

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
8:30 A.M. RETREAT WORK SESSION
June 9, 2023

Davis County Memorial Courthouse
28 East State Street, Room 211
Farmington, Utah

PRESIDING: Mayor Mark Shepherd

PRESENT: Councilmember Kent Bush, Councilmember Nike Peterson, Councilmember Tim Roper, Councilmember Karece Thompson

ABSENT: Councilmember Vern Phipps

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager Summer Palmer, City Attorney Stuart Williams, Police Chief Kelly Bennett, Assistant Police Chief Devin Rogers, Deputy Public Works Director Braden Felix, Utility Superintendent Kenny England, Parks and Open Spaces Manager Ben Frye, Streets/Fleet Supervisor Brad Wheeler, Community Services Director Eric Howes, Aquatic Center Manager Clint Warnick, Community Development Director Spencer Brimley, Finance Manager Rich Knapp, Communications Manager Shaundra Rushton, City Recorder Nancy Dean, Deputy City Recorder Chersty Titensor.

VISITORS: Judge Brian Brower

JJ Allen, City Manager, convened the meeting at 8:55 a.m.

County Commissioner, Randy Elliott, welcomed the Council to the County Courthouse and provided historical information about the building.

FUTURE PLANNING AND REVIEW OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLANS BY CITY COUNCIL

Facilities & Parks Capital Projects

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, presented information concerning the facilities and parks projects.

Clearfield Aquatic and Fitness Center (CAFC) Roof Replacement

Mr. Howes informed the Council that the original budgeted amount for the project increased from \$350,000 to replace the membrane to \$1.5M to replace everything due to issues found that had been created during the installation of the original roof. He explained the damage had been created due to the condensation of the pool and the lack of a vapor barrier being installed. He explained the work required to correctly address the moisture situation. Mr. Howes presented three

solutions to the problem:

- Eliminate Planned Projects to cover the costs,
- Use General Fund Balance to cover \$1.15M shortfall, or
- Combination of the two above mentioned approaches.

He presented the department's list of future projects, highlighting projects whose funds had already been committed. He pointed out the projects that could be delayed saving approximately \$1.5M. Mr. Allen asked if economic factors suggested a recession could be looming and whether the project could be delayed anticipating that construction costs might decrease. Mr. Howes informed him that the aquatic center roof leaked inside every time it rained outside and that the construction would take a considerable amount of time to complete and if the project were delayed any longer the conditions would continue for the entire winter, which was not an option. His preference was to delay the other projects.

Mayor Shepherd asked how this would impact the fund balance if the amount were to be pulled to cover the shortfall. Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, explained that each 1% was a reduction of \$222,000 and it would be a 5.2% reduction in the fund balance reducing it to 15.8% which was the lowest percentage the City had ever done. Mr. Howes thought a combination of delaying projects and utilizing part of the General Fund balance was the most realistic option. Councilmember Peterson asked if the City anticipated any negative impact by delaying the projects he had suggested. Mr. Howes brought up the purchase of a lift for the CAFC and explained they had been renting a lift to change the lights above the pool in the aquatic center since it opened, but explained it was not critical. He then gave an explanation of the increased vandalism occurring in the public restrooms at Island View Park where they had wanted to install electronic locks – he hated to see that get delayed. Benji Frye, Parks & Open Space Manager, brought up the repeated requests from patrons for lighting at the Bicentennial Park parking lot lights by the amphitheater. He thought the other projects could wait a year. Clint Warnick, CAFC Manager, pointed out that the current turnstile system could let in patrons that hadn't paid, but didn't think it was \$50,000 worth. Mr. Howes pointed out these were issues the staff had been dealing with and could continue to do so. The roof was an immediate concern because it could create new issues.

Regarding the prisoner elevator replacement at City Hall, which was already committed to, Mr. Allen asked if that would provide spare parts to keep the dual elevators in the lobby functioning. Mr. Howes confirmed that it would and informed the Council that the dual elevator at City Hall would need to be completed at the same time. Councilmember Peterson was concerned about the vandalism and the need for electronic locks for the public restrooms and wondered if it was a project that should be pushed through due to the amount of staff time and materials spent to keep things fixed if the problem was so prevalent. Mr. Howes said that was one project that could stay on the list considering they had saved \$20,000 on the stucco work at City Hall. Mayor Shepherd questioned whether the locks would prevent any vandalism since they were kicking in the doors. Mr. Howes said a lot of the damage was being done after hours and was a day-to-day event for the last couple of weeks. Councilmember Peterson asked if there were cameras in the area. Mr. Howes wasn't sure if the camera system was functioning. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion that they should delay the projects to get the roof fixed. There appeared to be a consensus that all projects not highlighted would be pushed to future years except the electronic locks for restroom and the General Fund balance would not be used.

