

NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

January 6, 2015

The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on January 6, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. in the North Ogden City Council Chambers at 505 East 2600 North. Notice of time, place and agenda of the meeting was delivered to each member of the City Council, posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on January 5, 2015. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on December 21, 2014.

PRESENT:	Brent Taylor	Mayor
	Kent Bailey	Council Member
	Lynn Satterthwaite	Council Member
	Cheryl Stoker	Council Member
	Phillip Swanson	Council Member
	James Urry	Council Member
STAFF PRESENT:	Bryan Steele	Finance Director/City Administrator
	Gary Kerr	Building Official
	Susan Richey	Building Permit Technician
	Kevin Warren	Police Chief
	Jeff Diamond	Pool Manager
VISITORS:	Blake Welling	Bill Bernard
	Sherry Bernard	Steve Rasmussen
	Tom Baguley	Rachel Trotter

Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 18, 2014 CITY COUNCIL MINUTES**
- 2. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 2, 2014 CITY COUNCIL MINUTES**
- 3. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 9, 2014 CITY COUNCIL MINUTES**

Council Member Satterthwaite stated he was not present during the December 9, 2014 City Council meeting, but the minutes indicate he was present. He recommended correction of the minutes.

Council Member Bailey moved to approve the consent agenda with the recommended changes to the December 9, 2014 minutes. Council Member Swanson seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Bailey	aye
Council Member Satterthwaite	aye
Council Member Stoker	aye
Council Member Swanson	aye
Council Member Urry	aye

The motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION AGENDA

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Bill Bernard, 176 W. 3275 N., stated he saw there will be discussion about the City's winter parking ordinance. He stated he would recommend loosening the ordinance or loosening enforcement. He stated when he is trying to get his car out of the garage, he sometimes moves his son's car onto the street and it would be nice to not have to worry about immediately moving it back into the driveway on a sunny day or when there is no threat of snow. He stated that currently the City ordinance prohibits on-street parking throughout the entire winter season, but he thinks that on-street parking should be allowed when the weather is nice.

Steve Rasmussen, 1092. E. 3250 N., stated he likes the new Smith's Marketplace store and he knows it brings revenue to the City, but it is also creating some traffic problems in the area. He stated that when waiting to turn into the Smith's parking lot off of Washington Boulevard, the wait can be very long; also if there is enough traffic, some thru traffic stops in the intersection on a red light and blocks the turning lane. He suggested a turn arrow be added to the traffic signal to improve traffic in the area and allow those turning to do so without waiting much too long. He acknowledged Washington Boulevard is the responsibility of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and he suggested the City inform them of the dangerous nature of the intersection. He then addressed the entrance/exit near the credit union and stated it is impossible to make a left turn from that point and it may be necessary to conduct a traffic survey to see how that issue can be addressed, possibly by installing a new traffic signal. He stated there are some times during the day when traffic is not a problem, but during rush hour access to the Smith's site is very problematic.

Mayor Taylor noted City Administration is very aware of the problem and they have informed UDOT of the problem; UDOT has committed to conduct a traffic study at the intersection and will report back by the end of January regarding whether left turn arrows at the traffic signal are justified. Chief Warren agreed and noted that if improvements are made to the traffic signal, he is hopeful it will be configured in the same manner as the traffic signal at 2600 North and Washington Boulevard. The Council engaged in a general discussion regarding the problematic

traffic in the area of Smith's, with Chief Warren indicating his Department will continue to monitor the situation.

Mr. Rasmussen then echoed Mr. Bernard's comments regarding the winter parking ordinance; he stated that his children park his cars on the street regularly and it would be nice to not have to worry about on-street parking on good weather days during the winter months.

Blake Welling, 1098 E. 3100 N., stated Section 8-4 of the City Code contains the ordinance regarding snow and ice removal from sidewalks. He stated that as a runner he prefers to run on the sidewalk, but during the winter months the sidewalks are often not clear; the City ordinance states that all snow and ice must be removed from sidewalks promptly and effectively. He stated that over the past week he has noticed that most sidewalks in the City are still covered in snow. He added that on 3100 North where the canal cuts across to Washington Boulevard, that stretch of sidewalk is never cleared. He wondered why the City creates ordinances if they are not going to be enforced; if the ordinances are not going to be enforced they should be eliminated.

