

1 **NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL TOWN HALL MEETING MINUTES**

2  
3 June 9, 2015

4  
5 The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on June 9, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. at the  
6 North Ogden Senior Center at 505 East 2550 North. Notice of time, place and agenda of the  
7 meeting was delivered to each member of the City Council, posted on the bulletin board at the  
8 municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on June 5, 2015. Notice of the annual  
9 meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on December 21, 2014.

10  
11  
12 **PRESENT:** Brent Taylor Mayor  
13 Kent Bailey Council Member  
14 Lynn Satterthwaite Council Member  
15 Phillip Swanson Council Member  
16 James Urry Council Member  
17 Cheryl Stoker Council Member  
18  
19 **STAFF PRESENT:** Bryan Steele City Administrator/Finance Director  
20 Annette Spendlove City Recorder/HR Director  
21 Jon Call City Attorney  
22 Dave Espinoza Public Works Director  
23 Kevin Warren Police Chief  
24 Gary Kerr Building Official  
25 Rob Scott City Planner  
26 Tiffany Staheli Parks & Recreation Director  
27

28  
29 **VISITORS:** Bob Buswell Dwane Parker Margaret Schvaneveldt  
30 Noel Schvaneveldt Leonard Looney Steven Rasmussen  
31 Justin Stowers Luke Stowers Jake Stowers  
32 Cody Hull Haden Smith Kurt Illum  
33 Kim Carter Dan Carter Mary Settlemire  
34 Ginger Heaton Kaye Wilson Guy Thornock  
35 Jay Thornock Joy Thornock John Arrington  
36 Julee Smith Gordon Robson Christian George  
37 John Hansen  
38

39 **PRESENTATIONS BY DEPARTMENTS – 6:30 P.M. – 7:20 P.M.**

40  
41  
42 **AGENDA**

43  
44 **1. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

45  
46 There were no public comments.  
47

48 \*Mayor Taylor then moved item four ahead of item two on the agenda.\*

49

50 **4. DISCUSSION ON FISCAL YEAR 2015 - 2016**

51

52 Mayor Taylor used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide those in attendance with  
53 information about the process to prepare the annual North Ogden City budget. The Budget Year  
54 runs from July 1 to June 30 of each year. Development of the budget is a collaborative process  
55 between Mayor, City Council, and Staff during multiple meetings from January to June. The  
56 City Council is the approving authority for the budget. The City budget must be adopted before  
57 June 20. The highlights of the 2014-2015 budget include, but are not limited to:

58

- 59 • Re-introduced the printed newsletter with utility bills
- 60 • Cherry Days community involvement (volunteer co-chairs leading)
- 61 • Smith's Marketplace and Café Rio opened
- 62 • Logo contest leads to a new City logo
- 63 • Walking path completed on 2550 North w/strong community support
- 64 • 3100 North re-striping project to improve school safety
- 65 • Parks & Rec events: Glow Run, Half Marathon, Luau
- 66 • Excellent police work: North Ogden named in Top 10 Safest Cities in Utah
- 67 • Nativity display discussion and positive resolution
- 68 • 5.5 miles of new trails along the Bonneville Shoreline (27 continuous miles)
- 69 • Former Councilman Justin Fawson elected to the Utah Legislature
- 70 • Re-financed the Aquatic Center bonds; interest rate dropped from 4% to 2.2% (\$230k in total savings)
- 71 • Purchased 3 new snow plows to improve snow plow service
- 72 • Purchased Chevy Silverado police vehicles, saving money versus an SUV
- 73 • Obtained \$2.2 million in grants for the future widening of 400 E/450 E
- 74 • Constructed major road repairs on 450 E and 1875 N
- 75 • Increase in sales tax generated in North Ogden
- 76 • Nearly \$1 million in upgrades to Water, Storm Water and Sewer systems
- 77 • First permanent raises for our hard working employees in 4 years
- 78 • We have the lowest utility rates of the 5 largest Weber County cities
- 79 • North Ogden has not had a property tax increase since 2009
- 80 • Public Works facility: on time and in budget; approximately \$3.3 million
- 81 • Monroe Blvd. land acquisition underway (construction is years away)
- 82 • Began transition to LED streetlights: bulbs save 75% electricity
- 83 • Purchased crack seal machine to perform road maintenance "in-house"
- 84 • NOPD obtained grants to purchase body cameras for all officers
- 85 • Reduced cost of 2nd recycling can to increase recycling efforts
- 86 • Shop Local campaign to raise awareness of the power of shopping local
- 87 • LED Christmas Lights at Bicentennial Park (thank you Civic League)
- 88 • Monthly City Council work sessions to generate discussion
- 89 • Transitioned temporarily from a City Manager to a full-time Mayor
- 90 • Future streetlight at 300 E and 2700 N to facilitate commercial growth
- 91 • Began installation of a new, cutting-edge utility meter reading system

- 92 • Library upgrade and expansion being planned with Weber County Library System
- 93 • Completed a new Dog Park (850 E 2600 N) for under \$6,000

94  
95 Mayor Taylor then provided an overview of the condition of the City’s General Fund. The  
96 General Fund is used to receive general tax dollars (sales and property tax, etc.) and to pay for  
97 general government operations, including police, planning, parks & recreation, and  
98 administration. He reviewed the revenues in the General Fund, noting the largest revenue source  
99 is sales tax. He also reviewed General Fund expenditures, noting the largest expense is to fund  
100 the Police Department. He then reviewed the budget highlights for the proposed 2015-2016  
101 budget:

