

City of
WASHINGTON TERRACE
Utah

Regular City Council Meeting

Tuesday, May 7, 2024

5249 South 400 East

Washington Terrace, UT 84405

801.393.8681

www.washingtonterracecity.com

1. WORK SESSION 5:00 P.M.

**1.1 PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION: FY 2025 TENTATIVE BUDGET AND
FY 2026-29 BUDGET PLAN**

A presentation of the FY 2024-25 Tentative Budget and FY 2026-289 Budget Plan. Topics to include, but are not limited to: Major Budget Issues, Governmental Services (non-utility) Operations & Capital, Fee Schedule (non-utility).

2. ROLL CALL 6:00 P.M.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. WELCOME

5. CONSENT ITEMS

5.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Any point of order or issue regarding items on the agenda or the order of the agenda need to be addressed here prior to the approval of the agenda

5.2 APPROVAL OF APRIL 2, 2024, COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

6. SPECIAL ORDER

Special orders will proceed as follows: Chair introduction of item, staff/applicant presentation, questions by Council, Chair opens public hearing, citizen input; Chair closes public hearing, then Council final discussion.

**6.1 PUBLIC HEARING: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)
SECOND PUBLIC HEARING TO HEAR CITIZEN INPUT CONCERNING THE
PROJECT THAT WAS AWARDED UNDER THE 2024 COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM**

7. CITIZEN COMMENTS

This is an opportunity to address the Council regarding your concerns or ideas that are not on the agenda as part of a public hearing. Please limit your comments to no more than 3 minutes.

8. NEW BUSINESS

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons who have need of special accommodation should contact the City Recorder at 801-395-8283.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted in three public places within the City of Washington Terrace City limits and sent to the *Standard Examiner* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Amy Rodriguez, City Recorder.

8.1 PRESENTATION: SHERIFF'S OFFICE QUARTERLY REPORT

A presentation on activity in Washington Terrace City

8.2 PRESENTATION: ANIMAL CONTROL QUARTERLY REPORT

A presentation on activity occurring in Washington Terrace City

8.3 DISCUSSION/MOTION: APPROVAL TO AWARD THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR 2024 STREET MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

Sealed bids were opened on April 30, 2024. The project entails road reconstruction and surface treatments throughout the city.

8.4 DISCUSSION/ACTION: FUTURE OF WEBER MORGAN HEALTH DEPARTMENT SENIOR PROGRAMMING

Discussion on the future of Weber Morgan Health Senior Programming within the County and how it may affect Washington Terrace

8.5 MOTION: APPROVAL TO AWARD THE CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL AUDIT SERVICES

Bids were reviewed and tabulated for independent auditing service for the City.

8.6 MOTION: TENTATIVELY APPROVE THE TENTATIVE BUDGET

State law requires that the tentative budget be reviewed, considered, and tentatively adopted by the governing body and may be amended or revised prior to its final adoption. A public hearing to consider public comment on the tentative budget will be held on May 21, 2024.

9. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION WITH STAFF

This is a discussion item only. No final action will be taken.

10. ADMINISTRATION REPORTS

This is an opportunity for staff to address the Council pertaining to administrative items.

11. UPCOMING EVENTS

May 21st : City Council Work Session (5:00 p.m) and Meeting (6:00p.m).

May 27th: City Offices Closed for Memorial Day Observance

May 30th: Planning Commission Meeting (tentative) 6:00 p.m.

12. ADJOURN THE MEETING

13. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING (Council will adjourn and enter into an RDA meeting immediately following the Council meeting)

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons who have need of special accommodation should contact the City Recorder at 801-395-8283.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted in three public places within the City of Washington Terrace City limits and sent to the *Standard Examiner* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Amy Rodriguez, City Recorder.

1

2 City of Washington Terrace

3

4

5 Minutes of a Regular City Council meeting 6 Held on April 2, 2024

7

8 **City Hall, 5249 South 400 East, Washington Terrace City, Utah**

9

MAYOR, COUNCIL, AND STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

10 Mayor Mark C. Allen
11 Council Member Jill Christiansen
12 Council Member Zunayid Z. Zishan
13 Council Member Cheryl Parkinson
14 Council Member Jeff West
15 Council Member Michael Thomas
16 City Manager Tom Hanson
17 City Recorder Amy Rodriguez

18 **Others Present**

19 Mike Lawrence, Gabe Thomas

20

21 **1. WORK SESSION**

5:00 P.M.

22 **PRESENTATION: FY 2025 TENTATIVE BUDGET AND FY 2026-29 BUDGET PLAN**

23

24 Hanson presented on major budget issues for the tentative 2025 budget.
25 Hanson stated that major budget issues are big changes in the budget or historically have a large impact
26 on the budget. He stated that they are areas that are significant that impact by need, change, or a major
27 project. Hanson stated that the goals are that we follow state mandates and have a document that
28 demonstrates the effort of staff to reflect the policy priorities of the Council.
29 Mayor Allen stated that we want to keep service levels as high as we can while balancing the budget.
30 Council Member West stated that the City conducts long term planning very well. He stated that we have
31 been good at planning and not kicking a project down the road until it is an emergency and possibly more
32 expensive. He stated that we are good at planning and having high service levels within our ability to pay
33 for it.

34

35 Hanson stated that the city mindset is to look at the budget pro-actively. He stated that we are
36 conservative on our approach and balance out expenditures and revenues to give confidence to residents
37 that we are working within our abilities to provide services. He stated that there are parameters. He stated
38 that staff considers investments (above ground, equipment, under ground,).
39 Hanson stated that Mayor and Council have been clear to staff to maximize the funds that we have and
40 grants play a big role. Mayor Allen stated that he estimates that the city has receive around \$23 million
41 dollars in grants over the last 20 years. Hanson stated that without grants, the city would have to forgo
42 certain projects, or receive the money from the stakeholders.

43

44 Hanson stated that there is an analysis every year to determine what we need for utility funds. Hanson
45 stated that it boils down to what we need to provide the services and it is very intentional. Hanson stated
46 that rates were frozen during the first year of Covid, and we have been making up for that.

47
48 Hanson addressed major budget issues.

49
50 **AMI System-** Hanson stated that this service has been in the works for around four years. Hanson stated
51 that we were able to find a partnership with Weber Basin Water that made the system much more
52 affordable. He stated that it is a significant benefit to residents and water conservation. Hanson stated that
53 once it is fully functional, the city, as well as residents, will be able to see leaks in real time. Hanson
54 stated that one of the Council policies is to use technology to help us with staffing needs. The AMI
55 system will help in our process whereas the Public Works crew will not have to drive around the city for
56 meters. This has been time-consuming and the new system will free up staff for other projects. He stated
57 that leaks will be found in real time, helping the residents with potentially high water bills. He stated that
58 the system will provide timely data. Council Member West stated that the leak detection will help
59 residents with high bills, as well as conserving water, as the city has to buy the water. Mayor Allen stated
60 that once it is all hooked up, there will be an alarm system to detect leaks. Residents will be able to set up
61 their own alarms as well. Hanson stated that the Weber Basin platform has been tested.

62
63 **Rohmer Park Pickleball Complex-** Hanson stated that we have been able to secure funds from RAMP
64 for phase one and two, with significant impact. Hanson stated that the transformation of the area of the
65 park has been amazing. He stated that we are working as part of the park plan to complete phases three
66 and four with grant funding.

67
68 **Public Safety-** Hanson stated that in 2003, the city was paying 1.2 million to run our own police force.
69 We received significant savings when we partnered with the Sheriff Office. He stated that it has taken 20
70 years, but we have now reached the 1.2 million cost. Hanson stated that the Sheriff Office and
71 Commissioners have looked to see what they really expend to use, and not what they may expend.
72 Hanson stated that they are in a wage war throughout the state. Hanson stated that they have challenges
73 with recruitment and retention. Hanson stated that because of that challenge, the spots that have not been
74 filled have been pulled from the anticipated budget. He stated that this has affected our contract amount.
75 He stated that we have received a reduction to \$1.1 million. Hanson stated that we did not receive an
76 increase, but rather a reduction. He stated that this affects the General Fund.

77
78 **Personnel-** Hanson stated that we have historically kicked the can down the road on compensation. He
79 stated that the pay plan has changed from the “average minus 10 percent”, to market place average.
80 Hanson stated that we want to be average with above average employees. Hanson stated that there was a
81 two year phase in plan to get up to average. He stated that there is overall 7 percent on wages and
82 benefits. He stated that not every position will receive 7 percent. He stated that we are fortunate to work
83 with PEHP for insurance. He stated that rates increased 5.5 percent. He stated that PEHP is not for profit
84 and is governed by the state. He stated that the compensation is a direct result of recruitment and
85 retention.

86
87 **Fire Department Equipment-** Hanson stated that the City has received a grant award for replacement of
88 the fire pumper. Hanson stated that we are looking at a five year plan as to how to address the purchase of
89 a ladder truck.

90
91 **Refuse Collections-** Hanson stated that we are not anticipating a rate increase from the transfer station.
92 Hanson stated that there will be a 3 percent CPI increase from local collection.

