

CITY COUNCIL MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

Notice is given that the Farmington City Council will hold a regular meeting on **Tuesday, June 18, 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.

- Green Waste Discussion
- Discussion of regular session items upon request

REGULAR SESSION - 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

- Invocation - Melissa Layton, Councilmember
- Pledge of Allegiance - Amy Shumway, Councilmember

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- Amending Municipal Budget for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024 **3**

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

Minute motion to reconvene the City Council Meeting

- Amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule (CFS) **24**
- Adopting the Compensation Schedule for Executive Municipal Officers **66**
- Adopting the Municipal Budget for Fiscal Year 2025 **68**

SUMMARY ACTION

- Approval of Minutes for 05-21-24 **100**
- Approval of Minutes for 06-04-24 **112**

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 13, 2024

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA TITLE: Amending Municipal Budget for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024

PRESENTED BY: Greg Davis

DEPARTMENT: Finance

MEETING DATE: June 18, 2024

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT FOR JUNE 18, 2024

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Greg Davis
Date: June 12, 2024
Subject: **Adoption of FY24 Budget Amendment - Municipal**

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review the attached narrative and schedules
2. Hold a public hearing on June 18, 2024
3. Consider and approve a resolution to amend the FY24 municipal budget

BACKGROUND

Administration wishes 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. Please see the attached narrative and budget amendment schedules.

Respectfully submitted,



Greg Davis
Finance Director

Review and concur,



Brigham Mellor
City Manager

NARRATIVE BUDGET AMENDMENT FOR FY24

Table of Contents

A.	Condemnation property near Rose Cove (\$76,000 expense, Real Estate Fund).....	2
B.	Landlocked parcel sale, adjacent to Forbush Park (\$40,000 revenue, Real Estate Fund)	2
C.	Land purchase for RMP's power substation (\$926,000 expense, RDA Highway 89).....	2
D.	(removed).....	2
E.	Permit for Station Park RDA (\$1,000 expense, RDA Station Park).....	2
F.	Transfer Xeriscaping cash back to GF (\$650,000 transfer from Park Capital Improvement Fund to General Fund).....	2
G.	Business Park as costs projected for FY24 not originally budgeted (multiple funds).....	2
H.	Davis County WSP Facility - lowering RMP power lines (\$400,000 exp, RDA Station Park)	2
I.	Salt Storage Shed construction costs to use Class C funds (multiple funds)	2
J.	West Davis Corridor inspections, reimbursed by UDOT (budget neutral).....	2
K.	Fire impact fees study (\$2,000 expense, Capital Fire Fund)	3
L.	Ivy Acres Park planning and design costs (\$218,000 expense, Park Improvement Fund).....	3
M.	Master Plan Study for Parks (\$120,000 expense, Park Improvement Fund).....	3
N.	Telemetry - move budget to General Fund operations (\$31,550 expense, multiple funds)	3
O.	Fire apparatus repairs - unanticipated repairs (\$40,000 exp, General Fund).....	3
P.	Uncollectible accounts, change in accounting principle (budget neutral, Ambulance Fund)	3
Q.	Ambulance purchase, budget rollover (\$248,000 expense, Ambulance Fund).....	3
R.	Grant - First Responders Mental Health, State of Utah (\$119,345, budget neutral, GF Fire and Police).....	3
S.	Grant – Jason W Read Protect and Serve Foundation (\$5,000, budget neutral, General Fund Police Dept)	3
T.	Security services revenue and expense (reduction of \$187,530 revenue and \$169,297 expense, GF Police Department)	3
U.	IT support and cyber security enhancements (\$85,000 expense, General Fund)	4
V.	Sewer billings/collections and paying over to district exceeding original budget (\$146,000, budget neutral, Sewer Utility Fund)	4
W.	Streets vehicle budget rollover (\$60,100 expense, Equipment Fund).....	4
X.	City Hall power surge protectors (\$7,275 expense, General Fund Buildings Program)	4
Y.	Fire Station's overhead bay doors and openers (\$22,000 expense, General Fund Buildings Program).....	4

A. Condemnation property near Rose Cove (\$76,000 expense, Real Estate Fund)

B. Landlocked parcel sale, adjacent to Forbush Park (\$40,000 revenue, Real Estate Fund)

C. Land purchase for RMP's power substation (\$926,000 expense, RDA Highway 89)

Farmington City plans to sell the property to Rocky Mountain Power during FY25. Price unknown at this time.

D. (removed)

E. Permit for Station Park RDA (\$1,000 expense, RDA Station Park)

F. Transfer Xeriscaping cash back to GF (\$650,000 transfer from Park Capital Improvement Fund to General Fund)

Due to the concerns with slowing of sales tax growth and economy in general, city management has opted to postpone this project.

G. Business Park as costs projected for FY24 not originally budgeted (multiple funds)

Due to the uncertainty of the timing and level of costs to be incurred during FY254, Administration chose to not establish inaccurate budgets in the original FY24 budget and instead utilize budget amendments during FY24 to more accurately project and reflect transactions for the year.

H. Davis County WSP Facility - lowering RMP power lines (\$400,000 exp, RDA Station Park)

This is the first part of an eventual estimated \$900,000.

I. Salt Storage Shed construction costs to use Class C funds (multiple funds)

Management recommends using Class C road funds instead of budget from the General Fund or its related capital improvement funds, when it is eventually constructed. This was originally budgeted in the Streets Capital Improvement Fund.

J. West Davis Corridor inspections, reimbursed by UDOT (budget neutral)

UDOT reimburses Farmington City for inspections conducted by a contractor.

K. Fire impact fees study (\$2,000 expense, Capital Fire Fund)

This item wasn't included in the original FY24 budget.

L. Ivy Acres Park planning and design costs (\$218,000 expense, Park Improvement Fund)

Administration now requests budget that hadn't been included originally for the initial phases for Ivy Park Acres Park.

M. Master Plan Study for Parks (\$120,000 expense, Park Improvement Fund)

N. Telemetry - move budget to General Fund operations (\$31,550 expense, multiple funds)

This type of expense is more appropriately recorded in General Fund Park Maintenance operations, rather than a capital improvement fund, in this case, the Parks Capital Improvement Fund. This amendment reduces the budget in the Parks Capital Improvement Fund and increases the budget in the Park Maintenance program of the General Fund.

O. Fire apparatus repairs - unanticipated repairs (\$40,000 exp, General Fund)

P. Uncollectible accounts, change in accounting principle (budget neutral, Ambulance Fund)

This amendment removes the \$500,000 budget for bad debt expense and establishes the same budget in the revenue section, but as a revenue reduction instead, using a separate general ledger item. This is in line with an accounting principle change.

Q. Ambulance purchase, budget rollover (\$248,000 expense, Ambulance Fund)

The build of this unity spanned several fiscal years. The budget is now needed in FY24 since delivery finally occurred this year.

R. Grant - First Responders Mental Health, State of Utah (\$119,345, budget neutral, GF Fire and Police)

This grant was recently received, benefitting our city's public safety personnel and even their families. The revenue is established in the General Fund, with expense budget in both Fire and Police departments.

S. Grant – Jason W Read Protect and Serve Foundation (\$5,000, budget neutral, General Fund Police Dept)

This grant will allow our Police Department to purchase 40mm less-lethal launchers and projectiles.

T. Security services revenue and expense (reduction of \$187,530 revenue and \$169,297 expense, GF Police Department)

Budget was originally established in FY24 because of anticipated services to Farmington's local theme park. The agreement for the services was discontinued and therefore Administration recommends removing associated revenue and expense budgets. The FY25 budget won't include these budgets.

U. IT support and cyber security enhancements (\$85,000 expense, General Fund)

Earlier in FY24 the Administration provided information about desired increases in IT services and certain cyber security measures to protect the city. This budget increase is to now establish budget for the services and software that the council was in favor of.

V. Sewer billings/collections and paying over to district exceeding original budget (\$146,000, budget neutral, Sewer Utility Fund)

This is a gross-up of the revenue and expense that flow through Farmington City, acting as a billing and collection service for the Central Davis Sewer District. The inclusion of sewer billings continues to be an efficiency benefit to our citizens and the sewer district. The city is compensated for handling their billing and remittance process.

W. Streets vehicle budget rollover (\$60,100 expense, Equipment Fund)

The budget was originally established in FY23 but delivery didn't occur until FY24. This amendment rolls over/opens up the budget that had dropped to fund balance in the prior year.

X. City Hall power surge protectors (\$7,275 expense, General Fund Buildings Program)

Administration installed surge protectors on all of City Hall's electrical panels that control all of the heavy equipment (HVAC, etc.). This prevents other costs for repairs, downtime, etc.

Y. Fire Station's overhead bay doors and openers (\$22,000 expense, General Fund Buildings Program)

Budget Amendment Summary by Fund and Item

Debits (Credits)

FY of BA	FY24
BA#	1

Sum of Amount	Expenditure	Transfers Out	Use of Fund Balance	Revenue	Transfers In	Fund Balance Increase
A. Condemnation property near Rose Cove						
#40 - REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND						
REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND - EXPENDITURES	76,000
REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(76,000)
B. Landlocked parcel sale, adjacent to Forbush Park						
#40 - REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND						
REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND - FUND BALANCE INCREASE	40,000
REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND - MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	(40,000)
C. Land purchase for RMP's power substation						
#20 - FARMINGTON RDA FUND						
FARMINGTON RDA FUND - CAPITAL PROJECTS	926,000
FARMINGTON RDA FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(926,000)
D. (removed)						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE INCREASE
E. Permit for Station Park RDA						
#22 - FARMINGTON STATION PARK RDA						
FARMINGTON STATION PARK RDA - EXPENDITURES	1,000
FARMINGTON STATION PARK RDA - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(1,000)

Budget Amendment Summary by Fund and Item

Debits (Credits)

FY of BA	FY24
BA#	1

Sum of Amount	Expenditure	Transfers Out	Use of Fund Balance	Revenue	Transfers In	Fund Balance Increase
F. Transfer Xeriscaping cash back to GF						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - CONTRIBUTIONS & TRANSFERS	(650,000)	...
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE INCREASE	650,000
#42 - PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND						
PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND - DEBT SERVICE & TRANSFERS OUT	...	650,000
PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(650,000)
G. Business Park costs as projected for FY24 - Sewer Fund						
#52 - SEWER FUND						
SEWER FUND	(37,500)
SEWER FUND - NON-OPERATING EXPENDITURES	37,500
G. Business Park costs as projected for FY24 - Storm Water impact fees funded						
#54 - STORM WATER FUND						
STORM WATER FUND	(1,960,000)
STORM WATER FUND - IMPACT FEE PROJECTS	1,960,000

Budget Amendment Summary by Fund and Item

Debits (Credits)

FY of BA	FY24
BA#	1

Sum of Amount	Expenditure	Transfers Out	Use of Fund Balance	Revenue	Transfers In	Fund Balance Increase
G. Business Park costs as projected for FY24 - Streets impact fees funded						
#38 - CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS						
CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(5,100,000)
CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS - IMPACT FEE PROJECTS	5,100,000
G. Business Park costs as projected for FY24 - Streets non-impact fees funded						
#38 - CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS						
CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(7,600,000)
CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS - MAJOR PROJECTS	7,600,000
G. Business Park costs as projected for FY24 - Water impact fees funded						
#51 - WATER FUND						
WATER FUND	(37,000)
WATER FUND - MISC. IMPACT FEE PROJECTS	37,000
H. Davis County WSP Facility - lowering RMP power lines (part of \$900K)						
#22 - FARMINGTON STATION PARK RDA						
FARMINGTON STATION PARK RDA - CAPITAL PROJECTS	400,000
FARMINGTON STATION PARK RDA - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(400,000)

Budget Amendment Summary by Fund and Item

Debits (Credits)

FY of BA	FY24
BA#	1

Sum of Amount	Expenditure	Transfers Out	Use of Fund Balance	Revenue	Transfers In	Fund Balance Increase
I. Salt Storage Shed - Class C fund to reimburse Fund 37 Buildings Capital Improvements						
#11 - CLASS C ROADS / LOCAL HWY						
CLASS C ROADS / LOCAL HWY - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(13,448)
CLASS C ROADS / LOCAL HWY - STREET OVERLAYS / PROJECTS	...	13,448
#37 - GOVT BUILDINGS IMPROV/OTHER						
GOVT BUILDINGS IMPROV/OTHER - CONTRIBUTIONS & TRANSFERS	(13,448)	...
GOVT BUILDINGS IMPROV/OTHER - FUND BALANCE INCREASE	13,448
I. Salt Storage Shed - Return cash back to General Fund, Class C will cover cost						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - CONTRIBUTIONS & TRANSFERS	(937,500)	...
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE INCREASE	937,500
#37 - GOVT BUILDINGS IMPROV/OTHER						
GOVT BUILDINGS IMPROV/OTHER - EXPENDITURES	...	937,500
GOVT BUILDINGS IMPROV/OTHER - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(937,500)

Budget Amendment Summary by Fund and Item

Debits (Credits)

FY of BA	FY24
BA#	1

Sum of Amount	Expenditure	Transfers Out	Use of Fund Balance	Revenue	Transfers In	Fund Balance Increase
J. WDC inspections, reimbursed by UDOT						
#38 - CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS						
CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS - CONTRIBUTIONS & TRANSFERS	(535,000)
CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS - EXPENDITURES	535,000
K. Impact fee study - Fire						
#43 - CAPITAL FIRE FUND						
CAPITAL FIRE FUND - EXPENDITURES	2,000
CAPITAL FIRE FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(2,000)
L. Park (Ivy Acres) - Preliminary costs (planning, design, etc.)						
#42 - PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND						
PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND - Business Park Park	218,000
PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(218,000)
M. Master Plan Study for Parks						
#42 - PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND						
PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND - EXPENDITURES	120,000
PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(120,000)

Budget Amendment Summary by Fund and Item

Debits (Credits)

FY of BA	FY24
BA#	1

Sum of Amount	Expenditure	Transfers Out	Use of Fund Balance	Revenue	Transfers In	Fund Balance Increase
N. Telemetry - move budget for telemetry software purchase to General Fund (operations)						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(31,550)
GENERAL FUND - PARKS & CEMETERY DEPARTMENT	31,550
#42 - PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND						
PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND - EXPENDITURES	(31,550)
PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND - FUND BALANCE INCREASE	31,550
O. Fire apparatus repairs - unanticipated repairs exceeded budget						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - FIRE DEPARTMENT	40,000
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(40,000)
P. Change in accounting principle - Ambulance Fund						
#55 - AMBULANCE SERVICE						
AMBULANCE SERVICE - ENTERPRISE REVENUE	500,000
AMBULANCE SERVICE - EXPENDITURES	(500,000)
Q. Ambulance purchase						
#55 - AMBULANCE SERVICE						
AMBULANCE SERVICE - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(248,000)
AMBULANCE SERVICE - NON-OPERATING EXPENDITURES	248,000

Budget Amendment Summary by Fund and Item

Debits (Credits)

FY of BA	FY24
BA#	1

Sum of Amount	Expenditure	Transfers Out	Use of Fund Balance	Revenue	Transfers In	Fund Balance Increase
R. First Responders Mental Health - grant from State of Utah						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - FIRE DEPARTMENT	47,738
GENERAL FUND - GRANTS	(119,345)
GENERAL FUND - POLICE DEPARTMENT	71,607
S. Grant from Jason W Read Protect and Serve Foundation						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - GRANTS	(5,000)
GENERAL FUND - POLICE DEPARTMENT	5,000
T. Lagoon security						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND	187,530
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(18,233)
GENERAL FUND - POLICE DEPARTMENT	(169,297)
U. IT support and cyber security enhancements						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT	85,000
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(85,000)

Budget Amendment Summary by Fund and Item

Debits (Credits)

FY of BA	FY24
BA#	1

Sum of Amount	Expenditure	Transfers Out	Use of Fund Balance	Revenue	Transfers In	Fund Balance Increase
V. Sewer billings/collections and remittance to district exceeding original budget						
#52 - SEWER FUND						
SEWER FUND - ENTERPRISE REVENUE	(146,000)
SEWER FUND - EXPENDITURES	146,000
W. Streets vehicle budgeted FY23 but received in FY24, rollover budget						
#39 - CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND						
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(60,100)
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND - PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURES	60,100
X. Surge protectors and such for City Hall						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT	7,275
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(7,275)
Y. Replacement of Fire bay overhead doors (2) and openers						
#10 - GENERAL FUND						
GENERAL FUND - BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT	22,000
GENERAL FUND - FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION	(22,000)
Grand Total	17,075,923	1,600,948	(18,590,606)	(157,815)	(1,600,948)	1,672,498

FUND BUDGETS AMENDED BY FY24 Budget Amendment

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024

Farmington City Corporation

	Adopted Budget	Amendment	Budget After BA
GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS			
General Fund (10)			
Revenues:			
Taxes Received	14,376,000		14,376,000
Intergovernmental	380,150	124,345	504,495
Licenses, Permits, Fees Received	921,000		921,000
Cost Sharing, Contributions Received	167,000		167,000
Charges for Services Revenue	378,490	(187,530)	190,960
Interest & Investment Earnings	51,500		51,500
Transfers In	2,230,000	1,587,500	3,817,500
Misc Revenue	24,500		24,500
Revenue total	18,528,640	1,524,315	20,052,955
Expenditures:			
Administration	1,451,961	85,000	1,536,961
Buildings Department	728,972	29,275	758,247
City Attorney	577,012		577,012
Community Development	1,511,474		1,511,474
Economic Development	171,740		171,740
Engineering	223,908		223,908
Fire	2,803,104	87,738	2,890,842
Legislative	158,072		158,072
Parks & Cemetery	1,448,912	31,550	1,480,462
Police	4,929,006	(92,690)	4,836,316
Streets Department	958,904		958,904
Transfers Out	4,620,467		4,620,467
Total Expenditures	19,583,531	140,873	19,724,404
Net change in fund balance	(1,054,891)	1,383,442	328,551

FUND BUDGETS AMENDED BY FY24 Budget Amendment

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024

Farmington City Corporation

	Adopted Budget	Amendment	Budget After BA
Special Revenue - RDA US HWY 89 (20)			
Revenue	189,000		189,000
Transfer In	-		-
Expenditures	184,805	926,000	1,110,805
Transfers Out	-		-
Net change in fund balance	4,195	(926,000)	(921,805)
Special Revenue - RDA Station Park (22)			
Revenue	462,000		462,000
Transfers In	-		-
Expenditures	15,000	401,000	416,000
Transfers Out	-		-
Net change in fund balance	447,000	(401,000)	46,000

FUND BUDGETS AMENDED BY FY24 Budget Amendment

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024

Farmington City Corporation

	Adopted Budget	Amendment	Budget After BA
Debt Service - RAP Tax Bond (30)			
Revenue	652,000		652,000
Transfers In	-		-
Expenditures	387,603		387,603
Transfers Out	300,000		300,000
Net change in fund balance	<u>(35,603)</u>	-	<u>(35,603)</u>
Debt Service - Police Sales Tax Bond (31)			
Revenue	1,000		1,000
Transfers In	-		-
Expenditures	72,684		72,684
Transfers Out	-		-
Net change in fund balance	<u>(71,684)</u>	-	<u>(71,684)</u>
Debt Service - 2015 G.O Park Bond (35)			
Revenue	410,000		410,000
Transfers In	-		-
Expenditures	410,000		410,000
Transfers Out	-		-
Net change in fund balance	<u>-</u>	-	<u>-</u>

FUND BUDGETS AMENDED BY FY24 Budget Amendment

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024

Farmington City Corporation

	Adopted Budget	Amendment	Budget After BA
Capital Projects - Class C Roads (11)			
Revenue	1,542,000		1,542,000
Transfers in	-		-
Expenditures	1,542,000		1,542,000
Transfers Out	-	13,448	13,448
Net change in fund balance	-	(13,448)	(13,448)
Capital Projects - Govt Buildings (37)			
Revenue	359,900		359,900
Transfers In	465,500	13,448	478,948
Expenditures	965,500		965,500
Transfers Out	-	937,500	937,500
Net change in fund balance	(140,100)	(924,052)	(1,064,152)
Capital Projects - Streets (38)			
Revenue	2,796,000	535,000	3,331,000
Transfers In	406,000		406,000
Expenditures	838,253	13,235,000	14,073,253
Transfers Out	-		-
Net change in fund balance	2,363,747	(12,700,000)	(10,336,253)
Capital Projects - Equipment (39)			
Revenue	17,000		17,000
Transfers In	1,420,152		1,420,152
Expenditures	1,556,152	60,100	1,616,252
Transfers Out	-		-
Net change in fund balance	(119,000)	(60,100)	(179,100)
Capital Projects - Land Acquisition (40)			
Revenue	5,705,000	40,000	5,745,000
Transfers In			-
Expenditures	-	76,000	76,000
Transfers Out	5,700,000		5,700,000
Net change in fund balance	5,000	(36,000)	(31,000)
Capital Projects - Park Improvements (42)			
Revenue	4,144,000		4,144,000
Transfers In	4,990,300		4,990,300
Expenditures	1,682,194	306,450	1,988,644
Transfers Out	-	650,000	650,000
Net change in fund balance	7,452,106	(956,450)	6,495,656

FUND BUDGETS AMENDED BY FY24 Budget Amendment

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024

Farmington City Corporation

	Adopted Budget	Amendment	Budget After BA
Capital Projects - Capital Fire (43)			
Revenue	255,600		255,600
Transfers In			-
Expenditures	657,074	2,000	659,074
Transfers Out	-		-
Net change in fund balance	(401,474)	(2,000)	(403,474)
Permanent Fund - Cemetery Perpetual Care (48)			
Revenue	8,500		8,500
Transfers In			-
Expenditures	-		-
Transfers Out	-		-
Net change in fund balance	8,500	-	8,500
ENTERPRISE FUNDS			
Water Fund (51)			
Revenue	6,269,200		6,269,200
Transfers In			-
Expenditures	13,375,652	37,000	13,412,652
Transfers Out	-		-
Change in Net Position	(7,106,452)	(37,000)	(7,143,452)
Sewer Fund (52)			
Revenue	2,563,000	146,000	2,709,000
Transfers In			-
Expenditures	2,431,627	183,500	2,615,127
Transfers Out	-		-
Change in Net Position	131,373	(37,500)	93,873
Garbage Fund (53)			
Revenue	2,022,300		2,022,300
Transfers In			-
Expenditures	2,004,673		2,004,673
Transfers Out	-		-
Change in Net Position	17,627	-	17,627
Storm Water Fund (54)			
Revenue	2,388,000		2,388,000
Transfers In			-
Expenditures	2,748,537	1,960,000	4,708,537
Transfers Out	30,000		30,000
Change in Net Position	(390,537)	(1,960,000)	(2,350,537)

FUND BUDGETS AMENDED BY FY24 Budget Amendment

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2024

Farmington City Corporation

	Adopted Budget	Amendment	Budget After BA
Ambulance Fund (55)			
Revenue	1,052,000	(500,000)	552,000
Transfers In	-		-
Expenditures	1,254,060	(252,000)	1,002,060
Transfers Out	-		-
Change in Net Position	<u>(202,060)</u>	<u>(248,000)</u>	<u>(450,060)</u>
Transportation Fund (56)			
Revenue	755,000		755,000
Transfers In	-		-
Expenditures	668,000		668,000
Transfers Out	-		-
Change in Net Position	<u>87,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>87,000</u>
Recreation Fund (60, 67)			
Revenue	1,065,135		1,065,135
Transfers In	1,138,515		1,138,515
Expenditures	2,603,030		2,603,030
Transfers Out	-		-
Change in Net Position	<u>(399,380)</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>(399,380)</u>

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-_____

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE MUNICIPAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING 6-30-24

WHEREAS, upon proper review and consideration, the City Council has held a public hearing concerning proposed amendments to its FYE 6-30-24 municipal budget.

WHEREAS, said public hearing has been held as required by law and pursuant to all legally required notices; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has heard and considered all public comment advanced at the aforementioned hearings; and

WHEREAS, the attached budgets are hereby found to comport with sound principles of fiscal planning in light of the needs and resources of Farmington City Corporation;

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

Section 1. FYE 6-30-24 Municipal Budget Amendment. The attached document entitled "Fund Budgets Amended by FY24 Budget Amendment", incorporated herein by reference, is hereby adopted.

Section 2. Miscellaneous Provisions.

a. **Severability.** If any part or provision of this Resolution is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Resolution, and all provisions, clauses, and words of this Resolution shall be severable.

b. **Titles and Headings.** The titles and headings of this Resolution form no part of the Resolution itself, have no binding or interpretative effect, and shall not alter the legal effect of any part of the Resolution for any reason.

c. **Effective Date.** This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon posting.

d. **Non-codification.** This Resolution shall be effective without codification.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF FARMINGTON CITY CORPORATION, STATE OF UTAH, ON THIS 18th DAY OF JUNE, 2024.

ATTEST

FARMINGTON CITY

DeAnn Carlile,
City Recorder

Brett Anderson,
Mayor

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA TITLE: Amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule (CFS)

PRESENTED BY: Greg Davis

DEPARTMENT: Finance

MEETING DATE: June 18, 2024



CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT FOR JUNE 18, 2024

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Greg Davis
Date: June 12, 2024
Subject: **Consolidated Fee Schedule (CFS) Amendments**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Accompanying this staff report are requested amendments to the consolidated fee schedule.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

Approval.

Suggested motion language: "I move that the City Council adopt the resolution amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule."

BACKGROUND

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 stated rates, the city will continue to bear more than cost recovery.

This CFS also includes rearranging certain sections to improve clarity. Such changes are noted.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Davis
Finance Director

Review and concur,

Brigham Mellor
City Manager

RESOLUTION NO: ____

**A RESOLUTION OF THE FARMINGTON CITY COUNCIL AMENDING THE
CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE**

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed the Consolidated Fee Schedule and has determined that the same should be amended as provided herein; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, upon recommendation from the City’s Administrative staff, has determined that an amendment of the Consolidated Fee Schedule is necessary to include certain new and adjusted fees

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF FARMINGTON CITY,
STATE OF UTAH AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1: Amendment. The Farmington City Consolidated Fee Schedule is hereby amended to include the various changes as proposed by City staff. See exhibited “A” attached.

