

CITY COUNCIL MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

Notice is given that the Farmington City Council will hold a regular meeting on **Tuesday, July 2, 2024** at City Hall 160 South Main, Farmington, Utah. A work session will be held at 6:00 pm in Conference Room 3 followed by the regular session at 7:00 pm in the Council Chambers. The link to listen to the regular meeting live and to comment electronically can be found on the Farmington City website www.farmington.utah.gov. If you wish to email a comment for any of the listed public hearings, you may do so to dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov

WORK SESSION - 6:00 p.m.

- Communities That Care Presentation
- Discussion of South East Corner of Burke Lane & Innovator Drive potential use

REGULAR SESSION - 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

- Invocation - Scott Isaacson, Councilmember
- Pledge of Allegiance - Brett Anderson, Mayor

PRESENTATION

- Paul & KayLynn White as Festival Days Parade Grand Marshals

PUBLIC HEARING:

- Consideration for additional text and changes to Title 12, Subdivision Regulations. [pg 3](#)

Minute motion adjourning to the Redevelopment Agency meeting. (See RDA Agenda)

Minute motion to reconvene the City Council Meeting

BUSINESS:

- Consideration of Additional Text and Amendments regarding Recreational Pools and Tennis Courts. [pg 10](#)
- Consider Approval of Minutes for 06-18-24 [pg 14](#)

GOVERNING BODY REPORTS:

- City Manager Report
- Mayor Anderson & City Council Reports

ADJOURN

CLOSED SESSION - Minute motion adjourning to closed session, for reasons permitted by law.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations due to a disability, please contact DeAnn Carlile, City recorder at 801-939-9206 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

I hereby certify that I posted a copy of the foregoing Notice and Agenda at Farmington City Hall, Farmington City website www.farmington.utah.gov and the Utah Public Notice website at www.utah.gov/pmn. Posted on June 27, 2024

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA TITLE: Consideration for additional text and changes to Title 12, Subdivision Regulations, designating the land use authority over Subdivision Plat Amendments

PRESENTED BY: Lyle Gibson

DEPARTMENT: Community Development

MEETING DATE: July 2, 2024

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Lyle Gibson – Assistant Community Development Director
Date: 7/02/2024
Subject: Consideration for additional text and changes to Title 12, Subdivision Regulations, designating the land use authority over Subdivision Plat Amendments. (ZT-9-24).

RECOMMENDED MOTION

Move that the City Council approve the proposed changes to Title 12, Subdivision Regulations.

Findings:

1. The following findings are restated within the enabling ordinance:
 - a. The proposed changes clarify which responsibilities remain with city staff within the Chapter that originally stated within its purpose that the processes within were administrative processes which would be approved by the zoning administrator.
 - b. Enabling the Planning Commission to review subdivision plat amendments will allow for additional oversight in a public format for the separation of ownership of detached accessory dwellings or other simple conventional lots splits which comply with ordinance requirements.
 - c. The City Council will remain the authority over amendment proposals where changes to easements or rights of way which are generally owned by the City are considered.

BACKGROUND

In consideration of a changes to the ordinance which would allow for potential ownership of detached accessory dwelling units, city staff has been reviewing process and is proposing changes to the Subdivision Plat Amendment approval process to more appropriate facilitate this pending consideration and other common requests.

The ordinance designates authority for dealing with Subdivision Plat Amendments which to date has not been identified within Farmington City Code. The city has simply followed process identified by the state and without having designated otherwise, has defaulted the authority to the City Council in all cases where a Subdivision Plat is amended. The proposed ordinance designates authority to city staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council differently depending on what is being proposed.

Respectfully submitted,



Lyle Gibson
Assistant Community Development Director

Review and concur,



Brigham Mellor
City Manager

Supplemental Information

- a. Enabling Ordinance

**FARMINGTON CITY, UTAH
ORDINANCE NO. 2024 -**

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 11-12, SUBDIVISIONS, UPDATING THE PROCESS BY WHICH SUBDIVISION PLAT AMENDMENTS ARE CONSIDERED. (ZT-9-24)

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has held a public hearing in which the text changes proposed for Title 12 were reviewed and has recommended that this ordinance be approved by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Farmington City Council has also held a public meeting pursuant to notice and as required by law and deems it to be in the best interest of the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Farmington to make the changes proposed; and

WHEREAS, the proposed changes clarify which responsibilities remain with city staff within the Chapter that originally stated within its purpose that the processes within were administrative processes which would be approved by the zoning administrator; and

WHEREAS, enabling the Planning Commission to review subdivision plat amendments will allow for additional oversight in a public format for the separation of ownership of detached accessory dwellings or other simple conventional lots splits which comply with ordinance requirements; and

WHEREAS, the City Council will remain the authority over amendment proposals where changes to easements or rights of way which are generally owned by the City are considered;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF FARMINGTON CITY, STATE OF UTAH:

Section 1. Amendment. Section Chapter 12-7 of the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance is amended in as shown in Exhibit “A”

Section 2. Severability. If any provision of this ordinance is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder shall not be affected thereby.

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon publication or posting or 30 days after passage by the City Council, whichever comes first.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Farmington City, State of Utah, on this 2nd day of July, 2024.

FARMINGTON CITY

ATTEST:

Brett Anderson, Mayor

DeAnn Carlile, City Recorder

EXHIBIT A

CHAPTER 7

LOT CONSOLIDATION, BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT, AND PLAT AMENDMENTS

12-7-010: PURPOSE:

This chapter is intended to outline the process by which~~allow~~ the consolidation of lots or adjustments of boundaries ~~on-between~~ lots within the city ~~through-is permitted~~an administrative process approved by the zoning administrator.

12-7-020: WHEN PERMITTED:

A. Lot Consolidation: Two (2) abutting lots located within the same platted subdivision may be consolidated into a single lot if they share a common boundary and a common owner.