Council Member Satterthwaite suggested that the Code Enforcement Officer be made aware of the situation. Building Official Kerr noted that in the past the City has enforced the sidewalk issue based upon complaints. Mayor Taylor stated that he will follow-up with the Code Enforcement Officer regarding his capacity to enforce the ordinance regarding snow removal from sidewalks.

2. DISCUSSION CONCERNING WINTER PARKING

A memo from Mayor Taylor explained that per requests from the City Council, City Administration would like to have a discussion during January regarding the winter parking ordinance and its enforcement. Items for discussion include:

- Use of warnings vs. tickets
- Holidays and out-of-town visitors
- Timeframes for enforcement

Currently our ordinance is written as a general prohibition on parking on city streets overnight during the winter months, regardless of whether or not it is currently snowing. Additionally, we also prohibit all parking on streets, regardless of the hour, during a snowstorm or within 24 hours after the end of a snowstorm. Here is the key portion of our ordinance:

A. Prohibited Parking:

1. It is unlawful for the owner of any vehicle to park his or her vehicle, or allow his or her vehicle to be parked, on any public street or roadway in the city between the hours of twelve o'clock (12:00) midnight and six o'clock (6:00) A.M. from November 15 through March 15 of each year, except for physicians or emergency vehicles in emergency situations.
2. It is unlawful for the owner of any vehicle to park his or her vehicle, or allow his or her vehicle to be parked, on any public street or roadway in the city during any snowstorm or within twenty four (24) hours following the cessation of snow after any snowstorm.

During the recent storm we had a lot of vehicles parked on the street, both overnight and during the day of the storm itself. Mayor Taylor was out with the plow teams several times on

Christmas Day and again on Dec 28 and there were a lot of vehicles on the roads in both cases. His memo included photographs that he took of vehicles parked in the street:



The problem with these cars is that they leave a large unplowed area once they are moved, which often goes unplowed because the plow trucks do not return if the storm has ended. These areas often become icy and slick. The challenge is finding the right balance on when to enforce the ordinance, because enforcement during a snowstorm itself is often a challenge because the police are tied up with more important calls (traffic accidents, slide-offs, etc.). Mayor Taylor's memo indicated he asked Chief Warren for some input and here is his statement:

“Most municipalities in Weber County that have winter parking ordinances have adopted one very similar to ours. The only noticeable difference between ordinances is the time of day it's enforced, and the month of the year it goes into effect and/or expires. I support the current ordinance, but would suggest that unless it is snowing, written warnings are issued up until December 1. (However, I wouldn't advertise this.) I've asked our police officers to use their judgment wisely and be less aggressive with enforcement during the recent Christmas holiday, but if it's snowing, then enforce the ordinance to help our snow removal crews clear the streets safely, and in a timely manner. I have always felt we should be proactive vs. reactive when it comes to enforcing this ordinance. Oftentimes, when these winter storms roll in, officers get busy handling crashes or calls for service and have limited time to enforce the ordinance. It is difficult to get through the entire city in one night because of calls for service and other assignments, and sometimes cars are parked after we've gone thru a particular subdivision so we may miss the habitual offenders. Out of area/state visitors are difficult to distinguish, but we will do our best to give them the benefit of the doubt and issue warnings on the first offense. As far as repeat offenders, there are very few during the five months the winter parking ordinance is in effect.”

Mayor Taylor summarized his memo and Chief Warren summarized his comments included in the memo relative to enforcement, focusing on the need to enforce against habitual offenders.

Council Member Bailey inquired as to the justification for disallowing on-street parking between midnight and 6:00 a.m. Mayor Taylor stated the intent is to prohibit overnight parking. Council

Member Bailey stated there will be problems with vehicles parked on the street throughout the day as well. Chief Warren stated that is where section two of the prohibited parking stipulation comes into play as it states “it is unlawful for the owner of any vehicle to park his or her vehicle, or allow his or her vehicle to be parked, on any public street or roadway in the city during any snowstorm or within twenty four (24) hours following the cessation of snow after any snowstorm.”

