increase of about \$100,000. Kent Bailey asked where those numbers are. Kent Christiansen replied on page 24.

Kent Christiansen said although the numbers were showing operating losses, the water utility, storm water utility, and solid waste utility fund each had an increase of cash during the year. It is primarily due to depreciation not being a cash consuming resource; it is a cost allocation entry that is made into the books. He said although it shows some operating cost deficiencies you still have some growth in your cash balances.

Kent Christiansen said the note disclosures are designed to provide additional information concerning the financial statements. It tells you about depth, fixed assets, and those types of things. He said the remainder of the report is the budget to actual comparisons. He said even though it shows a net decrease it exceeded your budget by an addition \$450,000.

Kent Christiansen said page 49 is a report on internal controls on financial reporting and he found no significant control weaknesses. He said page 50, 51, and 52 deals with State compliance issues. There was one finding this year, which was a couple of departments in the General Fund and in the RDA that exceeded spending that was budgeted.

Mayor Harris asked for a general statement for how things are going. Kent Christiansen said the City's finances are in A shape. He said there are a couple of areas with operating losses, but there is no significant concern. The City is in good financial state. He stated again their opinion is an unqualified opinion.

Council Member Fawson moved to accept the North Ogden City Audit. Council Member Bailey seconded the motion.

### **Voting on the motion:**

Council Member Bailey
Council Member Bigler
Council Member Fawson
Council Member Stoker
Council Member Taylor
aye

The motion passed unanimously.

# 3. CONSIDERATION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ACCESSORY BUILDING SETBACKS IN THE RE-20 ZONE.

Craig Barker reviewed the staff report. He explained that agriculture is allowed in the RE-20 zone. He said there has been some concern with the use of accessory buildings in a lot of the other zones. He said the minimum lot size for an RE-20 zone is twice as big as any other zone in the City except for the HP-3 zone. Craig Barker reviewed the proposed ordinance. He said the second page has been left off the ordinance. It states if the accessory building was going to be up to 25 feet high it would need to have the same set back as a home, which is 10 feet. He said that second part needs to be put in the ordinance before you pass it.

Craig Barker said there were two citizens who spoke at the Planning Commission's public hearing. He said Mr. Stowers will be able to build his accessory building.

Council Member Bailey asked if it is possible for a building, for a lot in an RE-20 zone to have an adjacent lot where we would have a building set three feet from the property line which could be causing line of sight issues or view issues from the adjacent property. Craig Barker replied it certainly is. He said they have never taken into account site issues. He said when the Planning Commission first started looking at this the City had people putting buildings close to the

property lines. He said the City didn't have complaints so much about the bulk of the buildings, it was mainly the height. He said that is why the Planning Commission said if homeowners want to go up in height at least have it setback the same as a house. He said many cities do regulate height because of site issues, but North Ogden City never chose to do so.

Council Member Bailey commented that he appreciates the work the Planning Commission has done on this. He said he is a little frustrated by zoning issues of this type because it is so difficult to foresee every possible situation. He said it would be nice as they are passing something that they do not create a new problem. He said if they create a new problem they will deal with it.

Craig Barker said he expects they will have some requests for changes in the smaller zones. He said the smaller zones are harder to deal with.

Council Member Bigler said if he understands it correctly the ordinance, in past allowed accessory buildings to be 3 feet from the property line unless they were higher than 15 feet. He said this takes care of the problem the way the ordinance was written from 2011. Craig Barker said this amendment clarifies the ordinance. Council Member Bigler said the ordinance is not changing from what it has been other than if the building is taller it will need to be away from the property line. He said they are helping the neighbors out more.

Craig Barker said most people who want the bigger accessory buildings seem to understand that if you go up in height the accessory building needs to be farther away from the property line.

Council Member Bailey clarified that this amendment only applies to the RE-20 zone. Craig Barker replied that is correct and said they did not want to amend all the other zones again. He said if people have issues they can make a request.

Council Member Bailey clarified that there is part of the ordinance that is not here. Craig Barker replied the part of the ordinance is missing that requires accessory buildings over 15 feet to have the same setbacks as a dwelling.

Ron Chandler asked if that part of the ordinance that has blanks spaces. Craig Barker said this ordinance needs to be revised and thinks staff has the wrong ordinance in the packet. Ron Chandler asked if there is a number they should include in that blank. Craig Barker replied no and said that the Planning Commission decided not to do that. Ron Chandler asked how that should be amended. Craig Barker replied they will need to bring back the correct ordinance at the next City Council meeting.

