

FARMINGTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday, January 8, 2003

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION/WEST CONFERENCE ROOM

PRESENT: Mayor Connors, Council Members Hasenyager, Haugen, Holmes and Johnson, City Manager Forbush, City Planner Petersen, and Deputy Recorder Chipman. City Council Member Hales was excused.

Mayor Connors began discussion at 6:30 P.M. The following items were reviewed:

- ▮ Agenda Item #4 regarding the proposed location for the Community Center was discussed. Susan Holmes explained the advantages of locating the center at the Main Park. Mr. Forbush stated the most difficult issue may be mitigating impact on nearby residents, however, he would present possible solutions during the regular meeting.
- ▮ Agenda Item #5 would be a general discussion of naming the reconstructed Burke Lane as it veers south on the west side of I-15. Mr. Haugen said there had been public reaction to the proposal.
- ▮ Agenda Item #6 would be deleted. Applicants were not ready for consideration.
- ▮ The City Council discussed the request for placement of a sales trailer at Farmington Ranches, Phase III (Agenda Item #8). Past experience with sales trailers had been negative and the Council wanted to make sure the same would not happen again.
- ▮ After briefly reviewing Agenda Item #9 (municipal boundary line adjustment with Kaysville) Council Members felt such action may be premature since all property owners involved were not in complete agreement.
- ▮ Agenda Item #10, a proposed trail realignment on a lot in the Hughes Estates development, was reviewed. The current property owner had not been given correct information regarding the original trail design. As a result, the placement of the home would be about a foot away from the proposed trail. Neither the home owner nor trail users would find that to be a tolerable situation.

REGULAR CITY COUNCIL/CITY CHAMBERS/CALL TO ORDER

PRESENT: Mayor David M. Connors, Council Members Bob Hasenyager, Larry W. Haugen, Susan T. Holmes, Edward J. Johnson, City Manager Max Forbush, City Planner David Petersen, City Recorder Margy Lomax, and Deputy Recorder Jeane Chipman. Council Member David Hale was excused.

Mayor Connors called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M. The invocation was offered by Larry Haugen and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Bob Hasenyager.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Motion:

The minutes of the December 4, 2002, City Council Meeting were considered. Ed Johnson moved to approve the minutes as written. Larry Haugen seconded the motion. The voting was unanimous in the affirmative.

The minutes of the December 11, 2002, City Council Meeting were read and corrected. Larry Haugen moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Ed Johnson seconded the motion. The voting was unanimous in the affirmative.

The minutes of the December 17, 2002, Special City Council Meeting were considered. Bob Hasenyager moved to approve the minutes as written. Susan Holmes seconded the motion. The voting was unanimous in the affirmative.

REPORT OF PLANNING COMMISSION (Agenda Item #3)

No Planning Commission meeting was held since the last City Council meeting. Mr. Petersen stated Council Members were invited to attend an Envision Utah meeting on January 16. He asked that they inform staff if they planned to attend.

FINAL SITE RECOMMENDATION FOR COMMUNITY CENTER (Agenda Item #4)

Packet information indicated that naming the preferred site by the City Council does not necessarily mean that the City is authorized to build at the site. The Planning Commission will be holding a public hearing on January 9 to consider a conditional use permit for locating the Community Center at the Main Park. The committee comprised of Council Members Holmes and Hale, Viola Kinney, David Petersen, Chief Wayne Hansen, Planning Commissioner Larry Jensen recommended the proposed site by the Main Park.

Susan Holmes reported the committee meeting. She said several concerns had been raised regarding possible location at the City Main Park. Those included safety, parking, privacy, security, and traffic increase. Mr. Bass (a nearby neighbor) and other neighbors would rather the Center not be at the Main Park location. However, the Leisure Service Committee and other staff felt it would be a location with more benefits than disadvantages. The Master Plan for downtown Farmington supported the Main Park location. Ms. Holmes said that the City's Police Department had also given input. Police felt the traffic pattern at the Main Street location would be much better than at the City Hall location. They had been asked to evaluate possible signage to help reduce incidence of parking by non-resident traffic in front of private homes. There would also be an effort to coordinate events at the location to reduce congestion of parking areas.

The Main Park location would be excellent for a variety of citizen activities.

