

NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

August 24, 2010

The North Ogden City Council convened in regular session on August 24, 2010 at 5:30 p.m. at the City Offices. 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 August 20, 2010. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on January 24, 2010.

PRESENT:	Richard G. Harris	Mayor
	Wade Bigler	Council Member
	Ronald Flamm	Council Member
	Martha Harris	Council Member
	Brent Taylor	Council Member
	Carl Turner	Council Member
STAFF PRESENT:	Edward O. Dickie	City Manager
	Annette Spendlove	City Recorder
	Julia LaSeure	Commercial Development Coord.
	Sue Richey	Deputy City Recorder (left at 5:45pm)
	Gary Kerr	City Building Official (left at 6:30pm)
	Mel Blanchard	Public Works Director
	Dave Carlson	City Attorney
	Polo Afuvai	Chief of Police
	Paul Rhoades	Police Officer
	Debbie Cardenas	Finance Director
VISITORS:	Justin Fawson	Phillip Child
	David Della Silva	Liz Della Silva
	Pam Trimble	Mel Beus
	Margaret Beus	Ann Crezee
	Beverly Gibson	Danny Rogers
	Inez Sparks	Robert Sparks
	Rowdy Irick	Jeannette Moran
	Brett Rogers	Dennis Crezee
	Brian Cleveland	Jodi Cleveland
	Jim Suhr	Kent Packer
	Wendy Packer	Mike McCrea
	Eileen Madsen	Gordon Madsen
	Robert Buswell	Cal Heiner
	Sandy Heiner	Pia Aerisnieme
	Beth Herschi	Kim Lavigne
	Tammy Titus	Breanna Dreyer
	Bruce Hall	Karen Hall
	Steven Russell	Nancy Christiansen
	Alan Christiansen	Charissa Roach
	Terral Morgan	Karla DuVall
	Fred DuVall	Marilyn Harris
	Ron Harris	George Parsons
	Helen Taylor	Beth Miller

Dale Miller	Denise Norris
Bruce Christensen	Lee Ann Christensen
Sara Fawson	Donna Walker
Reese Barker	Fred Jackson
Jim Hicks	Jerry Wood
Laurie Haines	Sylvia Hunt
Lloyd Hunt	Ann Schmitz
John Zurbuchen	Rex Coleman
Heather Coleman	Richard Krebs
Bill Norris	Marva Norris
Anne Warner	Dallin Warner
Colton Berube	Richard Brimhall
Troy Herzog	Dave Hulme
Lance Patterson	Andrea Patterson
Marilyn Brown	Fred Brown
Mary Shawham	Chuck Merrill
Kevin Southworth	Renee Erickson
Leland Erickson	Shaun Welker
John Welker	Carol Satterthwaite
Lynn Satterthwaite	Gloria Gross
Wallace Gross	Stacie Paraskos
Scott McKay	Chris O'Neill
Alan Mikesell	Jeanie Mikesell
Kim Morgan	Jean Berube
George Evans	Paula Evans
Elaine Hunt	Roger Hunt
Chad Smith	Kim Smith
Carl Grunander	Ned Malan
Ray Squier	Amy Squier
Merjam Barker	Mary Settlemire
Bruce Jones	Nina Wahlquist
Nina Slaughter	Dean Slaughter
Ben Slaughter	Natalie Nigro
Shirley Nigro	Mike Westbroek
Brett Forsberg	Nella Forsberg
Ruth Forsberg	Cody Muirbrook
Bob Napoli	Jim Harris
Cordell Perigo	Shawn Ludlow
Allison Ludlow	Robyn Turner
Alan Turner	Bret Lawson
Ted Schroeder	James Towery
Francis Jones	Franceen Jones
Cara Gordon	Nate Wood
Anne O'Neill	C. Stromberg
April Stromberg	Craig Tracy
Michelle Tracy	Chris Campbell
Brad Taylor	Heather Taylor
Berth Miller	Dale Miller
L.J. Berube	Marge Berube
Gary Rands	Matt Schueppe
Kent Bailey	Francis Jones

Marilyn Carter
Kristi Layton

Dan Nixon
Neal Berube

WELCOME

Mayor Harris welcomed those in attendance. Council Member Flamm gave the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA

Council Member Taylor moved to approve the consent agenda. Council Member Harris seconded.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Harris	yes
Council Member Flamm	yes
Council Member Bigler	yes
Council Member Taylor	yes
Council Member Turner	yes

Motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Harris asked that any discussion regarding the Public Works building be reserved for item #8 on the agenda. Any other items to be discussed can be brought to the Council at this time.

There were no public comments.

PRESENTATION OF A 15 YEAR PIN TO PAUL RHOADES, POLICE DEPARTMENT

Chief Polo Afuvai recognized Officer Paul Rhoades stating that he is the Resource Officer at North Ogden Jr. High. Chief Afuvai said Officer Rhoades does a great job with our kids and the staff at the schools. Officer Rhoades is also the Drug Abuse Resistance Education Program (DARE) officer; he teaches DARE at Bates Elementary School. He is also over the GIS program and crime statistics and writes all the grants for the Police Dept. He does a lot of things for the Police Department; he is that talented. Officer Rhoades was joined this evening by his wife Shelly and daughter Amanda. Chief Afuvai said that the City appreciates Officer Rhoades and all that he has done for us for 15 years.

PRESENTATION OF A 25 YEAR PIN TO MEL BLANCHARD, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

Ed Dickie, City Manager, stated that he has been with the City for just over two years and has had the opportunity to work with Mel Blanchard. Mr. Dickie said that they meet in staff meeting and talk about things that need to be addressed by Public Works. By the time they get out the things they talked about are already done. It's been a pleasure to know him. Mel Blanchard does a really good job and has been with the City for 25 years.

PRESENTATION ON THE CHERRY DAYS PARADE

Mr. Bolar asked to do this another time due to the number of people attending tonight. Mayor Harris reminded the public that we need everyone to sign the roll that is going around.

DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION REGARDING THE PROPOSED PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING

Mayor Harris reminded everyone to state their name and address. He asked that they be brief as there are a lot of people here. All those who would like to come forward are welcome to come up. Please use civility and good manners; no outbursts of applause or boos. We want a good town hall meeting here.

Steven Russell, Heritage Grove Subdivision, 2537 N 1550 E., read from a document. (Exhibit #1)

Ed Dickie stated that the City must have a copy of anything that is read.

