

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

**Minutes of the
Bountiful City Council Study Session
City Planning Conference Room
July 18, 2013, 5:00 p.m.**

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Present:	Mayor:	Joe L. Johnson
	Council Members:	Richard Higginson, Beth Holbrook, John Marc Knight, Fred Moss, and Thomas Tolman
	City Manager:	Gary Hill
	City Engineer:	Paul Rowland
	City Recorder:	Kim J. Coleman
	City Treasurer:	Mark McRae
	Planning/RDA Director:	Aric Jensen
	Department Heads:	Alan West, IT
	Recording Secretary:	Nancy Lawrence

Official Notice of this meeting had been given by posting a written notice of same and an Agenda at the City Hall and providing copies to the following newspapers of general circulation: Davis County Clipper, Standard Examiner, and on the Utah Public Notice Website.

Mayor Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:08 p.m., and welcomed those in attendance.

The Mayor reviewed the factors that prompted this study session – what prompted the discussion to build a new City Hall. Initially, the prospective of renovating two buildings (City Hall and the former City Hall now used by the Arts) estimated at costing millions of dollars led to the thought of spending \$6.2 million for a new building (an investment in the future and the answer to deficiencies of the current building). This would also create the opportunity to remodel the existing City Hall to be used by the Arts. This would leave the City with \$16-17 million in reserve (after the two buildings were completed). This seemed like a logical way to solve several problems and not impact the City financially. The proposed new building was visualized to be a building citizens could be proud of, expandable, and certainly not a Taj Mahal.

After the proposals came in much higher than originally anticipated – \$9.5 to \$10 million -- he felt it would be reasonable to give the staff the opportunity to go back and re-design the building to be adequate/useful/appreciated by and for the citizens. He also expressed that it would be a great mistake to cut corners, space, etc., and build a new building that would not provide the needed expansion. He proposed authorizing a budget range of \$9.5 to \$10.5 million for the construction and furnishing of the new building.

Councilman Moss stated that he felt totally opposite – that we should go back to the original idea of remodeling this (current) building and allocate \$2 million for the fine arts. He acknowledged that past councils have saved money, but questioned if it was for the purpose of building a new City Hall. He also noted that the new City Hall was not included in the 10-year plan. He said he has a problem on “us” (i.e. Council Chambers, etc.) and asked why not spend on streets, water, have a rainy day fund, etc. He questioned why, what started out at \$4.6 to \$6.2

1 million, is now at \$10 million. The Mayor noted that the original figure was obviously wrong –
2 that it was an arbitrary figure based on estimated costs.
3

4 Councilman Higginson commented that we “trusted” the estimates of the construction
5 and architect that were submitted; then the contracts came in substantially higher. He stated that
6 if the current costs were known at the beginning of the process, it would be doubtful that anyone
7 on the council would have supported the idea.
8

9 In response to Councilman Moss’s comment, Councilwoman Holbrook said that she sees
10 the need for the building as an effort to support the public and the City employees, with the
11 Council functions being only a part of the purpose of the building; and that we need to be able to
12 expand in the future and adequately fund those purposes.
13

14 Councilman Higginson questioned the need to plan for future expansion. He referred to
15 the City of Detroit, which did not expand, but rather decreased in size. He also stated that in
16 good conscience he could not spend \$10 million for a building that originally was proposed at
17 half that.
18

19 Mayor Johnson pointed out that one of the rationales for a new building was to locate it
20 on Main Street. He further explained that the state of the economy was a factor and it was
21 believed that the City could still take advantage of favorable construction costs.
22

23 Councilman Tolman stated that it did not make sense to build a \$6.5 million building and
24 lose space/advantages in the current building. It would make more sense for the architects and
25 engineers to design a building that will meet our needs in the future and give them a cap of \$9.5
26 to \$10.5 million. He also noted that since the former city hall building has been demolished, we
27 have missed the window of being able to remodel both buildings.
28

29 Councilman Moss asked what would happen to the fine arts if the proposed new City
30 Hall was not built; and would the existing City Hall last another 50 years -- as would a newly
31 constructed building. Councilman Higginson asked about the balance of the RDA funds. The
32 fact that the numbers came in much higher was again brought up and Mr. Rowland referred to
33 construction details (materials involved –roof requirements to meet energy codes for
34 commercial, etc.) that are much different per sq.ft. for commercial than residential and this was a
35 factor for much of the variance. He also asked the question – where are we starting and what do
36 we want to accomplish—some things could be solved in the existing building. However,
37 frontage on Main Street, reasonable ADA access, and adequate/proper HVAC upgrades would
38 be major hurdles if the new building was not constructed.
39

40 Councilman Knight said he would like to have a limit available for the architect and
41 engineer and plan a building that can be built at a price we can afford. The building needs to
42 have functional improvements over what we have now. Councilman Moss asked if there was a
43 valid reason to be back to square one. Councilman Knight indicated he would like to see a new
44 building constructed and use this City Hall for fine arts. Councilman Tolman noted that one of
45 the reasons the new city hall was proposed (with renovation of this building for fine arts) was
46 timing and the current economy. When the project was first proposed, construction costs were

1 down. He asked if \$2 million is still a good figure for renovating this building. He stated that if
2 we don't build a "better building" it would not be worth building a new, inadequate building. He
3 supported the idea of setting a limit for the City Engineer and moving forward with a new
4 building.
5

6 Councilman Knight made a motion to go forward with the project and authorize the City
7 Engineer to have a limit of \$9.5 - \$10.5 million to do a modified building that meets our needs
8 now and in the future. Councilman Tolman seconded the motion and voting was by a majority
9 with Councilpersons Holbrook, Tolman, and Knight voting "aye". Councilmen Higginson and
10 Moss voted "nay".
11

12 Mr. Rowland said he would proceed "post haste" to move forward with this project and
13 that he will work with the architect and project manager to use money as wisely as possible in
14 the range of \$9.5 - \$10.5 million. He noted that interior features (tile, carpet, etc.) will provide
15 some latitude. Mr. Hill noted that the planning thus far has not been done in a vacuum, that staff
16 and Council have attempted to work within the budget, yet still meet departmental needs. He
17 emphasized that the purpose of providing staff with adequate capacity in a building was to serve
18 the public.
19

20 At 5:54 p.m. Councilman Higginson made a motion to adjourn. Councilwoman
21 Holbrook seconded the motion and voting was unanimous with Councilpersons Knight,
22 Higginson, Holbrook, Moss and Tolman voting "aye".
23
24
25

26 _____
JOE L. JOHNSON, Mayor

27
28
29
30 _____
31 KIM J. COLEMAN, City Recorder

32 * * * * *
33
34
35
36
37