

# FARMINGTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday, April 21, 2004

---

## CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION/EAST CONFERENCE ROOM

**PRESENT:** Mayor David M. Connors, Council Members David Hale, Larry W. Haugen, Sid Young, and Rick Dutson, City Manager Max Forbush, and Deputy Recorder Jeane Chipman. Council Member Susan T. Holmes and City Planner David Petersen were excused.

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

- **Agenda Item #4–Recognition of Heroic Action and Dedicated Service of Brian Carlson, a Public Works Employee.** Mr. Forbush described the recent accident with a chemical delivery to one of the City’s wells. Mr. Carlson would be recognized for his heroic actions in diverting a very dangerous situation.
- **Agenda Item #5–Request for Lot Line Adjustment in Hidden Meadows Subdivision Adjacent to Lot 2.** Mr. Forbush stated that the lot line adjustment would make the lot under consideration more buildable. The property required for a detention basin would still be used as such and would retain easement status.
- **Agenda Item #6–Consideration of Resolution either requesting or approving Davis county Commission Resolution 2004–115 providing for establishment of a South Davis Recreation District and Review of Farmington Survey Results.** Mr. Forbush briefly discussed the survey results. Council Members had asked that the agenda item include a public hearing. The item had not received public hearing notification, however, the Mayor would open discussion to a public hearing and would accept public input during the regular session.
- **Agenda Item #8–Resolution Authorizing Revenue Bonds.** Mr. Forbush explained the agenda item. The resolution under consideration would set parameters for the sales tax revenue bonding. The money would be needed for flood mitigation improvements as planned by the City. The storm water utility fee imposed in 2003 did not satisfy bonding requirements for longevity, therefore the sales tax revenues would be used in the bonding process. Mr. Forbush stated that the storm water utility fee would be used to repay the debt.
- **Agenda Item #9–Inter-local Agreement Options with the Farmington Area Pressurized Irrigation District.** Mr. Forbush discussed the agenda item and stated that the City’s attorney had been helpful in drafting the 2004 agreement. He stated that the FAPID Board will likely have some concerns about the draft agreement. It would be necessary for the City Council to set policy regarding FAPID line repairs or relocations and under what circumstances there would or would not be a cost sharing between the City and FAPID.
- **Agenda Item #11– Road Agreement Permitting Developers/Builders to**

**Commence Housing Construction Prior to Asphalt Paving.** Mr. Forbush stated that Chief Gregory had expressed concern about access to homes under construction when there were no paved roads.

- **Agenda Item #12– Review of Bids to Flood Mitigation Projects/Consideration of Contract Award.** Mr. Forbush expressed concern about when contractors would be able to begin improvements. Flood mitigation projects were considered of immediate importance, and it would be ideal to have the work completed during the upcoming summer months.

### **REGULAR CITY COUNCIL/CITY CHAMBERS/CALL TO ORDER**

***PRESENT:*** Mayor David M. Connors, Council Members David Hale, Larry W. Haugen, Sid Young, and Rick Dutson, City Manager Max Forbush, City Recorder Margy Lomax, and Deputy Recorder Jeane Chipman. Council Member Susan T. Holmes and City Planner David Petersen were excused.

**Mayor Connors** called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. The invocation was offered by **Larry Haugen** and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by **Mayor Connors**.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Rick Dutson** moved that City Council approve the minutes of the April 7, 2004, City Council Meeting with corrections as noted. **Larry Haugen** seconded the motion. The voting was unanimous in the affirmative.

### **RECOGNITION OF HEROIC ACTION AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF BRAIN CARLSON, A PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE ( Agenda Item #4)**

Mayor Connors read the letter of commendation from the City to Mr. Carlson for his extraordinary service to Farmington City. Mr. Carlson’s actions were heroic in shutting off well valves to keep dangerous chemicals from entering the City’s water supply. Mr. Carlson was taken to the hospital because of injuries experienced. The Mayor thanked Mr. Carlson for his action and presented gift certificates as allowed through the City’s employee recognition program.

### **REQUEST FOR LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT IN HIDDEN MEADOWS SUBDIVISION ADJACENT TO LOT 2/CHRIS L. MARTINEAU (Agenda Item #5)**

**Mr. Forbush** indicated that the packet contained a request from Chris Martineau to adjust the lot line of Lot 2 in the Hidden Meadows Subdivision. The public easements over Lot 2 would be retained and would restrict the filling of wetlands. The lot line adjustment would, however, accommodate an improved building pad on Lot 2 by increasing the rear set back. The easements

would still remain on the portion of the property needed for a detention basin. The action would not affect the open space requirements for the subdivision.

