

Mayor
Kenneth Romney

WEST BOUNTIFUL CITY

City Administrator
Duane Huffman

City Council
James Ahlstrom
James Bruhn
Kelly Enquist
Mark Preece
Andrew Williams

550 North 800 West
West Bountiful, Utah 84087

Phone (801) 292-4486
FAX (801) 292-6355
www.WBCity.org

City Recorder
Cathy Brightwell

City Engineer
Ben White

Public Works Director
Steve Maughan

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

**THE WEST BOUNTIFUL CITY COUNCIL WILL HOLD A
REGULAR MEETING AT 7:30 PM, ON TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 6, 2016, AT THE CITY HALL, 550 N 800 WEST**

Invocation/Thought –James Ahlstrom; Pledge of Allegiance – Mark Preece

1. Accept Agenda.
2. Public Comment (two minutes per person, or five minutes if speaking on behalf of a group).
3. Discuss Park Strip Landscaping on Pages Lane Project.
4. Consider Resolution 394-16, A Resolution Amending the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement with Davis County Relating to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program.
5. Discuss Use of Consultant for Planned Unit Development Ordinance Review.
6. Engineering Report – Ben White.
7. Administrative/Financial Report – Duane Huffman.
8. Mayor/Council Reports.
9. Approve Minutes from the August 16, 2016, and August 22, 2016, City Council Meetings.
10. Executive Session for the Purpose of Discussing Items Allowed, Pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 52-4-205.
11. Adjourn.

Individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should contact Cathy Brightwell at (801)292-4486 twenty-four hours prior to the meeting.

This agenda was posted on the State Public Notice website, the City website, emailed to the Mayor and City Council, and sent to the Clipper Publishing Company on September 1, 2016.

MEMORANDUM



TO: Mayor & Council
DATE: September 1, 2016
FROM: Duane Huffman
RE: **Pages Lane Project - Park Strip Landscaping**

At Councilman James Bruhn's request, the September 6th Council Agenda will include a discussion regarding newly created park strips along the Pages Lane Project.

Background

Park strips are a section of the street right-of-way between the sidewalk and the back of the curb. Residents are generally responsible for their landscaping and on-going care and maintenance.

As part of the construction of new sidewalk, staff estimates that there is roughly 11,000 square feet of new park strip area along the project. The City Council discussed what to do landscape-wise with these park strips at several meetings during the planning process for the Pages Lane Project:

- September 15, 2015 City Council Minutes: "The consensus was that for purposes of the public meeting on September 29, staff would present a standard design on both sides of the road. If yards not in the right-of-way are affected, the city will repair them in a similar manner, but will not provide landscape in the park strip other than top soil and a conduit for sprinklers.
- October 20, 2015 City Council Minutes: "The park strips will have 4" topsoil and an irrigation conduit running under the sidewalk, but the project does not include sod or sprinklers in the park strip."

The following table outlines where this project currently stands from a cost/funding perspective:

	Original Budget	Sources	Current Estimate	Potential Source
Water	\$425,000	\$225,000 Water Fund, \$200,000 Water Impact Fees	\$450,000	Water Fund
Streets	\$523,000	\$175,000 Property Tax, \$198,000 Streets Impact, \$150,000 UDOT	\$550,000	General Fund or other capital projects
Storm Water	\$198,000	\$143,000 Storm Water Fund, \$50,000 General Fund	\$250,000	General Fund
Total	\$1,146,000		\$1,250,000	

Options

For discussion purposes, the following options are presented for the Council's consideration:

- A. Install sod and sprinkler in every new park strip. Estimated additional cost: \$30,000. Source: General Fund.
 1. Pros: Property owners will not have to bear the costs of new landscaping; there is a better chance park strips will not fill with weeds.
 2. Cons: Not every property owner has sprinklers to connect. Not every property owner wants sod; city residents (General Fund) bear the cost of the improvements.
- B. Allow property owners to choose between sod/sprinklers or standard rocks/weed cloth. Estimated additional cost \$30,000. Source: General Fund.
 1. Pros: Property owners will not have to bear the costs of new landscaping; property owners will have a choice as to what is in front of their homes; there is a better chance park strips will not fill with weeds.
 2. Cons: Not every property owner has sprinklers to connect. Not every property owner will want a standard rock; city residents (General Fund) bear the cost of the improvements.
- C. Provide property owners funding in lieu of landscape improvements so that they can decide and install what they would prefer. Estimated additional cost \$30,000. Source: General Fund.
 1. Pros: Property owners will not have to bear the costs of new landscaping; there is a better chance park strips will not fill with weeds.
 2. Cons: Some property owners will not want to perform the work or hire a contractor to install improvements; City residents (General Fund) bear the cost of the improvements.
- D. Retain current plan to fill new park strips with top soil. Estimated additional cost \$0.
 1. Pros: Funding already in place; property owners bear the cost similar to when improvements are generally installed.
 2. Cons: Many property owners will be upset; many areas of park strip will not be landscaped and will be filled with weeds.

MEMORANDUM



TO: Mayor & Council

DATE: September 1, 2016

FROM: Duane Huffman

RE: **Resolution 394-16 – CDBG Interlocal Agreement Amendment**

At the request of Davis County and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, The Council September 6 agenda includes a resolution approving an amendment to the current 2009 Interlocal Agreement between the City, Davis County, and various other cities in the County related to the Community Development Block Grant Program. The amendment makes technical changes and updates that do not appear to change the substance of the original agreement.

Background

The Community Development Block Grant is a longstanding federal program that assists communities provide affordable housing, anti-poverty programs, and infrastructure development. In 2009, West Bountiful joined most other cities in Davis County in having the County administer the program. Most recently, the City has received funding to assist with sidewalk infrastructure on 800 W.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approving this amendment.

RESOLUTION NO. 394-16

A RESOLUTION OF WEST BOUNTIFUL CITY, UTAH
APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO AN INTERLOCAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT
WITH DAVIS COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT RELATING TO
THE CONDUCT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the West Bountiful City Council (the “*Council*”) met in a regular session on 6 September , 2016, to consider, among other things, approving an interlocal cooperative agreement with Davis County; and

WHEREAS, local government entities are authorized by the Utah Local Cooperative Act (UTAH CODE § ANN. 11-13-101, *et. Seq.*) to enter into agreements with each other, upon a resolution to do so by the respective governing bodies, to do what each agency is authorized by law to perform; and

WHEREAS, a uniform interlocal agreement between various Davis County cities including West Bountiful City, has been prepared for approval which sets forth the purposes thereof, the extent of participation of the parties, and the rights, duties and responsibilities of the parties A copy of such interlocal agreement is attached hereto; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council that the attached amendment to an interlocal agreement be approved and that the Mayor and Recorder are hereby authorized and directed to execute and deliver the same.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage.

ADOPTED by the City Council of West Bountiful City, Utah, this 6th day of September, 2016.

Ken Romney, Mayor

Voting by the City Council:	<u>Aye</u>	<u>Nay</u>
Councilmember Ahlstrom	___	___
Councilmember Bruhn	___	___
Councilmember Enquist	___	___
Councilmember Preece	___	___
Councilmember Williams	___	___

ATTEST:

Cathy Brightwell, Recorder

**AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN DAVIS COUNTY
AND THE CITY OF WEST BOUNTIFUL RELATING TO THE CONDUCT OF COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2011, 2012 AND 2013
AND SUCCESSIVE 3 YEAR PERIODS THEREAFTER**

This Amendment No. 1 to Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Davis County and the City of West Bountiful Relating to the Conduct of Community Development Block Grant Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2011, 2012 and 2013 and Successive 3 Year Periods Thereafter (this "Amendment") is made and entered into by and between Davis County, a body corporate and politic and political subdivision of the state of Utah (the "County"), and the City of West Bountiful, a municipal corporation of the state of Utah (the "City"). The County and the City may be collectively referred to in this Amendment as the "Parties."

RECITALS

This Amendment is made and entered into by and between the Parties based, in part, upon the following recitals:

- A. The Parties previously entered into an *Interlocal Cooperation Agreement Between Davis County and the City of West Bountiful Relating to the Conduct of Community Development Block Grant Program for Federal Fiscal Years 2011, 2012, and 2013 and Successive 3 Year Periods Thereafter*, dated May 20, 2010 by the City and July 13, 2010 by the County, which is labeled Davis County Contract Nos. 2010-229, 2010-229A, and 2010-229B (the "Cooperation Agreement");
- B. Pursuant to Notice CPD-16-05 (the "Notice") issued by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Planning and Development ("HUD"), it is necessary for the Cooperation Agreement to be amended in order to satisfy certain requirements set forth in the Notice; and
- C. The Parties, through this Amendment, desire to modify certain terms and/or provisions of the Cooperation Agreement in order to comply with the Notice.

Now, based upon the foregoing, and in consideration of the terms set forth in this Amendment, the Parties do hereby agree as follows:

1. Recital D of the Cooperation Agreement is amended as follows:

July 1, 2010 is replaced with October 1, 2010.

2. Recital F of the Cooperation Agreement is omitted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

This Agreement provides for an initial three year term commencing on October 1, 2010 and continuing through September 30, 2013 with successive three year terms corresponding with HUD qualification periods, automatically renewing.

3. The second sentence of Recital G is amended as follows:

The word “federal” is added after “In order to ensure participation by the City in the urban county and as part of the ...” and before “fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013 urban county qualification process,”

4. The fourth sentence of Section 1 of the Cooperation Agreement is amended as follows:

July 1, 2011 is replaced with October 1, 2010 and June 30, 2013 is replaced with September 30, 2013.

5. Section 1 of the Cooperation Agreement is amended such that the sentence set forth below is the first sentence of Section 1. Section 1 shall otherwise remain the same.

This interlocal cooperation agreement (the “agreement”) covers the CDBG Entitlement program and, where applicable, the HOME Investment Partnership and Emergency Solutions Grants Programs.

6. The final three sentences of Section 3 of the Cooperation Agreement are omitted in their entirety and replaced with the following:

By executing the agreement, the City understands that it may: (1) not apply for grants under the State CDBG Program for fiscal years during the period in which it participates in the County’s CDBG Program; (2) receive a formula allocation under the HOME Program, if applicable, only through the County; thus, even if the County does not receive a HOME formula allocation, the City cannot form a HOME consortium with other local governments; (3) may receive a formula allocation under the ESG Program, if applicable, only through the County.

7. The following shall be added to the end of Section 6 of the Cooperation Agreement:

The City is precluded from selling, trading, or otherwise transferring all or any portion of the funds that it receives from County under the Agreement to another metropolitan city, urban county, unit of general local government, Indian tribe, or insular area that, directly or indirectly, receives CDBG funds in exchange for any other funds, credits or non-Federal considerations, but must use such funds for activities eligible under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended.

8. The penultimate sentence of Section 7 of the Cooperation Agreement is omitted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

In addition, the City and the County shall take all actions necessary to assure compliance with the County's certification under Section 104(b) of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, regarding Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, and affirmatively furthering fair housing, and the City and the County shall comply with Section 109 of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, which incorporates Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as well as other applicable laws.

9. Section 13 of the Cooperation Agreement is amended as follows:

(cooperation) is removed and replaced with cooperation.

10. Continuing Effect of the Agreement. Except to the extent specifically modified by this Amendment, the terms and conditions of the Cooperation Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

[Signature Page Follows]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have executed this Amendment in duplicate, each of which shall be deemed an original.

DAVIS COUNTY

John Petroff, Jr., Chair,
Davis County Board of County Commissioners
Date: _____

ATTEST:

Curtis Koch, Davis County Clerk/Auditor
Date: _____

Reviewed and Approved as to Form and Legality:

Davis County Attorney's Office
Date: _____

CITY OF WEST BOUNTIFUL

Mayor
Date: _____

ATTEST:

City Recorder
Date: _____

Reviewed and Approved as to Form and Legality:

City Attorney
Date: _____

MEMORANDUM



TO: Mayor & Council

DATE: September 1, 2016

FROM: Duane Huffman

RE: **PUD Ordinance Review Consultant**

The September 6th City Council meeting agenda will include a discussion regarding the use of a consultant to help with the review and any potential changes to the City's PUD ordinance.

Background

At the May 17th meeting the City Council established a temporary restriction on the further use of West Bountiful Municipal Code Title 17 Chapter 68 – Planned Unit Developments. This was done to give the City time to study and potentially make changes to the future use of PUDs. State Code tasks the Planning Commission with the initial review and recommendations for land use ordinances; however, the Planning Commission has asked for more input from the City Council to better understand in which direction they should go with potential modifications.

To help jump start discussion, staff presented a memo at the August 16th Council meeting that proposed broad changes to the City's PUD ordinance for the Council's consideration. In reviewing that memo and the complicated nature of the goals of a PUD, council members recommend that the City explore the use of an expert for additional assistance.

Recommendation

Based on the discussion at the August 16th meeting, I sought help from an expert at the Utah League of Cities and Towns. I was referred to Mr. John Jason, a consultant with years of experience on this subject. After a brief discussion of the City's situation, Mr. Jason provided the attached proposal.

If the Council is still interested in pursuing outside help with this ordinance, I recommend moving forward with Mr. Jason. At Tuesday's meeting, additional direction can be given regarding his scope.

West Bountiful Planned Unit Development Ordinance Update process

Project understanding – issues have a risen with the use the City’s Planned Unit Development ordinance. It needs an update including clarifications, process considerations, and redefinition of its’ intended purpose.

