

RICHMOND CITY COUNCIL

NOVEMBER 19, 2013

The regular meeting of the Richmond City Council was held at the Richmond City Office Building located at 6 West Main, Richmond, Utah on Tuesday, November 19, 2013. The meeting began at 7:00 P.M., Mayor Michael Hall was in the chair. The opening remarks were made by Tucker Thatcher.

The following Council members were in attendance: Brad Jensen, Terrie Wierenga, and Tucker Thatcher. Jeff Young joined the meeting at 7:47 P.M., Paul Erickson was excused.

A motion to approve the October 15, 2013 City Council meeting minutes was made by Terrie, seconded by Tucker and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Young, Erickson

BUSINESS LICENSE

STEVEN E. PORTER CONSTRUCTION, LLC

STEVE PORTER: I am a general contractor that builds homes and does other construction type projects.

MAYOR: Didn't you have a license previously?

STEVE: Yes, I let it lapse and need to get it renewed.

BRAD: I know Steve has been building for many years and I have never heard one complaint.

A motion to approve the business license request for Steven E. Porter Construction, LLC (Steve Porter) was made by Tucker, seconded by Brad and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson, Young

CANVASS OF ELECTION RESULTS OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2013 GENERAL ELECTION

JUSTIN: The general election was held in the Richmond City office building on Tuesday, November 5th. I would like to thank Mr. Liebes, Mrs. Abbott and Mrs. Lefgren for their participation as election officials. The voter turnout was 30.4% which is quite high compared to other communities. Mike Hall was elected as Mayor. Brad Jensen and Cheryl Peck were elected for the two Council positions with a four-year term. Tucker Thatcher was elected for the one, two-year Council position. There were 414 regular votes, 14 absentee ballots and 10 provisional ballots. The regular votes are the votes that were placed here at the City office on Election Day during the regular vote. Absentee ballots are those ballots that people request when they are going to be out of town and want to vote by mail. Provisional ballots are those ballots that occur when a person's name does not show up in the voting book. Their residency is verified by the County and records are checked to make sure they are registered and not trying to vote in more than one location. I was surprised to see that 9 of the 10 provisional ballots were accepted. Normally, the approval percentage is closer to 60%. In regards to the school bond proposition, there were 202 votes "For the Issuance of the Bonds" and 226 votes "Against the Issuance of the Bonds". This information was forwarded to Cache County and the School District as Richmond is just one piece of a very large vote on the school bond proposition. The bond did pass by a very small margin. There were 428 total votes accepted and there are 1,404 registered voters in the City. I am not aware of any issues or accusations of fraud with the election and believe the information that is presented to be true and correct.

A motion to accept the election results of the November 5, 2013 Richmond City General Election was made by Terrie, seconded by Tucker and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson, Young

FINANCIAL REPORT

JUSTIN: The accounts were cashed in on the Library donation and the total donation ended up being \$70,703.19. What an incredible gift from the Olsen family. The Fire Department collected \$7,102 in revenue in October of which \$7,059 was from the City response to the Millville fire. Rocky Mountain Power donated \$300 to the Youth Council and those funds have been received. Please see Line Item 3628 (Income – Equipment Rental) in the amount of \$3,487. This is the water and sewer funds paying their portion of the new portable welder. You will see the expense side for the water and sewer later in the financials. Line Item 4485, Streets – Portable Welder, is the total cost of the welder and it was paid for through the General Fund and then the Sewer Fund and Water Fund each paid 1/3 of the cost. There was \$1,294 in interest collected on the remaining water bond funds. See Line Items 5160, Water – Equipment Rental

and Line Item 5260, Sewer – Equipment Rental, this is the water and sewer fund each paying their portion of the portable welder. I have changed how I am accounting for interest. See Line Items 5178, 5182, 5183, and 5186. These are the interest accounts on the outstanding water bonds. In the past, I have showed the total interest paid in the month of the payment or the interest has been accrued on June 30th when applicable. I think it is a more fair representation to accrue the interest on a monthly basis so you will now see interest amounts every month. The water tank bond payment is due by July 1st of each year and all the other water bond payments are due by December 31st of each year. Right now the water tank bonds have a monthly interest cost of \$15,778.13. The amount remaining in the bond fund account is currently \$2,779,536. There is also a new account on the balance sheet, Line Item 1604, Sewer – Construction in Progress, this account is for the work going on at the MBR plant. It will be allocated to the correct account when that project is completed by Nelson Brothers and the other subcontractors. There have been two water and sewer impact fees collected so far in November. One was from Matt Fisher and the other from Neighborhood Non-Profit. I would like to propose a loan payment from the Water Enterprise Fund to the Sewer Enterprise Fund on the loan in the amount of \$8,802.00. The payment would consist of \$6,302.00 in principal and \$2,500.00 in interest.