200 South Well/Mabey Pond Water Supply

Mr. Howes gave a report on the efforts to increase the water level at Mabey Pond. He anticipated at the current rate; the pond would be full in January 2024. Mr. Howes recommended the City install a surface mounted vertical shaft pump which would cost between \$92k-\$100k. He said once the new pump was delivered, and they had a replacement on hand he would feel more comfortable ramping up the current pumping speed. He was reasonably confident that they would be okay. Mr. Allen feared the current pump would break down and there was no backup. Councilmember Peterson said the City had just insisted that the developers of Lakeside Square invest in that area, so the City should show it was matching the developer's investment level. Mr. Howes explained the advantages of a surface-level pump. Mr. Allen recommended waiting to see how things progressed with FY24 budget and evaluate whether it could be purchased with a budget amendment. Mr. Howes thought they had time to wait.

Interchange Landscaping

Mr. Howes explained the setbacks he had experienced in the approval process for the interchange landscaping plans with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). UDOT spread their approvals out through the design process and required another approval once the City had obtained 60% design completion. Mr. Howes thought they would be at 60% design completion shortly and then it would take about an additional month to go from 60% – 90% design work. He thought best case scenario was the City would get approval in late September at which time staff could request bids, but at the current rate it would be about a year behind schedule. He said staff was currently trying to identify utility locations and water connections. He said the biggest delay was the approval process through UDOT.

Capital Projects Planning Process

Mr. Howes reviewed the process his department implemented for establishing the Capital Projects List. He let the Council know the list was reviewed annually in October. He proposed that after the Community Services Department reviewed the list each year, staff could present its findings to the Council in a work session to receive the Council's input. He said the main goal was for Council to be able to review the priority list before budget discussions began. He showed the Council the list of projects and the anticipated date it would be started. Mr. Allen asked the Council if they had any feedback for staff after having reviewed the list. Councilmember Roper recognized the capital projects would take time. Councilmember Peterson thought the list was amazing and didn't have concerns but wanted to clarify her previous comments that brought about the review process with the City Council he was proposing. She said her comment was a general commentary on the budgeting process. She continued that the Council was bypassed in the budgeting process and lacked the ability to bring forward direct concerns from residents that may not be identified on current capital lists. She felt that the lack of an appropriate forum for the Council to vet such items pitted the Council's resident-driven requests against the department heads who make the capital lists. She understood her role was to serve the residents but felt if there wasn't a place for the residents to submit projects of concerns through their elected officials then City staff couldn't address resident feedback as part of the budgeting process. Mr. Allen said nine times out of ten those ideas would be capital in nature and, even if small, would compete with or need to fit into the

capital projects list at some point. After many conversations with staff, he said the staff always acknowledged elected officials' requests and worked to resolve any requests throughout the year, not just during the budget cycle. He asked for more input from Council to better meet needs and concerns if the current process didn't meet the need. Councilmember Peterson said she wasn't interested in interrupting the budgeting process for bigger capital projects such as the resident request for a crosswalk and sidewalk curb cut off Jenny Lane. She explained that being able to educate residents about the timelines used during the budgeting process by staff was useful. She wanted the same formal process whenever a resident-driven concern came to the council so it could be given a chance to be heard and pushed through the proper channels for review and determination of priority. Councilmember Roper said the councilmembers needed to manage time expectations with residents. Mr. Allen assured them that once a request was placed on the priority list it stayed there until it could be addressed. Councilmember Peterson was concerned that councilmembers didn't have any direct input on what made it onto the capital lists other than to approve what staff provided. Mr. Allen said his responsibility as staff, both by ordinance and by employment contract, was to prepare a draft budget and present to Council for consideration. Mr. Allen asked staff for their input on how best to incorporate public input. Mr. Knapp asked if Councilmember Peterson wanted to be able to be part of the process before the narrowed down draft of the budget in March. Councilmember Peterson explained that her desire wasn't to be involved earlier in staff budget plans but to ensure the council had the same opportunity. She reiterated her concern that the most recent small, neighborhood-specific "Love Letters" discussion, as helpful and productive as it was, identified projects for funding consideration right before the tentative budget had been settled which could potentially be disruptive to the budgeting process. She wanted a process where regional projects that might not be identified on capital plans could be considered for completion.