Proposed Process

1. Meeting, discussion, and fieldtrip with Duane Huffman, City Administrator

Objective - Discuss the big issues, concerns, and review projects built under the PUD ordinance

2. Fieldtrip with City Council and Planning Commission within City (optional fieldtrip to other PUD projects and communities in Davis County)

Objective – Education, photo inventory, and project evaluation form completion for subsequent analysis by consultant

3. Big issue/concerns resolution meeting – joint City Council and Planning Commission

Objective – resolve and reach consensus on the issues as presented by staff and determined through the fieldtrip/discussion

4. PUD text update and process update

Objective – create draft documents for review including ordinance text, development agreement template, process revisions, and application/checklists. Provide time for staff review, input, and modifications.

5. Provide draft version to City Council and Planning Commission for input in joint meeting or electronic format

Objective - receive input prior to the PC meeting on drafts

6. Optional developer input meeting (lunch at City Hall)

Objective – since developers will build the PUDs, input from that group may be useful to the process

7. Planning Commission hearing with consultant support

8. City Council hearing with consultant support

If a six month temporary zoning regulation has been put in place, then, the work needs to be completed by November 17th. Technically then all of the above would need to be accomplished within that timeframe. If an agreement for the work and process can be reached by mid-September, that leaves 2 months for completion of the work. I’d suggest that the above process is more doable in 4 months, but that includes the CC and PC hearings. The first few steps could be completed in 4 to 6 weeks, step 4 in about a month, and the last steps in about 2 months.

Not to exceed price - \$4500



John M. Janson AICP
Planning Solutions

2643 E 3120 S
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109
801-232-3778
j_janson@comcast.net

Education

University of Utah, Bachelor of Science in Geography - 1975
The Ohio State University, Master of City and Regional Planning, 1977

Employment

Millard Consultants, vice president, 1977 -1978, planning for small communities
Davis County Planning, planner, 1978 -1980

Responsible for the planning needs of Kaysville and Fruit Heights,
Hillside Ordinance, Community Design Handbook, Kaysville RDA

West Valley City, CED Assistant Director/Planning Director, 1980-2010
Long Range Planning emphasis, grants, CDBG, ordinance development,
co-author of the Transfer of Development Rights, Sign, Mixed Use, City
Center, and numerous other ordinances, City General Plan 1984, Vision
2020 Plan, Strategic Planning, and City Center Vision Plan. Project
review, SID project manager, and UTA LRT project liaison

Pleasant View City, City Planner, 1996 - 2005

Responsible for the planning needs of this semi-rural Weber County
community, General Plan update, preservation alternatives, ordinance
enhancements, project review

Consulting planning work, "Planning Solutions", with Steve Pastorik AICP

Davis County, Foothill Study, fall 2002 – public involvement

Kaysville City, 2003 – 2008 - various ordinances

Plain City, consulting planner, 2005 – 2006. Planned Unit Development
ordinance, application review

Loa Town, 2008-2009, General Plan and complete Zoning Ordinance

Utah Form Based Code Template/Manual, Project Manager 2010-2013

Jordan River Commission, Best Practices, Contributing author, 2012-2013

Consulting work with Civil Solutions Group

South Salt Lake Form Based Code, 2014

North Ogden General Plan, 2015

The Vineyard Town Center Vision and Form Base Code, 2015

Brigham City General Plan update, on-going in 2016

Associations

Utah American Planning Association – President for 3 terms

Past President of ASSIST - a non-profit community design coalition

Past Board member Provo-Jordan River Parkway Authority

Millcreek Township Planning Commission – past Chair

West Bountiful Finance Report

	Prior YTD	Current YTD	Budget	YTD % of Budget	Notes
1 General Fund Revenues					
2 Taxes	\$216,276	\$794,537	\$3,861,362	21%	Large property tax payment. Sales tax finally up.
3 Licenses and Permits	\$12,754	\$15,355	\$91,700	17%	
4 Intergovernmental	\$35,629	\$0	\$206,500	0%	Class C Road Funding Delayed
5 Charges for Services	\$735	\$12,543	\$25,200	50%	
6 Fines	\$4,612	\$5,043	\$80,000	6%	
7 Misc	\$5,329	\$181	\$13,000	1%	
8 Contributions/Transfers	\$0	\$0	\$6,665	0%	
9 Total GF Revenue	<hr/> \$275,335	<hr/> \$827,658	<hr/> \$4,284,427	19%	
10					
11 General Fund Expenditures					
12 Legislative	\$4,277	\$3,737	\$49,281	8%	
13 Court	\$2,046	\$2,650	\$32,300	8%	
14 Administrative	\$22,364	\$25,370	\$279,071	9%	
15 Engineering	\$6,632	\$8,068	\$85,653	9%	
16 Non-Departmental	\$12,687	\$76,462	\$195,400	39%	
17 Govt. Buildings	\$4,255	\$3,653	\$97,200	4%	
18 Planning/Zoning	\$2,530	\$3,036	\$40,648	7%	
19 Police	\$87,544	\$104,376	\$1,129,459	9%	
20 Fire	\$118,819	\$145,130	\$580,313	25%	
21 Streets	\$17,040	\$14,573	\$285,029	5%	
22 Class C	\$0	\$43,324	\$195,500	22%	
23 Transportation	\$0	\$2,071	\$157,000	1%	
24 Parks	\$19,415	\$23,880	\$252,542	9%	
25 Debt	\$0	\$0	\$156,000	0%	
26 Transfers/Sales Tax Sharing	\$43,908	\$4,602	\$749,029	1%	
27 Total GF Expend	<hr/> \$341,515	<hr/> \$460,931	<hr/> \$4,284,425	11%	

West Bountiful Finance Report

	Prior YTD	Current YTD	Budget	YTD % of Budget	Notes
28 RAP Tax Fund					
29 Revenues	\$16,855	\$17,413	\$231,597	8%	
30 Equipment/Improvements	\$328		\$23,000		
31 Irrigation	\$31,950				
32 Park Improvements			\$37,200	0%	
33 Legacy Trail					
34 Trail Protection					
35 Restroom					
36 Golf Transfer			\$100,300		
37 General Fund Arts Trans			\$4,500	0%	
38 Total RAP Expend	\$32,278	\$0	\$165,000	0%	
39 RDA Fund					
40 Revenues	\$32	\$0	\$490,654	0%	
41 Expenditures	\$5,777	\$6,975	\$490,654	1%	
42 Governmental Impact Fees					
43 Revenues	\$21,121	\$10,476	\$37,620	28%	
44 Expenditures	\$6,544	\$63,500	\$253,020	25%	
45 Jessi's Meadows					
46 Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$12,100	0%	
47 Expenditures	\$0	\$660	\$24,440	3%	
48 Streets Capital					
49 Revenues	\$102	\$0	\$212,500	0%	
50 Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$555,000	0%	
51 Water					
52 Revenues	\$136,436	\$125,691	\$1,877,673	7%	
53 Expend (non-capital)	\$35,344	\$40,474	\$999,662	4%	
54 Capital	\$32,663	\$63,500	\$1,604,000	4%	

West Bountiful Finance Report

	Prior YTD	Current YTD	Budget	YTD % of Budget	Notes
55 Solid Waste					
56 Revenues	\$31,324	\$31,472	\$373,000	8%	
57 Expenditures	\$24,743	\$37,849	\$349,903	11%	
58 Storm Water					
59 Revenues	\$16,402	\$8,101	\$117,000	7%	
60 Expenditures	\$2,761	\$4,248	\$64,739	7%	
61 Golf					
62 Revenues	\$122,762	\$113,800	\$983,850	12%	
63 Expenditures					
64 Pro-Shop	\$22,527	\$28,834	\$337,039	9%	
65 Grounds	\$44,428	\$31,498	\$458,564	7%	
66 Range	\$5,255	\$14,950	\$54,554	27%	
67 Café/Merch	\$13,129	\$14,434	\$82,500	17%	
68 Debt	\$7,531	\$25,533	\$43,560	59%	
69 Golf Expend Total	\$92,870	\$115,249	\$976,217	12%	

1 **West Bountiful City** **PENDING** **August 23, 2016**
2 **Planning Commission**

3 **Posting of Agenda** - The agenda for this meeting was posted on the State of Utah Public Notice
4 website and the West Bountiful City website, and sent to Clipper Publishing Company on
5 August 19, 2016 per state statutory requirement.

6 **Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of West Bountiful City held on Tuesday,**
7 **August 23, 2016, at West Bountiful City Hall, Davis County, Utah.**

8

9 **Those in Attendance:**

10

11 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Denis Hopkinson, Terry Turner,
12 Alan Malan, Mike Cottle, Laura Charchenko, Corey Sweat (Alternate).

13

14 **MEMBERS/STAFF EXCUSED: Andy Williams (Councilmember)**

15

16 **STAFF PRESENT:** Ben White (City Engineer), Cathy Brightwell
17 (Deputy Recorder) and Debbie McKean (Secretary).

18

19 **VISITORS:** April Lewis

20

21 The Planning Commission Meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Hopkinson.
22 Corey Sweat offered a thought from George Washington.

23 **I. Accept Agenda**

24 Chairman Hopkinson reviewed the agenda. Laura Charchenko moved to accept the agenda as
25 presented. Alan Malan seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor among members
26 present.

27 **Business Discussed:**

28 **II. Consider Conditional Use Permit for Miss April's Preschool at 729 West 2300 North**

29 Included in the Commissioner's packet was a memorandum dated August 19, 2016 from Cathy
30 Brightwell regarding a Conditional Use Permit for Home Occupation- Miss April's Preschool, a
31 conditional use permit application and Home Occupation Business License Application with a
32 site plan and signatures of property owners within a 300 foot radius of the exterior boundaries of
33 the intended business location (non-opposing) from April Lewis 729 West 2300 North, West
34 Bountiful, UT.

35 Memorandum included information from April Lewis desiring to apply for a Conditional Use
 36 Permit application and a Home Occupation Business License for Miss April's Preschool. The
 37 Preschool will be held Tuesday and Thursday mornings from 9:30 to 11:30 and run concurrently
 38 with the Davis County School schedule. Enrollment will be a maximum of 8 children with
 39 traffic consisting of parent(s) dropping off and picking up their children during those hours only.
 40 Parents will be required to walk children to and from the preschool held in her basement if
 41 parking is not available in her driveway or directly in front of her home.

42 Utah Department of Health does not require a license when care is provided for less than 4 hours
 43 per day. SDFA is scheduled to conduct a fire inspection on April 23, 2016.

44 Staff confirmed that Miss April's Preschool meets the requirements of the West Bountiful
 45 Municipal Code, Chapter 5.28 Home Occupation and Chapter 17.60 Conditional Uses and
 46 recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

47 Cathy Brightwell introduced the applicant and reviewed the information in the memorandum for
 48 the Commissioners.

49 April Lewis was invited to take the stand for questions from the Commissioners. Alan Malan
 50 asked if the yard was fenced in and Ms. Lewis answered to the affirmative. Alan Malan made a
 51 correction to the memorandum regarding the zoning for this business.

52 ***ACTION TAKEN:***

53 *Mike Cottle moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Home Occupation for*
 54 *Miss April's Preschool for April Lewis at 729 West 2300 North with the following*
 55 *affirmative finding: that the proposed use is desirable to provide a service that will*
 56 *contribute to the general well-being of the neighborhoods and community, will not be*
 57 *detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing in the vicinity,*
 58 *or injurious to property in the vicinity, shall not inordinately impact the streets in the*
 59 *area and will comply with the regulations specified in the R-1-10 zoning ordinance.*
 60 *The permit will be issued with the following conditions: Fire Marshall Inspection*
 61 *passes (done); parents will be told to park in the driveway or immediately in front of the*
 62 *home or walk their child to the door to and from the home; no external signage will be*
 63 *used for the preschool; a person who is not a resident of the dwelling shall not be*
 64 *employed to work on the premises; and applicant must provide a Criminal History*
 65 *Report from the Bureau of Criminal Investigation (done). Alan Malan seconded the*
 66 *motion and voting was unanimous in favor.*

67

68 **III. Discuss and Set Public Hearing for Title 13 - Storm Water Utility Changes.**

69 Commissioner's packets included a memorandum dated August 19, 2016 from Ben White
 70 regarding Changes to Title 13.30- Storm Water Utility and a draft of Chapter 13.30.

71

72 Chairman Hopkinson introduced the draft for Title 13 as being mostly new language. Ben White
 73 explained that we are taking what we have been doing and putting it into our City Code which is

74 a good thing. He pointed out the last section of this document contains the penalties which will
75 be decided by the City Council and added that the fee structure needs to be decided as well. A
76 public hearing will be held to get input on our storm management plan.

77

78 **Questions and Comments from the Commissioners:**

79

80 **Chairman Hopkinson** referred to Section 13.30.010 paragraph 2 and asked by whose authority
81 we are bound to this regulation? Ben White answered that it is a State regulation passed down
82 from the feds but he is not certain about the specific Federal regulation attached to it. It was
83 decided to modify the paragraph by removing the reference to the National Pollution Discharge
84 Elimination System.

85 Chairman Hopkinson commented that the definitions seem to be good but asked if the list could
86 be thinned out. Mr. White will go through the definitions and try to make a shorter list

87 Denis Hopkinson inquired about how fees and rates would be decided. Mr. White briefly
88 explained the fee structure is laid out in the City's Consolidated Fee Schedule and that there is
89 not currently a fee associated with a storm water permit but the city council could decide to
90 impose one at a future time. Currently, the only fees associated with storm water and grading are
91 included with building permits or subdivision approvals. Mr. Hopkinson suggested making the
92 language more clear regarding the fee structure.

93 Regarding 13.30.070 A. - Mr. Hopkinson has some issues regarding this section. He feels the
94 permit should cover any mitigation of storm water. Mr. White noted that any impact that will
95 disturb vegetation of more than an acre will require a permit. He is not sure that will be part of
96 the building permit or not. This issue will be discussed with Council to see how they want it
97 structured.

98 Page 14 G. Chairman Hopkinson asked Mr. White to explain this section. Mr. White explained
99 that if someone wants to redevelop their property they must comply with the storm drain
100 requirements. This applies to both personal property as well as business. Chairman Hopkinson
101 was concerned with the cost that could be incurred with this requirement.

102 Page 16. E. Concrete Wash Out- Mr. White explained this process and requirement and the
103 difference between larger contractors and smaller contractors and legalities.

104 **Corey Sweat** commented on 13.30.070. He is concerned about duplicating permits and fees.
105 Mr. White pointed out that this Section points back to our storm water management plan.
106 Reports, inspections, etc. have to be done and fees may need to be charged to cover these
107 expenses. The State is not funding these mandates and the cities have to find ways to pay for
108 these required regulations.

109 Some discussion took place regarding this issue and how fees are currently being charged for
110 inspections and such. Mr. Sweat understands the need to cover costs but feels we should not
111 duplicate fees and only implement one if necessary. Mr. White pointed out that this section is
112 talking about a permit and no fee has been determined at this time. City Council will discuss this
113 matter to determine if fees are necessary.

114 **Mike Cottle** asked if the audit conducted several years ago created this mandate. Mr. White
115 answered no, and explained that this was already in the making. We already have a storm water
116 management program and the State storm water permit update that requires the updated storm
117 water ordinance is a scheduled permit renewal. Nate Buzbee, in public works, is our storm water
118 official who oversees the inspections and ordinance compliance. He has attended various
119 trainings and has been certified to do the job. Ben White will complete the paperwork.

120 **Terry Turner** asked if it is possible to modify the regulations to let the city choose when to
121 apply or impact the citizens with these mandates. Mr. White explained that the State permit
122 requires certain storm water management control measures, but there is language in the
123 ordinance and the management plan that allows the city some flexibility if there is a better way
124 to achieve the same goal or if something, for instance, storm water detention in a high ground
125 water environment, is not possible.

126 Mr. Turner asked who will audit these regulations. Mr. White replied that it will be handled by
127 the State. Mr. Turner asked who wrote this document. Mr. White replied that the language for
128 this management plan was written by him with help from other cities ordinances.

129 Terry Turner inquired if there will there be any new city positions needed to manage this
130 regulation. Mr. White explained we already have expanded our Public Works department from 3
131 to 6 employees over the past few years and no additional employees are needed at this time to
132 handle the management of this mandate.

133 In regards to Section 13.30.070 C. on page 9, Mr. Turner asked if this increases the City's
134 liability. Mr. White responded that it does not. He noted that dust control is already required of
135 every construction project but now it is now a part of the documented plan.

136 Mr. Turner asked when these regulations were drafted. Mr. White answered they were started
137 1½ years ago, became effective March 1, 2016 and will run through March 2021.

138 **Laura Charchenko** had no additional questions and thanked Mr. White for putting all this
139 together.

140 **Alan Malan** asked how many pages the permit will be for an average builder when compared to
141 the size of our permit with the State. Mr. White explained while the State permit is lengthy, that
142 will not be the case with the average builder; it will only be a page or two, or may be combined
143 with the existing building permit.

144

145 Chairman Hopkinson asked staff to draft new language incorporating this discussion and get it
146 out to Commissioners for review before the next meeting so it can be reviewed, and comments
147 can be accepted, etc. before the public hearing at the next meeting.

148

149 **IV. Discuss and Set Public Hearing for Title 15- Building & Construction, Incorporating** 150 **Special Flood Hazard Language from Title 16 – Subdivisions.**

151 Ben White explained that the new Section 15.16 – Flood Damage Prevention in Special Flood
152 Hazard Areas, was moved from Title 16 – Subdivisions, Section 16.32 because it applies to more
153 than just subdivisions and it is a better fit. The bulk of this section relates to FEMA designated
154 areas which include both developed and undeveloped properties. He noted that the other change

155 is to make the city engineer, rather than public works director, responsible to administer and
 156 implement Building and Construction for the City.

157 There were no comments or questions from the Commission.

158

159 **V. Discuss and Set Public Hearing for Title 16, Subdivisions, Updating Storm Water**
 160 **Requirements, Moving Special Flood Hazard Language, and Other Miscellaneous**
 161 **Changes.**

162 Commissioner's packets included a memorandum dated August 19, 2016 from Ben White in
 163 regards to changes to our storm drain requirements in Title 13 that are also needing to be
 164 changed in Title 16 to eliminate redundancy, contradicting sections, and other proposed minor
 165 clarifications/changes that include:

- 166 • 16.8.50 E - water right requirement is being relocated from the drainage section
 167 (16.28.140) and included in the "Fee" section.
- 168 • 16.16.20D 91) - requirement for storm water design information is being directed to other
 169 sections of the code where those requirements are detailed as well as the city's design
 170 standards. The design standards have been adopted by a resolution of the city council.
- 171 • 16.16.20D (2) - The lighting plan requirement is being clarified that it is to comply with
 172 the city's design standards. Our City does have a design standard for street lights
 173 currently. It will need to be developed and adopted by the city council.
- 174 • 16.16.20.D (4) - A design standard for geotechnical reports needs to be developed.
- 175 • 16.28.60 A - The requirement for the hydrology report is referenced back to the storm
 176 water ordinance instead of having redundant or contradictory requirements listed here.
- 177 • 16.28.80 - The phrase "for a 100 year storm event" was added to clarify the developer's
 178 responsibility.
- 179 • 16.32 - has been moved to Title 15 and the proposed changes to this section are listed in
 180 the Title 15 discussion.

181 There was discussion regarding the hydrology report required in Section 16.28.60 and the desire
 182 to refer back to specific standards in Title 13.

183 There were no additional comments from the Commissioners.

184

185 ***ACTION TAKEN:***

186 ***Laura Charchenko moved to hold a public hearing on Tuesday, September 13 at 7:35 pm or as***
 187 ***soon thereafter as time permits regarding proposed additions and language changes to Title 13***
 188 ***Storm Water Utility Changes, Title 15 Building and Construction, and Title 16 Subdivisions***
 189 ***discussed above. Additional changes from this meeting will be incorporated and distributed by***
 190 ***staff so that all Commissioners can sign off on them before the public hearing. Alan Malan***
 191 ***seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.***

192

193 **VI. Discuss and Set Public Hearing for Title 17, Yard and Fence Requirements for**
194 **Residential Zones.**

195 Included in the Commissioner's packet was a memorandum from Ben White dated August 19,
196 2016 regarding Yard Setbacks and a copy of 17.04 with suggested language changes. The
197 memorandum included the following information:

- 198 • There are some discrepancies between the "yards and setbacks" definitions in Title 17,
199 the setbacks included in each zoning section and in city practices. Two inconsistent
200 items relate to fences and setbacks for corner properties.
- 201 • The copy attached of Title 17 is a clean version with no edit marks but has highlighted
202 areas that include language changes.

203 Ben White pointed out the changes made to the last document from our prior meeting.

204 Alan Malan inquired about 17.XX.100.B. He said he understands that language but would like to
205 see it clarified. He suggested that the sentence be made into two sentences so to maintain clarity
206 and understanding.

207 Chairman Hopkinson is concerned about the Fence requirements section and pointed out that we
208 have multitudes of properties that already do not comply with this language. We need to address
209 open space/agriculture areas versus subdivision property. If this language is put into place, new
210 property owners will be affected. Mr. White pointed out that properties prior to this ordinance
211 change would not be required to abide by this new language.

212 Mr. Chairman wants language put into place that will mitigate those concerns with larger
213 properties and animals. Mr. White pointed out that this ordinance is not pressing and we can
214 take time to think these things out before drafting final language.

215 Mr. Hopkinson asked if we should be placing restrictions on property owners on these issues.
216 Some discussion took place regarding this idea. Mr. White feels we do have a right to make
217 regulations for the health, safety and welfare of our citizens.

218 Chairman Hopkinson stressed the importance of studying what we put into place because it is
219 what we will have to live with in the future. Trying to make new regulations is a difficult thing
220 when we have so many that are out of compliance with the new language we are trying to put
221 into place.

222 Corey Sweat feels that by making the changes Alan Malan suggested in 17.xx.100 B. that makes
223 a difference. In observing fences already in place, 85 % of those in place are not in compliance
224 with the suggested language changes to this Title.

225 Mr. Sweat pointed out that in his opinion corner lots with fences in place currently do not pose a
226 safety hazard. We cannot and should not legislate all things. He feels for the most part we need
227 to protect the citizen's rights and leave common sense to take care of safety issues.

228 Mike Cottle concurs with Mr. Sweat but feels we do need to consider safety when making laws
229 and ordinances.

230 Terry Turner does not feel we need to be heavy handed in regulations but do need to protect the
231 public where applicable. Common sense needs to prevail.

232 Laura Charchenko feels that we need corner lot fence regulations but not necessarily regulate all
233 property owner's fence heights.

234 Alan Malan feels the front yard fencing should not be opaque in nature. He agrees with
235 Chairman Hopkinson to some extent.

236 Chairman Hopkinson suggested that we include definitions to clarify our standards and
237 regulations for fencing or is it possible to come up with language that includes all those different
238 uses? Mr. White commented that this could become a bit complicated to do for all instances in
239 our City.

240 Chairman Hopkinson wants to allow property owners' individuality to come out and gave
241 various examples of how that needs to take place. He wants to take the time necessary to create
242 a document that will not be regretted.

243 Further discussion will take place in the upcoming meetings before language is put into place or
244 a public hearing is scheduled.

245

246 **VII. Staff Report**

247 **Ben White:**

248 • **Layton city has introduced a new bus that looks like a trolley and runs from**
249 **Layton front runner station to the Mall, Convention Center, Hospital and to**
250 **the Clearfield station. It is funded by various businesses and is free to the**
251 **public; has included Prop 1 money.**

252 • **City has received a new set of plans from Ovation Homes with some changes**
253 **to the development agreement. We are reviewing the changes; some have to**
254 **do with retention water.**

255 • **City council is still looking at the PUD ordinance; it is not ready to come to**
256 **planning commission. Chairman Hopkinson would like PUD language to**
257 **come before them on the next agenda. He requested a point by point**
258 **discussion sheet of items that need to be discussed. This will allow the**
259 **Commission to have the opportunity to discuss their ideas while the City**
260 **Council discusses theirs.**

261 • **Asphalt may be down on Pages Lane by the end of the week. Denis**
262 **Hopkinson reported some soft spots along that road that need to be**
263 **addressed. Ben White explained that it may be a slow process until**
264 **completion.**

265 • **400 North construction in Bountiful is back in progress after a short work**
266 **stop.**

267 • **Our 500 South water project will be starting in a few weeks.**

268 **Cathy Brightwell reported:**

269 • **An application was received for amusement devices at the theatre. Our city code**
270 **regulates amusement devices quite strictly, including the need for conditional use**
271 **permits. She explained a few of the regulations. Chief Hixson has been contacted by**
272 **the State with concerns about machines that are close to gambling machines. Staff**
273 **and Legal are going to work to see what is necessary to regulate and what is not. .**

- 274 • **Land Use Training 101- This Saturday. If interested Cathy will register you to**
- 275 **attend.**

276

277 **VIII. Approval of Minutes of dated August 9, 2016**

278

279 **ACTION TAKEN:**

280 **Alan Malan moved to approve of the minutes dated as presented. Laura Charchenko**

281 **seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor among those members present.**

282

283 **IX. Adjournment**

284

285 **ACTION TAKEN:**

286 **Laura Charchenko moved to adjourn the regular session of the Planning Commission**

287 **meeting. Alan Malan seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor. The meeting**

288 **adjourned 9:55 p.m.**

289

290

291

292 The foregoing was approved by the West Bountiful City Planning Commission on September 13, 2014, by

293 unanimous vote of all members present.

294 _____

295 Cathy Brightwell – City Recorder

Minutes of the West Bountiful City Council meeting held on Wednesday, August 16, 2016 at West Bountiful City Hall, 550 N 800 West, Davis County, Utah.

Those in attendance:

MEMBERS: Mayor Ken Romney, Council members James Ahlstrom, Kelly Enquist, James Bruhn, Mark Preece, and Andrew Williams

STAFF: Duane Huffman (City Administrator) and Steve Doxey (City Attorney), Chief Hixson, Steve Maughan (Public Works Director), Paul Holden (Director of Golf), Ben White (City Engineer), Cathy Brightwell (Recorder)

VISITORS: Dal Wayment, Alan Malan, Ed Swanke, Gary Jacketta, Eric Eastman

Work Session called to order at 6:40 pm

South Davis Sewer District - Presentation and Discussion on the Methane Recovery Project

Dal Wayment - General Manager for South Davis Sewer District (SDSD), went over the history of the South Davis Sewer District which was created in 1959. He said the SDSD serves the cities of Bountiful, Centerville, North Salt Lake, West Bountiful, and Woods Cross, and charges the lowest sewer rates in the State, has not raised rates since 1988, and carries no debt.

He made a presentation on Turning Waste Organics into Energy, which is a joint venture between SDSD and ALPRO Energy & Water. It is a public/private partnership to process waste materials into energy, for example, processing food waste into energy by converting into methane gas. Both parties are providing 10% equity investment in the Project and 50% of project debt financing, all operational and maintenance costs will be shared equally.

He gave examples of working with companies like Stouffers who produces 75 tons of food waste per day, and Wasatch Integrated Waste Management. He added that they will produce bio-based fertilizer that will be marketed through existing fertilizer distributors and/or directly to large farming operations.

The total project costs are \$55m in capital costs, (phase 1 - \$25k for processing food waste only), and net annual cash flow of \$5.2m (phase 1- \$3.2m). One contract alone will pay for the project in full in six years.

Mr. Wayment discussed the benefits of the project which include reduced mileage for waste transportation; ability to recover important and valuable plant nutrients, i.e., nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium; creation of 12-16 full time jobs; providing the District with more sustainable bio-solid options for the future, and help to stabilize district sewer rates.

Mayor Romney thanked him for the information.

Worksession ended 7:27pm.

Regular Meeting at 7:36pm

Invocation/Thought – Kelly Enquist gave a thought by Abe Lincoln; James Ahlstrom led the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. **Accept Agenda.**

MOTION: *James Ahlstrom Moved to Accept the Agenda As Proposed. James Bruhn seconded the Motion which PASSED by unanimous vote of all members present.*

2. **Public Comment (two minutes per person, or five minutes if speaking on behalf of a group).**

Eric Eastman, 620 W 1950 North, asked Council what they thought about the art currently on display in council chambers; he wondered if they thought it was too much? Council members talked about how much they liked it. He said he will bring a biography of the artist to hang in the room with the art work.

Also, Mr. Eastman asked if the Mayor would allow audience participation on agenda item 6 (PUD Ordinance). He was told he would be allowed to make comments.

3. **Presentation by Mr. Ed Swanke regarding Neighborhood Watch.**

Ed Swanke, 771 N 1100 West, commented that he is looking for guidance from the City and police department. He has spoken to individuals in his neighborhood who are interested in implementing a neighborhood watch program. His online research shows that the majority of the burden falls on homeowners. He said he put a clipboard out by the street and had 25 people sign up. The benefits they see are greater safety and less crime. Participants would sign up and give their phone number, then someone volunteers to drive around and watch out for neighbors, e.g., calling homeowners if a garage is open in middle of night, etc. Because they are more familiar with the area, he believes they can develop better intelligence for the police department – but they are not sure how to proceed. He thinks they can get 10 signs for under \$200, and would be happy to include the golf course.

Council member Enquist said he is familiar with these programs and is glad to see volunteers; it shows that the community wants to be involved.

Mayor Romney suggested staff and Chief Hixson do some research and then get back with Mr. Swanke. He added that neighbors should always be looking out for each other and be careful; we need to train them to call the police

Mr. Swanke responded that they are going to go ahead and identify and assemble a group so they are ready to work with police and staff when they get back to him.

4. **Consider purchase approvals:**

- a. Asphalt Roller: \$29,830.00
- b. Police Radios: \$70,904.50

Duane Huffman referred to his August 10 memo. The recently adopted FY2017 budget included both of these items; he has brought them forward to comply with the City's procurement ordinance that requires purchase approval for non-regular items over \$10k.

Asphalt Roller - The public works department is in need of a roller that will allow them to do small road projects themselves without going out to independent contractors. The life span of this Roller is 20-30 years. As one could not be found on a state contract, the City solicited multiple quotes and the amount listed above is the lowest. In addition, a trailer is needed which costs approximately \$4,000. The total cost of both is \$33,805; the budgeted amount was \$35,000 with half coming from the streets budget and half from the water budget. There was a question about whether they considered buying a used roller. Mr. Huffman responded they did not; the intent is to keep this roller for many years.

Police radios - Chief Hixson explained their current radios are 6 years beyond life expectancy, outdated, and parts will only be available for a short time; it is important to upgrade so they can communicate with other agencies. They are requesting to purchase radios and accessories for 11 cars, and 14 handhelds. The negotiated rate is below state pricing and they are phase 1 & 2 compliant which means they will function now with current systems and also when digital phase 1 and 2 is implemented over the next two years.

In response to questions from council, Duane Huffman explained that they considered a possible phase in but ultimately recommends full implementation due to the age of the current radios.

Council member Enquist requested that in the future, more documentation be presented on large purchases such as pictures.

MOTION: *Andy Williams Moved to Approve the Purchases Listed Above. Mark Preece seconded the Motion which PASSED 4-1, with Kelly Enquist opposed.*

5. **Consider motion authorizing Mayor to execute the 2016 Interlocal Cooperation Agreement Between Davis County Cities and Davis County for the Utah Pollution Discharge Elimination System (UPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Protection.**

Duane Huffman explained that this agreement is a good faith effort to cooperate with the County. He said the various cities and County are working together towards eructation requirements, and a similar agreement was filed in 2011. We have a new Permit so there is a new Agreement.

MOTION: *James Ahlstrom moved to authorize the Mayor to execute the 2016 Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Davis County Cities and Davis County for UPDES General Permit (storm water protection). James Bruhn seconded the Motion which PASSED by unanimous vote of all members present.*

5. **Discussion regarding PUD Ordinance Study.**

Duane Huffman reviewed the temporary restriction on planned unit developments that was passed in May and runs through November 17, 2016 to give the City time to study and potentially make changes. State Code tasks the Planning Commission with the initial review and recommendations for land use ordinances; however, the Planning Commission has asked for more input from the City Council to better understand in which direction they should go with potential modifications.

Mr. Huffman, after reviewing the current code, land use principals, and the City's experience with PUDs, suggested broad recommendations regarding the use and review process for PUDs. The proposed modifications were broken in to two sections.

1) How/When a PUD Can Be Used. He recommended clarifying that PUDs be used to modify lot sizes (cluster) on land with building limitations, e.g., power or gas line easements, or to preserve open space/trails. PUDs should not be used to increase total density for a project, as his view is this is better done through the zone change process.

He proposed the use of PUDs be modeled after current ordinances related to variances, where very specific criteria must be met. Size limitations should be determined by the base zone, for example, 10 acres in R-1-10, 15 acres in R-1-22, etc. For eligible PUDs, potential modifications to all yard regulations should be allowed but set requirements that the perimeter of the PUD match the existing border of the surrounding traditional neighborhood which would better mitigate impacts to existing neighborhoods.

Mr. Huffman also discussed the concept of discretionary vs. entitlement; a land use ordinance that can be used at the City's discretion is problematic. The City's true discretion lies in having the ability to adopt ordinances that set standards and limitations. If a developer proposes something outside the City's Code, ordinance modifications can be considered at that time.

2) Improve and Streamline Process. The process should be shortened to be more like subdivision approval that includes a concept plan reviewed by staff; an initial application review,

public hearing and recommendation by planning commission; development agreement and preliminary plat approval by city council; and final plat approval by planning commission.

There was general discussion about the proposal and a concern that whatever is done is well thought out and not a knee jerk reaction to recent experiences. They discussed whether a PUD ordinance is even necessary or if there is adequate flexibility to do whatever needs to be done in response to specific requests. On the other hand, there was some concern that too much flexibility could be a problem and having something specific in black and white was preferable.

There was discussion about mixed use, e.g., Evergreen neighborhood, and using experts to help us even if we have to pay for them.

Eric Eastman commented that he read an excellent Wikipedia article on PUDs. We are unique because our residential and commercial areas have no overlap so a mixture does not apply. He agrees density bonus is a problem but believes the rest of the existing ordinance is good. We need to be careful that we use language that is good for us and throw out the bad. He suggested scheduling a brainstorm session including city council, planning commission and residents to explore issues and come up with solutions.

Duane will put together a processed outline and a plan on how to proceed.

6. **Discussion regarding RAP Funding.**

Duane Huffman explained that the Council's process to identify and prioritize Recreation Arts and Parks (RAP) projects began with a list of about 60 items that was narrowed down by only a few after the first round voting - no single item received all 6 votes. For Round 2 he proposes to give each voter fifteen votes to use any way they want – more than one vote can be given to single items which will show how much they care about specific items.

He reviewed the top vote getters from both Council and public works staff. Once the list is narrowed down, it will be taken to the public for input.

7. **Public Works/Engineering Report.**

Ben White –

- 500 South waterline project (Main St. to 300 East) starts in less than 3 weeks and triggers agreement with Holly.
- 400 N Bountiful project – concrete is too high, not sure what they will do.
- 1100 W was chip sealed last week. Do we want to put back the same striping or change? The current walking lane is separated by hash marks rather than a solid line. It was agreed the hashed area will be removed.

Steve Maughan -

- Pages Lane update – the asphalt has been removed; the finish grade looks good; pavement should begin next Tuesday. The concrete crew is back today and hopes to finish up this week. They will landscape after asphalt is in. He clarified we are leaving dirt in the park strip but will take care of yards with mowable grade, sod, and replace sprinklers and fences. Considering restricting the road to local traffic only this weekend if not paved due to dust; or should we reduce speed limit to 10 mph? Agreed to post multiple signs with heavier police patrol.
- Ranches at Lakeside subdivision being seal coated under warranty.

8. **Police Report.**

Chief Hixson reviewed his monthly report.

- School starts on the 24th so will be holding crossing guard training. We are lucky that all of our previous guards are coming back.
- Allan VanWagoner will be WBE liaison and the school staff is excited.
- EmPAC meeting was held today.
- Pokemon hunt was amazing. We had about 20 people participate. We may do it again and include other agencies. Several out of state agencies saw pictures and are going to do it.

9. **Administrative Report.**

Duane Huffman reminded Council the ULCT Conference will be held September 14-16 in Salt Lake. He will send out the tentative agenda and would like those who want to participate to let him know.

10. **Mayor/Council Reports.**

James Ahlstrom – no report.

Mark Preece thought the Sewer District presentation was good – it is a great project. Youth Council will be holding interviews next week for the upcoming session.

James Bruhn – the Back to School Bash sponsored by the Arts Council last Friday night had lighter than expected attendance –only about a dozen kids showed up.

Andy Williams commented that having trains at the 500 South train crossing at 5pm is ridiculous when train causes long shut-downs. There was discussion about relevant regulations that only apply if the train is moving – not if it is stopped. He also asked to have the sprinkler checked next to #2 green at the golf course. He has been told that water goes all the way to house, and the sprinkler at the #13 tee-box shoots up in the air.

Kelly Enquist reported that at his Mosquito Abatement meeting, they were told that there are no positive Zika or West Nile cases in Davis County at this time.

Mayor Romney asked staff to fix issues with the sound system.

11. **Approve Minutes from the July 19, 2016, and July 26, 2016, City Council Meetings.**

MOTION: *James Ahlstrom Moved to Approve the Minutes from the June 21 and July 13, 2016 City Council Meetings. James Bruhn seconded the Motion which PASSED by Unanimous Vote of All Members Present.*

12. **Potential Executive Session for the Purpose of Discussing Items Allowed, Pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 52-4-205.**

No executive session was necessary.

13. **Adjourn.**

MOTION: *James Ahlstrom moved to adjourn this meeting of the West Bountiful City Council at 9:57 p.m. James Bruhn seconded the Motion which PASSED by unanimous vote of all members present.*

The foregoing was approved by the West Bountiful City Council on Tuesday, September 6, 2016.

Minutes of the Special West Bountiful City Council meeting held on Wednesday, August 22, 2016 at West Bountiful City Hall, 550 N 800 West, Davis County, Utah.

Those in attendance:

MEMBERS: Mayor Ken Romney, Council members James Ahlstrom, Kelly Enquist, Mark Preece, Andrew Williams, and James Bruhn (was added by phone after Executive Session began)

STAFF: Duane Huffman (City Administrator), Steve Doxey (City Attorney), and Ben White (City Engineer)

Mayor Romney called the Special Meeting to order at 8:36 p.m.

- 1. Open Meeting/Welcome.**
- 2. Executive (closed) Session, Pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 52-4-205(c), for the Purpose of Discussing Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation.**

MOTION: *James Ahlstrom Moved to Go Into Executive Session in the Conference Room at 8:37 p.m. for the Purposes Described Above, Pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 52-4-205(c). Andy Williams seconded the Motion which PASSED.*

The vote was recorded as follows:

James Ahlstrom – Aye

James Bruhn – Excused (*he joined the meeting by phone after it moved into executive session.*)

Kelly Enquist – Aye

Mark Preece – Aye

Andy Williams - Aye

MOTION: *Andy Williams Moved to Adjourn the Executive Session and Return to the Regular Meeting at 10:35 p.m. James Ahlstrom seconded the Motion which PASSED by unanimous vote of all members present.*

- 3. Adjourn.**

MOTION: *Kelly Enquist moved to adjourn this meeting of the West Bountiful City Council at 10:37 p.m. James Ahlstrom seconded the Motion which PASSED by unanimous vote of all members present.*

The foregoing was approved by the West Bountiful City Council on Tuesday, September 6, 2016.