A motion to approve the transfer of \$8,802.00 from the Water Enterprise Fund Impact Fee Cash Account to the Sewer Enterprise Fund Cash Account consisting of \$6,302.00 in principal and \$2,500.00 for interest for July through November, was made by Terrie, seconded by Brad and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson, Young

JUSTIN: As part of our annual employee compensation we budget for and set aside funds for what we call a Christmas Bonus but in actuality are just part of the budgeted wages. I have a proposed list and have visited with the Mayor in regards to the Maintenance and Office staff and with Julienne regarding the Library staff.

A motion to approve the following as net Christmas bonuses for 2013, was made by Brad, seconded by Terrie and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson, Young

\$500 Ben Lundgreen, Chris Purser, Julienne Parrish, Justin Lewis, Marlowe Adkins, Matthew Funk, Robert Bair, Scott Ball

\$300 Charles Chism, Lyle Bair

\$200 Melissa Titensor

\$150 Jan Gilbert, Tamara Petersen

\$100 Tina Reese, Patricia Forsgren, Misti Dawn Ramirez, Ted Collins, Yumi Collins

\$50 Shaylee Nielsen

MAYOR: In the past, we have given Boyd Lewis \$500 for his help throughout the year on various City items.

JUSTIN: He helps to proof and review the minutes monthly, prepare the annual budget and State of Utah budget documents and help with various other financial projects that come up throughout the year. He is not an employee and I would hope we could offer him the same stipend as we have in the past for his help to the community. He is involved on a monthly basis.

BRAD: A second set of eyes to review the budget is a good thing.

A motion to approve a \$500 stipend for Boyd Lewis for the year 2013 was made by Brad, seconded by Terrie and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson, Young

COMMUNITY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM INFORMATION DISCUSSION

JUSTIN: I would like to pass on some information that I have found while working for Smithfield. They have teamed up with a company named Parlant Technologies. Parlant offers a technology that allows for a City-wide broadcasting system that can instantly send messages via email, text message and voicemail. I have used this system to put out messages in regards to Halloween, the election, winter parking ordinances, etc. It is a very neat system and I just wanted to make sure that the Council was aware of this option as I think it could be a valuable tool for the City. It would especially be useful during emergencies or even times to notify people of broken water lines or chip sealing. There are a couple of options to the system. The City could sign up to allow for just broadcasting messages to residents but there is also an option for a smart phone app that will allow for people to send messages to the City. I think the app could be useful down the road but at this point I would suggest just considering the ability to broadcast messages. I will send each of you a test message from the system so you can see what it looks like. The cost of the program has an initial fee and then moving forward it is just a per household yearly fee. The first year fee including the setup costs would be \$1,865 for just the ability to broadcast information and the option to have a smart phone app would cost a total of \$3,177.50. I would only recommend the software at this time. We don't have this as a budgeted item for this budget year but it is something that I would like the Council to consider for the future.

MAYOR: How much do we spend in extra mailings per year?

TERRIE: We do three or so door to door mailings per year at about \$140.00 per time. There are other systems out there than just Parlant. I have had people asking me if the City was considering this type of communication system. It is a nice system.

TUCKER: I like the map idea, how does the map work?

TERRIE: It works through Google maps and does an overlay of the City.

MAYOR: I think it is something to consider and get some cost estimates.

TERRIE: I know there are at least four other companies that offer this type of service.

JUSTIN: I will send the Council a test message. Other communities have just signed up for the ability to send out shut off notices instantly. I just wanted to make the Council aware of this option if we want to consider it down the road. Also, the initial setup would be somewhat tedious but after it is setup the information flowing in and out of the system would be easy. There are about 750 connections in the City and all of those would need to be entered into the system. They can be entered quite quickly as I enter them on a regular basis and know how fast they can be done. We could do a mailer with the monthly utility bills, Eagle Scouts, CERT or even help of the local church to gather the information and inform the citizens of the new system. If residents don't want to participate that is not a problem either, their account is just deleted from the software system.

MAYOR: Marlowe, please include this on next month's meeting to discuss. We might want to get input from some of the other software suppliers as well.

PUBLIC HEARING RELATIVE TO THE PROPOSED NEW GENERAL PLAN FOR RICHMOND CITY.

A motion to close the regular Council meeting and open the public hearing at 7:35 P.M. was made by Terrie, seconded by Tucker and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson, Young

MAYOR: This public hearing is to obtain public input on the new proposed General Plan.