Likewise, two (2) abutting metes and bounds parcels may be consolidated into a single lot if they share a common boundary and a common owner. The zoning administrator shall act as the Land Use Authority when considering a Lot Consolidation.

B. Boundary Adjustment: Two (2) abutting lots or parcels within the city may have their boundary adjusted if they share a common boundary and consent of both property owners is established by the applicant. The zoning administrator shall act as the Land Use Authority when considering a Boundary Adjustment.

C. Plat Amendment: The removal or adjustment of a platted shared common boundary between 2 or more abutting lots which is to be reflected on the records of the county.

i. This process shall be required when changes to 1 or more lots within a platted subdivision are desired which would impact common areas, streets or right-of-ways, pre-established easements or which create any additional lots.

12-7-030: PROPERTY BOUNDARY UNAFFECTED:

A. Unless otherwise provided by Utah or Davis County law, lot consolidation and boundary adjustments under this chapter that are made to platted lots shall not have the effect of adjusting any property boundary in the records of the county.

B. The application shall provide a notice to an applicant that property boundaries for platted lots are not affected by lot consolidation or boundary adjustments, which may impact the owner's ability to construct improvements on the adjusted lots.

12-7-040: APPLICATIONS:

A. An applicant wishing to either combine two (2) lots, or to adjust a boundary between two lots or parcels, shall submit an application to the city planner on a form approved by the city. The application shall provide proof of ownership of both lots. At the time the application is submitted, the applicant shall pay the required application fee, as set forth in the city's consolidated fee schedule.

B. For boundary adjustments, the application must be accompanied by a survey and legal descriptions of the parcels with adjusted boundaries. The applicant shall also present proof of ownership for properties, with an executed and notarized consent to the boundary adjustment for each property.

12-7-050: REVIEW:

The city planner shall review the application for completeness, which review shall not exceed thirty (30) days. The applicant shall be notified as soon as practicable if the application is not accompanied by the required documentation. At the conclusion of the review period, the zoning administrator shall render a decision on the application.

12-7-060: LOT CONSOLIDATION RESTRICTIONS:

A lot consolidation under this chapter shall not:

- A. Combine two (2) lots that do not share a common boundary line;
- B. Combine two (2) lots that are platted on different subdivision plats;
- C. Extinguish or modify any easements of record; or
- D. Create any new lots.

12-7-070: BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT RESTRICTIONS:

A boundary adjustment under this chapter shall not:

- A. Completely eliminate a lot;
- B. Result in a lot that does not conform to zoning or lot regulations of the city;
- C. Extinguish or modify any easements of record; or
- D. Create any new lots.

12-7-080: STATEMENT OF APPROVAL:

A. Upon approval of the application, the applicant shall submit to the city such proposed deeds or records that will accomplish the lot combination or boundary adjustment.

B. The ~~C~~city ~~p~~Planner shall review such submissions to assure they conform to the representations made in the application, and submit it to the zoning administrator for approval.

C. Upon approval, the zoning administrator shall sign a statement to be attached to the deeds reflecting the city's approval of the ~~L~~ot ~~c~~ombination-Consolidation or ~~b~~oundary-Boundary adjustmentAdjustment.

12-7-090: PLAT AMENDMENTS:

A. —A.—Administrative Review Process: The zoning administrator shall act as the Land Use Authority for applications for a Subdivision Plat Amendment for the purpose of consolidating lots or adjusting common lot boundaries only. An Administrative Reviewed Plat Amendment may only occur when no new lots are created, and where no changes are proposed to common areas, existing easements, or right-of-ways whether public or private.

B. Council Review Process: The City Council shall act as the Land Use Authority when consideration an application for a Subdivision Plat Amendment where any change is proposed which includes modifications to a common area, existing easement, or right-of-way whether public or private. The City Council shall also review a Subdivision Plat Amendment which involves the creation of lots with standards which vary from prior agreements or current land use regulations.

- a. Process: Applications for an amendment to a Subdivision Plat under Part B of this Section shall be considered as outlined by Utah State Code Sections 10-9a-608 and 10-9a-609.

B.C. Land Use Authority: The ~~City Council~~Planning Commission shall act as the Land Use Authority when considering an application for a Subdivision Plat Amendment where a new lot is created which meets current standards identified in the ordinance or a previously approved agreement, but no change is proposed to a common area, existing easement, or right-of-way whether public or private.

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



BUSINESS

AGENDA TITLE: Consideration of Additional Text and Amendments regarding Recreational Pools and Tennis Courts

PRESENTED BY: Shannon Hansell

DEPARTMENT: Community Development

MEETING DATE: July 2, 2024

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Shannon Hansell – Planning/GIS Specialist
Date: July 2, 2024
Subject: Additional text and amendments to Section 11-28-060, Location of Recreational Pools and Tennis Courts, of Title 11, ZONING REGULATIONS.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

Move that the City Council enact the enclosed ordinance to replace the requirement for a 6-foot fence or wall around a private recreational pool, with the language in the enclosed enabling ordinance.

BACKGROUND

It is currently required within the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance that individuals with a swimming pool on their property have a 6 ft. fence or wall installed which completely surrounds the pool.

The International Code Council has very detailed code requirements related to swimming pools in the International Swimming Pool and Spa Code (ISPSC). In effect, the code does have barrier requirements similar to the fence/wall requirement found in city code, however it also creates an exception where a wall type barrier is not required if the pool is equipped with a powered safety cover that complies with ASTM F1346 standards. Spas or hot tubs are dealt with similarly in this code. Furthermore, the ISPSC also deals with the type of fencing or barrier which should be used when applicable including details pertaining to height, openings, doors, etc. (ISPSC Section 305)

Multiple property owners and contractors have requested to be able to simply follow building code and not be required to fully fence in a swimming pool. Examples vary, but recent scenarios include properties where fencing is proposed around portions of the pool but retaining walls or other natural barriers are desired on other sides.