93 **Culinary Water**- Hanson stated that there will be an increase upwards of 13 percent for water from
94 Weber Basin Water. Hanson stated that personnel will also impact water rates.
95
96 **Sewer**- Hanson stated that paying to process sewer is very expensive. Processing, infrastructure, and
97 personnel have an impact on the rates. Hanson stated that we have been keeping up with our capital
98 projects for sewer replacement and sewer management.
99
100 **Storm Water**- Hanson stated that there is not a huge capital burden. He stated that increases are a direct
101 response to mandates.
102
103 **Utility User Fees**- Hanson stated that we are responding to inflation, legal mandates, levels of service,
104 contractual obligations, and our ability to provide services. Hanson stated that the any changes to the
105 rates is to the base fee. Hanson stated that the new rate is increasing \$4.85 (\$81.85). Hanson stated that
106 water is a significant portion of the rate change. He stated that infrastructure and the cost to buy water is
107 increasing. Hanson stated that the water increase is a pass through.
108 Council Member Zishan asked how much of the increase is contractually based. Mayor Allen stated that
109 the number one hit is the 13 percent increase from Weber Basin Water, as long as sewer increases.
110 Hanson stated that we are balancing what it costs to provide the services (operations, capital, personnel)
111 into the calculations. Council Member West stated that the only thing we have control over is the cost of
112 the services to provide the services, noting that we cannot control the increases to the water, sewer, and
113 refuse pass throughs. Council Member West stated that each utility has a cost of goods that we cannot
114 control. Hanson stated that each business line is separate from each other.
115 Council Member Zishan asked if we have excess of funds from a source, would we be able to put those
116 funds into the utility funds to keep the rates lower. Hanson stated that we would not be able to use
117 general funds to supplant utility rates. He stated that is a form of kicking the can. We use the marginal
118 increase that is needed at that time to fund the utilities. Hanson stated that money cannot be taken out of
119 the restricted funds.
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141

142
143 **MAYOR, COUNCIL, AND STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**
144 Mayor Mark C. Allen
145 Council Member Jill Christiansen
146 Council Member Zunayid Z. Zishan
147 Council Member Cheryl Parkinson
148 Council Member Jeff West
149 Council Member Michael Thomas
150 Public Works Director Jake Meibos
151 General Planner Tyler Seaman
152 GIS/Storm Water Manager Tanon Mathews
153 Fire Chief Clay Peterson
154 City Manager Tom Hanson
155 City Recorder Amy Rodriguez
156 Lt. Colby Ryan, Weber County Sheriff
157
158 **Others Present**
159 Mike Lawrence, Carey Seal, Val Claussen (Planning Outpost)
160
161 2. **ROLL CALL** **6:00 P.M.**
162
163 3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
164
165 4. **WELCOME**
166
167 5. **CONSENT ITEMS**
168 5.1 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
169 5.2 **APPROVAL OF MARCH 19, 2024, MEETING MINUTES**
170 Items 5.1 and 5.2 were approved by general consent.
171
172 6. **SPECIAL ORDER**
173
174 **6.1 PUBLIC HEARING: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)**
175 **SECOND PUBLIC HEARING TO HEAR CITIZEN INPUT CONCERNING THE**
176 **PROJECT THAT WAS AWARDED UNDER THE 2024**
177 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM**
178
179 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PUBLIC HEARING**
180 Mayor Allen opened the second public hearing for the CDBG program at 6:07 p.m. Mayor Allen
181 stated that this hearing was called to allow all citizens to provide input concerning the projects
182 that were awarded under the 2024 Grant Year Community Development Block Grant Program.
183 The City has amended its capital investment plan and decided to apply for funds on behalf of the
184 Rohmer Park -Parking Lot Improvements Project located at 650 West 5100 South.

185 The Mayor introduced Amy Rodriguez as Grant Manager, and stated that Jake Meibos was the
186 Project Manager.

187 The Mayor explained that the application was successful in the regional rating and ranking
188 process and The Rohmer Park -Parking Lot Improvements and was awarded \$248,988 of the total
189 project cost of \$404,875.

190 The Mayor and explained the project to those in attendance.

191 The Mayor then asked for any comments, questions and concerns from the audience.

192 The only comment came from Mike Lawrence, who thanked those who made the grants possible,
193 stating that without the grant money, many projects in the city would not be available to be
194 completed.

195 The Mayor stated that copies of the capital investment plan are available if anyone would like a
196 copy.

197 Council Member Zishan asked the City match amount. The city match amount is \$155,877.

198 Council Member West asked when the project is anticipated to be started. Rodriguez stated that
199 the project will not be able to begin until the executed contract with the state is completed, noting
200 that it is anticipated to begin in mid-July.

201 Council Member Parkinson asked if park services will be kept open during the summer project.
202 Meibos stated that we will work around baseball games and activities so that they can be
203 accommodated. He stated that is should only be a two-week project.

204 There were no more comments and the hearing was adjourned at 6:14 p.m..

205 **7. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

206 Mike Lawrence wanted to acknowledge Rep Blake Moore for his efforts concerning the grant for the
207 funding of the new fire engine. He stated that without Rep. Moore's efforts, we would not be seeing a
208 new fire engine.

209 Carey Seal gave an update on the Mosquito Abatement Board, stating that the contaminated material has
210 been cleared out and they are moving forward for the extension on their shops. He stated that the
211 Mosquito Abatement Board has a hangar at Ogden Regional, however, they have sold the plane, as they
212 use drones and hand sprays for the spray. He stated that the hangar is owned by the Mosquito Abatement
213 Board. He stated that they are going to be testing a new chemical before they change over.

214 .
215 **8. NEW BUSINESS**

216
217 **8.1 MOTION/ORDINANCE 23-03: ORDINANCE REPEALING AND RE-ENACTING**
218 **TITLE 16 “SUBDIVISIONS REGULATIONS” OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE**

219 Seaman introduced Val Claussen from Planning Outpost. She stated that legislation changed which
220 included clarification on the cap of four on the final plat review. She stated that the city attorney brought
221 language forward that he wanted added to the revisions. Seaman stated that the verbiage of who is
222 responsible for the plat was corrected today to read the Public Works Director. Seaman stated that the
223
224

225 state has funded the consultants to help construct our ordinance for compliance. Hanson stated that our
226 attorney took this opportunity to update our processes and modernize our ordinance.
227 Council Member Parkinson stated that she is grateful to the Planning Commission for working with
228 Seaman and Claussen, noting that it is good to have people who understand the jargon and the laws.
229
230

231 **Motion by Council Member Parkinson**
232 **Seconded by Council Member West**
233 **To approve Ordinance 23-03**
234 **“Subdivisions Regulations”**
235 **As presented**
236 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**
237 **Roll Call Vote**
238
239

240 **8.2 MOTION: APPROVAL TO ACCEPT THE HARDSHIP GRANT FROM THE STATE**
241 **OF UTAH WATER QUALITY BOARD**

242 Mathews stated that the City was awarded Environmental Protection funds via a Sewer Overflow and
243 Stormwater Reuse municipal grant. He stated that the grant normally requires a match, however, because
244 we fall under 10,000 population, we were able to qualify for a rural Hardship Grant from the State of
245 Utah Water Quality Board for \$21,000. The acceptance of the grant needs to be made by motion.
246 The grant total is \$103,000, with no cost to the City. Hanson stated that he appreciates the work Mathews
247 and Meibos have done to secure the grant.

248
249 **Motion by Council Member Christiansen**
250 **Seconded by Council Member Thomas**
251 **To accept the Hardship Grant from the**
252 **State of Utah Water Quality Board**
253 **In the amount of \$21,000**
254 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**
255
256

257 **8.3 MOTION/RESOLUTION 24-03: APPROVAL OF THE MUNICIPAL**
258 **WASTEWATER PLANNING PROGRAM REPORT**

259 Meibos stated that the annual report needs to be approved in Council. He stated that all municipalities
260 need to develop a Sewer System Management Plan to operate and manage overflow from the system. He
261 stated that the state wants to know what we are doing within our system, what are the goals of the system,
262 what is the fiscal cost to operate, and how the system is operating.

263
264 **Motion by Council Member West**
265 **Seconded by Council Member Christiansen**
266 **To approve Resolution 24-03**
267 **Approving the Municipal Wastewater Planning**
268 **Program Report**
269 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**
270 **Roll Call Vote**
271

272 **8.4 MOTION: APPROVAL OF 300 WEST WATER LINE PROJECT CHANGE**
273 **ORDERS ONE AND TWO**

274 Meibos stated that the scope of work on the 300 West waterline project has been changed due to some
275 unforeseen items. He stated that our purchasing policy reads that anything that exceeds 10 percent of the
276 original contract amount needs to go before Council for approval. He stated that the original contract was
277 for \$349,000. He stated that change order one is around \$12,000 and change order two is around \$20,000.
278 He stated that these changes put us right at the 10 percent mark over the contract amount. Meibos stated
279 that we have not exceed the approved project amount of \$384,000.
280

281 Meibos stated that we are anticipating quantity changes, an additional loop, and possibly another change
282 to the scope as the project moves forward. He stated that he will exceed the 10 percent mark again and
283 requested to increase the adjusted amount by 20 percent, for a total of \$457,000 for the contracted
284 amount. He stated that this will give him flexibility for any change orders or emergencies that may arise.
285 He stated this will help with the speed of the project because he would not have to come before Council
286 for the change orders. Meibos stated that we are well within the \$555,000 budgeted amount.
287

288 Meibos requested Council to approve the two change orders and asked for the additional 20 percent to the
289 contract amount so that the project can keep moving forward without delays.
290

291 **Motion by Council Member Christiansen**
292 **Seconded by Council Member West**
293 **To approve the 300 West Waterline Project**
294 **Change orders one and two**
295 **and an additional 20% (\$76,270)**
296 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**
297
298

299 **8.5 DISCUSSION/MOTION: APPROVAL OF PURCHASE OF FIRE ENGINE/PUMPER**

300 Chief Peterson stated that the purchase price has changed since the work session last meeting, as the
301 equipment has been incorporated into the purchase price. He stated that this will take care of the issues
302 that we had and we can use grant leverage to purchase this vehicle. He stated that we will have a \$50,000
303 cushion that we can use for the equipment or anything else that comes up.