TERRIE: The plan has been worked on for the last two and a half years or so and the most current version is on the website for review.

MAYOR: Paul has overseen this project from the Council side as well as input from Tucker and the Planning Commission. Cindy Gooch from J-U-B has been instrumental in this process as

well. The proposed plan was displayed at Black & White Days and during the City party. It has been viewable by the public for quite a while. The Planning Commission held a public hearing as well and did get a little bit of resident input.

BRAD: I know that the concern of the citizen was regarding a proposed park on the west side of town.

MAYOR: We can discuss that concern during the regular Council meeting.

****There was not any input from the public.****

****A motion to close the public hearing and reopen the regular Council meeting at 7:38 P.M. was made by Terrie, seconded by Brad and the vote was unanimous.****

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson, Young

BRAD: If you look at the future land use map the concern by the resident is that there is a proposed park on the west boundary of the City where she currently has a cattle feed yard. I understand her concern. I also understand why we included the potential for a park there. I want to discuss the actual possibility of development down there because of the ground and sewer issues. If the area is undevelopable then I think we should remove the proposed park from that area.

TUCKER: There would be a very low chance of development down there.

BRAD: I understand the plan will be reviewed again in the next 10 years but if there is not a probability of the park going in then let's remove it. This proposed park is on the far west side of town.

TUCKER: The same could be said for the proposed park on the south end of town as well.

DAREK: The committee just identified where parks may be needed in the community in the future. They are just represented by a cloud and not specifically on one person's property. As the City grows there is more of a need for new parks. The cloud for these parks actually goes off the current boundaries of the City. The proposed parks are more of a reminder for people to consider down the road as development occurs.

BRAD: I understand the cloud concept but the probability of a park below 500 West 200 South where that is an industrial area with a cattle feed yard and the sewer is below grade makes for a park in the area very unlikely.

MAYOR: The cloud in that area could be removed or made smaller.

BRAD: If we don't remove it then it needs to be moved to the north. This park area would be a long ways down the road before it would be considered.

DAREK: We could also move it a little bit to the east as well.

BRAD: Yes, we could.

DAREK: We can put the park cloud wherever you want.

TERRIE: I would suggest moving closer to Highway 91 and making the cloud narrower.

DAREK: We can make it ¼ of the proposed size and center it in the area by the highway.

BRAD: That is a good idea.

DAREK: The cloud is just a reminder to the Planning & Zoning Commission to consider park and trail type areas in the future. The intent of each cloud is just a reminder.

TUCKER: I joined the committee later on but I know that was the intent as well.

MAYOR: I have no problem shrinking and sliding the west park. I would like to still keep the original committee thought process in place. Let's move the west park to the east and cut it down in size. The plan would be to adopt this plan at the December Council meeting with the noted changes.

JUSTIN: Can Darek update the map and send it via email before the meeting?

DAREK: Yes.

MARLOWE: The new General Plan will be passed by Resolution and not Ordinance.

MAYOR: Terrie currently has the plan on the website and can change the map when it is received. The Council can make suggestions and tweak the revised map, as needed, before the December Council meeting.

CONTINUED REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMPACT FEES FOR WATER AND SEWER IN RICHMOND FOR THE FORTHCOMING FIVE YEARS.

MAYOR: This is a continuation of our previous discussion on setting impact fees for the next five years.

EMILY SIM: The wastewater appendix you are looking at is wrong as the links in my system did not transfer correctly. There have been a number of changes since our last discussion. Let's talk about the water impact fee first. Table 1, on Page 6, has changed a lot since the last time we visited. It now includes all the numbers from the new water system projects. I need to verify some of the 1993 project information with Darek to make sure it is correct. Does one of the water tanks no longer have any capacity?

DAREK: The main street tank was part of the 1993 projects.

****Council Member Jeff Young arrived at 7:47 P.M.****

EMILY: We would need to remove the cost of the old tank from this project.

DAREK: I thought I summarized all of that in an email to you but will double check.

EMILY: Right now the top part of the table has not changed. The bottom section of the table shows all the projects that are currently underway. The costs that are listed are the cost that is attributable to new development. That information is based on your existing connections. I have been using the numbers Darek supplied me for new growth. The total present value of the projects underway is \$2,967,100. The number at the bottom of this report will change based on the correct number of ERC's.

DAREK: I thought I sent you the information on the tank and will double check. The number of ERC's is going to be in that range, right around 1,200. I can dial that number in better. I was late in getting some of the information to Emily as it has been quite challenging over the last week and a half to come up with defensible numbers. We are really close.