Councilmember Thompson arrived at 9:50 a.m.

Mayor Shepherd said he explained the vetting process to residents for project ideas presented after the budget had been approved and explained that it would be added to the project list and reviewed in January. He encouraged Council to present any resident feedback at any of the meetings they held or to speak with the city manager any time. He said it was a rarity that a project was an emergency that could be prioritized over other projects. Councilmember Peterson pointed out that projects presented by the mayor could be acted upon because of his ability to direct staff, whereas projects presented by councilmembers were considered and needed buy-in from the group. Mayor Shepherd disagreed and informed her that the response he had historically received from the city manager was that it would be reviewed by the Council. Mr. Howes confirmed that any projects brought to staff were added to the list and prioritized. He then proposed they be addressed with Council in November in a work session to review further. Councilmember Roper expressed his opinion that as councilmembers they needed to present concerns throughout the year. Mr. Howes explained getting the requested projects throughout the year was crucial to allow councilmembers' input before the budget process began. Mr. Allen recommended time be built in at every retreat to gather input from the Council for resident feedback. Mr. Allen said anytime a request was received it could be incorporated into the project lists. He encouraged Council to contact him anytime to discuss priorities and projects. Shaundra Rushton, Communications Manager, said she got a lot of public input on social media and questioned what she should do with those requests. Mr. Allen encouraged her to use the same process so the requests could be vetted.

Braden Felix, Public Works Deputy Director, said explained how the Public Works Department decided on how projects were completed and how outside input that wasn't part of the plan was handled. He assured Council that staff cared about the issues. Mr. Howes said the process he outlined was not meant for emergency situations.

Mr. Allen wanted to revisit the discussion of projects that had been brought up during the Council's "Love Letter" discussions and wanted to verify whether those projects needed to be on one of the priority lists. He brought up the request from Councilmember Bush for a ramp coming down to the trail at the 800 North road. Mayor Shepherd said there was stairway access on the north side of road that Clinton needed to address for safety issues. He thought the City needed to coordinate with Clinton City. Mayor Shepherd said he would speak with Mayor Stanger. Council did not think Clearfield City needed to do anything to improve the access. Mayor Shepherd informed the Council of a potential issue for Clearfield residents to access the trail once work on 800 North began. Councilmember Peterson asked if signs should be placed to identify access points. Mr. Felix suggested the City could include in the Traffic Control Plan as part of the construction plan.

Mr. Howes brought attention to the small parcel on 500 West at the north end of Barlow Park and acknowledged there needed to be a plan in place. Councilmember Peterson thought staff could collaborate with the Parks and Recreation Commission to get ideas. Councilmember Bush brought attention to the south end of Barlow Park and suggested it might be a good place to do a demonstration garden. Councilmember Peterson suggested allowing residents to offer opinions on how it should be used, for instance for parking or even for a sidewalk. She would love to see a walking trail there. Mr. Frye gave some ideas staff had thought about for the south entrance like turning it into a parking lot, or having a smaller playground area. Mr. Howes said the south entry for Barlow Park was slated for improvement in 2027. Mr. Allen said he didn't want the Council to feel like their comments were ignored and could go back to the residents to let them know the timeline. Mr. Howes said the next project in Rose Garden was scheduled for 2029 but there would be some shifting.

Break was taken at 10:30 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:53 a.m.