304 Peterson stated that if we are not required to spend all the money. He stated that we would receive the
305 unspent funds back in a check.

306 Peterson stated that the city received a federal grant in the amount of \$467,000 towards that purchase of
307 the equipment. The city contribution will be \$355,435.

308 Hanson stated that this approval is part of authorization from the Council to move forward with the
309 application for the grant funding.

310 Hanson stated that approval will not put us in motion to purchase the vehicle, but it will allow us to
311 purchase in accordance with the terms of the grant. Hanson stated that if we do not receive the grant, the
312 city will have to reboot and look at other options. Hanson stated that we cannot spend or contractually
313 make any agreement until the federal process has been completed. He stated that this will put us on hold
314 for ordering the vehicle until grant is in place and may possibly take a few months. Peterson stated that
315 there is a chance will not receive the vehicle spoken about at the last Council work session, as others
316 have the opportunity to purchase the vehicle before we may get the chance.
317
318
319

**Motion by Council Member Thomas
Seconded by Council Member Zishan**

**To approve the purchase of the fire engine pumper truck
In accordance with grant requirements
Approved unanimously (5-0)**

8.6 DISCUSSION/ACTION: FIRE DEPARTMENT CONSOLIDATION DISCUSSION

Hanson stated that the City conducted an analysis in 2018 to see if it made sense to consolidate with South Ogden and Riverdale City for fire services. Hanson stated that the city will wait and see how the other cities study would work with our compensation and structure of the Department. Hanson stated that we are spending significantly lower than Riverdale, Roy, and South Ogden City. Hanson stated that he made no promises that the Terrace would be joining the three other cities. Hanson stated that it would not be in our best interest to commit to the study, however, we will share information with the other cities for their feasibility study. Hanson stated that we will keep our eyes open to see what comes out of the study. He stated that we are not giving any commitments. Hanson noted that Consolidated Districts can be very expensive. Hanson stated that we have a committed volunteer Chief. He stated that we have a governed spending appetite. He stated that we have good gear and good equipment. Mayor Allen stated that the Chief and team are working on stipends. Council Member Christiansen asked if we have narrowed the gap in service level with the changes that we have done in the last few years since the 2018 report. Chief Peterson stated that we have increased pay. He stated that we are now staffed with three firefighters per shift. He stated that the consolidation talks in 2018 included building a new fire station, which he stated would lessen our response time. Chief Peterson stated that he believes that our volunteer staff is sustainable. He stated that we have firefighters who are full time at other departments. Council Member West stated that our service level has increased since 2018, as we are fully staffed. He stated that he does not feel that it makes any sense to consolidate at this time.

8.7 MOTION: MOTION TO CANCEL THE APRIL 16, 2024, CITY COUNCIL MEETING

The City Council, along with the Mayor and City Manager, will be attending the Utah League of Cities and Towns Mid-Year conference in St. George the week of the 15th.

**Motion by Council Member West
Seconded by Council Member Thomas
To cancel the April 16, 2024
he Utah League of Cities and Towns con
Approved unanimously (5-0)**

9. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION WITH STAFF

363
364 Council Member Parkinson thanked Recreation Director Carlos Grava for all his hard work on the Easter
365 Egg hunt, noting that his follow through on organization, planning, and advertising led to a great turn out
366 and event, even with the rain.
367 Council Member Parkinson stated that she noticed that the trenches across the road on 300 West are
368 being deep and bogging down the cars, and stated that she is please that Meibos is on top of things
369 and has already worked out a plan to place asphalt down to make sure that it is safe for everyone if we are
370 going to keep the road open while they work.
371
372 Council Member Zishan asked for an update on the efforts for live streaming of the meetings. Hanson
373 stated that it is in the upcoming budget for consideration.
374
375 Council Member West expressed his thanks to staff for keeping the city on top of things. He also wanted
376 to give a shout out to Grava for being awesome. He stated that Roosevelt Elementary is having a going
377 away party at the end of the school year before the building is to be demolished and stated that Grava is
378 helping out with food trucks for the event.
379
380 Council Member Thomas stated that he has been asked if a tri- city food bank has been discussed within
381 the city. He stated that North Ogden , Harrisville, and Pleasant View have a Tri-city Food Exchange on
382 Fridays that are helping a lot of seniors. Chief Peterson stated that the exchange is to help lower income
383 families and all that is needed is a paper bill from their house showing residency in the cities. He stated
384 that they distribute eggs, cheese, crackers, and a variety of foods.
385 Council Member Zishan stated that God's Church in Riverdale City holds a similar service on the third
386 Saturday of the month. He stated that food from local businesses are donated. He stated that the service
387 has grown and they are getting more sponsors for the event. He stated that the Church is located by Cliff
388 Cars.
389
390 The Mayor asked Meibos to explain what he found out concerning a question posed by Council Member
391 Zishan at the last meeting concerning the parking lot at the Washington Terrace Elementary School.
392 Meibos stated that the first 110 feet of the road going into the parking lot is city owned and then it
393 becomes a private parking lot. The majority of the potholes are in the privately owned parking lot. He
394 stated that he reached out to the School District and they are going to look into whether they have an
395 agreement or an easement before we get a hold of the owner. He stated that he will work directly with the
396 School District to see how they want to approach the situation.
397
398
399 **10. ADMINISTRATION REPORTS**
400 Hanson stated that we are going to start re-promoting the Adopt a Storm Drain Program.
401
402 Hanson stated that the ribbon cutting for the Pickleball complex will be held on May 1st at 6:00 p.m.
403
404 Hanson stated that the Bonneville athletic group will be conducting spring cleanup on May 4th at Rohmer
405 Park. He is extending the cleanup to the community if they would like to join the efforts.
406
407 Hanson stated that there have been comments by residents that the speed and traffic violations are lacking
408 within the city. Hanson stated that there are 214 incidents that are currently being worked through in
409 court. Hanson stated that the Sheriff's Office is working with Meibos concerning drivers going through
410 contractor sites that have been closed to the public.
411

412 11. **UPCOMING EVENTS**

413 **April 17-19: Utah League of Cities and Towns Annual Conference : St. George**

414 **April 16th : Meeting tentatively cancelled**

415 **April 25th: Planning Commission Meeting (Tentative)**

416 **May 1st : Ribbon Cutting Ceremony for the Pickleball Complex 6:00 p.m.**

417

418 12. **ADJOURN THE MEETING: MAYOR ALLEN**

419

420 **Motion by Council Member Parkinson**

421 **Seconded by Council Member Christiansen**

422 **To adjourn the meeting**

423 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**

424 **Time: 7:18 p.m.**

425

426

427

428 Date Approved

City Recorder

429

City of WASHINGTON TERRACE *Utah*

City Council Staff Report

Author: Amy Rodriguez
Subject: CDBG SECOND PUBLIC HEARING
Date: 5-02-24
Type of Item: Public Hearing **Admin Dept.**

Summary Recommendations: The City Council will hear public comment on the 2024 Rohmer Park – Parking Lot Improvements CDBG project.

Questions from the audience need to be responded to (particularly those who may be immediately impacted by the projects).

Description:

A. Topic: CDBG SECOND PUBLIC HEARING

B. Background:

CDBG requires that a second public hearing be held after an applicant has been notified that their application has been funded by the Rating and Ranking committee (RRC) but before the final application is due in May. The City was notified in March that the proposed Project was recommended for funding of a total of \$ 249,988.

A second public hearing was held on April 2, 2024. During a consultation with the Director of the Community Development Block Grant Program, it was decided that another second public hearing should be held to make sure that the minimum days posting requirements are definitively met.

C. Analysis:

CDBG further requires that the second public hearing being conducted as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PUBLIC HEARING

Mayor Allen opened the second public hearing for the CDBG program. **Mayor Allen stated that this hearing was called to allow all citizens to provide input concerning the projects that were awarded under the 2024 Grant Year Community Development Block Grant Program.**

The City has amended its capital investment plan and decided to apply for funds on behalf of the Rohmer Park -Parking Lot Improvements Project located at 650 West 5100 South.

The Mayor introduced Amy Rodriguez as Grant Manager, and stated that Jake Meibos was the Project Manager.

The Mayor explained that the application was successful in the regional rating and ranking process and The Rohmer Park -Parking Lot Improvements and was awarded \$248,988 of the total project cost of \$404,875.

The Mayor explained the project to those in attendance.

The Mayor explained the project to those in attendance.
The Mayor then asked for any comments, questions and concerns from the audience.

The Mayor stated that copies of the capital investment plan are available if anyone would like a copy.

There were no more comments and the hearing was adjourned at _____.