EMILY: The total cost right now per ERC is \$5,359 and that number could go up or down. It will change but it should not change a lot.

DAREK: I don't expect much of a change, the present value of the old tank is minimal.

BRAD: So we are talking the total ERC's over the life of the project?

EMILY: Yes.

DAREK: We know how many ERC's the tank will hold.

BRAD: Are the numbers based on the current growth rate?

EMILY: The original analysis showed 3.5% but your current growth rate is much lower than that. Page 7, shows the plan improvements which include the engineering and cost of the impact fee analysis. The assumption is that the life of the plan is 10 years. The life of the impact fee analysis is six years. The number of connections in 10 years is using the current growth rate of 0.4% which came from the average of 6.2 connections per year over the last several years. I don't find anything wrong with this fee. If the growth rate explodes you might want to consider having the analysis redone.

BRAD: If growth increased for two or three years then we could use a different time period average?

EMILY: Yes. You could use the numbers based over seven or eight years.

TERRIE: Why the difference in the ERC's from table to table?

EMILY: The 1,296 versus the 1,603 is using the growth rate of 0.4% over the next 20 years. The number 1,603 comes from the growth out to the year 2023 not 2033. Different parts of the plan are applicable to different people such as the current number versus the future number.

Page 9, shows the debt service schedule. The number of ERC's changes yearly based on projected growth and we used 0.4%.

BRAD: These are the current connections?

EMILY: The current connections plus growth. People are issued a credit each month on the debt that they pay.

DAREK: A fee cannot be charged to pay the debt and then charge an impact fee as well. The 1,546 number does not mean the number of homes, some of the higher water users like the schools are more than one ERC.

EMILY: Table 4 is the calculation of the fee. The cost per ERC, \$5,359, plus the planned improvement costs, \$195, less the debt service credit, \$1,614 comes up with a fee of \$3,940. This number could change based on the changes to Table 1.

JUSTIN: Just to clarify, the City could charge up to \$3,940 for the water impact fee but not above it?

EMILY: Yes.

DAREK: The first draft copy was at a fee of \$2,864 but with more accurate numbers it is now at \$3,940.

EMILY: It is less than your current charge.

BRAD: Emily, I need you to think about a question for me. If we have a new project that is 100% new growth and we don't want the existing residents to pay for the project how do we make sure only new residents pay for it and old residents don't?

DAREK: Something to discuss after we go through the sewer portion of the analysis.

BRAD: Proportionately, the impact fees don't pay that much on the debt.

EMILY: I have updated the ERC's in Table 5. The water treatment plant is used through 2027 for a 20 year growth from 2007. I have used the sewer collection information that Marlowe located, after much research.

TERRIE: I am still hung up on the ERC's not matching.

DAREK: It is a great question. Take the wastewater from Pepperidge Farms, they use the wastewater system but not the water system. They are a big user so they would be much more than one ERC. Plus there is the outdoor use of water that does not go into the system. There are some assumptions in the model based on peaking factors. The water and sewer analysis won't have the exact same numbers. I noticed it as well when reviewing the information. Also, there is a big water user on the south end of town that uses a lot of water but does not discharge all of their wastewater into the system.

EMILY: In Darek's memo, they looked at dividing the City into a north and south area for the sewer. The north area currently has 638 ERC's and can accommodate an additional 150. The south area has 1,006 ERC's with a current excess of 90. More growth is projected on the north end than the south end. In fact, almost all of the growth is projected north. Table 5 shows the existing improvements and is figured based on remaining capacity. The system can still serve the north and south as stated.

DAREK: Originally, we looked at the system as a whole but the Council asked if we could break it up so we considered four pieces. It is a better fit to have just a north and a south area. There is limited capacity in each system. Do you want to combine the system into one?

EMILY: It looks like the collection system can serve the remaining number of ERC's.

DAREK: Yes, there is room in the north for 150 and in the south for 90 additional. At that point we run out of capacity.

TERRIE: What is the dividing line?

DAREK: It is kind of a line from 200 South to Main Street. It is not divided by a road and is not a straight line. It is based on the piping in the ground and where the connections are.

MAYOR: The south trunk line crosses the highway down by Big J's and the north trunk line is out by White Pine Middle School and goes down past Harris Dairyland.

SCOTT: It all ties in together at 800 West.

EMILY: There is not a west service area?

DAREK: Sorry, that is just a typo. There is only a north and south area.

EMILY: Table 6 shows the plan improvements and all of them were removed except for a project at 150 North 600 West with an estimated cost of \$194,000. The engineering and impact fee analysis costs were included as well.

DAREK: On Page 11, the middle paragraph shows we still have 150 home equivalent units' left on the north side.