Bruce Hall, 2548 N 1550 E, said he is a lifelong resident of North Ogden and has lived in Heritage Grove subdivision for the last 16 years. As a resident he would like to understand and see all the information that the committee used to select the east bench foothills. He said he wanted to clarify the statements from the Standard Examiner. Is this property no longer being considered for the Public Works complex? Mayor Harris said the City owns property up there and he can't say that it will never be considered but it is off the table right now. Mr. Hall said he is not here to dispute the need for an industrial maintenance complex but he doesn't believe all relevant data has been considered. The outer perimeter of the east bench location is a poor choice. Children walk to school along those streets. To have industrial equipment on these roads will open the City to lawsuits. There is also increased mileage and maintenance, the loss of productivity from travel times and increased maintenance on infrastructure on 2600 N and Mountain Rd. The Blalock study on page 35 states that a heavier road base is necessary for heavy vehicles, there will need to be two access points, the facility will double as an emergency operations center, animal control, and there is a place in the design for 15 tanks of liquid chlorine. The study stated there are to be 100 various vehicles stored at this site. The initial cost in providing safe sidewalks and additional operational costs would offset any perceived cost savings. The City Council has failed to consider the financial hardship to the people who live in that area; substantial loss of property land values; the negative impact from an industrial complex with close proximity to residents; the breach of trust between the City Council and the citizens. He purchased his home 16 years ago understanding that a lacrosse field would be constructed at this location. Mr. Hall said a lot of expense has gone into preliminary design work. The current site is a good one; the site already exists. With a hub and spoke configuration staff and equipment can be sent out across the City. The Blalock study states that 4 to 5 acres are required. The property west of the existing complex was under review for wetlands. It may be possible to rearrange the site and reduce operations costs. Moving the complex is not in the best interests of North Ogden citizens. He asked the City Council to honor their commitments and place the lacrosse field or park in this location. The Blalock study shows that the South Jordan, and North Salt Lake City sites were all references, they are all commercial sites.

Neil Berube, 1532 E 2525 N, thanked Mayor Harris for taking the time to take his phone calls. He said this is almost like Groundhog Day. Three years ago we came down here and two or three of the current City Council Members were serving at that time. He said he thinks there are two ways of doing things; the right way and the right thing. This Council can hang their hat on doing things on the technicalities of the law and be protected but doing the right thing is what we expect of our City Council. Three years ago we felt that this may be readdressed so many of us have been watching agendas in the paper. The December 22, 2009 City Council agenda, item #12, says presentation of the public works programming study. Most people would think that had something to do with automation. He said he thinks that is camouflage. The minutes of February 23, 2010 prior to the budget retreat talk about a final study on the public works building. The agenda from the February 27, 2010 meeting, the budget retreat, there is nothing on there that a public citizen would have any idea. There is a Jones and Associates presentation and a Lewis Young presentation. How would we as citizens have any idea what was taking place. The City Council agenda from July 13, 2010, item 11; tentative the City Council will consider a motion to enter into a closed meeting for the purpose of a strategy session to discuss the purchase, exchange or lease

of real property to be held in accordance with the provision of Utah Code 52.4.204.5. Why couldn't the agenda say to address the purchase, exchange or lease of land for a public works building? He pointed out from minutes of the budget retreat; apparently this building will be paid for by increases in sewer and water rates, garbage rates, etc. The first two years sewer takes a very steep jump in the first year and 30% after that. This is not the time to talk about these things. People are out of jobs and on fixed incomes. Interesting question, Council Member Flamm asked whether the bonds have to go to a public vote, Matt Millis stated that if it is utility revenue they do not but there could be a public hearing to get feedback. Not one Council Member said that's the right thing to do; once again, doing things right vs. doing the right thing. We are in a city that expects open government. We have elected you as our City Council Members, we hold you accountable for the decisions made in this City, and we understand you have to have staff to give you information but you knew this would be a controversial decision. He said that he would question who is running this City because as a businessman, if he got this far down the line on a certain project and his staff did that to him, after all this controversy he would be really upset. To find out that there is not enough land to build on. He said it is his understanding that this site has gone from the bottom of the list to the top of the list. He has sought information on this but all he got is "that's confidential". He said he understands the law regarding property values and the need for the City to do that but when questions are asked and answers aren't given it does create suspicion. Frankly he is going to ask the City Council to respond sometime during this meeting what they feel their duties are. We hold you accountable. He said he would hope that you would hear what we have had to say tonight. Woodrow Wilson said the following: "Government ought to be all outside and no inside. Everybody knows that corruption thrives in secret places and avoids public places and we believe in the fair presumption that secrecy means impropriety." After reading the minutes he said he can see how the City Council feels that this was open to them in the way it was discussed in the budget meeting but in no way would a citizen understand what was taking place. He publicly apologized if he caused Council Member Turner any problems but he is in no way appreciative of the things that were said about him. He has a lot of respect for Council Member Turner and Big D Construction; they do a quality job at a good price.

Justin Fawson, 2539 N 1600 E, said he has lived in North Ogden most of his life and also lived in Clearfield. He said one reason he moved out of Clearfield and never wants to move back is because they put large commercial and industrial zones right by residential zones. He heard it was tabled but have heard that before. He shares the same sentiments as his predecessors. Residential mixed with Industrial is a big issue. If Mountain Rd. is to be developed as a scenic byway, a route through our City there is no place there for an industrial building. The City has promised that beautification would occur. It was stated that this was a done deal and the only reason they were invited was to find volunteers to join a beautification committee. Studies were referred to in this meeting that stated that property values would increase. He really doubts that and would love to see those studies. This building should be placed in an area of the City where it fits in. People don't want this in their backyard; don't put it in someone's backyard; it doesn't belong in someone's backyard. It belongs in an industrial or commercial area. We got into some discussion about closed meeting vs. open meeting. He doesn't think there was a need for privacy or secrecy in this issue. His feeling was that there were a lot of people up for reelection and it was tabled for further review. At that time this site was one of the only sites being discussed. He understands that a selection was made of numerous sites but no one can tell him how the selection was made. He asked why City Council Members were not involved in the selection process and some of them were not. Mayor Harris stated that this never came to a vote but we did reach consensus. He is confused by that statement; how do you meet consensus without a vote. It appears that closed meetings are held so the Council doesn't face opposition. Violating open meeting laws come with a class B misdemeanor offense. He would like to see something placed there that would beautify the area.

Ned Mahlan, 1055 E 1700 N, said for 56 years he has lived right off Mountain Rd. He has enjoyed the City and would like to stay but he is having trouble finding money to pay taxes. If you don't have the money why even consider building. There was an old Dutch lady that said if you don't got it, you don't

spend it. Why are we going into debt for a building? The old adage is fix it up, use it up, wear it out just plain stay out of debt. His mother was raised in Denmark she went to a school that was 200 years old. She could have got out of school at 14 or 15 but if you wanted to stay in you had to learn four different languages. He said he appreciates what these other folks have said. Are we asking for more wants than we need? Mel Blanchard would like a nice, wonderful new shop but the one there now is serving the best it can. As you get some money then you can think about getting into more debt and more building. He doesn't think we are living within our needs. Mr. Malan stated that the scriptures say that the government is trampling on the heads of the poor; it says that in Amos. You look at the government buildings and schools; they look like castles going up. We don't need all that. We need to back off on ordinances and codes and let people live. Get off the people's backs. The City Council does a fine job. Thank you. He said he knows the Council means well but sometimes our means aren't so well. Two employees of Weber County were parked at 8:30 in the morning drinking their coffee at the burger stop on 12th street. He talked with one of them and was told "I'm not getting paid what I'm worth". Mr. Malan thinks that's a terrible thing to say. Learn to live frugally, live like the Word of Wisdom says. This government stuff, some employees need to be fired. Do unto others God's way. When he went to work, he did the best he could, wished our government would do that. Be frugal, stand up and look alive, work in a proper and feasible way. Stop borrowing so much to live on.

Alan Christiansen, 1305 E 2550 N, served twelve years on the City Council and suggested that the current Council use the Obama/ Pelosi line and blame former administrations. He said "most of us are gone and the rest are senile". He said he has served on some committees and if he was giving advice to the young ones he would say 'follow the plan'; the General Plan. There has never been a plan for this type of use to be in this area. He showed a drawing of a proposed lacrosse park at this location. People bought their homes based on this drawing on Jones and Assoc. paper. He mentioned the floods of 1982 and 83. Coldwater Creek was a flowing river through there. Property lines were poorly defined after that. Donated property for the equestrian park and made an area for a future park. How would you like to have a developer come along with this plan and try to sell you a lot? We'll either have an industrial area with salt piles, trucks, plows, etc. or a park. How would the sales be? This is Chapter 7 of our Zoning Ordinance it reads Single-family Residential Zones. The purpose and intent of these zones is to provide areas for single family, residential use at three different low density levels. The City can do public buildings, public parks, and public recreation grounds and associated buildings. He said he doesn't think that this qualifies as a public building. Can he pack a picnic lunch with his family and hang out? Play on the equipment. Sat around this building and talked to people, could've ordered a pizza probably. Do the right thing, sell the land to a developer or build a park there. He said he and his wife hike there all the time.

Bob Buswell, 962 E 3025 N, has a question and would like an answer. He has heard four main voices contrary to the Mountain Rd. site but has not heard from anyone to the west of the current public works site? Is there someone here to comment on that? Mayor Harris said apparently not. Council Member Bigler asked if they could talk about that after comments. Mayor Harris stated yes.

Mayor Muirbrook, 1333 E 2550 N, there's only one thing he would like on there. There is a lot of snow in bad years in that location. He has had his children in that area with 20 foot drifts, making snow huts and playing in it. If we have bad snow years how will we deal with getting the emergency equipment where it needs to be? He thanked the Council for all they do.

Brett Forsberg, 1463 E 2525 N, had a couple things to emphasize. Mountain Rd. is already what he considers to be a dangerous place. If one child were to be injured because we got too much traffic on that road or a truck couldn't stop; the safety concern outweighs anything else we are talking about. That is the overriding issue for him. It is fraught with lawsuits for the City. He said he believes that area is environmentally sensitive. Chemicals run down hill and could contaminate the water table. If this is

opposed it will likely require the City to do an environmental study. Those issues are substantial and need to be fully investigated. He said the City should slow down, practice full disclosure; doing it without hiding anything so we can hold our heads up high.

Mary Settlemire, 2701 Mountain Rd., said she has a problem with two things including the latest round of how this was handled. She said she needs to clarify that most of the knowledge she has is second hand. Since the Mayor Harris and the City Council only found it necessary to inform the Heritage Grove community she was not at that meeting. She lives right across the street from the Equestrian Park and whatever the City does in that area is really going to impact her. She said she is not happy about not being notified. There are a lot of other people that feel the same way. When you are talking about this area you are not just talking about a field somewhere. It is the side of a mountain; people use it for hiking, biking, sleigh rides, there are deer too. If you build this complex here, for security, you will have to light that area up at night. It is dark and beautiful; this will totally take away her peace and the beauty of that place. She doesn't think that's fair. This will increase the number of big trucks hauling into the green waste pit and that noise carries a long way. She has a friend that lives two blocks west of her house and she can hear those trucks. Instead of noise just during the day we will also have it at night. She has a husband with M.S. and she would not appreciate that. The City Council is known in this area for being hard on the businesses. If someone wanted to come in and build an industrial thing in a residential zone the City wouldn't even think about it.

Fred DuVall, 1470 E 2525 N, said he has lived in Heritage Grove for 20 years. He was informed that area would be a green belt or park also. The principal is this; you should never ever build an industrial park next to a residential area. Nobody wants to live with that noise, the mess. It's that simple; don't build it in a residential area.

Ryan Berube, 1532 E 2525 N, said one of his favorite things to do is go around in his wheelchair and this area is one of the places he goes. He said this is a terrible place to put it.

Nate Wood, 1225 E 2500 N, said he is a heavy equipment operator and knows that those trucks weigh 54,000 lbs when they're loaded with sand. There are little kids are out playing in this area. We are walking our family dogs there. Would you want that in your backyard? To listen to 60 db every time those trucks back up. He said he moved there because it is a neighborly neighborhood. People are friendly and help each other. He thinks the City Council should reconsider.

Dave Hulme, 513 E 1700 N, said that he is on the Committee that made the recommendations. The Committee doesn't make decisions; they look at the information and make recommendations to the City Council. He explained that he wanted to serve the City and was allowed to join the Committee. He wanted to tell everyone here that the kind of secretive back room deals that are being alluded to never happened. None of that ever happened. When we looked at the selection process, you can see all the sites. Yesterday he talked to his wife about the Committee, he has been on the Committee a year and that was the first time. There is a sensitive nature to these things. We don't live in a democracy, we live in a republic. You can't reach a consensus with that many people involved. This Public Works building is absolutely necessary. How far would we be if every meeting was run like this? The Committee was asked to take time that they probably didn't have to look at this information. He is proud to have been involved. The trucks that would go down your road would go down your road anyway. If they don't you won't have plowed streets. He understands this is an emotional topic but hopes the people that are so upset will understand that in his opinion the proper process was followed. They have been working for a year. He is here to tell the public that he joined this Committee so he could rest assured that he had done everything he could and he feels that this Committee has done everything it could to deal with this.

Troy Herzog, 2522 N 1600 E, said it seems to him that none of the Heritage Grove folks were on the Committee so they don't know what was discussed. As to trucks going up and down that road we are talking about the trucks that would be there to plow. You won't have the same traffic downtown that they have out there now. We don't put industrial sites next to residential areas.

Allison Ludlow, 2771 N 1275 E, said she wanted to address the government comment. She said she understands that we do live in a republic and we vote for the people to represent us. Quoting someone who is far smarter than I ever will be, "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." – Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Cobalt Stromberg, 2435 N Mountain Rd., said he lived here 3 ½ years; moved from Salt Lake City for the beauty of that area. We stretched ourselves a bit to be able to afford the home in this area. At this time we are doing ok. He thinks there are probably a lot of people in this room in the same situation. We need to be really careful right now about the added burden on the people. One more reason not to build an industrial site by a residential area is that property taxes will go down. People will fight with the County to lower value. There will be less revenue for the City. This is a long term concern. It's a beautiful area and if it's destroyed he said he doesn't know why anyone would want to live right there.

Dave Carlson, City Attorney, said he is probably the last person anybody wants to hear from. He wanted to weigh in and say as the City Attorney part of his responsibility is to make sure that the City operates by the playbook. The playbook is the Federal and State Constitutions, State laws, City ordinances, virtually everything the City does is regulated by laws. His responsibility is to make sure the people you have elected and the people they have appointed operate within the bounds of the Constitutions and the law. That includes transparency and the way decisions are made. There have been some allegations that there were improprieties in the way discussions were held regarding the public works building. He said he wanted the public to know that as long as he has been around and observed the process that is highly inaccurate, not true. The discussions that were held in the closed session a few weeks back were not only lawful to be held in closed session but very appropriate. In his opinion it would have been foolhardy to discuss those things in a public meeting. We can't go into details about the matters that were discussed; for your City government to represent you well and protect your precious tax dollars and when they do business they must do it wisely and prudently. There are certain discussions that need to be held in confidence. That's why you have elected these individuals and put your trust in them so that they can make decisions for you. I tell you that I can't go into detail but it had entirely to do with the City's evaluation of a number of different parcels of properties that the City was looking at as a possible site for public works. It had to do with a careful analysis the City had made of all of the plusses and minuses for those properties and the City's relative value for those properties. In order for the City to be able to negotiate with the owners of those properties in a fair way the City has to keep that discussion private. He said he has only been representing government entities for about 20 years so there may be others in this room that have more experience than him. He has never seen these types of discussions being held in a public meeting and they shouldn't be. As the City Attorney it would be his advice not to hold these kinds of discussions in a public meeting because it would be harmful to the City's interest. There was nothing inappropriate about this; they were talking about the purchase of real property. State law specifically allows that to be done in a closed meeting. There have been some comments that there was a vote taken in a closed meeting that is not true. Everything that happened in that meeting was according to the law. There was nothing to vote on. He is not a North Ogden resident but he wants to make one further comment; representing North Ogden City as a client has been a very easy thing for him to do. The caliber of people that you have elected is very high. They are smart and it's not hard to get them to follow the law and the playbook. He thinks that they have gone the extra mile to keep things open and public. He can't help that you may be uncomfortable with closed meetings, but it is necessary.

Alan Christensen stated that does apply when you are talking about public property. We are talking about City owned property. It should have been noticed and made public. Dave Carlson said that he doesn't want to get into a debate. Alan Christensen said he doesn't think there was an illegal meeting. When we got to the point that we are talking about City owned property it is public and has to be opened up. Dave Carlson said he doesn't want to get into a debate about that. The fact is the purpose of the closed meeting was to discuss all of the properties that were identified and what were the pluses and minuses and the potential cost to the City. The only reason the City's property came up is because one option was to not purchase anything. That's the only way that it came into the discussion. Should we make an offer on any of these properties or keep what we have. There was nothing illegal or inappropriate about that meeting. As legal counsel for the City he said he will stake his reputation on that.

Chris O'Neill, 2821 N1275 E, said you have had lawsuit upon lawsuit about street signs at businesses. What do you think is going to happen if you try to go forward with this? You are opening yourself up for problems that you just have no earthly idea about. The community is adamantly against this. He said he doesn't want to see his City lose money on a frivolous, wasteful project that no one wants. Maybe this is legal, maybe not. A lot of you shook my hand and said please vote for me because I will work for you. You are not working for me and you are not getting my vote. I do not understand why you would want to go against the very neighbors you live with. When he bought his lot 15 years ago he was told that it would be a park and no more development would go in that area. You have been voted in and you can be voted out.

Mayor Harris asked for responses from the City Council. He thanked Dave Carlson for his remarks. Mayor Harris stated first of all we need a new Public Works facility, the one we have is unsafe and inadequate; that's the first thing. We did not want to approach this in a shot gun or a scatter shot manner so last year we undertook with Blalock and Partners to do a study. During that study we looked at all the operations that are occurring within our public works facility now and will in the future. We looked at our needs, now and in the future. Blalock came up with the type of facility we would need to go ahead with. That turned out to be a site, we had different configurations, and according to the study we needed 4.5 to 5 acres. Mayor Harris said we decided to go with at least 5 acres; everything they looked at was over 5 acres. Rather than go with the minimum we decided to go with 5 acres. We looked around the City and there were a number of sites. We put some of those on a short list. All of them were privately owned except one. We went through a series of meetings. During our budget retreat the public works building was referred to no less than 13 times during the discussion. We knew we needed a new facility and some ground to put it on. We had some sites that we were looking at. We had to go through the process of negotiating with land owners, which we did. This is where I think we are having the problem with each other. As we talked about those various parcels there were various reasons that we could not acquire them. It was a process of elimination more than anything else. As we discussed one property if it was not available we went on to the next and the next. We went through that process of elimination and got to the one that the City owns. We decided to go with City owned property. At the beginning of this process we were very concerned about letting folks know; we needed to study the sites in more detail. He said he didn't want to have drilling going on without talking to the neighbors. This was the very earliest moment to do that. A letter was sent out; it was critical that we retain the services of an architect because we had to have some definitive cost data so we could look at acquiring some bonds. That is a whole other process. We wanted to take advantage of some bonding opportunities that expire at the end of this year. We involved the community as soon as we could. There was no intent to do anything behind anyone's back or keep them in the dark. We had a very short time frame; we wanted to get going with some design services. When we had our meeting, of course people were upset and allegations were made. The whole purpose of that was to involve the neighborhood right off the bat. As we started looking at the site, the residents asked us to consider other sites, specifically the north end of the pit and cancel the RFP for the architect. I did both of those things. I agreed that I would look at the north end of the pit. After talking to the Committee and with the understanding that we are putting ourselves in jeopardy with the bonds we

went ahead and cancelled the RFP. As we picked this short list of sites things could have been done better than they were. A five acre parcel was overlaid on those sites in a two dimensional configuration and we probably need to look at three dimensions. Kent Jones, City Engineer, had a concept plan of what a public works facility might look like up there. It looked like it would be awful tight. Rather than wait for an architect to get involved, the Mayor had the City Engineer go check it. This complex could not be built at this site without major cost. We need to drop this site and move on to consider others. We are right at the very beginning of the process. To do it over again he said he probably wouldn't involve the neighbors so fast. It's moot at this point, the site won't work, and we are moving ahead.

Council Member Bigler, stated first of all I want to thank you all for coming and for caring. I realize that we do represent you and I don't think the government is above the people. Hopefully all of you will know what all has transpired and how it transpired. I was blindsided a little bit and frustrated. I talked to the Mayor about this already, 100% agreement with you; basically everything that has been said from the process to the site. For the record, I was not involved in that closed meeting. I was out of town and I did join by my cell phone for another issue. The agenda had generically on it perhaps a closed meeting. I didn't know what that was about; I never even knew they held it until my friend Neal Berube called, with a concern. I'm a Member of the City Council and I didn't even know that this was a done deal. That is a concern that we need to address for the future; the process no matter what the issue is. If I had known that this was being discussed I would have stayed on the phone longer. After the meeting I still was never notified that this was discussed. As a Member of the City Council and as a citizen I was as frustrated as you are. We do need to improve things and I don't think we need to try to put that under the carpet. The closed meeting by law if you are discussing a purchase of property; when it went from the purchasing of property to City owned property that shouldn't have been done in a closed meeting in my opinion. That bothered me a lot because we weren't then discussing the purchase of property. No vote was taken but the words were, it's a done deal and there has been a consensus with the Council. When the citizens were met with and when the newspaper was called not once was it ever mentioned that I wasn't even present. That bothered me, not for political gain or anything. I love this City and I want to do what is right for the City but to try and group it together like there's comfort in numbers. Even if we did things a little bit wrong, I wish it could have been more forthcoming. I don't know how there could be a consensus in a closed meeting and I didn't know about it until Mr. Berube called me. I felt bad that I didn't have any answers so that's why I met with you citizens. Also, the Committee that was formed; the Committee does homework and makes recommendations to the City Council. On my end, back in February when we held our budget meeting when this study was done I specifically asked that I be informed every step of the way why each parcel wouldn't work. If the owner didn't want to sell a property that's a legitimate reason to move on to the next site. I heard nothing from the end of February until Mr. Berube called. That's troublesome. I wanted to be involved in this process and voice my opinion. I'm against the location and the process. The location for a few reasons, first one, it is a residential area. Somebody said what I've been thinking the only reason we are looking at that is because the City owns it. There has been talk in the last few days that we already own this so it will save money. Not necessarily because you have to look at excavation and all the long term things. If a developer wanted to build a commercial complex there, the City would say no, that's residential zone. Just because we legally can build it there doesn't mean we morally and ethically should. I don't live there and a lot of people in Heritage Grove area are my good friends. I told them that there may be things that they don't agree on but this, I agree with them. My kids take the bus and it stops all along there and there's no sidewalk there. These kids stand out there in the snow. When I heard that this was the decision and it was a done deal, it blew my mind. I just think it would be a disaster. Another area why I am against this is that there has been talk that when there's development property values actually increase. That depends on the type of development. With this type of development there is no way that property values are going to increase. It can be said that people will complain wherever it is; another huge reason that I am against this, not just now but I will forever oppose this site, is because I don't want a band-aid approach and then come back to it later. If it's too small now it's going to be too small a year from now. A big reason for it is because some of these citizens they did

their homework and came to the City and asked what was planned for that area. On that premise they went and purchased their property and built their home. It isn't ethical and I will never ever support that site for this facility. It's not like a builder was telling them this then the City's hands would be clean. They came to the City offices to see what was going to happen at the end of that street and the City showed them the plan. For me it's not just a legal issue it is an ethical issue. It's not fair. It's not the right site for that in a residential location. It's not morally right. What I would like to see happen is on Pleasant View Dr.; where it currently is there are some possibilities. I would like us to slow down and back up and have all of the City Council involved every step of the way. All of us together it's a check and balance. There's wisdom in that. I might miss something that you catch and vice versa. On Pleasant View Dr where there is less population if something like that could work out I think we would have a lot less squawking because that's where it already is. They're already used to the trucks coming in and out of there. It won't be a change for those neighbors. It's already near a main corridor. I would like to see us do that. We went through the different sites and why they wouldn't work and a couple of them I wasn't really satisfied with the answers. I would like to propose that we get everyone involved and take this site off the possibilities for good; if not for legal reasons then for ethical reasons. If we don't have any integrity then we shouldn't be trusted and we shouldn't be voted back in, for those that run again. We can put our heads together and work hard and something will happen there. In the future I hope that as we go through this process again all of the City Council Members and the public, that we're here to serve, are kept abreast of all the information that we can. Keep them posted step by step in what this process is. When it comes to a point when it is said that it's a done deal, all of us know what the deal is. Some might not like me saying this but I apologize to you. I appreciate you coming.

Council Member Flamm said what is interesting to him; he is on several committees here including the Public Works Committee and the Business Development Committee. Last week we invited Ron Kusina out to try to give us some ideas on commercial development. We were told that in Weber County all of the industrial parks in Weber County are full and they are looking for more space. We don't have an industrial area in North Ogden City. We don't have an industrial park to put this facility in. I don't know where we'd go. Can you imagine driving from out by the interstate to bring the vehicles in to the City? The other thing that was mentioned was let's put it in the commercial zone. Go up and down Washington and you'll see that there are homes near every parcel over 5 acres in the commercial zone. Where can we put it in the City that won't affect anybody? The current site is not big enough for the proposed complex. The very last thing we talked about was putting this facility up at the gravel pit and we didn't expect to see it come up. Personally he is grateful that it turned out that it shouldn't have been on the list. We have to go back and take another look. Do we really need a new Public Works complex? That's the first question. If you go to the Blalock study you can go through the first 30 pages that address our current facility and the problems we have there. There are enough OSHA issues there we could end up with horrific lawsuits. We are back to saying should we do something? They City spent \$69,000 to do the study and determine that we should do. Take a look at the proposal it is posted on the City website. We have taken a very systematic approach to determine whether we need a new Public Works complex. If you look at the study you'll find that their recommendation is yes, we need to do something different. The dilemma is where to put it. If any of you have five acres that you would love to sell the City at a reasonable amount and the neighbors won't complain that would be ideal, I'd love to hear it.

Alan Christiansen, 1305 E 2550 N, stated that the Blalock study is flawed because you're doing apples and oranges. If the City didn't own that property would Blalock have come up with different numbers? I don't think it would have. Council Member Flamm said the gravel pit was not #1 there were several other pieces of property looked at.

Council Member Taylor asked the public to give the City Council the same respect that they showed the public.

Council Member Flamm said we paid a lot of money to have a company come up and tell us that our current facilities are inadequate. We have a site that has some problems; you can't build a facility there that will handle the City until build out. As we look ahead there will be a lot more homes built in North Ogden and it will take more equipment and more buildings for the City for years to come. It's not easy, we are struggling through it. There is not an ideal site; no matter where we go in the City there will be problems and people who are not going to be happy. The process of looking at the gravel pit was to see if it would even work. That's why we did some more looking to see if it would work. It's off the table, it's not five buildable acres and it won't work for the current facility. We are back trying to figure out where to go. I appreciate you being here. I would like to respond to the comment regarding utility increases and sewer increase. Those increases are the result of federal government changes in the laws. Weber Sewer District is the one making those increases. The City has to pass it on to the residents. Those numbers you heard are a result of federal legislation. It's strictly out of our hands. We are trying to figure out what is best to do. We are more than happy to meet with you and listen to your suggestions. We're just moving ahead one step at a time. Anywhere we go; it's going to be a problem. Thank you for coming.

Council Member Taylor said first, I would like to say that I agree with everything you've said because that's smart politically but I don't. I believe with what brought you here tonight and I will not support that site. I hope you'll listen to me to say a few things some you'll agree with and some not. The process that happened here, I am obviously pretty new, but I have been hearing about this since late last year. All but one of these meetings have been public meetings. I wish more of you had come to those and seen that this is not a secret discussion. Hours were spent discussing this publicly. A brief meeting was held to discuss specific properties in private and for the reasons our attorney has said. I largely feel that we have screwed up with the process here. As one of your elected officials I have to take responsibility for problems something I learned that as an Army officer. If one of my soldiers has done something, even if I wasn't there, I am responsible. It's me who sets up the parameters and the discipline in the unit. I am upset that you are upset. Clearly we screwed up somewhere. I'm going to take responsibility for that and work with my fellow Council Members to make sure we do better in the future. I promise you that is going to happen; it's already happening. I want to draw a distinction here, there was nothing done in secret or maliciously here. We do need to look at this whole process and look at where we made mistakes to see where we broke the confidence with our residents. It's disappointing to me when I read things in the paper that the City is a villain; that the City is doing things maliciously. I can see where citizens could get that perception looking back. Please know folks, there was not a conspiracy here against your neighborhood, there is not one ongoing. At the closed meeting we discussed the properties from the final study there were several that were ranked higher. This was a very highly ranked property. It has been put out incorrectly that this was the lowest ranked property. That is not true at all, it was ranked #4 I have the study right here in front of me. Once the cost of land was figured in as the last factor it became the highest ranking. The information that this was the lowest property or one of the lowest properties and has risen somehow through staff mischief is just not true. The City Council has been informed of every property that was higher and what happened to it. I realize that you didn't know that; I hear you. When you are buying a house that is not a public transaction; there are strict confidentiality rules with real estate. We do not want to raise your taxes any more than necessary to build a building like this; if the building gets built. We try to find the best possible property, and those other properties fell out. You ask what the consensus was. Well, we have this property we don't have to buy it; let's use this as the proposed property. The next steps to be taken are two things; Mayor Harris was going to meet with the neighbors nearby first prior to the other public meetings that would normally be held for this, to let those residents know first and then testing that Mayor Harris has said needed to be done. There was certainly no decision made that this was the site for sure. The City slated in that meeting additional testing to be done to determine whether it was going to be feasible. What happened next was the meeting with those of you that were there; I wasn't at the meeting with the residents but clearly something was said that gave the residents the impression that this was a done deal. That was never true. That was not correct, that was never approved. This project hasn't been approved. Any decision like that will be made in a meeting

similar to this one. If this building is built there will be a tax increase and there will be a lot of people here. There's no reason for us to have a conspiracy about this. There was no conspiracy. You can believe me or not but that's all that happened. Things were said at the meeting with the residents that were not accurate. That has created a lot of the perceptions. That was a genuine mistake. The project is not approved. No site has been approved. We don't want you to have a lack of confidence in the government. The last thing I wanted to say is that it's not fair at all for any Council Member to get up here and say he was kept in the dark about this proposal. It is inappropriate to say that. In addition to the meeting that occurred, I think that it's common procedure that if you are absent from a meeting you need to find out what occurred during that meeting. That's what I do every meeting I miss. When I get back I come in and found out what happened. The City Manager has sent 3 updates to the Council, one was July 24th, one on July 31th, and one on July 19th, the first topic on all updates is this very topic. There is not a conspiracy to keep a Council Member out of the loop. I think my summary is I promise there was no conspiracy, I agree that the process was wrong and we need to look at that and make it better, I hope you all stay just as involved and continue to come to the Council meetings.

Council Member Turner said I can't say more than what's been said, other than the fact that I appreciate Mr. Berube apologizing. In this process, Mr. Berube has said he has been called some things. I have too but I have thick skin. So everybody knows, people have called my Mom and said things about me. My extended family, in other cities, has been called things. Also, my work has been called. Obviously this is not the site to build this building. I am really a little hurt by the fact that the residents that voted me in would call me the things they did. That's not cool. Man to man let's talk; man to woman too. I told my boss that if it turned out to be between my career and City Council I would resign today from the Council.

Council Member Harris said I would like to think I'm a lifelong learner. I have learned some things tonight. Number 1, when Rachel Trotter calls you on a Friday afternoon and says you are the only Council Member she can reach it would be best to not talk to her. Rachel probably quoted me correctly but they were taken out of context. Also, don't reply to an email in the heat of a moment. If I am a developer I have learned that it would be wise to include a drawing of a park near my development and that will help my property sell. I do know what we do and what previous Council's have done; it's very difficult to bind a future Council. So I think we have had a great discussion tonight about the future of that site. Is it appropriate for the five acres complex we envision? It doesn't look like it. What some future Council may decide, I don't know. The City evolves, the General Plan is revisited. A document like that will evolve. We do have some plans for review coming up soon.

Council Member Turner said the agenda says discussion and/or action; do we need some action here? The Committee will go back and look at other sites some other properties; do we need a motion for that? Mayor Harris said we can do what the Council desires. This site is off the table, we will be looking at other sites. See if we can find some more properties that would be suitable. The site in this neighborhood is off the table but we are looking at other portions of the pit. We have 30 acres up there. I can't say what will happen but the portion that abuts the neighborhood will not be considered any further. We will go ahead and look at other sites and see if we can come to an agreement.

Chris O'Neill, 2821 N 1275 E, said the City has 30 acres; we just argued about 4.7 acres. It's not going to change by just moving it north a bit. Can there be some discussion about what we want to do with this land so we don't have to keep coming here every three years. Council Member Flamm said he doesn't know that anything is cast in concrete for that site. There were some considerable donations made that turned another gravel pit into a soccer park. If your neighborhood could raise enough money then we could develop a park that would be something that we could certainly consider.

Bruce Hall, 2548 N 1550 E, said he wanted to restate that nowhere on the east bench is a suitable location for an industrial maintenance complex. It belongs in a central located area like a hub and spoke configuration. Keep it off the foothills.

Neal Berube said he asked Mayor Harris if the City would consider downsizing the proposal. Is that site being considered for a building being downsized? Mayor Harris said he doesn't know. Mr. Berube said he met with Council Member Taylor several times and he never indicated that he had been updated on this. He confirmed what Mr. Bigler said that he didn't know anything about this. He feels there is a conflict with Council Member Turner and Big D Construction. He said he takes strong exception with what Council Member Taylor said in public tonight about the site not being #1. Council Member Taylor said that is not what I said in your home, I said I could not give you all the information on the sites. I said a site had been lost due to money; a site was lost due to wetlands. I did give you some of the reasons but I said I couldn't tell you them all. As to it being the number 1 site, I just explained that in my previous comments. There was a numbering list from Blalock on which this site was #4; with the City owning the property it came up to #1. There is nothing I'm trying to hide here.

Justin Fawson, 2539 N 1600 E, said Mr. Taylor uses 'we' very loosely. In his conversations with Mr. Bigler and Mr. Flamm he doesn't believe that Mr. Taylor knew the reason that each site was not chosen. None of the Council Members have addressed each site specifically. Council Member Taylor said there were only 3 sites higher than this site in the numerical rankings not in the final rankings. For all three of those sites we were told why they were not chosen. Was every site gone over, no, but the sites that were higher numerically we were told why they were not selected.

Mayor Harris, it is obvious that we need to come to a resolution. We will take a careful look at things but cannot sit here and tell you that site will never be built on. Whatever comes forward you will have plenty of say about. We will have public comments no matter where we put the site. We will come to some resolution and you will know about it and we will go from there.

Neal Berube asked the City Council to put a deed restriction on that site and resolve this issue in that area once and for all.

Council Member Taylor said he would be comfortable looking at that, we have heard public discussion; clearly we have heard some things we have not considered. The sound off the mountains he didn't think of. That's what we need from the public. He would certainly be willing to support a vote to not put that complex up there.

Council Member Flamm said he thinks if you look at the large piece of property and analysis it, you'll see that the southern end was the only area that appeared to have the room. He personally doesn't feel comfortable looking at any portions of that site right now. He is on the Committee and that is his feeling at this point. He would not personally do anything to try to put anything up there at this time. We need to go through the process and keep looking at properties of 5 acres. As far as he's concerned that area is off the table. I don't know anything about deed restrictions. It would take some time to try to do a deed restriction and Council would need to talk about that. There are advantages and disadvantages of that. He would not be comfortable moving ahead on that without more facts.

Council Member Bigler asked if this could be put on a future City Council agenda and in the mean time get all the information to each City Council Member to study so we know what we're talking about there. I hope this would be taken off the table permanently, in my mind, it's a disaster area. The other point is it's not just a matter of a developer trying to sell property; they came to the City and were shown a future park. I propose that we take it off the table completely. How binding is a motion made now? Can a

future council undo it? Mayor Harris said that's the way he sees it. This Council can take it off the table but we can't bind future councils.

Council Member Bigler moved that we permanently take off the table that entire site for building this Public Works facility or anything like it because of what they were told when they bought the property. Council Member Taylor seconded the motion.

Discussion on the motion:

Council Member Harris said she is not opposed to the thought, I think we have discussed this, we've heard all of the comments, I don't think we're going to have a Public Works facility there. If we pass that motion tonight, the Committee that is studying this needs to have some options for that site and what it might be of value for the City. I don't want a motion that binds it too much, if there is some use for that that would be compatible for the neighborhood. Let the Committee do their work. Let's not tie their hands. Council Member Taylor said please show some respect. Council Member Harris said there are things that are still coming up about that property. She said she would like to hear the motion again.

Council Member Bigler repeated the motion and added that if it is not specific it should be more something that follows that landscape something similar. Council Member Bigler amended the motion. Council Member Taylor thinks that is a potential legal problem, we don't have before us what they were told. Let's say the Public Works building is not going there but leave off what is going there. He would support taking the Public Works building off but need to leave future discussion for another time.

Council Member Turner said he is not sure what the property is there. He is concerned, about deeds, restrictions, what was said. Did something say that it has to be a park? Could it be a subdivision? He is all for not putting the Public Works building there but not the rest.

Annette Spendlove, City Recorder, showed a drawing of the properties in question. She explained that the Fife property was donated with certain stipulations. The property south of the substation, the City bought from the Barker Family in 1971 and was deeded to the City in 1977. Ed Dickie, City Manager, stated that the Attorney will look at this to determine whether there are stipulations on these other pieces.

Mayor Harris said he is ok taking the Public Works building off that entire site but thinks we need to be very careful with what we say so we don't prohibit something that we are already doing up there.

Council Member Bigler moved to take the Public Works facility off that entire site and use that property only for uses that will fit into the residential zoning.

Annette Spendlove, City Recorder, mentioned that Alan Christensen had the zoning ordinance and certain other things are permitted there so be careful of your wording.

Council Member Bigler moved to stop the Public Works facility from going on that site. Council Member Taylor seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Flamm	yes
Council Member Bigler	yes
Council Member Taylor	yes
Council Member Harris	yes
Council Member Turner	yes

Motion passed.

**CONSIDERATION AND FINAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE FERNWOOD ESTATES
SUBDIVISION PHASE 2**

Annette Spendlove, City Recorder, stated regarding Fernwood Estates Phase 2 that all improvements are in. Kent Jones, City Engineer, has signed off and recommends that the City Council grant final acceptance.

Council Member Flamm moved to grant final acceptance to the Fernwood Estates Subdivision Phase 2. Council Member Bigler seconded.

Council Member Taylor said we discussed the additional safeguards because of past errors. He asked have there been some updates done. Ed Dickie stated that Gary Kerr has brought it for the Council's approval which shows that it has met all the conditions for final acceptance. Council Member Taylor asked if there were two sets of eyes on this to catch potential mistakes. Ed Dickie stated that the process is a lot tighter for this approval

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Turner	yes
Council Member Taylor	yes
Council Member Bigler	yes
Council Member Flamm	yes
Council Member Harris	yes

Motion passed.

**CONSIDERATION AND FINAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE HIDDEN WILLOW ESTATES
SUBDIVISION**

Annette Spendlove, City Recorder, stated that Fieldstone Homes Utah has completed all improvements for the Hidden Willow Estates Subdivision. Kent Jones has signed off on it and staff recommends approval.

Council Member Taylor moved to grant final acceptance to the Hidden Willow Estates Subdivision. Council Member Turner seconded.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Flamm	yes
Council Member Harris	yes
Council Member Turner	yes
Council Member Taylor	yes
Council Member Bigler	yes

Motion passed.

**CONSIDERATION AND FINAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE HALLTREE SUBDIVISION PHASE
13**

Annette Spendlove, City Recorder, said that all improvements are in and have been inspected. Kent Jones has signed off on this. Final acceptance will release escrow funds to the developer.

Council Member Taylor moved to grant final acceptance to the Halltree Subdivision. Council Member Turner seconded.

Voting on the motion:

Council Member Harris	yes
Council Member Flamm	yes
Council Member Bigler	yes
Council Member Taylor	yes
Council Member Turner	yes

Motion passed.

COUNCIL/PUBLIC COMMENTS

Kent Bailey, 859 E 2850 N, thanked the Council and stated that he came tonight because he was asked by someone concerned about the Public Works item.

Justin Fawson, 2539 N 1600 E, thanked the Council. He stated that there were some pointed things said and he appreciates the Council's service. Your job is challenging; I want to publicly thank you.

Bob Buswell, 962 E 3025 N, thanked the Council. He does have something to talk about that is far in the future. When we talk about sidewalks, buses and trucks, Mountain Rd. in the long run is going to be Skyline Dr. You all know that but he was hoping that there would still be some people here to realize that things will be changing up there.

Bruce Jones, 750 W 4200 N, Pleasant View, said he doesn't want to belabor the problems discussed tonight. You all read my name in the paper. I understand that you all know what it's like to have things said negative about you. Mr. Taylor, in the evolving of Quail Ponds, if you examine the records, everything that was expected of me, required of me, was done. There were some things that some select people in that Phase didn't want to abide by. The motivation of those people began the process of requesting the vacation of the PRUD ordinance. Knowing the atmosphere there, I felt it was the best thing for everybody concerned. As to why I didn't come to the meeting, I didn't ask for the meeting, I wasn't needed to lead the meeting. I was not in town. I believe the reporter called my office while I was out of town for my input on the dispute. I have asked Mayor Harris if he could have a private meeting with you and the Planning Commission Chairman. I guess I am just feeling from what I'm hearing from you tonight it's not fun to have your name in lights and in the paper.

Dave Hulme, 513 E 1700 N, also wanted to add his thanks for what the City Council does. Mr. Hulme stated that Council Member Turner said he has thick skin and I am glad I lost to every one of you. I don't want the citizens of this community to believe that the number one issue for decision making in this City is public clamor. I don't think that emotions, certainly the kind of behavior that is regularly displayed in something this emotional and complete lack of respect for rules of law should influence decisions. The Mayor chairs this meeting and he gets to decide whether people applaud. He was disappointed in having seen that. I would hope that everyone understands that we are going to move this from here to somewhere else and the residents there are going to wonder why we gave more consideration to these people than them. I hope as we move forward in the City we follow the rule of law, the Constitution, and not ridicule someone for making a mistake or misremembering. More people will then be more comfortable running for public office. I don't have the courage to do it again. I think that's too bad; I think I have a lot to offer. Thank you again for what you do, it is appreciated. I know it's thankless but you are in our thoughts and prayers.

Council Member Flamm stated that his father recently passed away and City staff sent flowers. He wanted to thank them publically.

Council Member Bigler said for him the decision had nothing to do with public clamor. As he met with the citizens, he told them that we will not always see eye to eye but on this issue I felt strongly that this location was not the way to go. Thank you for coming out tonight. We appreciate you as citizens and we realize that we are public servants and dedicated to listen to you, put our heads together and come up with the best decisions for the City.

Council Member Taylor said he wanted to thank everyone who came to participate. Hopefully, maybe we will see more people coming out. What disappointed him most is that if people want to blame the elected officials, that's fine. They are the ones that the people voted to do that stuff. One major frustration for him is accusations about the staff manipulating things or running this project, those things are not accurate. We were all involved and made aware of what was going on. Where there have been mistakes, and there have been, the City Council will take responsibility.

Council Member Bigler asked whether the next meeting has been changed to the 7th. Mayor Harris stated yes, September 7, 2010. Council Member Bigler asked if the business license fees and Good Landlord Program will be on that agenda. Mayor Harris stated that they will be setting the public hearing only on the 7th.

Annette Spendlove, City Recorder, read a letter from a resident that reads as follows:

To the citizens, the Council, the Mayor and Staff,

I just wanted to express my gratitude to this great City for picking up our water bill while Corey is deployed in the Air Force. He is miserable there and wishes he was home. I can't say that I have enjoyed having him gone either. It is so awesome to know I have one less bill through all this and I appreciate it very much. It is a great thing the City supports the military in this community. We live in an awesome place. Thank you once again,

Sincerely, Julie Baggs

Ed Dickie, City Manager, stated that there will be a ribbon cutting on Monday, August 30, 2010 at 11:45am for Yo!Gurt. It is at 428 E 2600 N just east of 7-11 across from Smith's strip mall.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Taylor moved to adjourn. Council Member Turner seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55pm.

Mayor Richard G, Harris

City Recorder

Date approved