Justice Court – Past, Present, and Future

Summer Palmer, Assistant City Manager, presented the Clearfield Justice Court's current position and requested to get feedback from the City Council as to the future of the justice court based on a recent trend of downward revenues. She expressed her opinion that the court was running more efficiently than it had in recent history, had a great staff, and had adjusted to almost strictly remote hearings. The court had seen a 15% increase in expenses over the last 10 years which was not a large increase, showing how tightly the expenses were managed. She said that given the changing needs of the police and police staffing issues, court revenues were not projected to increase. The court was seeing a 28% decrease in revenues over 10 years. Given the current trend she asked the Council if that was a service it wanted to subsidize in the future or if staff should

research alternative options. She had the court supervisor pull data to show who the court was serving. The data indicated the addresses of those coming to the court, 15-17% were Clearfield addresses, however, in the court supervisor's experience she felt it was higher and anecdotally thought it was closer to 30% of Clearfield residents. One other consideration was the ability of the court to utilize technology to offer the community the convenience of making court appearances without having to take time off work to attend court in person. Councilmember Thompson asked what level of offenses the justice court had jurisdiction over. Stuart Williams, City Attorney, answered misdemeanor B and below. Councilmember Thompson asked whether the decrease in revenue was lost to the District Court for higher offenses. Judge Brian Brower explained that justice courts received the most revenue for the least amount of law enforcement resource commitment through traffic stops. He explained that the responsibilities of law enforcement agencies had shifted over the years, handling criminal matters more often, which had led to fewer traffic tickets, which was partly the reason revenue had continued to decrease. He clarified that it was not a reflection of officers' efforts, but that traffic stops generated more revenue with less investment of law enforcement.

In response to a question from Councilmember Thompson, Judge Brower informed the Council that during the last legislative session, the Legislature passed a statute that modified some of the statutes governing justice courts where they established a governing task force to study justice courts and all aspects of the current court system. The Administrative Office of the Courts had also created a task force which reviewed the court system. Ultimately, that body determined that, if entities weren't worrying about budget, the best system of justice would be to roll justice courts into the State System. The legislature then reviewed it and decided to create their own task force to study the subject.

Judge Brower offered his perspective, which he admitted was biased, for several reasons. He suggested the current discussion might be premature because in 2-3 years the Legislature might change the court system at the local level. The other reason he thought it was premature was because he thought it was likely that the pendulum of change had swung completely and pointed to the fact that revenues were up in the current fiscal year. He didn't believe the court would be a large revenue generating entity for the local government, but believed the justice court could operate in the black without being a drain on the General Fund. He brought up the pandemic having had a drastic impact on the revenues and informed them that changes were not immediately seen due to the length of time it took to resolve a case. He pointed out that the increase in case numbers in FY23 would be reflected in next year's budget numbers. He understood that it was the responsibility of staff to bring to light the fiscal trends they had noticed, but from a policy perspective, he pointed out that in the 1990s there had to be a need identified for the City to establish the justice court. In establishing the justice court, he guessed that it was not the intention of the City to open a court to generate revenue. He thought it was a misnomer that courts needed to make money and offered his perspective that it was not the right philosophy for a court. He pointed out the importance of evaluating the service provided to the community. He questioned utilizing the statistic of the percentage of Clearfield residents that had cases in the court and pointed out that whether the resident was the person that got the ticket or not the resident could have been a victim so the City was providing a service to its residents. Although he had not discussed it with the police department, he thought Council would find that closing the court would result in less efficiency and responsiveness for the police department. He offered his opinion that

the court could operate for another few years, and the state was reviewing the whole system which might make it a moot issue.

Councilmember Thompson said the revenue motivation of the past had clarified the issue for him. Judge Brower mentioned the change to the court system that had drastically improved the quality of justice in the system, by allowing more court-appointed attorneys, which put a drain on the resources but provided a service.

Ms. Palmer said the question was not whether the City wanted to keep making money but whether based on the revenue trend, the Council wanted to house the court service in Clearfield. Councilmember Peterson thought it was too premature to have the discussion because while it was a policy discussion to determine whether Council wanted to provide the service to the City, the genesis of the conversation was financially motivated. She thought it felt like there were too many things outside the Council's purview. If the State weren't currently evaluating the needs, then it would be another question. She didn't feel like the Council had enough information to make the decision and that there were too many things that could shift on the financial side so the policy side would shift. Ms. Palmer said if the City waited 4-5 years for the Legislature's evaluation to play out, chances were that financially the impact would not stay in a holding pattern. Councilmember Peterson asked that staff bring the issue back to the Council at the point the City was actually subsidizing the court to re-evaluate. Mayor Shepherd said there was a difference in subsidizing water and the court system. He pointed out that with water the City had the ability to raise rates, but it did not have that ability with court fines. He also pointed out that water rates could be changed immediately whereas it would be a process to shut down a court. Mr. Allen also pointed out that state law did not allow productivity expectations from law enforcement. Kelly Bennett, Police Chief, said quotas were banned in the state in 2018. He said there were so many factors influencing the declining numbers, one of which was that 54% of calls were requiring two or more officers. He said they were seeing an increase in officer staffing and higher interest in law enforcement as an occupation. He also said the traffic officer's numbers were improving. He reflected on the fact that in the past the patrol division had a traffic division, but the days of patrol being traffic enforcement would never return because it was the responsibility of the patrol division to respond to calls. Ms. Palmer clarified that the calls the officers were responding to were more escalated calls. Chief Bennett explained they were seeing more mental health and domestic violence calls which required more officers.