Council Member Bigler stated the large accessory building ordinance not only pertains to the RE-20. Craig Barker stated it pertains to all the zones. Council Member Bigler said if this amendment only pertains to RE-20 they need to correct how that ordinance is written and how it reads with the other ordinances. He said when it was written the ordinance stated if the accessory building was taller than 15 feet then you would need to move it away from the property line. He said this pertained to the 15 feet building height regardless of its square footage, Council Member Bigler said Craig Barker has stated there has been no changes. Council Member Bigler said when the ordinance came back this year you are now saying it is the

square footage. The ordinance contradicts itself. He said his understanding is he thought they were doing it across the board, if not it needs to be changed. Craig Barker said there was an immediate issue with Mr. Stowers. He said they will clean the other ordinances up. He said in this ordinance they want to make clear the set back is three feet for any building that is less than 15 feet high. He said buildings over 15 feet high have the same setbacks as a dwelling.

Council Member Bailey said it is possible for two accessory buildings to be six feet apart on adjacent lots. Craig Barker said the Building Codes requires at least six feet away from buildings.

Council Member Bailey moved to table this item until staff returns with a complete amendment to the ordinance. Council Member Bigler seconded the motion.

### **Voting on the motion:**

Council Member Bailey aye
Council Member Bigler aye
Council Member Fawson aye
Council Member Stoker aye
Council Member Taylor aye

The motion passed unanimously.

### 4. <u>DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN AGREEMENT WITH DIGIS.</u>

Bryan Steele stated there was one addition made to the contract which is page three of the agreement. It was discovered the City has an easement to access the water tanks that goes through different properties. He said Digis would like to put the power for the tower along that easement. It will also be how they would access their tower on City property. He said the City has added an addition clause requiring Digis to work out an easement with the affected property owners before they can proceed with the construction of the tower.

Ron Chandler stated the easement they have is very specific to the water line that comes down to the water tank and it gives the City the ability to access the property and maintain the water line. He said it does not give us the ability to grant that easement to others. He said a property owner contacted him recently and they are interesting in developing the property. He said they spoke with the people from Digis and had the City Attorney add some language to the contract that would allow City Council to pass this agreement if desired. He said it also provides the City with some protection and it also allows Digis to obtain the easement they need to move forward with their project.

Kent Bailey asked where this is located. Bryan Steele replied it is by the Rice Creek water tanks. Ron Chandler added it is above the Mason Cove subdivision.

Council Member Bigler clarified they are only approving their easement and Digis will still need to negotiate with the residents. Ron Chandler confirmed that Digis will need to come to a resolution with the property owners. He said he had met with the property owners and they are

pretty agreeable with things. He thinks they will be good working partners, but the City cannot overstep its boundaries on this.

Council Member Bailey said they have other leases on towers in the area and asked if this lease is on a comparable basis with those. Bryan Steel replied yes, it is \$500 a month and increases 3.5% yearly.

Council Member Taylor commented that he appreciates the change in the contract. It is the best way to put it in the lessee's court to work out an agreement for the easement and not have the City overstep their boundaries. He complimented the staff on a good job for catching that and doing it in a way that respects the property rights of those owners.

Council Member Bigler said he wanted to make sure they were not forcing the hand of the property owners. Ron Chandler replied no, it will be up to Digis. It is also meant to protect the City so that we don't get into hot water. Mayor Harris added this is also so the City does not have to pay the easements.

Ron Chandler said there is a typo on the handout that was provided. On 6.3 it states "cause" and should state "caused". Mayor Harris noted that and said it will be changed.

Council Member Fawson moved to approve agreement A-2013-1 with the changes made to section VI. Council Member Bailey seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Bailey aye
Council Member Bigler aye
Council Member Fawson aye
Council Member Stoker aye
Council Member Taylor aye

The motion passed unanimously.

## 5. <u>DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A TIMELINE FOR THE PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT.</u>

Council Member Taylor said he wanted to bring this item to the City Council regarding the Public Works project as currently being worked on. He said he has attending the Public Works Committee meeting and a financing question has come up and it will be the City Council's responsibility to make some decisions. He said tonight he would like to share a few points on this and see if there is any discussion. He said he hopes to discuss a time line, funding options, and bonding. He said he hopes they can develop some items for staff to research and bring back additional information. He said he is hoping they can give staff some guidance on what things to research and to provide more options.

Council Member Taylor said there are two items in the memo included in the City Council Packet. He referred to page 4. He said this is a basic draft on the time line. He said if they have

a time line for the project that shows the date they are hoping to accomplish different tasks it can guide what the City Council and the Public Works Committee are doing. He said his suggestion is for City Council to come up with a general time line and forward it to the Public Works Committee to refine it. He said it needs to be a collaborative project with the City Council looking at the financial aspects and the Public Works Committee looking at the site, building issues, etc. He said another reason he put this together is it is good to learn from past experiences and mistakes. He said one of the things he felt last year is toward the end of the process things were compressed and hurried. He said as a member of the Public Works Committee last year things felt very rushed, which led to how the project was received. He said he hopes that by having a timeline earlier in the year they will be able to start the project this year. A timeline will allow them to think of the things they need to be doing ahead of time. He said he included a draft showing where some of the tasks may fall, such as the Committee pursuing real estate, identifying the top properties, and sending that to the City Council. He said meanwhile the City Council would be discussing potential bonding options or financial solutions. Council Member Taylor continued going through the time line.

Council Member Taylor brought up that there is a timeline to file for a bond election. He said they would need to file by a certain date and he would like staff to research that date so it can be included on the timeline. If there is going to be a public vote there is an option for a special election in June.

Council Member Bigler said he thinks for sure they need a timeline. Any project you have of any considerable size would have that. He said he would prefer to take the idea of the timeline and include the entire Public Works Committee. He said the bonding issues are strictly the Council's issues. He said the timeline will directly affect the Public Works Committee. He said those helping to develop the timeline should be those that have been asked to complete the project. He said he wouldn't want to go back to them with a timeline. They should involve the Public Works Committee in developing it.

Council Member Bailey said he agrees with Council Member Bigler. He commented that they have an excellent Public Works Committee and there have been some really nice things that have happened there already. He said he doesn't feel a great urgency. He said he knows they need to get a Public Works project underway. He said he thinks it is important for us to develop a timeline, but it is really important for the Public Works Committee to have input. He said there are some areas in which the City Council and the Public Works Committee may have some parallel tasks. He said it would be incumbent on the City Council to identify what those are so that they can be dealing with those.

Council Member Bailey said bonding is a completely different discussion and he proposes that staff provide them with funding options including bonding. He said he would much preferring doing this process without borrowing, if they could do that. He said it may be with some creativity that they can. He said he knows in the past the City has been able to take on some tasks by borrowing from the enterprise funds. He said the discussion as to how they are going to pay for the project needs to come with the Council better informed on what all the options are. He said he proposes that staff prepare the options and alternatives and educate the City Council as to what the pros and cons of each of those are in a future meeting. He said as far as the

timeline he supports Council Member Bigler's suggestion that they give this to the Public Works Committee to help establish a timeline that is doable within the resources they have and they will factor in those parallel activities in the process.

Mayor Harris said this timeline is general enough he would think the City Council can adopt it and leave room for the Public Works Committee to look it over and see if there are any concerns and it can be amended.

Council Member Bigler said he would prefer the Public Works Committee look at it first so they are included in it. He said he thinks the Council needs to be careful and doesn't want any of the Public Works Committee Members to feel they are just there as window dressing because they are very valuable and they have great expertise in these areas. He said he agrees with the things in the timeline, but he would prefer the Public Works Committee take a look at it and make the decision before Council adopts it. He said chances are many may remain quiet if it is already done.

Council Member Fawson said he agrees with Council Member Bigler and Council Member Bailey. He said whether the Public Works Committee wants to use this as a timeline or develop something on their own depends on the Committee but he would rather the recommendation be given by the Committee which has been put together for that purpose. He echoed the things that have been said before. He is not opposed to anything that will help him to be better educated and well informed; anything that staff can put together to help them make a decision is great.

 Council Member Stoker also agreed with allowing the Public Works Committee the chance to look at the timeline objectively and not have so much City Council input. She said she also would like to be educated on all the ways to pay for this. She said she is hoping there is a way to do some funding that will not cost the City and residents a lot of money and they will not have to do bonding on this.

Council Member Taylor suggested the City Council begin creating a timeline in the next few meetings and the Public Works Committee create a timeline of their own for the project side. Once they are both completed they can create an overall larger timeline.

Mayor Harris said the notion that they will have parallel activities taking place is well founded. He said he appreciates Council Member Taylor bringing this up so they are taking care of these kinds of things instead of realizing later on they have missed a step.

Council Member Fawson commented they are all eager to see it (Public Works Facility) move forward and doesn't think any of us want to see this delayed for any reason.

Council Member Bigler asked if they could put on their next agenda to discuss different financing options. He said last year the administration chose the utility bond. He said he would like to discuss with current Council as to why that was deemed best and what the pros and cons are.

Ron Chandler said there are several different types of debt instruments such as the general obligation bonds, utility rates, and sales tax revenue bonds. He said there are experts that go beyond his expertise and they have talked about inviting them to come to a City Council meeting. These experts can talk about the mechanics of each option and discuss the advantages, disadvantages, and timelines associated with them. He said there are things as far as how you are going to do this whether it will be done through a competitive bid or a private bond placement. Ron Chandler said they have already talked about a couple of people they think can give them some outstanding education without the feeling they are being pushed into a sale of a certain type. Council Member Bailey said that would be his concern; that they need to make sure it is someone who is objective. Ron Chandler said there is one firm in particular and they have even identified who in that firm would be a good person because they are very low key and they will not be high pressure on a sales type of thing.

Ron Chandler said the other thing Bryan Steele can work on is a general discussion of where they are financially. He said there was much that came out of the audit report that was not touched on that needs to be discussed, not only with this project but with other capital projects. He said for example Kent Christiansen mentioned the ability they have to pay the amount that was borrowed from the City's other funds for the RDA. He said the RDA borrowed money from all the funds, but mostly the general fund. He said they have not been paying on that for the last three or four years, but they have been able to accumulate enough cash to cover the RDA expenses, which is the debt service on the pool plus the ability to use the cash to pay back those loans. He said there is a lot of discussion Bryan Steele can lead us in as far as where the City is financially.

Council Member Bailey said he felt the discussion on where the City is financially is irrelevant to Kent Christiansen's discussion of the audit. He said he felt they would be able to take care of those issues as they meet in the budget retreat.

Council Member Fawson said from his perspective, the public perception of the utility bond option was that the utility bond was being used because there was no public involvement, there was no bond election. He said they need to be careful when they are sending this message out to the public. They need to be very clear on why they are choosing that bonding option. The equalization of how the expense hits North Ogden residents as well as the people in the County area that live within the City limits is one thing they have to consider. He said not only do they need to be educated; they need to clearly convey that message to the public.

Council Member Bigler agreed and said he thinks discussing the different types of bonds should be done in a City Council meeting rather than a budget retreat.

Council Member Taylor said what Council Member Bigler said makes a lot of sense. He asked if it would be possible to have the bonding discussion in two weeks. He asked if that is adequate time to prepare. Ron Chandler said he thinks so and will follow up and make sure they can get someone here. He said they can get into the details of the budget retreat in the following week, but that still enables them to create a draft timeline by the end of January for the financial side. He said they can ask Brent Chugg when the Public Works Committee will have the project

timeline ready. He said the financial side has impact on things that would have to be done depending on the type of financing that would be use.

Mayor Harris said he thinks the Council needs to understand the original proposal was on a fast track. He said it was felt that interest rates were low and construction costs were low and it was an optimal time to build a much needed new facility. He said they had no idea there would be a recession or the interest rates, bonding rates, construction rates would stay as low as they were for as long as they have. He said they had a professional financial advisor and he was the one to go with utility bonds. He said they always knew they did not have to have an election to do that and that was intended because they were on a fast tract. He said there was never any intention to keep information from the public or to avoid public involvement. He said they made a huge effort in his mind to involve the public and what he has heard from a lot of folks talking are things they tried to do. He said it is easy to talk about public involvement it is a lot harder to get it accomplished. He said he thinks they need to go forward, they need to be positive and understand why some things happened in the past and they did not work for various reasons. He said the underlying cause of this whole thing was the fact that they wanted to take advantage of low interest rates and low construction costs. He said it was felt that it was urgent they do that at the time.

Council Member Bigler said the Public Works Committee is moving forward and it is going very well. He said there are great Committee members and they are brainstorming and coming up with some great things. He said it is moving and taking shape regardless of the issues last year. He said they are moving forward and it will be done for the best possible price.

Council Member Taylor mentioned on page 3 of the timeline he put what the options were. He said after today's discussion there is a fourth option they could add. He said last year in one of the Public Works Facility Committee meeting he had asked if they could use some of the excess funds from the enterprise funds as a loan to the Public Works Facility to reduce the amount of the bond or potentially eliminate the need for a bond entirely. They would have to raise the utility rates to rebuild the fund status but it would be for a shorter time period than paying back a bond and there would be no interest. He asked staff to research the options of a general obligation bond, a utility revenue bond, a savings program, and using funds in the utility funds as a loan and raising utility rates to pay it back. He said borrowing from the utility funds would be paid off a lot sooner and with a lot less interest than a bond.

Council Member Bailey said it seems Ron Chandler has some other options in mind and suggested they listen to those as well.

Council Member Bigler said they want to look at every possible option. He suggested anything they discuss as far as financing this project they discuss it in a public City Council meeting rather than in the budget retreat. Council Member Bailey and Council Member Fawson agreed.

Mayor Harris said they need to have this timeline on the next Public Works Committee meeting agenda and they will discuss various financial tools they can use in their next City Council meeting.

Council Member Bigler said as far as the financial tools, it is great when they can get it, but he realizes that Bryan Steele and Ron Chandler are busy with tasks for the budget retreat. He said he would be fine if they discussed the financial options at the City Council meeting after the retreat. He said they have so much to do he would hate to add more unless they feel they can do it. Ron Chandler said as far as the types of debt instruments they will be fine inviting someone to come to the City Council meeting. He said the other items will come up during the budget retreat.

## 6. <u>DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION REGARDING HOLDING A BOND ELECTION FOR</u> THE PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT.

Mayor Harris stated this agenda item was covered with agenda item 5.

# 7. CONSIDERATION TO ENTER INTO A CLOSED MEETING TO DISCUSS THE PURCHASE OF REAL PROPERTY, AND THE CHARACTER AND PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF AN INDIVIDUAL. §UTAH CODE 52-4-205.

Council Member Bailey moved to enter into a closed meeting to discuss the purchase of real property and the character and professional competence of an individual § Utah Code 52-4-205. Council Member Bigler seconded the motion.

**Voting on the motion:** 

Council Member Bailey aye
Council Member Bigler aye
Council Member Fawson
Council Member Stoker aye

Council Member Taylor aye

The motion passed 4 to 1.

The City Council recesses at 7:41pm and convened in a closed session.

The City Council reconvened in an open session at 8:37pm.

# 8. <u>DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER EXPENDITURES RELATING TO THE PROPOSED PUBLIC WORKS FACITLITY.</u>

Council Member moved to approve \$4000 to be used for earnest money and up to \$25,000 for due diligence on properties they would be making offers on and to authorize the Mayor to negotiate up to \$556,000 on behalf of the City. Council Member Bigler seconded the motion.

Council Member Taylor asked if they can give an explanation for the motion to let the public know what they are doing and there are safeguards in place.

Council Member Bigler agreed and said he would ask Dan Nixon to do the same so it is not misconstrued that they are obligated in buying property because they are not.

Dan Nixon said they are attempting to buy two properties with due diligence for periods that allow us to exclude one of the properties after a period of time. He said the way they are structuring it is so they can due diligence on two properties instead of one to better find the best property. He said they will be able to take care of due diligence at that time.

Council Member Bigler added the due diligence includes the prep work for the property itself to see if there are any problems that would cost the City more. He clarified that they are not purchasing any property at this time. Dan Nixon confirmed and stated that he represents the Public Works Committee. He said he is a licensed realtor and his brokerage is representing the City on a volunteer basis. He said legally he wanted to declare that and divulge. He said having two properties under contract instead of one is an advantage to the City in having an opportunity to look at them and have a hard number and a good comparison. He said both sites are in his opinion feasible and will be functional in building this building.

Cheryl Stoker asked if once a decision has been made on a property, they will lose any of that money. Dan Nixon replied no, not up through the first due diligence period. He said both property owners know that and they know the City can withdraw their offer and have the City's money refunded during that first period of time no matter what the reason. He said that keeps it so the City can have the property tied up to prevent it from being sold out from under the City.

Council Member Bigler clarified the City will be putting \$2000 on each of the properties just so they don't sell them and it will allow the City to take 60 days to look at them and evaluate the land and so forth. If they decide not to purchase it they will get the entire \$2000 back. Dan Nixon confirmed and added it is similar to an option agreement. Council Member Bigler clarified the City Council will need to vote on any expenditures in a public meeting. Dan Nixon confirmed and added that he would like the City Council to know the Public Works Committee is not finished looking at other properties. He said they will continue to due diligence on other properties besides the two they would like to go into contract with.

Council Member Taylor thanked Dan Nixon and said it is important to have this discussion to note they are being careful in how they look at property. He said in the way this is put together the City will be able to do that work to see what the other costs may be while still having the option to get that property. He said this is a wise approach.

### Voting on the motion:

Council Member Bailey
Council Member Bigler
Council Member Fawson
Council Member Stoker
Council Member Taylor
aye

#### The motion passed unanimously.

### 9. PUBLIC COMMENTS.

There were no public comments.

#### **10.** CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR, AND STAFF COMMENTS.

571 572 573

574

575

Council Member Bailey said he would like to thank Dan Nixon for his service on the Public Works Committee and for volunteering his professional services and expertise on behalf of the City. He said he spoke with Brett Chugg and he had spoken with a number of others who have volunteered their time and professional services to help the City.

576 577 578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

Council Member Fawson said he thinks Dan Nixon and Council Member Bigler have done some awesome work. He said he is really excited about the options the City has and thinks residents will be also. He mentioned that he had been talking to Tiffany Staheli about the option of having a ski program for the youth that is part of their recreation program. He said she has reached out to some of the local resorts. He said many of their neighboring cities and some of the cities along the Wasatch front partner with resorts to offer this type of ski or snowboard education to their youth. He said they typically do it on a short school day and bus them to resorts to give them lessons. He said obviously they negotiate pricing with the resort to offer a reduced rate to the kids. He said Tiffany Staheli has done some research on that and he would like to present that to the City Council at a future date.

586 587 588

589

590

591

592

593 594

595

596

597

Council Member Bigler thanked Dan Nixon and everyone. He said in different steps along the way there will be different expertise that will be shown. He said he appreciates working with Dan Nixon on this. He said they are not prepared at this time to talk about everything that is in the works but it is exciting and moving along. He said there are some in the community they have talked to that are willing to use their expertise to help the City with various parts of the project, which will save the City money in various areas as well. He said he wanted to mention that both his 7<sup>th</sup> grade and his 9<sup>th</sup> grade daughters have said their new principal is awesome, he is young and he understands them. He said about a week later they told him that their new principal is Mayor Harris's son. He said he thought that was pretty cool and wanted to pass that along and congratulate Mayor Harris and his wife for raising a good boy. Mayor Harris thanked him and said he thinks that is one reason he is where he is because he can get along with kids. He said he is a good kid and thanked Council Member Bigler.

598 599 600

Council Member Stoker said she thinks they had a good discussion tonight and things are moving forward with the Public Works Committee. She said it is exciting and they are moving forward. She thanked Dan Nixon.

602 603 604

605

606

607

608

609

601

Council Member Taylor commented on the audit and said they have it done once a year by an outside auditing firm. He said it is good to know they have an outside professional looking at their procedures and accounts. He said North Ogden City is in good financial shape and given the economic conditions he would say the City is in excellent financial shape. He said that is attributed to staff, Mayor, City Council, and many years of staff and Council who have gotten North Ogden City to this point. He said it is important they have that audit and it shows the City is in good financial shape, which is great to know because it leaves a lot of options open for their future.

610 611 612

Mayor Harris echoed the thanks that have already been stated.

613

#### 11. ADJOURNMENT.

614 615 616

Council Member Fawson moved to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Stoker seconded the motion.

- 619 **Voting on the motion:**
- 620 **Council Member Bailey** aye
- 621 **Council Member Bigler** aye

622	Council Member Fawson	aye
623	<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	aye
624	Council Member Taylor	aye
625		
626	The motion passed unanime	ously.
627		
628	The meeting adjourned at 8:	50 pm.
629		
630		
631		
632	Richard G. Harris, Mayor	
633		
634		
635		
636	S. Annette Spendlove, MMC	
637	City Recorder	
638		
639		
640	Date Approved	