MAYOR: The current number of ERC's includes the approved lots in the subdivisions even that have not been built on?

JEFF: That is what I recall.

DAREK: I will double check. At 150 additional homes the line has a problem. That is not very far off ERC wise. We can include the cost of the project to upsize the line for future growth that is the project with the estimated cost of \$194,000.

JEFF: What does that add to the system in additional ERC's with that project completed? I would like to look at it right now. I don't want to dump this project on someone else later.

DAREK: The upsize project is to take out the build out of the north end of the City and it would add sufficient capacity.

TUCKER: The general plan shows the majority of the growth to the north.

DAREK: We can only charge for existing excess and what you are stating would require home number 151 to pay for the upsize of the line. What if that was only one home?

JEFF: That is my concern, the trend is slow growth and just a few subdivisions.

MARLOWE: The Gibbons subdivision will require a lift station.

DAREK: We have to commit to installing that line if it is included in the plan.

BRAD: We won't hit that number of 150 in the next six years. How do we accommodate for new development? The new growth should pay for the growth not the existing.

EMILY: The City fronts the money and it is paid back one home at a time.

DAREK: It is just like a water line.

BRAD: The way we currently have planned is where the impact fees buy up the excess capacity.

EMILY: If you are not going to do this project your impact fees will drop dramatically on the north area. Table 8 shows a north and a south impact fee.

DAREK: Ninety homes on the south end is a long ways out.

BRAD: The developer could be made to pay for the improvements.

DAREK: The Council has to be aware if we are going to be out of ERC's.

JEFF: I have thought about it and I think we have adequately done our part to bring the system forward. I am okay with the next group of Council members dealing with this issue.

DAREK: I agree with Council member Young.

MAYOR: I like the six year plan.

JUSTIN: Does the current number of ERC's include all of the homes not built in Cherry Creek Heights P.U.D. for phases four through seven?

DAREK: I need to double check, there is a limit on the sewer system. We are in really good shape on the water system for another 20 years. There are sewer collection limitations.

BRAD: It is good to know about future use and expansion.

DAREK: Master plans are worth their price ten-fold.

BRAD: I plan on being here and don't want to pay for new growth just as the same as the residents that were here in 1972 don't want to pay for sewer upgrades. Development or growth needs to be paid for by the new growth.

EMILY: There are two ways to pay for growth. The developer can pay for everything. Parks are paid for by developers in other communities. The other route is impact fees and the City recoups the cost over time. The problem with the first scenario is that the City plans for more than the developer needs to pay for. The City would pay for the developer to oversize the pipe put in the ground. The problem with impact fees is that it is slowly collected over time. We try and account for that by using the present value. The cost of the MBR plant was 3.316 million but the present day value is 4.2 million. Most cities use both methods. The sewer plant cannot be paid for by a developer as a development cost. Are you repaying back to the City enough in impact fees? If you are not charging the maximum fee then you are subsidizing new growth. I figure out the maximum amount that can be charged.

DAREK: Seventy percent of the new tank project is for new growth.

EMILY: Payback through impact fees is slow. Impact fees should increase yearly.

BRAD: It is a lot easier to pay for a project with 3,500 hookups than 750 hookups.

EMILY: The MBR plant is included in the analysis as long as it is used which maybe even thirty to forty years down the road.

BRAD: Thanks for coming in and explaining this analysis, it is what it is.

EMILY: Do you want to include the \$194,000 project?

MAYOR: I think we should remove it.

JEFF: I agree.

EMILY: That would change the fees in Table 8 on the north side to be about the same as the south. Do you still want to include a north and south area?

DAREK: I don't mind the same fee but still would split the system.

EMILY: The fees would be about the same for the north and the south with the project removed.

MARLOWE: When people are calling to ask about the fees we need to know where they are building to determine if they are in the north or the south area?

BRAD: The water impact fee would be the same, the sewer impact fee would be slightly different.

MARLOWE: I will need a very detailed map.

BRAD: Can we re-plumb the sewer lines and combine the north and the south?

DAREK: You would need to weigh the cost to do that versus the benefit of doing it. We can easily supply a map for Marlowe, Chris and the Council.

MARLOWE: We need to be able to quote people correctly.

EMILY: How can you increase the wastewater fee? See Table 5. The MBR plant is included and there is a 20 year life for the plant. The current number of ERC's is 1,644 and the table estimate is showing 1,738 with growth factored in. That is 96 different, does that pass the sniff test?

BRAD: The MBR plant is only at about 50% of capacity right now.

SCOTT: I agree, it is at about half right now.