The Planning Commission voted 4-2 in favor of the recommendation to remove the fencing requirement entirely. The dissenting votes expressed their concern with removing the requirement indicating their preference to go above and beyond the minimum requirements mandated by the building code and erring in the side of caution and additional safety.

The City Council reviewed and tabled the original amendment to remove the fencing requirement entirely on May 21, 2024. The Council wanted Staff to explore other municipal

ordinances, in addition to other research to determine if there was a compromise of some kind, rather than a variance or exception process. Some cities, such as Salt Lake and St. George, do not require fencing or barriers outside of what is required by the ISPSC. Other cities, like Sandy and Brigham City, broaden the requirement by incorporating language about what constitutes substantial barriers and openings in fences.

Ultimately, the amendment presented today includes a requirement for at least 4' tall fencing, walls, or other substantial barriers around pools. Substantial barriers are defined as any permanent barrier that would not allow passage by any person, except for gates. The amendment also maintains the self-closing and self-latching devices for gates. For applicable substantial barriers, fences and walls, a sphere four inches in diameter may not pass through. Applicability for substantial barriers would be determined by the City Planner.

The amendment also reorders the Private Recreational Pool section for ease of use, and also adds a setback requirement for distance from pools to side corner property lines.

Supplemental Information

1. Enabling Ordinance

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Hansell

Shannon Hansell

Planning/GIS Specialist



Brigham Mellor

City Manager

**FARMINGTON CITY, UTAH
ORDINANCE NO. 2024 -**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 11-28-060 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE
RELATED TO FENCING AROUND PRIVATE SWIMMING POOLS. (ZT-7-24)**

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has held a public hearing in which the text changes proposed for Chapter 11-28-060 were reviewed and has recommended that this ordinance be approved by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Farmington City Council has also held a public meeting pursuant to notice and as required by law and deems it to be in the best interest of the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Farmington to make the changes proposed;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF
FARMINGTON CITY, STATE OF UTAH:**

Section 1. Amendment. Section 11-28-060 of the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance is amended in as follows:

11-28-060: LOCATION OF RECREATIONAL POOLS AND TENNIS COURTS:

A. Private Recreational Pool:

1. **Location:** Any private recreational pool not completely enclosed within a building having solid walls shall be set back at least five feet (5') from the rear and side property lines and at least thirty feet (30') from the front property line, and at least twenty feet (20') from the side corner property line. The private recreational pool shall be not less than twenty feet (20') from any neighbor's dwelling. Any detached accessory buildings related to an unenclosed pool shall meet setback requirements and standards for such buildings, except the side corner setback may be reduced to fifteen feet (15').
2. **Access:** Any recreational pool shall be completely surround by a fence, wall, or other substantial barrier having a height of least four ~~six~~ feet (4' ~~6'~~). A substantial barrier shall be mean any permanent barrier that would not allow passage by any person, except for gates. Gates shall be equipped with self-closing and self-latching devices. Fences ~~or~~, walls, or applicable substantial barriers (as determined by the City Planner), that are not solid shall have intermediate rails or an ornamental pattern such that a sphere four inches (4") in diameter cannot pass through. ~~In lieu of fencing on hot tubs, spas or Jacuzzis, security covers may be provided. Fences or walls that are not solid shall have intermediate rails or an ornamental pattern such that a sphere four inches (4") in diameter cannot pass through. Gates shall be equipped with self-closing and self-latching devices.~~
3. **Other:** No loudspeaker device which can be heard beyond the property lines of the premises on which any recreational pool has been installed may be operated in connection with such pool, nor may any lighting be installed in connection with such pool which shall throw any direct rays beyond such property lines.

Section 2. Severability. If any provision of this ordinance is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder shall not be affected thereby.

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon publication or posting or 30 days after passage by the City Council, whichever comes first.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Farmington City, State of Utah, on this 2nd day of July, 2024.

FARMINGTON CITY

ATTEST:

Brett Anderson, Mayor

DeAnn Carlile, City Recorder

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



BUSINESS

AGENDA TITLE: Approval of Minutes for 06-18-24

FARMINGTON CITY – CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

June 18, 2024

WORK SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,
City Attorney Paul Roberts,*

*City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad
Boshell,
Finance Director Greg Davis, and
Public Works Director Larry Famuliner.*

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the work session to order at 6:10 p.m. Councilmembers **Roger Child** and **Alex Leeman** were excused.

GREEN WASTE DISCUSSION

City Manager **Brigham Mellor** presented this agenda item. He said it would take \$700,000 to buy green waste cans for all of Farmington, and the service would cost on top of that amount. However, because everything is trending more expensive than planned, the City should plan for it to be more expensive than that. For example, Farmington just got bids back for construction of the new park, and it is at least \$1.5 million over budget, resulting in another 10% on top of the 10% contingency that was budgeted for. Therefore, the City is planning for a similar situation with construction of the new fire station.

In May and November, 30% of what Farmington hauls is green waste, which is a heavy and wet load that gets shipped 100 miles away. Therefore, it is expensive to haul off, and it results in rate increases. Instead of hauling it off, green waste can instead be dealt with internally, which would result in a cost savings.

Woods Cross has a flat rate for bundling green, black, and blue cans, regardless of which ones are used. Dealing with green waste separate from all other waste keeps garbage rates low. Repurposing the black can to be used at times for green waste is another option.

Mellor said Clearfield and Clinton aren't participating in recycling. Layton doesn't participate in recycling or green waste separation, and that city produces a third of the garbage in Davis County. Therefore, other cities in the county are subsidizing Layton's garbage. There was a Wasatch Integrated Waste Management District re-vote that resulted in making recycling non-mandatory, which passed with a tight 9-8 vote.

Councilmember **Amy Shumway** asked about townhome subdivisions that don't mow their own lawns and don't have enough space for an additional garbage can. Her Homeowner's Association (HOA) hauls the green waste away. Whole neighborhoods and developments may want to opt out of green waste cans. Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** said Farmington has so many townhomes that it would be unfair if they were not allowed to opt out of green waste cans. **Mellor** noted that the Gattrell single-family home project as well as the Avenues at the Station are not townhomes, but they do not do their own landscaping.

Mellor said another option is green waste dump sites throughout the City. There could be one off 1525 West further west by the bird refuse, and one at Old Farm. Where he lives in Morgan County, he participates via opt-in. It could be treated like an enterprise fund, where residents are allowed to pay off the initial cost of the can over a number of years. **Mayor Anderson** said there are many options in how to handle this issue. For example, the garbage and recycling fees could be doubled if a resident doesn't use a green waste can. Councilmember **Melissa Layton** said a good option may be to allow Farmington residents to opt-in as a trial run, which could be evaluated after a time.

Public Works Director **Larry Famuliner** said the way Farmington does spring clean-up now doesn't fit the State's requirement. The day will come when the State cracks down on how Farmington conducts spring clean-up, where residents are now allowed to put green waste on the curb in the street. Debris in the gutters messes with the storm water system, and the State will likely prohibit green waste from being put on the street. **Isaacson** said he doesn't even have a curb in front of his home. **Mellor** said getting dumpster at drop sites could help wean residents away from the typical curb placement for their green waste.

Famuliner said the City spent between \$30,000 to \$35,000 paying an outside crew to help with spring clean-up. Additional money was spent when City employees hauled off loads on top of that. When the Community Council recently discussed this issue, they were fine with green waste cans as long as residents were allowed to opt out. Salt Lake has an ordinance that does not allow green waste in black cans, but they can opt out of green waste cans.

Shumway, Isaacson, and Layton said they like the idea of Farmington having green waste cans. **Layton** said she likes the idea of using black cans for green waste. **Mayor Anderson** said garbage and green waste would be picked up on separate days, so in theory it would not be confusing. He noted there is no tipping fees for green waste.

Mellor said an issue in the past had been residents not having enough room in their yard or garage to keep a third can, but that concern has not been brought up recently.

Famuliner noted that when he recently ordered 400 cans, they were six weeks out from delivery. It would be until September when the City could get 700 new cans. **Mellor** said that September is the closing season for green waste. Due to the Truth in Taxation public hearing scheduled for August; and the Recreation, Arts, and Parks (RAP) tax being on the November ballot; a September target date for green waste cans is too soon. It would be preferable to address the issue when discussing the Fiscal Year 2026 Consolidated Fee Schedule (CFS) next spring.

Mayor Anderson said he would work with the hauler and Wasatch Integrated and come back with figures to be used in a future discussion. He feels the first phase should be completely opt-in. That way, those signing up will be the ones paying the fee. **Mellor** thinks Farmington would likely get 50% of residents opting in.

CLOSED SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,*

*Councilmember Amy Shumway, and
City Attorney Paul Roberts.*

Motion:

At 6:42 p.m., Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** made the motion to go into a closed meeting for the purpose of character, professional competence, or the physical or mental health of an individual.

Councilmember **Amy Shumway** seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Scott Isaacson
Councilmember Melissa Layton
Councilmember Amy Shumway

X Aye ___ Nay
X Aye ___ Nay
X Aye ___ Nay

Sworn Statement

I, **Brett Anderson**, Mayor of Farmington City, do hereby affirm that the items discussed in the closed meeting were as stated in the motion to go into closed session, and that no other business was conducted while the Council was so convened in a closed meeting.

Brett Anderson, Mayor

Motion:

At 7:05 p.m., **Isaccson** made the motion to reconvene to an open meeting.

Councilmember **Melissa Layton** seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Scott Isaacson
Councilmember Melissa Layton
Councilmember Amy Shumway

X Aye ___ Nay
X Aye ___ Nay
X Aye ___ Nay

REGULAR SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,*

*City Attorney Paul Roberts,
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad
Boshell, and
Finance Director Greg Davis.*

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m. Councilmember **Alex Leeman** was excused. Councilmember **Melissa Layton** offered the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilmember **Amy Shumway**.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Amending Municipal Budget for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024

Finance Director **Greg Davis** presented this agenda item. Sales tax has been fluctuating, creating a roller coaster for budgeting. When March sales taxes were released at the end of May, it revealed that March 2024 sales taxes were down compared to March of 2023. January 2024 sales taxes were down 13% compared to January 2023. It could take until August of 2025 to receive all 2024 sales tax data. Sales tax revenue has Staff concerned.

Farmington must not be over budget in the General Fund on a department level, so adjustments are now required. Administration wished to amend budgets for items that were unforeseen, unplanned, or of different dollar amounts than originally budgeted during the budget cycle. Some items are covered by certain revenue sources, and some items require the use of fund balance. These include:

- Condemnation property near Rose Cove (\$76,000 expense, Real Estate Fund)
- Landlocked parcel sale, adjacent to Forbush Park (\$40,000 revenue, Real Estate Fund)
- Land purchase for Rocky Mountain Power's substation (\$926,000 expense, RDA Highway 89)
- Permit for Station Park RDA (\$1,000 expense, RDA Station Park)
- Transfer xeriscaping cash back to General Fund (\$650,000 transfer from Park Capital Improvement Fund to General Fund), project postponed
- Business Park as costs projected for FY24 not originally budgeted (multiple funds). Rather than establish inaccurate budgets, Administration chose to instead utilize budget amendments during FY24 to more accurately project and reflect transactions.
- Davis County Western Sports Park (WSP) facility, lowering Rocky Mountain Power lines (\$400,000 expense, RDA Station Park)
- Salt Storage Shed construction costs to use Class C funds (multiple funds) instead of General Fund or capital improvement funds
- West Davis Corridor inspections, reimbursed by the Utah Department of Transportation (budget neutral)

- Fire impact fees study (\$2,000 expense, Capital Fire Fund)
- Ivy Acres Park planning and design costs (\$218,000 expense, Park Improvement Fund)
- Master Plan Study for Parks (\$120,000 expense, Park Improvement Fund)
- Telemetry, move budget to General Fund operations (\$31,550 expense, multiple funds)
- Fire apparatus repairs, unanticipated repairs (\$40,000 expense, General Fund)
- Uncollectible accounts, change in accounting principal (budget neutral, Ambulance Fund), removing the \$500,000 budget for bad debt expense
- Ambulance purchase, budget rollover (\$248,000 expense, Ambulance Fund)
- Grant – First Responders Mental Health, State of Utah (\$119,345, budget neutral, General Fund Fire and Police)
- Grant – Jason W Read Protect and Serve Foundation (\$5,000, budget neutral, General Fund Police Department)
- Security services revenue and expense (reduction of \$187,530 revenue and \$169,297 expense, General Fund Police Department)
- IT support and cyber security enhancements (\$85,000 expense, General Fund)
- Sewer billings/collections and paying over to district exceeding original budget (\$146,000, budget neutral, Sewer Utility Fund)
- Streets vehicle budget rollover (\$60,100 expense, Equipment Fund)
- City Hall power surge protectors (\$7,275 expense, General Fund Buildings Program)
- Fire Station’s overhead bay doors and openers (\$22,000 expense, General Fund Buildings Program)

Davis said Farmington has around 28% in fund balance. The strategy is to postpone things that are not critical. Another strategy is to not have the General Fund carry the burden of things Class C money can pay for. Salt storage is a legitimate Class C expense. The expense won’t go away, but the critical expense is being pushed out of the General Fund into Class C.

Mayor Anderson asked if there had been any feedback from Farmington’s request that the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) contribute to fixing the road. He intends to ask Davis County Commissioners about it when he sees them at an upcoming golf tournament. City Manager **Brigham Mellor** replied that a letter of intent was submitted and is due July 12, so he expects to hear back in a few weeks.

Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** thanked **Davis** for his clear summary included in the Staff Report.

Mayor Anderson opened the Public Hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Rita Bodily (98 E. 700 S., Farmington, Utah) said she sent the Council an email, and she hopes members read the surveys about the proposed tax increase. She would like the Council to consider eliminating or reducing property tax increases for the elderly because the cost of living has increased substantially and many residents are struggling to make ends meet. Those on fixed incomes battle tax increases. She doesn’t like that Farmington continues to construct monumental projects that she doesn’t know about until after they are happening. She wants a vote on the things Farmington is doing. She asked why Farmington is not cutting back instead of spending \$11 million on a business park. She doesn’t remember voting on the business park, and such expensive projects should be a community effort. She is worried about traffic on Legacy Parkway, as the current roads can’t handle thousands of people.

She would like the City to provide a community garden for families, especially those living in apartments, so their children have something constructive to do instead of playing inside on their phones and computers. Greenhouses could help vegetables to grow in the winters. She would like to see a Farmington Farmer’s Market.

Mayor Anderson closed the Public Hearing at 7:25 p.m.

Motion:

Layton moved that the City Council approve the amended the Fiscal Year 2024 municipal budget.

Isaacson seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,
City Attorney Paul Roberts,*

*City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad
Boshell, and
Finance Director Greg Davis.*

Motion:

RDA member **Amy Shumway** made the motion to adjourn to the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Meeting.

RDA member **Melissa Layton** seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the meeting to order at 7:28 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Amending the RDA Budget for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024

Finance Director **Greg Davis** presented this agenda item. Assistant City Manager/City Engineer **Chad Boshell** said Farmington had no ability to force Davis County to bury the power lines on Clark Lane and 1100 West. City Manager **Brigham Mellor** said RDA funds can be used for this purpose, and the City depleted all the funds. It is a trade-off as if those lines are damaged in a wind storm, traffic must be shut down. Farmington didn't want the sign to be larger than necessary, and this provides the opportunity to move the sign closer to the street, thus keeping it smaller.

RDA Member **Scott Isaacson** said he wished the County would have made the Western Sports Park (WSP) more of a multi-use facility instead of just for sports. That being said, it will be a tremendous benefit to Farmington as people from outside the community come in and spend their money, thereby increasing the City's sales tax revenue. It will be a boon to the community.

Administration wishes to amend budgets for items that were unforeseen, unplanned, or of different dollar amounts than originally budgeted during the budget cycle. These include:

- Condemnation property near Rose Cove (\$76,000 expense, Real Estate Fund)
- Landlocked parcel sale, adjacent to Forbush Park (\$40,000 revenue, Real Estate Fund)
- Land purchase for Rocky Mountain Power's substation (\$926,000 expense, RDA Highway 89)
- Permit for Station Park RDA (\$1,000 expense, RDA Station Park)
- Transfer xeriscaping cash back to General Fund (\$650,000 transfer from Park Capital Improvement Fund to General Fund), project postponed
- Business Park as costs projected for FY24 not originally budgeted (multiple funds). Instead of establishing inaccurate FY24 budgets, Administration chose to instead utilize budget amendments during FY24 to more accurately project and reflect transactions.
- Davis County WSP facility, lowering Rocky Mountain Power lines (\$400,000 expense, RDA Station Park)
- Salt Storage Shed construction costs to use Class C funds (multiple funds). Class C road funds to be used instead of General Fund or related capital improvement funds.
- West Davis Corridor inspections, reimbursed by the Utah Department of Transportation (budget neutral)
- Fire impact fees study (\$2,000 expense, Capital Fire Fund)
- Ivy Acres Park planning and design costs (\$218,000 expense, Park Improvement Fund)
- Master Plan Study for Parks (\$120,000 expense, Park Improvement Fund)
- Telemetry – move budget to General Fund operations (\$31,550 expense, multiple funds)
- Fire apparatus repairs – unanticipated repairs (\$40,000 expense, General Fund)
- Uncollectible accounts, change in accounting principle (budget neutral, Ambulance Fund), removes the \$500,000 budget for bad debt expense
- Ambulance purchase, budget rollover (\$248,000 expense, Ambulance Fund)
- Grant – First Responders Mental Health, State of Utah (\$119,345, budget neutral, General Fund Fire and Police)

- Grant- Jason W Read Protect and Serve Foundation (\$5,000, budget neutral, General Fund Police Department)
- Security services revenue and expense (reduction of \$187,530 revenue and \$169,297 expense, General Fund Police Department)
- IT support and cyber security enhancements (\$85,000 expense, General Fund)
- Sewer billings/collections and paying over to district exceeding original budget (\$146,000, budget neutral, Sewer Utility Fund)
- Streets vehicle budget rollover (\$60,100 expense, Equipment Fund)
- City Hall power surge protectors (\$7,275 expense, General Fund Buildings Program)
- Fire Station’s overhead bay doors and openers (\$22,000 expense, General Fund Buildings Program)

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 7:32 p.m. as nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Shumway said RDA members had the budget numbers way in advance, and it is good to have the time needed to digest the issues. **Mayor Anderson** said the RDA and City Councilmembers start talking about budgets in March, so the last three months they have been going over these numbers.

Motion:

Isaacson moved that the RDA approve a FY24 RDA amended budget for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024.

Layton seconded the motion. All RDA members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Adopting the RDA Budget for Fiscal Year 2025

Davis presented this agenda item. After adopting the tentative budget at the May 7, 2024, meeting, no changes have been identified. From then until tonight, the Council has worked through a series of meetings and work sessions, hearing from department heads and watching for things they wanted changed.

Shumway said that since tax revenue is down, this budget has been kind of boring. Councilmembers have not had much to debate, as the budget has just been a skeleton budget.

Davis said property taxes do not affect the collection of Redevelopment Agency (RDA) revenues, as collections continue on the initial rates. This year is the last year for the Highway 89 RDA. When Farmington thought RDA 20 (Highway 89) would see an \$18,000 bump in property taxes last year, the County informed the City that wasn’t the case. He doesn’t fully understand why. **Mellor** said not all RDAs are created equal. He needs to research the procedural question of tax increment. **Mayor Anderson** said it is safe to say that RDA property tax is governed by a document, and there is not a uniform rhyme or reason. It is important to read the fine print.

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 7:43 p.m. as nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Motion:

Shumway moved that the RDA approve a resolution to adopt the FY25 RDA budget.

Layton seconded the motion. All RDA members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

BUSINESS:

Approval of Minutes for June 4, 2024

Motion:

Layton moved that the RDA approve the June 4, 2024, RDA meeting minutes.

Shumway seconded the motion. All RDA members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Motion:

Isaacson made a motion to adjourn and reconvene to an open City Council meeting at 7:44 p.m.

Layton seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

PUBLIC HEARINGS continued

Amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule (CFS)

Finance Director **Greg Davis** presented this agenda item. Rates require adjustments from time to time to reflect costs of providing services. The adjustments do not exceed City costs. They also take into consideration comparable market rates and residents’ ability to pay. With some rates, the City will continue to bear more than cost recovery.

Layton said the increase from \$400 to \$650 for the annexation application fee seems low.

Mellor said the annexation fee has not changed in 28 years, but he doesn’t want it to be prohibitively expensive. The last one was done for Flat Rock Drive, and it was a lot of work. Staff evaluated other cities with annexation declarations and set the rate accordingly. He noted that applicants do not get automatic approval.

Councilmember **Roger Child** joined the meeting at 7:48 p.m.

Layton inquired about the increase in garbage can replacements, from \$50 to \$110. This is more than double. She is concerned that the wind is often the reason residents need to replace their

cans. **Issacson** said Friday morning his can ended up two doors down, and it is now damaged. **Davis** said this is both the cost of the can and delivery, and it involves administration time as well. This will encourage citizens to tie down or take their cans inside. **Boshell** said it is mostly the cost of the can. The City covers the cost if it is caused during trash collection. However, if damage is from fireworks or charcoal, the resident must pay the fee.

Mayor Anderson said he did not see an increase in nonresident racket fees. **Mellor** said Staff has been bogged down and did not get to it. **Shumway** noted a decrease in pickleball participation in Farmington since other pickleball facilities have since opened up nearby.

Isaacson said Farmington’s General Fund subsidizes its parks and recreation. A fee is the fairest form of tax, as the person paying it directly benefits from it. There is justification to charge nonresidents more, and the Council needs to look at it. **Mayor Anderson** said it should be brought back.

Layton said she really struggles with the proposed residential child burial fee increasing up to \$300. In the last 3.5 years, Farmington has only buried 10 infants. These were stillborn children who were placed in hand-dug graves. This would have totaled \$3,000 over the last three years. She feels Farmington should come together as a community for someone who is already grieving the loss of a child and not charge a fee. She would love to see the residential child burial fee eliminated.

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 7:59 p.m. as nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Shumway asked what the actual cost is of employees going out and digging a grave, and if it is more than \$300. **Mellor** said he does not know, as digging a grave can take between 45 minutes and 12 hours depending on the condition of the ground. Some of the cemetery is on solid granite.

Regarding ambulance fees, **Child** said insurance typically only pays a certain amount. Farmington collects 50%, which is much better than other cities. **Mellor** said the federal government only pays 30 cents for every dollar. This affects ambulance transports for the Veterans Affairs (VA) and jail, as well as coverage by Medicare and Medicaid. He is not sure if Farmington charges for ambulances to transport jail inmates for medical checkups. If violence takes place at the jail, Farmington does the investigation and uses their ambulance. **Shumway** suggested talking to state legislators about the issue.

Motion:

Layton moved that the City Council adopt the resolution amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule, including a waiver of the residential child burial fee for only Farmington residents.

Isaacson seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Adopting the Compensation Schedule for Executive Municipal Officers

Mellor presented this agenda item. Every year Farmington does a compensation analysis of every position (appointed and non-appointed, department and assistant department heads) in every municipality within 22 miles. The size of the city used to be considered, but that is not how it works anymore. Now it must be decided if the job is equitable. Using this method, Farmington was determined to be one of the lowest paying. **Mellor** said the City has not done a great job of keeping up with department head pay over the last few years. Now that many have two or more years of experience, those people are in demand and could be promoted beyond an assistant. The target is that Farmington wants to be at 110%, but they are instead currently standing at 90% to 100% compensation when they are giving 110% effort.

He proposed that the following elective statutory officers receive compensation increases in the FY2025 budget: Assistant City Manager/City Engineer, 8.8% total percentage increase to wages; Assistant Community Development Director, 5.7%; Assistant Public Works Director, 11%; City Attorney, 5%; City Manager, 5.7%; Community Development Director, 5%; Councilmembers 5%; Finance Director, 9.1%; Fire Chief, 7.3%; Mayor, 5%; Parks and Recreation Director, 8.9%; Police Chief, 7.3%; and Public Works Director, 8.9%.

Mellor said he could have done a better job of supplying the Council with information. This is a new requirement that should be addressed beyond merit and Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) increases. He apologized and accepted responsibility for not providing the information in a more in-depth and timely way. He said it is interesting the Legislature is making cities do this, but not counties or the State.

Not a single department head has requested a pay increase, and no one is saying they are looking for another job. Because he doesn't want to send the wrong message to the affected departments due to his failure to provide the information, he encouraged the Council to not delay in approving these increases, and promised to send the supporting documentation in the morning. He acknowledged that the Council is in a municipal war with all the things they have going on, but he advised them that they wouldn't be able to survive the upcoming year if they had to replace any of these employees.

Layton said she would love to see that information. **Isaacson** said he appreciates **Mellor's** explanation. Even though he may agree with every proposed number, he wants to point out that he was only given some information two days before he was supposed to vote on it. He is concerned with raising salaries this much while also considering an increase in property taxes. While he is happy with the employees Farmington has, he is concerned with the process. He needs more information and background, as well as a chance to do his due diligence in order to vote on this and answer to his constituents. He trusts **Mellor**, but he needs the documentation.

Mellor apologized again, and said he is unsure how to approach this new requirement. **Isaacson** suggested that it be part of the budget process in general, an item to be discussed along with the other COLA and merit increases.

Child said he personally doesn't need a 5% pay increase. Accepting an increase while also proposing a tax increase is tough, especially when the economy is not doing so hot and sales tax is flat. Budgets are not being benefitted by sales taxes. **Mayor Anderson** also said he doesn't need a pay increase. While **Shumway** agreed, she is also concerned about making a decision for

a future Councilmember’s pay. **Isaacson** said anyone running for a Council position for the money has no business being on the Council.

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 8:19 p.m. as nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Isaacson asked why the Legislature is doing this, what he determined was a form of micro-managing. **Mellor** said at a recent city manager conference, the bill’s sponsor admitted it was a bad bill, but predicted it would pass. He asked for help. City Attorney **Paul Roberts** said the overarching reason is public transparency.

Child said these increases are not alarming given that inflation is 8% and higher. He noted that the only one higher than the inflation rate is that of the assistant public works director. Given that they are called out at all hours of the day, and that their life is lived constantly on-call, the pay is not enough. While the Fire Chief and Police Chief are each getting a 7.3% increase, they are giving their staffs higher increases and giving up a lot of their personal lives. Their increase is below the inflation rate, but they are still on the sacrificing side of things.

Mellor said the only department heads actively participating in this recent wage analysis included Human Resource Manager **Holly Gadd, Roberts**, and him. **Davis** pointed out that the total increase for Councilmembers and the Mayor was \$1,607 out of an \$18 million budget.

Isaacson said while this doesn’t have an impact on Farmington’s budget, the reasoning is symbolic. In some municipalities, elected officials are prohibited from raising their own pay, but allowed to do so for the next election cycle. While he is not unhappy with any employee, he wants the procedure improved.

Child said fire fighters work on a two- to three-day shift and have to pay for their own food. Often, they pool their money and cook together. Considering their hourly pay, he is inclined to donate his pay to the Fire Department for food.

Boshell said both Mayor and Councilmember positions are time-consuming positions, and they can’t be sure that the next person who runs for a position doesn’t need the money. He suggests voting in the increase, and then donating their cut to a fire fighter and public works lunch fund. He spent five years as a fire fighter himself.

Motion:

Isaacson moved that the City Council approve an ordinance enacting the compensation increase for executive municipal officers as presented.

Shumway seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Adopting the Municipal Budget for Fiscal Year 2025

Davis presented this agenda item. The list of key changes shows what was recommended in May including the Council-recommended \$449,000 increase in payroll expenditures, which should be covered with the proposed property tax increase. The City’s “skin in the game” for the Farmington creek lower trail grant will be \$70,000. He said the last year for the annual debt service for the 2014 street light replacements will be FY2025. **Boshell** said that debt was incurred in order to replace all old street lights at once.

Since the Council adopted the tentative budget at their May 7, 2024, meeting, there have been two proposed changes, including:

- Pay rate increases for sworn police officers working shifts. This is an additional pay rate increase of 15% on top of the 5% that is budgeted for all full-time and regular part-time Staff. (5% is budgeted for a combination of COLA and merit.) Cost of the 15% additional is \$449,000, all in the General Fund. Funding is to come from an increase to property tax.
- Trail construction of Farmington Creek Lower Trail. The total project cost is estimated to be \$338,500. Partial funding of \$244,488 will be from a Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant (UORG). The remaining \$94,012 is the City’s portion, \$23,500 of which was already incurred by the City in prior fiscal years. The FY25 adopted budget reflects grant revenue of \$244,488 and expenditures of \$315,000.