The Council engaged in a discussion regarding whether items one and two in the ordinance are both needed or if item two is sufficient. Council Member Urry stated he does not feel the ordinance is unreasonable; he referenced an epic snow storm in 1983 that caused serious problems for public works crews in removing snow from City streets and stated that he feels it is appropriate to prohibit on-street parking for four months out of the year. Discussion of the on-street parking ordinance continued, with Council Member Satterthwaite wondering if it is possible to include language in the ordinance to allow officers to have discretion when issuing citations or warning, especially when there is no snow on the ground. Council Member Swanson stated that selective enforcement is not good for the City. Chief Warren stated his suggestion would be that the City issue written warnings for the first couple weeks of the period during which on-street parking is prohibited, and after December 1, enforcement will take place during snow storms. He stated he would rather be proactive than reactive in his enforcement of the ordinance because removing vehicles from the street in advance of a snow storm will help public works crews be more effective in their snow removal duties. General discussion of Mr. Warren’s suggestion ensued, with Council Member Urry inquired as to how long the ordinance has been in effect. Building Permit Technician Ritchie stated the ordinance was last modified in 2002.

Council Member Swanson stated he likes the idea of giving officers some leeway in enforcing the ordinance; officers are likely most familiar with who the habitual offenders are and they should be given the authority to enforce the ordinances against them.

Council Member Stoker stated she likes the ordinance the way it is written and noted that it has done a lot to improve snow removal practices, especially on main streets like 2600 North. Council Member Bailey agreed, but stated he wants to be sure that the City is not accused of using the ordinance to increase revenues. Chief Warren stated the citation is only \$25 and most people that fight the citation end up having the fine reduced to \$10.

Mayor Taylor stated that it is important to consider practicality of enforcement; it is easy to say that it only takes a few minutes to visit with someone that has their vehicle parked on the street, but during a storm it would take hours to do the same for every person parked on the street and, instead, it would be much quicker and more effective to issue a citation. Council Member Satterthwaite asked if the code enforcement officer could be used to enforce the ordinance, to which Chief Warren answered yes, but noted that position has traditionally been used to focus on sidewalks while Police Officers have been used to focus on on-street parking. Council Member Satterthwaite suggested that the ordinance be left unchanged and that the Police Chief consider feedback from the Council relative to enforcement tactics. Chief Warren stated he will proceed in that manner. Council Member Bailey emphasized the need to focus on habitual offenders.

Mr. Bernard stated he understands both sides of the argument regarding the ordinance, but he still feels that on a 55 degree day with no chance of a snow storm, it is not necessary for the City to issue a citation for on-street parking.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that he thinks the section of the ordinance prohibiting on-street parking between midnight and 6:00 a.m. is not good and should be removed from the ordinance. He stated he also feels language should be added to the ordinance indicating that residents will not be cited for on-street parking on a day when the weather is good and snow is not imminent. He added that he understands that if he parks a vehicle on the street during a snow storm he deserves to be ticketed, but he does not believe he should be ticketed or warned on warm days or when there is no forecast for snow.

Council Member Urry stated the only way he would support Mr. Rasmussen's suggestion is if the fine for on-street parking during a storm were dramatically increased from \$25. Council Member Bailey stated the City may not have the ability to increase the fine according to statutory limits. Chief Warren stated he would need to check with Judge Lambert to determine if the fine can be increased. After continued discussion regarding the ordinance, the Council concluded to leave the ordinance as it currently reads with the understanding that it may not be necessary to enforce the ordinance on good weather days. A short discussion centered on initially issuing warnings on good weather days and possibly considering an amendment in the future that would escalate fines for repeat offenders.

Mayor Taylor stated he will continue to ride along with snow plow drivers during future snow storms and he plans to create a video of all the photos he takes in order to educate residents regarding the City's snow removal practices. He noted another issue snow plow drivers encounter is running into snow or ice in the street from people that use snow blowers to blow their snow into the road. The Council had a discussion regarding ordinances regarding that issue, with Council Member Bailey suggesting that an article be included in a future newsletter to educate residents regarding the ordinances relative to on-street winter parking and snow removal from driveways and sidewalks.

3. DISCUSSION CONCERNING AN AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE 11-16 HOME OCCUPATIONS, TO CLARIFY THE STANDARDS FOR THE ALLOWANCE OF ACCESSORY BUILDINGS/GARAGES

A staff memo from City Planner Scott explained when the City Council is acting in a legislative capacity it has wide discretion. Examples of legislative actions are general plan, zoning map, and land use text amendments. Legislative actions require that the Planning Commission give a recommendation to the City Council. Typically the criterion for making a decision, related to a legislative matter, requires compatibility with the general plan and existing codes. On June 4, 2014 the North Ogden Planning Commission (NOPC) directed Staff to investigate the home occupation standards exception for the allowance of garages. There are currently five home occupations that have a conditional use permit allowing a garage. Home occupations are allowed in all residential zones. On August 20, 2014 the North Ogden Planning Commission reviewed the current home occupation ordinance and a staff analysis. Information was provided on the five

existing garage home occupations. The Staff report included five options which the NOPC discussed and added an additional five alternatives for further consideration. Overall the NOPC felt comfortable with the staff report options presented; however, commissioners requested Staff to investigate several additional alternatives. On September 3, the NOPC further discussed the options for amendments to allowing garages as part of home occupations. The Staff report contained 10 options. The NOPC consolidated and narrowed the options to 5. On September 17, the NOPC further narrowed the amendment options. On October 1, 2014, the Planning Commission finalized the draft ordinance and gave direction to Staff to advertise the ordinance for the October 15, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. Notices were sent directly to the existing home occupations with garage exceptions. On October 15, 2014 the NOPC held a public hearing regarding the draft amendment. The amendment has the following components.

1. The ordinance allows garages with a sunset clause of two years; requires the operator to submit a new conditional use permit application for an additional extension of two years. There is no limit on new applications unless the operator violated the conditions of approval.

This amendment is applied to both new and existing home occupations. The operator would be required to submit a report each year demonstrating compliance with the conditional use permit conditions.

2. The ordinance clarifies that the required garage parking stalls cannot be used for the home occupation if the home occupation infringes on the space for the required parking stalls.

3. A new section is added establishing a purpose statement for the Home Occupation chapter. The other sections are renumbered.

There were 3 or 4 people in attendance from the existing operators. Their preference was to not have to reapply.

The memo explained the following sections from the General Plan should be considered as part of this decision process:

Community Aesthetics

- (3) Implementation Goal: Attractiveness, orderliness, and cleanliness are qualities that establish North Ogden as a place where people Care about visual appearances. These qualities should be preserved and required throughout the city.

Zoning and Land Use Policy

- (1) A definite edge should be established between types of uses to protect the integrity of each use.

- (2) Zoning should reflect the existing use of property to the largest extent possible, unless the area is in transition.

Residential Guidelines:

- (2) Avoid isolating neighborhoods.

The memo summarized the following potential City Council considerations:

- Are the draft changes appropriate to the home occupation provisions regarding exceptions to allow garages?
- Is the proposed purpose statement appropriate?
- Does the General Plan support these amendments?

The memo concluded the North Ogden Planning Commission recommends that the North Ogden City Council adopt the amendments to the home occupation ordinance.

Mayor Taylor introduced the agenda item and Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo.

The Council briefly discussed the five home based businesses for which conditional use permits have been issued.

Council Member Bailey stated that the staff memo indicates the Planning Commission recommends readdressing new conditional use permit re-applications and he asked what that means. Mr. Scott stated that the proposed ordinance states that businesses licensed as of December 31, 2014 would have two years to operate under the conditions initially established for the business; after two years the business would need to reapply to continue under the conditions of their original conditional use permit. He stated that for new businesses, the two year clock would start from the time they made application for their conditional use permit. Council Member Bailey asked if the Planning Commission would have the ability to consider or impose different conditions on a business when they seek renewal. Mr. Scott answered yes and noted that the two year period provides ample time to assess complaints against any business. Council Member Bailey stated it is his feeling that most conditions associated with conditional use permits are deeply flawed and immeasurable.