- 102 • Police: Four new patrol trucks; Cross training Animal Control Officer as a Police Officer;  
103 Implement Youth Court, beginning process for future K-9 program
- 104 • Parks & Recreation: Completing trail on Pleasant View Drive; Renovating restroom at  
105 Oaklawn Park; completing trail connection between IHC and Smith’s; Kubota Tractor;  
106 trailers for lawn mowers
- 107 • Planning: Adoption of updated General Plan, implement Form-Based Code ordinances;  
108 Review & Update of zoning & subdivision fees
- 109 • Streets: \$417,000 budgeted for street repairs; analyze and prioritize future street  
110 maintenance projects
- 111 • Motor Pool: Lift for new public works shop building; replacement truck for streets  
112 department;
- 113 • Overall City-Wide: 12% growth in sales tax revenues (*please remember to shop local*);  
114 Transferring \$262,750 to the Capital Projects Fund to help with future project funding.

115 He noted all of this will be accomplished without a property tax increase. He then discussed fund  
116 reserves; each fund has a “reserve”, or the balance left in the account at the end of the budget  
117 year after all expenses and revenue. Fund reserves are used to finance major projects or to cover  
118 years with low revenues. The North Ogden City funds are projected to have these balances as of  
119 June 30, 2016 when the 2015-2016 budget ends. North Ogden is in excellent financial health. By  
120 fully funding depreciation in utility funds, we are building strong reserves for future  
121 infrastructure projects and replacements. He reviewed the fund reserve amounts projected to be  
122 in place at the conclusion of the current budget year as follows:

- 123 • **General Fund**: \$1,392,992
- 124 • **Capital Projects Fund**: \$692,400
- 125 • **Motor Pool Fund**: \$311,706
- 126 • **Police Motor Pool**: \$44,290
- 127 • **RDA Fund**: \$678,389
- 128 • **Water Fund**: \$1,459,057
- 129 • **Sewer Fund**: \$885,986
- 130 • **Storm Water Fund**: \$1,808,045
- 131 • **Solid Waste Fund**: \$428,803
- 132 ○ **Total**: **\$7,701,668**

133  
134 Mayor Taylor then provided an economic development update. Under Utah law cities receive 1%  
135 of the total amount of taxable sales. The remaining 5-6% of the sales tax goes to the state,  
136 county, and other government entities. North Ogden’s population share increased 3% so far this

137 year, while the point of sale (POS) share has increased 28%. The City's total sales tax dollars  
138 have increased 10%. North Ogden receives far more sales tax from the population share, because  
139 the City has a relatively high population and low commercial sales. Elected officials and Staff  
140 are working hard to bring new businesses into the City to grow the POS share. He identified  
141 some of the economic development projects in the works as follows:

- 142 • Redevelopment of the old Smith's building.
- 143 • Development of property located at approximately Washington Boulevard and 2700  
144 North.
- 145 • Development of an eight acre Assisted Living Center
- 146 • 25 acre Mixed Use project at old Country Boy Dairy property.
- 147 • Re-Development of King's Plaza
- 148 • Housing growth

149  
150 He then provided information regarding the City's utility funds, starting with the water utility  
151 budget, which has a total budget of \$1.7 million. Highlights of the water utility budget include:

- 152 • \$400,000 to replace water lines in Coldwater Creek subdivision which was installed in  
153 the 1950's and has had 11 leaks since 2010
- 154 • \$600,000 for a new well at the top of 1050 East
- 155 • Purchase of a ranger to help with the checking of reservoirs and spring boxes (which are  
156 difficult to reach in a truck)

157  
158 The sewer fund has a total budget of \$1.6 million and the highlights of that budget include:

- 159 • \$400,000 for a sewer vacuum truck to replace the current one the City has had for 13  
160 years
- 161 • \$300,000 for slip lining of sewer lines
- 162 • \$37,000 for a work truck replacement

163  
164 The City completes "trenchless" sewer line repairs every year, which has been the practice since  
165 2009; this entails inserting a new PVC pipe into the old concrete pipe, which results in  
166 essentially a new pipe without the expense of digging up the road. This will keep the City's  
167 infrastructure healthy for the years ahead. The largest expense in the sewer fund is over \$1  
168 million in fees to the Central Weber Sewer District; the District increased their fees this year to  
169 cover the expense associated with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) mandates and it is  
170 necessary for the City to pass that increase on to residents.

171  
172 The storm drain fund has a total budget of \$683,572. The storm drain system includes all gutters,  
173 drains, detention basins, etc. that capture and detain rain runoff to prevent flooding in the City.  
174 North Ogden has a lot of mountains and hills and it is necessary to have a very robust storm  
175 drain system to prevent flooding. The highlights of the storm water budget include:

- 176 • \$160,000 to purchase an additional leaf collector truck to help with keeping gutters and  
177 storm drain boxes clean
- 178 • \$250,000 of Storm Drain improvements around 1525 N and Washington Boulevard

179  
180 The City has developed a comprehensive Master Plan for future storm drain improvements  
181 added to the existing lines and basins. Implementation of this plan will take a lot of money, but

182 will help keep the City from flooding; storm drain fees go towards funding these projects. Mayor  
183 Taylor reviewed a map to identify the location of some of the needed storm drain projects to be  
184 completed throughout the City.

185

186 He then reported the solid waste fund has a total budget of \$886,476. There is a proposal to  
187 decrease solid waste fees charged to residents. One highlight of the budget is the scheduling of  
188 an additional City-wide spring clean-up day due to the fact that the inaugural event in May of  
189 2015 was such a success.

190

191 Mayor Taylor then reviewed the City’s Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Economic Development  
192 budget. Funding will be allowed to pay for beautification projects throughout the City, including  
193 bus stops, benches, garbage cans, and flower planters. The City will also solicit grant funds for  
194 beautification projects. He concluded his budget presentation by reviewing a chart detailing how  
195 North Ogden City compares with other cities along the Wasatch Front. The chart was entitled  
196 “top ten lowest cost cities per capita for population groups under 20,000” and North Ogden ranks  
197 eighth among those 10 cities; this says a lot about the work the City staff does in being guardians  
198 of taxpayer dollars. He added that the City also conducted a utility rate study recently and found  
199 that North Ogden has the lowest utility rates among all other cities in Weber County.

200

201 Mayor Taylor then welcomed public comments and a question and answer session regarding the  
202 budget. There were no visitors present who wished to make public comments.

203

204 Mayor Taylor then used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide those in attendance with  
205 information regarding a proposal to implement a transportation utility fee in the City. He  
206 explained a transportation utility fee would treat roads like other utilities, wherein the City would  
207 save funds over time to pay for future maintenance and infrastructure costs. Provo City has  
208 implemented a transportation utility fee and Mayor Taylor reviewed the section of the Provo City  
209 Code detailing the implementation of the fee. Provo City has different categories for the fee,  
210 ranging from \$2.10 per month for multi-family residential properties all the way up to \$225.50  
211 for high use commercial businesses. He summarized the reasons he feels a transportation utility  
212 fee is appropriate:

- 213 • Accountability & Transparency: Dedicated funds are segregated to be used 100% on road  
214 maintenance and construction—cannot be diverted for other projects or purposes
- 215 • Equity: Rather than relying solely on property or sales taxes, all who use roads participate
- 216 • Fiscally Sound: We avoid road repair bonds/debt in the future, by proactively dealing  
217 with road maintenance and by saving for future construction projects

218

219 There are two primary future expenses for the proposed Transportation Utility Fund

- 220 • Maintenance: Regular pavement treatments and maintenance to extend lifespan of roads  
221 (crack seal, slurry seal, overlays, rebuilds, etc.)
- 222 • Future Construction: New road construction projects to improve city’s transportation  
223 network (i.e., Monroe Blvd., Skyline Dr., widening of 400/450 East, etc.)

224

225 City Engineer Matt Hartvigsen provided the audience with information regarding the types of  
226 maintenance projects that can be completed to extend the life of a road, including chip seals,  
227 crack filling and sealing, diamond grinding, dowel bar retrofits, fog seals, joint crack seals, joint

228 repairs, pavement patching, scrub sealing, slurry seals, spot high-friction treatments, and surface  
229 sealing. He noted that maintenance is very important and every one dollar spent on maintenance  
230 projects will save the City \$6.00 to \$10.00 in future road repair costs. He stated the City is doing  
231 what it can with the money it has to maintain roads, but more needs to be done to prevent greater  
232 future transportation costs. Mayor Taylor then reported the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has  
233 developed a program called the pavement condition index (PCI); it is widely used by states and  
234 cities throughout the United States to measure the condition of roads. He stated that if no  
235 maintenance is done on any given road, it should last approximately 15 years, but ongoing  
236 maintenance can extend road life beyond 30 years. He stated the City uses a pavement  
237 management system that tracks the maintenance need throughout the City. A 14-year resurfacing  
238 history, pre and post the great recession, indicates that from 2001 to 2008 the City completed  
239 62.77 miles of road (or 7.84 miles per year), but only 26.05 miles from 2009 to 2014 (or 4.34  
240 miles per year). He noted this is only 55 percent of the pre-recession rate. There are many areas  
241 that have not been resurfaced in the past 14 years and it may be several more years until those  
242 roads can be serviced. He summarized the condition of North Ogden City roads as follows:

- 243 • Professional Review: We had a professional company assess the roads (note: this  
244 company is connected to our pavement management software company, and is not  
245 bidding on any of the possible road work).
- 246 • Their review found that the majority of our roads have a remaining service life (RSL) of  
247 less than 10 years—increased maintenance can improve this.
- 248 • Their review found that 716 segments of our 984 total road segments are recommended at  
249 this time for a treatment maintenance (72% of all segments are recommended for a  
250 maintenance treatment).
- 251 • The total cost of all these maintenance recommendations is \$5,430,703.
- 252 • It would take approximately 10 years of our full allocation of B&C (“Gas Tax”) road  
253 funds to pay for the maintenance that is recommended today for our roads—additional  
254 funds are needed now, or we will significantly degrade our road network by missing  
255 opportunities to extend RSL on our roads.