Ms. Palmer pointed out that staff had recognized a downward trend, and considering how long some of the other options took to play out, it seemed most likely the court would be in the negative, so staff wanted to bring it to the Council's attention before it became an issue. Mayor Shepherd emphasized it was a convenience and service to the residents. He pointed out that having to attend a court outside of the local area was a barrier for many people. He acknowledged the City did a lot of things for convenience because it was a service to the community and that was a benefit to the residents. He didn't think the Council could identify the financial implications until they factored in the inconvenience to officers to appear in court in Farmington. Chief Bennett said his department was averaging 14 times a month an officer was required to appear in court. He pointed out the scheduling adjustments required to cover officers' shifts if they had to lose time traveling to court, whereas when they can appear remotely, they can excuse themselves during their shift. Ms. Palmer pointed out the county court was not offering remote hearings. Judge Brower gave an

example of a construction worker who attended court while on his equipment, and was able to keep working until his case was called, which did not impact his employment. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion that the Council needed to wait due to the Legislature taking the subject up to review because of the time it would take. Judge Brower reiterated that he didn't believe it would get to the point where the City was subsidizing the court. Councilmember Thompson pointed out that barriers to justice would affect the City more based on its demographics.

Councilmember Bush asked what played into increases in expenses. Judge Brower said staffing and raises. It was determined that Ms. Palmer would give an update next year as part of budget discussions. Mr. Allen pointed out that the revenues generated by the court were General Fund revenues and were not restricted to financing the court and over time the reduction had strained the City's ability to fund the Police Department or Parks & Recreation projects. He emphasized that as the downward trend continued it would put more pressure on tax revenue.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:31 a.m. for lunch

Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Code Enforcement – Neighborhood Blitz

Mayor Shepherd explained the history of Code Enforcement moving from being a proactive body to a reactive body and pointed out the disadvantages of that process. He suggested the City try a new strategy where the City gave neighborhoods advanced notice that Code Enforcement would be patrolling their neighborhood at a specified period of time, point out typical violations and give them a coupon for the landfill. He also suggested offering information about the dumpster program for neighborhoods if they showed interest. Councilmember Peterson was okay with the idea if all residents would receive the letter and the program would not target certain communities. Councilmember Thompson was all for setting the tone and keeping the tone. Councilmember Bush thought it was a great idea but had the concern that a lot of times the problem was in the residents' backyard. Mayor Shepherd said the program would only address problems that were visible from the street. Councilmember Roper thought it was a great idea that was worth trying. Councilmember Thompson would like to see it as a kickoff to reinforce the City's standard.

Councilmember Bush asked how big of an area would be done at one time and how long would it take to get through the City. Mr. Allen was confident staff could manage internally. He said that the Police Department had a map for parking enforcement where they had divided the City into different zones and the Police Chief had already shared that map with Spencer Brimley, Community Services Director. Mr. Brimley stated that there would be a cost associated with the notice and voucher, but it could be handled administratively. After speaking with one of the code enforcement officers, he shared that the bigger concern was the fact that even the smaller areas would take time to document and review. Mr. Brimley recently reviewed eleven cases which took 45 minutes, and advised Council that it took an officer about half an hour to compile a case. He pointed out the process would be a big undertaking so he wanted to understand the Council's expectations. He shared that in 2019 and 2020 Code Enforcement processed over 1200 cases and in 2022 they had done half of that. He suggested the City give more time for the residents to come into compliance because historically, residents already did not like the two

week timeframe.

Mayor Shepherd didn't want to give too much time because the residents already had the ability to request an extension. He said the areas that were noticed could be pared down if needed. There was a discussion on the possibilities of how to determine area sizes. Mr. Brimley brought up the administrative ability to grant extensions but suggested if they were already giving a two-week notice maybe they didn't grant extensions because then some individuals would come up with excuses to not get it completed within the specified timeframe. Mayor Shepherd didn't think they needed to grant extensions.