EMILY: The maximum build out is 1,738.

DAREK: Right now it is at about half but you need to keep in mind that Lower's may discharge to the City which would take up a significant amount of the excess capacity.

JEFF: Is this based off of peak capacity?

EMILY: Yes, it has to be done off of peak numbers.

DAREK: In the master plan we have two scenarios. One is where we receive discharge from the food processor and the other scenario is without receiving discharge from the food processor.

BRAD: Fifty percent of the plant capacity cannot be for one user.

EMILY: That is something we need to review. J-U-B did not do the engineering on that plant. We need to know the number of ERC's it is designed to serve. We must use peak capacity information.

JUSTIN: Could we include the property purchased from Zan Harris for future sewer projects?

EMILY: Yes, property could be included since it has over a 20 year life.

MARLOWE: We spent \$250,000 several years ago on improvements and they did not work.

EMILY: I don't see the lagoons in the information that we have.

TERRIE: I will check through our history to see if I have any of the old information.

EMILY: One problem we have is the lack of costs of the original system.

JUSTIN: I will get you the information on the land purchase, date, cost, etc.

DAREK: We have received some good answers tonight.

MAYOR: We will discuss again at the December 17th Council meeting and then finalize in January at the Council meeting on the 21st.

REPORT ON NEW WELL PROJECT BY CHERRY CREEK TANK WITH A DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE DECISION RELATIVE TO A CONDITIONAL AWARD OF THE PROJECT DRILLER.

DAREK: The bids were opened two weeks ago. This project is for drilling the well only. There were seven project plan holders and five potential bidders. Only two companies ended up bidding the project, Hydro Resources and Boart Longyear. The bid from Hydro Resources is in the amount of \$661,464 and the bid from Boart Longyear is in the amount of \$449,959. I am waiting on the final approval of the construction plans from the State of Utah.

MAYOR: Can we make a motion to accept the bid pending the approval by the State of Utah?

DAREK: Yes, the contractor is aware of this possibility as well. If the state changes something in the plans then we can address that with the contractor at that point.

MAYOR: I would suggest we award the contract to Boart Longyear with a pending approval.

A motion to award the Cherry Creek Production Well Drilling Project to Boart Longyear in the amount of \$449,959.00 conditional upon the approval of the construction plans by the State of Utah was made by Brad, seconded by Terrie and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Young, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson

BUSINESS LICENSE

YTECH

JEFF YOUNG: I do some IT, audio and video work with some local cities. I have a current City business license with another company of mine and this company has grown enough it is time to split it into a new company. I will be abstaining from any vote as I am the owner of the company.

A motion to approve the business license request for YTECH (Jeff Young) was made by Brad, seconded by Tucker and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Abstain: Young

Absent: Erickson

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF A CITY MAINTENANCE CONTRACT WITH POSSIBLE DECISION.

MAYOR: This is a continued discussion regarding an independent contractor agreement for the ground and building maintenance for the City. This is a joint agreement with the cemetery district as the contractor will take care of the cemetery as well. Attachment "A" and "B" have been included for your review. Attachment "B" is in regards to the cemetery and just a reference sheet for the Council to understand what the contractor will be doing at the cemetery. The City will be in charge of the contract and how the contract is regulated. I think it would be good for the contractor to meet with the City in June and November of each year to get an update on how things are going. The contract can be tweaked as needed.

JUSTIN: The Cemetery Board approved the contract at their October 7th meeting.

JEFF: The idea behind the contract is to save the City money and try something new and hopefully more efficient in the parks and cemetery. It is hard trying to find the right balance in both areas. I would like to try the approach of going to a contract pay. Attachment "A" is what we expect to get done by the contractor. The contract will be for these services and we cannot keep adding additional services to this list. The contractor is well aware that more time will be required during Black & White Days week and for the City party. Outside of the items listed in the attachment our Maintenance Shop will take care of stuff. Scott Ball has reviewed it and will be involved in the six month interviews as well. Scott will also be overseeing the maintenance and repair of the equipment that the contractor uses. I would like Scott's and the Council's input of any changes they think should be made. I don't have any disagreement with what is being presented.

BRAD: I would like to discuss the maintenance of the park strips on the highway. I have reservations of turning them over to the contractor. I think that is more of a street or Maintenance shop item.

JUSTIN: I can easily remove or modify any of the bullet points in the attachment.

JEFF: I agree with that. We have not asked the parks workers to maintain the park strips on the highway in the past. Also, we have not asked them to mow the weeds around signs and on the sides of roads either.

BRAD: I would like the park strips removed from Attachment "A". Also, I am sure the contractor knows this but the garbage cans need to be put back within a timely manner after they are dumped as well.

JEFF: In the past, the garbage cans have been put out the evening before the garbage is collected and put back into place in the afternoon of the day after, at the latest.

BRAD: I would like to see the pavilions included in the attachment as well. Just general items like sweeping and light bulb replacement.

JEFF: I need to come up with a checklist of things they need to do and can check off.

TERRIE: I have a previous checklist that I will resend to you.

BRAD: The playground area at the park cannot be ignored as well as the tennis courts.

JUSTIN: I will add those items to the attachment.

BRAD: The bathrooms need to be stocked on a regular basis as well.

JEFF: We need to address when and how often they are cleaned. Right now is the busy time for the building rentals. I need to get a mop and other stuff that is needed as well. People need to be able to mop and clean the floor in the Community Building when they are done. There is not any access to a vacuum either. People are willing to clean up but don't have the necessary items needed to clean properly.

TERRIE: We don't have a mop and mop bucket?

JEFF: I rented the building three weeks ago and there was nothing that I could find to clean up with.

MAYOR: We need to get all of those items and store them.

MARLOWE: We need to get the little maintenance closet organized.

MAYOR: There is lots of stuff in that closet.

JEFF: We need to come up with a checklist for when someone rents the building of what is expected after they are done and ready to leave.

TERRIE: It is on the rental contract but I think a laminated sheet would be good as well.

MARLOWE: We are having some communication problems. There was only one garbage bag left when I checked. I need to know when we are running low on supplies. I will get more keys to the locked steel cabinet in the little maintenance room as well. I have not had any feedback from the Collins.

JEFF: I am sure it was because they did not know who to notify.

SCOTT: They were told to let someone know when things got low.

MARLOWE: The restrooms are not to be cleaned by the renters!

CHERYL PECK: What if someone has a bloody nose or something?

MARLOWE: We are making the renter liable for the health issues.

MAYOR: We can post something about not cleaning the restrooms and a contact number if there is a major problem or issue. Does anyone have issues with the contract at this point?

JEFF: I need to let Ted and Yumi review it after it is approved. They did not want to see the contract until it was finalized by both parties.

A motion to approve the maintenance contract with Ted and Yumi Collins, the Richmond City Cemetery Maintenance District and Richmond City Corporation for the period of December 1, 2013 through November 30, 2014 was made by Terrie, seconded by Jeff and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Young, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS

TERRIE: I am sure you have all noticed that things are different in front of the City office building. Two of the three trees in front of the library were full of disease and needed to come down. The library decided to take all three down. Myself, Jeff, the Mayor and Justin discussed the one in front of the City office building and it is diseased and needs to come down as well. All four trees from the Library to the City Office will be removed and have the stumps ground. The new trees that will be installed are 4" caliper Parkway Maples. There is a sale on them right now and this is a great time to plant them.

JUSTIN: We are removing four trees and installing six trees. For reference, if you are in Hyrum City, they have put in 100 to 125 Parkway Maples in the last ten years or so.

TERRIE: It will look really nice for the Library's 100 year anniversary next October. The City cashed in the stocks on the Library donation and what started out as \$60,000, ended up with \$70,703 being collected. The work on the building has started and the new windows and front door have been installed. Work is being done on the back entrance to seal it off. A drain will be installed as well as a new roof on the north side of the building. The new drain will take care of the water infiltration issue. New wood was put in where it needed to be when the windows were replaced and some foam was used to fill in the gaps. The original windows were installed in 1914 and not all of them were the same size. To cover up the window areas, Western Construction has given us a bid for \$5,199 for all of the wood trim and installation on the inside of the windows. The wood will be bought, planed and stained to match the interior.

JEFF: That is a pretty creative idea to make everything look the same.

MAYOR: I agree, let's do it right.

TERRIE: The work that has been authorized so far for, replacing the windows, repairing the roof, installing the new door, etc. has a cost of \$48,433 to that point. There are still enough funds to accommodate the extra cost of the wood trim. Replacing the carpet is very high on their list as well.

BRAD: Was solid surface considered for the flooring?

TERRIE: The concern is the sound echoing. We prefer to keep the carpet. The current carpet is 27 years old. We are going to see if there are any rebates with Questar on the windows. One of our new Library Board members, Sharik Peck Jr., is getting married and will be leaving the community. We need to replace him in December and I have a person that has an interest in serving, Adrienne Larson.