Davis said as a Farmington resident, he sees his efforts to prepare this budget as a bit of a service rather than just a paying job. It is a small price to pay for the services he and other residents get in Farmington. He worked for Salt Lake City for 27 years, and another two years for the State of Utah. It is a joy to live and work in Farmington. In his opinion, the budget items aren’t luxuries, and Farmington doesn’t tax people too much. He said he was speaking from the heart when he said that he is grateful that it only costs him what it does to get the services he gets living in Farmington. Staff is not frivolous, and Farmington has honest, responsible workers and managers. Farmington is wise with its money.

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 8:45 p.m. as nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Motion:

Shumway moved that the City Council approve a resolution to adopt the FY25 municipal budget.

Layton seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___ Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___ Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___ Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___ Nay

Isaacson said the level of government that largely impacts lives is local government. When he lived in the sophisticated city of Buenos Aires for five years, a resident approached him wanting help from his employer to evade paying taxes. Everyone there does it, they said. But **Isaacson** refused, saying he and his local attorney would not participate in tax evasion. The requestor

replied that Isaacson came from America, a real country with schools, police, fire, retirement, roads, and water he could trust. **Isaacson** said many Americans take these things for granted. Many in Argentina don't send their children to public schools; they consider the police corrupt, and can't rely on running water.

SUMMARY ACTION:

Minute Motion Approving Summary Action List

The Council considered the Summary Action List including:

- Item 1: Approval of Minutes for May 21, 2024
- Item 2: Approval of Minutes for June 4, 2024

Motion:

Child moved to approve the Summary Action list items as noted in the Staff Report.

Shumway seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

GOVERNING BODY REPORTS:

City Manager Report

Mellor presented the park bids, saying 15 came in, although Staff is not sure if they are general or subcontractors. On Monday, the bids will be further analyzed. Bids ranged from \$13.19 million to \$16.75 million. This is \$1.5 million over the initial budget. The park will be replacing one that was taken away, and that is how Farmington got the resources to build it. The State condemned land that had trails, and impact fees paid for by development will help pay for the new park. A splash pad was also taken out, and will be replaced with something other than a "giant drinking fountain." Using value engineering, Staff can start cutting things from the park.

The Recreation, Arts, and Parks (RAP) tax is important for ongoing programs, and a lion's share is paid for by those living outside of Farmington, as it is based on sales tax. If the RAP tax doesn't get passed, Farmington will have to cut things. In preparing for the RAP tax vote, there is nothing Farmington employees can do except list what the RAP tax has paid for in the past 10 years. The newsletter can also publish this list. Employees may not advocate for passing the tax. **Mellor** said he is not terribly concerned with it not passing. However, City Council and Parks, Recreation, Arts, and Trails (PRAT) Advisory Board members can get the word out.

Mellor feels the new park is an effort to make a huge capital investment in the heart of future development, which will set the tone. While Farmington can cut back expenses, he doesn't want the "wow" factor to go away. His concern is costs for the \$3 million playground, splash pad, and ninja warrior course add up. Costs could likewise add up for the future west side fire station. He and **Boshell** had counted on impact fees being a revenue stream for the new fire department. However, if future developments throughout the City continue to be pushed back, it could affect

impact fees and the ability for Farmington to build the west side fire station now. In the meantime, construction costs could continue to climb.

He said while he is out of town for a week, **Roberts** and **Boshell** will fill in for him.

He noted that a carnival will be coming for Festival Days. They will be setting up camp in the police station/Woodland Park parking lot, as requested by the Police Department. The carnival will be in the City for nine days, but only open for operation Thursday through Saturday. They will set up on the north side of the baseball field. Farmington will not pay them anything. As requested by the City's insurance company, Festival Days cannot have bull riding or bouncy houses, which can blow away in the wind and injure people's backs.

Mayor Anderson and City Council Reports

Child said the feedback he has received about the Main Street Historic District has been positive. He has received no significant negative responses at all from his neighbors.

Regarding the homeless situation in the winters, **Child** likes the idea of the county having 18-wheeler trailers that can sleep up to 60 people. These trailers can move around from location to location. Trailers with portable showers are very inexpensive.

Mayor Anderson said the meeting about this that was supposed to be held yesterday had been canceled, but a decision must be made soon. Every city has to come up with one or two locations to use between October and March, and it will result in only three or four times total annually. A physical location may be needed until a trailer can be purchased. Davis County is looking into buying a decommissioned elementary school in Sunset. He suggested the foyer of the swimming pool. Farmington has to play along to get along, and doesn't want to be "that" city that refuses to participate. **Mellor** suggested the 1,300 square foot Rocky Mountain Power shed that has utilities but no bathroom. He said Farmington wants to be part of the solution so as not to be in the eye of the Legislature.

Mellor said there will not be an RV dumping station at the new Maverik. Davis County got rid of the RV dumping station at the fairgrounds, and has no intention of bringing one back. **Boshell** said he thought Cabela's had an RV dump station on the north side. **Mellor** said Farmington could consider putting one in the Public Works yard once it is expanded. Lagoon has some, but users have to pay a fee to use them.

Isaacson said the Mosquito Abatement District adopted its budget. It is the biggest abatement district in the State. The District uses trucks, bikes, and drones with 100 gallon tanks to kill mosquitos. Tablets are placed in drains and tree holes. Residents can request abatement prior to outdoor events. The new freeway will hurt the District's access, so mosquitos may get worse in the future as water pools on the east side of the freeway. The District is still looking to hire seasonal employees.

Layton inquired about **Mary Kimball's** email regarding Farmington Ranches. **Mellor** said it will be on the next Council agenda, and he will look into setting up a meeting in August.

Layton said when she spent a week in Chicago recently, she was impressed with their Art on the Mart program where both local and famous art is projected on the side of the building called "The Mart" to music every night at 8 a.m. Farmington should consider something similar.

Mayor Anderson said that in a recent interaction with a random resident, the resident said they were completely in support of a property tax increase to support police wages.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

Isaacson made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:19 p.m.

Layton seconded the motion. All Council members voted in favor, as there was no opposing vote.

Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

DeAnn Carlile, Recorder