### **Motion**

**Rick Dutson** moved that the City Council approve the lot line adjustment in Hidden Meadows Subdivision adjacent to Lot 2 as requested and as indicated by the map presented in the packet. **David Hale** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION EITHER REJECTING OR APPROVING DAVIS COUNTY COMMISSION RESOLUTION 2004-115 PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A SOUTH DAVIS RECREATION DISTRICT/REVIEW OF FARMINGTON SURVEY RESULTS (Agenda Item #6)**

**Mayor Connors** introduced the agenda item. He mentioned the issue had not been noticed as a public hearing, however, the Mayor stated that the City Council was very interested in public opinion and that he would allow public comments. The Mayor explained that the mayors representing six cities in south Davis County had been meeting to discuss issues common among the involved cities. One of the issues discussed from time to time was the desire to replace the “Bubble” recreation complex in Bountiful located near Viewmont High School and Bountiful Junior High School. The retiring complex would be replaced with a new, much larger facility. The new facility would include such amenities as gymnasium facilities, bigger swimming pools, and running areas. The process included discussion among the involved cities to combine to fund the new recreational center through a Special Service District to be set up by the County. Mayor Connors had stated that Farmington citizens may not feel a need to participate in the District because of the distance between the City and the facility. Farmington’s City Council had discussed the issues in previous meetings. There would need to be a special service district created in order to fund the facility. Mayor Connors explained that Davis County had approved Resolution 2004-115 allowing the district to be created. Each of the six cities were being given the opportunity to ratify or oppose the County resolution. The public still has to vote to bond for the funding of the construction and the maintenance of the new facility. If Farmington committed now to support the County resolution, it would be locked into support of the new center if the vote in general among the six cities were positive, even if Farmington citizens voted against it. The Mayor introduced Neil Jenkins, Bountiful City Parks & Recreation Director, and invited him to address the Council and citizens.

**Neil Jenkins** stated the bonding would be for about \$18 million. The money would be used to construct and maintain the new facility. He described the proposed recreational complex. Mr. Jenkins stated that there were many Farmington citizens who currently use the “Bubble” facility.

**Mayor Connors** stated that the majority of the mayors in the Council of Governments—the organization of six South Davis city mayors -- decided that the bond election should be placed on a ballot in August. The Farmington City Council must decide tonight about the City’s involvement.

The only tally that would count would be the total vote of all six cities. The vote would not be divided by separate cities. If within the city of Farmington the vote was negative and the broader vote was positive, then Farmington citizens would still be obligated to go forward with the project. The only opportunity to opt in or out of the special service district is right now. Mayor Connors said that the Leisure Services Board had met and had formulated a recommendation for the City Council. Also, Dan Jones and Associates had been hired to survey some of the citizens of Farmington regarding the project. The survey had been completed and the results were now in hand.

**Tom Hardy**, Bountiful City Manager, stated that some Farmington citizens do use the Bountiful facility. He said that over 1,100 Farmington residents had used the facility through the lesson program alone. Six L.D.S. Church wards from Farmington had also used the building just within the last year.

**Viola Kinney** stated that the Leisure Services Board had met the previous week and discussed the proposal. They had discussed the RAP tax and the possible creation of a special service district. The Advisory Board felt Farmington should not participate in the project to fund a new recreational complex in Bountiful. The reasons included the fact that Farmington City had just passed a bond election last year for the new Community Center and park facilities and that the distance between Farmington and the new center would discourage support by Farmington citizens. The Board felt the complex should be paid for by user fees.

At the direction of the City Council, Ms. Kinney had contacted Dan Jones and Associates and had worked with them regarding questions for the survey. The survey had been conducted in order to obtain a general feeling from Farmington citizens regarding support for the center. Because of time constraints, a thorough study could not be accomplished. Whether or not Farmington should be involved or should not be involved in the funding of the new Bountiful recreational complex was the main thrust of the survey. There were 21 questions in the survey. Ms. Kinney discussed the survey questions and the results of the survey. The survey indicated there was a need to give citizens more information especially regarding the RAP tax before a thorough understanding of citizen's feelings could be ascertained. Ms. Kinney stated that 11% of those surveyed would support the recreation complex while 44% oppose being involved with the Bountiful project. Reasons given for the opposition included that the project would raise property tax, the Bountiful complex was too far away, and those who use it should pay for it. Citizens commented that they felt they needed to know more regarding the RAP tax. Positive comments included the fact that it would be good to have a new facility.

### **Public Hearing**

**Mayor Connors** opened the meeting to a public hearing.

**Allan Wursten** (1651 West 1290 North) had concerns about the issue because of the

property tax increase and the distance of the proposed complex from Farmington. Not many of his neighbors had heard of the project, but after being told about it, none of them were in favor. Mr. Wursten felt there were already too many increases for services in Farmington.

**Paul Hayward** (1663 W 1410 North) stated he had grown up in the Val Verda area in Bountiful and in downtown Bountiful. He had a good affinity for the community. His family still lived in the south Davis area, and it was home to him. He could understand why Bountiful wanted to replace the “Bubble.” The building needed a great deal of attention. The question was, should Farmington participate? Mr. Hayward stated he felt it would be bad public policy to be involved with the project. A lot of taxes had recently gone up. The last six to seven years had seen a wholesale increase in taxes for services. He discussed the recent decision to build a library in Centerville because it was too far for Centerville citizens to drive to Farmington to use the library here. If it was too far for Centerville citizens to use the library in Farmington, then it is too far for Farmington citizens to drive to Bountiful to use the recreational center. Mr. Hayward felt that Farmington’s special needs are not being considered by the larger County interests. Mr. Hayward also felt that the School District involvement in the project was a great concern because all County citizens pay for School District projects. The School District won’t build a high school in Farmington, but they have money to do a recreation project. Mr. Hayward felt he was knowledgeable about the proposed recreational complex and the RAP tax. He said it was not a matter of being uneducated, it was a matter of not having the money. The new Farmington Community Arts Center and the new City park in northern Farmington came out of the pockets of the citizens. He urged that the City Council vote not to be involved in the Bountiful project.

**Gary Oscarson** (president of the local hockey league for youth) stated that Davis County is sadly lacking in hockey ice rink facilities. Davis High and Viewmont High teams both play their home games in the Bountiful facility. There are many people who travel from even further than Farmington to use the “Bubble” ice rink. The ice rink is an expensive facility that is used by people from great distances. Mr. Oscarson wanted to encourage the Council to provide the facility for the kids who want to play the sport.

**Richard Ellis** (44 East 400 North) asked for details regarding exact amounts that would be required of Farmington citizens in order to fund the Bountiful project.

**Mayor Connors** reported that it would be approximately \$36 per year for a \$180,000 property. The total assessment would be about \$2 million.

**Mr. Hardy** stated Farmington would be asked to provide about 13% of the total cost or around \$250,000 per year.

**Mr. Ellis** asked why the City Council wouldn’t want to keep that money in Farmington. There would be a great deal that could be done in the City with those funds. Mr. Ellis had talked to his neighbors and found that none of them wanted to be involved with the project. The City cannot

even afford to pick up the limbs from recent winds. It was Farmington City's responsibility to do so, and they could not afford it. Individual citizens had to take care of the limbs themselves at a cost of \$5 a load. Mr. Ellis felt this was the wrong time to be hitting the citizens with another big tax. He suggested Bountiful give the recreational project to the commercial industry and let them handle it. If recreation is important to some people then they should pay for it.

**Gene Lisonbee** (1319 North 1700 West) said he was present when the Bountiful Mayor presented original information regarding the project. The new recreational complex would be an impressive facility but he felt would not be a benefit to Farmington residents.

**Patrick Reese** (1365 North 550 West) asked what would happen if Farmington chooses not to participate but Farmington citizens want to attend the new recreational complex, will they be charged a different rate.

**Mr. Hardy** stated that decision would be left to the service district board.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no more forthcoming comments, the **Mayor** closed the public hearing. He asked the City Council to consider the resolutions in the packet. The resolutions gave both options, to either oppose or accept the Davis County Resolution creating a special service district. The other five cities had recently approved the resolution.

**David Hale** said that out of his 15 grandchildren, only two used the current Bountiful facility. That well could be representative of the Farmington usage of the building.

### **Motion**

**David Hale** moved that the City Council approve Resolution No. 2004-17, a resolution rejecting Davis County Commission Resolution 2004-115 providing for the establishment of a special service district, and requesting that Farmington City not be included within the special service district.

In discussion of the motion, **Mr. Young** said the new complex would be a great facility for Bountiful and surrounding communities. However, it's not very often that the City Council has the advantage of such a representative sampling of Farmington citizens' feelings. He felt the City Council had been given a mandate not to become involved with the project.

**Mr. Dutson** had fond memories of the hockey league games in the Bountiful ice rink. But because of the overwhelming response from Farmington citizens he felt he should oppose Farmington's involvement. After reviewing all the information given in the survey, Mr. Dutson stated that it seemed there were 60% of the citizens surveyed who said they just don't use the current

facility. That was very influential in his decision.

**Mr. Haugen** felt Farmington City was too far away from the proposed complex to locally participate. He had discussed the issue with a great many Farmington residents. None of them were in favor of Farmington participation.

**Mayor Connors** said the new facility would be a wonderful addition to the south Davis community. He was generally very supportive of regional facilities because it was a bad idea for each city to try to build everything for its citizens. It was a good idea for cities to get together and build nice facilities in cooperation. In general, he was in favor of regional facilities and in favor of the RAP tax. Regional recreation and arts programs need county-wide support. However, the Mayor viewed that as a different issue than the one before the Farmington City Council at this point. Farmington citizens had recently approved a \$2 million bond for improvements in parks and for a the new Community Arts Center. That Farmington bond was probably one of the biggest reasons the citizens did not feel a need to support the Bountiful project. Farmington is located at the far end of the zone of those who would use the Bountiful facility. There will be those in the City who will want to use the facility in the future, even if there is a surcharge imposed. Hopefully, the citizens will support the RAP tax that will be on the ballot in November. Given the results of the survey, the recommendation given by the Leisure Services Board, and the sense of the Council, the timing is probably not right for the City to join the Special Service District. If the situation were different and after the public bonding vote the Farmington community could opt out, the consideration by the City Council may be different. Otherwise the citizens may be taxed for a project they may vote against in August.

**Sid Young** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### **MINUTE MOTION APPROVING BUSINESS OF CONSENT (Agenda Item #9)**

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

1. Ratification of Construction Bond Agreements previously signed by Mayor Connors.
2. Approval of Public Improvements Extension Agreement between the City and Todd and Melinda Adams as enclosed.
3. Ratify authorization for staff to file Utah Quality Growth Commission Grant as enclosed. The application letter had to go in immediately. The total grant request is for around \$36,000. An equal amount of \$36,000 would have to be matched by the City. Submittal of the grant request does not necessarily mean an automatic award. A contract would have to be signed. The city Manager believes the City's match requirement could be met by other funding sources which will be pursued. Because the quality Growth Commission has encouraged application, the entire amount was

requested.

4. Approval of Chief Gregory's request to purchase training equipment. The equipment is a computer and projector. Both can be purchased out of the ambulance fund and the Fire Department current budgets. Because this is a change from the original budget, it is being submitted to the council for authorization. The City Manager and Finance Director recommended approval of the same.
5. Approval of two Change Orders as requested by Nelson Contractors, the contractor for the Special Improvement District. One pertains to 475 South Street; the other pertains to the sewer line adjustments on Glover Lane. This particular change order was approved conceptually previously by the City Council.

**Rick Dutson** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF NOT MORE THAN \$1,600,000 AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF SALES TAX REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2004 OF FARMINGTON CITY, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH, FOR THE PURPOSE OF FINANCING STORM DRAINAGE AND RELATED IMPROVEMENTS**

Mr. Forbush explained that last October the City Council had levied a storm water utility fee. Part of the use of those funds would be to make flood mitigation improvements throughout the City. The City had experienced many extreme storm events in the last few years that had forced the need for improved drainage facilities. On July 9, 2001, the City had a storm event that flooded many neighborhoods. When that happened, the City Council directed the City Engineer to review drainage needs City wide. The City Engineer and City Manager made a list of improvements that need to be made. The list had been reviewed by the City Council. It had been suggested that the City borrow money through the storm water utility fee revenue bonds, which had been adopted in October of 2003, to finance the improvements, but financial markets would not recognize the storm water utility fee as a stable revenue source. That being the case, the City must go to the sale tax revenues to secure bonding. The City Manager stated it was fully intended that the City would make payments to retire the debt through the storm water fee. A public hearing was set for May 19<sup>th</sup>.

In response to questions from the City Council, **John Bronson**, Financial Adviser for Zions Bank, distributed a graph of rates to each City Council member. He stated there would be a 30-day contest period and two publications of the public hearing notification. He discussed the issue of construction schedules and advised that construction should not commence before funding is secured after June 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Motion**

**Sid Young** moved that the City Council approve Resolution No. 2004-18, a resolution authorizing the issuance and sale of not more than \$1,600,000 aggregate principal amount of sales tax revenue bonds, series 2004 of Farmington City, Davis county, Utah, for the purpose of financing storm drainage and related improvements; calling a public hearing and establishing a date, time and location for said public hearing; providing for publication of a notice of public hearing and bonds to be issued; providing for a pledge of sales tax revenues for repayment of the bonds, fixing the maximum aggregate principal amount of the bonds, the maximum number of years over which the bonds may mature, the maximum interest rate which the bonds may bear, and the maximum discount from par at which the bonds may be sold; providing for the running of a contest period; and related matters. **Larry Haugen** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**INTER-LOCAL AGREEMENT OPTIONS WITH THE FARMINGTON AREA PRESSURIZED IRRIGATION DISTRICT (Agenda Item #9)**

**Mr. Forbush** referred to letter contained in the packet. The City Council was being asked to review the inter-local agreement in light of concerns by the FAPID Board as expressed through the letters. The 2004 agreement had been drafted with the help of the City Attorney. Mr. Forbush felt that the 2004 draft agreement addressed the issues of easements. Mr. Forbush detailed elements of the agreement. He reported it was the opinion of the City Attorney that the streets and rights-of-way were held in trust for the City by the City Council. It was a right the City Council ought to reserve. Mr. Forbush covered the more salient parts of the differences between the 2000 and the 2004 draft agreements.

**Mayor Connors** stated that the City of Farmington has had and wants to continue to have a good working relationship with the FAPID Board. FAPID has greatly helped to relieve the burden of the City's culinary water needs. By law, there is no "right" for FAPID to use the public easement. The draft agreement was being proposed to address that issue. Therefore, the City by its own volition, was proposing to give the right to FAPID to use the public easement. The proposed agreement would formalize the policy. One of the policy questions was whether, in the course of the City's normal process it finds that a FAPID line has to be moved, is it appropriate for the City to share in the cost or is it appropriate to have FAPID fund the entire move. Customarily, other utilities would be required to relocate at their own cost rather than a shared cost no matter who requests the work.

**Mr. Haugen** felt that if the City requested a FAPID line relocation, then the City should share in the cost. If FAPID needed to move a line, then they should fund the cost. FAPID provides a good service to the city. They should be treated fairly.

**Mr. Dutson** agreed with Mr. Haugen, however, he had a concern about precedence. Would the City run into problems with other utilities?

**Mr. Forbush** stated he could inquire of the City Attorney.

**David Hale** thought that FAPID provided a great service to the City. He also felt, however, that it would be unwise of the City not to adhere to the advice of the City Attorney. He felt the draft agreement as written should be presented to the FAPID Board, and they should be allowed to respond to it as it stands. There is a need for a standardized agreement between the two entities.

**Mr. Young** wanted the record to reflect he is employed by Questar. He did not feel that his employment constituted a conflict of interest. FAPID is a special service district and is therefore different than a public utility. Regarding public easements, the law has not stated what they are to be used for and who could use them. The legislature had revised the law just this year, regarding water companies and whether or not they could use public easements. Mr. Young felt that FAPID should be able to use the utility easements. FAPID provides a very important service for the City. Mr. Young was concerned about legal comments made by the City Attorney and about possible potential precedent issues. He felt, however, that the City should exercise a sense of fair play and recognize that in some situations the City could share costs. Such cases would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis and shared costs should not be automatic.

**David Potter**, a member of the FAPID Board, had concerns regarding what he referred to as the Shepard Heights problems, which included easement questions. He was also concerned about accommodating the City and the developers' needs to realign streets where FAPID lines were laid. He complimented the City Council for their spirit of compromise and cooperation. FAPID's biggest concern was safety and proper service for the City.

**Mayor Connors** said that there was no doubt that FAPID does a great service for the City and that the City Council desires to cooperate with the Board. He asked that Mr. Forbush contact the City's Attorney and find out what options are available. The City Council wants to be flexible. It was the sense of the Mayor that most Council Members felt there was no need to have FAPID bear the entire cost of relocation if done at the City's request. If lines were moved for purposes required by FAPID, then they should fund the expense. As long as the shared costs do not show any adverse precedence, it would not be a problem with the City. After suggestions from Council Members, the Mayor asked that the City Manager present the current draft agreement to the FAPID Board for their reaction and then bring it back to the City Council for consideration.

**DRAFT AGREEMENT WITH DAVIS COUNTY REGARDING OWNERSHIP/TRANSFER OF CLARK LANE TO THE CITY IN EXCHANGE FOR DAVIS COUNTY MAINTENANCE OF THE RUDD CREEK DEBRIS BASIN (Agenda Item #10)**

**Mr. Forbush** stated that the Rudd Creek debris basin is currently owned by Farmington City. Davis County has the equipment to do the work required to maintain it and are experienced with such basins. Clark Lane is owned by Davis County. A committee between the City and the County have been discussing the possibility of trading maintenance responsibilities of the debris basin and ownership of Clark Lane. A draft of an agreement regarding this trade was included in packet. Mr. Forbush asked that members of the Council if they had suggested changes. He received

comments and was to include them in the agreement forwarding the same to the County for consideration.

**ROAD AGREEMENT PERMITTING DEVELOPERS/BUILDERS TO COMMENCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION PRIOR TO ASPHALT PAVING (Agenda Item #11)**

According to packet information, it was City policy that no building permit would be issued in a subdivision until street improvements are installed. This included asphalt or concrete except as otherwise set forth in Section 12-2-04(b) of the Subdivision Ordinance. Paragraphs (3) and (4) of this section require that the City enter into an agreement with the Developer. The Hawkins Companies, developer of the Tuscan Cove subdivision, now desire to enter into such an agreement with the City. The developer may not meet the condition set forth in paragraph (1) of Section (b). Mr. Forbush said that the Fire Chief has responded to such issues within the City with great concern. Prior to paving the streets, developers must sign an agreement and the City must be held harmless. The City Attorney had reviewed the current draft.

**Paul Hayward** stated that he was a fire code consultant for the City. He had spoken with Chief Gregory and there were several situations in the City that presented great concerns. Mr. Hayward mentioned a flag log going in on 200 East and 1300 South where there was no physical way to get into the property should there be a fire or other emergency. Mr. Hayward gave several examples of problematic emergency response situations all involving the lack of appropriate pavement. He stated that pavement needs to be installed and that it must be to a standard that would support large fire engines. The intent of the State Fire Code is to provide the needed access 12 months of the year.

**Mayor Connors** said he would like to hear from Chief Gregory. It seemed obvious that the City ordinances and standards needed to be more specific.

**Mr. Forbush** reminded the City Council that the City ordinances allowed that there could be exceptions to the pavement requirement in certain situations.

**Mr. Young** felt the ordinance needed to be tightened to specifically require what standard the pavement needed to be for emergency access. He felt the ordinance should be redrafted and brought back to the City Council. Mr. Dutson questioned what is the motivation now. We are out of wet season. Is developer just trying to move project faster?

**REVIEW OF BIDS TO FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECTS/CONSIDERATION OF CONTRACT AWARD (Agenda Item #12)**

**Mr. Forbush** distributed a tabulation sheet of the bids received for the flood mitigation project. The Claude Nix Construction Company was the low bidder. Mr. Forbush stated that bidders

had been pre-qualified. There would need to be a financial analysis before formally awarding the bid. The City Manager stated that he would come back for permission to award the bid when the final study was completed.

### **HERITAGE PARK PLAQUE (Agenda Item #13)**

**Mr. Haugen** discussed the proposal to erect a plaque at the Heritage Park. He stated no other parks had plaques. He felt the Museum would be an appropriate place for a plaque as would the Municipal Pool. However, he felt the plaques at the parks would not be appropriate.

**Mr. Hale** felt it would be a good idea to have a plaque at the park because of the citizen involvement and the support given by the City officials. However, he would go along with the majority if they felt there should not be a plaque placed at Heritage Park.

**Mr. Young** felt that if previous parks had not had a plaque then the Heritage Park should probably not have one.

**Mayor Connors** noted that it was the consensus of the majority of the Council Members not to place plaques in parks. However, Viola Kinney was instructed to investigate placing one at the Municipal Pool.

### **MISCELLANEOUS REQUESTS (Agenda Item #14)**

#### **Uniting Neighbors Celebration/City Booth Request**

Mr. Forbush stated there is an increasing need to assign a volunteer to serve as a community service coordinator. When discussing the United Neighbors Celebration, Paul White recommended that the City not participate this year.

#### **Farmington “Mother of the Year” Selection**

Bob Mickleson (reporter for the *Davis County Clipper*) stated he had received nominations for the award. He would bring them to the Farmington City Offices the next day. Mr. Dutson and Mr. Haugen were asked and accepted the responsibility of choosing the final nominee.

#### **New Logo Consideration**

The City Council discussed the possibility of redesigning the City’s logo.

**Mr. Dutson** felt the current logo was probably outdated. It was important that an organization’s logo represent the true feelings and intent of the organization. The City Council

needed to be thoughtful and creative if a new logo were to be designed, and it must say what the City Council wants to say about the City. It should represent the historic nature of the City while being updated and attractive.

After a brief discussion, the City Council, by consensus directed that a study of the possibility of redesigning the logo should move forward.

**Mr. Forbush** stated that the current logo had not been designed in a corner. It was done by citizens who did so with a great deal of thought and care. The historical nature of Farmington had been considered. If a new logo is designed, Mr. Forbush felt that it should represent all departments of the City and that each department not have its own logo. He suggested that a committee be organized to study the possibilities.

### **MISCELLANEOUS (Agenda Item #15)**

#### **Museum Work Moving Forward**

Mr. Haugen gave a brief report regarding the work being done on the new City's Museum. There were some items in the building that would need to be moved elsewhere. Mr. Haugen and Mr. Forbush would meet to discuss what to do with the items.

#### **UDOT and Historical District Concerns**

Mr. Dutson met with residents of west State Street. UDOT construction was a great concern. Vibration of equipment, especially pile drivers, has a very negative impact on historical homes. Citizens in that area would like to have the overpass demolished and not replaced.

#### **West Nile Virus**

Mr. Hale distributed information on the West Nile Virus concerns. He stated that the Mosquito Abatement Department were doing an admirable job. However, the virus will be hitting Utah this summer. The best protection was to stay indoors after dark. There were other precautions that could be taken. It would be important to inform the public of the danger.

#### **Striping along 1525**

Mr. Hale asked if it were possible to stripe or otherwise increase the safety of traffic along 1525. Mr. Forbush stated he would investigate possibilities through the traffic engineers.

#### **Convention of Utah League of Cities and Towns**

Mr. Young reported the meetings of the convention which he attended. He felt there was

good information and that it was worth the time to be there. As a result, he felt it would be a good thing for the City Council to review the status of the budget more often during the year to make sure that the projected status is within acceptable parameters. He reminded Mr. Forbush that there was a telecommunication tax that needed to be filed before July 1. Mr. Forbush stated he was aware of the requirement and would take care of it.

### **Meetings with Rich Haws**

Mr. Young had attended meetings with the Haws group. He felt there was a need to better correlate work done between the City, the Haws group, and the development consultant. He suggested that the City designate a project manager to follow up with the RDA requirements, the work done by the consultant, and to oversee such crucial issues as the additional portion of Legacy north, which is so essential for Farmington in general and especially for the Haws.

### **Way-Finding Signage**

Mr. Young asked if the staff could give a report on the way-finding signage project. Mr. Forbush stated that could be done in the near future.

### **Upcoming Budget Sessions**

Mr. Forbush stated that as part of the up-coming budget sessions agendas, the City Council would need to hold a required "CDBG" hearing. The final hearing needed to be done soon. He said that notification would be hand delivered to involved property owners. He indicated the hearing could be set for 6 P.M. on Wednesday, April 28, 2004.

### **Issues for the Problems Resolutions Committee**

Mr. Forbush requested that the Problems Resolutions Committee meet again with Ken Hardy. He also requested that the Committee meet with residents of the Compton Bench area to resolve questions regarding landscaping of the new detention basin on the corner of 110 North and Compton Road.

### **ADJOURNMENT INTO CLOSED SESSION**

**David Hale** moved that the City Council adjourn to closed session to discuss strategy as it pertains to pending litigation at 10:00 P.M. **Larry Haugen** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

At 10:35 p.m. a motion was made by **Larry Haugen** to go back into open session with a second on the motion by **Rick Dutson**. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Larry Haugen** moved that the meeting adjourn at 10:35 p.m.

---

Margy Lomax, City Recorder  
Farmington City