A motion to appoint Adrienne Larson to the Richmond City Library Board was made by Jeff, seconded by Terrie, and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Young, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson

TERRIE: We have not had a CERT meeting for a couple of months. There was a good turnout for the training session at the airport. There were seven people from Richmond that attended where most other cities only had two. The EMT's are going along well and there have not been a whole lot of calls which is good for the community. The Harvest Market was quite successful for the year but there was a decrease in attendance the last couple of months.

MAYOR'S REPORT

MAYOR: There is a letter from Rocky Mountain Power regarding their \$300 donation to the Youth Council. Marlowe, please send them a thank you letter. The Veteran's Day dinner went well, the City provided the use of the building. I think things went well as there were 35 to 40 in attendance. Dave Johnson helped with the food. It was a fun activity. They left the building in good condition. You each have a copy of the planning commission meeting minutes from October and November. The October minutes have been approved. Last year, Morley Cox, donated 19.9 shares to the City and the City purchased one share for \$4,000. He has done this agreement because of some tax planning on his part. He has agreed to do the same agreement again this year and it needs to be completed by the end of 2013. The application has been filed with the state but we do need approval from the Council. This year he would be donating 19.99 shares and the City would purchase one share for \$4,000. There is a chance this same agreement could happen again in 2014 as well.

A motion to approve the purchase of one (1) water share for \$4,000.00 and accept 19.99 shares as a donation to the City from Mr. Morley Cox was made by Jeff, seconded by Tucker and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Young, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson

MARLOWE: I will contact Morley and Bruce Jorgensen to get the necessary paperwork completed.

MAYOR: Jim Malouf has some land west of town and he is possibly considering donating it to the City. I am not sure if it will ever happen. Jim wants to know if it is something we would be willing to discuss but there has not been anything official to this point and right now the I mention it just for informational purposes. We would have to discuss the possible liability of the property if or when the time comes. This is the property that borders the Nixon annexation property to the north. The next Council meeting will be on December 17th. The City employee Christmas party will be on January 10th at the Coppermill. The County is seeking names of people in each community to help with the municipal fair booths next year. There were only five booths this year. The County is pleading for cities to get involved. Any suggestions for people in the City to help with this?

TERRIE: Rhonda Imlay and Stephanie Tanner, they did a great job with the City parade float.

MAYOR: Please approach them and see if they have an interest.

JUSTIN: It could possibly be a good youth Council project as well.

A motion to pay the following bills was made by Jeff, seconded by Brad and the vote was unanimous.

Aflac	178.38
Agri-service	21.35
Allen Rock	749.28
Altius	1686.37
Angela Fannesbeck	35.00
Bear River Health	100.00
Bennetts Glass	21341.00
Bridgerland	105.00
Cache Co. Treasurer	777.67
Cache Service Area	16202.70
Cache Valley Publishing	26.27
Century Link	234.27
Chemtech Ford	628.00
Coats	108.35
Coca Cola	142.02
Comcast	435.58

Denny's	85.98
Deputy Barsuhn	25.00
Ecosystems	741.50
Fastenal	109.77
Galls	167.36
Halls Store	69.87
Harris	2111.29
Hobbs Turf Farm	20.40
IPACO	15.20
Itty Bitty	1428.53
John Nielsen Masonry	350.00
KVA Electric	450.00
Lee's	8.67
Les Olson Company	5858.58
Les Smith Construction	767.00
Lewiston City	29.25
Lowers	34.42
Maverik (Cemetery)	400.95
Maverik (City)	646.83
Micromarketing	55.49
NAPA	150.45
NAPA Communications	43.99
Nextel	158.37
Oldcastle	659.1
Olson & Hoggan	4203.25
Parsons	710.50
Peck Bro Const	1268.33
PEHP	94.40
Pitcher Propane	651.14
Questar	1498.42
Remote Control	690.00
Renegade Rentals	688.48
Richmond Irrigation	244.20
Rocky Mtn Power	19425.57
Smithfield Imp	198.14
Standard Plumbing	33.96
Staples	95.80
Suzie Barrett	138.80
The Book Table	59.94
The Herald Journal	171.80
The Home Depot	13.77
Tob Job Asphalt	7552.50
Treewise	1300.00

UEN	82.18
United Rentals	1718.55
Utah Local Government Trust	147.43
Utah LTAP	50.00
UVU	125.00
Verizon	305.50
Visa (City)	793.20
Visa (Library)	310.10
Wex Bank	119.50
Wheeler	93.00
Xerox	530.41
Ytech	2400.00

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Young, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson

A motion to adjourn was made by Jeff, seconded by Brad and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Jensen, Wierenga, Young, Thatcher

No Vote: None

Absent: Erickson

Adjournment at 9:26 P.M.

RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION

Michael E. Hall, Mayor

ATTEST:

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder