

# CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL WILL HOLD ITS REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING AT 7:00 PM ON JULY 21, 2015 AT THE CENTERVILLE CITY COMMUNITY CENTER AND CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 250 NORTH MAIN STREET, CENTERVILLE, UTAH. THE AGENDA IS SHOWN BELOW.**

*Meetings of the City Council of Centerville City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207, as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meeting will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.*

*Centerville City, in compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance, including hearing devices. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services, programs, or events should call Blaine Lutz, Centerville Finance Director, at 295-3477, giving at least 24 hours notice prior to the meeting.*

**A notebook containing supporting materials for the business agenda items is available for public inspection and review at City Hall and will be available for review at the meeting. Upon request, a citizen may obtain (without charge) the City Manager's memo summarizing the agenda business, or may read this memo on the City's website: <http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic>.**

**Tentative** - The times shown below are tentative and are subject to change during the meeting.  
**Time:**

7:00      **A.    ROLL CALL**

(See City Manager's Memo for summary of meeting business)

**B.    PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**C.    PRAYER OR THOUGHT**

Councilwoman Tamilyn Fillmore

7:05      **D.    OPEN SESSION (This item allows for the public to comment on any subject of municipal concern, including agenda items that are not scheduled for a public hearing. Citizens are encouraged to limit their comments to two (2) minutes per person. Citizens may request a time to speak during Open Session by calling the City Recorder's office at 295-3477, or may make such request at the beginning of Open Session.) Please state your name and city of residence.**

**E.    BUSINESS**

7:10      1.      Minutes Review and Acceptance

July 7, 2015 work session and Council meeting minutes; July 8, 2015 joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting minutes

- 7:10 2. Summary Action Calendar
  - a. Approve list of poll workers for 2015 municipal primary election
  - b. Accept public utility easement for Scott and Susan Trump residential parcel development located at 540 South 400 West
- 7:10 3. Award bids for Drainage Projects
- 7:20 4. Authorize city services relating to Stage 3 of the Tour of Utah event on August 5
- 7:30 5. Open & Public Meetings Training by City Attorney
- 7:45 6. Mayor's Report
  - a. Fire Agency
- 7:50 7. City Manager's Report
  - a. Request for direction re Planning Commission compensation
  - b. Invitation to submit RAP Tax arguments
  - c. Pedestrian bridge & fencing update
  - d. Extension of 1250 West
  - e. Police Chief retirement open house
- 8:05 8. Miscellaneous Business
- 8:05 9. Closed meeting, if necessary, for reasons allowed by state law, including, but not limited to, the provisions of Section 52-4-205 of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, and for attorney-client matters that are privileged pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 78B-1-137, as amended
- 8:05 10. Possible action following closed meeting, including appointments to boards and committees

## **F. ADJOURNMENT**

Items of Interest (i.e., newspaper articles, items not on agenda); Posted in-meeting information

**CENTERVILLE**

**Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No.

Short Title: (See City Manager's Memo for summary of meeting business)

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**BACKGROUND**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

- ☐ City Manager Summary of July 21, 2015 Council Meeting



# CENTERVILLE CITY

250 North Main Centerville, Utah 84014-1824 • (801) 295-3477 • Fax: (801) 292-8034

Incorporated in 1915



Mayor

Paul A. Cutler

City Council

Ken S. Averett

Tamilyn Fillmore

John T. Higginson

Stephanie Ivie

Lawrence Wright


City Manager

Steve H. Thacker

## interoffice MEMORANDUM

**to:** Mayor Cutler  
City Council

**cc:** Department Heads  
Planning Commission

**from:** Steve H. Thacker, City Manager 

**subject:** City Manager's Summary of July 21, 2015 Council Meetings

**date:** July 17, 2015

This should be a short meeting, considering the brevity of the agenda. Councilmembers Averett and Wright will be absent. Therefore, if any of the remaining councilmembers cannot attend, please let me know ASAP. Approval of any matter will require the unanimous vote of all three councilmembers expected to attend.

- E.1. Minutes Review and Acceptance** – The minutes to be approved are enclosed, including that portion of the July 8 Planning Commission meeting during which the Mayor and Council joined them to discuss the South Main Street Corridor.
- E.2. Summary Action Calendar**
- a. Approve poll workers** – Although the County is conducting this year's municipal elections under a contract with the City, the law requires the City Council to approve the list of poll workers.
  - b. Accept public utility easement** – This single parcel residential project was approved by the Planning Commission and does not need City Council action, other than the acceptance of the public utility easement required by the Planning Commission.
- E.3. Award Bids for Drainage Projects** – The City Engineer has received bids for four drainage projects—two storm drains and two subdrains. These are funded with a combination of Drainage Utility Fund revenues and Storm Drain Capital Improvement Fund revenues (i.e. impact fees), as explained in the staff report. The four projects can be summarized as follows:
- replacement of failed storm drain at 400 East and Porter Lane;
  - replacement of failed subdrain in Foxbridge Plat I (just north of Community Park);
  - relocation of subdrain on Valley View Drive, replacing a subdrain that currently runs through the backyards of several homes; and
  - completion of the new storm drain under I-15 at Lund Lane (completing the remaining gap between the Frontage Road and I-15).

- E.4. **Authorize City Services to Support Tour of Utah Event** – Davis County is hosting Stage 3 of the Tour of Utah event on August 5. The riders will come through Centerville on Main Street sometime between 1 and 3 p.m. The City's help is needed to close/control all of the intersections along Main Street during a brief period, and the City is also expected to see that Main Street is free of debris, etc. that may be hazardous to the riders.
- E.5. **Open & Public Meetings Training by City Attorney** – Considering the short agenda, the City Attorney recommends the City Council satisfy during this meeting the annual requirement for training on this subject. Although two councilmembers will be absent, both have been through this training several times and should be well-versed in the matter. The Council candidates will be encouraged to attend as part of their preparation for holding elected office.
- E.6. **Mayor's Report** – Mayor Cutler may update the Council on the process for considering the creation of a special service area and local district to fund capital needs of the fire agency.
- E.7. **City Manager's Report** – I will report on those topics showing on the agenda. I will specifically ask for clarification/direction about whether to bring back a resolution providing for compensation for Planning Commissioners who attend training sessions, as an incentive for them to seek more training. This was discussed in an earlier council meeting, but I am not sure of the Council's direction.
- E.8. **Miscellaneous Business** – At this time there are no topics showing under this heading.
- E.9. **Closed Meeting** – At this time I do not know of a need for a closed meeting, but the agenda allows for that possibility.
- E.10. **Appointments to City Boards/Committees** – This allows for possible appointments recommended by the Mayor.

***Potential Agenda Items for August 4, 2015 City Council meeting (subject to change):***

- Presentation by Davis County School District regarding bond issue on November ballot
- Consider Resolution initiating process of creating local district and special service area for fire/EMS services
- Analysis and discussion of data relating to South Main Street Corridor and possible revisions to Plan/Overlay Zone
- Resolution authorizing RAP Tax ballot question
- Work session with Parks & Recreation Committee and Trails Committee

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No.

Short Title: Councilwoman Tamilyn Fillmore

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**BACKGROUND**

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 1.

Short Title: Minutes Review and Acceptance

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time: 7:10

**SUBJECT**

July 7, 2015 work session and Council meeting minutes; July 8, 2015 joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting minutes

**RECOMMENDATION**

**BACKGROUND**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

- ☐ July 7, 2015 work session minutes
- ☐ July 7, 2015 regular Council meeting minutes
- ☐ July 8, 2015 Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting

1 Minutes of the Centerville City Council **work session** held Tuesday, July 7, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. at  
2 the City Hall Council Chambers, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah.

3  
4 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

5  
6 Mayor Paul A. Cutler

7  
8 Council Members Ken S. Averett  
9 Tamilyn Fillmore  
10 John T. Higginson  
11 Stephanie Ivie  
12 Lawrence Wright

13  
14 **STAFF PRESENT**

Blaine Lutz, Finance Director/Assistant City Manager  
Lisa Romney, City Attorney  
Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

15  
16  
17  
18 **STAFF ABSENT**

Steve Thacker, City Manager

19  
20 **VISITORS**

Jeff Bassett, South Davis Metro Fire Chief  
Dave Powers, Deputy Fire Chief  
Karl Hendrickson, Fire Agency Attorney  
Gary Hill, Bountiful City Manager

21  
22  
23  
24  
25 **WORK SESSION – SOUTH DAVIS METRO FIRE AGENCY**

26  
27 Councilman Averett disclosed that his youngest son is a part-time fire fighter for the  
28 South Davis Metro Fire Agency. Chief Bassett briefly explained the history of the South Davis  
29 Metro Fire Agency, and stated that the intention from the beginning had been to eventually  
30 become a district. The current movement toward creating a district at this time is driven by a  
31 need to meet existing debt, and begin specific capital projects. The Centerville Station needs a  
32 remodel/rebuild, and the Mueller Park and Foxboro Stations have issues that need to be  
33 addressed. Councilman Averett commented that one of the City Council candidates has  
34 claimed that the Fire Agency is planning to leave Main Street in Centerville, and asked Chief  
35 Bassett to respond. Chief Bassett stated that the Agency has looked, but not found a better  
36 location. They are working with architects to find a solution at the present location. Karl  
37 Hendrickson, Fire Agency Attorney, added that it is very difficult for an interlocal entity to sell  
38 bonds in the market. The Agency would not be able to finance the needed capital.

39  
40 Councilman Wright expressed concern that voters would no longer have any control  
41 over the taxes with a special district. He stated it is his understanding that a referendum is not  
42 possible at the district level, and asked Mr. Hendrickson if any mechanism for citizen control  
43 would be put in place. Mr. Hendrickson explained that the Board of Trustees is required to be  
44 made up of elected officials. The District would need to follow the Truth-in-Taxation process just  
45 like cities. Each city council chooses which official represents them on the Board. Mr.  
46 Hendrickson added that he suspects the Supreme Court would probably allow a referendum in  
47 a special district in matters of a tax increase, although the matter has not been fully addressed.  
48 Percentages required for a referendum would apply across the entire district rather than just a  
49 municipality.

50  
51 Councilman Higginson asked how the Agency would raise capital if a district is not  
52 created. Chief Bassett responded that many options have been researched, and the only option  
53 available would be to assess the cities. He added that not every city in the Agency could afford  
54 the necessary assessments. Gary Hill, Bountiful City Manager, stated that the Bountiful City  
55 Council's greatest concern regarding a taxing district has been ensuring that there be more



1 financial oversight and accountability. With the inclusion of a Budget Oversight Committee,  
2 made up of city managers, the Bountiful Council agreed with the creation of a district. Chief  
3 Bassett would present his proposed annual budget to the Budget Oversight Committee, and the  
4 Committee Chair, as Budget Officer, would present the budget to the Board. If the Fire Chief  
5 and the Oversight Committee were ever to strongly disagree over a budget issue, the Chief  
6 would have an opportunity to present his point of view to the Board. Mr. Hill stated that the  
7 Bountiful City Council is reluctant to limit property tax to capital use in the resolution, suspecting  
8 that the limitation would be regretted down the road. He said the Bountiful Council feels that  
9 between the Budget Oversight Committee and the Fire Board there would be enough  
10 accountability. Chief Bassett added that he already meets with the city managers regarding the  
11 budget, but the proposed process would be a little more formal and begin earlier. The budget  
12 year would change from a calendar year to a fiscal year to be more in line with the cities.  
13

14 Councilman Wright stated he is sensitive to giving appointed officials any more authority  
15 than they already have. He compared the situation to UTOPIA, and suggested the Budget  
16 Oversight Committee could provide recommendation without statutory authority. He recognized  
17 that fire services need to be funded, but since the money will come from the people either way,  
18 he feels it should remain as an assessment to the cities, with the cities increasing taxes if  
19 necessary.  
20

21 Mayor Cutler pointed out that the proposed resolution does not specify assessment  
22 values for levying city assessments, and asked if the values would be clearly stated in the  
23 bylaws. Mr. Hendrickson said he anticipates that the new interlocal agreement and bylaws  
24 would specify the assessment values. The Mayor asked for clarification regarding the protest  
25 period for creation of a district. Mr. Hendrickson stated that protest by 25% or more of the  
26 registered voters would stop the action, and added that he suspects the protest level would  
27 apply individually by city. Mr. Hendrickson and Ms. Romney were in agreement that the second  
28 Resolution, not the first, could be subject to referendum. Councilman Wright pointed out that  
29 this process will be simultaneous with the City's Council election period, and expressed concern  
30 about citizen information overload. The new district would begin to collect taxes in November of  
31 2016. Any subsequent tax increase would require a Truth-in-Taxation process. Mayor Cutler  
32 and Mr. Hill explained that the cities can currently choose to pay the Fire Agency assessment  
33 from any city revenue source. To protect the property tax revenue source for the cities, the  
34 initial property tax amount levied by the district would take into account that the cities will have  
35 to proportionately reduce their property tax revenue.  
36

37 Mr. Hendrickson read aloud from the current Interlocal Agreement that failure to pay any  
38 assessment within 90 days may be grounds for expulsion. It was pointed out that the  
39 Centerville Station building belongs to the Fire Agency, and the land belongs to the City.  
40 Councilman Higginson asked if the end result would be the same if the Board chose to remain  
41 an Agency and the cities were assessed the amount needed for capital projects. Mr. Hill  
42 responded that the situation would be worse as an Agency, because the Agency would not be  
43 able to spread the finances over time by bonding. All construction would have to be put off  
44 longer than would be feasible. The current Interlocal is a difficult tool for what needs to be  
45 accomplished because bonds cannot be issued, and not all of the cities would be able to  
46 contribute what is needed. Councilman Wright said he would like to see another course of  
47 action for comparison. Chief Bassett responded that they have looked at numerous other  
48 funding mechanisms, and none are feasible. Mayor Cutler added that the other cities have  
49 evaluated various courses of action and would like to move forward with a district. Bountiful  
50 was the only other city to hold out, and is now willing to move forward with the addition of the  
51 Oversight Committee.  
52

1 Councilwoman Fillmore asked Chief Bassett how much the proposed process would be  
 2 an additional drain operationally on his time and resources. Chief Bassett responded that it  
 3 would be similar to what he does now. He expressed a desire to make sure South Davis can  
 4 afford needed improvements as all of the cities continue to grow. Chief Bassett stated that  
 5 evaluating and meeting needs is a priority for him. Mayor Cutler commended the Chief for his  
 6 willingness to change from traditional methods to meet the needs of the cities. Councilman  
 7 Wright clarified that his hesitation in approving a district is related to removing the rights of  
 8 citizens. Chief Bassett asked if the citizens that would oppose creation of a district truly  
 9 understand the situation and the needs of the firefighters. Councilman Averett agreed that  
 10 everyone needs a better understanding of what the Agency has been up against for the last  
 11 several years. Councilman Averett repeated that he feels citizens deserve better emergency  
 12 services than have been possible in the past, and acknowledged that paramedic services cost  
 13 money. Councilman Wright agreed that a presentation should be made to the citizens.  
 14 Councilwoman Ivie expressed appreciation for what Chief Bassett has accomplished, but stated  
 15 that in a transition of leadership she would not have assurance that the processes and same  
 16 level of integrity would be continued. She expressed concern with the reduced ability of the  
 17 citizens to say "no". Chief Bassett agreed that a succession plan is important, and he likes to  
 18 think he has passed his vision on to his Assistant Chiefs. Councilman Wright added that the  
 19 ability of the City to leave the district should be articulated to the citizens. It was also discussed  
 20 that the advantages of a district versus the Agency should be presented to the citizens.  
 21 Councilman Wright asked what advantage is gained by having an appointed official serve as  
 22 Budget Officer versus a member of the Fire Board. Mr. Hill responded that the point is to put a  
 23 check on the ability of the Chief to set the budget.  
 24

25 Regarding the 1250 West Parrish Lane intersection, Mayor Cutler reported that UDOT  
 26 will require the City to pay for the addition of an Opticom system as a betterment. Chief Bassett  
 27 stressed the value of an Opticom system in ensuring the safety of civilian drivers and Fire  
 28 Agency staff. Chief Bassett offered to obtain an independent bid from an approved contractor.  
 29 Councilman Wright expressed a desire to look at including an Opticom system in all of the  
 30 intersections on Parrish Lane. Councilman Wright repeated his recommendation that the City or  
 31 the Fire Agency invest in a drone.  
 32

**ADJOURNMENT**

33  
34  
35 Mayor Cutler adjourned the work session at 6:55 p.m.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 \_\_\_\_\_  
Marsha L. Morrow, City Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_ Date Approved

42  
43  
44  
45  
46 \_\_\_\_\_  
47 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

# ***PRELIMINARY DRAFT***

1 Minutes of the Centerville **City Council** meeting held Tuesday, July 7, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at  
2 Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah.

## **MEMBERS PRESENT**

3  
4  
5  
6 Mayor Paul A. Cutler

7  
8 Council Members Ken S. Averett  
9 Tamilyn Fillmore  
10 John T. Higginson  
11 Stephanie Ivie  
12 Lawrence Wright

## **STAFF PRESENT**

13  
14 Blaine Lutz, Finance Director/Assistant City Manager  
15 Lisa Romney, City Attorney  
16 Randy Randall, Public Works Director  
17 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director  
18 Jacob Smith, Management Assistant  
19 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

## **STAFF ABSENT**

20  
21 Steve Thacker, City Manager

## **VISITORS**

22  
23 Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

## **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

24  
25  
26  
27 **PRAYER OR THOUGHT** Councilman Higginson

## **COMMENDATION**

28  
29  
30  
31 Blaine Lutz, Finance Director/Assistant City Manager, announced that Centerville has  
32 received a Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting for the sixteenth  
33 consecutive year. He explained the criteria, and recognized Jeannine Teel for her significant  
34 contribution to the most recent Financial Audit.

## **OPEN SESSION**

35  
36  
37  
38 No one wished to comment.

## **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE**

39  
40  
41  
42 The minutes of the June 16, 2015 work session and regular Council meeting, and the  
43 June 17, 2015 joint Council/Planning Commission meeting were reviewed. Councilwoman  
44 Fillmore made a **motion** to approve all three sets of minutes. Councilman Averett seconded the  
45 motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

## **FRONTAGE ROAD SIDEWALK PROJECT**

46  
47  
48  
49 Randy Randall, Public Works Director, explained that earlier this year UDOT Region  
50 One awarded Centerville \$50,000 in Federal Transportation Assistance Program (TAP) funding  
51 for construction of a sidewalk along the east side of the Frontage Road, which would complete  
52 the current gap in the sidewalk between the Woods Park PDO and the Lexington Subdivision.  
53 The cost above \$50,000 will be paid from two other sources – the City's street maintenance  
54 budget and a contribution from Abraham & Emily Millet. The Millets have an obligation to pay  
55 for the portion in front of their home because of a sidewalk deferral agreement executed when

1 they developed their property. Easements are needed from Mabel Devore and Christopher and  
2 Hermila Cutler to accommodate the sidewalk and the slope on the east side down to natural  
3 ground elevation. Lisa Romney, City Attorney, provided further details regarding the proposed  
4 actions.

5  
6 Councilman Averett made a **motion** to accept Public Sidewalk and Slope Easements  
7 from the Cutlers and Mabel Devore. Councilwoman Ivie seconded the motion, which passed by  
8 unanimous vote (5-0).

9  
10 Councilman Higginson made a **motion** to approve an Installment Payment and Security  
11 Interest Agreement for Sidewalk Improvements with Abraham & Emily Millet with changes to  
12 Section 1 regarding payment obligations and use of existing cash bond recommended by the  
13 City Attorney. Councilwoman Fillmore seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote  
14 (5-0).

15  
16 Councilwoman Fillmore made a **motion** to award construction contract to Bowen  
17 Construction in the amount of \$64,492 based on the base bid, with the option of an additional  
18 \$265.50 for upgraded fencing, subject to obtaining signed easements from Mabel Devore and  
19 the Cutlers and execution of the Millet Agreement. The motion was seconded by Councilman  
20 Wright and passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

21  
22 **PUBLIC HEARING – PLAT AMENDMENT TO FORD CANYON SUBDIVISION –**  
23 **REDUCING SETBACK TO 20 FEET**

24  
25 Eric Beard with Beard Construction answered questions from the Council regarding the  
26 application to reduce setback, and stated that many of the lots on Ford Canyon Drive have 20-  
27 foot setbacks.

28  
29 At 7:22 p.m. Mayor Cutler opened a public hearing for the proposed plat amendment,  
30 and closed the public hearing seeing that no one wished to comment. Councilman Higginson  
31 made a **motion** to approve the plat amendment for Ford Canyon Estates Phase 4 Subdivision,  
32 reducing the front-yard setback from 25 to 20 feet for Lots 408 and 409, subject to the following  
33 conditions and findings. Councilman Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous  
34 vote (5-0).

35  
36 Conditions:

- 37  
38 1) Preparation and submittal of a final linen subdivision plat to the City Recorder's  
39 Office to reflect the lot combination and reduction of the front yard setback to 20 feet.  
40 2) Review and acceptance of the final plat by the Fire Marshall and Public Works  
41 Director, in accordance with applicable regulations or written agreement  
42 requirements for fire protection.  
43 3) All original subdivision plat notes and the slope stability easement are also provided  
44 on the linen of the new plat to be recorded.

45  
46 Findings:

- 47  
48 a. The City Council finds that the amendment is consistent with the original plat's  
49 expectation to maintain a slope stability easement to mitigate the risk of slope failure.  
50 b. The City Council finds that to meet the City's standard level of service needs and  
51 expectations for constructing homes adequate fire protection must be deemed  
52 acceptable by the Fire Marshall and Public Works entities.

- 1 c. Therefore, the City Council finds that the public interest will NOT be materially injured
- 2 by the proposed plat amendment.
- 3 d. Therefore, the City Council finds that there is good cause for the plat amendment.
- 4

5 **PUBLIC HEARING – REQUEST TO ADD STREET NAME ALIAS TO 1250 WEST**

6  
7 Mr. Randall explained the request to add the alias “Child Lane” to 1250 West between  
8 Porter Lane and Parrish Lane, and recommended the applicant pay the cost of street sign  
9 changes. Robert Child, applicant, described his family’s history on 1250 West, and stated that  
10 West Bountiful acknowledges the road as “640 West/Child Lane”.

11  
12 Mayor Cutler opened a public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

13  
14 Dale McIntyre – Mr. McIntyre expressed his love and respect for Robert Child’s father,  
15 Brandt Child.

16  
17 Logan Breck – Mr. Breck asked who would pay for the new street signs. Mayor Cutler  
18 responded that, by Ordinance, the applicant is responsible to pay for new street signs.  
19 Councilman Higginson added that the Ordinance requires applicants to obtain 75% of area  
20 property owner signatures agreeing to the change.

21  
22 The Mayor closed the public hearing at 7:34 p.m. Councilwoman Fillmore stated she  
23 would not be anxious to entertain a lot of street name changes throughout the City, but she feels  
24 there is a strong argument, in this case, to have continuity between West Bountiful and  
25 Centerville. Councilman Wright made a **motion** to approve the request, subject to staff verifying  
26 that all conditions are met, and suggested that, given the historic nature of the situation, the City  
27 bear the cost of the sign change from Council Contingency. Councilman Higginson seconded  
28 the motion, but stated that he would not want this to set a precedent of the City paying for sign  
29 replacement. Councilman Averett stated that he suspects it was common long ago to name  
30 streets after prominent community members or property owners, and said he feels this sets a  
31 dangerous precedent. Councilwoman Fillmore said she agrees with Councilman Averett, but in  
32 this situation she feels the continuity between the cities is a strong argument. The motion  
33 passed by majority vote (4-1), with Councilman Averett dissenting.

34  
35 **PUBLIC HEARING – CONSIDER ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT – CHAPTER**  
36 **12-36 (TABLE OF USES) – FLAG LOTS**

37  
38 Flag lot development is currently only allowed in Residential-Low (R-L) Zones. Cory  
39 Snyder, Community Development Director, explained the request to permit flag lots in  
40 Residential-Medium (R-M) Zones, generated by an earlier request to build a duplex behind the  
41 Huffaker Dental building on Main Street on under-utilized land that is part of the same parcel on  
42 which the dental building is located, currently zoned Commercial, but adjacent to R-M. Mr.  
43 Snyder emphasized that a flag lot is a last resort land-use tool in Centerville. The Planning  
44 Commission is the land use authority designated to consider flag lot applications. The Planning  
45 Commission and staff have reviewed the current application and recommend approval of an  
46 ordinance allowing flag lot development as a last resort tool in R-M Zones.

47  
48 Jeff Cook, applicant, showed the property in question on a map, and explained that the  
49 neighboring dental office would still have sufficient parking. He said he believes the property  
50 could accommodate two or three townhome-type units. Councilwoman Fillmore asked if there  
51 are other properties in R-M Zones that would have potential for flag lot development. Mr.  
52 Snyder repeated that in order for a property to qualify as a flag lot, an applicant would have to

1 prove that no other option is available for the property. He said he feels the current flag lot  
2 ordinance is fairly strong. The Council discussed how the change could potentially affect other  
3 R-M areas in the City. Councilman Averett stated he is more concerned about the impact of flag  
4 lots in R-L Zones, and he thinks the application seems like a good use of the subject property.  
5 Councilwoman Fillmore agreed with Councilman Averett regarding the subject property, but said  
6 she was on the Planning Commission when the flag lot debate occurred, and she has serious  
7 concerns about the impact flag lots could have on neighboring properties. The ordinance  
8 approved by the Council did not include many of the considerations recommended by the  
9 Planning Commission. She recommended not approving the amendment until the ordinance is  
10 revisited. Staff cautioned that it would be problematic to allow a flag lot for this one property and  
11 not for others in the same zone. Ms. Romney agreed that text amendments should apply to an  
12 entire zone. Councilwoman Fillmore pointed out that a flag lot is not allowed if subdivision is  
13 possible.  
14

15 At 8:07 p.m. Mayor Cutler opened a public hearing, and closed the public hearing seeing  
16 that no one wished to comment. Councilwoman Fillmore made a **motion** to approve Ordinance  
17 No. 2015-13 amending Chapter 12-36 (Table of Uses Allowed) of the Centerville Zoning  
18 Ordinance to permit the use of flat lots in the Residential-Medium (R-M) Zone, with the note that  
19 she feels the Council should revisit some of the details in the existing flag lot ordinance.  
20 Councilman Averett seconded the motion, which passed by majority vote (3-2), with Council  
21 members Ivie and Wright dissenting.  
22

23 **PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS – SOUTH MAIN**  
24 **STREET OVERLAY ZONE AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONE**  
25

26 Ordinance No. 2015-14 – Maximum Density Cap – The City Council and Planning  
27 Commission accepted public comment regarding the South Main Street Overlay Zone during  
28 the month of June. Mr. Snyder stated that the Planning Commission noticed and debated  
29 adopting maximum density caps for residential development in the Traditional and City Center  
30 Main Street Districts. Staff found that a density cap of eight units per acre is consistent with  
31 both the General Plan and the South Main Street Plan. The Planning Commission debated and  
32 held a public hearing, and decided to recommend a two-tiered process: 1-4 units per acre  
33 permitted, with 5-8 units per acre by conditional use. Conditional use is an administrative  
34 decision, considered approved unless impacts or findings cannot be mitigated. Councilman  
35 Wright stated he does not see the proposed amendment as a solution to the density problem.  
36 He said it was his impression that residents want a cap at R-L rather than R-M. Mayor Cutler  
37 pointed out that the Council could approve a cap of less than 8 units per acre. Councilwoman  
38 Ivie agreed that the residents want R-L. Mayor Cutler commented that most citizens would want  
39 R-L next to their property, but the Council also heard from property/business owners who asked  
40 for flexibility. He stated the Council needs to find a balance between personal property rights  
41 and the desires of the community. Councilman Wright stated that it does not make sense to  
42 pass the amendment before more discussion has occurred. Councilwoman Ivie said she feels  
43 all regulations should be grouped in one place to be easily understandable.  
44

45 Councilwoman Fillmore commented that the Main Street Corridor is made up of lots in  
46 varying sizes. The intent of the SMSC Plan was to encourage positive redevelopment, without  
47 so many restrictions that redevelopment is not viable. Placing a density cap on smaller parcels  
48 makes redevelopment difficult. Councilwoman Fillmore added that she feels a density cap on  
49 the larger parcels would be appropriate. Mr. Snyder explained the history and basic intent of  
50 form-based code – to provide a framework for Main Street, letting the market determine the use.  
51

1 At 8:36 p.m. Mayor Cutler opened a public hearing for the proposed maximum density  
2 caps for residential use.

3  
4 Dale McIntyre – Mr. McIntyre stated he is concerned about the difference between  
5 theory and reality. He showed a diagram of proposed development on the Hafoka property on  
6 Porter Lane just west of 400 West, and stated that the developer can say the development is 8  
7 units per acre, but the reality is closer to 11 units per acre. He said he does not want that reality  
8 for Centerville.

9  
10 Nancy Smith – Ms. Smith said that in her opinion density is not the number one  
11 question. She believes the more important question is whether mixed-use is viable. If  
12 commercial is not viable, property owners have the ability to request a rezone. Ms. Smith said  
13 she is not opposed to R-M if it is done appropriately. The mixed-use concept in the R-M context  
14 is completely different than a purely R-M development. She stated that most of the Corridor has  
15 developed R-L, and she would love to see an R-L designation. Ms. Smith said she has a  
16 problem with conditional uses throughout the community, and encouraged the Council not to  
17 approve the conditional use of 5-8 until they have looked at some of the criteria for the  
18 conditional use permits. She added that Layton does not allow any development with less than  
19 a 26-foot road for emergency services access. She feels the City needs to retain quality of life,  
20 and asked the Council not to lift the TZRO until they have looked at issues that pertain to quality  
21 of life, and whether or not mixed-use is really viable on Main Street.

22  
23 Tim Hawkes, Utah House of Representatives – As a Centerville resident, Representative  
24 Hawkes said he feels it is unfortunate that the Council is looking at this specific tool the night  
25 before the joint discussion between the Planning Commission and the City Council. He agreed  
26 with Mayor Cutler that it was a mistake to shift to an overlay without caps on density. However,  
27 he pointed out that prior to 2010 the residential option was not available whatsoever. He said  
28 he feels it would be fair to place caps as long as expectations are clear to developers.  
29 Representative Hawkes stated that he feels 8 units per acre is high, and agreed with Mr. Snyder  
30 that caps can be set low, and the City can incent higher if desired. He said he believes the  
31 residents are more concerned with quality of life than form. He suggested setting the cap at 4  
32 units per acre, with conditional use at six units per acre, and stated that, since the Walton  
33 development is an existing application, he does not feel it should be subject to the new  
34 restrictions. Representative Hawkes added that he hopes the Council is discussing density  
35 caps in the Pages Lane area as well.

36  
37 William Ince, Centerville Planning Commissioner – Commissioner Ince commented that  
38 there had been discussion in the Planning Commission meetings of 16 units per acre on the  
39 Walton property, and he feels the cap of 8 units per acre is an improvement, but not one that  
40 satisfied a vast majority. He said he thinks something less than eight solves more problems,  
41 and it would be worth it for the Council to pass something, even if it is not a final step.

42  
43 Robyn Mecham – Ms. Mecham said it is unfair to developers to be unclear, and she  
44 thinks the cap should be as low as possible and clearly stated for builders and developers. She  
45 said she does not believe the Commissioners really understood that they were voting for more  
46 than 1-4 units per acre. She cautioned the City to be careful with conditional use, and start with  
47 a base of 1-4 units per acre. She stated there are 638 condos or apartments between Pages  
48 Lane and Parrish Lane on Main Street, and the City needs to keep the density lower. More  
49 family homes are needed. She said it is hard to find a single-family home for sale in Centerville.  
50 She passed on a comment made by the CEO of Brighton Homes that this is a different  
51 community because the citizens care more about the quality of life than the property values.

1 She added that property values in Centerville are high because of the high quality of life. Higher  
2 density brings crime. Ms. Mecham asked the Council to consider R-L for now.

3  
4 Mayor Cutler closed the public hearing at 8:57 p.m.

5  
6 Councilman Higginson stated he is moving towards favoring a maximum of 4 units per  
7 acre. Councilman Averett expressed a desire to table further discussion until after the joint  
8 discussion with the Planning Commission, and added that, as a realtor, he checked the MLS  
9 and found many single-family homes for sale in Centerville. Councilwoman Fillmore agreed  
10 with the idea of waiting until after the meeting with the Planning Commission. She commented  
11 that Main Street is a commercial corridor, and the Council often hears that citizens want the  
12 corridor redeveloped to be a benefit to the community. It is easy to ask for lower density, but at  
13 some point redevelopment becomes economically impossible. Councilwoman Fillmore stated  
14 she feels a fairly intensive study would be needed to be respectful of the property owners.

15  
16 Councilwoman Fillmore made a **motion** to table discussion of Ordinance No. 2015-14  
17 regarding maximum density caps for residential development within the Traditional and City  
18 Center Main Street Districts. Councilman Higginson seconded the motion. Councilwoman Ivie  
19 made a **substitute motion** to approve Ordinance No. 2015-14 approving R-L (maximum of 4  
20 units per acre) in the Traditional and City Center Districts, with no conditional use. Councilman  
21 Wright seconded the substitute motion. Councilwoman Fillmore stated she would be open to  
22 considering Councilwoman Ivie's suggestion, but said she feels making such a drastic change  
23 without further study would be disrespectful to the long and intensive process originally gone  
24 through to put the SMSC Plan in place. Councilmen Averett and Higginson stated they feel it  
25 would be premature. The substitute motion to adopt with a density cap at R-L failed (2-3), with  
26 Council members Averett, Fillmore, and Higginson dissenting. The motion to table Ordinance  
27 No. 2015-14 passed by majority vote (4-1), with Councilman Wright dissenting.

28  
29 Ordinance No. 2015-15 – Planned Development Overlay (PDO) – Mayor Cutler stated  
30 that PDOs are currently allowed in every district on a minimum of five acres, with the exception  
31 of single-family development, which does not have a minimum acreage requirement. The  
32 Mayor sought clarification of this issue. Mr. Snyder expressed the opinion that the minimum is  
33 not applicable in a single-family residential zone, but would apply to a single-family development  
34 within the SMSC Zone. Mr. Snyder explained that a minimum acreage requirement is standard,  
35 particularly in Utah. Reducing the minimum can begin to compromise the space required for  
36 infrastructure. However, Mr. Snyder stated that PDOs are a flexible tool, and a minimum of  
37 three acres may work for planned developments. He added that the PDO is not meant to be a  
38 free-for-all, nor is it meant to be too stringent. The objective is to look at the intent of an area in  
39 the General Plan and determine how a PDO could accomplish it better. Mr. Snyder said he  
40 feels it would be a mistake to use a PDO to solve any issues in the SMSC. The SMSC already  
41 has an enhanced overlay, and putting an overlay on top of an overlay would be going beyond  
42 the purpose of a PDO. Mayor Cutler asked for clarification on 12-41-040 of the proposed  
43 Ordinance, and the Council discussed desired wording with staff. Councilman Wright said he  
44 does not think the City will ever need the change from five to three acres. Mayor Cutler pointed  
45 out that there may at some point be a situation on Main Street when the reduced acreage  
46 requirement would allow a PDO to facilitate a better development. Councilman Wright  
47 cautioned that things can change, and a few people with power can make a decision counter to  
48 what citizens would want or expect.

49  
50 Mayor Cutler opened a public hearing at 9:23 p.m.

51



1            Dale McIntyre – Mr. McIntyre stated that many citizens have asked the Council to not  
2 increase density. The citizens want R-L. He said he was extremely disappointed that six of the  
3 seven Planning Commission members listened to the citizens in public hearings and still  
4 lowered the threshold from five to three acres. Mr. McIntyre said he hopes the Council will not  
5 do the same.

6  
7            Travis Davis – Mr. Davis thanked the Council for taking the time to listen to the public.  
8 He said it is not a good idea to lower the acreage requirement for a PDO. He stated that  
9 residential works better than anything else on Main Street. He asked that the Council maintain  
10 the density cap at 1-4 units per acre if they do decide in favor of the PDO, possibly allowing 5-6  
11 units per acre if they are going to incent. Mr. Davis expressed the opinion that the SMSC Plan  
12 needs to be completely reworked, or at least put a density cap in place that would maintain the  
13 integrity of the community.

14  
15            Robyn Mecham – Ms. Mecham agreed with Mr. Snyder that a PDO is a bonus to  
16 density, and would be going the wrong direction. A vote for reducing the acreage for PDO  
17 would be going against 99% of the residents who have stated they do not want higher density.  
18 She said it would also be sending the wrong message to builders, because residents do not  
19 want higher density.

20  
21            At 9:30 p.m. Mayor Cutler closed the public hearing. Councilman Wright made a **motion**  
22 to reject Ordinance No. 2015-15 reducing the minimum acreage required for planned  
23 developments. Councilwoman Ivie seconded the motion. Councilwoman Fillmore said that, at  
24 face value, reducing the acreage requirement for a PDO city-wide is fine, because a PDO is a  
25 good tool to ensure a quality product. However, in the Main Street Corridor it could be  
26 problematic and she has reservations. Councilwoman Fillmore stated she would vote against  
27 taking action to reduce at this time because it has been mixed up in the SMSC issue. The  
28 motion to reject Ordinance No. 2015-15 passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

29  
30            At 9:33 p.m. the Council took a break, returning at 9:41 p.m.

31  
32            **CONTINUE PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT,**  
33 **CHAPTER 12-60, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADUs)**

34  
35            Jake Smith, Management Assistant, reported on the varied impact fee policies regarding  
36 ADUs in other cities. Mr. Snyder recommended separating any ADU impact fee from the  
37 ordinance with a reference to the City Fee Schedule. He commented that an ADU is intended  
38 to be secondary to the primary dwelling unit. Councilwoman Fillmore stated that her greatest  
39 concern about the proposed ordinance is the setbacks and how they affect neighboring  
40 properties. She said she would want the ordinance to clarify that a detached ADU must be built  
41 within the remaining buildable area of the lot. The Council and staff discussed setbacks and  
42 ADU size, and it was suggested that setbacks could vary based on the square feet of the  
43 structure.

44  
45            At 9:56 p.m. Mayor Cutler opened a public hearing regarding ADUs.

46  
47            Spencer Summerhays – Mr. Summerhays showed photographs of a large accessory  
48 structure that has been constructed on the property adjacent to his backyard. He stated that the  
49 definition of ADU is ambiguous regarding whether an accessory dwelling unit can be part of a  
50 larger accessory building, and expressed the opinion that the two should not be mingled. He  
51 said the ordinance needs clarification regarding size and height of structure. The ordinance is

1 close to what it needs to be, but there are still pieces that remain to be figured out. He asked  
2 the Council to be careful with setbacks in terms of relationships with other buildings.  
3

4 Mr. Snyder clarified that the ordinance allows an existing accessory building to be  
5 converted to an ADU. Councilman Wright said it sounds like the accessory building ordinance  
6 is a companion to the ADU ordinance. Councilwoman Fillmore agreed that the ordinances are  
7 related, and suggested the Council discuss general concerns to direct back to Planning staff or  
8 the Planning Commission. Mr. Summerhays recommended the Council ensure that an ADU,  
9 whether stand-alone or part of another structure, meet some measure of size restriction in  
10 relationship to nearby structures. He suggested increasing setback with increasing height.  
11

12 Mark Briggs – Mr. Briggs said one of his neighbors built an ADU on top of their garage,  
13 which does not work in his type of neighborhood. The deck of the ADU can look down on  
14 everyone’s backyard taking away privacy. He suggested the Council restrict the height of ADUs  
15 to be level with the existing primary dwelling.  
16

17 William Ince, Planning Commission – Commissioner Ince strongly encouraged the  
18 Council to reconsider the restriction that an ADU cannot exceed 25% of the size of the primary  
19 dwelling. He said he suspects most citizens who take advantage of the ADU ordinance will  
20 convert their basement, which could easily exceed 25% of the primary living area.  
21 Commissioner Ince stated he supports the 25% restriction for a separate structure, but equal  
22 size allowance for upstairs and downstairs makes sense to him. He recommended the Council  
23 send the ordinance back to the Planning Commission for further consideration.  
24

25 At 10:14 p.m. the Mayor closed the public hearing. Councilman Wright stated he is in  
26 favor of ADUs. The Council needs to look at balancing one person’s property rights against  
27 another’s. He said the Council needs to look at the accessory building ordinance again, and  
28 pointed out that changes can be made as issues arise. Councilwoman Fillmore and Mayor  
29 Cutler expressed a desire to refer the ordinance back to the Planning Commission with clear  
30 guidance. Councilman Wright suggested eliminating the 25% size restriction. Mayor Cutler  
31 expressed the concern that equal size opens up the possibility for duplex situations.  
32 Councilman Wright stated he is resistant to sending the ordinance back to the Planning  
33 Commission. Councilwoman Fillmore said she feels there should be more clear distinction  
34 between ADUs in an existing home versus a separate structure, and said she would like to see  
35 a dual-track ordinance. Mr. Snyder cautioned the Council that it is more difficult to decrease  
36 than to increase size allowance, and said he feels it would be a mistake to try to accommodate  
37 individual scenarios with an ordinance that would apply city-wide. He added that the size  
38 restriction is related to density – 800 square feet can accommodate up to four residents, with an  
39 additional resident allowed with each additional 200 square feet.  
40

41 Mr. Snyder explained the complications involved in calculating building height.  
42 Councilwoman Fillmore agreed with Mr. Summerhays’ suggestion that the relation to other  
43 buildings needs to be considered. She said the basement ADU issue could be solved easily if  
44 the two types of ADUs are separated in the ordinance. Mr. Snyder said the separate structure  
45 issues could probably be solved with the accessory building ordinance. Mayor Cutler and  
46 Council members Higginson, Ivie, and Fillmore indicated support for separating the two types of  
47 ADUs in the ordinance. Councilman Averett stated that he does not personally like ADUs, and  
48 has been asked by some of his constituents to not support ADUs. He said it is a density issue  
49 that deteriorates a single-family neighborhood, and he will not vote in favor of ADUs.  
50 Councilman Wright said he understands Councilman Averett’s point of view, but pointed out that  
51 ADUs can be appropriate, and can be an opportunity to provide accommodations for an aging  
52 population.

1 Councilwoman Fillmore made a **motion** to separate the ADU use in existing structures  
2 from detached ADU structures, table the ADU use in existing structures to another Council  
3 meeting, and direct Planning staff and the Planning Commission to revisit separate accessory  
4 buildings when they have time on their schedule. Councilwoman Ivie seconded the motion.  
5 Councilman Wright made a **substitute motion** to table discussion of the proposed ordinance to  
6 a Council meeting in August, and ask staff to make a recommendation that reconciles some of  
7 the issues. Mr. Snyder pointed out that the Council has made the Main Street issue a priority.  
8 Councilman Wright amended his substitute motion to table discussion of the property ordinance  
9 until the TZRO on the SMSC is lifted or expires. Councilwoman Ivie seconded the substitute  
10 motion, which passed by majority vote (4-1), with Councilwoman Fillmore dissenting.

11  
12 **MAYOR'S REPORT**

- 13
- 14 • Mayor Cutler reported that the Chair of the UIA called a special meeting to discuss  
15 starting the process of issuing the remaining authorized UIA bonds for the purpose of  
16 continuing construction. The Mayor said he sent a letter stating he thinks they  
17 should wait until the Macquarie situation is ended and a new executive director is  
18 hired. It has been recommended that the bonds be issued in two tranches. He  
19 reported that a vigorous discussion occurred regarding whether assessments should  
20 continue to be levied for a couple more months to provide a financial buffer and  
21 avoid assessments in the future. Mayor Cutler said he argued that assessments  
22 should end if cash flow is positive. He expressed a desire for Centerville to be  
23 current with the assessments. The Council discussed UTOPIA's construction goals  
24 moving forward. Mayor Cutler expressed the opinion that Centerville may have been  
25 able to influence ending the Macquarie situation sooner if the City were current with  
26 assessments. Councilman Higginson stated that Centerville agreed to be a partner,  
27 and UTOPIA needs to be whole at some point. He added now that UTOPIA is cash  
28 flow positive it should never go back to levying an assessment. Councilman  
29 Higginson said he believes a lot of Centerville residents really don't know about  
30 UTOPIA. Mayor Cutler said he would like to have a flier included in the utility bill  
31 notifying residents what is available (without advocating any specific service  
32 provider).

33  
34 **CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT**

35  
36 Councilwoman Ivie reported that the Landmarks Commission is scheduled to host a  
37 social in September, and is eagerly waiting time on the Council agenda to discuss the historic  
38 district. She reported on the success of the historic home tour held on June 6<sup>th</sup>. She also  
39 reported that the June community hike scheduled by the Trails Committee was postponed to  
40 July 8<sup>th</sup>.

41  
42 **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

43  
44 Mr. Lutz explained the calculation of property tax valuation, and explained his frustration  
45 with the values determined by the County. Mayor Cutler suggested he meet with the County  
46 Assessor and County Clerk.

47  
48 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

49

1 Councilman Wright made a **motion** to approve commencement of the warranty period  
2 for The Pasture commercial project, effective July 7, 2015. Councilwoman Ivie seconded the  
3 motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0).  
4

5 **RDA MEETING**

6  
7 At 11:08 p.m. Councilman Wight made a **motion** to move to a meeting of the  
8 Redevelopment Agency of Centerville. Councilman Higginson seconded the motion, which  
9 passed by unanimous vote (4-0). In attendance were: Paul A. Cutler, Chair; John T. Higginson,  
10 Vice Chair; Directors Averett, Fillmore, Ivie, and Wright; Blaine Lutz, Finance Director; Lisa  
11 Romney, City Attorney; Jacob Smith, Management Assistant; and Katie Rust, Recording  
12 Secretary.  
13

14 The Council returned to regular meeting at 11:11 p.m.

15  
16 **CLOSED MEETING**

17  
18 At 11:13 p.m. Councilman Wright made a **motion** to move to a closed meeting to  
19 discuss the character and competency of an individual. Councilman Higginson seconded the  
20 motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0). In attendance were: Paul A. Cutler, Mayor; and  
21 Council members Averett, Fillmore, Higginson, Ivie, and Wright.  
22

23 When the Council returned to regular meeting Councilman Wright made a **motion** to  
24 authorize a "meets expectations" salary increase of 2% for the City Manager. Councilwoman  
25 Fillmore seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (5-0). Councilman Wright also  
26 expressed a desire to further show appreciation to the City Manager with a gift card, and the  
27 rest of the Council indicated agreement. The Mayor will meet with the City Manager to pass on  
28 the comments of the Council.  
29

30 **ADJOURNMENT**

31  
32 At approximately 11:45 p.m. Councilman Wright made a **motion** to adjourn. The motion  
33 was seconded by Councilman Higginson and passed by unanimous vote (5-0).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 \_\_\_\_\_  
Marsha L. Morrow, City Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_ Date Approved

40  
41  
42  
43  
44 \_\_\_\_\_  
45 Katie Rust, Recording Secretary

3. The submitted grading and utility plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to a building permit being issued.
4. Applicant shall provide appropriate public utility easements and submit to the City. All easements shall be accepted by the City Council and recorded with the Davis County Recorder's Office.
5. A current title report shall be submitted to the City Attorney for review prior to issuance of a building permit.

***Reasons for Action (findings):***

1. The applicant has clearly shown how the property may be developed [Section 12-21-110(d)(2)].
2. The applicant has submitted a full final site plan application [Section 12-21-110(e)(2)].
3. Proposed utility easements are required on all developed lots [Section 12-21-110(e)(2)(iii)(d), 15-5-106(8)].

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Merrill and passed by unanimous roll-call vote (6-0).

**WORK SESSION | SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR PLAN & PUBLIC COMMENTS REVIEW - The City Council and the Planning Commission will discuss the South Main Street Corridor Plan and review all the public comments received from various meetings.**

The Planning Commission and City Council reviewed and discussed several aspects of the South Main Street Corridor Plan (SMSC), including the many public comments that have been made over the past several meetings. Mayor Cutler explained the City Council recently reviewed the proposed density cap as recommended by the Planning Commission and after a lengthy discussion the issue was ultimately tabled for further review and discussion. In addition to density caps the Commission and Council also discussed viability, mixed-uses, building heights and framing, and public spaces.

City staff reviewed conditional use permits and how this tool is used to allow additional development options if negative impacts are appropriately mitigated. Staff also reviewed the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) tool, which also provides an option for additional density but also ensures an overall better developed project. Staff explained there may be some ways to take a more conservative approach to density including a density cap. Several Council and Commission members agreed each tool can be useful but that each tool also presents its own challenges with respect to the SMSC. A majority of the members present agreed a density cap is an appropriate safeguard for the SMSC.

1 Chair Hirschi said density and viability go hand in hand; the viability of commercial uses  
2 depends on residential roof tops. He said if residential density is too restricted then commercial  
3 uses will struggle. He said residential density should promote both commercial and retail uses.  
4 He said commercial is important and should be encouraged along Main Street in addition to  
5 appropriate residential uses. He said there have been many comments made that residential only  
6 is the way to go. He is not sure this is best for Main Street. He said single-family uses are more  
7 difficult to control. He questioned if the city really wants single-family homes with yards and  
8 structures that cannot be specifically regulated along Main Street. He also questioned if people  
9 would really be interested in raising a family on a busy Main Street. He believes the mixed-use  
10 concept is still the best option for Main Street. He said he is also concerned with the idea of a  
11 single-family PDO on Main Street. He said this could potentially put a fence along Main Street  
12 with single-family homes facing interior. He does not believe a “wall” on Main Street is a good  
13 idea. He is also concerned with “down zoning” Main Street from commercial to residential only.  
14 He said this is unfair to current property owners who have been paying commercial taxes for  
15 many years.

16  
17 Councilwoman Fillmore said the SMSC uses form base standards to help unify  
18 development along the frontage of Main Street, but does not address the rear parcels very well;  
19 perhaps some clarification may be appropriate for rear residential uses. She believes the mixed-  
20 use concept is still the best option for Main Street. She said economic viability is very important.  
21 There needs to be enough return so a property owner is able to demolish an old building and  
22 build a new high quality project. However, she is concerned comments made regarding viability  
23 may be just that, comments. She believes viability needs to be studied more thoroughly to know  
24 for sure if this is an issue. She said the mixed-use concept allows people to live and work in  
25 Centerville. She said the SMSC is appropriate because it provides flexibility. She said current  
26 property owners have expressed a desire for flexibility so they can find the best redevelopment  
27 option for their situation. She said Main Street is intended to be primarily commercial. She  
28 suggested keeping commercial as the primary use and residential or mixed-use as secondary. She  
29 is concerned a density cap could be detrimental for smaller properties and may hinder their  
30 ability to redevelop. She believes a required commercial use or mixed-use will help control  
31 density. She said the majority of the comments made in the past few meetings have been concern  
32 over density, not necessarily negatives toward the SMSC plan. She believes eliminating  
33 commercial on Main Street will intensify residential uses and density. She said a density cap may  
34 be appropriate but is worried that if set to low could encourage blight because there is no  
35 incentive for redevelopment. She believes it is important to maintain the synergy of the SMSC  
36 and encourage consistent redevelopment.

37  
38 Commissioner Merrill said single-family lots are not as sought after with rising  
39 generations. Research has shown that generations to come prefer smaller mixed-use homes with  
40 little to no maintenance and services within walking distance.

1 Mayor Cutler said flexibility is important and questioned if there is a need to promote  
2 townhomes or other forms of multi-family housing on Main Street. Commissioner Johnson said  
3 he likes the flexibility of either residential, commercial, or mixed-use. Commissioner Hayman  
4 agreed flexibility is best, but does not believe residential only is the best or viable option. She  
5 said townhomes could be appropriate with a suitable density cap and green space requirement.  
6 She questioned if a lower density cap could be set with incentivized increases? She too is  
7 concerned with blight, but also wants to find a balance in keeping Centerville's unique small  
8 town feel.

9  
10 City staff discussed possible density caps (i.e., 4, 6, and 8). Staff believes there are pros  
11 and cons to each density cap option. Staff is willing to research possible incentive options and  
12 tools. Staff also discussed the General Plan for Main Street explaining some changes to the  
13 SMSC may also require a change to the General Plan. Staff explained it may be possible to cap  
14 residential densities and/or size of parcel with some type of tiered density system. Staff  
15 explained that a density cap will affect viability and the City needs to be careful not to negatively  
16 impact property owners. Staff agreed the higher the density cap the more likely it will not  
17 negatively affect smaller parcels.

18  
19 Councilman Higginson agreed commercial uses should be encouraged along Main Street.  
20 He said commercial uses should front Main Street with residential uses behind. He is not  
21 concerned with catering to every demographic. He said Centerville is different and unique. He  
22 said walkability is often discussed but is rarely a reality. He said there are walkable  
23 developments but most people drive to them, then walk around. He said Main Street will not  
24 likely ever become a true walkable area. He said he is in favor of a density cap and is also in  
25 favor of keeping commercial uses on Main Street.

26  
27 Councilman Averett questioned if the City is planning for the past or planning for the  
28 future. He said retail is not viable on Main Street mostly due, he believes, to online sales. He said  
29 current research shows that 1 in 5 Americans work from home at least once a week and trends  
30 show that number will only increase in the future. He agrees live/work concepts are important  
31 and should be encouraged. He agreed future generations want to live in smaller PDO type  
32 developments with no maintenance. He said it seems the future is leaning toward mixed-use  
33 options.

34  
35 The Planning Commission and City Council discussed density with regard to the Pages  
36 Lane area which is set at a much higher density. Members present were not as concerned with  
37 this area as it is different from the Core District and will bring a different type of redevelopment.  
38 A majority of the members present agreed the Pages Lane area may still require a density cap but  
39 at a much higher option in order to maintain flexible redevelopment options. The Planning  
40 Commission agreed to research and discuss the Pages Lane area and provide a recommendation  
41 for density to the City Council in the near future.

1 Councilwoman Ivie said she is not comfortable with any density over four (4) units per  
2 acre along Main Street including the Pages Lane area. She said Centerville already has over 600  
3 units within this small SMSC area, which is too dense. She said any additional density will only  
4 negatively impact the area.

5  
6 City staff discussed public open space options along Main Street, including sidewalk,  
7 trees, street furniture, parking and lighting. Staff explained how UDOT is involved with these  
8 decisions as Main Street is a State owned road. The City intends to complete a public space plan  
9 for Main Street in the future. The public right-of-way is narrow and options are limited. Any  
10 public space plan will require feasibility studies and coordination with UDOT. The Commission  
11 and Council discussed requiring aesthetic public space improvements as part of redevelopment  
12 plans thus placing the burden on property owners. Staff reminded those present that these types  
13 of burdens are generally balanced with density increases. Chair Hirschi suggested creating a  
14 PDO option for Main Street with bonus density provisions for public space improvements. This  
15 possible PDO option could also maintain the SMSC building structure/framing and commercial  
16 use requirements. The Planning Commission agreed to research and discuss possible public  
17 space options in the near future.

18  
19 The Commission and Council discussed building heights for Main Street. The building  
20 height for all residential homes across the city is 35 feet. A majority of the members present  
21 agreed a maximum building height of 35 feet is appropriate for Main Street and will help  
22 encourage redevelopment. It was also mentioned that building height can be mitigated with  
23 setbacks. City staff discussed the “framing” concept. If buildings are brought forward then  
24 parking is pushed behind providing less vehicular accesses on Main Street and a buffer between  
25 the commercial fronts and residential uses behind. It was mentioned that “framing” should  
26 provide more commercial viability because the cost from UDOT to install an access on Main  
27 Street is excessive.

28  
29 The Commission and Council discussed street width. Concerns were raised regarding the  
30 challenges that sub-standard street widths can produce (i.e., maintenance, fire access, density,  
31 parking, etc.). City staff debated the challenges that can come when full-width streets are  
32 required in private developments (i.e., parking lots, car ports, decreased circulation, speed, etc.)  
33 Staff agreed to research possible options to increase street widths where possible.

34  
35 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

- 36  
37 1. The next Planning Commission meeting will be Wednesday, July 22, 2015.  
38 2. Upcoming Agenda Items  
39 • Porter Lane Townhomes, Conditional Use Permit & Final Site Plan  
40 • Youngblood Storage, Conceptual Site Plan  
41



1           The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

2

3

4

5           \_\_\_\_\_  
David Hirschi, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved

6

7

8

9           \_\_\_\_\_  
Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 2.

Short Title: Summary Action Calendar

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time: 7:10

**SUBJECT**

- a. Approve list of poll workers for 2015 municipal primary election
- b. Accept public utility easement for Scott and Susan Trump residential parcel development located at 540 South 400 West

**RECOMMENDATION**

- a. Approve the appointment of the poll workers listed in the attached document and authorize Davis County to appoint additional poll workers that may be needed in case of an emergency (i.e., in the absence of appointed poll worker).
- b. Accept Public Utility Easement for Scott and Susan Trump residential parcel development located at approximately 540 South 400 West and direct City Recorder to execute and record the Public Utility Easement with Davis County Recorder's Office.

**BACKGROUND**

- a. The enclosed list of proposed poll workers for the Municipal August 11 Primary election has been compiled by the County Elections office. Most of the poll workers have served in the past while using the electronic voting machines. As required by State law, (UCA 20A-5-602), the municipal legislative body shall appoint or provide for the appointment of municipal election poll workers at least 15 days prior to the primary election.
- b. On July 8, 2015, the Planning Commission approved final site plan for the Trump residential parcel located at approximately 540 South 400 West. Since this property is not in a subdivision and is merely a parcel, the City Zoning Code requires the applicant to receive site plan approval for development. As a condition of site plan approval, the applicant is required to provide public utility easements on three sides of the parcel. A public utility easement has been prepared for this purpose. Staff recommends the City Council accept the easement and direct the City Recorder to submit the same for recording at the Davis County Recorder's Office.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

- ☐ List of Poll Workers for Primary Election
- ☐ PUE-Trump

<b>POLL_NAME</b>	<b>POLL_CITY</b>	<b>FIRST</b>	<b>LAST</b>	<b>PHONE</b>	<b>MAILING ADDRESS</b>	<b>POSITION</b>	<b>PRECINCT</b>
Centerville Elementary	Centerville	Kirsten	Facer	(801)298-0881	112 W 700 S	Receiving Clerk	CEO1:I-S-
Centerville Elementary	Centerville	Michael	Gibson	(801)294-4096	379 W 950 N	Provisional Clerk	CEO6:I-S-
Centerville Elementary	Centerville	Clara	Markowski	(801)403-6896	181 W 1050 S	Poll Manager	BO15:I-S-
Centerville Elementary	Centerville	Rebekah	Pierce	(801)403-3921	16 W 780 S	Poll Book Clerk	CEO1:I-S-
Centerville Elementary	Centerville	Melinda	Wan	(801)721-1346	PO Box 1232	Technician	BOO3:I-S-
Stewart Elementary	Centerville	Elaine	Hansen	(801)550-2794	957 Shadow Mt Cir	Poll Book Clerk	CEO5:I-S-
Stewart Elementary	Centerville	Sandra	Hunt	(801)292-1905	357 W 2025 N	Poll Manager	CEO9:I-S-
Stewart Elementary	Centerville	Stephanie	Ivie	(801)397-0272	595 S 700 E	Technician	CEO2:I-S-
Stewart Elementary	Centerville	Camille	Jessop	(801)298-5906	1597 Lewis & Clark Dr	Receiving Clerk	CE10:I-S-
Stewart Elementary	Centerville	Ann	Monroy	(801)300-0087	60 W 115 N	Receiving Clerk	CE11:I-S-
Stewart Elementary	Centerville	Lynette	Sunday	(801)200-4095	36 Old Haul Rd	Provisional Clerk	CEO8:I-S-
Stewart Elementary	Centerville	Sandra	Yates	(801)298-2538	382 W 1500 N	Poll Book Clerk	CE10:I-S-

**WHEN RECORDED, MAIL TO:**

Centerville City  
Attn: City Recorder  
250 North Main  
Centerville, Utah 84014

Affects Parcel No.: 03-001-0055

**PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT**

For good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the undersigned Grantors, **SCOTT TRUMP AND SUSAN TRUMP**, hereby grant, convey, sell and set over unto **CENTERVILLE CITY**, a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, as Grantee, its successors, assigns, licensees and franchisees, a perpetual right-of-way and easement to lay, maintain, operate, repair, inspect, protect, install, remove and replace public utility structures and facilities, hereinafter called the "Facilities," said right-of-way and easement being situated in Davis County, State of Utah, over and through a parcel of Grantor's land, which easement is more particularly described in **Exhibit A**, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

To have and to hold the same unto said Grantee, its successors and assigns, perpetually, with right of ingress and egress in said Grantee, its officers, employees, agents, contractors and assigns to enter upon the above described property with such equipment as is necessary to install, construct, maintain, operate, repair, inspect, protect, remove and replace said Facilities. During construction periods, Grantee and its contractors may use such portions of the property along and adjacent to said right-of-way and easement as may be reasonably necessary in connection with the construction or repair of the Facilities. The contractor performing the work shall restore all property, through which the work traverses to as near its original condition as is reasonably possible. Grantors shall have the right to use said premises except for the purpose for which the right-of-way and easement is granted to the Grantee, provided such use shall not interfere with the Facilities, or with Grantee's use thereof, or any other rights provided to the Grantee hereunder.

Grantors shall not build or construct, or permit to be built or constructed, any building or other improvement over or across said right-of-way and easement, nor change the contour thereof, without the written consent of Grantee. This right-of-way and easement grant shall run with the land and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Grantors and Grantee and their respective heirs, representatives, successors and assigns.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the Grantors have executed this right-of-way and easement this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.

**“GRANTORS”  
SCOTT TRUMP AND SUSAN TRUMP**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Trump

\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan Trump

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

**STATE OF UTAH**                    )  
                                              :SS  
**COUNTY OF DAVIS**            )

On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015, personally appeared before me **SCOTT TRUMP AND SUSAN TRUMP**, who being by me duly sworn, did acknowledge that they are the owners of the Property referred to in the foregoing instrument and that they executed the same in their individual capacity.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

Residing at:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Accepted for Recordation by Centerville City:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Marsha L. Morrow, City Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Exhibit A

### Legal Description of PUE

A 10.0 ft. Wide Public Utility Easement being entirely on the Left side of the following described boundary:

Beginning at the Southeast Corner of Grantors Property which point is East 1,110.78 ft. (16.83 Chains) and N00°31'E 1,375.44 ft. (20.84 chains) and N89°14'E 571.56 ft. (8.66 chains) from the West Quarter Corner of Section 18, T.2N., R.1E., S.L.B.& M. and running thence North 58.80 ft. along the West Boundary of 400 West Street (a 66.00 ft. wide Road)

Also a 7.0 ft. Wide Public Utility Easement being entirely on the Left side of the following described boundary:

Beginning at a point on the East Boundary of Shaela Park P.U.D. in Centerville, Utah which point is East 1,110.78 ft. (16.83 Chains) and N00°31'E 1,494.24 ft. from the West Quarter Corner of Section 18, T.2N., R.1E., S.L.B.& M. and running thence S00°31'W 118.80 ft. along said East Boundary of Shaela Park P.U.D.; thence N89°14'E 571.56 ft. (8.66 chains) along the South Boundary Grantors Property to a point on the West Boundary of 400 West Street.

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 3.

Short Title: Award bids for Drainage Projects

Initiated By: City Engineer and Public Works Director

Scheduled Time: 7:10

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Award bid to Kapp Construction in the total amount of \$192,068.20 for Bid Schedule A, B and C and to Fusion Pipeline, Inc. in the amount of \$40,185 for Bid Schedule D for the Storm Drain & Subdrain Projects.

Accept bid awards for materials from Old Castle in the amount of \$6,584.95 (with tax) for the concrete pipe and from Western Water Works in the amount of \$2139.27 (with tax) for PVC.

**BACKGROUND**

ESI Engineering and Centerville Public Works received bids for the Storm Dain and Subdrain Projects. See these attachments: 1) email from Kevin Campbell regarding bid awards, including recommendation to revise Bid Schedule A; 2) bid tabulation for all 4 projects; and 3) email from Mike Carlson explaining costs for materials. Project descriptions are provided below.

**(A) Porter Lane and 400 East Storm Drain** -- Replacement of this failed pipe is a priority in the recently updated capital improvement plan (CIP). As mentioned in Kevin Campbell's attached email, the bid amount of \$72,672 from KAPP Construction has been increased to \$88,946.50 due to a decision by Kevin and Randy Randall to realign this drain. This will redirect the flow to avoid aggravating a flooding risk that became apparent during the recent heavy thunderstorm.

**(B) Foxbridge Plat I Subdrain** -- This project is not on the CIP because staff did not become aware of the need to replace this subdrain until earlier this year. A homeowner north of Community Park contacted the City after his basement was flooded twice and he thought it might be caused by a backup in the City's drainage system. Upon investigation, staff discovered a section of subdrain that is severely affected by tree roots in the heavily wooded, undeveloped area just north of the Community Park, east of the Frontage Road swale. The homeowner has submitted a claim for damages from this flooding. The City Engineer solicited bids for three different methods of correcting this problem, as shown on the bid tabulation. The lowest cost method is open cut and replacement with solid pipe that will minimize root infiltration. Although this project is not on the CIP, staff have reviewed that plan and agreed on other projects that can be delayed to accomodate this project.

**(C) Valley Drive Subdrain** -- This is a subdrain relocation that is on the CIP. Maintenance/replacement of the current subdrain is problematic because it is within the backyards of several homes. Staff can explain this situation further at the Council meeting.

**(D) Lund Lane Connection** -- This is the fourth and final segment to complete the new drainage pipe under I-15 and the railroad tracks at Lund Lane. The first segment was bored under the railroad tracks with funding from the Woods PDO developer and the City. The second segment--a bore under I-15--was a partnership between UDOT and the City. The third segment--under the Frontage Road--was constructed by the Woods PDO developer. This left a gap between the east side of I-15 and the Frontage Road, which will be completed with this current project referred to as the "Lund Lane Connection". This is an impact fee eligible project and, therefore, will be funded by the Storm Drain Capital Improvement Fund (storm drain impact fee revenues).

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

- 📎 City Engineer Recommendation re Storm & Subdrain Projects
- 📎 Bid Tabulations - Storm & Subdrain Projects
- 📎 Recommendation for materials for Storm & Subdrain Projects



## Marsha Morrow

---

**From:** kevin campbell <kevin.campbell@esieng.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2015 1:32 PM  
**To:** Steve Thacker  
**Cc:** Marsha Morrow; cody pedersen; Randy Randall; Mike Carlson  
**Subject:** Storm Drain and Sub-drain Projects Bid  
**Attachments:** 14-158\_Bid Tab.pdf; 00 51 00 Notice of Award\_Kapp.pdf; 00 51 00 Notice of Award\_Fusion.pdf; Award Amounts\_Storm and Sub (Kapp).pdf; 14-158\_Sheet04\_rev1.pdf

Steve -

Bids were received on June 23 for the Storm Drain and Sub-drain Replacement Projects. Bids were received from Kapp Construction and Fusion Pipeline, Inc. See attached bid tabulation for bid results.

It is recommended that Bid Schedule A, B, and C be awarded to Kapp Construction in the amount of \$192,068.20.

The recommended award amount for Bid Schedule A has been revised from \$72,672.00 to \$88,946.50 in order to accommodate a revised storm drain alignment down Porter Lane as opposed to the original alignment along 400 East. This revised alignment is recommended by Randy and myself due to recent, localized flooding issues at 300 East and 700 South.

It is recommended that Bid Schedule D be awarded to Fusion Pipeline Inc., in the amount of \$40,185.00.

We have checked references for both contractors.

Let me know if additional information is needed.

Kevin

**Kevin Campbell, P.E.**  
Centerville City Engineer

**Kevin Campbell, P.E.**  
ESI Engineering, Inc  
3500 S. Main St.  
SLC, Ut 84115  
801.263.1752



**STORM AND SUB DRAIN REPLACEMENT PROJECTS - #14-158  
BID TABULATION FOR CENTERVILLE CITY**

Item No.	Description	Amounts	Units	KAPP Construction		Fusion Pipeline Inc.		Engineer's Estimate	
				Unit Price	Total	Unit Price	Total	Unit Price	Total
<b>(A) - Porter Lane and 400 East Storm Drain</b>									
1	Remove and replace curb and gutter	160	LF	\$40.00	\$6,400.00	\$32.00	\$5,120.00	\$20.00	\$3,200.00
2	Sawcut, remove and replace asphalt, 4-in thick or match existing	95	TN	\$172.00	\$16,340.00	\$140.00	\$13,300.00	\$140.00	\$13,300.00
3	Remove exiting CMP culverts and curb inlet/outlet structures	1	LS	\$2,700.00	\$2,700.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$9,500.00	\$9,500.00
4	Install 15-in RCP storm drain	392	LF	\$33.00	\$12,936.00	\$27.75	\$10,878.00	\$25.00	\$9,800.00
5	Install 4-ft dia. concrete manhole	2	EA	\$2,200.00	\$4,400.00	\$2,225.00	\$4,450.00	\$2,500.00	\$5,000.00
6	Install double curb inlet box and grate	2	EA	\$3,310.00	\$6,620.00	\$4,400.00	\$8,800.00	\$3,000.00	\$6,000.00
7	Remove and replace wheelchair ramp	4	EA	\$750.00	\$3,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$10,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$4,000.00
8	Install single curb inlet box and grate	1	EA	\$2,100.00	\$2,100.00	\$2,550.00	\$2,550.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
9	Connect 15-in RCP to existing box	1	LS	\$1,063.00	\$1,063.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$800.00	\$800.00
10	Untreated base course	130	TN	\$13.25	\$1,722.50	\$17.00	\$2,210.00	\$18.00	\$2,340.00
11	Gravel bedding	380	TN	\$14.60	\$5,548.00	\$19.00	\$7,220.00	\$15.00	\$5,700.00
12	Use excavated native material as backfill	105	CY	\$8.50	\$892.50	\$5.00	\$525.00	\$8.00	\$840.00
13	Restore landscaping	1	LS	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$800.00	\$800.00
14	Pothole existing utility	1	EA	\$450.00	\$450.00	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
15	Mobilization	1	LS	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$14,000.00	\$14,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
16	Traffic Control	1	LS	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
<b>Total Base Bid (A)</b>					<del>\$72,672.00</del>		<b>\$89,353.00</b>		<b>\$79,280.00</b>

*88,946.50 (see KC email)*

<b>(B) - Foxbridge Plat I Sub Drain</b>									
<b>Construction Method 1 - Open Cut</b>									
1	Remove and replace curb and gutter	20	LF	\$70.00	\$1,400.00	\$32.00	\$640.00	\$20.00	\$400.00
2	Sawcut, remove and replace asphalt, 4-in thick or match existing	200	SF	\$8.00	\$1,600.00	\$4.00	\$800.00	\$6.00	\$1,200.00
3	Install 8-in PVC SDR-35 sub drain line (solid pipe)	366	LF	\$33.25	\$12,169.50	\$28.00	\$10,248.00	\$18.00	\$6,588.00
4	Furnish and install 4-ft concrete manhole, connect existing drain line	2	EA	\$1,630.00	\$3,260.00	\$4,000.00	\$8,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$5,000.00
5	Plug abandoned sub drain inside manhole with concrete	1	EA	\$755.00	\$755.00	\$950.00	\$950.00	\$450.00	\$450.00
6	Remove and replace sidewalk	48	SF	\$21.00	\$1,008.00	\$8.00	\$384.00	\$10.00	\$480.00
7	Remove and replace gravel driveway	1,200	SF	\$1.00	\$1,200.00	\$3.35	\$4,020.00	\$2.00	\$2,400.00
8	Remove and replace fence and gate	100	LF	\$11.00	\$1,100.00	\$34.00	\$3,400.00	\$12.00	\$1,200.00
9	Remove and replace asphalt path	100	SF	\$10.00	\$1,000.00	\$4.00	\$400.00	\$4.00	\$400.00
10	Remove existing tree 5-in to 12-in diameter	5	EA	\$365.00	\$1,825.00	\$300.00	\$1,500.00	\$350.00	\$1,750.00
11	Remove existing tree 12-in to 20-in diameter	4	EA	\$1,300.00	\$5,200.00	\$500.00	\$2,000.00	\$500.00	\$2,000.00

Item No.	Description	Amounts	Units	KAPP Construction		Fusion Pipeline Inc.		Engineer's Estimate	
				Unit Price	Total	Unit Price	Total	Unit Price	Total
12	Clear and grub along sub drain alignment	1	LS	\$2,925.00	\$2,925.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
13	Untreated base course	12	TN	\$16.60	\$199.20	\$17.00	\$204.00	\$20.00	\$240.00
14	Gravel bedding	100	TN	\$14.60	\$1,460.00	\$19.00	\$1,900.00	\$15.00	\$1,500.00
15	Excavate, stockpile and backfill with granular native material, including compaction	400	CY	\$10.55	\$4,220.00	\$5.00	\$2,000.00	\$8.00	\$3,200.00
16	Restore landscaping	1	LS	\$5,675.00	\$5,675.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
17	Protect existing utilities in place, including residential power box	1	LS	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$700.00	\$700.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
18	Mobilization and traffic control	1	LS	\$3,550.00	\$3,550.00	\$13,400.00	\$13,400.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
<b>Total Base Bid (B) Method 1</b>					<b>\$49,046.70</b>		<b>\$59,546.00</b>		<b>\$43,308.00</b>

(B) - Foxbridge Plat I Sub Drain									
Construction Method 2 - Pipe Burst									
1	Remove and replace curb and gutter	20	LF			\$32.00	\$640.00	\$20.00	\$400.00
2	Sawcut, remove and replace asphalt, 4-in thick or match existing	400	SF			\$4.00	\$1,600.00	\$6.00	\$2,400.00
3	Install 8-in PVC SDR-35 sub drain line (solid pipe)	175	LF			\$25.00	\$4,375.00	\$18.00	\$3,150.00
4	Furnish and install 4-ft concrete manhole, connect existing drain line	3	EA			\$400.00	\$1,200.00	\$2,500.00	\$7,500.00
5	Plug abandoned sub drain	1	EA			\$950.00	\$950.00	\$450.00	\$450.00
6	Remove and replace sidewalk	48	SF			\$8.00	\$384.00	\$10.00	\$480.00
7	Remove and replace asphalt path	100	SF			\$4.00	\$400.00	\$4.00	\$400.00
8	Remove existing tree 5-in to 12-in diameter	4	EA			\$300.00	\$1,200.00	\$350.00	\$1,400.00
9	Remove existing tree 12-in to 20-in diameter	3	EA			\$500.00	\$1,500.00	\$500.00	\$1,500.00
10	Clear and grub along sub drain alignment	1	LS			\$2,750.00	\$2,750.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
11	Untreated base course	20	TN			\$17.00	\$340.00	\$20.00	\$400.00
12	Gravel bedding	40	TN			\$19.00	\$760.00	\$15.00	\$600.00
13	Excavate, stockpile and backfill with granular native material, including compaction	150	CY			\$5.00	\$750.00	\$8.00	\$1,200.00
14	Restore landscaping	1	LS			\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
15	Protect existing utilities in place, including residential power box	1	LS			\$700.00	\$700.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
16	Mobilization and traffic control	1	LS			\$13,400.00	\$13,400.00	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00
17	Pipe burst existing 8-in PVC with 8-in HDPE	250	LF			\$72.00	\$18,000.00	\$75.00	\$18,750.00
<b>Total Base Bid (B) Method 2</b>							<b>\$52,449.00</b>		<b>\$57,130.00</b>

Item No.	Description	Amounts	Units	KAPP Construction		Fusion Pipeline Inc.		Engineer's Estimate	
				Unit Price	Total	Unit Price	Total	Unit Price	Total
<b>(B) - Foxbridge Plat I Sub Drain</b>									
<b>Construction Method 3 - Directional Drill</b>									
1	Remove and replace curb and gutter	20	LF			\$32.00	\$640.00	\$20.00	\$400.00
2	Sawcut, remove and replace asphalt, 4-in thick or match existing	400	SF			\$4.00	\$1,600.00	\$6.00	\$2,400.00
3	Directional drill 8-in HDPE sub drain line	366	LF			\$72.00	\$26,352.00	\$100.00	\$36,600.00
4	Furnish and install 4-ft concrete manhole, connect existing drain line	2	EA			\$4,000.00	\$8,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$5,000.00
5	Remove and replace sidewalk	48	SF			\$8.00	\$384.00	\$10.00	\$480.00
6	Remove and replace asphalt path	100	SF			\$4.00	\$400.00	\$4.00	\$400.00
7	Untreated base course	20	TN			\$17.00	\$340.00	\$20.00	\$400.00
8	Gravel bedding	25	TN			\$19.00	\$475.00	\$15.00	\$375.00
9	Excavate, stockpile and backfill with granular native material, including compaction	150	CY			\$5.00	\$750.00	\$8.00	\$1,200.00
10	Restore landscaping	1	LS			\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
11	Protect existing utilities in place, including residential power box	1	LS			\$700.00	\$700.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
12	Mobilization and traffic control	1	LS			\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
13	Remove and replace survey monument	1	EA			\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
<b>Total Base Bid (B) Method 3</b>							<b>\$57,141.00</b>		<b>\$62,255.00</b>

<b>(C) - Valley Drive Sub Drain</b>									
1	Sawcut, remove and replace asphalt, 4-in thick or match existing	45	TN	\$193.00	\$8,685.00	\$140.00	\$6,300.00	\$140.00	\$6,300.00
2	Install 8-in PVC SDR-35 perforated drain pipe, including fabric and gravel envelope	280	LF	\$48.75	\$13,650.00	\$42.00	\$11,760.00	\$30.00	\$8,400.00
3	Install 4-ft concrete manhole, connect existing sub drain where applicable	2	EA	\$3,319.00	\$6,638.00	\$3,400.00	\$6,800.00	\$2,500.00	\$5,000.00
4	Furnish and Install 6-in valve	1	EA	\$1,595.00	\$1,595.00	\$1,300.00	\$1,300.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
5	Raise valve to grade with concrete collar	1	EA	\$385.00	\$385.00	\$350.00	\$350.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
6	Raise manhole to grade with concrete collar	4	EA	\$385.00	\$1,540.00	\$450.00	\$1,800.00	\$500.00	\$2,000.00
7	Shore deep and narrow trench, approximately 10-ft deep, 5-ft wide	1	LS	\$1,100.00	\$1,100.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
8	Install 4-ft x 4-ft x 1-ft thick clay flow barrier	1	LS	\$550.00	\$550.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
9	Install 3-ft concrete manhole, connect existing sub drain where applicable	2	EA	\$3,210.00	\$6,420.00	\$3,400.00	\$6,800.00	\$2,500.00	\$5,000.00
10	Plug existing sub drain line on outside edge of manhole, including excavation and asphalt patch	1	LS	\$3,825.00	\$3,825.00	\$950.00	\$950.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
11	Untreated base course	60	TN	\$16.60	\$996.00	\$17.00	\$1,020.00	\$20.00	\$1,200.00
12	Gravel bedding	35	TN	\$14.60	\$511.00	\$19.00	\$665.00	\$15.00	\$525.00
13	Use excavated native material as backfill	135	CY	\$8.00	\$1,080.00	\$5.00	\$675.00	\$10.00	\$1,350.00
14	Pot hole existing utility	2	EA	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$300.00	\$600.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00
15	Mobilization and Traffic control	1	LS	\$5,100.00	\$5,100.00	\$13,400.00	\$13,400.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00
<b>Total Base Bid (C)</b>					<b>\$54,075.00</b>		<b>\$56,920.00</b>		<b>\$55,675.00</b>

				KAPP Construction		Fusion Pipeline Inc.		Engineer's Estimate	
Item No.	Description	Amounts	Units	Unit Price	Total	Unit Price	Total	Unit Price	Total
<b>(D) - Lund Lane Connection</b>									
1	Install 42-in Steel (9/16-in thick) storm drain	20	LF			\$500.00	\$10,000.00	\$300.00	\$6,000.00
2	Install catch basin and grate, connect existing and new storm drain system	1	EA			\$5,500.00	\$5,500.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
3	Core existing manhole and connect 42" Steel storm drain	1	LS			\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
4	Loop existing fiber utility lines as needed	2	EA			\$2,500.00	\$5,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$14,000.00
5	Install concrete pipe supports to protect Weber Basin 24-in PVC irrigation line	1	LS			\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00
6	Plug existing 24" ADS connected to existing system	1	LS			\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
7	Gravel bedding	15	TN			\$19.00	\$285.00	\$20.00	\$300.00
8	Excavate, stockpile and backfill with granular native material, including compaction	20	CY			\$5.00	\$100.00	\$10.00	\$200.00
9	Mobilization and Traffic control	1	LS			\$10,800.00	\$10,800.00	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00
<b>Total Base Bid (C)</b>							<b>\$40,185.00</b>		<b>\$42,000.00</b>

SUMMARY			
	KAPP Construction	Fusion Pipeline Inc.	Engineer's Estimate
<b>Porter Lane and 400 East Storm Drain - Total Bid (A)</b>	\$72,672.00	\$89,353.00	\$79,280.00
<b>Foxbridge Plat I Sub Drain -Total Bid (B) - Open Cut</b>	\$49,046.70	\$59,546.00	\$43,308.00
<b>Total Bid (B) - Pipe Burst</b>	-	\$52,449.00	\$57,130.00
<b>Total Bid (B) - Directional Drill</b>	-	\$57,141.00	\$62,255.00
<b>Valley Drive Sub Drain - Total Bid (C)</b>	\$54,075.00	\$56,920.00	\$55,675.00
<b>Lund Lane Connection - Total Bid (D)</b>	-	\$40,185.00	\$42,000.00

## Marsha Morrow

---

**From:** Mike Carlson  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2015 11:41 AM  
**To:** Steve Thacker; Marsha Morrow; kevin campbell; cody pedersen (cody.pedersen@esieng.com)  
**Subject:** Revised bid 7/17/15

### For the Concrete pipe 15" RCP (price per foot) Project 14-158

#### Oldcastle

\$10.85 per foot, Quote good for 30 Days, Total \$6584.95 with tax. This includes the add on footages by ESI

#### Geneva Pipe

\$11.20, Quote good for 30 Days, Total \$6797.34with tax. This includes the add on footages by ESI

### For the 8" PVC SDR 35 (price per foot)

#### Western Water Works

\$3.10 per foot

Bid did not say how long the price was good.

#### Ferguson

\$3.15 per foot

#### HD Supply

\$3.27 per foot Must be order be 7/30/15 and Shipped by 8/30/15

#### Mountain States

\$3.50 per foot

All the above are without tax.

### Price break out for each Job.

- (A) Porter lane and 400 East storm drain \$6854.95 with tax. (concrete)
- (B) Fox bridge Plat I sub-drain Method 1 Open Cut \$1211.81 with tax. (PVC)  
Fox bridge Plat I sub-drain Method 2 Pipe Burst \$579.66 with tax. (PVC)
- (C)Valley Drive and 400 West Sub-Drain \$927.46 with tax. (PVC)

We have reviewed the bids for materials from Western Water Works and Oldcastle and found that they meet all specifications. We recommend awarding these bids to:

**Oldcastle** for \$6584.95 for the concrete pipe.

**Western Water Work** price pending which way City council decides to go, but has the low price of 3.10 per foot plus tax.

Sincerely Mike Carlson

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 4.

Short Title: Authorize city services relating to Stage 3 of the Tour of Utah event on August 5

Initiated By: County Commission/Davis County mayors

Scheduled Time: 7:20

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Authorize the use of City employees and some expenditures to support Stage 3 of the Tour of Utah event.

**BACKGROUND**

Davis County has been chosen as a venue to host Stage 3 of the 2015 Tour of Utah, a multi-stage cycling race across the State of Utah. The Tour of Utah is administered by Cycling Partnership, Inc., a Utah corporation. Davis County has agreed to host Stage 3 of the Tour of Utah which will occur on August 5, 2015. Stage 3 of the Tour will ride through the entire length of Centerville City on Main Street. Davis County has asked Centerville City to assist the County by providing services for that portion of Stage 3 that will ride through our City. This involves Police, Public Works and Parks employees, and other volunteers, to close off all the intersections at Main Street for a brief period on the afternoon of August 5. There is also an expectation that the City will inspect the condition of Main Street in advance and sweep it as needed to minimize hazards to the racers.

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 5.

Short Title: Open & Public Meetings Training by City Attorney

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time: 7:30

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

The City Attorney will provide the required annual training on the Utah Open & Public Meetings Act.

**BACKGROUND**



**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 6.

Short Title: Mayor's Report

Initiated By: Mayor Cutler

Scheduled Time: 7:45

**SUBJECT**

a. Fire Agency

**RECOMMENDATION**

Mayor Cutler may update the Council on the process for considering the creation of a special service area and local district to fund capital needs of the Fire Agency. A portion of the Fire Agency's latest monthly report is also attached.

**BACKGROUND**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

- ☐ Fire Agency Monthly Report

# SOUTH DAVIS METRO FIRE AGENCY

June 30, 2015

## FINANCIAL REPORT

	<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
1.	Cash Position	1
2.	Impact Fees Collected	2
3.	Board of Directors Financial Summary	3
4.	Financial Statements Detail	4

## South Davis Metro Fire Agency

### Cash Position by Fund and in Total

Funds								
Month	General	Grant	Public Training	Capital Reserve	Debt Service	Debt Reserve	Total	St Treas Int. Rate
June	1,575,733	39,879	29,182	559,135	207,903	269,000	2,680,832	0.5610%
May	1,979,523	39,879	28,687	541,609	200,131	269,000	3,058,829	0.5558%
Apr	1,643,529	39,879	26,855	785,828	169,171	269,000	2,934,262	0.5475%
Mar	1,748,266	39,879	26,583	858,664	168,967	269,000	3,111,358	0.5294%
Feb	2,142,251	39,879	30,185	723,979	155,089	269,000	3,360,383	0.5184%
Jan-15	2,323,799	39,879	30,285	706,482	147,584	269,000	3,517,028	0.5073%
Dec	1,913,763	39,879	29,542	688,917	141,605	269,000	3,082,706	0.5078%
Nov	1,783,921	39,879	28,258	721,355	133,377	269,000	2,975,790	0.5071%
Oct	2,097,865	39,879	25,941	704,070	110,116	269,000	3,246,870	0.4850%
Sep	1,305,145	39,879	29,148	707,771	(36,465)	269,000	2,314,478	0.4767%
Aug	1,874,107	39,879	29,691	698,743	232,777	269,000	3,144,197	0.4699%
July	2,108,885	39,879	29,242	684,890	217,357	269,000	3,349,253	0.4693%
June	1,491,903	23,698	29,335	672,178	203,132	269,000	2,689,246	0.4799%
May	1,820,686	30,971	28,565	1,223,223	194,481	269,000	3,566,927	0.4879%
Apr	2,217,866	30,971	28,391	1,205,793	156,309	269,000	3,908,330	0.4992%
Mar	1,451,650	30,971	27,721	1,188,356	149,354	269,000	3,117,052	0.5023%
Feb	1,909,545	11,966	28,628	1,170,809	135,806	269,000	3,525,754	0.5070%
Jan-14	2,288,411	11,966	27,126	1,177,037	135,669	269,000	3,909,209	0.5074%
Dec	1,997,356	19,971	26,470	735,830	127,300	269,000	3,175,928	0.5103%
Nov	1,827,008	19,971	26,444	768,166	109,582	269,000	3,020,171	0.5150%
Oct	1,500,545	34,971	25,328	730,937	47,884	269,000	2,608,665	0.5143%
Sep	1,389,813	34,971	26,826	893,773	38,844	269,000	2,653,227	0.5125%
Aug	1,702,676	34,971	25,776	879,878	294,743	269,000	3,207,045	0.4962%
Jul	2,069,176	34,971	26,643	862,694	257,162	269,000	3,519,646	0.5115%
Jun	1,330,839	34,971	26,025	849,929	229,257	269,000	2,740,021	0.5046%
May	1,720,150	33,521	25,859	845,327	223,139	269,000	3,116,996	0.4902%
Apr	2,155,452	33,521	25,567	1,009,390	215,946	269,000	3,708,876	0.5295%
Mar	1,422,662	24,255	25,482	1,036,059	192,908	269,000	2,970,365	0.5740%
Feb	1,845,411	23,726	25,465	1,145,025	160,789	269,000	3,469,416	0.6120%
Jan-13	2,113,161	23,726	25,112	1,133,500	158,018	269,000	3,722,517	0.6499%
Dec	1,348,824	23,726	25,013	1,115,562	123,097	269,000	2,905,222	0.6908%
Nov	1,340,315	3,726	23,661	790,820	117,303	269,000	2,544,825	0.7235%
Oct	1,871,207	4,506	25,302	769,080	117,082	269,000	3,056,177	0.7484%
Sep	1,293,523	4,506	27,315	751,350	91,014	269,000	2,436,708	0.7784%
Aug	1,440,923	15,189	27,269	909,275	345,477	269,000	3,007,133	0.7791%
Jul	1,897,454	15,189	26,966	891,076	340,430	269,000	3,440,115	0.7877%
Jun	969,247	6,673	26,308	876,826	327,975	269,000	2,476,029	0.7894%
May	1,345,892	2,025	25,727	889,796	341,080	255,526	2,860,046	0.7917%
Apr	1,735,534	5,802	24,900	870,617	300,224	251,608	3,188,685	0.7941%
Mar	1,029,061	1,250	25,036	852,728	285,647	247,697	2,441,419	0.7937%
Feb	1,332,353	(944)	24,304	993,849	286,108	243,783	2,879,453	0.7950%
Jan-12	1,016,551	(944)	24,324	987,347	289,265	239,883	2,556,426	0.7496%
Dec	1,001,809	(7,523)	24,414	969,503	226,971	235,984	2,451,158	0.7190%
Nov	1,025,724	8,794	20,722	740,643	227,857	232,094	2,255,834	0.6790%
Oct	1,375,654	900	21,963	729,100	229,112	228,218	2,584,947	0.6336%
Sep	632,884	6,350	23,518	584,703	183,807	224,344	1,655,606	0.5961%
Aug	1,162,381	8,392	24,875	550,405	456,971	220,493	2,423,517	0.5577%
Jul	1,074,863	4,953	24,367	533,055	454,834	216,643	2,308,715	0.5455%
Jun	665,639	(86)	24,297	516,227	443,850	212,797	1,862,724	0.5463%
May	1,048,915	4,989	23,944	502,121	446,658	208,955	2,235,582	0.5374%
Apr	1,041,509	4,989	24,799	485,282	447,105	205,114	2,208,798	0.5362%
Mar	813,265	(400)	24,334	476,708	445,523	201,277	1,960,707	0.5173%
Feb	1,214,116	(3,896)	24,185	458,659	446,786	197,443	2,337,293	0.4900%
Jan-11	1,561,835	5,314	23,240	291,577	448,447	193,623	2,524,036	0.4878%
Dec	798,668	1,714	23,563	274,694	435,345	189,797	1,723,781	0.4880%
Nov	745,200	10,519	31,010	131,139	435,578	185,973	1,539,419	0.4946%
Oct	1,109,180	10,519	33,516	120,901	433,758	182,152	1,890,026	0.5160%
Sep	567,904	9,519	33,164	102,415	433,707	178,326	1,325,035	0.5622%
Aug	941,612	9,519	32,931	85,586	705,040	174,497	1,949,185	0.5851%
Jul	1,112,263	12,593	32,846	48,023	708,453	170,665	2,084,843	0.5989%
Jun	499,203	12,593	32,410	30,622	702,619	166,832	1,444,279	0.5955%
May	904,648	7,023	32,133	12,289	705,690	163,004	1,824,787	0.5833%
Apr	1,325,601	7,023	31,605	705,265	704,950	159,177	2,933,621	0.5649%
Mar	729,360	11,352	32,112	683,479	695,107	155,358	2,306,768	0.5605%
Feb	1,082,385	11,352	31,862	725,051	752,282	151,538	2,754,470	0.5180%
Jan-10	1,444,384	11,952	33,755	707,707	743,799	147,727	3,089,324	0.5922%

SOUTH DAVIS METRO FIRE AGENCY							
IMPACT FEES COLLECTED							
DATE BELOW							
DATE	CENTERVILLE	DAVIS COUNTY	NORTH SALT LAKE	WEST BOUNTIFUL	WOODS CROSS	TOTAL REVENUE	TOTAL FOR THE YEAR
2004-4 Mos	716.00	-	38,593.68	3,402.00	4,158.00	46,869.68	
2005	44,124.66	-	160,858.93	65,640.10	33,128.24	303,751.93	
2006	67,908.61	-	203,896.39	16,793.12	10,156.80	298,754.92	
2007	39,666.50	263.47	118,685.88	52,937.65	65,296.28	276,849.78	
2008	20,118.60	-	95,684.71	5,275.78	10,142.74	131,221.83	
2009	8,231.81	-	73,623.57	3,507.38	41,737.05	127,099.81	
2010	26,063.64	-	24,968.28	2,337.92	18,292.00	71,661.84	
2011	49,665.03	-	30,643.20	3,896.38	16,894.44	101,099.05	
2012	34,245.82	-	90,356.64	12,653.19	41,196.00	178,451.65	
2013	37,542.04	-	155,267.66	9,633.00	25,231.02	227,673.72	
2014	11,095.04	13,990.00	205,859.07	5,179.00	50,727.58	286,850.69	
1/31/15	-	-	-	-	-	-	
2/28/15	-	-	-	-	-	-	
3/31/15	-	-	13,494.75	-	-	13,494.75	
4/30/15	-	-	-	-	-	-	
5/31/15	942.00	-	26,498.98	1,327.00	1,985.10	30,753.08	
6/30/15	-	-	7,569.38	-	-	7,569.38	
7/31/15						-	
8/31/15						-	
9/30/15						-	
10/31/15						-	
11/30/15						-	
12/31/15						-	51,817.21
TOTAL	340,319.75	14,253.47	1,246,001.12	182,582.52	318,945.25	2,102,102.11	Down
						2,102,102.11	Across

**South Davis Metro Fire Agency**  
**Board of Directors Financial Summary Year 2015**  
**June 30, 2015**

50% of the year expired

Line No.	Fund	YTD 2015	Annual Budget	Budget	Page No.	Comments
----------	------	----------	---------------	--------	----------	----------

**\*\*\*\*\* General Fund 10\*\*\*\*\***

Revenue						
1	Property Taxes-PM Funding	334,353	668,705	50%	7	
2	Intergovernmental Revenue-Cities & Co.	2,657,413	5,500,403	48%	7	
3	Ambulance & PM Fees-Net	1,039,622	1,885,000	55%	7	
4	All Other General Fund Revenue	2,385	8,000	30%	7	
5	Total Revenue	4,033,773	8,062,108	50%		
Expenditures by Division						
6	Operations	3,188,010	6,804,956	47%	8	
7	Logistics	187,306	447,115	42%	9	
8	Communications	171,558	401,037	43%	9	
9	Fire Prevention	2,147	16,250	13%	9	
10	Training	23,711	57,950	41%	10	
11	Emergency Medical Services	79,278	134,800	59%	10	
12	Transfer to Capital Reserve Fund	100,000	200,000	50%	10	
13	Total Expenditures	3,752,011	8,062,108	47%		
14	Revenues Over/(Under) Expendtrs Before	281,762	-	0%		
15	Transfer to Capital Reserve Fund	300,000	-	0%		
16	Depreciation & Loss on Fixed Assets Sold	164,058	350,000	47%	10	
17	Net Revenues Over/(Under) Expendtrs	(182,296)	(350,000)	52%		

**\*\*\*\*\* Other Funds\*\*\*\*\***

Grant Fund 21						
1	Revenues	-	-	0%		
2	Fund Balance Appropriation/(Addition)	-	-	0%		
3	Expenditures	-	-	0%		
4	Revenues Over/(Under) Expendtrs	-	-	0%		
Public Training Fund 22						
5	Revenues	6,985	5,850	119%	13	
6	Fund Balance Appropriation/(Addition)	-	-	0%	13	
7	Expenditures	7,873	5,850	135%	13	
8	Revenues Over/(Under) Expendtrs	(887)	-	0%		
Capital Reserve Fund 45						
9	Revenues and Transfers	405,310	208,400	194%	15	
10	Fund Balance Appropriation/(Addition)	260,800	521,600	50%	15	
11	Expenditures	535,757	730,000	73%	15	
12	Revenues Over/(Under) Expendtrs	130,353	-	0%		
SDFD Equity Fund 70						
13	Revenues	-	-	0%	16	
14	Fund Balance Appropriation/(Addition)	69,000	138,000	50%	16	
15	Expenditures	63,318	138,000	46%	16	
16	Revenues Over/(Under) Expendtrs	5,682	0	0%		
Debt Service Fund 72 & 73						
17	Revenues	53,017	151,500	35%	19	
18	Fund Balance Appropriation/(Addition)	58,890	117,780	50%	19	
19	Expenditures	70,700	269,280	26%	19	
20	Revenues Over/(Under) Expendtrs	41,207	0	0%		



# South Davis Metro Fire Agency June 2015

Fire Response Summary by NFIRS Incident Type Codes

Overall Response Time: 6:54  
Fire Response Time: 6:27

Fire Calls	False Calls	Rescue/EMS	Good Intent	Hazard Cond.	Explosion/Overpressure	Service Call	Special Incid.	Weather Inc.	Totals
0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	5
3	11	37	3	1	1	8	0	0	64
0	2	11	5	0	0	1	0	0	19
5	1	38	2	3	0	1	0	0	50
5	16	55	10	4	0	1	0	0	91
2	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	8
7	24	238	25	6	0	16	0	0	316
1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
<b>23</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>556</b>

Davis County  
Centerville  
West Bountiful  
Woods Cross  
North Salt Lake  
Farmington  
Bountiful  
SLC & Other

Totals:

**Responses by Station:**  
 ST81: 164 29%  
 ST82: 84 15%  
 ST83: 136 24%  
 ST84: 63 11%  
 ST85: 109 20%

**Responses by Unit:**  
 801 5 802 2  
 803 0 BC81 49  
 EN82 18 ME82 63  
 EN83 19 ME83 0  
 EN84 6 EN85 52  
 MD82 59 MD83 104  
 TK81 64 TK85 0  
 HZ85 0 HR81 0

**Total Dollar Loss:** \$97,520  
 Davis County: \$0  
 Centerville: \$2,800  
 W. Bountiful: \$0  
 Woods Cross: \$2,300  
 North Salt Lake: \$65,920  
 Bountiful: \$6,500  
 SLC/County \$0

**Mutual/Auto Aid Report:**  
 Aid Received: 1  
 SLDFD: 3  
 Aid Given: 4  
 FCFD: 3  
 SLCFD: 1

556 TOTAL INCIDENTS  
 571 May 2015  
 3320 YEAR TO DATE

Average Staff on an Incident: 4



# South Davis Metro Fire Agency

## EMS Summary June 2015 Average EMS Response Time: 5:42

### Ambulance Transports

Transport to Emergency Dept by EMT:	153	Last Month	154
Transport to Emergency Dept by Paramedic:	125	Last Month	140

### No Ambulance Transports

DOA at Scene:	5
Evaluated and Released Against Med Advice:	21
Evaluated and Released With Med Advice:	71
Transported by Air	2
Transported by other EMS agency	0
No Treatment Given	0
Refused Medical Care:	8

**Total Patient Contact: 385                      Last Month: 411                      Patients to Date: 2283**

### Patients Transported by District

#### ALS and BLS

DISTRICT	BLS	ALS	AIR
Davis County:	1	0	0
Centerville:	8	18	0
West Bountiful:	5	2	0
Woods Cross:	8	14	1
North Salt Lake:	15	19	0
Farmington:	1	0	0
Bountiful:	115	72	0
SLC/Other:	0	0	0

### EMS Patients by District

Davis County:	1	100% Transported
Centerville:	36	72% Transported
West Bountiful:	11	63% Transported
Woods Cross:	36	63% Transported
North Salt Lake:	59	55% Transported
Farmington	5	20% Transported
Bountiful:	236	79% Transported
SLC/Other:	0	0% Transported

**Total EMS Calls: 376                      Last Month: 406                      EMS Calls to Date: 2245**  
**Total Patient Transports: 278                      Last Month: 294                      Transports to Date: 1655**

72% of patients in June were transported to the Hospital.

Transport percentage is up 1% since May 2015. 72% of all patients are transported year to date.

### EMS Responses by Unit

A811	0	AM81	167	AM82	34
AM83	80	AM84	64	AM85	102
AM855	6	MD82	59	ME82	63
MD83	104				

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 7.

Short Title: City Manager's Report

Initiated By: City Manager

Scheduled Time: 7:50

**SUBJECT**

- a. Request for direction re Planning Commission compensation
- b. Invitation to submit RAP Tax arguments
- c. Pedestrian bridge & fencing update
- d. Extension of 1250 West
- e. Police Chief retirement open house

**RECOMMENDATION**

The City Manager will seek direction as to whether to bring back a resolution providing for compensation for Planning Commissioners who attend training sessions. He will also report on the other topics shown on the agenda. The announcement of the Police Chief's retirement open house is attached. Near the end of that open house, Paul Child will be sworn in as the new Police Chief.

**BACKGROUND**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

- Police Chief Retirement Open House



# Centerville Police Department



**Chief Neal Worsley  
is retiring!**



**Please join us on August 7<sup>th</sup> from 3:30 – 5:30pm  
in the city council room for an open house  
in honor of Chief Worsley  
and his 31 years of distinguished service  
with the Centerville Police Department  
Presentations begin at 4:30**

**Light refreshments will be served**

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 8.

Short Title: Miscellaneous Business

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time: 8:05

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**BACKGROUND**

No matters are shown at this time under this heading.

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 9.

Short Title: Closed meeting, if necessary, for reasons allowed by state law, including, but not limited to, the provisions of Section 52-4-205 of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, and for attorney-client matters that are privileged pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 78B-1-137, as amended

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time: 8:05

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

At this time staff are not aware of a need for a closed meeting, but the agenda allows for that possibility.

**BACKGROUND**

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No. 10.

Short Title: Possible action following closed meeting, including appointments to boards and committees

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time: 8:05

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Mayor Cutler may recommend appointments to City boards/committees.

**BACKGROUND**

**CENTERVILLE  
CITY COUNCIL  
Staff Backup Report  
7/21/2015**

Item No.

Short Title: Items of Interest (i.e., newspaper articles, items not on agenda); Posted in-meeting information

Initiated By:

Scheduled Time:

**SUBJECT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**BACKGROUND**