**NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES**

June 2, 2015

The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on June 2, 2015 at 6:35 p.m. at the North Ogden City Council Chambers at 505 East 2600 North. Notice of time, place and agenda of the meeting was delivered to each member of the City Council, posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on June 1, 2015. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on December 21, 2014.

PRESENT: Brent Taylor Mayor

 Kent Bailey Council Member

 Lynn Satterthwaite Council Member

 Phillip Swanson Council Member

 James Urry Council Member

STAFF PRESENT: Bryan Steele City Administrator/Finance Director

 Annette Spendlove City Recorder/HR Director

 Jon Call City Attorney

 Dave Espinoza Public Works Director

 Kevin Warren Police Chief

 Gary Kerr Building Official

 Rob Scott City Planner

 Tiffany Staheli Parks & Recreation Director

EXCUSED: Cheryl Stoker Council Member

VISITORS: Alex Ander Davis Bailey Connor Clow

 Jake Ballard Connor Crittenden Easton McKay

 Matt Schweppe Martin McKinnie

**work session meeting – 6:35 p.m.**

Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance.

Council Member Satterthwaite offered the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**AGENDA**

**1. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Boy Scouts Jake Ballard, Easton McKay, Connor Crittenden, Davis Bailey, Connor Clow, and Alex Ander introduced themselves and stated they are working on their Citizenship in the Community Merit Badge.

Mayor Taylor then moved item two to the end of the meeting agenda.

**3. discussion and/or action on change order considerations at the new public works facility**

A staff memo from Acting City Administrator/Finance Director Steele reviewed the change orders presented for consideration for the Public Works Building:

1) Change order to install 30” storm drain pipe from Chamberlain’s property to the detention basin (needs to be done before asphalt)

a. Cost - $18,341

2) Change order for south gate. It needs to open to the east instead of the west because of future detention basin vertical expansion

a. Cost - $2,994

3) Change order to install curb & gutter down the sides of the driveway on the south end of the property

a. Cost - $11,840

The memo indicated change order one can be paid from the Storm Drain Fund, while change orders two and three can be paid from the General Fund, Capital Projects Fund or Enterprise Fund reserves.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and Public Works Director Espinoza used the aid of the site plan for the Public Works Facility project to provide an explanation of the need for the change orders. The Council and staff engaged in a general discussion regarding the purpose for the change orders, with a focus on funding sources for the change orders; the Council ultimately concluding to support the change orders.

**Council Member Satterthwaite motioned to approve change orders one through three with the stipulation that the cost of the change orders to be paid from the General Fund or the Storm Drain Utility Fund will be reimbursed by a commercial development area (CDA) to be created a future date. Council Member Bailey seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

**Council Member Bailey aye**

**Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

**Council Member Swanson aye**

**Council Member Urry aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Mayor Taylor then provided the Council with an update regarding the progress on the creation of a Commercial Development Area (CDA) for the City.

**4. discussion on budget for fiscal year 2015-2016**

Mayor Taylor reported that he and City Administrator/Finance Director Steele have updated the tentative budget in response to direction received by the Council during previous discussions regarding certain items contained within the budget document.

Mr. Steele used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide the Council with a review of the updates to the tentative budget. He began by reviewing information regarding the creation of new employment positions within the City; first is a part-time Administrative Assistant for the Planning Department:

* This request is to add a part time (20 hours per week) clerical staff position to handle the administrative day to day aspects of the planning function. This person would log in applications, create and manage files, develop agenda packets, attend Planning Commission meetings and take minutes, take Technical Review Committee minutes, advertise public hearings, and take phone calls. This position will allow the professional planners to work full time processing applications and accomplish long range planning activities, e.g., General Plan policies, code writing, etc. The work this position would be doing is currently being completed by the Deputy City Recorder. Filing this position would free the Deputy City Recorder to help the City Recorder/HR Director more. In 2014 the Planning Commission handled the following number of applications:
	+ Annexations - 4
	+ City Property Purchase / Lease Requests - 2
	+ Conditional Use Permits - 5
	+ Site Plan Reviews - 7
	+ Subdivisions – 18 subdivisions, 143 lots, 221 units, 85.44 acres
	+ Rezone Map Amendments - 6
	+ Rezone Text Amendments - 8
	+ Variances - 2
* The cost for the position would be approximately $14,000, to cover wages and benefits
* The Planning Department is in the process of reviewing and adjusting the Building & Planning fees which will offset some of the costs.

The Council had a discussion regarding the proposal to create the new position, with a focus on whether the fees charged for applications handled by the Planning Department are covering the cost of staff work. Mayor Taylor stated the Planning Department is currently very busy and he anticipates growth will continue and accelerate and the position is needed. Council Member Urry stated he would prefer to be able to identify a revenue source to cover all expenses within the budget. City Planner Scott stated that is difficult to do in some situations because it can be hard to quantify indirect costs associated with a certain program or application process. Mayor Taylor noted he has been working closely with Administrative and Planning staff to identify deficiencies within the City’s impact fee schedule; they have been reviewing the actual cost of development, but it will take several months to complete an in-depth analysis. Council Member Bailey asked if it there is an intention to adjust impact fees in a manner that they will cover the cost of the additional employee. Mayor Taylor stated the impact fees will generate greater revenues, but not for the purpose of covering the cost of this employment position. Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would like to create a model that can be used to determine when new employment positions are needed in the City; the model could include measurable data for each Department. Council Member Bailey agreed and stated he hesitates to take money from the General Fund each time City Administration feels a new employee is needed. Discussion and debate regarding the creation of the position continued among the Council and staff, with the Council concluding that they would be comfortable creating the position as long as staff understands it is not a permanent position and the Council will review the status of the position during the preparation of next year’s fiscal year budget with the potential to eliminate the position if it is no longer needed. Council Member Swanson stated that he will support creating the position on a temporary basis, but noted that it is important for the Council to understand that it is not always possible to quantify everything and sometimes it is necessary to trust staff when they say that they need certain things to improve efficiencies in their respective Departments.

**Council Member Bailey motioned to approve the request for a part-time administrative assistant position for the Planning Department contingent upon reviewing the position during preparation of the FY2016-2017 budget. Council Member Urry seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

**Council Member Bailey aye**

**Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

**Council Member Swanson aye**

**Council Member Urry aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Steele then reviewed the request from the Parks and Recreation Department for a full-time Assistant Park Supervisor/Irrigation Specialist. The City had budgeted $39,000 for the two permanent part time positions, but the actual costs incurred for those positions in the fiscal year was $13,500; the difference is $25,500. The Parks and Recreation Department has had to use personnel from a temporary employment agency to make up for the absence of having those positions filled, so the net difference will end up being around $20,000.

Ms. Staheli provided the Council with information regarding the need for the new position, with a focus on the number and types of sprinkler systems that her Department is responsible for throughout the City. She noted that she needs to increase her staffing levels to provide her with the ability to monitor and better maintain sprinkler systems, some of which are currently failing. The Council discussed Ms. Staheli’s proposal to increase her staffing levels; they also discussed a future project to research technology available to the City that could improve efficiency of the City’s sprinkler systems and make maintenance easier. Ms. Staheli stated she would love to work on a project like that and one thing she would like the new employee to do is conduct an inventory of all of the sprinkler systems currently in use.

Council Member Bailey inquired as to the fiscal implication of Ms. Staheli’s request. Mr. Steele stated the position would cost approximately $65,000, which is an approximate increase of $40,000 over what has been budgeted in past years. The focus of the discussion then shifted to the potential of privatizing the maintenance of City parks in the future, with Ms. Staheli noting that she feels contractors would not be willing to maintain City parks knowing the current condition of the sprinkler systems within the parks. Council Member Bailey stated he is in favor of approving Ms. Staheli’s request, with the caveat that the position also be reviewed during the process to prepare the 2016-2017 budget. Council Member Satterthwaite agreed and added he would even be supportive of budgeting an additional $5,000 to aid in the completion of an inventory project and inputting all inventory data into iWorqs.

**Council Member Satterthwaite motioned to approve the request for the creation of a Full-Time Park Supervisor/Irrigation Specialist Position as well as up to $5,000 for an inventory and data tracking project for the City’s irrigation systems. Council Member Swanson seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

**Council Member Bailey aye**

**Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

**Council Member Swanson aye**

**Council Member Urry aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Steele then provided a review of the City’s water usage rates, beginning with what is currently charged:

* $8.65 base rate
* $1.62 per 1,000 gallons usage rate for the first 19,000 gallons used
* $2.16 per 1,000 gallons usage rate for any usage 20,000 gallons and greater

He reviewed the proposed changes as well:

* $8.65 base rate
* 1.62 per 1,000 gallons usage rate for the first 6,000 gallons used (70% of the households would fall in this tier)
* $2.62 per 1,000 gallons for usage of 6,001- 12,000 gallons - (24% of households would fall in this tier)
* $3.62 per 1,000 gallons for usage of 12,001 – 18,000 gallons (4%)
* $4.62 per 1,000 gallons for any usage 18,001 gallons and over (2%)

Mayor Taylor reviewed rates charged in other cities noting that North Ogden’s rates have historically been much lower than rates charged in other cities. Council Member Urry stated that North Ogden is much different than other cities and it is not always appropriate to compare with rates charged in other cities. Council Member Bailey agreed, but noted the information about rates charged in other cities is valuable. Discussion then ensued regarding water sources available to the City, with Council Member Bailey noted that his goal when considering utility rates is ensuring that the City charges appropriate rates to cover operation of each utility as well as depreciation costs. The Council concluded they are comfortable with presenting the rate increases being proposed to the citizens during an open house meeting scheduled for next week.

**Council Member Satterthwaite motioned to approve the proposed rate increases referenced by Mr. Steele. Council Member Swanson seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

**Council Member Bailey aye**

**Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

**Council Member Swanson aye**

**Council Member Urry aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Steele then referred to the section of his PowerPoint presentation regarding recreation fees. Council asked staff to see if Recreation Fees could be increased to help cover more of the costs of the Recreation Department. Ms. Staheli and her staff came up with two proposals; the first proposal is most aggressive and would generate an additional $20,000 in revenue. Proposal two includes increases that would bring in $10,000 additional revenue.

Ms. Staheli reviewed each of her proposals and these revenue calculations were based off the registration numbers falling within the 2013-2014 fiscal year. Because some sport seasons and registration dates span fiscal years, these figures are not to be interpreted as seasonal sport participation numbers. Estimated increases in revenue were calculated based on the proposed fees multiplied by the number of registrations taken in the 2013-2014 fiscal year. These figures are accurate to the extent that number of registrations remains the same after fee increases, and that the North Ogden resident to “non-resident” ratio remains the same. Staff estimates that registrations will drop slightly with the proposed fee increases, and that the North Ogden Resident to “non-resident” ratio average will remain the same. Staff proposes the “Non-Resident” or regular registration fees to be $15 above the proposed discounted North Ogden Resident rate for applicable sports. On average, 20% of our recreation registrations for this fiscal year were made up of residents from cities other than North Ogden. This differential will generate additional revenue. The proposed figures will put North Ogden City resident discounted registration fees at the high end of registration fees for surrounding cities, but equal to or lower than the average “Non- Resident” or regular registration fee for surrounding cities. This proposal also includes charging outside organizations (AYSO Soccer, SWAT Soccer, etc.) a higher per player fee for the year. We currently charge a $1 per player fee. By way of information, the AYSO soccer organization is currently charging $65/$85 fees for early and regular registrations, respectively, for their spring/fall season. Because multiple sports are currently in their registration period and/or span the City’s Fiscal budget year, we propose that these fees take effect for the next/upcoming registration dates for each sport.

Council Member Swanson asked how long it has been since recreation participation fees were increased. Ms. Staheli noted she analyzes fees each year, but it has been approximately five years since they have been adjusted.

Council Member Urry stated that he would also like for the City to increase the fees charged to the AYSO soccer organization as well as investigate other options for lowering costs associated with each program. Discussion then ensued regarding what it would take to discontinue use of AYSO and create a City-operated soccer program. Ms. Staheli stated she would prefer to increase the charges assessed to AYSO than operate an in-house program.

The Council and staff engaged in a philosophical discussion regarding increasing recreation rates and offering in-house recreation programs versus working with private entities. Council Member Urry stated that the City is not required to provide recreation services to residents, but they are required to provide utilities and streets for residents. He stated that he is uncomfortable increasing utility rates and not increasing recreation rates. Mayor Taylor agreed, but noted that he is hesitant to increase the fee charged to AYSO so drastically without working with AYSO or other cities first. Council Member Urry stated that AYSO is taking advantage of the City and other cities and he feels it is time to take a stand. Council Member Satterthwaite stated he is comfortable moving in the direction of increased fees charged to AYSO, but he does not feel it is necessary to enact all increases included in Ms. Staheli’s proposal one in one fell swoop. Mayor Taylor agreed and stated that he would like to approach the situation more cautiously to avoid negative publicity and damaging the relationship with AYSO. Council Member Bailey agreed. Council Member Satterthwaite suggested that City staff talk with other cities about their feelings about the fees charged to AYSO to determine if they can work together to address the perceived inequity. Council Member Urry stated that he will support Ms. Staheli’s proposal one because he feels it is feasible at this time.

**Council Member Satterthwaite motioned to direct staff to work with other cities and AYSO to discuss the potential of increasing fees charged to AYSO and table consideration of Ms. Staheli’s fee increase proposals until that process is concluded.**

Council Member Bailey stated he would prefer to adopt Ms. Staheli’s fee proposal two. Council Member Urry stated he would prefer to adopt Ms. Staheli’s first fee proposal because he feels revenues should cover 60 percent of the operations of the Parks and Recreation Department budget. Ms. Staheli stated that she would prefer the Council choose proposal number two because it would be better accepted by the residents. Discussion regarding the opportunity to increase fees charged to AYSO for use of City facilities continued.

Council Member Satterthwaite withdrew his motion.

**Council Member Bailey motioned to accept Ms. Staheli’s proposal number two, with the exception of the increase of AYSO fees to give staff additional time to work with other cities to determine their appetite for negotiating a fee increase for AYSO. Council Member Swanson seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

**Council Member Bailey aye**

**Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

**Council Member Swanson aye**

**Council Member Urry nay**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

\*\*The Council meeting recessed at 9:45 p.m. and reconvened at 10:00 p.m.\*\*

Mr. Steele then refocused on utility rates, noting the additional utility rate changes that are being considered include a $1.00 increase for sewer passed on by Central Weber Sewer District, a $1.16 increase for storm water, a $1.00 decrease for solid waste; and a new $3.00 fee for street maintenance/construction. Mayor Taylor provided his own presentation regarding the proposal to create a $3.00 fee for transportation and street maintenance/construction. He noted the purpose of the fee is to treat roads like other utilities, wherein we save funds over time to pay for future maintenance and infrastructure costs. He reviewed the model for the transportation utility fee for Provo City, noting they have several different levels of the fee for different residential and commercial users. He stated he feels a transportation utility fee is appropriate because it provides accountability and transparency, equity, and helps the City be fiscally sound by avoiding road repair bonds/debt in the future, by proactively dealing with road maintenance and by saving for future construction projects. He indicated there are two primary future expenses for the proposed transportation utility fund: maintenance and future construction. He noted road maintenance saves the City money in the long run. He reviewed the cost of pavement deterioration after which he referenced the current condition of North Ogden roads; the City had a professional engineering company assess the roads (note: *this company is connected to our pavement management software company, and is not bidding on any of the possible road work*). Their review found that the majority of our roads have a remaining service life (RSL) of under 10 years—*increased maintenance can improve this.*  Their review found that 716 segments of our 984 total road segments are recommended at this time for a treatment maintenance (72% of all segments are recommended for a maintenance treatment). The total cost of all these maintenance recommendations is $5,430,703. It would take approximately 10 years of our full allocation of B&C road funds to pay for the maintenance that is recommended today for our roads—additional funds are needed now, or we will significantly degrade our road network by missing opportunities to extend RSL on our roads. He then reviewed photographs of deteriorating roads, after which Public Works Director Espinoza provided the Council with a demonstration of how street maintenance data is tracked in the iWorqs program. Mayor Taylor then reviewed a map that identified overlays and chip and slurry seal projects that have been completed on the City’s roads, noting there are large areas within the City’s center that have not been overlaid in the past 14 years; if overlay work is not being completed it is truly necessary to complete chip and slurry seal projects to extend the life of the road. He then reviewed the estimated costs of needed road construction projects, such as the widening of 450/400 East ($10 million), extension of 450 East to Skyline Drive ($4 million), construction of Skyline Drive ($30 million), construction of Monroe Boulevard ($20 million), Mountain Road operational improvements ($2.5 million), and 2550 North operational improvements ($2.5 million). He then reviewed various revenue sources for road construction or maintenance as follows:

* Class B & C state road funds (generated by the “gas tax”), which includes an increase passed this year by the State Legislature.
* Property & sales tax revenues (General Fund revenues).
* Impact fees on new developments (we currently do not have).
* Utility Transportation Fee (we currently do not have).
* Cuts in other areas to shift funds towards roads.
* State & Federal road grants: this is the best funding source for major road projects, but funds are limited and higher “matches” will greatly enhance our chances of success. To offer higher “matches,” we need additional road revenues.

He concluded the total amount of revenue generated by all existing sources is approximately $1.1 million. He then reviewed his 10 year transportation proposal:

* **Years 1-5**
	+ Complete $6 million in road maintenance
	+ Set aside/expend $500,000 for new construction projects (leveraged much higher by grants; ROW purchase is priority)
* **Years 6-10**
	+ Complete $4 million in maintenance
	+ Set aside/expend $3 million for new construction projects (leveraged much higher by grants)

Council discussion regarding the Mayor’s proposal ensued, with a focus on the steps the City needs to take to increase the life expectancy of the City’s roads. Council Member Satterthwaite noted the information provided by Mayor Taylor presents a good argument for increasing impact fees and creating the transportation utility fee. He noted he looks forward to presenting the information and discussing it with the residents at the town hall meeting scheduled for next week. Mayor Taylor stated that he feels if most residents take the opportunity to learn about the purpose of the fee they would support it.

Mr. Steele then reviewed additional budget issues:

* Salaries
	+ Average increase this year will be 3.5% which again is a combination of salary range adjustments and merit increases
* Benefits
	+ Health Insurance
		- Increasing City’s contribution percentage to:
			* 90% for Traditional Health Plan
			* 95% for HDHP
		- Costs of increase
			* $25,480 for the General Fund
			* $6,064 for the Enterprise Funds

Council Member Bailey inquired as to the total fiscal impact relative to total compensation including benefit increases. Mr. Steele stated personnel costs will increase by approximately 4.3 percent.

Council Member Urry stated he appreciates the City’s employees, but there are many employees in the private sector or retired residents that do not get any assistance in paying for their health benefits. He stated he is not prepared to support the proposal to pay an additional percentage for employee benefits. Discussion then centered on the health benefit options available to the employees, with Council Member Bailey indicating that the annual increases for health benefits are not sustainable and at some point in time the City will need to make the decision to pass increases on to employees rather than absorbing them. Mayor Taylor stated that he agrees there are some big problems with the health care system, but he feels the benefits being afforded to employees along with a pay increase for employees have been greatly appreciated by the employees and employee morale is currently good. Council Member Bailey asked if City Administration has developed a system by which employees will be eligible for pay increases that is not subjective. Mayor Taylor answered yes and noted that the City has developed a performance evaluation system that will be used by all Departments in the City. Discussion then centered on whether employees are being paid within their range according to benchmarking that was done recently, with Mayor Taylor noting that most employees are pleased with the salary they are earning and only two employees have left recently for higher pay in other cities.

**Council Member Bailey motioned to accept Administration’s proposal relative to salaries and benefits for City employees. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

**Council Member Bailey aye**

**Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

**Council Member Swanson aye**

**Council Member Urry nay**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Steele then reviewed capital project and equipment purchase costs included in the tentative budget.

* Capital Projects Fund
	+ Pleasant View Trail - $85,000
	+ Renovate Oaklawn Park Restroom - $400,000
	+ Form Based Code Consultant - $55,000
* Water Fund
	+ Ranger & Accessories - $19,050
	+ Coldwater Creek Waterline Replacement - $400,000
	+ New well – Exploration & Equipping - $600,000
* Sewer Fund
	+ Replace Department Work Truck - $37,000
	+ Replace Sewer Line Flush Truck - $400,000
	+ Slip Lining - $300,000
	+ Installing Manholes - $20,000
* Storm Water Fund
	+ Leaf Collector Truck - $160,000
	+ 1500 North Piping - $250,000
* Motor Pools
	+ Mowhawk Lift - $21,000
	+ Replace Pickup Truck (Streets) - $36,500
	+ Kubota Tractor (Parks) - $45,000
	+ 2 Trailers (Parks) - $7,000
	+ Pesticide Sprayer (Parks) - $4,500
	+ Lease on Backhoe - $6,000
	+ Lease on Skidder - $6,000
	+ 4 Police Trucks - $157,576
* RDA
	+ Walking Path around IHC property - $28,000
	+ Washington Blvd Beautification - $50,000

There was general discussion regarding a few of the capital projects or equipment purchases throughout Mr. Steele’s presentation.

Mr. Steele and other members of staff briefly reviewed other budgetary issues for Council consideration:

* Legal Fees in Judicial Department
	+ Judicial has requested an increase in Attorney Services, GL 10-42-310, which includes prosecutor wages, payment for certified interpreters, and payment for the public defender.
	+ There is an increase in the amount of time the prosecutor is utilized by the City. More and more criminally based cases are being filed, which result in a longer court schedule, which directly corresponds with how much time the prosecutor is present. For example, from Jan. through April of 2014, there were a total of five DUI's. In 2015, for the same time period, there were a total of 21 DUI's. Also the prosecutor remains after court hours, or arrives early to address questions about cases from police officers. The prosecutor is also regularly consulted on relevant topics concerning the City, for example, youth courts and juvenile curfew.
	+ We have had more and more people who qualify under the poverty guidelines to be appointed a public defender. The public defender is paid a set fee for each case, $200.00.
	+ We are encountering more and more Spanish speaking only defendants which requires the use of certified interpreters.
* Snowplowing reserve/City Manager savings reserve
	+ Any amount we save in those items goes into Fund Balance. If Council wants to “set aside” or reserve an amount of the Fund Balance for those purposes they have the ability to do so.
* Uniform Allowance
	+ Reduced to last year’s budgeted amounts
* RFP for Credit Card services
	+ We will look at doing this next fiscal year
* Building Maintenance Fund
	+ Still compiling information. Will have to do a budget amendment after to incorporate into budget
* Changes to the budget with no net effect
	+ Due to State Code and Accounting requirements (City’s portion of RDA Increment, the City not charging itself for utilities).

The budget discussion concluded with a brief general discussion regarding a few of the additional budgetary issues, with the Council simply seeking clarification on a number of the items.

**2. discussion on north view senior center**

A memo from Mayor Taylor indicated he would like to have a discussion about the City’s support for and relationship with the North View Senior Center. In recent months some members of the Senior Center staff and Board have expressed concerns about the City’s use of the NVSC building for City events. Additionally, some concerns have arisen relative to the City’s rental of the building, including cleanliness of the building and availability of the building for rentals. The North Ogden City/Weber County interlocal agreement governing the NVSC has expired, and this is a good opportunity to discuss this agreement and re-negotiate the terms. We want to maintain a healthy and positive working relationship with the NVSC, while also ensuring that our citizen’s tax dollars are spent in a judicious and wise manner. To that end, I propose we discuss the following:

* City’s financial support of the NVSC
* City expectations of the NVSC
* Rental of the building
* Relationship with the NVSC
* City use of the building.

Mayor Taylor summarized his memo and facilitated a discussion regarding the City’s use of the facility. Council Member Urry stated he feels various community groups and other users should have the opportunity to use the facility, but some members of the NVSC Board are not supportive of that proposal. Mayor Taylor stated he has asked other Mayors about the use of the senior centers in their respective cities and their situations vary widely; one entity splits responsibility for the center 50/50; another funds their senior center entirely; and the third is entirely funded by the County.

Council Member Swanson stated he feels the center should be renamed as the Senior and Community Center and that it should serve a greater portion of the City than just the senior citizen population. He stated the City funds a large portion of the facility and it is inappropriate for any community member or group to be turned away from using it. Mayor Taylor agreed and stated that he feels the next step should be to renegotiate the agreement with the County and focus on some of the concerns and expectations the City has.

**5. public comments**

There were no public comments.

**6. council/mayor/staff comments**

The Council had a discussion regarding the practice of selling top soil located on the Public Works Facility site. Council Member Bailey stated he would prefer that the majority of the top soil be kept for use at future parks sites, but if residents are truly interested in purchasing the soil he is comfortable selling it. Mayor Taylor agreed. The Council directed staff to take appointments for loading of top soil during a specific time during the business day.

**7. adjournment**

**Council Member Swanson motioned to adjourn. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

**Council Member Bailey aye**

**Council Member Satterthwaite aye**

**Council Member Swanson aye**

**Council Member Urry aye**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**The meeting adjourned at 12:28 a.m.**
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