Council Member Satterthwaite stated that the business that likely spurred this discussion and a review of the City's ordinance relative to home based businesses is an auto repair shop that has had several complaints lodged against it. He asked if it is possible to impose conditions that will mitigate those complaints. Mr. Scott stated he does not know if it will ever be possible to address all complaints, but it is his opinion that the owner of the auto repair shop referenced has been able to meet the conditions of his conditional use permit.

Council Member Swanson stated the proposed ordinance states that garage based businesses shall not disturb the peace and quiet of a neighborhood and shall not be associated with noise emitted or discernable beyond the premises. He stated that some of the complaints the City has received about the auto repair shop referenced is that noise from the business can be heard by nearby residents. Building Official Kerr stated that he has visited the neighborhood to measure the noise levels near the auto repair shop and there was no noise audible. Council Member Swanson asked if the business owner was asked to turn on his compressor in order to see if it could be heard from neighboring properties. He stated if the compressor can be heard, the business does not meet the regulations of the proposed ordinance. He added the difference in his mind between noise generated by a business and usual noise generated in a neighborhood is that the other noise generated in a neighborhood is residential in nature. Council Member Bailey agreed and stated that it is his opinion that the ordinances of the City have been crafted in a way to allow some business activities to take place in residential neighborhoods as long as the property still looks, acts, and smells residential in nature; basically as long as neighbors cannot tell there is a business operating in the neighborhood, it could be permitted. The Council and staff had a general discussion regarding auto repair businesses in neighborhoods with a focus on the conditions that have been placed on such businesses. Discussion shifted to parking requirements for home occupations, with Mr. Scott clarifying that home occupations with

garages shall maintain the required two car parking spaces and any additional area beyond the two required spaces can be used for traffic associated with the business. Council Member Urry asked if a person with an auto repair business would need to have a three car garage in order to maintain the two parking spaces required for his home and to work on someone else's car in his garage, to which Mr. Scott answered yes.

Mr. Scott continued his review of the staff report, focusing on the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding the types of uses that are not suitable for home occupations because they are too intense.

Council Member Bailey stated there is another auto repair business in the City and the owner of that business conducts his work in an accessory detached garage; he noted he feels that violates the City's ordinance because it clearly states that accessory buildings cannot be used for home occupations. Council Member Swanson agreed. Mr. Scott stated another section of the ordinance notes that businesses can be conducted in garages and his interpretation of the code is that even though a detached garage can be classified as an accessory building, business can be conducted there because it is still a garage. Council Member Bailey stated he feels there are conflicts within the City's ordinances. The Council and staff reviewed the City Code and had a discussion regarding whether accessory buildings should be used for home occupations, specifically auto repair businesses, with Council Member Bailey stating that he would like to correct any conflicts in the code. He stated that he feels it behooves the City Council to be proactive rather than reactive; just because there have been no past problems with certain home occupations does not mean there will not be future problems and he would like to do everything he can to write the code in a way that will assist the City in avoiding potential problems.

Council Member Swanson stated that he has read the sections of City Code dealing with home occupations several times and it is his interpretation that the intent of the code is that home occupations may be allowed in neighborhoods as long as they are not easily visible or detectable. He stated he wants to protect neighborhoods from being infringed upon by businesses that emit sounds or odors that do not belong in a neighborhood; he does not want to sacrifice peace and quiet in neighborhoods throughout the City.

Council Member Bailey asked Mr. Scott if he is aware of any other cities that prohibit home occupations altogether. Mr. Scott answered no. Council Member Bailey asked if other cities prohibit the use of a garage for home occupations. Mr. Kerr noted South Ogden City does not allow home occupations in garages. Discussion regarding whether it is appropriate to allow home occupations in garages ensued. Council Member Swanson stated that it is his opinion that there are some uses, specifically those that would take place in a garage, that are too intense and not appropriate for a neighborhood. He stated he would like to delineate and prohibit those uses in the City Code because they detract from the feel of a neighborhood. Discussion focused on auto repair businesses in neighborhoods, with the discussion centering on whether it is appropriate to provide an incubator period for businesses that will negatively impact a neighborhood for two years, but then must relocate.