24SO2198 ANIMAL CONTR WT SO 16:00:49 03/05/24 RMK 293 E 4675 S
24SO2429 BARKING DOG WT SO 16:22:43 03/13/24 RMK 5094 S RIDGELINE DR; 500 W
24SO2629 ANIMAL CONTR WT SO 15:22:58 03/19/24 RMK 139 E 5350 S

24SO2622 BARKING DOG WT SO 12:38:47 03/19/24 RMK 139 E 5350 S

24SO2186 FOLLOW UP WT SO 08:36:40 03/05/24 RMK 4335 S 200 W
24SO2275 FOLLOW UP WT SO 08:18:09 03/08/24 RMK 4335 S 200 W; **4FAC2**
24SO2294 ANIMAL CONTROL WT SO 16:11:49 03/08/24 RMK 4940 S 425 W; #22
24SO2440 BARKING DOG WT SO 05:54:21 03/14/24 RMK 248 W 5300 S
24SO2458 ANIMAL CONTROL WT SO 15:10:17 03/14/24 RMK 335 E 4575 S
24SO2461 ANIMAL CONTROL WT SO 15:11:00 03/14/24 RMK 373 W 5650 S
24SO2489 ANIMAL CONTROL WT SO 13:43:07 03/15/24 RMK 5160 S 200 E
24SO2491 ANIMAL CONTROL WT SO 15:06:53 03/15/24 RMK 177 W 4500 S
24SO2573 DEAD ANIMAL WT SO 07:50:10 03/18/24 RMK 4650 S 300 W
24SO2577 ANIMAL CONTROL WT SO 09:43:58 03/18/24 RMK 353 W 4900 S

24SO2573 DEAD ANIMAL WT SO 07:50:10 03/18/24 RMK 4650 S 300 W
24SO2577 ANIMAL CONTR WT SO 09:43:58 03/18/24 RMK 353 W 4900 S
24SO2622 BARKING DOG WT SO 12:38:47 03/19/24 RMK 139 E 5350 S
24SO2730 FOLLOW UP WT SO 12:02:05 03/22/24 RMK 362 W 4650 S; 4FAC2

24SO2629 ANIMAL CON1WT SO 15:22:58 03/19/24 RMK 139 E 5350 S
24SO2900 ANIMAL CON1WT SO 07:57:13 03/27/24 RMK 323 E 4450 S
24SO2918 ANIMAL CON1WT SO 12:17:50 03/27/24 RMK 5534 S 500 W
24SO2921 FOLLOW UP WT SO 12:38:11 03/27/24 RMK 362 W 4650 S; 4FAC1
24SO2925 ANIMAL CON1WT SO 16:18:08 03/27/24 RMK 4324 S 250 W

24SO3038 ANIMAL CONTROL WT SO 15:20:54 03/30/24 RMK 103 W 5000 S

24SO2977 CRUELTY ANIMALS WT SO 15:23:41 03/29/24 RMK 4960 S 350 E; #f19

Combined Statistics Report

WT

Intake Type

03/01/24 to 03/31/24

Cats

5

STRAY

5

Dogs

3

REHOME

2

STRAY

1

Total Intakes:

8

Outcome Type

03/01/24 to 03/31/24

Cats

6

REHOME EXP

2

2

TRANSFER

4

RESCUE GRP

4

Dogs

5

ADOPTION

1

OWNER NEW

1

DELETE ENT

1

1

REHOME EXP

3

3

Total Outcomes:

11

	Attack/Bite	Barking	Stray/Roam	Carcass Rem	Citizen Assis	Followup	Injured anim	Citations	Cruelty	Calls For Ser	Extra Patrol	
Mar-24	0	2	9	3	2	5	0	0	0	21	0	
Feb-24	4	1	24	0	3	0	0	0	2	35	1	
Jan-24	0	1	11	1	1	9	1	6	30	0		
Dec-23	3	4	14	0	0	6	0	0	5	32	0	
Nov-23	4	2	13	0	0	3	1	4	2	29	0	
Oct -23	1	2	23	1	0	4	2	4	3	40	0	
Sep-23	0	4	18	1	1	4	3	1	4	37	1	
Aug-23	0	2	11	0	3	10	0	1	3	23	2	
Jul-23	1	1	13	1	3	5	2	3	3	33	1	
Jun-23	1	5	18	3	2	1	4	2	4	41	1	
May-23	1	4	18	0	0	3	1	5	2	38	4	
Apr-23	4	3	13	1	1	4	0	1	3	32	2	
Mar-23	1	2	16	0	3	2	1	0	2	27	0	
Feb-23	1	3	16	0	0	3	0	0	2	26	1	
Jan-23	2	2	8	0	0	2	0	0	6	20	0	
Dec-22	1	2	8	1	3	1	0	0	3	19	0	
Nov-22	2	2	5	0	1	0	1	2	0	14	1	
Oct-22	1	2	#	2	0	6	4	5	2	#	3	
Sep-22	3	6	21	0	1	3	1	5	1	44	3	
Aug-22	1	2	13	1	1	6	2	1	0	29	2	
Jul-22	6	2	17	5	2	5	0	0	2	42	3	
Jun-22	2	2	18	0	0	3	0	0	1	29	3	
May-22	0	5	9	0	0	8	0	8	6	39	3	
Apr-22	0	5	11	1	2	4	0	8	0	33	11	
Mar-22	0	4	6	1	0	5	0	1	1	17	0	
Feb-22	0	5	7	2	2	4	0	0	1	23	2	
Jan-22	1	7	11	1	2	8	0	0	1	32	1	
Dec-21	0	0	6	1	1	5	0	4	1	18	0	
Nov-21	5	0	15	2	0	8	1	4	3	40	2	
Oct-21	2	1	21	3	0	15	0	10	1	58	5	
Sep-21	1	1	14	0	0	2	0	3	0	23	2	
Aug-21	0	1	15	1	2	4	1	0	2	26	0	
Jul-21	1	7	11	0	2	4	1	1	1	33	5	

Jun-21	1	7	12	1	5	6	1	0	3	39	3
May-21	5	2	9	0	0	4	1	0	0	22	1
Apr-21	3	2	8	0	1	4	0	0	1	19	0
Mar-21	3	6	#	1	0	1	0	0	1	#	2
Feb-21	5	5	11	0	0	12	0	0	2	39	4
Jan-21	2	1	9	1	0	3	1	1	1	23	4
Dec-20	1	6	5	0	1	2	0	5	3	30	7
Nov-20	1	0	10	0	0	1	1	5	1	22	3
Oct-20	3	2	11	1	1	8	0	8	2	38	2
Sep-20	4	3	16	0	0	7	0	3	3	41	5
Aug-20	0	0	7	2	2	7	1	4	3	35	7
Jul-20	1	2	9	1	1	1	0	0	1	22	6
Jun-20	0	4	4	0	1	0	0	0	6	19	4
May-20	3	2	7	0	1	1	1	15	2	33	1
Apr-20	1	2	3	0	1	1	1	7	4	26	6
Mar-20	4	0	12	1	0	1	0	0	3	27	6
Feb-20	1	4	13	0	1	4	1	4	4	30	2
Jan-20	0	0	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	16	2
Dec-20	0	2	9	1	3	0	0	0	1	22	6
Nov-19	2	5	5	1	2	4	0	0	3	30	8
Oct-19	1	5	8	1	0	4	1	0	1	29	8
Sep-19	1	1	7	1	0	3	0	3	2	19	1
Aug-19	2	4	11	0	1	0	1	1	1	21	0
Jul-19	3	1	6	1	2	4	3	0	1	24	3
Jun-19	2	10	9	0	2	2	0	0	2	29	1
May-19	3	6	8	0	1	1	1	1	3	29	5
Apr-19	0	5	18	0	1	4	0	0	1	32	3
Mar-19	0	1	10	2	3	1	0	0	3	25	5
Feb-19	0	1	8	0	1	2	0	4	1	23	6
Jan-19	2	3	9	1	4	1	1	0	2	23	0
Dec-19	0	0	6	0	2	1	1	0	3	13	0
Nov-18	1	7	12	0	1	2	0	2	2	31	4
Oct-18	1	4	8	0	1	3	0	1	1	23	4
Sep-18	2	4	13	0	6	4	1	0	2	34	2

Aug-18	0	3	9	1	4	3	0	0	1	23	2
Jul-18	0	1	8	0	2	4	0	0	2	17	0
Jun-18	3	0	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	28	4
May-18	0	4	10	1	0	0	1	21	2	41	3
Apr-18	0	6	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	26	13
Mar-18	2	7	8	1	2	3	0	2	1	26	0
Feb-18	1	2	6	2	0	1	0	0	3	15	0
Jan-18	2	2	5	1	0	3	0	7	1	22	1
Dec-18	0	0	4	0	0	3	1	2	5	15	0
Nov-17	0	4	18	0	1	7	0	5	4	40	0
Oct-17	2	2	11	2	3	1	1	6	0	23	1
Sep-17	0	1	16	1	0	1	0	3	1	26	3
Aug-17	2	0	13	1	3	2	1	5	0	30	3
Jul-17	2	1	11	1	6	3	0	6	2	33	1
Jun-17	1	2	5	0	3	2	0	9	2	25	1
May-17	2	0	19	0	5	0	1	10	2	44	5
Apr-17	4	3	16	0	2	2	1	17	1	48	11
Mar-17	0	1	13	0	2	14	0	0	1	33	4
Feb-17	0	0	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	22	5
Jan-17	1	7	9	0	4	11	1	4	3	40	0
Dec-16	4	1	22	2	7	2	1	0	3	43	1
Nov-16	1	1	10	0	2	5	0		1	25	5
Oct-16	2	11		3	8			2		29	3
Sep-16	4	2	18	4	5	1	0	0	0	35	3
Aug-16	1	2	8	0	3	9	2	0	2	27	6
Jul-16	2	1	8	0	2	1	0	4	0	23	9
Jun-16	4	1	11		4	4		2	32	6	
May-16	2	5	16	0	2	10	2	5	5	59	18
Apr-16	1	1	13	1	4	6		4	4	54	23
Mar-16	0	1	5	0	2	12	0	0	2	24	7
Feb-16	1	4	10	1	3	1	0	5	3	23	1
Jan-16	3	3	13	0	5	7	2	2	1	30	0
Dec 15	0	1	16	0	2	1	0	2	1	21	0

Nov 15	1	3	7	1	1	1	1	0	1	17	1
Oct-15	2	9	14	2	1	0	1	3	0	28	2
Sep-15	2	4	17	1	0	5	2	9	0	32	0
Aug-15	3	12	10	1	5	8	0	0	5	44	1
Jul-15	4	2	11	0	1	3	1	3	1	26	0
Jun-15	1	7	7	1	2	13	0	4	3	34	0
May-15	2	3	16	1	0	14	1	0	2	39	0
Apr-15	3	1	15	0	2	4	0	2	2	21	3
Mar-15	2	1	8	0	0	2	0	2	2	18	1
Feb-15	1	5	10	0	0	2	0	4	1	24	5
Jan-15	1	2	7	1	0	4	0	2	2	21	3
Dec-15	1	3	7	0	4	7		1	2	24	1
Nov-14	1	6	6	0	2	0	0	0	5	22	2
Oct-14	2	1	27	0	2	1	2	1	1	38	1
Sep-14	3	6	8	0	3	3	0	4	1	26	3
Aug-14	1	2	11	5	1	1	1	2	1	35	13
Jul-14	1	6	11	0	0	11	2	11	2	33	10
Jun-14	0	5	12	0	0	1	1	4	2	23	
May-14	0	3	14	0	4	0	1	6	0	20	
Apr-14	2	3	19	1	3	2	0	25	0	34	
Mar-14	1	9	13	2	0	2	4	1	0	31	
Feb-14	2	1	7	1	1	1	1	0	2	16	
Jan-14	1	2	10	2		2	1		3	19	
Dec-13	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1		1	
Nov-13	2	0	11	1	0	3	0	2		19	
Oct-13	2	3	14	0	8	1	1	2		32	
Sep-13	4	1	16	0	5	1	0	0		30	
Aug-13	4	0	7	0	7	1	2	17		26	
Jul-13	1	0	11	0	8	3	1	5		24	
Jun-13	2	4	12	0	5	2	0	1		25	
May-13	1	1	10	0	4	16	4	4		29	
Apr-13	3	1	6	2	3	8	1	5		24	
Mar-13	0	3	16	0	2	8	0	1		29	
Feb-13	0	3	12	1	1	2	1	0		20	

Jan-13	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	19
Dec-12	1	5	4	0	2	2	1	1	16
Nov-12	2	6	10	1	0	3	0	3	19
Oct-12	2	7	11	1	3	2	2	6	28
Sep-12	1	6	15	2	2	0	2	1	27
Aug-12	1	4	9	1	3	0	0	1	16
Jul-12	1	3	3	1	4	1	1	1	23

City Council Staff Report

Author: Jake Meibos

Subject: 2024 Street Maintenance Projects

Date: 5/7/2024

Type of Item: Discussion and Motion

W^{City of}ASHINGTONTERRACE
Utah

Summary Recommendation: Award the contracts to selected contractor(s) for the 2024 Street Maintenance Project for the total bid amount of **\$209,360.05**

Low bid received:

Asphalt repairs, street maintenance and paint striping: **Morgan Pavement \$ 209,360.05**

Description:

- A. **Topic:** City Council approval is requested for awarding the 2024 Street Maintenance Projects in Washington Terrace City.
The scope of the projects consists of:
 - Asphalt repairs
 - Seal Coats
 - Paint Striping in selected areas throughout the city
- B. **Background:** LTAP (Local Technical Assistant Program) has provided an Analysis and Recommendation that was established August 2019. Using that information, we were able to identify and prioritize the areas in need for maintenance projects. Using the LTAP analysis and evaluating the areas we have determined the proper application for each area.
- C. **Analysis:** The engineers' construction estimate including engineering cost and contingency for completion of the 2024 Street Maintenance Project is **\$240,764**. Quantities and cost estimates for each application were estimated using previous projects and area calculations.
- D. **Department Review:** Public Works, City Manager, Finance, Jones & Associates

Alternatives:

- A. **Approve the Request:** Staff is requesting Council to approve the award of the 2024 Street Maintenance Projects to said contractor(s) for the total amount of **\$240,764** and authorize Staff and the Mayor to execute all applicable contract documents.
- B. **Fiscal Impact:** Annual street maintenance projects are funded with Class B-C road funds received from the state. This year's street maintenance project will be funded within the current budget.

C. **Recommendation:** It is recommended that Council authorize the Mayor and Staff to award the 2024 Street Maintenance Projects to **Morgan Pavement** for the combined amount of **\$240,764**.

This will ensure the completion of the Street Maintenance Projects for 2024.

D. **Deny The Request:** By denying or delaying all or part of this request, street maintenance and paint striping in Washington Terrace City will not be completed and will need to be postponed until 2025. The projects may need to be rebid.

E. **Continue the Item/Impact:**

Significant Impacts: The 2024 Street Maintenance and Paint Striping is in need for safety and the longevity of the streets. By delaying maintenance, the streets will require a high level and more expensive treatment to preserve the life of the street. Vibrant road markings are valuable in avoiding accidents and guiding traffic.

Consequences of not taking the recommended action: Not awarding the contracts in this council meeting may delay the completion of the Street Maintenance Projects throughout Washington Terrace City this year.

City Council Staff Report

City of WASHINGTON TERRACE *Utah*

Author: Tom Hanson
Subject: Senior Center Update
Date: May 7, 2024
Type of Item: Discussion / Action

Summary Recommendation: Weber Morgan Health and Weber County are proposing the transfer of the responsibility to oversee aging service programing to the cities rather than continue to provide those services as currently constituted. Weber Human Services (WHS) has submitted a request for proposal from each participating city. (See attachment)

The authority to administer aging services has been delegated to Weber County from the state of Utah and is responsible to administer those services. The details are included in the attaches summery. Putting the responsibility of the city will have a long-term impact on the city.

Description:

- A. **Topic:** Response to the Weber Human Services RFP to provide senior service programing. (See news letter article)
- B. **Background:** For many years, Weber Human Services (WHS) has played a pivotal role in supporting senior services within our community, fostering a cooperative and supportive relationship with the cities it serves. This partnership has been characterized by a division of responsibilities: while the city provides the physical infrastructure and operational support through the provision of buildings, WHS and the County takes charge of designing and implementing the programming aimed at meeting the diverse needs of seniors. This arrangement has ensured a comprehensive approach to senior care, with the city and WHS working hand in hand to create an environment conducive to the well-being of our elderly population.

Central to this collaboration was the construction of a dedicated building aimed at serving seniors from across the city and the wider county. This facility stood as a beacon of community support, offering a range of services and activities designed to enhance the quality of life for seniors. From health and wellness programs to social gatherings and educational workshops, the building served as a hub for seniors to connect, engage, and thrive. Its construction represented a tangible commitment to the welfare of seniors, reflecting the values of compassion and inclusivity cherished by both WHS and the city.

- C. **Analysis:** While the proposal to transfer responsibility for senior services from Weber Human Services (WHS) to the cities may seem like a logical step in decentralizing service provision, several key considerations warrant caution and further examination before proceeding. Firstly, WHS has developed specialized expertise and established relationships within the senior community over many years, which may not be easily replicated by individual cities. Centralizing senior services under WHS has likely

contributed to economies of scale, efficiency, and consistency in service delivery, which could be jeopardized by fragmentation across multiple municipal entities. Additionally, the transfer of responsibility to the city may inadvertently result in disparities in service quality and access based on the resources and priorities of each locality. Our smaller city may recognize budget constraints and may struggle to adequately fund and manage senior programs, leading to unequal outcomes for seniors depending on where they reside. This could exacerbate existing inequalities and hinder efforts to ensure equitable access to vital services for all seniors, regardless of their geographic location. Note: reporting of senior services and hours of operation will be required to receive state and federal funding.

Furthermore, transitioning responsibility for senior services to the city may introduce administrative complexities and coordination challenges, potentially leading to gaps or overlaps in service provision. WHS, as a centralized agency, likely has the capacity to streamline processes, share best practices, and coordinate resources more effectively than individual cities operating in isolation. Fragmentation of responsibility could impede collaboration, innovation, and the ability to respond promptly to emerging needs or crises within the senior population.

D. **Fiscal Impact:** The proposal to transfer responsibility for senior services from Weber Human Services (WHS) to the cities raises significant concerns regarding long-term financial sustainability and the potential burden placed on the city's municipal budget. While WHS has committed to providing financial support up to \$78,600 annually for three years, the prospect of this funding stream coming to an end underscores the need for cities to carefully assess their capacity to assume full responsibility for senior operations beyond this timeframe. No inflationary clause is included in the proposal.

The reliance on WHS funding to offset a portion of senior service costs may provide temporary relief for cities facing budget constraints. However, the impending cessation of this financial support highlights the importance of developing robust and sustainable funding mechanisms to ensure continuity of services for seniors in the years to come. Without a clear plan in place to secure alternative sources of funding or to absorb the additional financial burden, the city may be grappling with difficult decisions, such as scaling back services, increasing taxes, or diverting funds from other essential programs.

Moreover, the uncertainty surrounding future funding for senior operations introduces a level of unpredictability and risk that could undermine the stability and effectiveness of senior services. City administrators may be hesitant to commit resources to long-term planning or investment in innovative programs if there is ambiguity regarding funding availability beyond the three-year term. This uncertainty could also deter potential partners or donors from contributing to senior initiatives, further exacerbating financial challenges.

In light of these concerns, it is imperative for the city to engage in comprehensive financial planning and risk assessment to evaluate the feasibility and implications of assuming full responsibility for senior operations post-2028. It is appreciated that WHS and the County are willing to help with the initial cost of transferring responsibility, this proposal lacks the long term sustainability needed for a community of strained resources.

Department Review: The departmental review underscores critical concerns that warrant careful consideration before making any decisions regarding the assumption of county programming responsibilities by the city. Financial responsibility looms large as a significant factor, particularly given the uncertainty surrounding the cessation of WHS funding and the potential implications for our municipal budget. The prospect of assuming management of employees currently under the county program adds another layer of complexity, requiring careful consideration of staffing levels, qualifications, and potential impacts on existing city operations.

Equally important is the responsibility of managing liabilities associated with senior services, including legal, regulatory, and operational risks. Without adequate resources and expertise to navigate these challenges, the city may find itself exposed to liabilities that could have far-reaching consequences. Moreover, the allocation of city resources to support a county-wide program raises legitimate questions about equity and the prioritization of municipal services. Balancing the needs of city residents with broader county-wide initiatives require a thoughtful approach to resource allocation.

In light of these concerns, it is prudent for staff to recommend against taking over the county programming at this time. While the city remains committed to supporting senior services, the potential risks and challenges associated with assuming responsibility for county programs outweigh the perceived benefits. Instead, efforts should focus on exploring alternative models of collaboration with WHS and other partners to ensure the continued provision of high-quality senior services while mitigating financial and operational risks for the city. That being said: there is an alternative...see below

Alternatives:

A. Approve the Request:

Response to the RFP

1. Partnership: WHS recruit and retain employees, as currently constituted. WHS Supervise, recruit, and retain employees, and manage programing.
2. Funding resources will be made available for the operations and maintenance of facilities where senior operations are conducted.
3. Information not available for partnering with other cities currently.
4. Not clear what this means.



City Manager Tom Hanson,

Weber Human Services (WHS) is seeking to enter into new partnerships with 3 cities in the operation of senior centers in Weber County. Funding is available for up to \$78,600 per year for three years for each funded location. Funded locations must commit to operating at least 5 days per week for a minimum of 6 hours per day and to make available a variety of programming including social activities, health and wellness activities, and congregate meals provided by WHS.

Cities that are interested in partnering with WHS to operate a senior center in their city should submit a letter of interest by 5:00 pm on Friday, July 19, 2024 to WHS with the following information:

- What type of partnership would your city prefer with WHS? WHS pass through funding to city and city employ and supervise staff and programming, or WHS employ staff and supervise staff and programming?
- What funding or resources will be provided/made available by the interested city toward the operation of the senior center? Give details.
- Describe any partnerships with other cities that will add resources to the partnership.
- If funding allocations included a component related to citizen participation levels in senior center services, what do you think should be considered in that component?

All partners must agree to the following terms:

- Patrons must be welcomed into the center, regardless of city of residence.
- Donations for lunch must be voluntary and returned to WHS to help cover the cost of the meal.
- The City must agree to recognize the partnership with WHS in their written materials and promotions, including website, newsletters, fliers, brochures.
- The City must provide data and information on their services upon request from WHS. All participants must complete the registration form, including the extra questions for those who receive meals. The city must maintain a registered user list and submit the list monthly, or as requested, to WHS.
- The City must ensure that the senior center director (or his/her designee) will participate in monthly meetings with WHS and the directors of other senior centers that receive operational funds and/or congregate meals from WHS.
- The City must create a reservation list for patrons and notify WHS Nutrition at least one business day in advance regarding how many meals will be needed.

WHS anticipates making a decision about funding partnerships to begin in FY 2026 by October 1, 2024.

What's Happening in Weber County?
Termination of Senior Programming in Washington Terrace

With a heavy heart, we share the news that Weber County and Weber Human Services will be terminating funding for Senior Center programming in Washington Terrace in the near future. Weber County leadership has concluded that it is no longer in their best interest to sustain this service in Washington Terrace due to the financial strain caused by a full-time employee and a couple of part-time people that help serve lunches.

The increasing financial burden of funding and managing these positions at the Senior Center has become unsustainable within the constraints of the county budget. Despite efforts to explore alternatives, Washington Terrace City lacks the resources and personnel to justify taking over responsibilities that have traditionally been provided by the County as a County wide program. In essence, without the City's management and funding, the county funds earmarked for supporting the Washington Terrace senior center will be diverted elsewhere.

It's crucial to recognize the significance of county management in senior centers and social programming. While this decision affects Washington Terrace, Weber County remains committed to partial support of senior center operations at other locations yet to be determined. Residents of Washington Terrace will be encouraged to attend any of these centers in the future.

Washington Terrace has been and will continue to be a supportive partner in this endeavor, having constructed a senior center facility and diligently maintained its operation. However, given the current circumstances, the County's termination of senior programming in Washington Terrace has become unavoidable.

Should County leadership and Weber Human Services Board of Directors reconsider their decision in serving the seniors in this region, we are eager to welcome the partnership and continue supporting their efforts with a well-maintained facility well into the future. The city will continue to welcome all seniors throughout the greater Weber County area as they come to enjoy the programming currently provided by Weber Human Services.

The exact timeline for this termination is still being determined. In the meantime, we urge community members to continue supporting the senior center and those who contribute to making Weber County and Washington Terrace vibrant places to live.

Seniors who paved the way for our success ... it's What's Right with Washington Terrace City!

City Council Staff Report



Finance Department

Author: Shari' Garrett
Subject: Approve Contract for Professional Auditing Services
Date: May 7, 2024
Type of Item: MOTION

Summary Recommendations: That the City Council, by motion, approve staff entering into a contract with Keddington & Christensen, LLC for professional auditing and consulting services for a term of up to 5 years.

Description:

A. Topic: Audit and Consulting Services Contract

B. Background:

The City's independent audit contract with Keddington & Christensen expired at the conclusion of the Fiscal Year 2023 audit. Therefore, in March the City solicited a formal request for proposals (RFP) for independent financial statement audit services.

Selecting an Independent Auditor – Best Practices

According to the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) it is long recommended that state and local governmental entities obtain independent audits of their financial statements, and single audits, if required based on the entity's use of federal or state grant funds, performed in accordance with the appropriate professional auditing standards. Properly performed audits play a vital role in the public sector by helping to preserve the integrity of the public finance functions, and by maintaining citizens' confidence in their elected leaders.

The GFOA also recommends that governmental entities should enter into multiyear agreements of at least five years in duration when obtaining the services of independent auditors.... Such agreements allow for greater continuity and help to minimize the potential for disruption in connection with the independent audit. Multiyear agreements can also help to reduce audit costs by allowing auditors to recover certain "startup" costs over several years, rather than over a single year.

These and other GFOA recommended best practices were included as part of the RFP process.

Audit Evaluation Team

The audit evaluation team members include Mayor Allen, Council Member West, City Manager Hanson, and Finance Director Garrett.

Request for Proposal (RFP) *See attached*

The normal terms and scope of these services are outlined in an annual engagement letter provided by the auditor prior to commencing audit services. The engagement letter is reviewed and signed by the Mayor and staff.

C. Analysis:**Respondents**

The City received responses from 2 firms: Keddington & Christensen and Larson & Co.

Evaluation Criteria

The proposals were reviewed and scored based on the evaluation criteria described in the RFP.

- Mandatory & General Elements
- Firm Qualifications & Experience
- Staff Qualifications & Experience
- Specific Audit Approach
- References
- Fee

Evaluation Team Scoring Results

1. Keddington & Christensen 100/100
2. Larson & Company 62/100

While cost represented 40% of the scoring, Keddington's proposal was significantly lower than Larson's. Pricing for the Fiscal Year 2023 audit was \$9,500 for a financial statement audit and \$1,500 for a single audit.

Fiscal Year	#1		#2	
	Keddington & Christensen		Larson & Co.	
	FIN STMT	SINGLE AUDIT	FIN STMT	SINGLE AUDIT
2024	17,500	1,500	55,000	6,000
2025	18,025	1,545	57,200	6,200
2026	18,566	1,591	59,500	6,400
2027	19,123	1,639	61,900	6,700
2028	19,696	1,688	64,400	7,000
	\$ 92,910	\$ 7,964	\$ 298,000	\$ 32,300

The Evaluation Team has been pleased with the performance of K&C. They have demonstrated a high level of competency and use an open and fair approach when conducting the audit. They have also demonstrated excellent customer service, a willingness to work through questions or concerns, and their rate appears to be fair and equitable based on the market and their excellent work.

Recommendation: That the City Council, by motion, approve the Mayor and staff entering into a contract for Professional Auditing and Consulting Services with Keddington & Christensen for a term of up to 5 years beginning fiscal year ended June 30, 2024, through June 30, 2028.

D. Department Review: Audit Evaluation Team



5249 South 400 East
Washington Terrace, UT 84405
(801)393-8681
www.washingtonterracecity.com

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Professional Auditing Services
(Financial Statement)

The City of Washington Terrace is soliciting proposals from qualified firms of certified public accountants to provide audit and financial statement preparation services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2024, with the option to renew for four subsequent fiscal years.

To be considered for this engagement, your firms must meet the qualifications and satisfy the requirements set forth in the RFP.

Proposals are due by March 28, 2024, at 5:00 pm.

Proposals must be received electronically by 5:00 pm on Thursday, March 28, 2024, by emailing the City Recorder at amyr@washingtonterracecity.org.

Questions regarding this RFP should be directed to Sharí Garrett in writing at sharig@washingtonterracecity.org.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	NATURE OF SERVICES REQUIRED.....	4
	A. Scope of Work to be Performed	
II.	TERM OF ENGAGEMENT.....	5
	A. Term	
III.	DESCRIPTION OF THE GOVERNMENT.....	5
	A. Background Information	
	B. Financial Software	
	C. Availability of Prior Reports	
IV.	TIME REQUIREMENTS.....	5
	A. Proposal Calendar	
	1. Request for Proposal	
	B. Schedule for the 2024 Fiscal Year Audit	
	1. Entrance Conference, Detail, Detail Audit Plan, & Timeline	
	2. Fieldwork Fieldwork Complete	
	3. Progress Conference	
	4. Draft Reports	
	5. Exit Conference	
	6. Final Report Due	
	7. Final Report Presented to Governing Body	
V.	PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.....	6
	A. General Requirements	
	B. Required	
	1. Title Page	
	2. Transmittal Letter	
	3. Detailed Proposal	
	• Firm Qualifications and Experience	
	• Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience	
	• Specific Audit Approach	
	• References	
	4. Fee	
	• Total All-Inclusive Maximum Price	

CITY OF WASHINGTON TERRACE, UT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL | PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES

VI. EVALUATION PROCEDURES.....8

- A. Evaluation Team
- B. Review of Proposals
- C. Evaluation Criteria
 - 1. Technical Qualifications
 - 2. Price
 - 3. Proposal Instructions
- D. Oral Presentations
- E. Final Selection
- F. Right to Reject Proposals

APPENDICES

- A. Proposer Guarantees.....11
- B. Proposer Warranties.....12
- C. Fee Summary.....13

I. NATURE OF SERVICES REQUIRED

A. Scope of Work to be Performed

- The City of Washington Terrace desires the auditor to express an opinion on the fair presentation of its governmental activities, its business-type activities, each of its major funds, and its aggregate remaining fund information in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.
- The City also desires the auditor to express an opinion on the fair presentation of its combining and individual fund financial statements and schedules in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. The auditor is not required to audit the supporting schedules contained in the annual comprehensive financial report. However, the auditor is to provide an "in-relation-to" opinion on the supporting schedules based on the auditing procedures applied during the audit of the basic financial statements and the combining and individual fund financial statements and schedules. The auditor is not required to audit the introductory section of the report or the statistical section of the report.
- The auditor shall also be responsible for performing certain limited procedures involving required supplementary information required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board as mandated by generally accepted auditing standards.
- The auditor will also report on Internal control over financial reporting and compliance with provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and award agreements, noncompliance with which could have a material effect on the financial statements in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*.
- The auditor will assist in preparing the financial statements, notes, and schedules. City staff will prepare the Introductory Section, MD&A and Statistical Section of the ACFR. The Finance Director will review the auditor draft making final report revisions.
- Single Audit. If necessary, the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards and related auditor's report, as well as the reports on compliance and internal controls are to be issued as part of the annual comprehensive financial report.
- The City will send its annual comprehensive financial report to the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada for review in their Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting program. It is anticipated that the auditor will be required to provide special assistance to the City to meet the requirements of that program.
- If the City anticipates preparing one or more official statements in connection with the sale of debt securities which will contain the general purpose financial statements and the auditor's report thereon. The auditor shall be required, if requested by the fiscal advisor and/or the underwriter, to issue a "consent and citation of expertise" as the auditor and any necessary "comfort letters."

CITY OF WASHINGTON TERRACE, UT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL | PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES

- Consult on technical matters that may arise throughout the year while maintaining auditor independence.

II. TERM OF ENGAGEMENT

A. Term

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2024, with the option to extend for four (4) subsequent fiscal years if mutually agreed upon by both parties.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE GOVERNMENT

A. Background & Organization Information

Detailed information on the government, organization and its finances can be found within the City's Annual Comprehensive Financial Report at the Finance & Budget Department at www.washingtonterracecity.com.

B. Financial Software

The financial accounting software used is Caselle. Major software applications used are:

Accounts Payable	Asset Management	Cash Receipting
General Ledger	Payroll	Utility Billing

C. Availability of Prior Years' Reports

Interested proposers who wish to review prior years' Annual Comprehensive Financial Reports including audit reports can visit the Finance & Budget Department on the City's website at www.washingtonterracecity.com.

IV. TIME REQUIREMENTS

A. Proposal Calendar

1. Request for Proposals

Request for proposal issued.....	Friday, March 1, 2024
Due date for proposals.....	Thursday, March 28, 2024

2. Notification and Contract Dates

Selected firm notified by.....	Tuesday, April 30, 2024
Contract date by.....	Friday, May 31, 2024

B. Schedule for the 2024 Fiscal Year Audit

(A similar time schedule will be developed for audits of future fiscal years if the City exercises its option for additional audits).

The following is an estimated timeframe for completion. A firm working timeframe will be negotiated with the auditor.

1. Entrance Conference, Detailed Audit Plan & Negotiated Timeline.....June 2024
The auditor shall meet with appropriate City officials to discuss prior audit problems, interim work to be performed, year-end work to be performed, a detailed audit plan and a negotiated timeline, and other items deemed necessary in preparation of the audit.

2. Fieldwork | Fieldwork Complete October 2024
3. Progress Conference as needed
4. Draft Reports November 2024
Draft of audit report(s) and recommendations available to management for review.
5. Exit Conference with Management November 2024
Summarize the results if the fieldwork and review significant findings.
6. Final Report Due November 2024
7. Final Report Presented to Governing Body December 2024
Summarize the results if the audit

V. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

A. General Requirements

The purpose of the proposal is to demonstrate the qualifications, competence and capacity of the firms seeking to undertake an independent audit of the City of Washington Terrace in conformity with the requirements of this request for proposals. The Proposal should be prepared simply and economically, providing a straightforward, concise description of the proposer's capabilities to satisfy the requirements of the request for proposals.

Proposals must be concise, complete and *organized according to the required sections below*. Executed copies of Appendix items should be included with the proposal.

Failure to adhere to the requirements of this proposal will negatively impact the evaluation score.

B. Required Sections

1. Title Page

Title page showing the request for proposals subject; the firm's name; the name, address, and telephone number of the contact person; and the date of the proposal.

2. Transmittal Letter

A signed letter of transmittal briefly stating the proposer's understanding of the work to be done, the commitment to perform the work within the time period, a statement *why the firm believes itself to be best qualified to perform the engagement* and a statement that the proposal is a firm offer for up to a five-year contract period.

3. **Detailed Proposal** (60 points)

SECTION ONE | Firm Qualifications and Experience

The proposer shall state the size of the firm, the size of the firm's governmental audit staff, the location of the office from which the work on this engagement is to be performed and the number and nature of the professional staff to be employed in this engagement.

The firm shall also provide information on the results of any federal or state desk reviews or field reviews of its audits during the past three (3) years. In addition, the firm shall provide information on the circumstances and status of any disciplinary action taken or pending against the firm during the past three (3) years with state regulatory bodies or professional organizations.

SECTION TWO | Partner, Supervisory and Staff Qualifications and Experience

Identify the principal supervisory and management staff, including engagement partners, managers, other supervisors and specialists, who would be assigned to the engagement. Indicate whether each such person is registered or licensed to practice as a certified public accountant in Utah. Provide information on the government auditing experience of each person, including information on relevant continuing professional education for the past three (3) years and membership in professional organizations relevant to the performance of this audit.

Provide as much information as possible regarding the number, qualifications, experience and training, including relevant continuing professional education, of the specific staff to be assigned to this engagement. Indicate how the quality of staff over the term of the agreement will be assured.

Engagement partners, managers, other supervisory staff and specialists may be changed if those personnel leave the firm, are promoted or are assigned to another office. These personnel may also be changed for other reasons with the express prior written permission of the City. However, in either case, the City retains the right to approve or reject replacements.

Other audit personnel may be changed at the discretion of the proposer provided that replacements have substantially the same or better qualifications or experience.

SECTION THREE | Specific Audit Approach

Submit a general audit work plan to accomplish the scope defined in these guidelines. The audit work plan should demonstrate that the proposer understands the audit requirements and the audit tests and procedures to be applied in completing the audit plan.

SECTION FOUR | References

- Provide the names and contact information for other similar sized clients of the partner or manager that will be assigned to our audit within the last three years.
- Include a copy of your firm's most recent peer review report, the related letter of comments, and the firm's response to the letter of comments. Include a statement whether the review included a review of specific government engagements.
- Identify the three largest governmental clients your firm has lost in the past three years and why.
- Explain an instance when the firm has lost a client due to an unresolved auditing or accounting matter and the process attempted to resolve the issue.

