

## NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING

June 26, 2014

The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on June 26, 2014 at 6:33 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 June 20, 2014. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on January 24, 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:	Ronald F. Chandler	City Manager
	Jon Call	City Attorney
	Bryan Steele	Finance Director
	S. Annette Spendlove	City Recorder/H.R. Director
VISITORS:	Joan Brown	Patrick Lowry
	Joanna Lowry	Jordan Talbot
	Anita Talbot	Kenneth Rowe
	Vicki Droogsma	Jason Droogsma
	Jeanne Droogsma	Blake Welling
	Carol Campbell	Bob Campbell
	Kurt Illum	

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

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**ACTIVE AGENDA**

**1. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

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

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

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

Mayor Taylor provided a brief summary of the process undertaken to select a resident to be appointed to the North Ogden Planning Commission. Steven Prisbrey applied for the position

and after a long interview the Mayor felt he would be a great member of the Planning Commission.

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

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **2. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN AGREEMENT WITH REPUBLIC SERVICES FOR THE DISPOSAL AND PICKUP OF SOLID WASTE RECYCLING**

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

Term:

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

Fees:

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

- Recycling Rebate:
- The City receives 100% of the recycling rebate.

Pick-up:

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

Acceptable Waste:

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

Non-Acceptable Waste:

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

Acceptable Recycling:

- Corrugated cardboard
- magazines
- Catalogs
- Newspapers
- Plastics 1-7
- Office paper
- Paperboard
- Phone books,
- Aluminum
- Small metal and steel cans
- Junk mail
- Paper bags
- Plastic grocery bags that are bound in a bail or tied in another bag (Section 2.b.i)

Non-Acceptable Recycling:

- Glass
- Styrofoam
- Large or heavy steel/metal items

- Yard waste including leaves, limbs, etc.
- Food Waste

Drop Off Location:

- Weber County transfer station for both trash and recycling. (Section 2.a). Another recycling drop-off location may be used if approved by the City and Republic. (Section 2.b)

Payment:

- Monthly

Mr. Chandler summarized his staff memo.

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

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

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

### **3. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE**

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

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

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

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

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

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

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

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



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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **8. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.**

## **RDA**

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

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Board Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Board Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>

<b>Board Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Board Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Board Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **2. ADJOURNMENT**

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

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Board Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Board Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Board Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Board Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Board Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

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

---

Brent Taylor, Mayor

---

S. Annette Spendlove, MMC  
City Recorder

---

Date Approved