Council Member Bailey stated that he appreciates all the time and effort the Planning Commission has put into considering this issue, but noted their recommendation does not fall in

line with his personal interpretation of zoning. Council Member Swanson agreed and stated he would prefer to proceed with prohibiting garage based businesses in order to avoid situations in the future similar to the situation the City faced with an existing garage based business. Mr. Scott asked if the Council wants to allow those existing businesses the two year period to transition from their home elsewhere. Council Member Swanson answered yes. Council Member Bailey reminded the Council of the problematic nature of conditional use permits; they are difficult to track and the conditions may be difficult to enforce. He stated he is more concerned about broadly and equally providing the protections of City laws to all residents of the City.

Council Member Bailey then stated it may be necessary to revisit the issue of accessory building heights and setbacks in the RE-20 zone of the City; the Council received a complaint regarding the placement of an accessory building in the RE-20 zone.

Mayor Taylor asked if it will be appropriate for the City Council to hold a public hearing regarding home occupations. Mr. Scott answered yes and noted it could be scheduled as early as February 10. He then acknowledged the Planning Commission for having done an immense amount of work evaluating the issue of home occupations in North Ogden.

4. DISCUSSION CONCERNING GRANTS

A staff memo from Finance Director/City Administrator Steele explained based on prior discussions, he has prepared a couple of spreadsheets. The spreadsheet contains detailed information of each grant (based on the spreadsheet Councilmember Urry sent around a few weeks ago) and also the cash flow of the Capital Projects Fund out to 2019. There are three categories of grants that are under consideration at this time:

1. Road projects
2. Parks/Trails related projects
3. Planning projects

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo as well as the spreadsheet referenced in his memo.

Mayor Taylor led a discussion regarding the three grant categories and noted grant applications for the various programs must be finalized by January 15 or January 30 for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. He also provided the Council with an update regarding the progress of the design of the library renovation project in conjunction with the relocation of the City's skate park. Council Member Swanson noted Harrisville and Pleasant View are supportive of the relocation of the City's skate park and he wondered if they would be willing to contribute funding for the project. Mayor Taylor stated that he would discuss that option with the Mayors of the other two cities. He noted, however, that he feels it is appropriate to apply for a RAMP grant for the relocation project. Discussion then centered on how the relocation of the skate park would impact the various locations that have been listed as options for its future home. Mayor Taylor stated that if the Council cannot decide upon the exact location at this time, the City will simply list potential future locations on the RAMP application; the application committee mainly focuses on the actual project rather than the location.

Mr. Steele continued his review of the spreadsheet detailing the grant applications proposed by City Administration. General discussion occurred throughout Mr. Steele's presentation.

There was a brief discussion about the difference between form based codes and the type of zoning code the City currently employs. Mr. Scott noted the architects working with the City to update the General Plan have extensive experience writing form based codes and can assist the City through the transition process of writing form based code for the downtown area of the City.

Council Member Urry noted that if the City were successful in receiving all grants for which the Administration proposes submitting applications, it would be necessary to provide \$600,000 in matching funds in the 2015-2016 fiscal year (FY). Council Member Swanson noted that is the worst case scenario if the City does not receive other grants that can be used for matching funds. Staff provided the Council with their assessment of the likelihood of the City receiving the various grants for which Administration recommends application.

The Council concluded to support all applications recommended by City Administration, with the prioritization of RAMP grant applications being (1) Oaklawn Park restroom, (2) trails, (3) Lomond View Park restroom, and (4) skate park relocation. Council Member Swanson stated that if the City does not receive the RAMP grant for the skate park relocation, he would prefer to hold off on the project until after the library renovation project is complete. Discussion then centered on considering grant applications in conjunction with budget development in the future, with Council Member Bailey adding he would like to move towards creating a 20 year capital plan rather than just a five year capital plan for the City.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

6. COUNCIL/MAYOR/STAFF COMMENTS

Council Member Urry stated he would like the City to consider upgrading the sound system in the Council chambers and he referenced a system used by the LDS Church that would serve the City's needs. He then stated that he and the Mayor talked recently about utility billing and he would like to suggest that the City conduct an audit of the City's utility billing system to ensure the accurate amount is being charged to all customers for all services. Council Member Bailey stated he would be supportive of that recommendation. This led to a discussion regarding all costs associated with the City's utility billing system, specifically meter replacement costs, with Mayor Taylor noting he plans to schedule a work session to focus more time on all issues utility billing related. Council Member Bailey stated the problems with the City's utility billing system are an embarrassment and he wants it addressed as soon as possible.

Council Member Stoker thanked the Public Works Department for their assistance in removing a fallen pine tree during a recent snow storm. She stated it was very helpful to the resident that lost the tree.

Council Member Bailey stated that he feels the City may not be sufficiently advertising the City's service to collect leaves from residents' front yards and he asked that more efforts be taken to spread the word. He then asked if there has been any progress on the dispute between the owners of the Valley View subdivision and Pine View Water. Mayor Taylor stated he has reached out to Pine View Manager Terrel Grimley and has not heard back from him. Council Member Urry suggested that the City contact each member of the Pine View Water Board. Council Member Bailey agreed and stated he would like for the City to do whatever possible to assist the owners of the subdivision in solving the dispute.

Council Member Satterthwaite inquired as to the actual number of water meters in the City. Mayor Taylor stated there are approximately 5,600 meters City-wide. Council Member Bailey asked if the new meters can be phased in using a smarter method by selecting higher water users. Council Member Satterthwaite agreed other methods would have been better and it was not the best idea to install 4,000 new water meters at the same time. He asked if the City has the option of implementing an equal pay system for users throughout the year. He noted this would allow the City to only read meters a couple of times each year rather than monthly. Mayor Taylor reiterated he is planning to have a more detailed discussion regarding utility billing at an upcoming work session.

Council Member Satterthwaite then stated he would like to hear an update regarding the Public Works Facility project and the contingency fund, landscaping costs, etc. Mayor Taylor stated he will provide that report during the January 27 meeting. Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would also like to have follow-up discussion regarding the project to implement a GIS system that will track all City infrastructure and assets; this project would help the City have more confidence in the budgeting process in the future.

Council Member Swanson stated he is concerned about correcting the recent utility billing issues and noted he wants to be sensitive to those that may be on a fixed income and cannot afford to pay two months' worth of utility bills at one time.

Mayor Taylor then reviewed the schedule of various meetings scheduled for the month of January. He also provided the Council with an update regarding the progress of the Monroe Boulevard extension project, noting there will be a meeting scheduled with all property owners adjacent to the corridor. He then asked the Council if they have concerns regarding the Letter of Intent (LOI) for the old Smith's property; if there are no concerns he will proceed and bring the agreement back for final approval once it is available. Council Member Bailey stated his concern is that the numbers provided by the City's Economic Development Consultant on December 9 do not match the numbers previously provided by Mayor Taylor. Mayor Taylor stated that the City will be responsible for wetland mitigation; the LOI states the City will pay \$20,000 for the demolition of a home and pay the total amount for wetland mitigation since the developer was not comfortable with a cap on the amount the City will pay for such mitigation. He noted the final agreement will include more detailed information and the Council can deny approval of the agreement if they are not comfortable with the terms. He noted the City Engineer will be tasked with providing an estimate for the wetland mitigation and he will keep the Council informed of that process.

Council Member Urry suggested that something like a google calendar be created for the City Council so they can all see the same calendar events at any given time. Mayor Taylor stated he will investigate that option.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Swanson motioned to adjourn. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Bailey	aye
Council Member Satterthwaite	aye
Council Member Stoker	aye
Council Member Swanson	aye
Council Member Urry	aye

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:37 p.m.

Brent Taylor, Mayor

S. Annette Spendlove, MMC
City Recorder

Date Approved