

NORTH OGDEN CITY BUDGET RETREAT AND CITY COUNCIL MEETING

May 8, 2014

The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on May 8, 2014 at 12:40 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 May 8, 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
 James Urry Council Member

 Eric Thomas Chairman
 Don Waite Vice-Chairman
 Scott Barker Commissioner
 Joan Brown Commissioner
 Blake Knight Commissioner
 Dee Russell Commissioner
 Phillip Swanson Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT: Ronald F. Chandler City Manager
 S. Annette Spendlove City Recorder/ H.R. Director
 Bryan Steele Finance Director
 Kevin Warren Police Chief
 Gary Kerr Building Official
 Tiffany Staheli Parks & Recreation Director
 Stacie Cain Comm. Dev. Coord./Deputy City Recorder

VISITORS: Phillip Swanson

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

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

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

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

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

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

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

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

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

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

Voting on the motion:

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

The motion passed unanimously.

2. DISCUSSION ON SOLID AND GREEN WASTE CONTRACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Mayor then called for a vote on the motion.

Voting on the motion:

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

The motion passed unanimously.

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

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

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

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

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

a good, solid proposal. The Department Heads have been very involved in determining the amount of money each employee should receive.

Council Member Satterthwaite asked if the funding will be included in the final budget, to which Mayor Taylor answered yes. Council Member Satterthwaite stated \$250,000 is a lot of money and he hopes the employees will see it as a vote of confidence with the understanding that the Council will continue to expect great performance from them.

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

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

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

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

concerned about the fashion in which the Council has isolated discussions about specific issues and it is difficult to make global decisions.

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

The Council took a break at 2:40 p.m.
The meeting reconvened at 2:50 p.m.

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

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

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

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

added to the base bid amount, including the \$180,000 to import fill dirt; the sale of top soil estimated at \$100,000; and land sale revenues and demolition costs. The final cost is \$4,139,927 and Public Works Director Giles has provided input regarding his priorities for the project, including the fuel station, salt storage shed, and storage area under the administration building. Mr. Chandler encouraged the Council to have an open dialogue with the Lundahl representative to get their questions about various components of the project answered and then go through the process of elimination to reduce the price of the project.

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

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

Mr. Chandler then reviewed the funds available for the project and stated based on the projected cost of the project there is a shortfall of \$205,000. There was a general discussion regarding the contingency amount built into the project and Council Member Bailey stated he would like the Council to have oversight regarding the use of the contingency. Mr. Chandler stated the Council

could place limits on the contingency and there was a general discussion about what would happen if the total project cost exceeded the amount approved by the Council. Mr. Robinson stated that he wanted to assure the Council that it is very important to him that the City gets the most 'bang for their buck' with their project and that is why he recommended a design that was different than anything recommended by any other bidder. He stated there will be flexibility in the project costs and he will not do work that is not sensible or functional for the Public Works Department.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Bailey **aye**
Council Member Satterthwaite **aye**
Council Member Stoker **aye**
Council Member Urry **aye**

The motion passed unanimously.

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

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

The meeting reconvened at 5:44 p.m.

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

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

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

Mr. Chandler then led the discussion regarding potential changes to the City’s utility rate structure. Council Member Urry suggested that the Council reach out to the residents before considering changes to the City’s utility rate structure. Council Member Bailey agreed and

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

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

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

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

Voting on the motion:

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

The motion passed unanimously.

RDA

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

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

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

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

Voting on the motion:

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

The motion passed unanimously.

2. ADJOURNMENT

BUDGET RETREAT/PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY MEETING – CONTINUED

5. DISCUSSION ON COMMITTEES

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

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

See above

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

8. CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR, AND STAFF COMMENTS

There were no additional comments.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Satterthwaite moved to adjourn. Council Member Stoker seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

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

The motion passed unanimously.

CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION

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

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

2. INTRODUCTION

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

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

4. GENERALLY

5. MANDATORY PLAN ELEMENTS

6. OPTIONAL PLAN ELEMENTS

7. WASATCH FRONT LOCAL PLANNING RESOURCE GRANTS

8. GENERAL PLAN SCOPE OF WORK

9. DOWNTOWN PLAN SCOPE OF WORK

10. NEXT STEPS

11. BRAINSTORM “TOPICS WANTING TO ADDRESS”

12. HOW TO INVOLVE PUBLIC INPUT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The list included:

Access

Defined City Center

Transportation/effective roads and their impact on economic development

Aesthetically pleasing street designs, particularly on main corridors

Mixed use developments

Incorporation of parks and trails into new subdivisions (mandatory versus incentivized)

Incorporation of trail and park plans into the General Plan

Definition of North Ogden City now and in the future: vision statement
Home based businesses; neighborhood economic development
Job creation
Business community growth; business attraction
Connection to nearby recreation areas
Citizen involvement
City branding
Improvement of the gateway to the City
How much commercial space does the City need at buildout?
Implementation of manufacturing and production land uses and job creation – is there space for it?
Focus on development of the entire region
Inclusion of gathering places in the community
High density or multi-family housing
Miscellaneous development plans and projects in other communities
Advertising and encouraging residents to shop local
Incorporation and encouragement of public transit

Council Member Bailey suggested a consultant may be able to facilitate the generation of a new list with more focused goals or priorities. Mayor Taylor agreed and noted this information will be used to draft the request for proposals (RFP) for a consultant.

Mayor Taylor asked the group for ideas for encouraging public input. The list of ideas included:

Town hall or neighborhood meetings in residential homes
Place greeting tables at grocery stores to communicate with patrons
Place meeting information and announcements at senior center and aquatic center
Place a North Ogden planning booth at the Cherry Days celebration
Mail-in survey with incentives to participate
Contests to encourage participation
Provide anonymity for responders
Engagement of citizens through the school system
Engagement of citizens through corporate community involvement representatives

There was a brief discussion regarding the timeline for developing the RFP and for holding the next public meetings necessary.

Mayor Taylor then reported that he would like to schedule the ground breaking event for the Public Works Facility on June 3 at the beginning of the work session meeting. He stated it will be a public event and everyone is invited to attend.

13. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Bailey moved 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 Urry	aye

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Brent Taylor, Mayor

S. Annette Spendlove, MMC
City Recorder

Date Approved