Councilmember Thompson thought the perception was that the City didn't enforce code because they had become less heavy-handed. Mr. Brimley said the code enforcement officers had tried to be helpful which created a dependency. Councilmember Peterson brought up that it was important to recognize there might be health/financial issues and suggested reaching out to various interfaith communities, and volunteer communities that could assist in their community. Councilmember Thompson pointed out that Job Corps kids were looking to do positive things and volunteer. Stuart Williams, City Attorney, pointed out that it was a lot of work for staff to coordinate volunteers. Councilmembers acknowledged their responsibility in assisting the staff to find volunteer groups to help.

Ms. Palmer asked if it would be helpful for staff to provide talking points for councilmembers to respond to the residents. She also pointed out that the code was so broad it would be difficult for code enforcement to identify all the code issues. She asked what big issues Council wanted code enforcement to identify knowing the officers would potentially only have four blitzes before summer was over. Councilmember Roper suggested any health and safety issues. There was a discussion as to which items would be identified in the letter to residents. The Council identified typically visible violations such as: open debris, weeds in public walkway, access points and park strips, multiple abandoned cars, and junk. Councilmember Bush pointed out that trailers parked in the street would be handled separately by the police. Mr. Brimley shared the code enforcement officers' concerns that when they go to a property after receiving complaint and see other violations as they drive through the area, they would be seen in a negative light by the public and they had received instructions from Council to not be proactive when they see violations. Mr. Allen said staff would prepare a letter and get the process organized. Councilmember Peterson requested that the letter be reviewed by the mayor prior to distributing. Mr. Williams asked if parking on the street needed to be addressed in the same letter. The Council thought it needed to be included.

Book Club: 13 Ways to Kill Your Community

The group divided into four groups and discussed which single topic they felt was most important from "13 Ways to Kill Your Community."

Main points from the book shared by the four breakout groups with the whole group:

- "Don't Paint the City" – they had discussed the daunting task of code enforcement. Mayor Shepherd thought that "Don't Paint" tied in with "Don't Attract Business." He supported

the enforcement of code throughout the City because as new development came into the City the older properties became the least valuable area and were not maintained. He commented that neglect was infectious and if issues were not addressed by the City the guy that reported the violation believed the City didn't do anything about it so then he resigns himself to not maintaining his property also.

- “Don’t Attract Business” and the need to verify that the City policies were not opposing business. He posed the idea to try to incentivize business owners to beautify their properties by possibly reducing licensing fees. He wondered whether crime could be discouraged if more businesses took care of their properties. He wanted to explore how the City could incentivize businesses to take pride in the City.
- “Don’t Shop Local” – Councilmember Roper offered his perspective from his experience with the Chamber of Commerce. He thought social media really controlled the tempo of new businesses coming into the City. Mr. Allen shared a recent negative comment on social media as an example.
- “Ignore Outsiders” – Councilmember Peterson suggested that right after the code enforcement blitz the City should follow up by letting people adopt the hydrants and electric boxes and let them provide labor and paint to beautify them. She felt the principal of “Ignore Outsiders” section of the book was important to build a sense of community for people of different backgrounds. Those “outsiders” are all of us. Councilmember Thompson felt like there needed to be more balance to the Form Based Code.
- “Reject Everything New” – Councilmember Bush presented different examples that could be applied to the City. He pointed out a section in the “Grow Complacent” that addressed sustainability.

Mr. Allen shared a quote from the Conclusion section of the book:

”Ultimately the success of a community does not fall solely or even primarily to the responsibility of government and those elected leaders. The success of a community is the responsibility of every single member of that community and that success is dependent on the attitudes that prevail. Success or failure always comes down to your attitude, whether you are a student or an adult, whether you are an association or an organization, whether you are a business or a community. The reason communities, any communities, fail is because of wrong attitudes. Of all the things affecting our lives every day, we can really only control our attitudes.” (Doug Griffiths, “13 Ways to Kill Your Community, page 152)

Break

Public Works CIP Review – Streets, Water, Sewer, and Stormwater

Braden Felix, Deputy Public Works, reviewed the Public Works department planning process and the decisions that went into determining how projects would be prioritized. He outlined the sources used in planning for capital projects:

Capital Facility Plans

Prepared by CEC. Plans included: Water (2019), Sewer (2013), and Storm Drain (2016). Projects were included based on known needs, age of infrastructure, and impact fee studies. Each project required closer evaluation for scope and costs.