256  
257 He then reviewed photographs deteriorating roads throughout the City, after which he reviewed a  
258 map identifying recommended overlay and chip slurry seal projects. He then reviewed a chart  
259 identifying needed road construction projects, the estimated cost for each project, and  
260 miscellaneous costs for each project. The list included the widening of 450/400 East (\$10  
261 million), the extension of 450 East to Skyline Drive (\$4 million) the construction of Skyline  
262 Drive (\$30 million), the construction of Monroe Boulevard (\$20 million), Mountain Road  
263 operational improvements (\$2.5 million), and 2550 North operational improvements (\$2.5  
264 million). He then identified the funding sources available to the City as follows:

- 265  
266 • Class B & C state road funds (generated by the “gas tax”), which includes an increase  
267 passed this year by the State Legislature.
- 268 • Property & sales tax revenues (General Fund revenues).
- 269 • Impact Fees on new developments (*we currently do not have*).
- 270 • Utility Transportation Fee (*we currently do not have*).
- 271 • Cuts in other areas to shift funds towards roads.
- 272 • State & Federal Road Grants: Generally not for maintenance, but for new construction.  
273 This is the best funding source for major road projects, but funds are limited and higher

274 “matches” will greatly enhance our chances of success. To offer higher “matches,” we  
275 need additional road revenues.  
276

277 The City currently has \$555,000 in available B&C monies. If a gas tax increase is enacted the  
278 City could receive an additional \$103,570 in B&C monies. If the 0.25% sales tax increase  
279 passes, the City could receive an additional \$180,472 in revenues. If the City implements a  
280 transportation utility fee it would generate approximately \$208,800. If the City implements a  
281 transportation impact fee of \$1,000 it would generate approximately \$75,000 per year. State and  
282 federal road grant opportunities are largely dependent upon the cost of the project and the City’s  
283 ability to provide matching funds. If the transportation utility fee and transportation impact fee  
284 are enacted, the revenues generated by those fees coupled with B&C road monies could  
285 accomplish the following:

- 286 • **1-5 Year**
  - 287 ○ Complete \$6 million in road maintenance
  - 288 ○ Set aside/expend \$500,000 for new construction projects (leveraged much higher  
289 by grants; ROW purchase is priority)
- 290 • **6-10 Year**
  - 291 ○ Complete \$4 million in maintenance
  - 292 ○ Set aside/expend \$3 million for new construction projects (leveraged much higher  
293 by grants)

294  
295 The outcomes of the proposal include boosting the City’s average RSL from 8 years, to 12 years;  
296 saving \$25 million in future road rebuild expenses; and beginning construction of necessary road  
297 projects that have been planned for years. Alternative funding approaches include:

- 298 • **Property Tax Increase:** This alternative would involve a property tax increase to generate  
299 revenues to fund increased road maintenance. The size of the tax increase would be  
300 between 15-20% (a total increase of \$27-37 per year for the average North Ogden home).
- 301 • **Cuts in other Programs:** This alternative would involve significant cuts in other areas,  
302 such as parks and recreation or personnel in order to fund increased road maintenance.
- 303 • **Bond & Tax Increase:** This alternative would involve issuing \$3-5 million in bonds in  
304 order to complete the majority of the recommended maintenance in a relatively short  
305 timeframe. A property tax increase would provide the revenues to pay back the bonds.  
306 The property tax increase would be about 10% (or about \$19 per year for the average  
307 home), but we would be paying back the bonds for up to 30 years, spending millions on  
308 interest.
- 309 • **Do Nothing:** Wait and see what unfolds with the possible local option transportation sales  
310 tax and the Gas Tax. Consider options again in the future.

311  
312 He then concluded by reviewing the pros and cons of each funding source, after which he invited  
313 public comment and a question and answer session among the public, City Council, and staff.  
314

315 Dan Carter, 113 W. Elberta Drive, stated that he has learned that when replacing main artery  
316 roads in the City it is necessary to install a sub-base made of screened material that will build a  
317 solid base. He stated even some smaller roads should have a sub-base, which will prolong the  
318 life of City roads by allowing water a place to drain. He stated it is important to not throw good  
319 money after bad roads by trying to prolong the life of roads that cannot be saved. He stated that

320 when he was in the profession of building roads he made sure that all infrastructure underneath a  
321 road was in good working order so that it is not necessary to cut into a newly constructed road to  
322 repair other infrastructure. He agreed with the Council and Mayor that implementing a \$3.00 fee  
323 is a smart thing to do in order to meet the needs of residents and businesses in the City. He  
324 stated he worked building roads for 40 years and would be willing to offer his expertise to the  
325 City if needed.

326  
327 Steve Rasmussen, 1092 E. 3250 N., referenced 1050 East and noted there are six or seven  
328 locations where someone has trenched across the road for various purposes and those trenches  
329 now have pot holes. He asked if the City is capable of filling those holes or if the work must be  
330 contracted out. Mr. Hartvigsen noted the majority of that type of work is contracted out. Mayor  
331 Taylor noted that the only maintenance the City performs in house is crack-sealing. Mr.  
332 Rasmussen asked if it is correct that a project to repair 1050 East would be done by the revenues  
333 generated by the proposed transportation utility fee. Mayor Taylor noted that an overlay could  
334 repair some of the issues on 1050 East, but that project is not on the current year overlay plan.  
335 Mr. Rasmussen stated that many cities deal with deteriorating roads as well, but he is intimately  
336 familiar with many roads in North Ogden that are in very bad shape; if they are allowed to  
337 deteriorate further there will be major problems. He stated he does not want his property taxes  
338 raised, but he understands that if nothing is done in the near future the situation will only worsen;  
339 he feels the most effective measure the City can take is to implement an impact fee for new  
340 construction and the transportation utility fee. He feels it would be very detrimental to wait 10  
341 more years to work on needed projects and it would also be wise to seek grant funds and  
342 potentially consider bonding to complete repair or construction projects.

343  
344 John Arrington, 254 E. 2900 N., stated that having driven on one of the worst roads he has been  
345 on in a long time, he is not present to speak against the transportation utility fee; however, he  
346 wondered if measures are being taken to ensure that the same level of general fund monies  
347 currently being dedicated to transportation needs remains constant. Mayor Taylor noted that  
348 recently passed gas tax legislation mandates that cities maintain the same level of general fund  
349 contributions to transportation for the next five years. He stated he is hopeful that the funding  
350 contribution does not change after the expiration of that five year period. Mr. Arrington stated  
351 he would recommend against the use of revenues generated by a sales tax increase for  
352 transportation; that is a general fund revenue and there are other things in the City that need to be  
353 funded by that revenue.

354  
355 Council Member Bailey stated that if the sales tax is implemented by the County the revenues  
356 must be used for transportation and for no other purpose. Mayor Taylor added that his 10-year  
357 plan did not include revenues generated by a gas tax; any such revenues would increase the pace  
358 by which roads can be improved or new projects can be completed.

359  
360 Council Member Urry referenced Mr. Rasmussen's comments about 1050 East and he inquired  
361 as to the number of trenches that have been dug in the road. Mr. Rasmussen answered between  
362 six and eight. Council Member Urry stated that it has been his experience that when things like  
363 that occur, contractors have done subpar work by reusing old material rather than putting new  
364 material in a trench. He asked if the City secures bonds for such contractors and he asked if the  
365 bond has been released before the work has been secured. Mr. Hartvigsen stated the City can



366 only require a one-year guarantee of work according to State Law. Council Member Urry asked  
367 if the trenches on 1050 East have failed within the year or after the year has expired. Mr.  
368 Hartvigsen noted those kinds of deficiencies usually take longer than one year to manifest;  
369 however, if the problems present themselves in one year the City can go after the contractor and  
370 require them to fix them. Council Member Bailey asked if the City inspects each project to  
371 ensure that contractors are compacting the ground and completing patches according to the  
372 City's construction standards. Mr. Hartvigsen stated it is not possible to inspect every road cut  
373 and patch, but inspections are completed on as many of these types of projects as possible; the  
374 City would need more inspectors if there was an expectation to inspect every such project.  
375 Mayor Taylor added it may also be an option to contract with private companies or individuals  
376 that are certified to perform inspections.

377  
378 Bob Buswell, 962 E. 3025 N., asked how much private property the City has purchased for the  
379 Monroe Boulevard extension project. Mayor Taylor stated that no property has been purchased  
380 to date, but the City has extended offers for five parcels. The City was awarded a \$2 million  
381 grant for property acquisition for the project and it has taken some time to complete appraisals  
382 and engineer the project alignment.

383  
384 Ginger Heaton, 869 E. 3400 N., stated that she came to the meeting tonight feeling opposition to  
385 the transportation utility fee, but she has been convinced that the fee is needed. She likes the  
386 idea of saving for the projects rather than going into debt to fund projects. She added she also is  
387 not supportive of property tax increases. She asked when the fee would take effect if it is  
388 enacted. Mayor Taylor stated that will be decided by the Council, but it would be his proposal to  
389 enact it this year.

390  
391 Mary Settlemire, 2701 N. Mountain Road, stated she likes the proposal to enact a fee and she is  
392 also supportive of saving for the future. She stated that the roads need attention and it would be  
393 foolish to delay projects any longer. She stated she would be more than willing to pay \$3.00 a  
394 month to fund the needed projects.

395  
396 Council Member Bailey stated that the Council will be considering the adoption of the 2015-  
397 2016 budget during their next meeting and this item will be on the table.

398  
399 Council Member Satterthwaite stated that the Mayor and City Council are very hesitant to  
400 increase fees or rates of any kind; they would not bring this issue to the citizens if they did not  
401 feel there is a basis for implementing a fee. He stated he is anxious to get feedback from  
402 residents and he is convinced that as people become educated about the need for the fee they will  
403 be more understanding of the actions the Council may take. He encouraged residents to attend  
404 the June 16 meeting to hear final discussions regarding the issue. Council Member Bailey  
405 agreed and noted that the City Council is interested in building a long term solid financial base  
406 for the City and it is his opinion that bonding is an excuse for poor planning.

407  
408 Council Member Swanson noted the City Council is keenly aware that the decisions they make  
409 can have an impact on residents and their finances; a \$3.00 fee may not sound like a lot, but the  
410 City Council understands that additional fees and taxes can compound and they have engaged in

411 long, laborious discussions with the goal of making the right decision and doing what is right for  
412 the City.

413  
414 Council Member Stoker added that all members of the City Council are also residents and all  
415 decisions have the potential to personally impact them as well; they are very conservative and  
416 mindful of the impacts their decisions can make.

417  
418 Mayor Taylor thanked the Council and those in attendance and reiterated that the Council will  
419 take final action on the 2015-2016 budget next Tuesday, which could include action on the  
420 proposed transportation utility fee.

421

422

423 **2. PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE COMMENTS TO CONSIDER**  
424 **AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCE 11-11-5E & 11-12-4F PARKING**  
425 **REGULATIONS**

426

427 A staff memo from City Planner Scott explained when the City Council is acting in a legislative  
428 capacity they have wide discretion. Examples of legislative actions are general plan, zoning map,  
429 and land use text amendments. Legislative actions require that the Planning Commission give a  
430 recommendation to the City Council. Typically the criteria for making a legislative decision  
431 requires compatibility with the general plan and existing codes.

432

433 The Ranches PRUD project is short 33 visitor parking stalls. The applicant is requesting that the  
434 standards for visitor parking in PRUDs be modified to provide flexibility to count on street  
435 parking as part of the visitor parking calculation. Similar standards are found in the Group  
436 Dwelling chapter and these standards should also be looked at.

437

438 Research was conducted on how other cities treat visitor parking standards. There is no universal  
439 way that cities apply visitor parking standards, e.g., some cities have one standard for multi-  
440 family dwelling units and do not specify parking for the main use and visitor parking. North  
441 Ogden's approach to have a separate standard is also used.

442

443 The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on this amendment on June 3, 2015. The  
444 Planning Commission previously reviewed this request on May 6, 2015. There were four options  
445 considered, i.e., allow visitor tandem parking, allow on-street parking to be considered for visitor  
446 parking, adjust the visitor parking formula, and provide for a parking analysis.

447

448 The four options are summarized below:

449

450 Tandem Option

- 451 • Allow tandem parking as long as it is for the same unit.
- 452 • Require that one of the tandem spaces be covered.
- 453 • Require any tandem parking pad to meet a size requirement, e.g., 10 feet wide by 20 feet  
454 in depth.

455

456 This option would allow tandem parking stalls to be used as visitor stalls in meeting the parking  
457 requirement. Practically, this is what occurs when visitors come. The above standards would  
458 insure that the parking space is of adequate size so that cars will not be parked across sidewalks,  
459 it can't be used by other than the same unit, and one of the stalls would be covered.

460  
461 On-street Option

- 462 • Allow some on-street parking to count toward the visitor parking requirement.

463  
464 This option would allow on-street parking to be used in the parking calculation. Again,  
465 practically speaking on-street parking is used by visitors albeit not as convenient. The city  
466 already has standards for not allowing overnight on-street parking.

467  
468 Formula Option

- 469 • Lower the amount of visitor parking required from 1 space per two units to 1 space for 4  
470 units.

471  
472 This option would lessen the visitor parking standard in half. It would still not solve The  
473 Ranches deficit. Many cities are reducing standards in general; however, this option should be  
474 examined at a later time.

475  
476 Parking Analysis Option

- 477 • Allow the zoning administrator to review a parking analysis provided by the applicant  
478 demonstrating the suitability of the number of parking stalls.

479  
480 This option would require the applicant to provide a parking study demonstrating the adequacy  
481 of the parking for the project. It would require an additional expense and possibly be overkill to  
482 provide this information.

483  
484 The Planning Commission concluded that a combination of adjusting the visitor parking ratio  
485 and allowing tandem parking with defined standards is appropriate. The parking ratio is  
486 recommended to be amended from 1 stall per 2 dwelling units to 1 stall per 4 dwelling units.  
487 Allowing tandem visitor parking is recommended with certain restrictions, i.e., both the required  
488 parking stalls and visitor tandem parking stalls must be for the same dwelling unit, one of the  
489 tandem parking stalls must be enclosed, and establishes a tandem parking pad size requirement  
490 of 10 feet in width by 20 feet in depth.

491  
492 The General Plan calls for "All development in the community should be built on land suitable  
493 for the intended use."

494 "All existing and new development should be required to fairly and uniformly provide  
495 improvements according to city standards."

496  
497 Zoning Ordinance

498 Suggested improvements for the city of North Ogden Zoning Ordinance include the following.

499 (1) Update the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a variety of current housing types.

500  
501

502 Housing

503 A variety of housing opportunities should be available to the citizens of the City. Quality  
504 residential development will be measured by design, maintenance, preservation of community  
505 resources, and open space.

506  
507 The memo offered the following summary of potential Planning Commission considerations:

- 508 • Is the proposal consistent with the General Plan?
- 509 • Is the flexibility of design for an amended visitor parking standard appropriate?

510  
511 The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the amendment to adjust the  
512 visitor parking ratio and allow tandem parking with conditions.

513  
514 Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo.

515  
516 Council Member Swanson asked why there is a necessity for tandem parking and a reduction in  
517 the visitor parking ratio. Mr. Scott explained the Planning Commission felt that both requests  
518 were reasonable. Council Member Swanson stated that making the amendment for tandem  
519 parking would solve the issue in The Ranches PRUD and he cannot imagine another situation in  
520 another development where the tandem parking amendment would not solve a similar issue. Mr.  
521 Scott stated that may be the case.

522  
523 Council Member Satterthwaite stated that if the recommendation is approved, the number of  
524 visitor parking stalls in this type of development will essentially be cut in half. Mr. Scott stated  
525 that is correct.

526  
527 Council Member Urry stated he has been concerned about the availability of parking in the  
528 townhome development behind the North Point Theater and he inquired as to the visitor parking  
529 ratio in that development. Mr. Scott stated he is unsure of the answer to that question and would  
530 need to do some research. Council Member Urry stated that if the proposed ordinance  
531 amendments would allow similar parking ratios in other developments, he would vote against the  
532 Planning Commission's recommendation.

533  
534 Council Member Bailey asked if adoption of the ordinance would result in modification of  
535 parking requirements for all multi-family developments in the City. Mr. Scott answered yes.  
536 Council Member Bailey stated he is concerned by that. He then asked for more information  
537 regarding tandem parking. Mr. Scott explained tandem parking is the parking area located in a  
538 driveway to a home or unit; the City's ordinance currently does not count tandem parking spaces  
539 towards the parking requirement within group dwellings or PRUDs and that has resulted in some  
540 developers constructing very short stub driveways that can cause hazardous conditions in his  
541 opinion. He stated the proposed ordinance amendment will encourage developers to build full  
542 driveways because the parking space on those driveways will count towards the parking  
543 requirements.

544  
545 The Council then engaged in a discussion regarding the difference between the tandem parking  
546 and visitor parking ratio, ultimately concluding they would like staff to conduct further research  
547 regarding the visitor parking ratios in group dwellings or PRUDs.

548 Council Member Bailey asked if there is a way to craft the ordinance so that it would only affect  
549 PRUDs and no other multi-family types of development. Mr. Scott reiterated the ordinance  
550 would only apply to PRUDs and group dwellings and would not have any impact on single  
551 family residential developments. City Attorney Call added that the City is now requiring PRUD  
552 developments to have full-width roads, so there will be opportunities for on-street parking within  
553 those developments though that will not be counted towards the parking requirements. He noted  
554 he feels staff has been working to address congestion issues within PRUD developments and the  
555 question becomes whether the parking spaces in a unit's driveway should count towards the  
556 parking requirements. Mayor Taylor added that he feels the ordinance amendments are  
557 appropriate and indicated that this is not simply a reaction to a request of a developer, but, rather,  
558 is a staff effort to improve PRUD and group dwelling developments throughout the City.

559

560 Mayor Taylor opened the public hearing at 10:01 p.m.

561

562 John Hansen, Real Estate Agent for the developer of The Ranches PRUD, noted that some on the  
563 Council may feel that developers are trying to push things as far as possible, but he feels that  
564 North Ogden is in a transition where there is a desire for different commercial and residential  
565 developments; there is also a need to generate additional revenue for the City and he feels staff  
566 has done an excellent job in trying to solve the parking issue in PRUD and group dwellings so  
567 that developers are enticed to build projects in North Ogden. He stated The Ranches PRUD will  
568 have adequate parking for owners and visitors; all units will be owned by one owner and will be  
569 rented to tenants and there will be strict rules within the lease agreements regarding the fact that  
570 tenants cannot use their garages for storage and use their driveways for parking their vehicles. He  
571 added that the visitor parking spaces will be used for visitor parking only and there will be  
572 penalties associated with violating the parking rules in the lease agreements. He added that the  
573 parking provided in the proposed development will actually exceed the City's requirement by 38  
574 stalls, though some of those stalls are not counted towards the City's ratio. He stated he would  
575 never be supportive of a design similar to the one used in the development behind the North  
576 Pointe Theater because he does not feel there is adequate parking there and that some of the  
577 parking situations are causing safety problems.

578

579 Council Member Satterthwaite indicated the Planning Commission has recommended a visitor  
580 parking ratio of one parking stall per every four units and he asked if The Ranches PRUD meets  
581 that parking requirement or the old parking requirement of one stall for every two units. Mr.  
582 Hansen stated that for every unit there are two tandem stalls and he is asking that one of those  
583 tandem stalls count towards the visitor parking requirement.

584

585 Mayor Taylor asked if The Ranches would meet the parking requirements of the ordinance if  
586 only the change pertaining to tandem parking were approved. Mr. Scott stated that if the tandem  
587 parking change were approved, but not the visitor parking ratio, The Ranches PRUD would  
588 comply with the ordinance; however, if the opposite occurred and the tandem parking change is  
589 not approved, the project would not comply.

590

591 Discussion then centered again on the visitor parking ratio compared to the tandem parking  
592 issue, with Mr. Call noting that the Planning Commission was not adamant that the two items be  
593 considered together, but they did feel tandem parking was appropriate and that the change to the

594 visitor parking ratio would not create significant problems. He added, however, that with any  
595 legislative decision the Council has the ability to choose which items to take action on with the  
596 option to table the entire proposal altogether until additional information is available.  
597

598 Council Member Urry noted he is not comfortable adjusting the visitor parking ratio at this time,  
599 but he would be comfortable accepting the recommendation regarding tandem parking; this will  
600 give The Ranches PRUD the opportunity to proceed and the City can observe how it functions  
601 and whether there are parking problems. He added the Council can reconsider the visitor parking  
602 ratio at a future date if appropriate.  
603

604 Steve Rasmussen, 1092 E. 3250 N., stated that people that live in PRUD or group dwelling  
605 developments can accommodate one or two visitors, but he would not be in favor of reducing the  
606 visitor parking ratio because if there are four or five visitors during an event such as a family  
607 gathering there would not be adequate parking or the visitors would use other owners' visitor  
608 parking stalls and cause congestion issues. He stated that he has experienced that situation  
609 personally and it was very difficult. He feels the City is responsible to ensure there is adequate  
610 parking within these types of developments.  
611

612 Mr. Hansen stated that he is not asking to reduce the visitor parking ratio; he is only asking that  
613 one tandem parking stall be counted towards the visitor parking ratio in order to meet the City's  
614 parking requirements. He stated he feels The Ranches PRUD project is a great project. He  
615 added that the City has made changes to the development requirements for this type of project;  
616 developers are now required to provide wider public streets and increased parking, but he feels it  
617 is appropriate for the City to compromise somewhat and make some concessions regarding  
618 visitor parking.  
619

620 Council Member Bailey stated that his only concern is that the proposed ordinance would apply  
621 to all PRUD and group dwelling developments and not just The Ranches PRUD. Council  
622 Member Satterthwaite agreed and stated he would like additional information regarding how the  
623 proposed ordinance would impact other future developments. Mr. Hansen stated he is willing to  
624 wait for the Council to take action on the item to ensure that they are comfortable that the  
625 developer he is representing will create a quality development, but he is hopeful they will move  
626 quickly.  
627

628 **Council Member Swanson motioned to close the Public Hearing. Council Member**  
629 **Bailey seconded the motion.**  
630

631 **Voting on the motion:**  
632

633 <b>Council Member Bailey</b>	<b>aye</b>
634 <b>Council Member Satterthwaite</b>	<b>aye</b>
635 <b>Council Member Swanson</b>	<b>aye</b>
636 <b>Council Member Urry</b>	<b>aye</b>
637 <b>Council Member Stoker</b>	<b>aye</b>

638  
639 **The motion passed unanimously.**

640 **Public Hearing closed at 10:17pm**

641

642 **4. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE AMENDING**  
643 **ORDINANCE 11-11-5E & 11-12-4F**

644

645 The Council continued general discussion regarding the proposed ordinance, with the consensus  
646 to proceed with the change dealing with tandem parking and tabling action on the change dealing  
647 with the visitor parking ratio. Mayor Taylor suggested that the Council table the entire ordinance  
648 in order for staff to make the changes requested by the Council; the ordinance could then be  
649 brought back before the Council during the June 16 meeting.

650

651 **Council Member Urry motioned to allow tandem parking but not change the visitor**  
652 **parking ratio.**

653

654 Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would like to hear more from the Planning Commission  
655 regarding the basis for their recommendation.

656

657 Council Member Bailey stated he is supportive of separating the two issues and acting upon  
658 them independent of one another.

659

660 **Council Member Swanson seconded Council Member Urry's motion.**

661

662 Mayor Taylor clarified that his understanding of the motion is that staff be directed to prepare a  
663 final ordinance to allow the Council to act on the tandem parking recommendation independent  
664 of the visitor parking ratio recommendation.

665

666 Council Member Bailey supported Council Member Satterthwaite's request for more information  
667 from the Planning Commission regarding their recommendation to change the visitor parking  
668 ratio.

669

670 Council Member Satterthwaite suggested that the motion be amended to table the entire issue to  
671 give the Planning Commission the opportunity to provide more information regarding their  
672 recommendation during the June 16 meeting. Council Member Urry indicated he is not willing  
673 to amend his motion. He asked that the Mayor call for a vote on his motion. Mayor Taylor  
674 added that another Council Member has the ability to make a substitute motion as well.

675

676 **Council Member Satterthwaite made a substitute motion to table the entire issue and wait**  
677 **for the Planning Commission to provide additional information regarding their**  
678 **recommendation during the June 16 meeting. Council Member Bailey seconded the**  
679 **motion.**

680

681 Discussion regarding the substitute motion ensued, with Council Member Swanson stated he  
682 feels it would be more sensible to direct staff to prepare two different motions for the Council to  
683 consider: one that includes both recommendations of the Planning Commission and one that only  
684 includes the tandem parking recommendation. Council Member Satterthwaite indicated he is  
685 comfortable with that direction as well.

686 **Voting on the motion:**  
687  
688 **Council Member Bailey** aye  
689 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye  
690 **Council Member Swanson** aye  
691 **Council Member Urry** aye  
692 **Council Member Stoker** aye  
693

694 **The substitute motion passed unanimously.**  
695  
696

697 **5. PUBLIC COMMENTS**  
698

699 There were no public comments.  
700  
701

702 **6. COUNCIL/MAYOR/STAFF COMMENTS**  
703

704 There were no additional comments.  
705  
706

707 **7. ADJOURNMENT**  
708  
709

710 **Council Member Satterthwaite motioned to adjourn. Council Member Urry**  
711 **seconded the motion.**  
712

713 **Voting on the motion:**  
714

715 **Council Member Bailey** aye  
716 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye  
717 **Council Member Swanson** aye  
718 **Council Member Urry** aye  
719 **Council Member Stoker** aye

720 **The motion passed unanimously.**  
721

722 **The meeting adjourned at 10:35pm**  
723  
724

725 \_\_\_\_\_  
726 Brent Taylor, Mayor  
727

728 \_\_\_\_\_  
729 S. Annette Spendlove, MMC  
730 City Recorder  
731

732 \_\_\_\_\_  
733 Date Approved