Section 2: Severability. If any section, clause, or provision of this Resolution is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder shall not be affected thereby and shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 3: Effective Date. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF FARMINGTON CITY, STATE OF
UTAH, THIS 18th DAY OF MAY 2024.**

ATTEST:

FARMINGTON CITY

DeAnn Carlile, City Recorder

Brett Anderson, Mayor

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

A4. Site Plan Approval by Planning Commission

Concept Plan \$ 400.00

Site Plan Application (Commercial, Industrial, or Apartment Dwelling Group)

First acre or portion thereof \$650.00

Acres 2, 3 and 4 or any portion thereof \$500.00 per acre

Each acre or portion thereof over 4 \$ 350.00 per acre

Time extensions \$ 100.00

SPARC Review \$ 250.00

PLUS:

Engineering and Professional Service Fee, Initial & Quarterly Deposit \$ 500.00

(Deposit for consultant services beyond the amount covered in the base fee. Adjustment shall be made prior to submittal of site plan according to direct consultant service costs incurred - see note above)

Project Master Plan (PMP) Application \$ 400.00

(Adjustment shall be made prior to submittal of Site Plan according to direct professional service costs incurred - see note above. Developer shall pay actual cost.)

Single-family, Two-family dwelling, and Other Minor Permitted Uses

Site Plan Review \$ 25.00

(Applicant shall also pay all review costs incurred by the City Engineer and City Attorney)

Condominium Conversion \$ 150.00 +

\$ 50.00 per unit

Time Extension \$ 100.00 See A16.

A5. Board of Adjustment Administrative Hearing Officer / -Building Board of Appeals Application Bldg BOA moved to Section C

Appeals ** \$ 300.00

Non-Conforming Uses \$ 250.00 \$ 50.00 25.0%

Variances \$ 250.00 \$ 50.00 25.0%

** Cost of appeal will be refunded if appeals board or officer finds the City to have erred

Table with columns for Resident (New Rate, \$ Change, % Change) and Non Resident (New Rate, \$ Change, % Change). It contains data for various fee items, including 'Time Extension' and 'Non-Conforming Uses'.

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

A6. General Plan Amendment	\$ 300.00
A7. Temporary Use Application (to Planning Commission)	\$ 100.00
A8. Special Exception	\$ 150.00
A9. Zoning Amendment	
Rezone	\$ 300.00
Text Change	\$ 200.00
A10. Re-Application	
When Application is pulled by Applicant	\$ 50.00
Conditional Uses	50% of original fee
A11. Public Hearing Notice Fee	Varies
<i>Cost of newspaper publication plus</i> Postage for each individual notice (Charged every time a public hearing is required).	
A12. Maps and Publications	
Maps sized 11"X17" - Streets, General Plan, Zoning, Other	
Black and White	\$ 0.50
Color	\$ 2.50
Maps sized 24"X36" - Streets, General Plan, Zoning, Other	
Black and White	\$ 5.00
Color	\$ 15.00
Trails Book	\$ 20.00
Zoning Ordinance Text	\$ 15.00
General Plan Text	\$ 5.00 <i>Now available online</i>
Subdivision Ordinance Text	\$ 5.00
Other Titles	\$ 5.00

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

A13. Planning Commission Review \$ 25.00

(Used for informal review of proposal by the Planning Commission)

City Council Review \$ 25.00

(Used for informal review of proposal by the City Council)

A14. Conservation Easement Amendments

Application Fee	\$	250.00
Engineering and Professional Service Fee, Initial & Quarterly Deposit	\$	750.00

(In accordance with the Conservation Easement Amendment Policy, the applicant is required to pay for any legal and engineering fees incurred by the City in response to an application request. The Professional Services Deposit is required to be paid at the time the application is filed with the City, and each quarter thereafter - see note above. Any unused deposit will be refunded to the applicant after recording of the easement amendment or denial of the application, as applicable. The applicant shall be required to pay for any legal and engineering costs incurred by the City in response to the application that exceed the deposit - see note above. Such costs shall be paid prior to recording of the easement amendment, if approved, or within 30 days of final decision, if denied.

Recording Fee *Varies* Included in reg. fees

~~(Actual cost determined and charged by Davis County Recorder)~~

Conservation Easement Enforcement and Monitoring Fund As set by City Council

A15. Additional Reviews

(After the second review, each application re-submission to the Development Review C committee (DRC) shall require full payment of the respective application fee).

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

B. DEVELOPMENT-RELATED FEES

Time of Payment

Application fees shall be payable at the time the application is filed for review with Farmington City. Applications shall not be deemed complete until payment is made. Development Impact Fees or other required fees shall be payable prior to issuance of permits for developments or, in the case of subdivisions, prior to recordation of a subdivision plat.

[Note: the initial deposit for professional service/consultant fees set forth below is required at the time of application and each quarter thereafter up and until plat recordation, the issuance of building permit, the submittal of a site plan, application for preliminary, minor, or final subdivision plat, street dedication plat recordation, street vacation or street name change recordation, and/or until an easement or easement amendment is recorded--whatever the case may be--in anticipation of direct engineering/survey, City Attorney, and/or consultant review costs to be incurred by the City; fees are also required quarterly to pay any such cost incurred above the deposit amount—likewise, any deposit money not needed to off-set these costs will be refunded to the applicant].

~~B1. Impact Fees~~

~~a. City (See Exhibit B (1)(a))~~

~~b. Others—Central Davis Sewer & Benchland Irrigation (See Exhibit B(1)(b)(1) & (2))~~

See Section C

B1. Inspection of Improvements - 2% of City Engineer's estimate of the cost of public improvements.

B2. Subdivision / Planned Unit Developments (PUD)

Schematic Plan or Subdivision Yield Plan	\$ 400.00
Preliminary Plat or minor Subdivision Plat	\$ 500.00 + \$45/Lot
Final Plat	\$ 500.00 + \$60/Lot
Preliminary (PUD) Master Plan or Development Plan	1/2 of Prelim Plat Fee
Final (PUD) Master Plan or Development Plan	\$ 500.00 + \$45/lot

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Subdivision by Metes & Bounds (Without dedication only - with dedication see Preliminary Plat)	\$ 200.00 + \$45/Lot
Plat Amendment	\$45/Lot
With no streets	\$45/Lot
With streets	\$45/Lot
Recording Fee (Actual cost charged by Davis County Recorder)	Varies
Condominium Conversion	\$ 150.00 + \$50/Unit
Lot Line/Boundary Adjustment	\$ 125.00
Time Extension	\$ 100.00
B3. Streets and Easements	
Street Dedication	\$ 150.00
Street Vacation	\$ 150.00
Street Name Change	\$ 150.00
Easement Vacation	\$ 100.00

*No longer distinguishing
No longer distinguishing*

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

B4. Slurry Seal Fee \$ ~~3.06~~ per sq. yd

The slurry seal will be contracted by the City or under the direction of the City following specs as outlined in the City's Development Standards.

Street Excavation Fees

Working without a permit will double all fees in this section (E1). All fees in this section are non-refundable.

*MOVED FROM SECTION E
without rate changes*

Street Excavation Permit Fee \$ 70.00

Requires minimum cash bond of \$1,000 as per Section 8-5-140 of City code and additional bonding as determined by the City's Public Works Director

Construction Inspection as Required Actual Cost

***Excavation Trench Maintenance Fees**

Perpendicular Road Cuts

Road Cuts < 1/2 of road width \$ 250.00

Road Cuts > 1/2 of road width \$ 500.00

Parallel Road Cuts \$ 15.00 per linear ft

Microtrenching Fees

In the seam between the curb and the asphalt \$ 0.50 per linear ft

Anywhere else in the road \$ 1.50 per linear ft

Cutting Fees

Road age 3 years or less** \$ 500.00 minimum

Road age 4-5 years \$ 250.00 minimum

Road age 6 years or more \$ 150.00 minimum

Potholing & Bore Pit Maintenance Fees (in or out of the road)

Pothole < 24" x 24" \$ 25.00 each

Bore Pit > 24" x 24" \$ 70.00 each

Road closure fee*** \$ 500.00 per day

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 3.34	\$ 0.28	9.2%			

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

B7. Storm Water Permit Fees

Storm Water Permit City SWPPP Application Fee	\$135
Storm Water Permit UPDES state permit Application Fee	\$450
Storm Water Permit Bond	\$700 + \$1,100/acre (not to exceed \$4,000)
Storm Water Permit Reinstatement Fee (After a Stop Work Order)	\$300

Storm Water Permit Violation Minimum Fines:

Violation	Initial Offense	2nd Offense	3rd Offense
Lapse of UPDES Permit Coverage	\$60 per month out of coverage		
SWPPP not posted on site	\$100	\$200	\$400
Tracking of soil off site	\$100	\$200	\$400
Housekeeping Violations	\$100	\$200	\$400
BMP's not installed as shown on SWPPP	\$100	\$200	\$400
Not completing On Site Inspections	\$150	\$300	\$600
Uncontrolled Storm Water around site	\$150	\$300	\$600
Improper Chemical Storage	\$150	\$300	\$600
Soil/Construction Material Stacked on Impervious Surface	\$150	\$300	\$600
Improper Sediment Control	\$150	\$300	\$600
Improper Outhouse location/ not staked down	\$150	\$300	\$600
Failure to Maintain Records of SWPPP	\$200	\$400 with Stop Work Order	
Illegal Discharge from site	\$300	\$600 with Stop Work Order	
Improper Concrete Washout	\$300	\$600 with Stop Work Order	
Failure to Obtain a permit	\$500 with Stop Work Order		
Failure to Implement the SWPPP	\$500 with Stop Work Order		

- * 3rd Offense will be accompanied with a Stop Work Order
- * Fines are minimums and can be adjusted to compensate for the severity of the infraction.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

B8. Storm Water Illicit Discharge Cleanup Fee *Actual costs

*Actual costs include administrative and overhead costs

B9. PLUS:

Engineering and Professional Service Fee, Initial & Quarterly Deposit

First 10 Lots \$ 1,000.00

Each additional Lot \$35/lot, \$50/lot in Foothill OZ

(Engineering and legal fees are required with adjustment made prior to application for Final Plat according to direct professional service costs incurred - see note above)

Single Lot or Parcel Residential Construction Cleaning Fee

0 - 500 Square feet \$ 75.00

501 - 1000 Square feet \$ 150.00

1001 - 2500 Square feet \$ 225.00

2501 - 4000 Square feet \$ 300.00

4000 - Square feet and larger \$ 375.00

B10. Miscellaneous or Pre-Application Professional Services Deposit

Minimum Deposit \$ 150.00

Maximum Deposit (Unless otherwise set by the Council) \$ 2,500.00

(A professional services deposit may be required for applications, inquiries or pre-application review of proposals or contracts, or any other services rendered by the City's engineering, legal, building, planning, architectural, or other consultants. Any services valued above the minimum deposit must be approved by the City Manager.)

B11. Additional Reviews

(After the second review, each application re-submission to the Development Review Committee (DRC) shall require full payment of the respective application fee.)

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

B12. Fire Hydrant Meter Fees

Deposit (cost to replace meter, refundable)*	\$	1,850.00	
One-time permit fee	\$	70.00	
Monthly rental fee (1 month minimum)	\$	70.00	per month
Cost of water	\$	5.00	per 1,000 gal

*The deposit refund will be reduced by the amount of the water usage

Unpermitted use - Theft of service

First offense	\$	250.00
Subsequent offenses	\$	500.00

B13. Service Fee for Credit/Debit Cards 2.75%-See G7.

C. BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION & RELATED FEES

Time of Payment

Fees in this section shall generally be payable prior to the issuance of the building permit.

C1. Application Fees

~~See Exhibit C(1)(a) "Resolution 2008-31".~~

C1. Plan Review Deposit

Residential	\$	75.00
Commercial	\$	250.00

C2. Plan Check Fee

Residential	40% of building application permit fee.
Residential (same model)	\$ 100.00
Commercial	65% of building application fee.

C3. State Inspection Fee 1% of bldg. application fee

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

C4. Cash Bonds:	
Construction, Residential	\$ 500.00
Construction, Commercial	\$ 1,000.00
Storm Water, Residential (See B-9)	\$ 1,000.00
Storm Water, Commercial (See B-9)	\$ 1,000.00

No longer collect construction bonds; storm water bonds referenced in section B

C4. Building Board of Appeals Application	
Appeals (Cost of appeal will be refunded if appeals board or officer finds the City to have erred)	\$ 300.00

Bldg BOA moved from Section A

C5. Temporary Occupancy Application Fee*	\$ 50.00
---	----------

Moved from Section B

**Requires minimum cash bond of \$5,000 as per Section 10-5-050 of City code and additional bonding as determined by the City's Building Official.*

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Farmington City Miscellaneous Residential Building Permit Fees

Item	Cost Per Square Foot or Flat Rate
Basement Rough (New Construction)	\$13.75+
Basement Finish (New Construction)	\$18.45+
Finish Basement (Existing)	\$6.05+
Garage	\$23.65+
Carport	\$13.03+
Porches with Redwood Deck	\$15.69+
Porches with Concrete Slab	\$13.31+
Patio - Concrete	\$3.99+
Open Deck - Redwood	\$8.23+
Swimming Pool (above ground)	\$33.37+
Swimming Pool (below ground)	\$44.41+
Hot Tub (2 inspections, flat rate)	\$111.10+
Retaining Wall (8')	\$61.71+
Retaining Wall (2')	\$40.29+
Convert Roof - Flat to Pitch	\$8.51+
Agriculture Building (under 400 s.f.)	\$14.22+
Agriculture Building (over 400 s.f.)	\$19.65+
Agriculture Building (open)	\$12.06+
Storage Shed (under 400 s.f.)	\$17.15+
Storage Shed (over 400 s.f.)	\$19.57+
Solar (Flat Rate)	\$ 378.01

**On small projects that are difficult to determine a valuation, the Building Official has the discretion to determine how many inspections the project will require and charge accordingly.

Note: Minimum permit fee is \$55.00 for one inspection and .55 for State 1%
 All residential building permit fees will also be charged a Plan Check Fee of 40% of the Building Permit Fee
 Plan Check Fee for Duplicate Models (card file) Plans - \$100

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Building Valuation Data

Square foot Construction Costs (a,b,c,d)

Group	(2006 International Building Code)	Type of construction				
		IA	IB	IIA	IIB	IIIA
A-1	Assembly, theaters, with Stage	\$ 196.11	\$ 189.78	\$ 185.37	\$ 177.60	\$ 167.20
	Assembly, theaters, without stage	\$ 177.62	\$ 171.29	\$ 166.88	\$ 159.10	\$ 148.75
A-2	Assembly, nightclubs	\$ 149.94	\$ 145.74	\$ 142.04	\$ 136.49	\$ 128.53
A-2	Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls	\$ 148.94	\$ 144.74	\$ 140.04	\$ 135.49	\$ 126.53
A-3	Assembly, Churches	\$ 180.72	\$ 174.39	\$ 169.98	\$ 162.21	\$ 151.82
A-3	Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums	\$ 152.81	\$ 146.48	\$ 141.07	\$ 134.30	\$ 122.33
A-4	Assembly, arenas	\$ 176.62	\$ 170.29	\$ 164.88	\$ 158.10	\$ 146.75
B	Business	\$ 154.16	\$ 148.70	\$ 144.00	\$ 137.27	\$ 125.07
E	Educational	\$ 166.52	\$ 160.91	\$ 156.34	\$ 149.52	\$ 140.14
F-1	Factory & industrial, moderate hazard	\$ 92.68	\$ 88.42	\$ 83.70	\$ 80.93	\$ 72.45
F-2	Factory & industrial, low hazard	\$ 91.68	\$ 87.42	\$ 83.70	\$ 79.93	\$ 72.45
H-1	High Hazard, explosives	\$ 86.84	\$ 82.58	\$ 78.86	\$ 75.09	\$ 67.79
H234	High Hazard	\$ 86.84	\$ 82.58	\$ 78.86	\$ 75.09	\$ 67.79
H-5	HPM	\$ 154.16	\$ 148.70	\$ 144.00	\$ 137.27	\$ 125.07
I-1	Institutional, supervised environment	\$ 152.30	\$ 147.08	\$ 143.14	\$ 137.34	\$ 128.24
I-2	Institutional, hospitals	\$ 256.26	\$ 250.80	\$ 246.11	\$ 239.38	\$ 226.55
I-2	Institutional, nursing homes	\$ 179.18	\$ 173.72	\$ 169.02	\$ 162.30	\$ 150.51
I-3	Institutional, restrained	\$ 174.99	\$ 169.52	\$ 164.83	\$ 158.10	\$ 147.16
I-4	Institutional, day care facilities	\$ 152.30	\$ 147.08	\$ 143.14	\$ 137.34	\$ 128.24
M	Mercantile	\$ 111.44	\$ 107.24	\$ 102.53	\$ 97.99	\$ 89.62
R-1	Residential, hotels	\$ 154.24	\$ 149.02	\$ 145.08	\$ 139.28	\$ 129.95
R-2	Residential, multiple family	\$ 129.33	\$ 124.11	\$ 120.17	\$ 114.37	\$ 105.16
R-3	Residential, one & two-family	\$ 122.11	\$ 118.76	\$ 115.86	\$ 112.68	\$ 108.62
R-4	Residential, care/assist living facilities	\$ 152.30	\$ 147.08	\$ 143.14	\$ 137.34	\$ 128.24
S-1	Storage, moderate hazard	\$ 85.84	\$ 81.58	\$ 76.86	\$ 74.09	\$ 65.79
S-2	Storage, low hazard	\$ 84.84	\$ 80.58	\$ 76.86	\$ 73.09	\$ 65.79
U	Utility, miscellaneous	\$ 65.15	\$ 61.60	\$ 57.92	\$ 55.03	\$ 49.70

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Building Valuation Data (continued)

Group	(2006 International Building Code)	Type of construction			
		IIIB	IV	VA	VB
A-1	Assembly, theaters, with Stage	\$ 162.27	\$ 171.92	\$ 152.56	\$ 146.94
	Assembly, theaters, without stage	\$ 143.82	\$ 153.43	\$ 134.10	\$ 128.49
A-2	Assembly, nightclubs	\$ 124.91	\$ 131.71	\$ 116.50	\$ 112.58
A-2	Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls	\$ 123.91	\$ 130.71	\$ 114.50	\$ 111.58
A-3	Assembly, Churches	\$ 146.89	\$ 156.54	\$ 137.18	\$ 131.57
A-3	Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums	\$ 118.97	\$ 128.63	\$ 108.26	\$ 103.65
A-4	Assembly, arenas	\$ 142.82	\$ 152.43	\$ 132.10	\$ 127.49
B	Business	\$ 120.41	\$ 131.97	\$ 109.81	\$ 105.37
E	Educational	\$ 132.98	\$ 144.59	\$ 123.34	\$ 118.69
F-1	Factory & industrial, moderate hazard	\$ 69.29	\$ 77.68	\$ 59.67	\$ 56.50
F-2	Factory & industrial, low hazard	\$ 68.29	\$ 76.68	\$ 59.67	\$ 55.50
H-1	High Hazard, explosives	\$ 63.63	\$ 71.84	\$ 55.02	Not permitted
H234	High Hazard	\$ 63.63	\$ 71.84	\$ 55.02	\$ 50.85
H-5	HPM	\$ 120.41	\$ 131.97	\$ 109.81	\$ 105.37
I-1	Institutional, supervised environment	\$ 124.73	\$ 138.61	\$ 116.09	\$ 111.54
I-2	Institutional, hospitals	Not permitted	\$ 234.08	\$ 211.31	Not permitted
I-2	Institutional, nursing homes	Not permitted	\$ 157.00	\$ 135.27	Not permitted
I-3	Institutional, restrained	\$ 141.52	\$ 152.80	\$ 131.92	\$ 125.48
I-4	Institutional, day care facilities	\$ 124.73	\$ 138.61	\$ 116.09	\$ 111.54
M	Mercantile	\$ 87.00	\$ 93.21	\$ 77.59	\$ 74.67
R-1	Residential, hotels	\$ 126.44	\$ 140.32	\$ 117.80	\$ 113.25
R-2	Residential, multiple family	\$ 101.65	\$ 115.53	\$ 93.01	\$ 88.46
R-3	Residential, one & two-family	\$ 105.77	\$ 110.77	\$ 101.74	\$ 95.91
R-4	Residential, care/assist living facilities	\$ 124.73	\$ 138.61	\$ 116.09	\$ 111.54
S-1	Storage, moderate hazard	\$ 62.63	\$ 70.84	\$ 53.02	\$ 49.85
S-2	Storage, low hazard	\$ 61.63	\$ 69.84	\$ 53.02	\$ 48.85
U	Utility, private garages, miscellaneous	\$ 46.33	\$ 51.94	\$ 39.23	\$ 37.34

*Unfinished basements (all use group) = \$15 per sq. Ft.

*For shell only building deduct 20%

Note: (1) As per 10-3-110, working without a permit is up to double amount of standard fee

Electronic files of the latest Building Valuation Data can be downloaded from the Code Council website at www.iccsafe.org/cs/techservices

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Table No. 1-A Building Permit Fees from 1997 Uniform Building Code

Total Valuation	FEE
\$1.00 to \$500	\$23.00
\$501 to \$2,000	\$23.50 plus \$3.05 for each additional \$100.00, or fraction thereof, to and including \$2,000.00
\$2,001 to \$25,000	\$69.25 plus \$14.00 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000.
\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$391.75 plus \$10.10 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000.
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$643.75 plus \$7.00 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000.
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$993.75 plus \$5.60 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000.
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$3,233.75 plus \$4.75 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000.
\$1,000,001 and Up	\$5,608.75 plus \$3.15 for each additional \$1,000, or fraction thereof.

1. Inspections outside of normal business hours..... Minimum Charge - Two (2) hours	\$55.55/hr*
2. Reinspection fees assessed under provisions of Section 305.8.....	\$55.55/hr*
3. Inspections for which no fee is specifically indicated Minimum Charge - one-half hour	\$55.55/hr*
4. Additional plan review required with changes, additions or revisions to plans.....	\$55.55/hr*
5. For use of outside consultants for plan checking and inspections, or both.....	Actual Costs**

* Or the total hourly cost to the jurisdiction, whichever is the greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages, and fringe benefits of the employees involved.

** Actual costs include administrative and overhead costs.

- NOTE:**
- (1) Commercial plan check fees are 65% of building fee.
 - (2) Residential plan check fees are 40% of the building fee.
 - (3) As per 10-3-110, working without a permit can result in double fees.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Impact Fees (other than Transportation and Water)						
Property Type	Unit of Measure	Impact Fees per Unit				
		Storm Water Drainage*	Parks & ** Recreation	Fire Impact Fee for Land & Building**	Police Capital Facilities**	Total
Single Family	dwelling unit	\$ 1,709.87	\$ 6,616.00	\$ 915.48	\$ 772.38	\$ 10,013.73
Multi-Family 8	dwelling unit	\$ 1,299.50	\$ 4,440.00	\$ 915.48	\$ 772.38	\$ 7,427.36
Multi-Family	dwelling unit	\$ 1,299.50	\$ 4,440.00	\$ 900.06	\$ 642.70	\$ 7,282.26
Hotel	Room	\$ 1,299.50	No Fee	-	-	\$ 1,299.50
	1,000 sq. Ft.	-	No Fee	\$ 1,380.00	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 2,400.00
Commercial	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$ 2,376.71	No Fee	\$ 1,380.00	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 4,776.71
Office	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$ 1,812.46	No Fee	\$ 1,380.00	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 4,212.46
Industrial	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$ 2,103.14	No Fee	\$ 1,380.00	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 4,503.14
Warehouse	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$ 2,103.14	No Fee	\$ 1,380.00	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 4,503.14
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$ 2,103.14	No Fee	\$ 1,380.00	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 4,503.14
Institutional	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$ 837.83	No Fee	\$ 1,380.00	\$ 1,020.00	\$ 3,237.83

*Impact Fee Collected at Plat Recordation

**Impact Fees Collected at Building Permit

Water Impact Fees*	
Property Type	Amount
Single Family / dwelling unit	\$ 4,263.00
Multi-Family / dwelling unit	\$ 2,500.00
Hotel / ERC**	\$ 4,263.00
Commercial / ERC**	\$ 4,263.00
Office / ERC**	\$ 4,263.00
Warehouse / ERC**	\$ 4,263.00
Industrial / ERC**	\$ 4,263.00
Institutional / ERC**	\$ 4,263.00

* Impact Fee Collected at Plat Recordation

** One Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC) = 24 Drainage Fixture Units (DFU). Minimum impact fee is \$4,263.00.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Transportation Impact Fee				
Property Type	Unit of Measure	Impact Fee Amount*		
		Cost per Average Daily Trips (ADT)	Adjusted Trip Rate	Amount/Unit
Single-Family	Dwelling Unit	\$509.41	4.72	\$2,404.42
Multi-Family (townhomes)	Dwelling Unit	\$509.41	3.66	\$1,864.44
Multi-Family (apartments)	Dwelling Unit	\$509.41	2.72	\$1,385.60
Industrial Park 130	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	1.69	\$860.90
General Manufacturing	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	1.97	\$1,003.54
Warehousing	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	0.87	\$443.19
Mini-Warehouse	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	0.76	\$387.15
Mobile Home Park	Dwelling Unit	\$509.41	3.25	\$1,655.58
Assisted Living Center	Bed	\$509.41	1.3	\$662.23
Hotel	Room	\$509.41	4.18	\$2,129.33
Movie Theater	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	39.05	\$19,892.46
Elementary School	Students	\$509.41	0.95	\$483.94
Middle School / Junior High School	Students	\$509.41	1.07	\$545.07
High School	Students	\$509.41	1.02	\$519.60
Private School (K-8)	Students	\$509.41	2.06	\$1,049.38
Church	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	13.82	\$7,040.05
Day Care Center	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	23.81	\$12,129.05
Library	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	36.03	\$18,354.04
Hospital	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	5.36	\$2,730.44
General Office Building	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	4.87	\$2,480.83
Medical-Dental Office Building	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	17.4	\$8,863.73
Business Park	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	6.22	\$3,168.53
Building Material and Lumber Store	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	9.03	\$4,599.97
Nursery (Garden Center)	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	34.05	\$17,345.41
Shopping Center / Strip Mall	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	12.46	\$6,347.25
Automobile Sales (New)	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	13.92	\$7,090.99
Automobile Sales (Used)	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	13.53	\$6,892.32
Tire Store	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	10.27	\$5,231.64
Supermarket	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	34.17	\$17,406.54
Convenience Market	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	186.76	\$95,137.41
Drive-in Bank	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	32.51	\$16,560.92
Restaurant, Sit-Down (High Turnover)	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	31.97	\$16,285.84

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Fast Food without Drive-Through Window	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	98.68	\$50,268.58
Restaurant with Drive Through Window	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	117.74	\$59,977.93
Auto Care Center	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	11.86	\$6,041.60
Gasoline/Service Station	Fueling Position	\$509.41	49.88	\$25,409.37
Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Store	1,000 sq. Ft.	\$509.41	316.8	\$161,381.09
Self Service Car Wash	Wash Stall	\$509.41	54	\$27,508.14
* Impact Fee Collected at Building Permit				

C6. Connection Fees/Other

Culinary Water (See August 16, 2001, Memo)

\$ ~~160.00~~

Included below

Cost of Water Meter Only

Size of Meter	Meter Fee
3/4"	\$ 317.00
1'	\$ 469.00
1 1/2"	\$ 880.00
2"	\$ 1,048.00
3"	\$ 2,353.00
4"	\$ 3,196.00
6"	\$ 5,187.00
8"	\$ 6,167.00

Fee covers the City's expense for inspection, meter installation, overhead, inventory and account setup charges, plus actual cost of meter rounded to the nearest \$5 if meter box, lid and setter or yoke and other pertinent parts are supplied by developer or contractor, or actual cost of the meter, box, and lid, setter or yoke and other pertinent parts rounded to the nearest \$5 when they are not provided by contractor or developer.