Transportation Master Plan

Mr. Felix hadn't seen a transportation master plan for the last 20 years. Staff was interested in Jones Associates completing an updated Transportation Plan, but the project would be based on obtaining funding from Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) to help pay for the study in the coming year. The Master Plan would outline the transportation needs of the City based on existing roadways and anticipated growth. The plan would require a close partnership with Community Development.

Mr. Allen noticed that neighboring cities seemed to get a lot more frequent funding from WFRC and asked if it had to do with types of improvements. Mr. Felix said a lot of grant funds did not go toward maintenance of roads. The funding opportunities were more widely used for new facilities, making streets wider, adding curb and gutter, or something to make the facilities nicer in the end.

Pavement and Sidewalk Analysis

Mr. Felix explained the evaluation of pavement and sidewalks was completed every few years.

- IWorq evaluated the pavement conditions of all City roads in 2020.
- Report outlined each road with a remaining service life (1-2 years, 5 years, 10 years, 20 years).
- Report also suggested treatment method for each road (crack seal, slurry seal, mill and fill, full reconstruct).
- Utah Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) evaluated all the City's sidewalks and outlined issues found.
- Much simpler than asphalt as there are less options with concrete.
- \$2.4 million work of repairs currently mapped, so \$250,000/year recommendation to repair it all in 10 years (includes ADA ramps).
- \$1.3 million (54%) in just ADA ramps

Impact Fee Facility Plans

Recently completed water and sewer facility plans through JUB's evaluation. Each utility evaluated through computer models of existing infrastructure with projected growth.

Sewer study helped us find a large deficiency in the sewer system under SR-193

Due to Low Impact Development (LID) requirements, Storm Drain was not evaluated.

Councilmember Thompson asked when they evaluated ADA standards did, they provide a map of the areas and did they pinpoint higher needs areas. Brad Wheeler pointed out that there was a GIS map that showed every area of concern. Mr. Felix showed the map and explained it showed areas where curb, gutter and sidewalk was missing. Staff was working on getting the information into a

list. Councilmember Thompson questioned how staff reviewed new development areas for ADA standards and how developers were addressing ADA innovation and access. Mr. Felix said if there would be public access the City could review.

Big Ticket Projects

Projects that weren't part of utility facility plans or impact fee modeling:

- Clearfield Station TOD
- MOC Phase 3
- 500 West

Other Organizations

Oftentimes, outside agencies have a capital project in the City and staff tried to “capitalize” on the opportunity. For instance

- 300 North with West Point
- 500 West with Syracuse.
- Weber Basin Water often replaced waterlines when the City had a road project over their line.
- DWCCC had been doing lots of projects that required City dollars.
- If we have a neighboring city replacing a shared road, we'll work with them to improve the City's system as well.

Elected Official Input

- Most input had been for General Fund capital projects. (streets, streetlights, etc.).
- Public Works aimed to address construction concerns ASAP (State Street, Howards ,TOD).
- Often these were suitable additions to the City street treatment contract every 2-3 years
- Public Works staff would consider how the suggested project could be incorporated into the City's facility plans to make it fit or if there was another way to fund it.

Mr. Felix reviewed projects that had been completed recently, projects that had been requested and were planned or under construction. Mr. Allen pointed out that it was the position of the City that on undeveloped parcels to wait for sidewalk improvements to be completed by the developer unless it was a safe route to a school but reminded the Council that if it was a concern of an elected official, it could be readdressed. Councilmember Bush pointed out there was a sidewalk on the west side of 1000 West and didn't think it was a highly used pedestrian area and he wouldn't waste money on it.

Mr. Felix reviewed the status of various projects throughout the City projected through 2029.

There was a short break.

Reconvened at 4:00 p.m.

Rotating Department Breakouts

The members of the Council individually participated in department breakouts where they asked questions and provided input and suggestions.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

****ADJOURN AS THE CITY COUNCIL****

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 22nd day of August 2023**

/s/ Mark Shepherd, Mayor

ATTEST:

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Clearfield City Council meeting held Tuesday, June 9, 2023.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder