

NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES

April 1, 2014

The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on April 1, 2014 at 6:40 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 March 27, 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
	Justin Fawson	Council Member
	Lynn Satterthwaite	Council Member
	Cheryl Stoker	Council Member
	James Urry	Council Member
STAFF PRESENT:	Ronald F. Chandler	City Manager
	S. Annette Spendlove	City Recorder/ H.R. Director
	Craig Giles	Public Works Director
VISITORS:	Vern Keeslar	Joan Brown
	Steve Rasmussen	Doug Carlsen
	Matt Hartvigsen	Val John Halford
	Nora Jackman	Jerry Burns
	Phillip Swanson	Kip Billings
	Blake Welling	Toby Mileski
	Claudean Burke	

Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance. Council Member Urry gave the invocation and led the pledge of allegiance.

ACTIVE AGENDA

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Steve Rasmussen, 1092 E. 3250 N., stated he addressed the Council a couple of months ago about installing a flashing stop sign at the intersection of 1050 E. and 3250 N. He stated the City deserves praise for following through on his request and he noted he feels it will make the intersection much safer. He noted he had one suggested improvement to the intersection and stop sign and he used the aid of a rendering to provide the Council with information about the suggested change, with a focus on the orientation of the stop sign to make it easier for motorists to see the flashing lights. He applauded what the City has done and noted it can be improved if the stop sign is shifted slightly.

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

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

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

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

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

Voting on the motion:

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

The motion passed unanimously.

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

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

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

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

Voting on the motion:

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

The motion passed unanimously.

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

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

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

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

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

AGENDA – WORK SESSION

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

1. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chandler asked Mr. Halford to discuss the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). Kip Billings, WFRC Representative, provided a brief overview of the makeup of the STIP and noted it is

reviewed annually and cities have the opportunity to recommend needed transportation projects for inclusion in the plan. He noted there are three funding sources for projects included in the STIP: surface transportation program (STP); condition mitigation and air quality (CMAC) funding; and transportation alternatives program (TAP) funding. Mr. Chandler noted that in order for the City to receive federal transportation funding, a project must be included in the STIP. Mayor Caldwell inquired as to the length of time it could take for the City to receive approval of funding for any given project. Mr. Billings stated some projects have been seeking funding approval for 10 to 15 years while others receive funding the first year a request is made. He noted the STIP is updated each year and funding is programed for eligible projects each year; cities could expect to wait at least five years for funding of a project.

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

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

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

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

2. NORTH OGDEN'S 2008 TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Vern Keeslar, whose firm prepared the 2008 Transportation Plan, provided the Council with an overview of the components of the plan and the issues that were considered in development of the plan, with a focus on the projected growth of the City as well as the prioritization of projects included in the Plan. He noted Washington Boulevard is a challenge from a safety perspective; it should have an accident rating of 2.5, but the actual rating is somewhere between 5 and 7 depending on the segment under consideration. He stated Washington Boulevard is a State road and the State should definitely be considering upgrades to the road. He then reinforced some of

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

3. CORRIDOR PRESERVATION

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

Mayor Taylor asked Mr. Larsen to discuss how corridor preservation funds can be used. Mr. Larsen stated there is a requirement that the City contract with a certified acquisition agent and that the City only use UDOT approved appraisers; if a title company is used, they must be UDOT approved as well. He stated these requirements are in place because of some difficult lessons the County has learned over the past several years. There was a discussion about some liabilities the City would assume if these policies and procedures are not followed relative to corridor preservation. Mr. Larsen then noted the consultant will ensure that the property owner is provided with all information relating to their property rights and they prepare an acquisition package that is ultimately presented to the County for submittal to UDOT, who will then issue the check for the property acquisition. Council Member Urry asked who negotiates a purchase price for the acquisition of a property. Mr. Larsen stated there is no negotiation and, by law, funding is authorized up to appraised value of the property. The funds cannot be used for eminent domain. The property owner has the right to reject an appraisal and request an additional appraisal. The property owner could also escalate the issue to the State Property Rights Ombudsman and request a third appraisal. The consultant presents the initial offer based upon the appraisal. There was a discussion regarding the process for selecting a consultant and appraiser, after which there was a discussion

regarding whether entities are required to provide matching funds for projects for which they are seeking corridor preservation funding.

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

4. NORTH OGDEN PROJECTS

A. SKYLINE DRIVE

B. MONROE BLVD

C. WASHINGTON BLVD

D. FRUITLAND DRIVE AND 2100 NORTH INTERSECTION

E. ELBERTA DRIVE

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

Mr. Chandler then referenced the Washington Boulevard, or 450 East, project; it calls for the widening of the street between 2700 North and 3100 North; this would be a very expensive project because it would require property acquisition on both sides of the road. The project is listed in the first or second phase of the City's transportation plan. There was a general discussion about the financial and political implications of the project and Mayor Taylor noted many of the other potential projects listed in the transportation plan would create much less turmoil, while still alleviating traffic problems in the City.

Mr. Chandler then referenced a potential project to widen 3100 North; he stated he is not positive that this project is necessary and noted it would also require a significant amount of property acquisition to complete the project. He highlighted the current width and layout of the road and noted he believes it will be possible to include a center turning lane in the road as it is presently constructed. He concluded the final project listed on the project list for discussion this evening is the Elberta Drive project. Mr. Hartvigsen provided an overview of the components of the project and there was a general discussion about the various design projects that are geared towards improving safety in the area. Mayor Taylor stated the design is purely conceptual at this point and noted there has not been a lot of discussion about property acquisition. High level discussion regarding various design options ensued. Mr. Chandler concluded the Administration is grateful for input from the Council regarding the needed transportation projects in the City; the input will be used in proceeding with drafting an update to the transportation plan. Mayor Taylor stated the Council should be thinking about options for funding some of the projects they may view as high priorities. Mr. Chandler stated he would like to start the process to select a right-of-way acquisition expert for the Monroe Boulevard project and he asked for permission to draft a contract for the Council to consider. Council Members Stoker and Urry stated they felt that would be a good idea. Mr. Hartvigsen noted it is also important to identify sensitive properties along the potential corridor to ensure that the City is not purchasing property that the road cannot be built upon; these types of properties include historical properties or properties with environmental issues, such as wetlands. He stated he did not believe there are any of those properties in that area, but it is best to have a clear understanding that is the case. Mayor Taylor stated he feels the most important transportation projects in the City are the Monroe Boulevard project and the Washington Boulevard widening project; there are many issues to consider, such as funding, but he is hopeful to receive direction regarding the prioritization of the needed projects in the City. Council Member Bailey stated he believes the Skyline Drive project will be completed as development occurs in the City and he feels the highest priorities are addressing the intersection at 2100 North and Fruitland Drive as well as the problems on 2800 North. He stated the City will ultimately be responsible for funding those projects independently. Mr. Hartvigsen agreed and noted he feels the Washington Boulevard widening project will be very expensive and property acquisition may be difficult; the City should seek grant funding for that project.

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

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

Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would like to have more detailed discussions regarding funding for the various transportation projects in the future budget meetings. There was a general discussion regarding potentially considering implementing a street maintenance fee that would be charged monthly to each household in the City. Mr. Hartvigsen stated it is also important to reevaluate the City's impact fees to determine if the transportation impact fee is appropriate.

5. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

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

7. CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR AND STAFF COMMENTS

8. ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Brent Taylor, Mayor

S. Annette Spendlove, MMC
City Recorder

Date Approved