Irrigation Water - Benchland Water District

C7. Street Cleaning Fee

0 - 500 SF	\$ 80.00
501 - 1,000	\$ 160.00
1,001 - 2,500	\$ 240.00
2,501 - 4,000	\$ 325.00
Above 4,000	\$ 405.00

C8. C3. Service Fee for Credit/Debit Cards

2.75% See G7.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 532.66	\$ 55.66	17.6%			
\$ 652.10	\$ 23.10	4.9%			
\$ 1,118.37	\$ 78.37	8.9%			
\$ 1,286.61	\$ 78.61	7.5%			
\$ 3,161.25	\$ 648.25	27.5%			
\$ 3,999.81	\$ 643.81	20.1%			
\$ 6,392.48	\$ 1,045.48	20.2%			
\$ 8,941.25	\$ 2,614.25	42.4%			

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

D. ENTERPRISE FUND—USER FEES UTILITIES

Time of Payment

Payment is due by the end of each billing month.

D1. Culinary Water

Water minimum (Base Rate)

Residential		\$ 23.70	per month
Commercial	Up to 1"	\$ 23.70	per month
	1.5"	\$ 49.70	per month
	2"	\$ 79.50	per month
	3"	\$ 149.00	per month
	4"	\$ 248.20	per month
	6"	\$ 496.50	per month
	8"	\$ 794.50	per month

The meter size will be determined by the largest meter installed. If more than one meter is installed of the same size, then the charge will be determined by the number of those meters installed. If more than one size of meter is installed, the largest meter size will be charged the base meter rate.

Usage charges:

Residential	0-5000	Minimum	Base Rate
	5001-10000	\$ 3.30	per 1000 gals
	10001-20000	\$ 3.60	per 1000 gals
	20001&above	\$ 4.00	per 1000 gals
Commercial		\$ 2.80	per 1000 gals

Water users living outside of Farmington City limits will be charged double the rate.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 24.40	\$ 0.70	3.0%			
\$ 24.40	\$ 0.70	3.0%			
\$ 51.20	\$ 1.50	3.0%			
\$ 81.90	\$ 2.40	3.0%			
\$ 153.50	\$ 4.50	3.0%			
\$ 255.60	\$ 7.40	3.0%			
\$ 511.40	\$ 14.90	3.0%			
\$ 818.30	\$ 23.80	3.0%			
\$ 3.40	\$ 0.10	3.0%			
\$ 3.70	\$ 0.10	2.8%			
\$ 4.10	\$ 0.10	2.5%			
\$ 2.90	\$ 0.10	3.6%			

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

D2. Sanitary Sewer

Farmington City bills and collects on behalf of Central Davis Sewer District (CDS). Farmington City's fee structure is based on what CDS bills Farmington City. CDS's fee structure can be found at <https://www.cdsewer.org/documents/>

Single family residential units and individually metered multi-family units	\$ 28.00	per month
Single family residential units and individually metered multi-family units - pumped	\$ 29.50	per month
Multi-family units sharing a common meter & non-residential units		
First 20,000 gallons	\$ 48.50	per month
Additional usage (per 1,000 gallons)	\$ 2.32	per month
First 20,000 gallons - Pumped	\$ 51.50	per month
Additional usage - Pumped (per 1,000 gallons)	\$ 2.40	per month

D3 Garbage Collection

First automated container	\$ 17.80	per month
Each additional automated container	\$ 14.50	per month per container
Extra can pickup fee	\$ 25.00	per occurrence
Extra can delivery fee	\$ 25.00	per occurrence
Can replacement fee	\$ 50.00	per occurrence

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 38.70	\$ 10.70	38.2%			
\$ 40.20	\$ 10.70	36.3%			
\$ 66.70	\$ 18.20	37.5%			
\$ 3.21	\$ 0.89	38.4%			
\$ 69.70	\$ 18.20	35.3%			
\$ 3.29	\$ 0.89	37.1%			
\$ 19.00	\$ 1.20	6.7%			
\$ 17.40	\$ 2.90	20.0%			
\$ 110.00	\$ 60.00	120.0%			

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

D4. Recycling Collection Fee

\$ 3.60 per month
per container

Extra can pickup fee \$ 25.00 per occurrence

Extra can delivery fee \$ 25.00 per occurrence

Can replacement fee ~~\$ 50.00~~ per occurrence

D5. Storm Water Utility

***Drainage Utility Fee**

Each single family residential unit and residential duplex shall be charged the following monthly "Drainage Utility Fee" as the established base rate for one Equivalent Service Unit (ESU) equaling 4,083 sf of impervious surface. ~~\$ 8.20~~ per month

Each developed multi-family residential parcel, commercial parcel, and other non-residential parcel shall be charged a monthly Drainage Utility Fee as the multiple of the base rate set forth in Section 1, based upon the number of ESU's on the property and the measured impervious surface area. The number of ESU's on any particular developed parcel shall be determined by measuring the amount of impervious surface on the parcel (in square feet) and dividing that number by the designated base ESU of 4,083 sf. The actual monthly Drainage Utility Fee shall be computed by multiplying the total ESU's for the parcel by the monthly rate set forth in Section 1. For example, a parcel with 25,000 square feet of impervious surface area shall pay a fee of \$42.86 per month: 25,000/4,083=6.123 ESUs then 6.123X\$7=\$42.86. ~~\$ 8.20~~ per month per ESU

NOTE:-

~~All deposits are cumulative and adjustments will be made at building permit issuance or plat recordation unless developer withdraws application(s) or approvals expire.~~

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 110.00	\$ 60.00	120.0%			
\$ 8.60	\$ 0.40	4.9%			
\$ 8.60	\$ 0.40	4.9%			

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

D6. Transportation Utility

Residential Transportation Utility Fee ~~\$ 3.40~~ per month per ERU

~~a. Single Family Dwelling. Residential Uses.~~ As specified in the latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip General Manual, a single family dwelling generates 9.5 trips/day. Accordingly, each single family dwelling shall be charged the following above monthly "Residential Transportation Utility Fee" as the established base rate for one Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) ~~equaling \$3.40~~

~~b. Two-Family Dwelling and Multiple-Family Dwelling. Each two-family and multiple-family dwelling use shall be charged a monthly Transportation Utility Fee based upon the number of ERU's on the property as measured by the size of the use and the trips generated thereby as set forth in the ITE manual for such use. The actual monthly Transportation Utility Fee shall be computed by multiplying the total ERU's for the use/parcel by the monthly residential rate set forth above~~ *Combined w/above note*

Non-Residential Transportation Utility Fee ~~\$ 1.73~~ per month per ERU

Non-Residential Uses. Each and all non-residential uses shall be charged a monthly Transportation Utility Fee based upon the number of ERU's on the property as measured by the size of the use and the trips generated thereby as set forth in the ITE manual for such use. The actual monthly Transportation Utility Fee shall be computed by multiplying the total ERU's for the use/parcel by the monthly non-residential rate set forth above.

D7. Penalties for Late Payments and Nonpayments on Utility Bills

Late payments	5% of past due balance
Reestablishment of service fee	\$ 25.00
Returned payment fee	\$ 20.00

D8. Deferral fee (paid at time of request) \$10.00* per month

*The deferral fee is in lieu of services provided by Farmington City (water, garbage, storm water, and transportation). Customers will still be billed the full amount for sewer services as C.D.S.D does not have a deferral program.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 3.60	\$ 0.20	5.9%			
\$ 1.84	\$ 0.11	6.4%			

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

E. PUBLIC PROPERTY/ PARKS & RECREATION FEES

E1. Street Excavation Fees

MOVED TO SECTION B, no changes

Working without a permit will double all fees in this section (E1). All fees in this section are non-refundable.

~~Street Excavation Permit Fee \$ 70.00~~

~~Requires minimum cash bond of \$1000 as per Section 8-5-140 of City code and additional bonding as determined by the City's Public Works Director~~

~~Construction Inspection as Required Actual Cost~~

~~*Excavation Trench Maintenance Fees~~

~~—Perpendicular Cuts~~

~~—Short Crossing \$ 250.00~~

~~—Long Crossing \$ 500.00~~

~~—Parallel Cuts \$ 15.00 per linear ft~~

~~Microtrenching Fees~~

~~—In the seam between the curb and the asphalt \$ 0.50 per linear ft~~

~~—Anywhere else in the road \$ 1.50 per linear ft~~

~~Cutting Fees~~

~~—Road age 3 years or less** \$ 500.00 minimum~~

~~—Road age 4-5 years \$ 250.00 minimum~~

~~—Road age 6 years or more \$ 150.00 minimum~~

~~Potholing & Bore Pit Maintenance Fees~~

~~—Pothole \$ 25.00 each~~

~~—Bore Pit \$ 70.00 each~~

~~Road closure fee*** \$ 500.00 per day~~

~~*An additional 15% of the original Excavation Trench Maintenance fee will be assessed each day beyond the original deadline until the excavation is patched as per the Excavation Permit requirements.~~

~~** Cutting into road surfaces less than 3 (three) years old must be approved by the Public Works Director. If cutting into such a road is required, maintenance fees double.~~

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

***The City Engineer and the Public Works Director must approve all road closures. All excavations within the City Right of Way are subject to the requirements of the excavation permit.

~~Service Fee for Credit/Debit Cards~~ 2.75%

Time of Payment

- a. For Cemetery services, payment is generally due at time request for services is made
- b. Parks & Recreation user fees are due as per the Parks & Recreation Rules & Procedures

E1. Cemetery Fees

~~Transfer of burial rights from one designated heir to another~~ \$ ~~27.00~~

Grave Marker Fees

Flat Marker \$ ~~27.00~~
 Raised Markers \$ ~~160.00~~
 Fine for placing a marker without a permit \$ 1,000.00

Sale of "Right to Burial"

Residential Adult \$ ~~790.00~~
~~Non-residential Adult~~ \$ ~~1,060.00~~
 Residential Child \$ ~~160.00~~
~~Non-residential Child~~ \$ ~~190.00~~

Burial Fees (Weekdays)*

Residential Adult \$ ~~540.00~~
 Non-residential Adult \$ ~~1,075.00~~
~~Residential Child~~ \$ ~~160.00~~
~~Residential Urn~~ \$ ~~160.00~~
~~Non-residential Child~~ \$ ~~430.00~~
~~Non residential Urn~~ \$ ~~430.00~~
 After hours charge (begins at 3pm) \$ 250.00

*child and urn
now separate*
*child and urn
now separate*
 per hour

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 50.00	\$ 23.00	85.2%			
\$ 200.00	\$ 40.00	25.0%			
\$ 850.00	\$ 60.00	7.6%			
\$ 300.00	\$ 140.00	87.5%			
\$ 600.00	\$ 60.00	11.1%			
\$ 1,600.00	\$ 525.00	48.8%			
\$ 300.00	\$ 140.00	87.5%			
\$ 250.00	\$ 90.00	56.3%			
\$ 700.00	\$ 270.00	62.8%			
\$ 500.00	\$ 70.00	16.3%			

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Burial Fees (Weekends/Holidays/After 4:00)*

Residential Adult	\$ 810.00	
Non-residential Adult	\$ 1,350.00	
Residential Child	\$ 430.00	child and urn now separate
Residential Urn	\$ 430.00	child and urn now separate
Non-residential Child	\$ 810.00	
Non residential Urn	\$ 810.00	

Late notice burial fee* \$ 100.00

* Farmington City must be informed of burials at least 48 hours in advance.

Disinterment Fees

Residential Adult (limited to vaults only)	\$ 1,300.00	no non-resident fee now
Non-residential Adult (limited to vaults only)	\$ 2,150.00	
Residential Child or Urn (adult or child)	\$ 860.00	
Non-residential Child or Urn (adult or child)	\$ 1,075.00	

Repurchase Price for the City's "Right to Burial"

Burial sites adjacent to each other or single site adjacent to another single burial site	\$ 430.00	per grave
Single burial sites	\$ 110.00	per burial site

E2. Parks & Recreation Facilities Use Fees

Park Picnic Pavilions (2 hour min)

Deposit (fully-refundable)	\$ 55.00	
Food Truck Deposit (refundable)	\$ 110.00	
Resident (per pavilion)	\$ 15.00	per hour
Non-resident (per pavilion)	\$ 25.00	per hour
Woodland Amphitheater	\$ 27.00	per hour
Employee Rental Rates	\$ 15.00	per hour

Deposits and fees must be paid at the time of reservation. Cancellations shall not be made less than 7 days before the reservation date in order to obtain a full refund. Cancellations made with less than 7 days advance notice will forfeit all fees paid, with the exception of bad weather or a lightning storm.

	Resident			Non Resident		
	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
Residential Adult	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 290.00	35.8%			
Non-residential Adult	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 750.00	55.6%			
Residential Child	\$ 800.00	\$ 370.00	86.0%			
Residential Urn	\$ 750.00	\$ 320.00	74.4%			
Non-residential Child	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 390.00	48.1%			
Non residential Urn	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 190.00	23.5%			
Late notice burial fee*						
Disinterment Fees						
Residential Adult (limited to vaults only)	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 200.00	15.4%			
Non-residential Adult (limited to vaults only)						
Residential Child or Urn (adult or child)	\$ 900.00	\$ 40.00	4.7%			
Non-residential Child or Urn (adult or child)						
Repurchase Price for the City's "Right to Burial"						
Burial sites adjacent to each other or single site adjacent to another single burial site						
Single burial sites						
Park Picnic Pavilions (2 hour min)						
Resident (per pavilion)						
Non-resident (per pavilion)	\$ 30.00	\$ 5.00	20.0%			
Woodland Amphitheater						
Employee Rental Rates						

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Special Use Permit Fees

Animal show	\$ 27.00	
Electricity for Woodland Amphitheater	\$ 27.00	
Food Trucks	\$ 27.00	
Use of amplified sound	\$ 27.00	per hour
Groups over 300 participants	\$ 80.00	
Band(s) with amplified sound (2 hour max)	\$ 110.00	
Other special uses that may adversely affect neighboring property owners	\$ 50.00	

Community Arts Center Rental Fees

Main Floor

Deposits (Refundable):

Main Hall & Kitchen	\$ 215.00
---------------------	----------------------

Main Hall Rental Fees (minimum of 2 hours):

Resident	\$ 55.00	per hour
Non-resident	\$ 135.00	per hour
Commercial	\$ 135.00	per hour
Non-profit clubs and recitals*	\$ 70.00	per hour
Other Organizations*	\$ 70.00	per hour
City Employees	\$ 27.00	per hour

*(Non-Profit Clubs and organizations must be Farmington based and 75% residents.)-

Main Hall Rental Fees (minimum of 2 hours)

	Resident	Non-Res.	
Cleaning and damage deposit (fully-refundable)	\$ 215.00	\$ 215.00	same rate for the deposit, applies to all facility now
Family Events	\$ 55.00	\$ 110.00	per hour
All other Events	\$ 100.00	\$ 200.00	per hour
City Employees	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	per hour

Miscellaneous Fees

One Microphone CD and/or iPod hookup	\$ 11.00	
Sound and Light Technician	\$ 27.00	per hour
Kitchen (minimum of 2 hours)	\$ 15.00	per hour

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 30.00	\$ 3.00	11.1%			
\$ 30.00	\$ 3.00	11.1%			
\$ 35.00	\$ 8.00	29.6%			

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Classrooms (minimum of 2 hours)

Cleaning and damage deposit (fully-refundable)	\$	54.00	
Resident (per classroom)	\$	16.00	per hour
Non-resident (per classroom)	\$	27.00	per hour

Classrooms (minimum of 2 hours)

	Resident	Non-Res.	
Cleaning and damage deposit (fully-refundable)	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	
Family Events	\$ 20.00	\$ 40.00	per hour
All other Events	\$ 30.00	\$ 60.00	per hour

Multi Purpose Room (including sound and kitchen)

Cleaning and damage deposit (fully-refundable)	\$	80.00	
Resident	\$	32.00	per hour
Non-resident	\$	59.00	per hour
City Employees	\$	11.00	per hour

Multi-Purpose Room Fees (including sound and kitchen, minimum of 2 hours)

	Resident	Non-Res.	
Cleaning and damage deposit (fully-refundable)	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	
Family Events	\$ 35.00	\$ 70.00	per hour
All other Events	\$ 60.00	\$ 120.00	per hour
City Employees	\$ 15.00	\$ 15.00	per hour

Entire Basement (including sound)

Resident	\$	43.00	per hour
Non-resident	\$	86.00	per hour

Ceramics room is not available

Holiday Rental

All holiday rentals apply to all observed Holidays - except for Thanksgiving, Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, **Martin Luther King Day**, **President's Day**, and the 4th of July as the facility shall be closed and unavailable those particular holidays.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 55.00	\$ 1.00	1.9%	\$ 55.00	\$ 1.00	1.9%

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

SWIMMING POOL

Daily Admission

	Resident	Non-Res.
Youth (2 and Under)	Free with paying adult	
Ages 3 years - 64 years	\$ 5.00	\$ 7.00
Senior Citizens (65 and older)	\$ 4.00	\$ 5.00
Lap Swim/Water Aerobics	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00

20 Punch Passes

	Resident	Non-Res.
Open Swim	\$ 90.00	\$ 120.00
Senior Open Swim	\$ 60.00	\$ 80.00
Lap Swim/Water Aerobics	\$ 80.00	\$ 90.00
City Employees (full-time, permanent part-time, including fire fighters and elected officials)		\$ 30.00

Season Membership

	Resident	Non-Res.
Individual	\$ 75.00	\$ 125.00
Family Pass* - First two members in household	\$ 150.00	\$ 240.00
Family Pass* - Each additional member of household	\$ 20.00	\$ 30.00

per member

*Family passes are for guardians and dependents living in the same household

Military discount (active duty and veteran) on daily admissions and pool memberships 25.0%

	Resident	Non-Res.
Pool Rental*	\$ 540.00	\$ 650.00

*Pool rental is available only from 7pm-10pm during summer break. Once school begins, the pool can be rented from 5:30pm-8:30pm

Pool Rental Refund Policy

If cancelled prior to seven (7) days there will be a \$5 processing fee charged. If a cancellation is made as permitted in this section, the city shall promptly refund to the User any monies received, less the processing fee or cancellation fee. The cancellation fee shall be either Fifty Dollars (\$50) or the amount of the partial payment, whichever is less, an is to compensate the City for processing the cancellation and rescheduling of the Facilities.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Swim Lessons*

	Resident	Non-Res.
Individual Lessons	\$ 69.00	\$ 92.00
Group Lessons	\$ 38.00	\$ 50.00

*Individual lessons are four, 30 minute lessons taught during open swim. The teacher-student ratio is 1:1. Group lessons are eight 37min lessons. The teacher-student ratio for beginners is 2:6. All other group classes are 1:6.

Recreation Activities*

Baseball Fields

Deposit (single use)	\$ 60.00	plus 25% of rental price
Deposit (multiple days or tournaments)	\$ 300.00	plus 25% of rental price
Rental Fee (per field)	\$ 30.00	per hour/per field
Upstairs Use of Crow's Nest (Site Supervisor)	\$ 40.00	per hour
City Staff Crow's Nest (Score Keeper)	\$ 24.00	per hour
Field Prep		
Monday - Friday	\$ 40.00	per field
Saturday	\$ 50.00	per field
Baseball Mound Rental		
Monday - Friday	\$ 30.00	per mound
Saturday	\$ 54.00	per mound
Baseball/Softball Home Run Line Painted on Field in place of Homerun Fence	\$ 54.00	per field
Lighting Usage (must have field rental in order to get lights)	\$ 20.00	per hour/per field

Soccer Field Rental

Deposit (league or single use event)	\$ 60.00	
Deposit (Tournament or other large scale event)	\$ 150.00	
Soccer Goal (Set up and Take down)	\$ 50.00	per set up
Rental Fee	\$ 30.00	per hr/per field

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

	Resident	Non-Res.
Jr. Jazz		
Kindergarten - 2nd Grade	\$ 68.00	\$ 78.00
3rd - 4th Grade	\$ 73.00	\$ 83.00
5th - 12th Grade	\$ 78.00	\$ 88.00
Team Registration	\$ 484.00	\$ 484.00

Fees to be determined on jersey cost and affiliation fees with the Utah Jazz, by the Parks & Recreation Department. Setting of those fees are herein authorized by the Farmington City Council.

	Resident	Non-Res.
Flag Football		
Flag Football Kindergarten - 4th Grade	\$ 60.00	\$ 70.00
Flag Football 5th - 9th Grade	\$ 75.00	\$ 86.00
Spring team 3-4	\$ 650.00	\$ 650.00
Spring team 5-6	\$ 700.00	\$ 700.00
Spring team 7-8	\$ 700.00	\$ 700.00

	Resident	Non-Res.
Soccer		
3 year olds-Kindergarten	\$ 30.00	\$ 45.00
1st - 4th Grade	\$ 35.00	\$ 50.00
5th - 6th Grade	\$ 40.00	\$ 55.00
7th - 9th Grade	\$ 45.00	\$ 60.00

One-time Jersey Fee - Fees to be determined on jersey cost by the Parks & Rec Department. Setting of those fees are herein authorized by the Farmington City Council.

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 81.00	\$ 3.00	3.8%	\$ 91.00	\$ 3.00	3.4%
\$ 509.00	\$ 25.00	5.2%	\$ 509.00	\$ 25.00	5.2%
\$ 78.00	\$ 3.00	4.0%	\$ 88.00	\$ 2.00	2.3%
\$ 675.00	\$ 25.00	3.8%	\$ 675.00	\$ 25.00	3.8%
\$ 725.00	\$ 25.00	3.6%	\$ 725.00	\$ 25.00	3.6%
\$ 725.00	\$ 25.00	3.6%	\$ 725.00	\$ 25.00	3.6%
\$ 55.00	\$ 10.00	22.2%	\$ 40.00	\$ (5.00)	-11.1%
			\$ 45.00	\$ (5.00)	-10.0%
			\$ 50.00	\$ (5.00)	-9.1%
			\$ 65.00	\$ 5.00	8.3%

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Fall Softball

	Resident	Non-Res.
Kindergarten	\$ 27.00	\$ 37.00
1st - 2nd Grade	\$ 32.00	\$ 42.00
3rd - 4th Grade	\$ 32.00	\$ 42.00
5th - 6th Grade	\$ 42.00	\$ 52.00

One-time Jersey Fee - Fees to be determined on jersey cost by the Parks & Rec Department and authorized by the Farmington City Council.

Adaptive Recreation

	Resident	Non-Res.
Jr. Jazz	\$ 30.00	\$ 40.00
Super Sport	\$ 30.00	\$ 40.00
Baseball	\$ 30.00	\$ 40.00

Super Sport*

	Resident	Non-Res.
Spring	\$ 30.00	\$ 40.00
Summer	\$ 30.00	\$ 40.00
Fall	\$ 30.00	\$ 40.00

*This is for a 3 day program. Fees will be adjusted by Parks & Recreation if school break is changed.

Volleyball

	Resident	Non-Res.
Youth Volleyball League - grades 3rd - 8th	\$ 35.00	\$ 45.00
Youth Volleyball League - 9th through 12th grades	\$ 45.00	\$ 55.00

Adult Programs

Basketball - Men's		\$ 400.00
Basketball - Women's		\$ 400.00
Soccer (Co-ed only)		\$ 375.00
Softball (Co-ed only)		\$ 430.00
Volleyball - Women's		\$ 250.00
Volleyball (Co-ed)		\$ 250.00

Pickleball

	Resident	Non-Res.
Pickleball League (4 days) instructional	\$ 30.00	\$ 40.00
Pickleball League (6 days)	\$ 32.00	\$ 42.00
Pickleball Round Robin	\$ 16.00	\$ 26.00

per team

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 47.00	\$ 17.00	56.7%	\$ 57.00	\$ 17.00	42.5%
\$ 47.00	\$ 17.00	56.7%	\$ 57.00	\$ 17.00	42.5%
\$ 33.00	\$ 3.00	10.0%	\$ 43.00	\$ 3.00	7.5%
\$ 40.00	\$ 5.00	14.3%	\$ 50.00	\$ 5.00	11.1%
\$ 450.00	\$ 50.00	12.5%	same as resident		
\$ 450.00	\$ 50.00	12.5%	same as resident		
\$ 475.00	\$ 100.00	26.7%	same as resident		
\$ 505.00	\$ 75.00	17.4%	same as resident		
\$ 275.00	\$ 25.00	10.0%	same as resident		
\$ 275.00	\$ 25.00	10.0%	same as resident		
\$ 32.00	\$ 2.00	5.0%	\$ 42.00	\$ 2.00	5.0%

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

<u>Other</u>	Resident	Non-Res.
Tennis Lessons	\$ 43.00	\$ 53.00
Archery	\$ 32.00	\$ 42.00
Fishing Program	\$ 25.00	\$ 35.00

<u>Partnership Programs</u>	Resident	Non-Res.
Music in Me	50	60
Lego	180	190

<u>High-school Partnership Programs</u>	
Wrestling	30% City, 70% high school, after overhead
Track & Field	30% City, 70% high school, after overhead
Volleyball	30% City, 70% high school, after overhead

Farmington City Gymnasium

<u>Daily Admission</u>	Resident	Non-Res.
6 & under free (must be accompanied by an adult)	\$ -	\$ -
Youth Day Pass (Ages 7-17)	\$ 1.50	\$ 2.50
Adult Day Pass (18 and older)	\$ 2.00	\$ 3.00
Senior Day Pass (65+)	\$ 1.50	\$ 2.50
Senior Day Pass (65+) - Walking Track Only	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.75

<u>Punch Pass - 20 Punches</u>	Resident	Non-Res.
Youth (7-17)	\$ 30.00	\$ 50.00
Adult (18 and Older)	\$ 30.00	\$ 50.00
Senior (65+)	\$ 20.00	\$ 40.00

<u>One Month Membership</u>	Resident	Non-Res.
Youth (7-17)	\$ 30.00	\$ 50.00
Adult (18 and Older)	\$ 30.00	\$ 50.00
Senior (65+)	\$ 20.00	\$ 40.00
Family (first two members)**	\$ 50.00	\$ 90.00
Each additional family member**	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change
\$ 32.00	\$ 7.00	20.0%	\$ 42.00	\$ 7.00	20.0%

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

BUSINESS LICENSING

F. Timing of Payment

Payments on licensing renewals are due by January 31 of each year or at the time of a new license being issued during the year.

***Business Licensing Fees:**

Basic Business License Fee	
a. Small Commercial (under 10,000 sqft including outdoor sales area)	\$ 135.00
b. Medium Commercial (10,000 to 40,000sqft including outdoor sales area)	\$ 215.00
c. Large Commercial (over 40,000 sqft including outdoor sales area)	\$ 320.00
Home Occupation License Fee	
a. Pre-school (Impactful, requires annual fire inspection)	\$ 75.00
b. Day-Care (Impactful, requires annual fire inspection)	\$ 75.00
c. Requested (non-impactful per home business owner's request)	\$ 30.00
Temporary Business License Fee	\$ 50.00
Mobiles and Itinerant Business	\$ 150.00
New Location Transfer Fee	\$ 20.00
Name Change Transfer Fee	\$ 20.00
Other Licenses Transfer Fee	\$ 10.00
Duplicate License Transfer Fee	\$ 10.00
Regulatory License/Amusement Park	\$ 300.00
Regulatory License/Solicitors	\$75.00+
	\$ 50.00 per solicitor
Regulatory License/Theaters	\$ 350.00
Regulatory License/Video Stores	\$ 100.00
Regulatory License/Fireworks	\$ 300.00
Beer/Liquor Class A	\$ 300.00
Beer/Liquor Class B	\$ 300.00
Beer/Liquor Class D	\$ 300.00
Special Event License	\$ 300.00
Sexually Oriented Business	\$ 800.00

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

OTHER MISCELLANEOUS

G. Time of Payment

Payment is due upon request for services.

G1. Advertising Space in City Newsletter

Large Block Advertising Space \$ 600.00
(Space measured up to 3" X 5")

Medium Block Advertising Space \$ 150.00
(Space the size of a standard business card - approximate size not to exceed 3 1/2" X 2")

Small Block Advertising Space \$ 75.00
(Space measured up to 1 1/2"X 1 1/2")

G2. Municipal Parking Violation Fine (except for handicapped parking) \$ 25.00

G3. Civil Penalty Fines

Citation: Property maintenance (weeds, inoperable vehicles, debris, etc.)* \$ 100.00

Administrative Fee to Oversee Abatement \$ 100.00

Building code or zoning violations \$ 1,000.00 maximum**

Continuing building or zoning violations \$ 100.00 per day

Conducting business without a license \$ 50.00 per day

Conducting business with a suspended/revoked license \$ 200.00 per day

Illicit discharge or connection into Storm Water System*:**

Negligent discharge of non-hazardous waste \$ 50.00 per day

Negligent discharge of hazardous waste/sewage \$ 200.00 per day

Intentional discharge of non-hazardous waste \$ 125.00 per day

Intentional discharge of hazardous waste/sewage \$ 500.00 per day

Violations of posted orders:

Unlawful to do business \$ 300.00 per day

Stop Work Order \$ 500.00 per day

Closed to Occupancy \$ 200.00 per day

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

*If paid within ten (10) days of the date of service of civil citation \$100. The civil penalty shall be \$200, if paid after ten (10) days but within twenty (20) days of service. The civil penalty shall be \$300 if paid after twenty (20) days but within thirty (30) days of service. After thirty (30) days, unpaid civil penalties shall accrue interest at the rate set forth by the State of Utah for unpaid judgements.

** Fines vary at the discretion of the enforcement official depending upon the severity of the offense, which considers the following factors: intentions of the offender, whether it is a repeated offense, and the impact or harm to neighbors or the community.

***These are minimum amounts. The actual fine will reflect the severity of the violation. Second offenses committed within twelve months of a prior offense shall be subject to double the penalty listed in this schedule. Each subsequent offense is subject to triple the penalty listed (but not to exceed \$1,000 per day).

G4. GRAMA Request

Copying per page	\$	0.25	
Time in researching and compiling the record (exceeding 15 minutes)	\$	30.00	per hour
CD/Jump Drive	\$	30.00	

G5. Police Department

Police Report (free for the victim)	\$	15.00	
Accident Report (accessed online through online provider)	\$	20.00	
Accident Report (provided by staff)	\$	30.00	
Accompanying Data (photographs, diagrams, etc.) provided on CD/jump drive	\$	30.00	
Video requests (dashcam, bodycam)	\$	30.00	per video
Fingerprints (Farmington residents only)	\$	5.00	
Fingerprints (Non-Residents)	\$	25.00	<i>not doing for non-residents</i>
Event Security (charged at an hourly rate* plus fees for equipment and apparatus used for the event**)	\$	75.00	per hour for each staff member plus equipment

*Minimum of two (2) hours. The City will charge in hour increments for time at the event.

**Vehicle and apparatus fees will be charged based on the hourly rates established by the FEMA schedule of equipment rates. The schedule can be found here: <https://www.fema.gov/assistance/public/tools-resources/schedule-equipment-rates>

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

Changes effective July 1, 2024 unless otherwise noted

FARMINGTON CITY CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

G6. Ambulance Services

Farmington City charges for ambulance services in accordance with state code.

The code can be found here: <https://bemsp.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/34/2022/07/EMS-Ground-Ambulance-Rates-07.01.2022.pdf>

Ambulance/EMT Standby \$ 55.00 per hour for each staff member plus equipment
 (charged at an hourly rate* plus fees for equipment and apparatus used for the event**)

*The City will charge in hour increments for time at the event plus an additional 1/2 hour for deployment and recovery time.

**Vehicle and apparatus fees will be charged based on the hourly rates established by the FEMA schedule of equipment rates. The schedule can be found here: <https://www.fema.gov/assistance/public/tools-resources/schedule-equipment-rates>

G7. Service Fee for Credit/Debit Cards

2.75% *same rate, just now listing this in one new location*

Last Revision: Amended 6-18-2024

Resident			Non Resident		
New Rate	\$ Change	% Change	New Rate	\$ Change	% Change

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA TITLE: Adopting the Compensation Schedule for Executive
Municipal Officers

PRESENTED BY: Greg Davis

DEPARTMENT: Finance

MEETING DATE: June 18, 2024

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA TITLE: Adopting the Municipal Budget for Fiscal Year 2025

PRESENTED BY: Greg Davis

DEPARTMENT: Finance

MEETING DATE: June 18, 2024



160 S Main
Farmington Utah 84025

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT FOR JUNE 18, 2024

To: Mayor and City Council
From: Greg Davis
Date: June 12, 2024
Subject: **Adoption of FY25 Municipal Budget**

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review the attached budget documents
2. Hold a public hearing on June 18, 2024 for the FY25 municipal budget
3. Consider and approve a resolution to adopt the FY25 municipal budget

BACKGROUND

The recommended FY25 budget was presented to the City Council on May 7, 2024 and adopted as a tentative budget that evening. In subsequent work sessions the City Council entertained detailed presentations by city leadership for all programs and funds.

The following are two proposed changes to that tentative budget:

1. 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.
2. Trail construction, Farmington Creek Lower Trail – Total project cost is estimated at \$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.

A truth-in-taxation hearing will be held Tuesday, August 20, 2024 before setting the certified tax rates for property taxes.

Attached schedules:

- Calendar for budgeting FY25
- Highlights of major items
- Fund list by transaction type FY25 adopted budgets
- Key changes by fund, showing changes from the current year FY24's original adopted budget to the new year FY25's budget, as adopted
- Key changes for General Fund departments
- Staffing document

Respectfully submitted,



Greg Davis
Finance Director

Review and concur,



Brigham Mellor
City Manager

BUDGETING FOR FY25

January 2024	February 2024	March 2024	April 2024	May 2024	June 2024
<p>Budget Season Planning w/ Budget Committee</p> <p>Work on: Revenue projections Market comparisons Impact fee analysis Debt Fleet replacement funding Road projects Waterworth models</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Jan 22 (Mon) - 26 (Fri) Individual dept kickoff mtgs with Finance</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Feb 13 (Tue) Current year projections due from departments</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Feb 26 (Mon) Budget requests due from depts including staffing and fees/rates</p> <p style="text-align: center;">HR market study completed</p>	<p style="background-color: black; color: white; text-align: center;">March 1, 2 (Fri, Sat) Council Retreat</p> <p>Council to discuss: 1. Budget priorities, initiatives 2. FY24 Operating projections 3. FY25 Revenue projections 4. Funding new fire station 5. Project prioritization</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mar 11 (Mon) Budget committee meetings w/ department directors and teams</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Apr 22 (Mon) Budget committee meetings w/ Mayor and department directors</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">May 2 (Thu) Recommended budget transmitted</p> <p style="background-color: black; color: white; text-align: center;">May 7 Council Meeting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Work session (5pm start): - Dept presentations Regular Session: - Presentation of recommended budget and adoption as the 'tentative' budget</p> <p style="background-color: black; color: white; text-align: center;">May 21 Council Meeting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Work session (5pm start): - Dept presentations</p>	<p style="background-color: black; color: white; text-align: center;">June 4 Council Meeting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Work session (start time TBD): - Council deliberations</p> <p style="background-color: black; color: white; text-align: center;">June 18 Council Meeting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Work session (start time TBD): - Council deliberations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Regular Session: For Municipality and RDA: Public hearings and adoption of 1. Budgets 2. Consolidated Fee Schedule (CFS) 3. Certified Tax Rate for Property Tax 4. Compensation increases for elective and statutory officers</p> <p style="background-color: red; color: white; text-align: center;">August 20, 2024 (Tuesday) Truth in Taxation</p>

HIGHLIGHTS OF MAJOR ITEMS

FY25 Adopted Budget

Sales Tax:

Projected sales tax revenue for FY25 (\$7,775,000) anticipates 2% growth for the fiscal year, using distribution information through the end of May, 2024 (based on sales through March 2024). This is lower than had been anticipated previously. Administration is being conservative in this FY25 projection due to substantial swings in sales tax receipts during recent months. Farmington has relied heavily on sales tax funding, with sales tax being its largest single revenue source for General Fund operations, representing roughly half of ongoing sources.

Balancing the General Fund - Ongoing Revenues versus Ongoing Expenses

The slowing of sales tax growth has put pressure on the General Fund's capability to cover ongoing expenses with ongoing revenues. The slowdown of sales tax comes at the same time as substantial inflation on payroll, supplies, and contract services used by the General Fund. This adopted budget includes a property tax increase and a draw from the fund balance of the General Fund in order to cover ongoing expenses. The total draw, for ongoing and one-time needs, is approximately \$700,000.

In response to the smaller-than-usual sales tax growth, the city has trimmed various non-critical budget items and delayed equipment purchases and improvement projects. For example, the General Fund's adopted budget doesn't include the typical funding (transfers to) its capital project funds.

Council has authorized an election issue to renew/continue collection of RAP taxes, which issue will appear on the ballot in November 2024.

Staffing and Pay

- Conversion of one regular part-time to a full-time position in City Administration
- A 5% combination of cost-of-living increase and merit for all full-time and regular part-time employees and elected officials
- Market pay adjustments to certain positions lagging behind peers in other government entities, including an additional pay rate increase of 15% for sworn officers. Funding is to come from an increase to property tax.
- Additional budget to address compression and employee reclassifications

Property Tax Increase:

The FY25 Adopted Budget utilizes a property tax increase of 27%. This property tax increase will only affect the Farmington City portion of a citizen's property tax bill, resulting in an additional \$137 (equal to \$11 month) property tax burden on the average market value residential home. This increase is necessary to help cover inflationary impacts on supplies and services but particularly on payroll (refer to note above - Staffing and Pay). This property tax increase for operations will only take effect if adopted by the city council following a truth-in-taxation (TNT) hearing on Tuesday, August 20, 2024.

Utility Rate Increases:

The FY25 budget includes increases on most utility rates. The utility enterprise/business funds don't receive property tax and therefore rely on user fees. The rate increases are necessary to ensure that ongoing revenues are sufficient to cover operating expenses in utility enterprise funds. The rate increases will also allow these funds to address proper maintenance and replacement of critical existing infrastructure.

FY24 vs FY25 Proposed Utility Fees (typical residential bill)

	FY24	FY25	\$ Change	% Change	
Water	23.70	24.40	0.70	3.0%	Inflationary impacts and infrastructure maintenance
Sewer	28.00	38.70	10.70	38.2%	Includes \$10 increase assessed by Central Davis Sewer District
Garbage	17.80	19.00	1.20	6.7%	Inflationary impacts from contracted hauler and WIWMD (dump)
Recycling	3.60	3.60	-	0.0%	
Storm Water	8.20	8.60	0.40	4.9%	Inflationary impacts and infrastructure maintenance
Transportation	3.40	3.60	0.20	5.9%	Inflationary impacts and infrastructure maintenance
Total	84.70	97.90	13.20	15.6%	

Note - 76% of the overall fee increases in this example bill is due to Central Davis Sewer District's assessment, which is not in control of Farmington City.

FY25 ADOPTED BUDGET BY FUND AND TRANSACTION TYPE

Revenues and sources are shown as negatives (credits)

	REVENUE	TRANSFERS IN	SALE OF CAPITAL ASSETS	FINANCING SOURCES	EXPENSES	TRANSFERS OUT	NON-CASH EXPENSES	FUND BAL INCREASE (USE)
GENERAL FUND								
#10 GENERAL FUND	(16,827,285)	(34,040)	-	-	15,428,148	2,145,855	-	(712,678)
SPECIAL REVENUE (RDA) FUNDS								
#20 FARMINGTON RDA FUND	(174,600)	-	-	-	187,003	-	-	(12,403)
#22 FARMINGTON STATION PARK RDA	(392,100)	-	-	-	630,000	1,473,000	-	(1,710,900)
DEBT SERVICE FUNDS								
#30 RAP TAX BOND	(701,700)	-	-	-	384,380	452,000	-	(134,680)
#31 POLICE SALES TAX BOND 2009	-	-	-	-	-	4,040	-	(4,040)
#34 2007, 2009 BLDGS G.O. BOND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
#35 2015 G.O. PARK BOND	(412,300)	-	-	-	410,000	-	-	2,300
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS								
#11 CLASS C ROAD FUND	(1,837,100)	-	-	-	3,136,500	-	-	(1,299,400)
#37 GOVT BUILDINGS IMPROV/OTHER	(634,066)	-	-	(2,700,000)	2,700,000	-	-	634,066
#38 CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS	(1,605,200)	(152,000)	-	-	429,345	270,000	-	1,057,855
#39 CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND	(16,500)	(450,000)	(7,000)	-	401,000	-	-	72,500
#40 REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND	(1,400)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,400
#42 PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND	(2,880,588)	(2,195,000)	-	(1,180,000)	13,263,394	-	-	(7,007,806)
#43 CAPITAL FIRE FUND	(817,760)	-	-	(13,300,000)	13,328,488	-	-	789,272
PERMANENT FUND								
#48 CEMETERY PERPETUAL FUND	(14,200)	-	-	-	-	-	-	14,200
ENTERPRISE FUNDS								
#51 WATER FUND	(4,882,610)	-	-	-	10,418,613	-	-	(5,536,003)
#52 SEWER FUND	(3,573,700)	-	-	-	3,557,769	-	-	15,931
#53 GARBAGE FUND	(2,217,895)	-	-	-	2,550,002	-	-	(332,107)
#54 STORM WATER FUND	(1,968,000)	-	-	-	3,567,642	30,000	-	(1,629,642)
#55 AMBULANCE SERVICE	(855,600)	-	-	-	808,486	-	-	47,114
#56 TRANSPORTATION UTILITY FUND	(775,700)	-	-	-	868,000	-	-	(92,300)
#60,67 RECREATION FUNDS	(1,037,589)	(1,543,855)	-	-	2,702,864	-	-	(121,420)
Grand Total	(41,625,893)	(4,374,895)	(7,000)	(17,180,000)	74,771,633	4,374,895	-	(15,958,740)

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
GENERAL FUND (Fund #10)						
Revenue						
Ongoing revenue:						
Sales tax	8,400,000	7,775,000		7,775,000		
Property taxes before FY25 rate increase	4,000,000	3,900,000		3,900,000		
Additional property tax from FY25 rate increase	-	567,000	449,000	1,016,000		
Energy Sales and Use Tax	1,480,000	1,700,000		1,700,000		
Building permits	721,000	550,000		550,000		
Service contract with Fruit Heights for Fire/EMS response	300,000	315,000		315,000		
Property lease revenue	76,960	125,680		125,680		
Excavation permits	19,000	104,000		104,000		
Interest income	50,000	115,500		115,500		
Transfer In from the Storm Water Fund for storm basin maintenance	30,000	30,000		30,000		
Billings for PD security services (also reduction in expense)	187,530	-		-		
Various ongoing revenues	1,064,150	1,226,105		1,226,105		
Total ongoing revenue	16,328,640	16,408,285	449,000	16,857,285	528,645	3.2%
One-time revenue:						
Transfer In from RAP tax fund #30	300,000	-		-		
Transfer In from Real Estate Fund	1,900,000	-		-		
Transfer In from Debt Service Fund	-	4,040		4,040		
Total one-time revenue	2,200,000	4,040	-	4,040	(2,195,960)	-99.8%
Total Revenue	18,528,640	16,412,325	449,000	16,861,325	(1,667,315)	-9.0%
Expenditures						
Payroll (wage and benefits for each item listed)	11,038,829	11,038,829		11,038,829		
Base-to-base payroll changes		(160,833)		(160,833)		
Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)		686,520		686,520		
Payroll increases for sworn officers on shifts			449,000	449,000		
PD security services (also reduction in revenue)		(184,568)		(184,568)		
Reduction in overtime wages		(37,500)		(37,500)		
Other changes		(94,161)		(94,161)		
Total Payroll	11,038,829	11,248,287	449,000	11,697,287	658,458	6.0%

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
GENERAL FUND (Fund #10) continued						
Supplies and services	3,617,585	3,617,585		3,617,585		
Remove one-time from prior year		(277,600)		(277,600)		
Wellness program		112,000		112,000		
IT support contract		82,000		82,000		
First Responders Mental Health program (grant funded)		119,000		119,000		
General Fund cost allocations		(252,650)		(252,650)		
Other changes		119,226		119,226		
Total Supplies and Services	3,617,585	3,519,561	-	3,519,561	(98,024)	-2.7%
Capital Outlay						
Ongoing base budget	71,900	104,600		104,600		
Various one-time items	234,750	106,700		106,700		
Total Capital Outlay	306,650	211,300	-	211,300	(95,350)	-31.1%
Transfers Out						
Transfer to Recreation Fund (#60) for ongoing base	1,427,587	1,465,027		1,465,027		
Transfer to Recreation Fund (#60) for ongoing requests	37,440	78,828		78,828		
Transfer to Recreation Fund (#60) for one-time items	73,488	-		-		
Transfer to Recreation Fund (#60) - one-time reduction (cash mgt)	(400,000)	-		-		
Transfer to Buildings Fund (#37) for one-time items	465,500	-		-		
Transfer to Capital Streets Fund (#38) for one-time items	406,000	-		-		
Transfer to Capital Streets Fund (#38) for recurring costs	-	152,000		152,000		
Transfer to Capital Equipment Fund (#39) for one-time items	1,070,152	-		-		
Transfer to Capital Equipment Fund (#39) - ONGOING	350,000	450,000		450,000		
Transfer to Park Improvement Fund (#42) for one-time items	1,190,300	-		-		
Total Transfers Out	4,620,467	2,145,855	-	2,145,855	(2,474,612)	-53.6%
Total Expenditures	19,583,531	17,125,003	449,000	17,574,003	(2,009,528)	-10.3%
Net change to fund balance	(1,054,891)	(712,678)	-	(712,678)		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
-----------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------	---------------------	-------------

SPECIAL REVENUE - RDAs

#20 HIGHWAY 89 RDA FUND

Property taxes received - City portion	60,000	64,000		64,000	
Additional from property tax increase on City's portion	18,000	-		-	
Property taxes received - other entities	105,000	107,000		107,000	
Interest income	6,000	3,600		3,600	
Total Revenue	189,000	174,600	-	174,600	(14,400) -7.6%
Debt service (last payment in FY25)	177,405	179,603		179,603	
Other expenditures	7,400	7,400		7,400	
Total Expenditures	184,805	187,003	-	187,003	2,198 1.2%
Net change to fund balance	4,195	(12,403)	-	(12,403)	

#22 STATION PARK RDA FUND

Property taxes	350,000	370,000		370,000	
Additional from property tax increase	105,000	-		-	
Interest income	7,000	22,100		22,100	
Total Revenue	462,000	392,100	-	392,100	(69,900) -15.1%
Administrative costs	15,000	15,000		15,000	
Contribution to West Davis Sports Park	-	615,000		615,000	
Transfer to Park Capital Improvement Fund for park construction	-	1,473,000		1,473,000	
Total Expenditures	15,000	2,103,000	-	2,103,000	2,088,000 13920.0%
Net change to fund balance	447,000	(1,710,900)		(1,710,900)	

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
-----------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------	---------------------	-------------

DEBT SERVICE FUNDS

#30 RAP TAX BOND for 650 W. park and gym

RAP tax collections	650,000	700,000		700,000		
Interest income	2,000	1,700		1,700		
Total Revenue	652,000	701,700	-	701,700	49,700	2485.0%
Transfer Out to the General Fund	300,000	-		-		
Bond payment and fees (through FY25), for 650 W. park and gym	387,603	384,380		384,380		
Transfer to Park Capital Improvement Fund for park construction	-	452,000		452,000		
Total Expenditures	687,603	836,380	-	836,380	148,777	21.6%
Net change to fund balance	(35,603)	(134,680)	-	(134,680)		

#31 POLICE SALES TAX BOND 2009 for Police Station

Interest income	1,000	-		-		
Transfer In from the General Fund	-	-		-		
Total Revenue	1,000	-	-	-	(1,000)	-100.0%
Bond payment and fees, through FY24	72,684	-		-		
Transfer remaining cash balance to General Fund	-	4,040		4,040		
Total Expenditures	72,684	4,040	-	4,040	(68,644)	-94.4%
Net change to fund balance	(71,684)	(4,040)	-	(4,040)		

#35 2015 G.O. PARK BOND (\$6M original bonding for Gym)

Property taxes	409,000	410,000		410,000		
Interest income	1,000	2,300		2,300		
Total Revenue	410,000	412,300	-	412,300	2,300	0.6%
Expenditures - Bond payment and fees (through FY35)	410,000	410,000	-	410,000	-	0.0%
Net change to fund balance	-	2,300	-	2,300		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS						
#11 Class C ROADS / LOCAL HWY (all restricted)						
Class C funding from UDOT	900,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		
Local Transportation Sales Tax	640,000	800,000		800,000		
Interest income	2,000	37,100		37,100		
Total Revenue	1,542,000	1,837,100	-	1,837,100	295,100	19.1%
Capital Outlay	1,452,000	1,552,000		1,552,000		
Road materials storage shed (Had been budgeted in Fund 37 in FY24)	-	965,500		965,500		
Road improvements	-	514,000		514,000		
Supplies and Services	90,000	105,000		105,000		
Total Expenditures	1,542,000	3,136,500	-	3,136,500	1,594,500	103.4%
Net change to fund balance	-	(1,299,400)	-	(1,299,400)		
#37 GOVT BUILDINGS IMPROV/OTHER						
Unrestricted Funds						
Interest income	1,500	3,800		3,800		
Transfer In from the General Fund	465,500	-		-		
Total Revenue - unrestricted	467,000	3,800	-	3,800	(463,200)	-99.2%
Capital - various one-time items	15,500	-		-		
Capital project - materials storage building at PW (now budgeted in Class C)	950,000	-		-		
Total Expenditures - unrestricted	965,500	-	-	-	(965,500)	-100.0%
Net Change in Unrestricted Fund Balance	(498,500)	3,800	-	3,800		
Restricted Funds - Impact Fee Projects						
Police impact fees	358,400	602,766		602,766		
Interest earnings	-	27,500		27,500		
Bond Proceeds	-	2,700,000		2,700,000		
Total Revenue - restricted	358,400	3,330,266	-	3,330,266	2,971,866	829.2%
Expenses - New Fire Station Construction - restricted	-	2,700,000	-	2,700,000	2,700,000	
Net change to restricted fund balance	358,400	630,266	-	630,266		
Combined Restricted and Unrestricted						
Total Revenue	825,400	3,334,066	-	3,334,066	2,508,666	303.9%
Total Expenses	965,500	2,700,000	-	2,700,000	1,734,500	179.6%
Net change to fund balance	(140,100)	634,066	-	634,066		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

#38 CAPITAL STREET IMPROVEMENTS

Unrestricted Funds

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
Transfer In from the General Fund	406,000	152,000		152,000		
Interest income	150,000	94,200		94,200		
Miscellaneous revenue	14,000	14,000		14,000		
Total Revenue - unrestricted	570,000	260,200	-	260,200	(309,800)	-54.4%
Capital projects	406,000	250,000		250,000		
Transfer to Park Capital Improvement Fund for park construction	-	270,000		270,000		
Miscellaneous expenditures	166,000	166,000		166,000		
Debt service on street lights replacements in 2014 (through FY25)	66,253	13,345		13,345		
Total Expenditures - unrestricted	638,253	699,345	-	699,345	61,092	9.6%
Net change to unrestricted fund balance	(68,253)	(439,145)	-	(439,145)		

Restricted Funds - Impact Fee Projects

Impact fee revenue	2,607,000	1,527,000		1,527,000		
Interest income	25,000	(30,000)		(30,000)		
Total Revenue - restricted	2,632,000	1,497,000	-	1,497,000	(1,135,000)	-43.1%
Developer reimbursements	200,000	-		-		
Capital Projects	-	-		-		
Total Expenditures - restricted	200,000	-	-	-	(200,000)	-100.0%
Net change to restricted fund balance	2,432,000	1,497,000	-	1,497,000		

Combined Restricted and Unrestricted

Total Revenue	3,202,000	1,757,200	-	1,757,200	(1,444,800)	-45.1%
Total Expenses	838,253	699,345	-	699,345	(138,908)	-16.6%
Net change to fund balance	2,363,747	1,057,855	-	1,057,855		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

#39 CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND

Transfer in from General Fund

Sale of fixed assets

Interest income

Total Revenue

Administration vehicle replacements and outfitting

Fire apparatus purchase and outfitting (carryover)

Parks and Rec equipment and vehicle purchases

Police vehicle purchases and outfitting

Public Works equipment and vehicle purchases

Total Expenditures

Net change to fund balance

#40 REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND

Sale of Real Estate

Interest income

Total Revenue

Transfer out to the Parks Capital Projects Fund

Transfer out to the General Fund

Total Expenditures

Net change to fund balance

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
Transfer in from General Fund	1,420,152	450,000		450,000		
Sale of fixed assets	15,000	7,000		7,000		
Interest income	2,000	16,500		16,500		
Total Revenue	1,437,152	473,500	-	473,500	(963,652)	-67.1%
Administration vehicle replacements and outfitting	96,000	-		-		
Fire apparatus purchase and outfitting (carryover)	515,000	-		-		
Parks and Rec equipment and vehicle purchases	555,740	159,000		159,000		
Police vehicle purchases and outfitting	303,412	225,000		225,000		
Public Works equipment and vehicle purchases	86,000	17,000		17,000		
Total Expenditures	1,556,152	401,000	-	401,000	(1,155,152)	-74.2%
Net change to fund balance	(119,000)	72,500	-	72,500		
#40 REAL ESTATE PROP. ASSET FUND						
Sale of Real Estate	5,700,000	-		-		
Interest income	5,000	1,400		1,400		
Total Revenue	5,705,000	1,400	-	1,400	(5,703,600)	-100.0%
Transfer out to the Parks Capital Projects Fund	3,800,000	-		-		
Transfer out to the General Fund	1,900,000	-		-		
Total Expenditures	5,700,000	-	-	-	(5,700,000)	-100.0%
Net change to fund balance	5,000	1,400	-	1,400		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

#42 PARK IMPROVEMENT FUND

Unrestricted Funds

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
Transfers in	4,990,300	2,195,000		2,195,000		
Grant contributions - Farmington Creek Lower Trail			244,488	244,488		
Revenue miscellaneous	11,000	(17,400)		(17,400)		
Total Revenue - unrestricted	5,001,300	2,177,600	244,488	2,422,088	(2,579,212)	-51.6%
Park improvement projects	1,490,300	229,000		229,000		
Irrigation telemetry	20,000	29,500		29,500		
Construction of Farmington Creek Lower Trail	-	-	315,000	315,000		
Construction of new park in west Farmington	-	5,695,000		5,695,000		
Total Expenditures - unrestricted	1,510,300	5,953,500	315,000	6,268,500	4,758,200	315.0%
Net change in unrestricted funds	3,491,000	(3,775,900)	(70,512)	(3,846,412)		

Restricted Funds - Impact Fee Projects

Impact fee revenue	4,130,000	2,545,300		2,545,300		
Interest earnings on impact fees	3,000	108,200		108,200		
Debt Proceeds	-	1,180,000		1,180,000		
Total Revenue - restricted	4,133,000	3,833,500	-	3,833,500	(299,500)	-7.2%
Construction of new park in west Farmington - bond proceeds	-	1,180,000		1,180,000		
Construction of new park in west Farmington - impact fees	-	5,643,000		5,643,000		
Debt service exp for 650 W. park (ends in FY26)	171,894	171,894		171,894		
Total Expenditures - restricted	171,894	6,994,894	-	6,994,894	6,823,000	3969.3%
Net change in restricted funds	3,961,106	(3,161,394)	-	(3,161,394)		

Combined Restricted and Unrestricted

Total Revenue	9,134,300	6,011,100	244,488	6,255,588	(2,878,712)	-31.5%
Total Expenses	1,682,194	12,948,394	315,000	13,263,394	11,581,200	688.5%
Net change to fund balance	7,452,106	(6,937,294)	(70,512)	(7,007,806)		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

#43 CAPITAL FIRE FUND

Fire facility and fire equipment impact fees
 Interest on impact fees
 Bond proceeds
Total Revenue

FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
250,600	791,960		791,960		
5,000	25,800		25,800		
-	13,300,000		13,300,000		
255,600	14,117,760	-	14,117,760	13,862,160	5423.4%

Design of new fire station
 Construction of new fire station
 Debt service on ladder truck (through FY25)
Total Expenditures

600,000	-		-		
-	13,300,000		13,300,000		
57,074	28,488		28,488		
657,074	13,328,488	-	13,328,488	12,671,414	1928.5%

Net change to fund balance

(401,474)	789,272	-	789,272		
------------------	---------	---	----------------	--	--

#48 CEMETERY PERPETUAL CARE FUND

Sale of burial rites
 Marker fees
 Interest income
Total Revenue

7,500	7,500		7,500		
-	4,000		4,000		
1,000	2,700		2,700		
8,500	14,200	-	14,200	5,700	67.1%

Total Expenditures

-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
---	---	---	---	---	---------

Net change to fund balance

8,500	14,200	-	14,200		
--------------	---------------	---	---------------	--	--

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
-----------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------	---------------------	-------------

BUSINESS-TYPE FUNDS

#51 WATER FUND

Unrestricted Funds

Customer billings	2,772,400			3,018,000		
Increase in customer billings from rate increases	included	90,510		90,510		
Water connection fees	54,800			45,000		
Interest income	20,000			95,500		
Miscellaneous revenue	5,000			5,000		
Sale of Fixed Assets	90,000			-		
Total Revenue - unrestricted	2,942,200		3,254,010	-	3,254,010	311,810 10.6%
Operating expenses						
Payroll base	1,224,952			1,174,130		
Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)	included	93,133		93,133		
Temporary, part-time water position	-	35,000		35,000		
Supplies and services	1,030,550			1,109,700		
Total operating expenses	2,255,502		2,411,963	-	2,411,963	156,461 6.9%
Miscellaneous capital projects	312,500			274,000		
Misc equipment purchases	210,000			-		
Truck for on-call staff		55,000		55,000		
Woodland well SCADA		90,000		90,000		
Trailer for excavator		18,000		18,000		
Pneumatic plate compactor for wheeled mini		15,000		15,000		
Capital outlay - asphalt grinder (split with GF Streets)		17,000		17,000		
Total capital outlay and projects	522,500		469,000	-	469,000	(53,500) -10.2%
Total Expenses - unrestricted	2,778,002		2,880,963	-	2,880,963	102,961 3.7%
Net budget of unrestricted funds	164,198		373,047	-	373,047	

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
#51 WATER FUND continued						
Restricted Funds						
Impact fees	3,325,000	1,507,000		1,507,000		
Interest earnings on Impact fees	2,000	121,600		121,600		
Total Revenues - restricted	3,327,000	1,628,600	-	1,628,600	(1,698,400)	-51.0%
Major projects - ARPA funded (delayed and rolled over from FY23 to FY24)	2,998,886	-		-		
Major impact-fee construction projects - w/ bonding (rolled over from FY23)	6,901,114	7,000,000		7,000,000		
Debt service on \$7M water revenue bond	537,650	537,650		537,650		
Major impact-fee construction projects - w/ cash	160,000	-		-		
Total Expenses - restricted	10,597,650	7,537,650	-	7,537,650	(3,060,000)	-28.9%
Net budget of restricted funds	(7,270,650)	(5,909,050)	-	(5,909,050)		
Combined Restricted and Unrestricted						
Total Revenue	6,269,200	4,882,610	-	4,882,610	(1,386,590)	-22.1%
Total Expenses	13,375,652	10,418,613	-	10,418,613	(2,957,039)	-22.1%
Net budget	(7,106,452)	(5,536,003)	-	(5,536,003)		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
#52 SEWER FUND						
Sewer customer billings	2,553,000	2,580,000		2,580,000		
Increase in customer billings from rate increases	included	993,000		993,000		
Interest Income	10,000	700		700		
Total Revenue	2,563,000	3,573,700	-	3,573,700	1,010,700	39.4%
Billing collections submitted to Central Davis Sewer District (CSDS)	2,289,000	3,352,000		3,352,000		
Operating Expenses	129,386	100,378		100,378		
Base-to-base payroll adjustments	(18,942)	1,143		1,143		
Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)	2,183	4,248		4,248		
Sewer concrete collars	30,000	100,000		100,000		
Total Expenses	2,431,627	3,557,769	-	3,557,769	1,126,142	46.3%
Net budget	131,373	15,931	-	15,931		
#53 GARBAGE FUND						
Customer billings for Garbage and Recycling Pickup Charges	2,012,300	2,085,000		2,085,000		
Increase in customer billings from rate increases	included	119,395		119,395		
Miscellaneous revenue	10,000	13,500		13,500		
Total Revenue	2,022,300	2,217,895	-	2,217,895	195,595	9.7%
Operating Expenses						
Payroll base	146,212	151,230		151,230		
Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)	included	39,066		39,066		
Supplies and services	140,700	127,800		127,800		
Fees paid to waste collection hauler and WIWMD (dump)	1,642,761	1,762,156		1,762,156		
Capital outlay - can purchases	75,000	79,750		79,750		
Capital Outlay - Vac pit, green waste site (split w/ Garbage Fund)	-	75,000		75,000		
Capital Outlay - Swap loader (replacement)	-	315,000		315,000		
Total Expenses	2,004,673	2,550,002	-	2,550,002	545,329	27.2%
Net budget	17,627	(332,107)	-	(332,107)		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

#54 STORM WATER FUND

Unrestricted Funds

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
Customer billings	967,000	1,010,000		1,010,000		
Increase in customer billings from rate increases	included	50,500		50,500		
Miscellaneous revenue	65,000	55,000		55,000		
Interest income	15,000	25,500		25,500		
Total Revenue - unrestricted	1,047,000	1,141,000	-	1,141,000	94,000	9.0%

Operating Expenses

Payroll - base	658,599	666,806		666,806		
Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)	included	43,748		43,748		
Supplies and services	264,938	260,388		260,388		
Transfer Out to General Fund for storm basin maintenance	30,000	30,000		30,000		
Capital Outlay - misc equipment	-	15,000		15,000		
Capital Outlay (bobtail truck, robotic camera, etc.)	215,000	-		-		
Capital Outlay - Vac pit, green waste site (split w/ Garbage Fund)	-	75,000		75,000		
Miscellaneous capital projects	95,000	95,000		95,000		
Total Expenses - unrestricted	1,263,537	1,185,942	-	1,185,942	(77,595)	-6.1%

Net budget for unrestricted funds

	(216,537)	(44,942)	-	(44,942)		
--	------------------	-----------------	----------	-----------------	--	--

Restricted Funds

Impact fees	1,291,000	836,100		836,100	(454,900)	-35.2%
Interest income (expense) on impact fees balance	50,000	(9,100)		(9,100)	(59,100)	-118.2%
Total Revenue - restricted	1,341,000	827,000	-	827,000		

Shepard Creek detention basin	1,500,000	-		-		
Ivy Acres land purchase and construction		1,957,000		1,957,000		
Lagoon Drive and Main Street area improvements		100,000		100,000		
Impact fee revenue refunds to developers under agreement		242,700		242,700		
Davis County WSP Facility - 1100 West Storm Drain improvement		97,000		97,000		
Other impact fee projects	15,000	15,000		15,000		
Total Expenses - restricted	1,515,000	2,411,700	-	2,411,700	896,700	59.2%

Net budget of restricted funds

	(174,000)	(1,584,700)	-	(1,584,700)		
--	------------------	--------------------	----------	--------------------	--	--

Combined Restricted and Unrestricted

Total Revenue	2,388,000	1,968,000	-	1,968,000	(420,000)	-17.6%
Total Expenses	2,778,537	3,597,642	-	3,597,642	819,105	29.5%
Net budget	(390,537)	(1,629,642)	-	(1,629,642)		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

#55 AMBULANCE FUND

Ambulance service charges
 Uncollectible accounts (was reflected as expense in FY24)
 Interest income
 Miscellaneous revenue
Total Revenue

Operating Expenses

Payroll - base
 Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)
 Supplies and services
 Capital Outlay misc.
 New gurney for new ambulance
 New station alerting system for firehouse (split with GF Fire)
 Provision for doubtful accounts (offset to revenue in FY25)
Total Expenses

Net budget

#56 TRANSPORTATION UTILITY FUND

Transportation utility fee
 Increase in customer billings from rate increases
 Miscellaneous revenue
Total Revenue

Expense - sidewalk and road projects

Net budget

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
Ambulance service charges	1,040,000	1,670,000		1,670,000		
Uncollectible accounts (was reflected as expense in FY24)	-	(850,000)		(850,000)		
Interest income	10,000	35,600		35,600		
Miscellaneous revenue	2,000	-		-		
Total Revenue	1,052,000	855,600	-	855,600	(196,400)	-18.7%
Operating Expenses						
Payroll - base	360,848	500,956		500,956		
Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)	included	26,030		26,030		
Supplies and services	240,000	271,500		271,500		
Capital Outlay misc.	40,000	10,000		10,000		
New gurney for new ambulance	73,212	-		-		
New station alerting system for firehouse (split with GF Fire)	40,000	-		-		
Provision for doubtful accounts (offset to revenue in FY25)	500,000	-		-		
Total Expenses	1,254,060	808,486	-	808,486	(445,574)	-35.5%
Net budget	(202,060)	47,114	-	47,114		
#56 TRANSPORTATION UTILITY FUND						
Transportation utility fee	750,000	720,000		720,000		
Increase in customer billings from rate increases	included	45,000		45,000		
Miscellaneous revenue	5,000	10,700		10,700		
Total Revenue	755,000	775,700	-	775,700	20,700	2.7%
Expense - sidewalk and road projects	668,000	868,000	-	868,000	200,000	29.9%
Net budget	87,000	(92,300)	-	(92,300)		

KEY CHANGES BY FUND - FY25 COMPARED TO FY24

#60, 67 RECREATION FUNDS

Charges for services
 Donations, contributions, fundraisers
 Interest income
 Advertisements and sponsorships
 Transfer from General Fund (#10) for ongoing base
 Transfer from General Fund (#10) for ongoing requests
 Transfer from General Fund (#10) for one-time items
 Transfer from General Fund (#10) - one-time reduction (cash mgmt)

Total Revenue

Operating Expenses

Payroll - base
 Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)
 Supplies and Services
 Equipment - new camera system for Gym - annual payment
 Equipment - new camera system for Gym - installation costs, first yr pmt
 Capital outlay - various
 Capital outlay - permanent seasonal lights for city gym and pool

Total Expenses

Net budget

	FY24 ADOPTED	FY25 RECOMMENDED	Council Adjustments	FY25 ADOPTED	\$ Budget Change	% Change
	1,032,885	1,004,289		1,004,289		
	24,250	-		-		
	6,000	21,300		21,300		
	2,000	12,000		12,000		
	1,427,587	1,465,027		1,465,027		
	37,440	78,828		78,828		
	73,488	-		-		
	(400,000)	-		-		
Total Revenue	2,203,650	2,581,444	-	2,581,444	377,794	17.1%
Operating Expenses						
Payroll - base	1,626,482	1,625,450		1,625,450		
Payroll increases (reclasses, merit, COLA, market adj)	included	75,199		75,199		
Supplies and Services	910,915	958,115		958,115		
Equipment - new camera system for Gym - annual payment	-	13,900		13,900		
Equipment - new camera system for Gym - installation costs, first yr pmt	-	20,200		20,200		
Capital outlay - various	10,000	10,000		10,000		
Capital outlay - permanent seasonal lights for city gym and pool	55,633	-		-		
Total Expenses	2,603,030	2,702,864	-	2,702,864	99,834	3.8%
Net budget	(399,380)	(121,420)	-	(121,420)		

KEY CHANGES TO GENERAL FUND DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Department Title	FY24 Adopted	Changes FY24 to FY25	FY25 Adopted	Dept % Change	Full-time FTE as allocated
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT	1,451,961				5.44
Ongoing					
Moving City Manager & Recorder from Admin Dept. to City Manager & Econ. Dev. Dept.		(285,458)			(1.65)
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		57,126			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		42,573			
Mid-year conversion of part-time employee to full-time		8,045			0.30
10-440-382 - Caselle support costs - inflationary increase		500			
10-440-382 - Email software conversion		(12,000)			
Various items moved to other departments		(34,950)			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(87,450)			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(47,600)			
10-440-350 - RAP tax reauthorization fees, November 2024 ballot		7,000			
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT Total		(352,213)	1,099,748	-24.3%	4.09

KEY CHANGES TO GENERAL FUND DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Department Title	FY24 Adopted	Changes FY24 to FY25	FY25 Adopted	Dept % Change	Full-time FTE as allocated
BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT	728,972				1.80
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		6,341			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		15,643			
10-610-300 - Painting of City Hall and Drywall Repair (originally budgeted in FY24)		20,809			
10-610-300 - Preventive Maintenance for Rubber Roofs (2 Visits) City Hall		2,400			
10-610-310 - Preventive Maintenance for Garage Doors for City Shops Department		2,730			
10-610-310 - Preventive Maintenance for Rubber Roofs (2 Visits) Public Works		4,000			
10-610-330 - Preventive Maintenance for Garage Doors for Fire Department		1,492			
10-610-331 - Preventive Maintenance for Garage Doors Police Department		223			
10-610-331 - Preventive Maintenance for Rubber Roofs (2 Visits) Police Department		2,400			
10-610-510 - New Camera System - Public Works		11,000			
10-610-530 - New Camera System - Police Station (incl interview rooms)		8,800			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		3,000			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(208,359)			
10-610-300 - Wattsmart - City Hall lighting - update to LED		19,941			
10-610-331 - Upgrade Card access for the Police Department		8,765			
10-610-335 - New Card access for Community Center		18,149			
10-610-335 - Resurface Community Center floor and stage		10,943			
10-610-336 - Yellow brick house window replacements		7,900			
10-610-510 - New Camera System - Public Works		29,300			
10-610-530 - New Camera System - Police Station (incl interview rooms)		20,000			
10-610-540 - Banquet tables at Community Center (replacements)		5,500			
10-610-540 - Sound System Upgrade At Community Center		12,000			
BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT Total		2,976	731,948	0.4%	1.80

KEY CHANGES TO GENERAL FUND DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Department Title	FY24 Adopted	Changes FY24 to FY25	FY25 Adopted	Dept % Change	Full-time FTE as allocated
CITY ATTORNEY DEPARTMENT	577,012				1.84
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		567			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		16,841			
10-490-210 - Policy consulting service - Contractual increase		500			
10-490-235 - Business Meals & Entertainment		(500)			
10-490-236 - Holiday Party & BBQ from Atty Dept to Recreation Fund		(7,300)			
10-490-236 - Service Awards		1,050			
10-490-236 - Veteran's Day Gift Cards		500			
10-490-236 - Wellness Program Reimbursements (doubled from last year) + new employees		60,500			
10-490-240 - Social Media Feed Priority		(4,000)			
10-490-370 - Newsletter Increase (rate increase)		3,600			
10-490-370 - Prosecution Services - rate increase		12,000			
10-490-370 - TechNet Renewal Increase		400			
10-490-382 - Archive Social Annual Renewal		3,292			
10-490-382 - Website Hosting Renewal - WP Engine		650			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(1,320)			
Budget moved from Administration		30,500			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(950)			
CITY ATTORNEY DEPARTMENT Total		116,330	693,342	20.2%	1.84
CITY MANAGER AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT	171,740				0.00
Ongoing					
Moving City Manager & Recorder from Admin Dept. to City Manager & Econ. Dev. Dept.		285,458			1.65
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including allocations between funds		14,882			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		15,631			
Budget moved from Administration		4,450			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(6,900)			
CITY MANAGER AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Total		313,521	485,261	182.6%	1.65

KEY CHANGES TO GENERAL FUND DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Department Title	FY24 Adopted	Changes FY24 to FY25	FY25 Adopted	Dept % Change	Full-time FTE as allocated
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT	1,511,474				7.10
INSPECTION PROGRAM					
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		(5,296)			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		30,247			
10-560-202 - Clothing, boots, and work pants		1,800			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(8,550)			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(3,909)			
PLANNING AND ZONING PROGRAM					
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		(19,530)			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		37,444			
10-500-382 - Software license maintenance		(2,400)			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(30,050)			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(111,000)			
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Total		(111,244)	1,400,230	-7.4%	7.10

KEY CHANGES TO GENERAL FUND DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Department Title	FY24 Adopted	Changes FY24 to FY25	FY25 Adopted	Dept % Change	Full-time FTE as allocated
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT	223,908				1.00
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		(2,348)			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		14,441			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(4,250)			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(3,000)			
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT Total		<u>4,843</u>	228,751	2.2%	<u>1.00</u>
FIRE DEPARTMENT	2,803,104				16.87
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		(4,100)			0.03
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		131,075			
10-530-135 - Employee Education Assistance budget increase		3,500			
10-530-202 - Uniforms and PPE allowance increase		4,500			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(25,180)			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(38,632)			
10-520-370 - First Responders Mental Health grant (split with PD), received in FY24		47,000			
10-530-540 - New base radio units for 2 of 3 battalion chief vehicles (1 of 3 already in place)		10,000			
FIRE DEPARTMENT TOTAL		<u>128,163</u>	2,931,267	4.6%	<u>16.90</u>

KEY CHANGES TO GENERAL FUND DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Department Title	FY24 Adopted	Changes FY24 to FY25	FY25 Adopted	Dept % Change	Full-time FTE as allocated
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT	158,072				0.00
Ongoing					
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		3,952			
One-time					
None					
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT Total		<u>3,952</u>	162,024	2.5%	<u>0.00</u>
PARKS & CEMETERY DEPARTMENT	1,448,912				8.10
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		(20,612)			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		52,308			
10-640-202 - Uniforms, PPE, and Clothing budget increase		2,500			
10-640-250 - Preventive Maintenance for Garage Doors Regional Park and Concessions		382			
10-640-540 - New Camera System - Regional Park		8,800			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(54,050)			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(16,900)			
10-640-100 - Bonuses for certifications		3,000			
10-640-490 - Fire cabinet for fuel storage		4,000			
10-640-490 - Forestry Tools		8,000			
10-640-490 - Laptop for office manager		2,000			
10-640-540 - New Camera System - Regional Park		19,900			
PARKS & CEMETERY DEPARTMENT Total		<u>9,328</u>	1,458,239	0.6%	<u>8.10</u>

KEY CHANGES TO GENERAL FUND DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Department Title	FY24 Adopted	Changes FY24 to FY25	FY25 Adopted	Dept % Change	Full-time FTE as allocated
POLICE DEPARTMENT	4,929,006				31.00
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment		(200,766)			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		670,833			
Payroll for police support to Lagoon - service reduction		(184,568)			
10-520-210 - Software subscription for investigations		5,000			
10-520-230 - Training budget Increase		10,000			
10-520-490 - Laptop replacements (6 units)		9,000			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(16,000)			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(72,500)			
10-520-210 - Antivirus license		2,000			
10-520-370 - First Responders Mental Health grant (split with Fire), received in FY24		72,000			
10-520-490 - Radar trailer replacement		10,000			
10-520-540 - Upgrade gym equipment - treadmill, rowing machine		10,000			
POLICE DEPARTMENT Total		<u>314,999</u>	5,244,005	6.4%	<u>31.00</u>

KEY CHANGES TO GENERAL FUND DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Department Title	FY24 Adopted	Changes FY24 to FY25	FY25 Adopted	Dept % Change	Full-time FTE as allocated
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - STREETS PROGRAM	958,904				5.70
Ongoing					
Payroll base-to-base adjustment, including reallocations between funds		12,903			
Payroll increases (pay rates, reclasses, market adjustments)		52,926			
Changes in General Fund overhead allocation methodology		(21,900)			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(9,500)			
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - STREETS PROGRAM Total		34,429	993,333	3.6%	5.70
TRANSFERS FROM GENERAL FUND	4,620,467				0.00
Ongoing					
10-660-992 Transfer Out to Recreation Fund (the 'subsidy')		78,828			
10-670-990 Transfer Out to Capital Improvement Funds		252,000			
One-time					
Remove prior year one-time budget		(2,805,440)			
TRANSFERS FROM GENERAL FUND Total		(2,474,612)	2,145,855	-53.6%	0.00

FARMINGTON CITY CORPORATION

Full-time Employees By Function

Function	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>Change</u>	
General Government				
Finance and Administrative Services	5	6	1	Conversion of regular part-time to full-time position
Office of the City Attorney	3	3	-	
Office of the City Manager	2	2	-	
Community Development	7	7	-	
Engineering	4	4	-	
Public Safety				
Police				
Officers	29	29	-	
Civilians	2	2	-	
Fire				
Firefighters & Paramedics	18	19	1	Vacancy from FY24 wasn't included in FY24's staffing document, in error
Civilians	1	1	-	
Parks & Recreation	18	18	-	
Public Works				
Administration	2	2	-	
Fleet Maintenance	2	2	-	
Streets	10	10	-	
Water	7	7	-	
Total Employees	<u>110</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>2</u>	

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-_____**ADOPTING A MUNICIPAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING 6-30-2025**

WHEREAS, upon proper review and consideration, the City Council has held a public hearing concerning adopting FYE 6-30-2025 municipal budget;

WHEREAS, said public hearing has been held as required by law and pursuant to all legally required notices;

WHEREAS, the City Council has heard and considered all public comment advanced at the aforementioned hearing; and

WHEREAS, the attached budgets are hereby found to comport with sound principles of fiscal planning in light of the needs and resources of Farmington City Corporation;

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

Section 1. Municipal Budget Adopted. The attached document entitled "Key Changes by Fund – FY25", and incorporated herein by reference, is hereby adopted.

Section 2. Proposed Property Tax Levy. There is hereby proposed a tax levy for all taxable property within Farmington City, a tax at the rate of 0.001741 for purposes of establishing the operating budget of the City until the final budget is approved through the "Truth in Taxation" process. The certified rate does exceed the certified rate determined by the Davis County Auditor's office.

Section 3. Miscellaneous Provisions.

- a. Severability. If any part or provision of this Resolution is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Resolution, and all provisions, clauses, and words of this Resolution shall be severable.
- b. Titles and Headings. The titles and headings of this Resolution form no part of the Resolution itself, have no binding or interpretative effect, and shall not alter the legal effect of any part of the Resolution for any reason.
- c. Effective Date. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon posting.
- d. Non-codification. This Resolution shall be effective without codification.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF FARMINGTON CITY CORPORATION, STATE OF UTAH, ON THIS 18TH DAY OF JUNE, 2024.

FARMINGTON CITY

Attest:

Brett Anderson, Mayor

DeAnn Carlile, City Recorder

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA



SUMMARY ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes for 05-07-24
2. Approval of Minutes for 06-04-24

FARMINGTON CITY – CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

May 21, 2024

WORK SESSION

Present:

*City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex
Leeman,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,
City Attorney Paul Roberts,
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,*

*Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Finance Director Greg Davis,
City Parks and Recreation Director Colby
Thackeray,
Planning and GIS Specialist Shannon
Hansell, and
Police Chief Eric Johnsen.*

City Manager **Brigham Mellor** called the work session to order at 5:04 p.m. Mayor **Brett Anderson** and Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** were excused.

BUDGET PRESENTATIONS AND DELIBERATION

Finance Director **Greg Davis** presented the proposed tentative budget. The main sources of money in the General Fund are sales and property tax, as well as other fees. It is not intended for Farmington to make a profit, but just to make enough cash flow to cover expenses. There are several operating budgets for different departments within the General Fund. Debt service funds include general obligation bonds. The proposed budget contemplates an increase in property tax for the General Fund to fund general services (such as maintenance, police, and fire) that residents aren't charged for. Business funds (such as water, sewer, and recreation) can't be used to bail out the General Fund. Usually the General Fund helps subsidize funds such as recreation.

Mellor said water fees can't be used for things like road maintenance, snow plowing, and pothole filling. The water fund will fund some wage increases including 2.5% Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) and 2.5% merit increases. Every enterprise fund is usually subsidized by the General fund.

Mellor said that at their last meeting, the City Council tentatively approved a 15% tax increase to address the budget for this upcoming year. However, that may be raised to 27%, as will be discussed tonight. That would be a \$6 to \$11 increase a month for the average Farmington home owner. The difference between 15% or 27% will be police wages. Farmington would like to be the fourth highest city in Davis County in regards to police wages. This could be contingent on what happens with budgets in other cities across the County. In order to prepare the budget for June 18, 2024, Staff needs Council direction tonight. The budget will not be finalized until the August 20, 2024, Truth in Taxation meeting.

Because the fiscal year starts July 1, 2024, but the budget is not finalized until August 20, 2024, the City may have to temporarily hold off on raises. If raises happen effective July 1, 2024, the City may have to dip into fund balances or cut future expenses. The Council may receive public commentary August 20, 2024, that sways their decision.

Parks and Recreation Fund

City Parks and Recreation Director **Colby Thackeray** said he was tasked with cutting ongoing budgets. It was a good exercise to tighten the budget. His budget proposes 110 to 112 full-time employees. There are a couple of employee reclassifications in the budget. Farmington is a place the employees want to be, and many have come from Syracuse and Kaysville.

The budget includes new cameras at the regional park, as the ones there are useless because they only produce choppy footage for police use. He requested new forestry tools and a boom truck.

The Recreation Fund budget includes \$12,000 in revenue from advertisers and sponsorships, and that will likely be a low figure. **Thackeray** is excited about those revenues. Farmington will also start doing its own concessions, which should profit the City \$300 to \$400 each day it is open.

Police Department Fund

Police Chief **Eric Johnsen** said his budget includes a \$5,000 investigation software subscription renewal that integrates with a new Crime Tracer system being used statewide. The budget also includes confidential mental health services provided by therapists who were formerly involved in law enforcement. The mental health grant will be split between the City's police and fire departments.

His \$10,000 training budget increase would cover a chief conference. Practice is to take the best police officers and promote them to sergeants, at which time their training ceases. However, the patrol officers continue to get training. In this system, sergeants lack refined leadership training. **Johnsen** wants to make sure his sergeants get trained, and the budget includes sending Farmington sergeants to a three-part FBI leadership training. It would cost \$900 per sergeant.

The budget also includes a radar trailer, which is put out upon requests that are complaint-driven. Its visibility helps slow down traffic and also provides data. The Police Department is asking for the budget to replace six laptops, renew an antivirus license, and upgrade gym equipment including a treadmill and rowing machine.

Farmington's starting police wage is \$25.95 an hour, \$1.37 an hour under the County average, and \$4.18 lower than **Johnsen's** target. Centerville pays police well, and Clearfield is the County's lowest at \$26.57 an hour. The Syracuse City Council strives to be in the top three cities in Davis County regarding police pay. **Johnsen** doesn't want to rely on subpar police officers, and believes Farmington deserves the best of the best. Farmington has a unique demand for its officers with Lagoon, the County Jail, Station Park, and the canyon. The future County Western Sports Park (WSP) could likewise add strain to Farmington's police force.

Councilmember **Alex Leeman** said last year, after dealing with inquisitive residents who threw different statistics at him, he has decided that response times are a much better metric of Farmington's police service level. Two to four minutes of response time can make a difference. If there is a school shooting at the local high school, that is not the time to think about response times or if the responding officers are rookies or officers with a decade of experience.

Johnsen said he knows his department is the most expensive in the City, but he wants the caliber of officers to be what is expected. He wants responding officers to be those who can control a room with confidence and do his or her job effectively.

Councilmember **Roger Child** said there are a lot of freeways leaking into Farmington, and those provide a lot of ways in and out. **Johnsen** said those coming into and out of the City are the problems, and the department has to deal with a lot of drunk drivers.

Councilmember **Amy Shumway** said this is the first time in recent memory that the Council has had to squeeze everything in the budget. **Davis** agreed, saying in prior years the budget has accommodated a lot more requests. There has been a contraction of sales tax at the same time wages need increased.

Mellor said Farmington will just be buying time, because the requests for things cut in this budget will come back. Sales taxes could increase because there is a new ride opening at Lagoon. The WSP, with a projected spring 2025 opening, may also bring in more sales tax. He said each department prioritized their budget requests A through D, and only a few A items were cut.

Mellor advised the Council to keep the property tax increase narrative with residents as simple as possible. Last year's increase was to make sure the Police Department was fully staffed each night. Now Farmington needs to pay them so the City is not understaffed or constantly replacing officers. The 15% property tax increase would cover 5% which includes merit and COLA increases. If the Council chose to increase property taxes by 27%, the difference between 15% and 27% would be fully attributable to police wages, vehicles, and equipment.

City Attorney **Paul Roberts** said since a 27% increase in property taxes sounds scary, it is better to put it into dollar amounts. It is more palatable to say it is a \$11 a month increase. **Mellor** said Farmington's portion is only 3% of the entire property tax bill that a resident gets each year. He will send a draft of a property tax newsletter article out to all councilmembers for their input. The objective is to have stable revenue pay for police and fire. While the City can put off hiring seasonal employees and mowing lawns, they can't put off funding police and fire.

Tying the funding of police and fire to sales tax or building permit revenues would be unwise. The only building permits being pulled are the townhomes. **Mellor** recently met with the Boyer Company and a representative of the Evans family, who are optimistic they will make something happen. However, the timing is up in the air. There are examples of office buildings (such as Novell) being torn down in the State in order to make way for more apartments. Class A offices must be a show piece on Farmington sites in order to stay in demand. Other office projects built in the 1980s, 90s, or earlier are not filling needs anymore, especially if they are not on prime roads with great visibility.

Child said housing affordability in Utah is the worst it has ever been. The average home is eight times the average salary, which is off the charts. It is going to be an interesting election year that could produce an unstable environment. He said things won't get less difficult, as housing affordability is forcing people onto the streets and the population is becoming desperate. **Mellor** said that a high rise apartment complex in Salt Lake City currently under construction is going for \$900,000 a door in construction costs alone.

Councilmember **Melissa Layton** said she is happy to take heat from residents who are against an increase in police wages. Police officer pay should reflect what they are being asked to do, which is putting their lives on the line every day.

Leeman said he would like to go with the 27% increase instead of the 15% increase, even though it may be difficult. Although he is worried about how stretched everyone's budgets are, it is the right decision. Farmington is in a never-ending arms race that can't be solved but that they have to keep up with. There are not enough police officers coming out the academy anymore.

Mayor **Brett Anderson** joined the work session at 6:46 p.m.

Child said Farmington's Police Department is not deep enough to hire rookies before they go to the academy for training. It takes time to raise cops to that level, and Farmington now needs to compete with other cities to keep up. The City needs better wages to do that.

Shumway said even with a 5% wage increase, Farmington's police will still be at the bottom of the County's pay schedule. Farmington needs to do this big of a jump now in order to get ahead of others, then do smaller increases annually going forward.

Child said Farmington could do what Syracuse has done and commit to being in the top three of the County. That type of commitment says something to the police, even though it may bind a future Council.

Mellor said there is a difference between a 15% tax increase discussed, and a 27% increase needed for police wages. If Farmington expects the best caliber of police, pay has to be increased and residents' taxes may have to increase 27%. There is a nationwide shift in how police officers are treated, with their wages on a sharp increase. However, fire fighters' wages have not kept pace with police officers'. He reminded the Council that the City is self-insured, and if police officers "screw up," it would ultimately cost Farmington. **Thackeray** said that the recent active shooting incident opened people's eyes to the importance of police in Farmington.

Johnson said Farmington could lose three officers in the near future. Farmington was once at the bottom. If the City doesn't constantly look at where police wages rank, the City may have to catch up, which is not fun. He said he has two officers who are the grave shift being paid overtime. Farmington has a new officer coming from Ogden City who will serve as a Farmington detective. The City's detectives are worn out from the enormous caseloads and required overtime.

DISCUSSION OF REGULAR SESSION ITEMS UPON REQUEST

Planning and GIS Specialist **Shannon Hansell** addressed the text amendment regarding the fencing of recreational pools. Farmington's current ordinance calls for a 6-foot tall fence around all pools. However, the updated building code standard calls for either a locking pool cover or a 4-foot fence. The building permit technician said Farmington residents are not getting their final inspections on their pools. Despite a recent change in building code standards, some Planning Commissioners want a fence anyway for safety. **Mellor** said fences around private pools are required by some insurance carriers.

Child said there are certain conditions where a 6-foot fence doesn't make sense. It should be adaptable to the site conditions and situation, and common sense has to kick in at some point. Some glass pool covers are 2 to 3 feet above the water level and are retractable in the summer. **Roberts** said he is surprised with the change, because the international building code is known for being cautious, conservative, and designing for safety. **Mayor Anderson** said new pool covers can be walked and slept on, unlike ones from the past.

REGULAR SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex
Leeman,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,
City Attorney Paul Roberts,
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,*

*Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Fire Chief Rich Love,
City Planner/GIS Specialist Shannon
Hansell,
Assistant City Manager/City Engineer Chad
Boshell, and
City Parks and Recreation Director Colby
Thackeray.*

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** was excused.

Roll Call (Opening Comments/Invocation/Pledge of Allegiance)

Councilmember **Alex Leeman** offered the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilmember **Roger Child**.

PRESENTATION:

Junior Jazz Award Presentation

Recreation/Gym Manager **Linda Weeks** presented this agenda item, recognizing **Nate Martinez** for his 18 years of commitment to the Junior Jazz program. He has coached for flag football and basketball and has been very involved. Junior Jazz is now in its 42nd season. Over 2 million children have gone through the program in that time, and the Junior Jazz is now seeing its third generation of participants.

Four to five years ago, the State Junior Jazz started recognizing one of their 110 different programs each season. Programs can apply for a grant to be recognized. The application asks why they should be the Junior Jazz program of the year, and the organizers look for someone who takes advantage of all that Junior Jazz has to offer. There were only a few applications that checked every one of the 10 to 15 boxes. **Martinez** said the things Farmington is doing for their recreation program are not the norm; they care a lot more than most cities do. They have smaller teams for younger kids so they can play and learn more. As such, Farmington has been declared the 2023-2024 Junior Jazz Program of the Year. Farmington's Rec Staff will get basketball tickets for next season, a ball signed by all members of the 23-24 NBA Jazz team, and \$2,500.

Update from Commissioner Lorene Kamalu and Animal Care Director Ashleigh Young

Davis County **Lorene Kamalu** addressed the Council, saying Farmington is the fifth of 15 cities she is planning to address. She passed out a document detailing how Davis County is organized, complete with three County Commissioners, other elected officials, and their assigned responsibilities according to State Statute. **Kamalu** is in her sixth year on the Commission. Over a year ago, she was assigned to oversee Animal Care. She said Animal Care Director **Ashleigh**

Young has worked really hard with the city managers throughout the County in order to get their input, trust, and buy-in. Animal services are typically provided by the cities, and State law had to be changed in order to officially keep Davis County in charge of animal services and for the County to get its own line item on the tax form. Davis County's Animal Care has been getting national recognition for being a stand-out for services in the whole state. If animals are all over, it becomes a public health and safety problem. Animal Care is one of the most popular departments for volunteers.

Young has been with Animal Care since 2021. As a no-kill organization, over 90% of its animals exit alive. Of the 4,000 animals that are taken in annually, 70% are strays. They have 10 full-time animal control officers on duty seven days a week. The facility only deals with domestic animals, not wildlife.

In 2021, a feasibility study began to consider the program's future including a look at the building and a review of its operations. They wanted an unbiased look at the program, as it has been through a number of directors in recent years. The 10,000 square foot building is over 40 years old. Davis County is working toward a new 32,000 square foot building that would better accommodate the 4,000 animals that come in annually. Since COVID, Davis County has seen animals pour into shelters, and they need a bigger facility and more funding. A Request for Proposals (RFP) is in progress searching for an architect, and Animal Services hopes to break ground on a new building at the end of 2024. The new \$15 million facility is being funded by Davis County, which is not asking any of the cities for funds. The building will be highly specialized with drainage and kennels. In preparation, County Staff have toured a number of different sites. The new building will be built near the current location, which helped with funds since new land did not have to be purchased.

Young said the County will go through the truth in taxation process in order to get a small increase for Animal Care next year. The Commissioners all voted to move forward with the process. The last increase was in 2018. Inflation has been hard on all, and Animal Services needs a behavior trainer as well as more veterinarian resources.

Mayor Anderson said if the County doesn't handle Animal Services, the cities will have to, which would be a less efficient alternative. City Manager **Brigham Mellor** said there is a lot of stray dogs in Farmington that Davis County handles. **Kamalu** said just like homelessness, animal services tracks with the size of population. It is happening because of human owners, not because animals are populating themselves.

Blalock Presentation

Assistant City Manager/City Engineer **Chad Boshell** presented this agenda item. The new Fire Station is getting close, as crews are paving the road in front of the site this week. The site has to sit for a little while after the grade is raised before construction can begin.

Kevin Blalock, principal and owner of Blalock Architects based in Salt Lake City, provided an update on Fire Station 72 located off the new Innovator Drive. He has been working with Fire Chief **Rich Love** and Police Chief **Eric Johnsen**. The partial two-story building will be over 22,000 square feet with four pull-through apparatus bays; eight dorms; three refrigerators; a private interior courtyard; satellite police office work space on the second floor; and second floor education, training, and community meeting space. The second story outdoor deck lines up well

with a view of Flag Rock. There is room to expand the second floor. The exterior is a dark charcoal brick. **Boshell** said he is excited about the second floor that overlooks the new park and is open to the public.

Blalock said his design incorporated all the newest designs, including a four-fold door design that can get out of the way quicker and has 10 times the life expectancy. **Mellor** said the old style fire doors each take \$2,000 to maintain annually. The station will be five times more energy efficient.

The current cost estimate is \$13.202 million with an additional \$450,000 contingency. The bid document will be out toward the end of July, and Staff is hoping for a September 11, 2024, ground breaking. They hope for a permit review process the first part of July 2025.

Blalock said construction costs are volatile, with a 3.5% to 4% increase year over year. 2019 was the year that started a steady escalation that totaled a 17% jump in four years. Construction costs have been driven up in every sector. More recently, the increase has been more like 7% year over year. Election years and international volatility can lead to instability, so anything could happen through the middle of March of 2025. Recently, those associated with the Farmington Fire Station went through a cost reduction exercise to “trim the fat” without hindering future growth and inevitable changes. A third party looked at trimming costs per square foot. With the airport and prison construction frenzy subsiding in Utah, construction costs may be calming and it may not be a good idea to delay construction. However, event venues, hotels, and infrastructure may be the sectors that stretch the construction industry thin in the future.

Mellor said the new fire station will be big enough to house the full Fire Department while the old fire station is renovated. There isn’t anything on recent fire station tours that Staff hasn’t considered and that hasn’t been addressed in the new plans. When both fire stations are available, each will run four-handed. The department was budgeted to run eight-handed this year, but it didn’t end up being run that way. Equipment costs will come up. Increasingly, it is becoming a full-time job to manage the City’s buildings.

Child said Farmington is anticipating a lot of growth on its west side, so a fire station on the west is important. **Mellor** said it will be another three years before the new fire station is operational.

Love spoke about equipping the new fire station. A new engine is being delivered this summer, three years after ordering it. There is fire equipment in the public works lot as well. When the department is fully staffed, there could be fire fighters sleeping on the floor.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Fire Station 72 – Zone Change and Enabling Ordinance

City Planner/GIS Specialist **Shannon Hansell** presented this agenda item. The property for the future fire station is still zoned Open Space (OS) because of its proximity to Shepard Creek. Zoning it to Mixed Use wouldn’t allow for public uses and Chapter 18 is difficult to meet. The site plan for the fire station has more flexibility if it was zoned Agricultural (A) instead.

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 8:17 p.m. Nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Motion:

Layton moved that the City Council approve the enabling ordinance changing the zone for 471 N. Innovator Drive from Open Space (OS) to Agricultural (A), subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Additional Text and Amendments regarding Recreational Pools and Tennis Courts

Hansell presented this agenda item. The proposal is to take out a section in the ordinance requiring placing a 6-foot fence around all private pools. The proposal is to reduce the fence height to 4 feet unless there is a locking power safety cover. Staff recommends that the ordinance reflect the building code standard, which would require removal of the fencing requirement. The Planning Commission had two nay votes due to those Commissioners wanting a fencing requirement in place unless removed by special exception.

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 8:22 p.m. Nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Mayor Anderson received comments via email, which will be made part of the record.

Leeman said he thinks it is weird not to have a fence requirement. He can see some logic in having a physical barrier to restrain young children, and a fence is objectively easy for Staff to enforce. However, pool covers are very impressive and a 6-foot fence is not necessary. He would like the ability to make an exception for anything that is a barrier functionally equivalent to a fence.

Councilmember **Melissa Layton** said it makes her nervous not to have any fences around pools, but there are definitely exceptions. However, a 6-foot fence is not realistic. **Mayor Anderson** said he has a 6-foot fence that his teenagers can hop. This is about keeping young children out.

Child said there are a myriad of different methodologies and styles of pool protection and auto covers. Fencing may now be an archaic form of pool protection. While he supports protection for children and toddlers, he thinks having language that dictates a 6-foot fence is not keeping up with the times. There are hundreds of other solutions. Architecturally, a fence around a pool is unattractive and not inviting.

Hansell said if considering an exception feels too burdensome or vague, the Council can agree on a physical barrier requirement other than a fence.

Mayor Anderson said he would like Staff to poke around to see if other cities have language to impede toddler access to pools. **Child** noted that fences won't stop children or grandchildren who are already in your home from entering a pool. He is not sure a fence is going to be the solution. Pools are an attractive nuisance. He is in favor of removing the fence requirement. **Leeman** said he was surprised to hear that the updated building code didn't require a fence.

City Attorney **Paul Roberts** said building permits are required for pools with foundations, while swim spas don't require such foundations.

Motion:

Layton moved that the City Council table this item.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

BUSINESS:

Resolution providing notice to Davis County of intent to place the RAP Tax on November 2024 Ballot

Roberts presented this agenda item. The recreation, arts, and parks (RAP) tax has been in place in the City since 2018, after the voters approved it in 2017. State code requires that before a city can put the opinion question of imposing the RAP tax on the ballot, they must provide notice of intent to their county. The County has 60 days to provide a response to the City, indicating whether they will be imposing a county-wide RAP tax (which impacts the City's ability to assess a RAP tax of its own). If the City has received that notification, then they are in the clear to place the opinion question on the ballot. Passage of this resolution at this date provides ample time for the 60 days to pass before the contents of the November 2024 ballot are finalized. The City cannot make actions to endorse passage of the tax.

Motion:

Leeman moved that the City Council adopt the resolution providing to Davis County the City's notice of intent to submit to voters the opinion question of whether to renew the recreation, arts, and parks (RAP) tax.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Review a De Minimis Impact Concurrence Request from the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for the Interstate 15 (I-15) widening project

Boshell presented this agenda item. UDOT is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the I-15 widening project. City Staff has been working with UDOT consultants to review various areas being impacted by the improvements along the freeway. UDOT intends to make de minimis impact finding regarding 4(f) recreation resources. The letter (in the Staff Report) describes the areas impacted under 4(f) and how they may be mitigated. Staff would like

the City Council to review the letter and have the opportunity for discussion prior to signing the impact concurrence request.

The letter from UDOT Cultural Resources Program Manager Liz Robinson claims that since UDOT did not receive any comments concerning effects on Ezra T. Clark Park, South Park, or Farmington Creek Trail during the 45-day public comment period (ending November 13, 2023), they are now requesting Farmington's concurrence that the I-15 project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes that make these properties eligible for section 4(f) protection.

Boshell said Farmington doesn't have to sign the letter, but UDOT is being persistent in asking the City to. **Mayor Anderson** said he looked at it and wants to be careful about what is said or not said. Farmington is trying to be good neighbors with UDOT before they come in and ruin the City with their project. **Mellor** said there are still a lot of unknowns such as if UDOT is going to build a tunnel under the 400 West trail and who will pay for it; what will be done about landscaping; and if the skate park will be addressed. He suggested relating that Staff had a conversation with Councilmembers, who is still concerned with the number unknowns. That will give UDOT a chance to address and clarify the unknowns. The Council needs more facts.

Boshell said he is fine leaving it open for future argument. He sees two areas of concern: the tunnel/City's financial obligation; and clear language about the skate park. There would not be a safe place to watch the ball fields as a spectator.

Layton asked if the Council was aware of UDOT sending Historic Preservation Commission Chairman **David Barney** a letter March 12 about UDOT having the money and land for a 1525 interchange, but that the Farmington City Council said they didn't want it. **Mellor** said Staff was aware. Speed limit signs have been ordered.

SUMMARY ACTION:

Minute Motion Approving Summary Action List

The Council considered the Summary Action List including:

- Item 1: Consider approval of BH Inc. to construct the Overlays FY 2025 in the amount of \$1.262 million to be paid from various street maintenance funds
- Item 2: Consider approval of Morgan Pavement to construct the ONYX FY 2025 Road Maintenance Project Bid for \$36,544.37 to be paid from various street maintenance funds
- Item 3: Consider approval of Staker Parson to construct the Chip Seal FY 2025 Road Maintenance Project Bid for \$114,950 to be paid from various street maintenance funds.
- Item 4: Consider approval of Asphalt Preservation to construct the crack Seal FY 2025 Road Maintenance for \$41,175 to be paid from various street maintenance funds
- Item 5: Amendments to Previously Approved Interlocal Agreement with Davis County and University of Utah Medical Center
- Item 6: Pick-Up Contribution for Public Safety and Firefighter Tier II Employees.
Roberts said it is an odd state law that cities don't have to pick up the contribution for public safety, but if they don't, the public safety people get upset.

Motion:

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

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nay

GOVERNING BODY REPORTS:

Mayor Anderson and City Council Reports

Layton said the Communities that Care (CTC) will be on an upcoming work session. She will be out of town during the June 4, 2024, City Council meeting but will try to call in. She recently spoke with the principal of Farmington High School regarding the parking problem in the nearby cul-de-sac. The principal has a few ideas that could help deter students from parking there.

Shumway said there are many eyes on the City’s transportation utility fee. In a Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) of the Utah League of Cities and Towns, she said she heard that in anticipation of the Olympics coming to Utah in the future, there is a push to increase the number of State Parks from 47 to 50. There is talk of making a State Park between Farmington and Bountiful. This could lead to massive improvement of the canyon, another campground, and maybe a road open year round. It would provide more recreational activity.