4. **Fee** (40 points)

1. **Total All-Inclusive Maximum Fee**

The bid should contain all pricing information relative to performing the audit engagement as described in this request for proposal. The total all-inclusive maximum price to be bid is to contain all direct and indirect costs including all out-of-pocket expenses.

The cost bid should include the following information:

- a. Maximum annual price for the 2024-2028 (5-year schedule) *financial statement audit* as described herein
- b. Maximum annual price for *single audit* (5-year schedule), if necessary
- c. Describe how you bill for questions on technical matters that may arise throughout the year.

VI. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A. **Evaluation Team**

Proposals submitted will be evaluated by the appropriate city officials including but not limited to members of the governing body and management team.

B. **Review of Proposals**

City officials will use a point formula during the review process to score proposals.

Each member of the review team will first score each proposal by each of the criteria described below, *Evaluation Criteria*. The team will then convene to review and discuss these evaluations and to combine the individual scores to arrive at a composite score for each firm. At this point, firms with an unacceptably low technical score will be eliminated from further consideration.

The maximum score for price will be assigned to the firm offering the lowest total all-inclusive maximum price. Appropriate fractional scores will be assigned to other proposers.

C. Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated using three sets of criteria. Firms meeting the mandatory criteria will have their proposals evaluated and scored for both technical qualifications and price. The following represent the principal selection criteria which will be considered during the evaluation process.

1. Technical Quality: (Maximum Points 60)**a. Expertise and Experience**

- (1) The firm's past experience and performance on comparable government engagements including three (3) contact references. The City reserves the right to conduct an independent evaluation of the firm's experience and performance beyond the references listed.
- (2) The firm's past experience with auditing federal or state financial assistance programs;
- (3) The quality of the firm's professional personnel to be assigned to the engagement and the quality of the firm's management support personnel to be available for technical consultation

b. Audit Approach

- (1) Adequacy of work plan for various segments of the engagement
- (2) The proposer demonstrates an understanding of the audit requirements
- (3) The proposer demonstrates an understanding of the audit tests and procedures to be applied in completing the audit plan.

c. References**2. Price: (Maximum Points 40)**

The maximum score for price will be assigned to the firm offering the lowest total all-inclusive maximum price. Appropriate fractional scores will be assigned to other proposers.

3. General proposal instructions were not met (Point reduction up to -10)**D. Oral Presentations**

During the evaluation process, City officials may, at its discretion, request any one or all firms to make oral presentations. Such presentations will provide firms with an opportunity to answer any questions City officials may have on a firm's proposal. Not all firms may be asked to make such oral presentations.

CITY OF WASHINGTON TERRACE, UT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL | PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES

E. Final Selection

The Washington Terrace governing body will select a firm based upon the recommendation of the evaluation team. Refer to TIME FRAME for selection and contract timeframe.

F. Right to Reject Proposals

Submission of a proposal indicates acceptance by the firm of the conditions contained in this request for proposal unless clearly and specifically noted in the proposal submitted and confirmed in the contract between the City and the firm selected.

The City of Washington Terrace reserves the right without prejudice to reject any or all proposals.

CITY OF WASHINGTON TERRACE, UT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL | PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES

APPENDIX A

PROPOSER GUARANTEES

Ability to Perform

The proposer certifies it can and will provide and make available, as a minimum, all services outlined in this request for proposal.

License to Practice in Utah

The firm and all assigned key professional staff are properly licensed to practice in Utah and will maintain their licensing with the State of Utah during contract period. If key professional staff are not licensed to practice in Utah, provide name and qualifications of key licensed staff member(s) overseeing work performed.

Independence

The firm is independent of the City of Washington Terrace as defined by generally accepted auditing standards/the U.S. Government Accountability Office's *Government Auditing Standards*.

Opinion

The proposer will render the appropriate opinion in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America and in accordance with Government Auditing Standards.

Firm: _____

Signature of Official: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

CITY OF WASHINGTON TERRACE, UT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL | PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES

APPENDIX B

PROPOSER WARRANTIES

- A. Proposer warrants that it is willing and able to obtain an errors and omissions insurance policy providing a prudent amount of coverage for the willful or negligent acts, or omissions of any officers, employees or agents thereof.
- B. Proposer warrants that it will not delegate or subcontract its responsibilities under an agreement without the prior written permission of the City of Washington Terrace.
- C. Proposer warrants that all information provided by it in connection with this proposal is true and accurate.

Firm: _____

Signature of Official: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

CITY OF WASHINGTON TERRACE, UT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL | PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES

APPENDIX C

FEE SUMMARY (40 points)

FOR THE AUDIT OF THE 2024 - 2028 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

COMBINING SCHEDULE

Fiscal Year	Financial Statement All Inclusive Maximum Price	Single Audit All Inclusive Maximum Price
2024	\$ _____	_____
2015	_____	_____
2016	_____	_____
2017	_____	_____
2028	_____	_____

Describe how you bill for questions on technical matters that may arise throughout the year.

Certification

I _____, (Name & Title) hereby certify that I am entitled to represent the firm _____, (Firm Name), empowered to submit this proposal for services, and authorized to sign a contract with the City of Washington Terrace for the services described herein.

City of **WASHINGTON TERRACE** *Utah*

City of Washington Terrace
Redevelopment Agency Meeting
Tuesday, May 7, 2024
following the Regular City Council Meeting
City Hall Council Chambers
5249 South 400 East, Washington Terrace City

1. ROLL CALL

2. INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

3. CONSENT ITEMS

Any point of order or issue regarding items on the Agenda or the order of the agenda need to be addressed here prior to the approval of the agenda.

3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3.2 APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM JANUARY 2, 2024

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 DISCUSSION/MOTION: TENTATIVELY APPROVE THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025

State law requires that the tentative budget be reviewed, considered, and tentatively adopted by the governing body and may be amended or revised prior to its final adoption. A public hearing to consider public comment on the tentative budget will be held on May 21, 2024.

5. COMMENTS CONSIDERED

6. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING: CHAIR ALLEN

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons who have need of special accommodation should contact the City Recorder at 801-395-8283.

**CERTIFICATE OF
POSTING**

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted on the Utah Public Notice Website www.utah.gov/pmn/index, the City Website www.washingtonterracecity.com, and City Hall located at 5249 S 400 East, Washington Terrace. Amy Rodriguez, City Recorder.

City of Washington Terrace
Minutes of a Redevelopment Meeting
Held on January 2, 2024
Following the Regular City Council Meeting
City Hall, 5249 South 400 East, Washington Terrace City, Utah

BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair Mark C. Allen
Board Member Jill Christiansen
Board Member Zunayid Z. Zishan
Board Member Cheryl Parkinson
Vice Chair West
Board Member Michael Thomas
General Planner Tyler Seaman
City Recorder Amy Rodriguez
City Manager Tom Hanson

Others Present-

Steve Jacobson, Matt Roper, Kathleen Craynor, John Craynor, Mike Lawrence, Paul Klema

1. ROLL CALL

2. INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

3. CONSENT ITEMS

3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3.2 APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 5, 2023

Items 3.1 and 3.2 were approved by general consent.

4 SPECIAL ORDER

4.1 PUBLIC HEARING: TO HEAR COMMENT IN SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION REGARDING AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2023-204 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

35 Hanson stated that the amendment to the budget was for the Golden West Credit Union \$1.2
36 million incentive payment due upon the completion of their administrative office building and in
37 accordance with their Development Agreement. The payment amount was approved at the last
38 RDA meeting. The adjustment is to move the incentive amount to the expenditure side.

39 Hanson stated that the second adjustment is in preparation for the sale of the Adams Avenue
40 property. Staff is adjusting expenditures of \$20,000 for incurred appraisal, legal fees, and
41 transactional fees in relation to the sale.

43 Chair Allen opened the public hearing at 8:46 p.m.

45 Steve Jacobson asked what the parking lot behind the property would be used for. Hanson stated
46 that the property behind the library cannot be developed. He stated that the library uses the

47 parking lot for library overflow. Seaman stated that there are some agreements that will need to
48 be made between the new owners and the library.

49 Hanson stated that the intent of the undevelopable property is for it to be “gifted” to the library
50 so that they can continue to maintain the property.

51
52 **Chair Allen closed the public hearing at 8:98 p.m.**

53
54 **5. NEW BUSINESS**

55 **5.1 MOTION/RESOLUTION 24-02: A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE 2023-2024**
56 **FISCAL YEAR BUDGET**

57
58 **Motion by Vice Chair West**

59 **Seconded by Board Member Thomas**

60 **To approve Resolution 24-02 amending the 2023-24 Fiscal Year Budget**

61 **As discussed**

62 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**

63 **Roll Call Vote**

64
65 **6. MOTION: ADJOURN INTO CLOSED SESSION**

66
67 **Motion by Board Member Parkinson**

68 **Seconded by Board Member Christiansen**

69 **To adjourn into Closed Session**

70 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**

71 **Roll Call Vote**

72 **Time: 8:51 p.m.**

73
74 The Board adjourned into closed session to discuss:

75 ○ Strategy sessions to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property
76 when public discussion of the transaction would disclose the appraisal or
77 estimate value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body
78 from completing the transaction on the best possible terms.

79
80
81 **7. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING: CHAIR ALLEN**

82
83 **Motion by Board Member Thomas**

84 **Seconded by Board Member West**

85 **To adjourn the closed session and regular meeting**

86 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**

87 **Time: 9:07 P.M.**

88
89
90
91
92 **Date Approved**

93
94 **City Recorder**