Mayor Connors suggested that if indeed the Council decided to choose the Main Park location it may be beneficial to have the minutes reflect a list of specific reason for the decision. The City Council stated the following reasons:

- Pedestrian safety at the Main Park location would be superior to the City Hall location.
- Parking would be more available at the Main Park location. If the Center were to be located at the City Hall site, more land would have to be purchased.
- The land at the Main Park location is already owned by the City.
- The Main Park location would provide green, open space.
- The City's Police Department recommended the Main Park location for safety and security reasons.
- It would be possible to coordinate activities to help reduce parking problems.
- The Main Park location was consistent with the Downtown Master Plan and the City's General Plan.
- Management and oversight of the Community Center would be facilitated by proximity to the swimming pool.
- Over flow parking needs could be accommodated nearby. At the City Hall location access would have to take a circuitous route.
- Mitigation of neighbor concerns may be easier because the location effected fewer residents.

Mr. Forbush stated that neighborhood mitigation issues should take priority.

Mr. Hasenyager expressed his concern that noise issues raised because of plays and other uses of the Woodland Park venue should be considered to make sure the same problems do not exist at the Community Center location.

Motion:

Susan Holmes moved that the City Council name the Rose Garden area of the City's Main Park as the preferred site for the proposed Community Center and that City officials shall work with nearby property owners to mitigate concerns in an acceptable manner. Ed Johnson

seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. Mayor Connors commented that Council Member Hale had expressed his support of the Main Park location for the Community Center during his participation as a member of the committee reviewing possible locations.

Ms. Holmes stated that a committee had been working on creating a non-profit fund raising organization which would help pay for needed equipment and other resources for the new Center.

PROPOSED RE-NAMING OF BURKE LANE TO “NORTH POINTE PARKWAY” AND GENERAL DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION OF RELATED LANDSCAPE AGREEMENT (Agenda Item #5)

Mr. Forbush introduced the agenda item. He stated Rich Haws had been in contact with UDOT representatives and had come up with ideas for a new name for the portion of Burke Lane that was being reconstructed and rerouted. The name being proposed for Mr. Haws’ commercial development on the west side of I-15 near the new road was “The Crossings at Farmington Parkway.” “Farmington Parkway” was the suggested name for the newly constructed road. Mr. Haws had requested the issue be placed on the City Council agenda. He also requested conceptual approval of an agreement between UDOT, the City and himself on landscaping of the ramp (Farmington Parkway) leading across I-15 to Clark Lane. The Planning Commission will consider formal action on the request at its meeting on January 9th.

Rich Haws stated issues regarding the street name were somewhat urgent because UDOT was currently developing a signage package for the area. The package will be complete by the end of February. The original suggested name was “North Pointe.” However, that name has been and is being used a great deal in the Davis County area. There were feelings among citizens that *Farmington* should be included in the name. It is also important to have the street name in place for marketing reasons.

Mr. Petersen stated the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the matter during their meeting on January 9th.

The City Council discussed the issues, including the following points:

- ▭ Traffic experts should be consulted to advise regarding having part of the road near Main Street called Burke Lane and the part veering south named Farmington Parkway.
- ▭ Most Council Members favored having the name of Farmington in the road name.
- ▭ It may simplify use of the road to have the name consistent all the way from Main Street to Clark Lane.
- ▭ Having traffic coming from one direction see one name and traffic coming from another direction see another name could be confusing.

- ▭ In general, the City Council was supportive of the name Farmington Parkway. Mr. Haugen had reservations and was unfavorable.

Mr. Forbush requested consideration of the landscaping proposals.

Mr. Haws stated that an architect had been employed to design landscaping for the ramp connection to Clark Lane. UDOT was not opposed to the landscaping but had no funds to accomplish the work. UDOT was concerned there would be no irrigation water available to sustain the landscaping. Mr. Haws stated his development would provide water and that UDOT had agreed to install the landscaping if the City would agree to maintain it. A brief discussion ensued wherein a development agreement was considered giving the developer opportunity to participate in maintenance.

BUFFALO “HORSE” RANCH PROPOSAL/GENERAL DISCUSSION (Agenda Item #6)

Agenda Item #6 was be deleted. Applicants were not ready for City Council consideration of their proposal.

MULTI-FAMILY PROPOSAL NORTH OF LAGOON ON BURKE LANE/DAN LOFGREN (COWBOY PARTNERS) (Agenda Item #7)

Mr. Petersen reported that Dan Lofgren of Cowboy Partners L.C. requested a zoning ordinance amendment to accommodate an apartment proposal north of Lagoon on the Bourne property. Mr. Lofgren’s proposal was well received by the Planning Commission. On December 30th he met with the City Council’s development review committee (Bob Hasenyager and Susan Holmes) as well as three members of the Planning Commission. After the meeting it was decided that the full City Council should hear the proposal. If the City Council is favorable towards the project, the developer will go back to the Planning Commission. There will be further opportunities for public hearings.

Dan Lofgren made the following points:

- ▭ The Bourne property owners are anxious to proceed.
- ▭ The Planning Commission gave positive feedback which he felt was because the project was suitable for the property, the project was high quality, and the west end of the parcel would be enhanced as an open space including a park-like green space, trail amenity which would be ideal for that portal to the City.
- ▭ The west end would provide and important window to the possible commercial property to the north.
- ▭ This type of use tolerates and is benefitted by the traffic on the road to the south.

- ↯ If economic development comes to the area they will look for this type of housing.
- ↯ The developer will work with City staff to achieve a design acceptable to the City.
- ↯ The developer was open to entering into a development agreement which included a reverter clause—meaning that if the project does not go forward as planned the property will revert to the previous zone.
- ↯ The project only addresses the portion of land west of Lagoon Drive.
- ↯ The project is planned to contain 12.74 units per acre.

Susan Holmes expressed the concern of several Council members about making an ordinance text change for the benefit of one parcel which will effect the entire City, possibly negatively.

David Petersen said the Planning Commission had been waiting for the results of the economic study currently under way. However, they felt this project would not sabotage any development to the north. There would be ample visibility because of the open space on the west end. The development enhanced access to the north. This project would keep the visual effect of cars and asphalt on the interior which would not be likely with commercial endeavors. The portal to the City would be better served with this project over a big box commercial building. The Planning Commission also reasoned that this project would fill a housing need in the City.

Mr. Hasenyager reminded Council Members of the survey taken of citizen interests which indicated the communities preference to having high density apartment type uses dispersed through the town. Going against that preference would have to be discussed.

When the Mayor inquired regarding the cost of the apartments, **Mr Lofgren** reported the apartments were intended for people with a high degree of discretionary funds. They would rent for between \$1,000 and \$2,000 each a month. This project would be for life style renters. As to the density issue that had been raised, Mr. Lofgren felt that the area to the north would most likely develop into commercial uses. The apartments would be the ideal neighbor for such development and that commercial uses would be a good neighbor the apartments. There would not be the impact problems experienced in residential neighborhoods. He stated the landscaping would be maintained by the developer.

Mr. Petersen stated the high density would be necessary financially to maintain the amenities being provided.

Mr. Haugen asked if drainage issues had been addressed. He felt the property would be at risk for drainage problems. He felt Farmington was not ready for this type of project. .

Mr. Lofgren stated again he believed there would be nothing about his project that would preclude any plans for the surrounding property.

Mayor Connors asked about the UDOT imposed no-access line along the road.

Mr. Petersen said there was a no-access line from U.S. 89 all the way to Lagoon Drive.

Mr. Haugen said there were also concerns by the neighbors about children from the apartment complex crossing fence lines and getting into areas where there was danger from large animals—horses and cows.

Mr. Lofgren agreed that the issue would warrant study but that properly designed fencing could be a good solution.

Mr. Haugen commented that the design of the project was attractive and that he liked the way the roof levels were lowered compared to street levels.

Mr. Johnson stated he liked this kind of “high end” project as a gateway to the City. He raised a concern about access to the complex from that portion of Lagoon Drive stubbed to the north of Burke Lane. There would be a right out in the morning, but when renters returned from the freeway in the evenings, there would be a left hand turn which could cause stacking.

Mr. Lofgren felt that the signal at Burke and Lagoon Drive could be regulated to reduce stacking.

Mr. Hasenyager felt Mr Johnson’s concern was valid, and he would want the City Engineer to review the situation before any approval was given.

Mayor Connors stated the City was currently trying to master plan the entire area and wanted to make the proper decision about any such project. He asked if the developer had considered draft designing surrounding property to show how his project may impact any possible uses.

Milo Marsden (husband of Jackie Bourne Marsden, owner of the property) expressed his concern about what he considered to be another in a long line of delays regarding the use of the property. He made reference to the MTC Corporation which had wanted the property but because of delays, MTC went to Centerville. Mr. Marsden had sympathy for the need of a master economic development for the area, but he was supportive of the current potential buyers. The project warranted looking into and there needed to be a decision on zoning before more action could be taken.

**REQUEST FOR EXCEPTION OF SALES TRAILER AT FARMINGTON RANCHES
PHASE III, HAMLET HOMES (Agenda Item #8)**

Mr. Petersen explained that Michael Brodsky of Hamlet Development requested approval for a temporary sales trailer in Phase III of the Farmington Ranches Subdivision. The temporary use section of the Zoning Ordinance provided for the creation of a real estate office only in a model home and not in a trailer. Notwithstanding this, Section 11-28-120(i)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance titled "Exempt Uses" allows for exemptions to the ordinance as specifically approved in writing by the City Council.

Michael Brodsky stated he was under contract to purchase 40 lots in Farmington Ranches. He was currently constructing a model home for sales purposes but would like to place a temporary trailer on the property to promote pre-sales. When the model home is finished it will be used for sales and the trailer will be removed. He felt the request was not an unusual one. He had done the same in many other communities. He was willing to comply with customary conditions for approval.

The City Council discussed the issue, including the following points:

- ▭ The suggestion was made that potted bushes be brought in to hide the skirt of the trailer and enhance the looks of the temporary building.
- ▭ The City Council preferred the use of a model home over a trailer. Past experienced had been negative when another developer had used a trailer.
- ▭ A cash performance bond could be in place to assure compliance with conditions of approval, including security for the City that the trailer would be moved after completion of the model home.
- ▭ The developer could be required to remove the trailer on a date certain.

Mr. Brodsky stated he wanted to establish good faith with the Council and was willing to abide by any reasonable condition, including a cash bond to ensure performance.

Mayor Connors felt the general sense of the Council was to let City Staff work out the details of the conditions for approval, including having the trailer removed at a date certain or forfeiture of an appropriate cash bond.

Mr. Petersen stated exceptions to the ordinance government sales structures had to be given in writing over the signature of the Mayor. It was the general consensus of the Council that the item did not have to return to the City Council provided Staff worked closely with the applicant.

Motion:

Bob Hasenyager moved that the City Council approve the placement of a sales trailer at Farmington Ranches Phase III, Lot 392, at 1596 West Clark Lane by the Hamlet Companies, giving an exception in writing as provided in City Ordinance [Section 11-28-120(i)(6)], subject

to conditions outlined by City Staff. Mr. Hasenyager further moved that the City Council authorize Mayor Connors to sign the written exception upon compliance with said conditions. Susan Holmes seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT WITH KAYSVILLE CITY TO PERMIT DEVELOPMENT NEAR JIM LYONS' PROPERTY IN THE OAKRIDGE AREA/DAVID ERICKSEN (Agenda Item #9)

Mr. Petersen reviewed the agenda item. David Erickson of Leisure Villas proposed to develop a senior community on the Lyons and Evans property now in Farmington located in the northwest corner of the City. In order to be better served by existing utilities Mr. Erickson requested that the City Council consider a boundary adjustment with Kaysville thereby moving the Lyons and Evans property into Kaysville City. The Kaysville City Council has not reviewed the proposal so it is not known whether or not Kaysville City would approve the request if a boundary line adjustment was implemented by Farmington. Nonetheless, Mr. Erickson was directed to come to Farmington first because said property is in the Farmington City corporate limits and any boundary adjustment request must be approved by Farmington first.

After a brief discussion and upon being informed that not all property owners were involved in the request, **Mayor Connors** suggested that City Council not take the time to consider the proposal at this time.

Ms. Holmes stated utilities needed to be identified. The sewer system is the same in both Farmington and Kaysville. Power would probably not be a problem. However, water was not accessible to the property and lines would need to be lain.

MOYER PROPOSAL REQUESTING TRAIL REALIGNMENT AND CONSERVATION EASEMENT/LAUREL MOYER (Agenda Item #10)

Packet information indicated that Walter and Laurel Moyer were in the process of obtaining a building permit for a single-family home on Lot 125 of the Hughes Estates Subdivision. In conjunction with this process, they proposed a slight realignment for the trail behind their proposed home. This trail was originally constructed by the developer, USDS, for Farmington City. Bob Hasenyager, Max Forbush and David Petersen reviewed the request and visited the site and thus far have found that the Moyer request seems reasonable. However, their request will require approval by the City Council because it is located in a conservation easement granted to the City.

Ms. Moyer presented the request, stating that the road provided for Weber Basin Conservancy District to access and maintain their facilities could be realigned, giving the home more room and giving the District improved access. She had been in contact with the District who were favorable towards the realignment and improvements suggested by the property owner.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the agenda item and described alternative trail alignments to the

City Council. Misinformation had been given the property owner regarding trail placement. He said the property owner had obtained opinions from excavators who assured her the trail could be constructed on nearby property owned by the City. Mr. Petersen expressed some hesitation because of the slope of the property.

Motion:

After a brief discussion, Bob Hasenyager moved that the City Council conceptually approve the realignment of the trail according to staff recommendations, subject to concurrence of the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, review and approval of the City Engineer, and providing there is no cost to the City and all other City ordinances and standards are observed. Ed Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

MINUTE MOTION APPROVING BUSINESS OF CONSENT (Agenda Item #11)

Motion:

Larry Haugen moved to approve the following items by consent as follows:

25. Ratification of construction bond agreements previously signed by Mayor Connors.
26. Approval of November's disbursement list.
27. Approval of CDBG Contract #02-0161, Termination Extension. This contract extension extends the deadline for completion of our CDBG grant project (Brass Comb Project) from December 31, 2002, until September 30, 2003. This should allow sufficient time for the contractor to complete the work and for the City to sell the building.
28. Authorization to join Tree Utah. This will cost the City \$75.00. The City Manager recommends the City join Tree Utah to demonstrate support for this worthy organization.
29. Formal declaration of surplus property—authorization for sale.

Bob Hasenyager seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE AND SALE OF G.O. BONDS NOT TO EXCEED \$1.9 MILLION; SUPPLEMENTING PARAMETERS RESOLUTION ADOPTED DECEMBER 4, 2002; PRESCRIBING THE FORM OF THE BONDS; PROVIDING FOR THE MANNER OF EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF SAID BONDS; PROVIDING FOR THE USE OF THE PROCEEDS THEREOF AND HOW PAYMENT OF SAID BONDS WILL BE MADE; AUTHORIZING ALL OTHER

RELATED ACTIONS NECESSARY FOR THE CONSUMMATION OF THE TRANSACTIONS CONTEMPLATED BY THIS RESOLUTION AND RELATED MATTERS (Agenda Item 12)

Jon Bronson, (Public Finance director for Zions Bank) had acted as the bond attorney for the City in pursuit of securing funds to proceed with projects approved in the last bond election. Mr. Bronson stated that his office had structured the bond to specifications given by the City and had done so to the best advantage for the City. He reviewed bidding companies and stated that Zions Bank had entered the lowest bid by just over \$700. He then discussed elements of the General Obligation Bonds Series 2003, including the purpose of the bond issues, security for the bond issue, and sources and uses of the funds.

Motion:

Susan Holmes moved that the City approve Resolution 2003-01, a resolution authorizing issuance and sale of G.O. bonds not to exceed \$1.9 million dollars, supplementing Parameters Resolution adopted December 4, 2002; prescribing the form of the bonds; providing for the manner of execution and delivery of said bonds; providing for the use of the proceeds thereof and how payment of said bonds will be made; authorizing all other related actions necessary for the consummation of the transactions contemplated by this resolution and related matters. Ed Johnson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

PIPELINE CROSSING AGREEMENT AND RELATED URMMA LIMITATIONS/URMMA REPORTS (Agenda Item #13)

Packet information indicated the proposed agreement pertains to the relocation of the water line under I-15 at Clark Lane from State Street to 100 North by UDOT. The water line has, in fact, been installed. The City Manager had previously signed a faxed agreement earlier permitting installation of the line. As part of the installation, the contractor installing the pipe was required to obtain bonding and to be bound by the requirement of naming union Pacific as an additional liability insurance in perpetuity should anything fail. URMMA, the City's insurance carrier, will provide the necessary certificate of insurance required for this guarantee. However, since URMMA is a municipal insurance risk pool, it cannot insure anyone else. Therefore, the railroad cannot be named as an additional insured. The City Manager is having UDOT's contractor, FAK, review this with the railroad. Hopefully, the Railroad will drop the requirement of having the City naming the Union Pacific Railroad as an additional insured.

The City Manager included in the packet correspondence that he obtained at a recent URMMA Board Meeting. It was announced at the Board Meeting that URMMA had purchased reinsurance. The cost of the reinsurance was substantial. The administrative board of URMMA decided to reduce the amount of coverage to keep the premiums somewhat reasonable. As a result the amount of coverage available per occurrence per each city is \$6 million instead of \$10 million. The hard insurance market, plus the 9/11 event, are driving the cost of reinsurance up even though there has never been a claim submitted by URMMA against the reinsurance company since URMMA's inception.

The City Manager also included additional information that was presented at the Board meeting. This information reflects URMMA's commitment to training and inspection. The City Manager was very impressed with the upcoming 2003 training meetings and very impressed at the thoroughness of inspections being conducted by URMMA at each city location.

Motion:

Larry Haugen moved the City Council authorize the Mayor to sign the Pipeline Crossing Agreement providing, however, that the section related to insurance naming Union Pacific Railroad as an additional insured, be deleted from the agreement. Bob Hasenyager seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

REPORT ON LIGHT RAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO MAYORS OF SOUTH DAVIS CITIES/ MAYOR CONNORS (Agenda Item #14)

Mayor Connors reported a recent meeting held involving the five South Davis city mayors and representatives from UTA. According to packet information, it had been suggested by John English, General Manager of UTA, that the issues of commuter rail and light rail extension be considered as separate issues. The Interregional Corridor Study had provided the alternatives analysis that recommended commuter rail. Commuter rail has been accepted as the locally preferred alternative for inter-regional transit service by the Wasatch Front Regional Council. An environmental analysis had been initiated to move ahead with the commuter rail. No preferred method of transit service in the south Davis County area had been performed, and, according to Mr. English, until such a feasibility study is conducted, it would be premature to perform an environmental analysis on light rail extensions. In a letter to the Mayor, John Njord, Executive Director of UDOT, expressed UDOT willingness to work with UTA to include available information on commuter rail and light rail in the Legacy Parkway Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

The Mayor said alternatives to light rail had been discussed and that he had additional information if Council members were interested. A "bus-rapid transit" alternate would solve several problems and could be converted to light rail when conditions and funds permitted. Such an alternate could make it possible for connections between light rail and commuter rail on either side of I-15.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ISSUES: INTERVIEWING RDA/EDA CONSULTANTS; CONSIDERATION OF RICH HAWS ON TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE; AND JANUARY 14 AND 15 SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETINGS (Agenda Item #15)

Interviewing RDA/EDA Consultants

Mr. Forbush recommended that an interview committee comprised of two City Council

members, the City Manager, and the City Finance Director and an economic development expert be appointed to select the appropriate RDA/EDA attorneys and consultants. By consensus, Susan Holmes and David Hale were asked to be members of the committee.

Consideration of Rich Haws on Technology Committee

Mr. Haws had requested that he be included as a part of the committee being considered by the City Council to review technology needs of the City. Mr. Johnson had no objections to Mr. Haws inclusion on the committee and said he would contact Mr. Haws.

January 14th and 15th Special City Council/Economic Development Committee Meetings

Mr. Forbush reviewed proposed agendas for the Economic Development Committee Meetings to be held on January 14 and 15, 2003.

Mr. Hasenyager requested that care be taken to ensure a wise use of time and that all participants be brought up to speed with the work that had been done so that previously covered issues did not have to be repeated. He also asked that the City's finance director be asked to review financial information contained in the agendas (specifically agenda item #4 on Friday's agenda - the fiscal impact of the Haws' proposal).

AT&T BROADBAND EXPANSION OF SERVICES PLAN AND RELATED INFORMATION (Agenda Item #16)

Mr. Forbush reported that Scott Dansie of ATT&T had announced AT&T's plan to expand their services by upgrading their fiber system through Farmington and extending the co-axial cable throughout their system to accommodate improved services to residences within the community. The agenda item was for information only.

PLANS TO CREATE 501(C)(3) NON-PROFIT CORPORATION/AUTHORIZATION TO USE CITY FUNDS/OTHER RELATED ORGANIZATION ISSUES (Agenda Item #17)

Susan Holmes discussed the need to raise funds to complete and furnish the new community center. She explained plans to create a non-profit fund-raising committee with the aid of the Utah Foundation for the Arts. In discussion of the committee, Ms. Holmes indicated plans were not firm and there would be upcoming meetings with the Leisure Services people and staff to outline bylaws and responsibilities.

Mr. Hasenyager inquired regarding the possible function of the fund-raising committee and intimations that the committee could be used to direct the use of the Community Center. He felt that the impact of a non-profit organization on the City would have to be carefully considered.

After discussion, **Mayor Connors** expressed the consensus of the Council that they were

not quite ready to commit funds to initialize the non-profit organization. It seemed the sense of the Council was that the expense could be justified but that more details would need to be discussed first.

MISCELLANEOUS

Liability Problems

Mr. Hasenyager stated Niels Plant had reported a significant drop off along one of the City Streets which could cause liability problems for the City.

Mr. Forbush stated he would follow up on the situation.

Crossing Guard in Place

Mr. Hasenyager reported his approval of the quick response to direction to have a crossing guard in place and striping of State and Main Streets. He was concerned about whether the striping was completed. Max Forbush reported that striping was completed by UDOT, but he would check into whether or not it had been completed to comply with standards.

Sound Wall Re-seeding

Mr. Hasenyager asked if the re-seeding had been done. Mr. Forbush reported that the sound wall property frontage had been re-seeded.

Envision Utah Award

Mr. Hasenyager felt that the City's conservation ordinances would qualify for an award being presented by Envision Utah. By consensus the City Council directed staff to apply for the recognition.

Citizen Approval of Performances in Woodland Park

Mr. Johnson reported a citizen had contacted him and complimented the City for the performances held in Woodland Park. The citizen was a close neighbor to Woodland Park.

Crusade Against Pornography

Mr. Johnson said there was a woman who had suggestions for establishing a community standard for the cities. He suggested that the woman be contacted and asked if she would present information to the City Council.

Pedestrian Safety Near Windridge Elementary

Mr. Hasenyager noted that there was citizen concern regarding the lack of sidewalks for

children to walk on to get to Windridge Elementary. The issue needed to be discussed with the School District and representatives of Kaysville City.

Mr Forbush reported that the City's Public Works Department would have suggestions to present to the City Council regarding the pedestrian issue at a future City Council meeting. The citizen's concern was being addressed.

Signal at 1072 West Shepard Lane

Mayor Connors had been contacted by Nicole Green who was not in favor of a signal at 1075 West and Shepard Lane.

Relocation of Utah Power Pole

Mr. Forbush explained the concern of Sam and Jana Fowers, who are building a home at 1017 North Oakridge Drive and who would like to move a Utah Power light pole out of their future driveway to a location across the street. A lengthy discussion ensued. By consensus, the City Council directed Mr. Forbush to gather more information and take appropriate action, and then report the action back to the City Council.

FAPID Request

Aaron Richards had contacted Mr. Forbush to request the City's approval on an easement agreement between FAPID and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). FAPID is proposing to install a 24" diameter pipe across City property east of their reservoir in Farmington Canyon to resolve sediment problems in FAPID pipes.

After discussion and by consensus, the City Council directed Mr. Forbush to have the City Attorney review the proposed agreement with FAPID and the BOR prior to the Mayor signing the same.

Day at the Legislature

Mr. Forbush stated the City Council was invited to attend the annual "Day at the Legislature" and asked Council Members to inform the City Recorder if they planned to attend.

Approval of Phipps Construction for Historical Museum Remodeling.

Motion:

Larry Haugen moved to approve the Museum contract to Phipps Construction Company. Bob Hasenyager seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Ice Fishing in Farmington Pond

Mr. Forbush asked if the City Council were in favor of the City holding an ice fishing derby on Farmington Pond considering the risk management required by URMMA. A lengthy discussion ensued. By consensus, the Council asked for more information, which Mr. Forbush said he would provide and bring the issue back to a future City Council meeting.

Farmington Creek Bridge Widening/Pedestrian Tunnel

Mr. Forbush had been contacted by UDOT and informed that the bids for work on the Farmington Creek Bridge expansion and pedestrian tunnel had been submitted. However, UDOT's contractor said Main Street would have to be closed for four months; that is causing UDOT to re-think awarding the bid to the contractor. UDOT is considering rebidding the project and having it begin next fall. UDOT is seeking the City's approval for delaying construction on the bridge until after Lagoon closes in the fall of 2003. By consensus, the City Council approved the delay.

ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION

Bob Hasenyager moved to adjourn to closed session to discussion strategy as it relates to pending litigation at 10:50 P.M.. Larry Haugen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

At 11:15 p.m. the City Council reconvened in open session upon motion by Bob Hasenyager with a second by Larry Haugen.

There being no further business, upon motion of Bob Hasenyager the meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Margy Lomax, City Recorder
Farmington City