Mayor Anderson mentioned that in the upcoming Utah governorship race, he feels Farmington currently has a friend in the governor’s office and wants to keep that relationship strong.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

Child made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nay
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

DeAnn Carlile, Recorder



DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

City council meeting-pool regulations

1 message

Denise Pappas <dpappas@endeavorb2b.com>
To: "dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov" <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Tue, May 21, 2024 at 11:03 AM

Hello,

I am unable to make the meeting this evening although would like to express my support in amending the text regarding "pools and tennis courts".

I myself am in the process of installing an in-ground pool and will be installing an automatic pool cover. Currently the code requires a 6ft fence surrounding the pool. I personally have a 10ft rock wall that would be much harder to climb than a 6ft fence. To place a 6 ft fence in front of the 10 ft rock wall would be redundant, unsightly and costly. I understand the past council has voted against an amendment in this code although the code on safe-guarding a recreational pool in the city of Farmington is antiquated.

There are numerous other states and many cities currently within the state that allow for an automatic pool cover to suffice, as the auto-covers do not allow for access to the pool when the cover is closed and only able to be opened with a code.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing the meeting virtually.

-Denise Pappas
National Accounts Manager
Endeavor Business Media
Dpappas@endeavorb2b.com
M: 631.300.8317

FARMINGTON CITY – CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

June 4, 2024

WORK SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex
Leeman,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,
City Attorney Paul Roberts,
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,*

*Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Community Development Director Dave
Petersen,
Assistant Community Development
Director/City Planner Lyle Gibson,
Finance Director Greg Davis, and
City Parks and Recreation Director Colby
Thackeray.*

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the work session to order at 6:06 p.m. Councilmember **Melissa Layton** was excused.

CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE DISCUSSION

Finance Director **Greg Davis** presented this agenda item, highlighting changes to the Consolidated Fee Schedule (CFS). He said the City is not supposed to be making a profit off any fee. In that regard, Farmington is “way” safe, particularly when taking into account all the costs incurred (such as the field, building, vehicles, etc.) to provide sports. Staff does look at the market particularly for recreation and cemetery fees.

City Manager **Brigham Mellor** said the City transfers \$1 million from the General Fund to recreation every year. Every year each department head takes part in the budget process, looking particularly at fees in relation to Farmington’s neighbors. Since being instituted four years ago as part of the budget review process, fees are being discussed more frequently than in the past. Proposed is an increase in pool and gym memberships. A 25% discount will be offered to only veterans and active duty military.

City Parks and Recreation Director **Colby Thackeray** said there has not been an increase in fees for a long time. Some adjustments were made two years ago. It really boils down to the market, and Farmington was still really low. The cemetery child burial fee is proposed to increase from \$160 to \$300, which would still be at the bottom since it does not have perpetual care fees tacked on. Farmington is trying to catch up with everyone else, although Salt Lake cemeteries are “crazy” high. Farmington does not add after-hours and weekend fees. The new \$650,000 cemetery irrigation system looks nice.

Thackeray said there have been small adjustments in recreation fees after some discrepancies were discovered. Contracted referee fees for adult team sports have increased substantially. The adaptive fee for junior jazz increased because of new jerseys.

Mayor Anderson asked if the nonresident fees are high enough. There are a flood of people coming into Farmington to participate in programs such as pickleball. Councilmember **Alex Leeman** said he would support charging 50% more. **Thackeray** said he isn’t opposed to

increasing the gap, particularly for soccer. However, it is difficult to determine if someone is a resident or not. Councilmember **Amy Shumway** said some cities don't offer the programs Farmington does, such as flag football. She pointed out that Farmington residents can sign up for pickleball a day before nonresidents.

Davis said the Council can look at the proposed fees for a few more weeks prior to their June 18 public hearing. **Mellor** said pushback on fees can help Staff determine where they should ultimately be set. For example, Farmington got pushback last year on new pool fees—not the fee per se, but the way the fee was applied. Fees can be changed.

Councilmember **Scott Isaacson** said a fee is the fairest form of tax because the people getting the service are the ones paying for it. The Council should look seriously at charging higher fees if the General Fund is subsidizing recreation, and taxpayers are paying for services they don't benefit from.

Davis said the Central Davis Sewer District has asked Farmington to charge differently for multifamily residences. However, the Central Davis Sewer Board has to meet again to flesh out the exact details. **Mellor** said the Council can set an effective date for any fee change.

Davis said there will need to be adjustments made to the proposed budget for the Farmington Creek Lower Trail project, which carries a total cost of \$338,000. The grants cover 72% of the total. The City has already spent \$23,500. The remaining \$315,000 will be spent in Fiscal Year 2025. The City needs \$73,500 to make up the difference, and it will be taken from park improvement funds. **Mellor** said Farmington only had one effective bid for the project, and they may have opportunities to go after others. The City has until September of 2025 to complete the project, so it needs to be done this fiscal year.

Another change in the General Fund is additional police officers. Instead of having only a 5% raise [2.5% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) and 2.5% merit like all other employees], the budget includes an additional 15% pay rate increase. That would be covered by an additional 15% property tax increase, for a total 27% property tax increase. **Davis** said Farmington does not have final numbers from the County regarding growth.

Mellor said the primary changes from the tentative budget previously presented in May include the trail grant and the property tax increase for police wages. The Council is set to approve the budget on June 18 and hold a Truth in Taxation hearing on August 20, 2024. Two newsletters will be going out before then. The first will include information about the mural and the grant from Davis County to pay for it. The next will be the August newsletter that will mention the tax increase and the items it will go toward, specifically the police wages. He said he will have a draft of that newsletter article to Councilmembers soon.

Mellor said there will be a knee-jerk reaction from some residents who will criticize property taxes increasing more than inflation, especially with growth producing more revenue. The core of the message is that the City raised taxes last year to handle the number of police on staff. Farmington Police Department is still two seats down, and they need to be able to have a wage that is competitive enough to not only keep the Staff they have, but to attract new employees. That is hard to push back against, **Mellor** said. Just \$11 a month is not a lot to get bent out of shape over.

Shumway said everyone's budget is tighter this year compared last. **Isaacson** said that in the last two years, Farmington's portion of property taxes have been raised a total of 60%, including the proposed 27% this year. He would like to provide residents with the property tax numbers of surrounding cities, and a chart that shows Farmington's tax rate compared to others. Those two charts should be included with everything that the City sends out. If they are, he predicts 90% of residents will understand the proposed increase. It may help to also explain how sales tax revenue that has increased in the last several years has instead plateaued lately. Big increases cannot be expected anymore. **Davis** added that a graph showing how total payroll has increased and even doubled in the last four years may also be helpful.

Mayor Anderson wondered how many other cities are currently proposing tax increases. **Davis** said three other cities in Davis County have set a Truth in Taxation hearing so far, in addition to the South Davis Recreation Center. City Recorder **DeAnn Carlile** said that Syracuse City and two fire departments in the County are proposing increases. She will inquire with her contact at Davis County to find out if there are more.

Councilmember **Roger Child** said it is not prudent to tie public safety to sales tax revenue. **Davis** said the approximately \$8 million budgeted in sales tax revenue is not a reliable source for the General Fund compared to property tax revenue. Property taxes are a reliable, stable revenue source.

Leeman said animal control increases are proposed to be \$11 a month for every Davis County home. **Child** would like to compile a list of state resources that can help residents who can't afford property tax increases, which can result in liens against homes.

DISCUSSION OF REGULAR SESSION ITEMS UPON REQUEST

Mellor said CW has decided their agenda item (The Charlotte) is not ready to come back to the Council yet. They are trying to look at options and don't want to ruffle feathers. They have asked a lot about the trail and allowing one building to be pulled before residential is built. They want the opportunity to completely eliminate the commercial building permit requirement in order to not be tethered to commercial.

Assistant Community Development Director/City Planner **Lyle Gibson** said the Council does not have a real requirement to do anything, as the applicant already has their Development Agreement (DA) and Project Master Plan (PMP). He said there are three options including leaving the DA the way it is, allowing to build residential whenever the applicant wants, or the middle ground of only pulling one commercial building permit.

Leeman said he is not O.K. with changing it, as other projects have similar requirements. **Child** said he would be fine with a work session. **Mellor** said July is the soonest a work session could be held on this item. **Gibson** said he would send a message to the applicant that the Council is not up to amending the DA, but they can plead their case at the work session.

Community Development Director **Dave Petersen** discussed the Main Street Landmark Register Designation agenda item. **Isaacson** said he received a flurry of emails saying affected residents didn't get notice, which is frustrating when the City has bent over backwards to both take time looking through this issue as well as inform people about it.

Shumway said one email worried her regarding a resident who didn't want the unelected Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) officials approving a Certificate of Appropriateness. **Petersen** said the property owner has the choice if they go to the HPC or not.

Isaacson noted that people opposed to an item are usually the ones to show up to a public meeting, and he wonders how many people in the district are not opposed to it. **Mellor** said it is a fair estimate that the people to the north of State Street are O.K. or ambivalent to the landmark designation, but those to the south are very concerned. Those to the south have a different zoning, and the north is more restricted. **Isaacson** said the houses to the south are all bungalows built in the 1920s. No one thinks that similar houses on 17th South and 5th East in Salt Lake City are that unique or in a historic district. **Leeman** said bungalows don't look historic to him. **Child** said those to the south have an instigator, but they are not being stripped of their rights to have a duplex on their property.

Petersen said the Council could eliminate those to the south from the landmark district. **Mellor** said people may want to tear down a structure to build a newer one in order to get more density. While the residents would not be losing out on density, the means to get there are different and uncomfortable for those to the south of State Street. **Leeman** said the answer is to convince a committee, **Petersen**, or an expert—basically go through someone else to get permission with no guarantee of a permissive attitude. **Petersen** said the appeal would be to the City Council. **Child** said they are afraid of the unknown. He wants to make sure every homeowner can address concerns over the seismic safety of their home. He doesn't want to tell homeowners they can't renovate for seismic stability.

Isaacson said he has heard some who claim that Lagoon is the problem. **Leeman** offered that Lagoon tore down a house, although it was demolition by neglect.

REGULAR SESSION

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex
Leeman,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton via Zoom,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,*

*City Attorney Paul Roberts,
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Community Development Director Dave
Petersen, and
Assistant Community Development
Director/City Planner Lyle Gibson.*

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. Councilmember **Melissa Layton** and Councilmember **Alex Leeman** participated electronically via Zoom. Councilmember **Roger Child** offered the invocation, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilmember **Scott Isaacson**.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Code Text Change Proposal – Section 11-39-050 F of Chapter 39 of the Zoning Ordinance

Community Development Director **David Petersen** presented this agenda item. On March 21, 2024, the Planning Commission held a public hearing related to changes to Chapter 39 of the Zoning Ordinance, but tabled the action to allow time for Staff to prepare findings for their future consideration. On April 18, 2024, the Commission reviewed the changes, but did not recommend either of the two alternative options included in the Staff Report. Staff tried to simplify things. He said the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) did not recommend that the Council approve this item.

Mayor Anderson opened the Public Hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Brad Bornemeier (54 S. Main Steet, Farmington, Utah) said he appreciates that the City did not rush into this decision. At first, the meetings with affected landowners proceeded like, “This is going to happen. Now, how can we make it easier on you?” After two years on this journey, he said the chapter was poorly written and many changes have had to be made for residents. He wants to make it as easy as possible for him to do what he wants with his home. He predicts that this won’t be the last historic district, so the Council should think ahead to how residents will feel in the future.

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

Main Street Landmark Register Designation Ordinance

Petersen presented this agenda item. The Council reviewed this request at their September 19, 2023, public hearing, tabling consideration to allow time for additional feedback from property owners and for further study. The Council again considered a Main Street Landmark Register Designation Ordinance on December 5, 2023, but tabled action again. Erring on the side of

caution, the City sent out notice to all 100 of the affected properties, even though it was not required.

Mayor Anderson said the City has received several emails that were reviewed by the Council and will be made part of the record. He opened the Public Hearing at 7:29 p.m.

David Newton (74 S. Main Street, Farmington, Utah) said he had concerns that this was originally presented as this thing was going to happen, but the landowners could determine how they wanted it. He felt it was Big Government handing them something, and then asking how they wanted to receive it. This didn't sit well with anyone, as they wanted the chance for the City to consider that the landmark district not happen at all. Why should the government dictate what landowners do with their home as taxpayers?

His home is south of State Street, and he would like the Council to consider that those south of State Street don't want this. Their zoning is both R4 and R8, which shows a precedent to zone things differently in the area. He would like the option to opt out or have some different level of participation. He said properties that qualify for the landmark register got to that point by themselves, as property owners all care for their structures and do their own yardwork.

He appreciated the later opportunity to meet with Staff to review options. He feels many of the options Staff listed as benefits of being a part of a landmark register designation are ambiguous, using noncommittal words that sound good on paper.

Brad Bornemeier (54 S. Main Steet, Farmington, Utah) said affected landowners were called out for not attending meetings. However, all six homeowners south of State Street are either attending or being represented at tonight's meeting, and every one of them is against this. One homeowner is on a mission, but submitted a letter to the Council for consideration. Since he has lived in this area, three homes have been demolished. Now that his own property rights are in question, he and his neighbors are a little standoffish for what will go on here. He thanked the Council for waiting to making a decision about this. He said the Staff's listed financial benefits for belonging to a landmark district are false. This area is already on the federal district, so there will not be any new tax breaks available to them. In his experience, a homeowner would have to pay \$40,000 to \$60,000 in order to qualify for tax breaks, which would mean they would have to almost take out a loan. For example, his home has over 30 windows, many of which were boarded up when he bought the home. To replace it to its original condition (as called for by the landmark district), it would have to be wooden frames and single-pane glass, which would cost \$30,000 to \$40,000. Yet vinyl would cost half as much.

If developers like **Jerry Preston** had a hard time qualifying, what chances do individual homeowners have? Property owners south of State Street are asking to be left out. Different parts of Main Street have historically been treated differently, so precedence has already been set.

In 2000, he lived in nearby apartments and heard rumors about the HPC. He determined that he would not buy a home if it was in a landmark district or Original Townsite Residential (OTR) zone. There were concerns about demolitions on the street. His parents' home on 1400 North was purchased and then demolished. His home is already protected and he couldn't demolish it as easily as his parents' home was demolished. Chapter 39 has an extra layer he would have to go through in comparison to a normal resident demolishing a home. He does not want his rights

taken away and given to a committee that is not elected or employed by the City, who do not have building qualifications, but who have the power to grant him permission of what to do or not do with his home. The “compromise” will not go well if landowners can’t control what happens to their own property. Those south of State Street want to be left off. They didn’t want to be part of it, and they didn’t ask for it.

Judy Roosendaal addressed the Council. She lives next to the Rock Church and also owns another home in the historic district. She couldn’t be more grateful for how the City takes care of people, faith, family, and freedom. She appreciates the Council taking care of older properties like her old home.

Mayor Anderson closed the Public Hearing at 7:47 p.m.

Mayor Anderson recognized that this is a hot item wrestling the desire to preserve the unique historic aspect of Farmington with property rights. He understands the tension. However, as Mayor, he only votes if there is a tie. So, he would like to at least share his thoughts before turning the issue over to voting members. In competing philosophies and ideals, he leans toward property rights to control what is theirs. If residents want to opt into the landmark register, they can join later. He is against forcing people. If a district is created and then a person moved in later, they know what they bought into. But it is hard to swallow forcing someone into it or the government telling someone what to do. It has been interesting to hear the issue deliberated. This is an issue that Councilmembers have debated for a long time, so they have taken time to think and prepare for this agenda item.

Layton said as a liaison with the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), she has wrestled with this issue and been able to discuss it in depth. She leans toward property rights, which are important rights to protect. She also understands why the City as a whole would want to protect an iconic, beautiful street that adds value. That ambiance does not disappear overnight, but can be chipped away at little by little if there are no preservation efforts.

Isaacson said he respects everyone’s opinion and the appreciates the civility of the discussions. He understands both sides, but wants to step back to a 3,000 feet view. When we choose to live in a community, we give up certain rights. We do not have property rights to do things that would injure our neighbors under City ordinances. WE do have to give up some rights to live in a community because those rights could injure the rights of others. There is a fair line between doing whatever you want and what benefits the community as a whole. He is in favor of preserving Farmington’s historic center for the benefit of the entire community, subject to certain restrictions. That is not un-American. While visiting Charelston, South Carolina, recently, he noticed blocks of historic homes that are lived in today under strict rules that preserve the historical look of the community. There are likewise similar restrictions in downtown Park City. While he knows Farmington is not Park City, maybe the City is going too far. He is concerned that everyone south of State Street is opposed to it, and he is considering excluding them even though he thinks it is better in the long run to include them. He would be in favor of modifying the recommended ordinance because the zoning is different south of State Street. This does make a difference in his mind. He is persuaded that being a part of a historic district does benefit the involved landowners.

Mayor Anderson asked if homes south of State Street excluded from the landmark district now could opt in in the future. **Petersen** said they could if they first petition to join, which would be reviewed by the HPC and then the City Council.

Leeman said he has the same feelings as the Mayor. He is concerned about forcing things on people who have not chosen to be in a district. While the Council may adopt a historic district, they are not required to do so. It is a judgment call for the City Council. The decision of if it is worthy or important enough to preserve is a heavy decision to make, as it affects property rights. The Council has to decide if it is good for the community as a whole. He personally has a hard time distinguishing if something is historic or just old. However, he is struck by the fact that there does seem to be a line on the map, with those on one side in support or ambivalent and those on the south being against it. He would like to sever the properties south of State Street.

Child said this discussion illustrates well that there is a balance between personal property rights and preserving the community. He is in favor of personal property rights. It must be determined at what point personal and community rights conflict. There is not a whole lot of conflict over the desire to keep residential preserved on Main Street. From a 30,000 foot level, most are in agreement with a level of preservation. However, he would like to stop at the 20,000 foot level.

He has been to Charleston, and it is beautiful. However, in order to paint a house in Charleston, a homeowner has to take eight grades of paint to get scientifically tested. He never wants to go to that level in Farmington. Most people are afraid that their rights could be taken away. The City and Staff have tried to preserve property owners' rights over those who interpret if a dandelion is a weed or flower, or have a preference for a certain type of fence or window. There is a certain level to stop at.

The Planning Staff has done a great job of allowing property owners to have a voice. It is important not to force someone into the level of detail that takes property rights away, but instead preserves the quality and character of Main Street. Three options have been proposed. If this is passed, there is a declaration that the general nature of Main Street be preserved with four avenues of appeal. First, the HPC. While there are great people on that committee, and he has sat on that committee in the past, that is not his first choice. Time is money, and they are not interested in making a quick decision. He would not put an interest rate clock against the HPC. Secondly, decisions can be appealed to Staff. He has a high degree of confidence in Staff. Third, appeals can be brought to the City Council. Lastly, at the cost of the City, plans can be reviewed by an architect.

He does not want to put property rights into the hands of a pet peeve hobby horse. He wants something more efficient. He feels as a City, they have stopped at the 20,000 foot level, balancing between property rights and the desire to preserve the character and quality of Main Street. You can demolish your house if you want to, but have to put back a structure of the same character and quality of other residences on Main Street. He wants to make sure that there is a strong life safety proponent; residents have the right to have a home that is seismically safe, and there should be a process to review that. He has never seen things taken to the level of approving wood windows over vinyl windows. He is in favor of having what you want in your own home.

Isaacson said the ordinance is triggered if what is being proposed requires a building permit. Minor things that don't require a building permit aren't considered. **Child** noted that a building

permit is required for demolitions and additions, but not required for type of windows or a modern look inside the home.

Leeman physically left the meeting at 8:10 p.m., but then called in to join the meeting electronically.

Councilmember **Amy Shumway** said she is sorry that **Newton** felt the ordinance presented would be passed no matter what. She hopes nobody ever feels that way again. While being a part of a historic landmark district may not benefit **Bornemeier** personally, it will benefit those with really large backyards in the future. It is a hard balance, and she doesn't want to take away property rights. With the courthouse so close to those south of State Street, she doesn't feel those homes should be excluded. She feels all homes should be included. However, taking a bird's eye view, it is not a deal killer if those homes are excluded. She said it sounds like all agree on preserving Main Street.

Isaacson said he was saddened by **Newton's** lack of trust in City government. At the same time, **Newton** is asking the City to trust that he won't demolish his home. The Council has been studying this for years, and he hopes there is respect that goes both ways.

Petersen said Farmington's landmark districts include West State Street, Clark Lane Historic District, and the Main Street Historic District. The new district could be adopted with everything south of State Street not needing a Certificate of Appropriateness (CA) for anything other than demolitions. A CA would not be required for repairs, alterations, or additions. If someone is worried about seismic soundness, they may want to demolish and replace with something fitting to the historic district. Even appropriate duplexes can be "fitting." Something separate can be done to the south.

Mayor Anderson said the intent is that the only ordinance affecting those south of State Street is the demolition and relocation ordinance.

Motion:

Isaacson moved that the City Council approve the enabling ordinance (enclosed in the Staff Report) amending Section 11-39-050 F. subparagraph 2.a. and subparagraph 3. of Chapter 39 (Historic Buildings and Sites) regarding historic resources on the Farmington City Historic Landmark Register and adding paragraph 5 from Option 1, changing the wording to read as follows:

A Certificate of Appropriateness for an historic resource located in the Main Street Historic Landmarks Register district in the area south of State Street and north of 200 South on Main Street is not required for repairs, alterations, or additions, but only for demolitions or relocations.

Findings 1-3:

1. The amendment provides greater flexibility to the owner of an historic resource to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness for repairs, alterations, or additions.
2. The proposed subparagraph 3 enables access to greater information to an owner of an historic resource wanting to do repairs, alterations, or additions consistent with appropriate standards.
3. The amendment reduces redundancy as "repairs" is already referenced in subparagraph 4.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Motion:

Isaacson moved that the City Council approve the ordinance (enclosed in the Staff Report) designating the historic resources located in the Main Street National Historic District as historic resources on the City’s Historic Landmark Register.

Findings 1-3:

1. The Farmington Main Street Historic District is located within the corporate boundaries of Farmington City.
2. It is currently listed in the national register of historic places (the “national register”).
3. The Main Street Historic District meets six of the seven criteria below necessary for Landmark Register Designation [Note: Only compliance with two of the seven criteria is required.]
 - i. It is an easily identifiable visual feature of its neighborhood or the City because of its positioning, location, age, scale, or style, and it contributes to the distinctive quality or identity of its area in such a way that its absence would negatively affect the area’s sense of place;
 - a. The district is one of the most identifiable area of the City. It contains buildings from the entire settlement history of Farmington in a variety of styles and types ranging from small settlement-era vernacular classical homes to the recently constructed City Hall in 2010.
 - b. Unlike many main streets across the county, Farmington’s Main Street is primarily single family residential.
 - c. The district area has the most historically intact collection of buildings in Farmington City, and maintains a cohesive historic streetscape with little modern infill between historic buildings.
 - ii. It figures importantly into Farmington City’s founding or development through its uses, especially public uses;
 - a. The territorial legislature designated Farmington as the seat of government for the newly formed Davis County, and the first courthouse in Utah (an adobe building) was built in the district in 1854 to 1855. Although this building no longer exists, the recently restored Memorial Courthouse, constructed in 1933 is also part of the district at 28 East State Street.
 - b. The Rock Church (or meeting house) at 272 North was erected 1862-1863, and dedicated on January 9, 1864. The

- LDS Primary Association, conceived by Aurelia Spencer Rogers, was organized in this building. 224 children enrolled at the first meeting on August 25, 1878.
- c. The Hector C. Haight House at 208 N. Main was built in 1857, and at one time was used as a hotel, which included a restaurant. It is now a single-family home.
 - d. The Farmington Tithing Office, located at 108 N. Main Street and built in 1907, is the Farmington City Museum.
 - e. The City purchased the Tithing Office for use as a City Hall in 1917. There have been three subsequent City Halls built since then, which includes the current City Hall constructed within the District at 160 S. Main Street in 2010.
 - f. Davis County School offices are also located on Main Street.
- iii. It is associated with persons significant in the founding or development of Farmington city, especially the earliest settler families (1847-1900); Hector Haight and his family were Farmington's earliest settlers in 1847, and two Haight homes are located within the district. The Hights were joined by five other families in 1848 including the Burke, Davis, Grover, Miller, and William Smith families, and six other families in 1848 including the Hess, Clark, J. Smith, Robinson, and Secrist, and Richard families. At least four of these 11 families have direct ties to the Main Street District.
 - iv. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the founding or development of Farmington City;
 - a. The Farmington City General Plan states that it is the social and cultural center of the community, and is the location of annual parades, festival days, and plays.
 - b. Main Street is the location of Farmington's earliest commercial development, clustered primarily around State and Main street.
 - v. It illustrates an important architectural form, style, or building technique, especially as an example of "local vernacular" (e.g. Single- and two-story rock/adobe homes; simple brick Victorians) or as a singular example of form, style, or technique within the City.
 - a. Architectural Classifications include: Mid 19 Century; Greek Revival; Late Victoria; Victorian; Late 19th and early 20th Century revivals; Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival; Late 19th and early 20th Century American movements; Prairie School, Bungalow/Craftsman; and Other: Minimal Traditional, Ranch.
 - vi. It has been used as a wayfinding landmark for at least 50 years;
 - a. Main Street is lined with mature deciduous trees, predominantly sycamores and is the major north-south

“non-freeway” public Right of Way in Farmington. This section of Main Street is also State Route 106.

- b. Main Street is part of the alignment of the historic Lincoln Highway as well, a precursor to the Interstate Highway Act of 1956.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
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

Isaacson thanked **Petersen** for the fair compromise and the creativity that went into it.

Request to vacate a platted but unimproved portion of the 1525 West Right of Way beginning in the vicinity of Innovator Drive at the north boundary of parcels identified by the following Davis County Tax I.D. numbers 08-059-0068 and 08-059-0041, and running thence north to Maker Way

Assistant Community Development Director/City Planner **Lyle Gibson** presented this agenda item. Farmington City, the applicant, has previously been working on the construction of Maker Way and Innovator Drive for a couple of years. These projects are nearing completion. In consideration of improving this area, part of the agreements with STACK Farmington Land, LLC, the adjacent property owner, is that they would provide the Right of Way needed for these major roadways if, among other things, the City vacates this old section of Right-of-Way which does not follow the built or planned road network. The vacation of this portion of property has been delayed pending the completion of utility connections, which will sever the need and use of existing utilities under this section of Right of Way. As the new primary utility network finished building out, the timing of vacation for this section of Right of Way is appropriate.

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 8:39 p.m. Nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Motion:

Shumway moved that the City Council approve the ordinance (enclosed in the Staff Report) vacating a portion of the 1525 West Right of Way to the adjacent property owner. Recording of the ordinance to vacate the Right of Way shall take effect upon verification by the City Engineer that access to utilities under this Right of Way are no longer needed.

Findings a-d:

- a. The property owner of 08-057-0073 is the logical recipient of the Right of Way.
- b. The property can be better utilized as part of the master planned development of the North Station Area under private ownership.
- c. The Right of Way has never been improved, and is not planned to be. It will no longer serve as access to utility systems with the completion of the Maker Way and Innovator Drive project.

- d. Previous agreements between the City and Stack Farmington Land, LLC indicate that this property would be vacated to them.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING

Present:

*Mayor Brett Anderson,
City Manager Brigham Mellor,
Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex
Leeman,
Councilmember Roger Child,
Councilmember Scott Isaacson,
Councilmember Melissa Layton,
Councilmember Amy Shumway,*

*City Attorney Paul Roberts,
City Recorder DeAnn Carlile,
Recording Secretary Deanne Chaston,
Community Development Director Dave
Petersen, and
Assistant Community Development
Director/City Planner Lyle Gibson.*

Motion:

Councilmember **Roger Child** made the motion to adjourn to the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Meeting.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor **Brett Anderson** called the meeting to order at 8:42 p.m. Roll call established that all members of the Governing Board of the Redevelopment Agency of Farmington City were present.

Adoption of a Conservation Easement Amendment Policy

Community Development Director **Dave Petersen** presented this agenda item. Farmington City is pursuing eventual approval and construction of a fire station on property it owns at 471 N. Innovator Drive. Notwithstanding this, the RDA owns a conservation easement which does not allow for such public uses. A conservation easement amendment policy will enable the RDA to consider amendments to a conservation easement so long as such amendments are consistent

with the conservation values of the property. This language mirrors almost verbatim the Farmington City conservation amendment policy. Due to an oversight, it failed to mirror it previously.

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

Mellor said there was an in-house question about how necessary this is, as the fire station will be providing a public benefit on City property. However, to be safe, he feels this is the best way to go as both the land and the easement are owned by the City.

Motion:

Child moved that the RDA approve the resolution (enclosed in the Staff Report) adopting a conservation easement amendment policy.

Finding:

A conservation easement amendment policy enables the RDA to consider amendments to its conservation easements now and in the future.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Conservation Easement Amendment Request

Petersen presented this agenda item. The conservation easement in question was originally established when the West Glover Lane Park was impacted by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and a replacement property was needed. As additional planning and design have taken place over recent years, a minor adjustment to the conservation easement is necessary to enable the construction of the future fire station.

Mayor Anderson opened and closed the Public Hearing at 8:52 p.m. Nobody signed up in person or electronically to address the Council on the issue.

Motion:

Child moved that the RDA approve the second amendment (attached to the Staff Report) to the conservation easement dated April 16, 2019, which allows for public uses as an allowed use, subject to final review of the Farmington City Attorney. [Note: The easement encompasses approximately 15 acres of property and is located at about 500 North 1525 West (Davis County Tax ID #s 08-060-0070, 08-060-0071, and 08-060-0072).

Findings a-h:

- a. The amendment is consistent with the overall purposes of the conservation easement and will not be detrimental to or compromise the protection of the stated conservation values of the property.
- b. The amendment is substantially equivalent to or enhances the conservation values of the property, adds adjacent land, contributes to the public good, or achieves greater conservation of the property.
- c. The amendment is consistent with the RDA’s goals for conservation of land under applicable City Ordinances and will not undermine the RDA’s obligation to preserve and enforce conservation easements it has accepted.
- d. The amendment is the minimum change necessary to achieve the desired and acceptable purpose.
- e. The amendment is clearly warranted and in the best interest of public and subject property.
- f. Granting the amendment will not set an unfavorable precedent for future amendment requests.
- g. The amendment does not adversely affect the RDA’s qualification as holder of conservation easements.
- h. The amendment does not provide a private benefit to the landowner or any private party.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Motion:

Councilmember **Scott Isaccson** made a motion to adjourn and reconvene to an open City Council meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Shumway seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

BUSINESS:

Sycamore Lane Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) Master Plan

Petersen presented this agenda item for 0.31 acres of property near 300 West, north of the junior high. The applicant wants to build a single-family home behind a historic home, which will be the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in the front. The existing addition to the historic home is proposed to be removed. The Original Townsite Residential (OTR) zone does not allow an ADU

in the front yard. **Petersen** said it is a great idea to place the new home's garage behind the historic ADU so that only the new home's porch area is visible from the street.

The applicant also owns a piece of landlocked property behind the home. As a pre-1969 lot, it predates the ordinance, so it is legally nonconforming, which is a windfall for the landowners. Upon consideration, the Planning Commission pointed out that one lot cannot be developed so as to be a detriment to any adjacent property. If the new home had been constructed as initially proposed, it would have restricted access to the lot behind it. Access would require 15 feet, which was not possible as previously contemplated. Therefore, the applicants slid plans for the new home over to allow 20 feet of access to the back parcel, which was acceptable to the Fire Department, utilities, and title. Since it is accessed through an easement, and since it predates the ordinance, the back parcel would not be considered a flag lot. The Planning Commission recommended this for approval.

Applicants **Anna and Nick May** (791 S. Price Road, Farmington, Utah) addressed the Council, saying they have made concessions for access and to preserve the Sycamore trees, as they want to make this aesthetically pleasing to the neighborhood. The back lot is about a quarter acre in size.

Petersen said if they combined the 0.31- and 0.25-acre lots into one lot, they would lose the right to build on the 0.25 acre lot in the back. Surrounding property owners don't want to cooperate for access from any other direction, despite the applicants' efforts.

Petersen said the City has recently embarked on a subcommittee exploring the possibility of ADUs being carved off into their own lots. This would help people get equity and find more affordable housing. **Child** said he does like the idea of ADUs providing a creative solution for some older homes. It is a win/win situation and solution. **Shumway** said this application reminded her of the Rice project, which **Petersen** said is tiny compared to this one, although the Rice property is one of the top five historic pieces of property in Farmington.

Motion:

Child moved that the City Council approve the Preliminary PUD Master Plan for the Sycamore Lane Planned Unit Development, accompanying development agreement, and PUD enabling ordinance subject to all applicable Farming City development standards and ordinances and the following Conditions 1-2:

1. The property owner shall enter into the Development Agreement (attached to Staff Report) with the City to preserve the historic dwelling.
2. The property owner must provide and record a reciprocal access and utility easement agreement acceptable to the City between the owners of Parcels 08-089-004 and 08-089-0006 to ensure access to Parcel 0006- now and in the future.

Findings 1-5:

1. The applicant plans to preserve the historic home.
2. The impact of the PUD is similar to that of a traditional main dwelling unit and accessory dwelling unit setup.
3. NO new lots are being created.
4. The PUD option creates the most efficient use of the parcel.

- The applicant worked with City staff and fire marshal to provide adequate future access to Parcel 08-089-0006 to enable the construction of a dwelling on this lot in the future.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Consideration of Amendment to the Development Agreement for The Charlotte

Motion:

Isaacson moved that the City Council table this item at the request of the applicant.

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

Mayor Pro Tempore/Councilmember Alex Leeman	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Scott Isaacson	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Melissa Layton	X Aye	___	Nay
Councilmember Amy Shumway	X Aye	___	Nay

Additional text and amendments to Title 15, Sign Regulations, and Chapter 41, Scenic Byway Overlay, and Chapter 26, Light Manufacturing and Business (LM&B) of Title 11, Zoning Regulations

Gibson presented this agenda item. Each zoning district in the City includes lists of things that a property owner may do with their land, falling under either permitted or conditional uses. Permitted uses are allowed as a matter of right. A request to do something listed as permitted does not require any public process, but may require review and approval by Staff. Conditional uses may require additional safeguards. In recent years, Courts have affirmed that conditional uses are allowed and must be approved as long as reasonable conditions can be applied to anticipated detrimental impacts. Based on this recent shift, it is advised to move conditional uses with established standards to permitted uses.

In the case of Farmington’s LM&B zoning district, the ordinance has not been updated or modified since 2002, except in relation to the 2022 water efficient landscaping ordinance. This zoning district only regulates about 60 acres of property around 650 West and the West Davis Corridor. **Gibson** said this area has many flex, tilt-up, industrial buildings with sporting uses that continue to be popular on the Wasatch Front.

As currently established, the LM&B zone has a very brief list of permitted uses. Feedback indicates that this creates a challenge for perspective tenants who may have to wait several weeks to find out if their business will even be allowed. Additionally, in contrast to all other commercial zoning districts, all signage must be approved through a conditional use review, including wall signage.

The primary item of concern is a restriction in the City’s Scenic Byway Overlay District found in Chapter 41 of the zoning ordinance. This district restricts land use in close proximity to the Legacy Parkway to help maintain the aesthetic value of the corridor. Multiple cities along the Legacy Parkway corridor cooperated to develop principles and standards, including type of signage, along this route. **Gibson** said this was to prevent billboards from popping up. However, none of the communities (including Centerville, Woods Cross, West Bountiful, and North Salt Lake) have adopted policies as restrictive as Farmington City regarding signage or otherwise.

The proposed ordinance increases the number of uses which may be considered by right to better accommodate desired uses within the zone. It also proposes a change to allow the consideration of wall signs on buildings to be placed higher than 15 feet. These signs would be approved by Staff similar to how they are handled in a commercial district. The proposed language is consistent with signage that is already in place in neighboring cities. The Planning Commission felt it was appropriate to let signs go higher up along the Scenic Byway.

City Attorney **Paul Roberts** said this is the one area of the City where Sexually Oriented Businesses (SOBs) are allowed. By law, SOBs have to be allowed somewhere. **Mellor** said this area of the City has some of the most desired real estate in the City, is passed by lots of traffic, and is where buildings were quickly built on speculation. Staff has been surprised at how fast construction happened and how restrictive the ordinance appeared. The landowner, a long-time Farmington resident, doesn’t want signs and logos to look clustered and cluttered, and wants signs that help people find the facility.

Isaacson said that when he served on the Centerville City Planning Commission years ago, he spent a lot of time reviewing their sign ordinance. He said this proposal looks good to him. **Shumway** thanked Staff for the samples and visuals included in the Staff Report.

Motion:

Shumway moved that the City Council approve the proposed changes to Chapters 11-26 and 11-41 of the City’s zoning ordinances.

Findings 1-2:

1. After completing the additional research, the proposed updates in the opinion of City Staff are both appropriate for the properties which would potentially be impacted within Farmington City, and also consistent with the regulations in effect in neighboring cities along Legacy Parkway.
2. The proposed uses in the Permitted Use category can be addressed appropriately through a Staff-level review process based on existing criteria and standards already found within the ordinance.

Child 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

SUMMARY ACTION:

Minute Motion Approving Summary Action List

The Council considered the Summary Action List including:

- Item 1: Discontinue Dispatch Services Agreement with Davis County Sheriff’s Office (DCSO)
- Item 2: Enter into Dispatch Services Agreement with Bountiful City
- Item 3: Interlocal Agreement for Third-Party Building Inspections
- Item 4: Approval of Minutes for May 7, 2024

Motion:

Child moved to approve the Summary Action list items 1-4 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 said paving is being finished on Innovator, and final construction is being wrapped up on Burke. He will make sure to inform the Council about when Burke will be opened. There will be some traffic headaches until the lights are installed. The road is not striped yet, and is linked to when the slurry seal will be put down after the one-year warranty period. This gives the opportunity to see where the road is defective. At the very least, some signage can be put in. He will check with the City Engineer about it.

Mayor Anderson wants a way to warn people not to drive on the road, as there is no lighting and it is hard to see anything. **Isaacson** said speed limit signage is needed. **Mellor** said south of Burke Lane is done, but motorists should stay off the road north of Burke.

Gibson said Maverik has everything it needs from the City, but is still dealing with a federal easement overseen by the Weber Basin Water District. Maverik is eager, but the easement is holding them up.

Mayor Anderson and City Council Reports

Shumway asked what is being done with the lot in front of the Hampton Inn. **Mayor Anderson** said since they couldn’t get the parking they needed, the owner is now rethinking the proposed use. They are now considering a walk-in ice cream shop. They want a unique, local Farmington business there and think they can get more sales revenue from ice cream than an office building.

Mellor said the City has not had any flooding issues this year. **Gibson** said Staff put together letters about landowners encroaching on trail easements. He will check that they were sent out.

Mayor Anderson said he has had residents reach out to him about inconsistent enforcement of e-bikes on public streets. Farmington needs to clarify if they are allowed or not. Law enforcement has pulled over those throttling. Some e-bikes can go 35 mph and that is very fast for sidewalks. It is not a bad thing that people use e-bikes to go to the store and back. Farmington needs to find ways to facilitate non-vehicular traffic.

Mellor said one of the ways cities have been managing e-bikes is by setting a speed limit. That might be an easy place to start handling a dangerous situation. Scooters max out at 15 mph; pedal-assists can go to 20 mph; and others can go 28 mph. The City Attorney can research what is being done in other cities regarding e-bikes and scooters, and it can be discussed in an upcoming work session.

Isaacson said he got an email from a resident, and he shared the letter with the Development Review Committee (DRC). The complaint was how it is difficult to use e-bikes in Farmington because to get from a home to a trail is unsafe and often requires crossing a freeway or other busy road. It may be worth a study.

Mayor Anderson said he doesn't want to run out of candy at the upcoming Festival Days parade. **Mellor** said paying for taffy or Tootsie Rolls will come out of both the City Council and Fire Department budgets. **Shumway** said she would rather have a box left over at the end instead of run out.

Mayor Anderson said the State Legislature is requiring every county and city to have a Code Blue plan for winter nights when the temperatures are below 15 degrees. There has to be a "warming center" to house the homeless population during a Code Blue event. Last year within six months, there were less than 20 total days below 15 degrees in Davis County, where there are between 10 to 30 homeless individuals on the streets.

The Code Blue Commission in Davis County has been meeting for a year and haven't quite come up with a solution, although the plan is supposed to be submitted to the State in 58 days. They would like four or five separate rotating locations, each in a different city. That way each city would have a Code Blue location about five nonconsecutive days each year. A facilitator would know where to pick them up, and he would know where to house them that night, but the homeless individuals would not know where they were going from day to day. Those using the facility would be prescreened, so they are not stoned or wasted. The facilitator said some homeless individuals don't prefer to use a Code Blue location, as they don't want to leave their "own place," even in the cold. There are reasons why it should not be a predictable, permanent place, nor should it be close to amenities. If they don't know in advance, they won't congregate at selected locations. **Mayor Anderson** said they do not want homeless people near Station Park. It should be a place where they want to leave in the morning. For example, it could be the pool lobby. Every city would come up with a location, and the group would get together to evaluate locations, picking the best four or five that meet the needs.

This is an unfunded mandate, meaning the State is not offering money to meet the requirement. **Child** said without funds, it would be difficult to incentivize private property owners to provide space for Code Blue events. **Mayor Anderson** said there is a risk that if the counties and cities don't find a solution on their own, the State will eventually force a solution on them. This is a chance for the cities in Davis County to be the masters of their own destiny. He would like

Councilmembers to consider suitable locations, perhaps a warehouse on the south end of town, and share them at an upcoming work session.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

Child made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 p.m.

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

Councilmember Roger Child	X Aye	<input type="checkbox"/> Nay
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

DeAnn Carlile, Recorder



DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Fwd: Landmark Designation

1 message

Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>
To: DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Tue, Jun 4, 2024 at 8:29 PM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marlene Kay <8ssgreat@gmail.com>
Date: June 4, 2024 at 11:48:29 AM MDT
To: mlayton@farmington.utah.gov
Subject: Landmark Designation

Dear Mayor Anderson and City Council Members,

My name is Marlene Kay and I live 10 S. Main St, (the home on the corner of State and Main) which is part of the parcel being disputed in the proposed amendments to chapter 39 of the City Code that outlines the Landmark code. I have attended numerous meetings on this matter expressing my opposition of being swept into the Historic District's affairs for reasons that really don't apply the same way as they do two blocks up from us.

I love living in this lovely part of town but have watched vigilantly as other proposed proposals for use of various properties around me have been entertained and debated. It always seem that those with some authority have the desire to exercise their vision and may manipulate their "good intentions" without fully realizing the unintended/intended consequences for the homeowners it directly affects. It is an eclectic block with many precedences and exceptions to zoning and use permits. We cannot be viewed and enforced with the tools as other parts of historic Farmington. Thus, as a home-owners on the block west of State Street, I do not want to be legislated by the Historic Committee. As I have previously stated in writing and at prior meetings, I feel that we are experiencing unnecessary government overreach by a non-elected committee that may affect us long after those people leave their office.

In as much as I cannot attend the meeting this evening, I wanted to restate my position. Thank you for your service and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Marlene Kay



DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Fwd: Proposed Historic District

1 message

Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>
To: DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Tue, Jun 4, 2024 at 9:29 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **jack servicelovehope.org** <jack@servicelovehope.org>
Date: Tue, Jun 4, 2024 at 4:50 PM
Subject: Proposed Historic District
To: dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>, banderson@farmington.utah.gov <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>
CC: rchild@farmington.utah.gov <rchild@farmington.utah.gov>, sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov <sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov>, Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>, Alex Leeman <aleeman@farmington.utah.gov>, ashumway@farmington.utah.gov <ashumway@farmington.utah.gov>, Brad B <middleb24@gmail.com>

Mayor Anderson

My wife and I are owners of 30 South Main St. and as such want to **once again register our unequivocal opposition** to the matters at hand related to changes in landmark and zoning designations. We wrote our detailed feelings on December 1, 2023, (below) with a follow-up on December 5, 2023 regarding the poorly administered owner survey.

As I understand the situation, fear has grown over the years regarding Lagoon properties, their maintenance and potential demolition. If that is the concern, the City should deal with that directly. This smacks a bit of the guilty being caught, but the innocent punished. If the plan is to restrict demolition of houses on our block, we are already restricted by the current regulations in place. Further regulation is unnecessary.

One of our major concerns is that an unelected, non-employee board with accountability to no one but themselves will be left to define what constitutes "minor changes" that we will be allowed to make to the exterior of our houses. They will also have the power to require work, regardless of the cost to meet whatever standard they deem appropriate. Putting that much control in the hands of an unelected body takes away our basic property rights. As a homeowner and building contractor for over 40 years, I think I am much better qualified to decide what is best for my home, as long as it is within existing codes and guidelines.

If there is merit in this plan for our street, than would it not be more just and less of an infringement on our property rights to introduce the change gradually as we sell our homes. In that way the new owners will know what they are getting into, unlike those of us who have no desire for this change and the costs that we are sure will result.

My wife and I are in Ecuador serving a mission and are therefore unable to attend but would be happy to answer any questions.

Regards,

Jack and Lestelle Schwab

From: jack [servicelovehope.org](mailto:jack@servicelovehope.org)
Sent: Friday, December 1, 2023 12:39 PM
To: banderson@farmington.utah.gov
Cc: rchild@farmington.utah.gov; sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov; mlayton@farmington.utah.gov;

Subject: Proposed Historic District

Dear Mayor Anderson,

My wife and I are owners of 30 South Main and 177-179 200 W. We would like to express our **unequivocal feelings against** the historic district under consideration. After two lengthy conversations with the City Planner, David Peterson, we have yet to understand any real advantage to such a move.

The following are some of the arguments for the historic District that Mr. Peterson presented to us:

Property values are low and will only increase because of the Historic District.

My experience dealing with historic preservation committees in New York City and Virginia have shown me quite the opposite, as any restrictions reduce property values because owners will not have a freehand in external renovations (as far as building and zoning codes allow).. In addition, the possibility of mandated changes and related fines will cause concern for many potential buyers.

No one want to live on Main St. because of the condition of the houses and the 14,000 cars a day which pass on the street.

I have never heard anything but praise about how beautiful our street is and how the sycamore trees, the courthouse and limited commercial areas give it a real hometown feel. As to 14,000 cars a day, we cannot imagine that many cars in a month. Other than when there is a traffic backup on I-15, rarely is there even a line of more than a few cars at the light. Regardless, this debate is over the historic district, not traffic control. This unrelated argument seems to be used purely to sway support.

Absentee landlords have let their houses deteriorate bringing the entire neighborhood down.

All 5 houses on our block are owner-occupied so where is the benefit? The only complaints we have heard about absentee landlords is Lagoon and if they are a problem they should be dealt with individually. This proposal is ultimately trying to deal with Lagoon while hiding behind the Historic District. We are all going to be required to pay because the Town is not happy with Lagoon.

A majority of owners are in favor of the change.

I would like to see the data on this because no one we know is in favor of it.

I have heard only upsides from the City and only downsides from the residents. Needless to say no plan is without flaws and to present this plan as flawless is disingenuous. The survey seems to have been very biased to induce positive answers. Were all the respondents fully briefed on the implications? How many of the "yes" votes were from the designated area? How many would have voted yes if it was going to cost them money? Mr. Peterson represented the historic district as being a painless almost happy experience to us and if we had not known better, we would have told him "yes" ourselves.

We are in Ecuador serving a mission, so could not be present at the hearing, but we were appalled when we read the minutes. Some of the arguments, seemingly well documented, were in fact highly subjective and speculative. Some of the arguments violate the basic statistical principle of "correlation is not causation".

For instance:

"Absentee owners of contributing properties enjoyed an increase in property values of 31%, while owner-occupied noncontributing properties had an increase of 48%. This shows that owners who occupy their property tend to take better care of an asset than absentee owners."

This shows nothing of the kind. It shows that that the author made his own conclusion. Was there a proper multi-factor statistical analysis done? It certainly appears not. Do these numbers take into consideration age, location, size of property, size of house, proximity to schools or highways? It certainly appears not.

"It is better to preserve historic homes before their values drop."

Our house value has more than doubled since we bought it a few years ago. Why would we want to endanger that with restrictions and City mandated costs? Is that value going to keep increasing if this burden is placed on our property? Why would we want to take that chance?

"...qualification for grants and federal income tax incentives."

The idea that grants are readily available to help offset costs is not the full story. Has anyone asked, what will be the average cost of required repairs? Who can qualify for a grant? Is there a maximum income qualification? How much will the grants be? How much paperwork will be required? What is the likelihood of success? This is the same argument used in favor of tax breaks. Personally, we would rather not have any expenses that needed offsetting.

“Main Street is very iconic; the City’s tree logo was fashioned after the trees found along Main Street.”

This argument has no bearing on the issue at hand. First, it contradicts Mr. Peterson’s statement that no one wants to live on Main Street. Secondly, the trees are iconic. But no one is debating the trees. They are City property and not in dispute. (Of course, those who live on Main Street must carry the burden of leaf and branch clean-up.)

Issuing of orders and fines will be totally subjective and the only way to fight will be through an administrative process likely taking countless hours. What are the guidelines that will govern this process? Should they not be written before the vote so everyone can make a fully informed decision? Standards rarely are lessened. We all know that year-by-year many standards will be tightened, often to the point of strangulation.

There is a very distinct division in Farmington: those on the west side live in new homes, in planned developments, who probably visit the downtown area infrequently. Why would they? There is very little there commercially to attract anyone. It is easy to approve of something that will cost the owner nothing. Would they still vote yes if they were to carry some of that burden in fixing our homes? If all benefit from the historic district, then all should pay.

If those speaking at the meeting are typical of the thought process, we need go no further. Of the 6 speakers 1 was for (not in the affected area), 2 against and 3 were on the Historic Preservation Committee, none of whom live in the affected area.

I agree with Main Street owner, Brad Bornemeier. The houses on Main Street should be excluded. As a general contractor for over 40 years, I can verify they were cheaply built houses, now over 100 years old, that are in constant need of repair. Adding an ever-growing burden on the homeowners for improvements is patently unfair. And since none of those in favor live within the new district it smacks a bit of “Taxation without Representation”.

There are certainly better ways to resolve the Lagoon problem than this, however. Let us start with:

A proper survey that includes negative impacts.

A proper analysis prepared by an independent expert.

A hearing with just the affected owners.

Once these are accomplished everyone can make a better-informed decision. If this historic district is imposed on us and our property values do in fact decrease and our overall quality of life decreases as well, we will have nowhere to look but to City Hall.

Thank you for your time,

John and Lestelle Schwab

C: City Council



DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Fwd: Main Street Historic Landmark

1 message

Melissa Layton <mlayton@farmington.utah.gov>
To: DeAnn Carlile <dcarlile@farmington.utah.gov>

Tue, Jun 4, 2024 at 8:53 PM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Brad B <middleb24@gmail.com>
Date: June 4, 2024 at 2:03:33 PM MDT
To: aleeman@farmington.utah.gov, rchild@farmington.utah.gov, sisaacson@farmington.utah.gov, mlayton@farmington.utah.gov, ashumway@farmington.utah.gov, Brett Anderson <banderson@farmington.utah.gov>, Brigham Mellor <bmellor@farmington.utah.gov>
Subject: Main Street Historic Landmark

Before tonight's meeting I'm asking if you could quickly look at City Code 11-28-230 sub section D-3. I know some are concerned about historic homes being torn down without more scrutiny. Since Main Street is already in a Federal historic district this section applies to us already and requires we go through the process outlined in chapter 39. That makes the Landmark designation redundant and unnecessary. I will bring this up tonight but just wanted to get this on your radar before the meeting tonight. Thank you for your time and also thank you for not rushing a vote on this.

Brad Bornemeier
54 S Main St
385-262-1418