

**COUNCIL MINUTES**  
**MAY 27, 2015**

The City Council held a meeting on Wednesday, May 6, 2015, at 5:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 10 North Main Street, Cedar City, Utah.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Maile Wilson; Councilmembers: Ron Adams; John Black; Paul Cozzens; Don Marchant; Fred Rowley.

**STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Rick Holman; City Attorney Paul Bittmenn; City Engineer Kit Wareham; City Recorder, Renon Savage; Finance Director Jason Norris; Police Chief Robert D. Allinson; Fire Chief Mike Phillips; Economic Development Director Danny Stewart; Public Works Director Ryan Marshall; Wastewater Plant Manager Darrell Olmsted.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Weston Smith, Tim Beery, Tom Jett, Jerom Hlebasko, Leslie Hlebasko, Brent Spackman, Theresa Spackman, Douglas Spencer, Eric Spencer, Joe Burgess, Jeff Burgess, Barbara Imlay, Brenda Haight, Wade Grimm, Robin Haight, Terri Hartley, Scott Jolley.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Michael of Mountain View Baptist Church gave the opening prayer; the pledge of allegiance was led by Councilmember Rowley.

**AGENDA ORDER APPROVAL:** Councilmember Adams moved to approve the agenda order; second by Councilmember Marchant; vote unanimous.

**ADMINISTRATION AGENDA – MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS; STAFF**

**COMMENTS:** ■Rowley – our damaged gabion basket is repaired, without rocks. Kit – that is part of the bid, they will get it done. Rowley – the snack bar was good for the pool with the school kids. At East Canyon Park there were fence posts around the old playground, they are bent and someone could get injured, we should get those taken care of. I am neighbors with Nathan Merrill of UDOT, he says that Cedar City hates bicyclists, can we get it straight with UDOT's standards. Kit – Jeff spent at least \$10,000 restriping bike lanes. Rowley - As I reviewed the bills, we are paying \$1,600 to send our cans to St. George, I think we should renegotiate that contract or look into it. Ryan Marshall – the last round we negotiated, the cost was \$3,200 a month for their actual costs. We agreed that they reduce it down and they keep the revenue. Trying to track the commodity is too hard. We settled on \$1,600 so they take the revenue, some months they make money, some months they lose. ■Marchant – earlier this evening I heard a comment that there was no trash cans at the cemetery for Memorial Day. Some time ago we received a letter from Linda Yon about a Helen Foster Snow program over there, will that be coming up. Rick – we can put it on the next work agenda. ■Mayor – Congressman Chris Stewart was in town, we had a chance to speak with him and his staff about the Coal Creek project, we are moving that along. We have talked with both our State Legislators and the House and Senate in DC. The USG Opening Ceremony is June 11<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 p.m. The upcoming municipal election, we have City Council seats, filing

dates are June 1-8. The Iron County Honor Flight is a week from Saturday, the return celebration is June 6<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 until the Veterans arrive back in town around 10:00 p.m., it will be a nice community celebration, it will be held at the Leavitt Hangar at the Airport. Our next Council meeting, we need a Mayor Pro-Tem. Councilmember Black suggested that Ron Adams serve as Mayor Pro-Tem, the other councilmembers all agreed. There was a nice memorial at the Cemetery on Monday, and the Cemetery looked beautiful, thanks to the City crew and the community members that came out. ■Business Update – Danny Stewart: Cameron invited Rob here to give an update on the new Christensen's store. Rob Christensen, we are locally owned and operated since 1929, I am 3<sup>rd</sup> generation, Christensen and Peterson worked together. We feel lucky to have the community support. The new location is doing great as expected and sales are up considerably. Our plans for the future are to pay for the building and continue selling shirts and shoes. Marchant – it is a very nice building and set up. Cozzens – the synergy between the Boulevard and Christensen's are good. Danny – it is a nice addition to the business community. Short update, ICSC convention last week, it was very helpful and we made good connections. I was there with Chamber of Commerce President; we walked a lot of miles and talked with a lot of people. Rowley – did their eyes light up? Danny – some sought us out, that was good. There were also a lot that we talked to and we are on the radar. Rowley – did anyone reference the Trade Magazine? No, I gave some out but no one mentioned it.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** ■Presentation on Curb-Cut Mapping – Jerom Hlebasko, CDAT Member: I am a recent member of the Cedar Disability Awareness Action Team. My task is to map, part of the CDAT Team is we need curb cuts for wheel chairs and strollers, in Washington City I helped them out on a curb, gutter and sidewalk information for certain residents. There are symbols and colors, reds, greens and a mix. The red there is no curb, gutter or sidewalk in Washington City. They had a lot of flooding issues last year, part of the study is to calculate this for them and the accessibility came into play. Red is not accessible, and orange is it is accessible, but not according to standards, green, yes accessible and up to standards. We want to make the city aware of where the problems are and they can budget for it to make it accessible. We want to give the city tools on how to best approach it. We want to convert this to a smart system which is the cloud. I can click on the red and it tells if it is accessible, it is in quadrants. It is a good feature for the City and maintenance crew, there is an inventory of sidewalk cutting and ADA accessibility, it also shows a picture of the intersection, we have tools. Mapping it for you to have the tools and decisions would come in handy for you. Rowley – did any ramps fail ADA because they don't have the bumpy bumps? Jerom – when they are accessible, they are cut, but it could be 8% which I couldn't get up. I can take it one step further, creating a heat map, taking no ramp present and not ADA compliant. Part of the board, the City has the tools to do this; you just need direction to use it. You have GIS licenses so you have a free version of this. Rowley – is some of that task in the range of an Eagle Scout? Jerom – yes, it is a big job to do all of Cedar City. Divide it into sections, they can go out with cell phones and collect data, I can give them access, they can fill in yes and no and put pictures on their phones. Cozzens – how do you handle the grade? Jerom – we can give them a measurement, a scout will not know grade, but the City can do it. Marchant – coordinating this with your

group to take the lead, get Eagle projects in an organized fashion, I see nothing but a positive result. I encourage this. Black – it would be a good project for SUU Service Day. Rowley – can you do it for when we do replacements? Kit – we have done that where we have projects like 300 West and Fir Street the ramps were redone with the street, it is common practice. Jerom – we can bring grades in if the City has that. Rowley – it would be good to set up a web site for people with a wheel chair to say I am trying to get from one place to another. Jerom – there are community involvement applications. I can type in my address and get zone and direction to fire station. Marchant – what part of the City is compliant? Kit – we would be lucky to have 20%. Marchant – a big project, we can do a little at a time. How do you feel about this, is it feasible for Eagle Scouts? Kit – to get them inventoried yes, but to get them replaced is a different story. Cozzens – what is the budget per year? Ryan Marshall - \$20,000 which is about 10 curb cuts a year. Marchant – is there a way of more critical areas? Jerom – you can do traffic consecration. The new Maverick on U-56 has traffic galore. Rowley – some scouts could do fund raisers. Jerom – the data is only as good as the person doing it. The Council thanked Jerom for his work. ■ Marcus Brinkerhoff, ICAT Swim Team, our date is coming up with the Iron County Swim Team, we are proposing to do a fund raiser for Katie Webster. I want a feel for how the Council would allow this, usually swim meets money is for ribbons, we have someone providing that. Sadie was on the swim team. This is set for June 20<sup>th</sup>. Mayor – if you're not asking for a waiver of the fees it would not be a problem. When it comes here is they are asking fee waivers. We have talked with Chris at the Aquatic Center; he said to run it by the City Council. Mayor – follow the process for the other swim meets with reservations, etc.

**CONSENT AGENDA: (1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES DATED MAY 6, 11, 12, & 13, 2015; (2) APPROVAL OF BILLS DATED MAY 26, 2015 ; (3) APPROVE SINGLE EVENT PERMITS FOR (1) FIRE ROAD HELD JUNE 27<sup>TH</sup>; AND (2) JULY JAMBOREE HELD JULY 11<sup>TH</sup> – MARK BARUFFI; (4) APPROVE ACCEPTING A ROAD DEDICATION ON PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VICINITY OF 200 SOUTH 3325 WEST – PAUL BITTMENN/PLATT & PLATT ENGINEERING; (5) APPROVE SEWER REPAIR BLANKET CONTRACT WITH ORTON EXCAVATING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$360 PER LINEAR FOOT – DARRELL OLMSTED; (6) APPROVE GRANT CONTRACT FOR UDOT FUNDS FOR CATS – TAMMY NAY; (7) APPROVE ANNUAL BLANKET CONTRACTS FOR: STREET LIGHT MAINTENANCE, PAVEMENT MARKINGS, SMALL CONCRETE PROJECTS, INSTALLED ASPHALT, STREET MATERIALS SUPPLY, CRACK SEALANT/ASPHALT CHIP SEAL OIL MATERIAL SUPPLY, CHIP SEAL ASPHALT/OIL APPLICATOR, ASPHALT STREET CRACK SEAL PROJECT, TREE TRIMMING, AND TOWING – JEFF HUNTER (SEE EXHIBIT “A”); (8) APPROVE AN AGREEMENT WITH THE STATE OF UTAH DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE DELAYED PAYMENT OF IMPACT FEES FOR ITS FACILITY LOCATED IN THE VICINITY OF 646 NORTH MAIN STREET - PAUL BITTMENN AND KIT WAREHAM; (9) APPROVE DISPOSAL OF CITY PROPERTY THROUGH AUCTION – MIKE PHILLIPS;** Black – did we get things taken care of on the process for #9? Chief Phillips – I am waiting for approval.

Councilmember Rowley moved to approve the consent agenda items 1 through 9 as written above; second by Councilmember Black; vote unanimous.

**CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE ZONE FROM AT TO R-1 ON PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE VICINITY OF 200 SOUTH 3325 WEST – PAUL BITTMENN/PLATT & PLATT ENGINEERING:** Councilmember Marchant moved to approve the zone change from AT to R-1 on property in the vicinity of 200 South 3325 West; second by Councilmember Rowley; roll call vote as follows:

Ron Adams	-	AYE
John Black	-	AYE
Paul Cozzens	-	AYE
Don Marchant	-	AYE
Fred Rowley	-	AYE

**CONSIDER A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FEE SCHEDULE TO INCLUDE PARK RESERVATION FEES – AUSTIN BINGHAM:** Councilmember Black moved to approve the resolution amending the fee schedule to include park reservation fees; second by Councilmember Cozzens; vote as follows:

AYE:	<u>5</u>
NAY:	<u>0</u>
ABSTAINED:	<u>0</u>

**PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION FOR REVISION OF THE 2014-2015 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET – JASON NORRIS :** Cozzens – I missed last meeting, did we not find money for smart controllers what Mr. Hall helped us with. Two would be \$15,000. Could we find funds for one? Jason – probably with a month left it would be difficult to have them installed by the 30<sup>th</sup>; we can consider it for the next budget. Mayor – if it was out of this budget they would have to be installed by June 30<sup>th</sup>. Cozzens – next year’s budget. Jason – we have suggested RAP Tax since it happens on the athletic fields; otherwise we will have to look at other funding sources. Rowley – we had 3” of rain this month. Cozzens – have we had most of the parks shut off? Rick – I don’t think we have had to water much; we have had private people watering more.

Mayor Wilson opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments. The hearing closed.

Councilmember Black moved to approve the resolution amending the revision of the 2014-15 fiscal year budget; second by Councilmember Marchant; vote as follows:

AYE:	<u>5</u>
NAY:	<u>0</u>
ABSTAINED:	<u>0</u>

**CONSIDER VICINITY PLAN FOR THE WINDMILL PLAZA COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION – KIT WAREHAM/WINDMILL PLAZA LLC:** Mayor – if there are public comments, we welcome input, but we ask that it be new information that was not discussed last week.

Tim Watson – at our meeting there were a few items brought up for the vicinity plan, first being the sewer and capacity for Interstate and flow to the north and the drainage. There have been solutions for the sewer identified; you received an email from Kit discussing that. The Developer and I met with Kit yesterday and then the developer met with Kit today. The drainage, I ran preliminary numbers, the existing site is producing 4 cubic feet per second, there are two culverts to drain the area, one in the SE corner and SW corner, they have been historically used to drain the area, Mr. McConnell answered questions, we will utilize the north culvert and can max that out at 24”, any additional drainage will be the responsibility of each site, the combination of the entire development will not exceed 24”. Cozzens – with lot 1 how big of retention pond? Tim – the whole property if developed is about 30 cubic feet per second. Each lot will take their fair share. There is a little in I-15 median. There are three drainage areas. Cozzens – can the parking lot be designed to be part of the detention? Tim – yes, it doesn’t happen a lot. The Day’s Inn has two detention basins in their parking lot. We will try and direct flow as much as possible. Rowley – is it to detain or retain? Tim – to detain. Rowley – slowly flow to the freeway, not a pond. Tim – that is correct depending on the rain storm; I would think an hour or two. Rowley – there are several in the City? Kit – yes and we try and get out and look at them. It is part of the storm drain ordinance, they can have impact fees waived if they put those systems in, and it is a controlled release and designed to drain in 24 hours. Cozzens – the North Stake Center, how long does it take to drain? I have seen it one time almost overflow. Kit – around 24 hours. Black – what about the hard scape run off? Tim – our focus will be the street, the location of drop inlet or control feature at the north end of the property will make it easy, the rest is the individual lot owners. Rowley – did I read some will break eastward or will the entire drive move to the west? Tim – the natural grade is to the northwest. Kit – I talked with the retention on each lot and handling the street drainage that flows to the north and west. Tim – we are asking for the approval of the vicinity plan and we will complete the drainage study for the commercial development. Rowley – Mr. Gillespie phoned in and realized that when he was referring to sewer codes it was for 3,000 rooms in Nevada. The sewer plan in place would be adequate to handle the flow of this design? Kit – yes, we have done an analysis and I sent you an email to modify the downstream sewer system to make capacity for this development. Larry also did calculations on the proposed motel and size of sewer lateral and a 6” is sufficient. Black – what would be needed downstream? Kit – it is a simple modification. The sewer line down 1100 West also feeds up along 800 South almost to Main Street, the Village Inn, the SWATC Building, Boulevard and Christensen’s. We looked at an option proposed by the developer to take the line down 800 West and divert to 860 South to the 900 West line and it would take out sufficient flows that would leave a 12% available capacity in the 1100 West line. Rowley – would it require trenching? Kit – yes, a small area. Cozzens – is this the only bottleneck? Kit – yes, the line down 900 is a 12” and it would bring it to 50% capacity and 1100 West and 900 West tie into larger lines. Rowley – we talked about a lift station



EXHIBIT "A"

CITY COUNCIL MAY 27, 2015

BID TABULATION  
STREET LIGHT MAINTENANCE  
FY 2016

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	BARNEY BROTHERS ELECTRIC UNIT COST	MARSHALL EVANS ELECTRIC UNIT COST
1	Bulb Replacement (Parts & Labor)				
	A Local (Residential) Street Light (sheet R14)	Each	1	\$ 62.00	\$ 65.00
	B Commercial Street Light (sheet R15)	Each	1	\$ 63.00	\$ 65.00
	C Industrial Street Light (sheet R16)	Each	1	\$ 62.00	\$ 65.00
2	Ballast Replacement (Parts & Labor)				
	A Local (Residential) Street Light (sheet R14)	Each	1	\$ 123.00	\$ 110.00
	B Commercial Street Light (sheet R15)	Each	1	\$ 120.00	\$ 110.00
	C Industrial Street Light (sheet R16)	Each	1	\$ 124.00	\$ 115.00
3	Photo Cell Replacement (Parts & Labor)				
	A Local (Residential) Street Light (sheet R14)	Each	1	\$ 61.00	\$ 65.00
	B Commercial Street Light (sheet R15)	Each	1	\$ 61.00	\$ 65.00
	C Industrial Street Light (sheet R16)	Each	1	\$ 61.00	\$ 65.00
4	Pole Assembly Replacement (No Foundation)				
	A Local (Residential) Street Light (sheet R14)	Each	1	\$ 2,025.00	\$ 1,750.00
	B Commercial Street Light (sheet R15)	Each	1	\$ 3,684.00	\$ 3,120.00
	C Industrial Street Light (sheet R16)	Each	1	\$ 5,434.00	\$ 4,510.00
5	Mobilization - City Street Right-of-Way	LS	1	\$ 100.00	\$ 85.00
6	Mobilization - UDOT Street Right-of-Way	LS	1	\$ 350.00	\$ 370.00
7	Subcontracted Work Near High Voltage Electric Lines & Equipment if Bidder is not Certified Sheet (R16)				
	A Bulb Replacement (Parts & Labor)	Each	1	\$ 62.00	\$ 125.00
	B Ballast Replacement (Parts & Labor)	Each	1	\$ 124.00	\$ 160.00
	C Photo Cell Replacement (Parts & Labor)	Each	1	\$ 62.00	\$ 125.00
	D Pole Assembly Replacement (No Foundation)	Each	1	\$ 5,434.00	\$ 4,600.00
8	Repairs not Associated Directly with Above Items				
	A Labor Rate per Hour	Hour	1	\$ 45.00	\$ 50.00
	(Parts for these Repairs will be Paid at Cost Plus 10%)				
	<b>TOTAL BID AMOUNT</b>			\$ 18,057.00	\$ 15,620.00

Low Bidder: Marshall & Evans Electric

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)

PAVEMENT MARKING

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	STRAIGHT STRIPE		INTERSTATE BARRICADE	
				UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT
1	Mobilization	LS	3	\$ 400.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 6,400.00	\$ 19,200.00
2	8" Dashed Line	LF	1,000	\$ 0.180	\$ 180.00	\$ 0.360	\$ 360.00
3	8" Single Solid	LF	500	\$ 0.180	\$ 90.00	\$ 0.360	\$ 180.00
4	8" Double Solid	LF	1,000	\$ 0.360	\$ 360.00	\$ 0.720	\$ 720.00
5	4" Dashed Line	LF	5,000	\$ 0.090	\$ 450.00	\$ 0.180	\$ 900.00
6	4" Single Solid	LF	9,000	\$ 0.090	\$ 810.00	\$ 0.180	\$ 1,620.00
7	4" Double Solid	LF	5,000	\$ 0.180	\$ 900.00	\$ 0.360	\$ 1,800.00
8	4" Miscellaneous Hash Line	LF	1,000	\$ 0.090	\$ 90.00	\$ 0.900	\$ 900.00
9	4" x 20' Parking Lot Space Lines	EA	500	\$ 6,000	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 11,000	\$ 5,500.00
10	14" x 7 1/2' Through-Lane Use Arrows	EA	10	\$ 14,500	\$ 145.00	\$ 21,000	\$ 210.00
11	14" x 7' Turn-Lane Use Arrows	EA	10	\$ 14,500	\$ 145.00	\$ 21,000	\$ 210.00
12	14" x 10 1/2' Turn and Through-Lane Use Arrows	EA	5	\$ 29,000	\$ 145.00	\$ 21,000	\$ 105.00
13	18" x 8' School Cross-Walk/Ladder Runs	EA	205	\$ 20,000	\$ 4,100.00	\$ 21,000	\$ 4,305.00
14	12" Wide Cross-Walk Lines	LF	400	\$ 1,250	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,850	\$ 740.00
15	4' x 5' Handicapped Parking Space Marking	EA	20	\$ 20,000	\$ 400.00	\$ 40,000	\$ 800.00
16	8' x 20' Railroad Crossing Marking	EA	10	\$ 35,000	\$ 350.00	\$ 147,000	\$ 1,470.00
17	30" x 8' Elongated Letter Marking	Each Letter	20	\$ 2,000	\$ 40.00	\$ 21,000	\$ 420.00
18	12" x 12" Squares	EA	1,000	\$ 0.200	\$ 200.00	\$ 1,850	\$ 1,850.00
19	3' 3" x 5" 9" Bike Lane Symbols	EA	30	\$ 10,000	\$ 300.00	\$ 21,000	\$ 630.00
20	2' x 6' Bike Lane Arrows	EA	30	\$ 10,000	\$ 300.00	\$ 21,000	\$ 630.00
21	Remove Pavement Markings with Paint	Per Hour	1	\$ 500,000	\$ 500.00	\$ 300,000	\$ 300.00
21a	Remove Pavement Marings with High-Pressure Wash	Per Hour	1	\$ 625,000	\$ 625.00	\$ 528,000	\$ 528.00
21b	Remove Pavement Markings with Sandblasting	Per Hour	1	\$ 625,000	\$ 625.00	\$ 720,000	\$ 720.00
22	Layout	Per Hour	1	\$ 95,000	\$ 95.00	\$ 125,000	\$ 125.00
<b>TOTAL BID</b>					<b>\$ 15,550,000</b>		<b>\$ 44,223,000</b>

Low Bidder: Straight Stripe

Last Year's Low Bidder: Straight Stripe \$15,927.25

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)

SMALL CONCRETE PROJECTS

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	GLEAVE CONCRETE		M.S. CONCRETE		GORAIN, LLC		SCHMIDT CONST, INC.	
		UNIT	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT
1	30-Inch Curb & Gutter Type A (Machine Placed)	LF	100	\$ 17.00	\$ 1,700.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 18.20	\$ 1,820.00
2a	30-Inch Curb & Gutter Type A (Hand Placed - Up to 40')	LF	40	\$ 17.00	\$ 680.00	\$ 23.57	\$ 942.80	\$ 23.78	\$ 951.20
2b	30-Inch Curb & Gutter Type A (Hand Placed - 40' to 100')	LF	100	\$ 17.00	\$ 1,700.00	\$ 20.57	\$ 2,057.00	\$ 18.85	\$ 1,885.00
3a	36-Inch Curb & Gutter Type C (Hand Placed - Up to 40')	LF	40	\$ 15.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 21.00	\$ 840.00	\$ 24.16	\$ 966.40
3b	36-Inch Curb & Gutter Type C (Hand Placed - 40' - 100')	LF	100	\$ 15.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 18.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 19.26	\$ 1,926.00
4a	Concrete Sidewalk (4" Thick) (Adjacent to Curb & Gutter)	S.F.	1,000	\$ 3.95	\$ 3,950.00	\$ 3.75	\$ 3,750.00	\$ 3.75	\$ 3,750.00
4b	Concrete Sidewalk (4" Thick) (Adjacent to Parkstrip)	S.F.	1,000	\$ 3.95	\$ 3,950.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 3.80	\$ 3,800.00
5	Concrete Drive Approach, Residential (6" Thick)	SF	1,000	\$ 4.90	\$ 4,900.00	\$ 4.75	\$ 4,750.00	\$ 5.42	\$ 5,420.00
6	Concrete Drive Approach, Commercial (6" Thick)	SF	500	\$ 5.25	\$ 2,625.00	\$ 5.25	\$ 2,625.00	\$ 5.44	\$ 2,720.00
7	6' Wide Concrete Waterway (8" Thick Reinforced)	SF	1,500	\$ 6.25	\$ 9,375.00	\$ 6.50	\$ 9,750.00	\$ 7.64	\$ 11,460.00
8	Handicap Accessible Ramp	SF	800	\$ 6.00	\$ 4,800.00	\$ 5.50	\$ 4,400.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 3,200.00
9	Small Structures Less Than 1 C.Y. (Includes Forming, Concrete & Rebar)	CY	<1 CY	\$ 900.00	\$ 900.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 800.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 1,200.00
10	Small Structures More Than 1 C.Y. (Includes Forming, Concrete & Rebar)	CY	>1 CY	\$ 700.00	\$ 700.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 600.00
11	Water Jobs (Sidewalk, Pad, Collar) (See Work Description and Detail Pg. 256)	LS	40	\$ 125.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 479.77	\$ 19,190.80
12	Bond Cost Amount	EA	2	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 792.72	\$ 1,585.44
	<b>TOTAL BID</b>				<b>\$ 45,980.00</b>		<b>\$ 45,980.00</b>		<b>\$ 60,474.84</b>

Low Bidder: M.S. Concrete

NOTE: Last Year's Low Bidder: Gleave Concrete \$40,610.00

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)  
 INSTALLED ASPHALT

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	ASHDOWN BROTHERS CONSTRUCTION		WESTERN ROCK PRODUCTS		GORAN, LLC	
				UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT
1	1/2 to 1-inch, Average 3/4-inch Thick Laydown Machine Skin Patch	TON	<25	\$ 120.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 145.00	\$ 3,625.00	\$ 111.03	\$ 2,775.75
1a	1/2 to 1-inch, Average 3/4-inch Thick Laydown Machine Skin Patch	TON	>25<250	\$ 110.00	\$ 27,500.00	\$ 93.00	\$ 23,250.00	\$ 107.47	\$ 26,867.50
2	1 to 3-inch, Average 1 1/2-inch Thick Laydown Machine Skin Patch	TON	<100	\$ 100.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 102.50	\$ 10,250.00	\$ 98.67	\$ 9,867.00
3	2 to 3-inch, Average 1 1/2-inch Thick Laydown Machine Skin Patch	TON	>100<500	\$ 90.00	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 96.09	\$ 48,045.00
4	2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Hand Spread)	S.F.	<500	\$ 1.75	\$ 875.00	\$ 2.50	\$ 1,250.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 2,500.00
5	2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	40,000	\$ 1.10	\$ 44,000.00	\$ 1.15	\$ 46,000.00	\$ 1.83	\$ 73,200.00
5a	2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	20,000	\$ 1.20	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 1.18	\$ 23,600.00	\$ 1.84	\$ 36,800.00
5b	2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	10,000	\$ 1.30	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 1.20	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 1.86	\$ 18,600.00
5c	2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	5,000	\$ 1.40	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 1.25	\$ 6,250.00	\$ 1.90	\$ 9,500.00
6	2 1/2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Hand Spread)	S.F.	<500	\$ 2.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 3.70	\$ 1,850.00	\$ 6.17	\$ 3,085.00
7	2 1/2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	15,000	\$ 1.30	\$ 19,500.00	\$ 1.27	\$ 19,050.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 30,000.00
7a	2 1/2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	10,000	\$ 1.45	\$ 14,500.00	\$ 1.30	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 2.02	\$ 20,200.00
7b	2 1/2-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	5,000	\$ 1.60	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 1.35	\$ 6,750.00	\$ 1.84	\$ 9,200.00
8	3-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Hand Spread)	S.F.	<500	\$ 2.25	\$ 1,125.00	\$ 4.25	\$ 2,125.00	\$ 5.60	\$ 2,800.00
9	3-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	10,000	\$ 1.60	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 1.55	\$ 15,500.00	\$ 2.13	\$ 21,300.00
9a	3-inch Thick Asphalt Mat (Machine Spread)	S.F.	5,000	\$ 1.75	\$ 8,750.00	\$ 1.60	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 2.16	\$ 10,800.00
10	Tack-coat	GALLON	1.0	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 3.25	\$ 3.25	\$ 8.98	\$ 8.98
11	Flush-coat	GALLON	1.0	\$ 3.50	\$ 3.50	\$ 3.25	\$ 3.25	\$ 19.88	\$ 19.88
12	Bond Coat Amount	L.S.	2	\$ 4,350.00	\$ 8,700.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 2,600.00
	TOTAL BID			\$ 4,796.20	\$ 251,957.50	\$ 959.30	\$ 238,566.50	\$ 1,776.47	\$ 328,169.11

Low Bidder: Western Rock Products  
 NOTE: Last Year's Low Bidder: Ashdown Brothers Construction \$170,610.00

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)  
 STREET MATERIALS SUPPLY CONTRACT

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	SUNROC CORPORATION		WESTERN ROCK PRODUCTS		MEL CLARK, INC.		ASHDOWN BROTHERS CONSTRUCTION		SCHMIDT CONSTRUCTION	
		UNIT	COST	UNIT	COST	UNIT	COST	UNIT	COST	UNIT	COST
1	Road Base Material	TON	\$ 6.50	\$ 4.00	\$ 3.75	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00			
2	Sand Material (Cyclone or Equivalent)	TON	\$ 5.25	\$ 2.75	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 16.00				
3	Bituminous Surface Course Material (Hot Mix)	TON	\$ 59.50	\$ 59.00	\$ -	\$ 60.50	\$ -				
4	Bituminous Surface Course Material (Cold Mix)	TON	\$ 95.00	\$ 90.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				
5	Bituminous Surface Course Material (UPM or Equivalent)	TON	\$ 100.00	\$ 175.00	\$ -	\$ 140.00	\$ -				
6	Flowable Backfill Material (City Specifications)	CY	\$ 69.00	\$ 70.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				
7	Flowable Backfill Material (Sand Only, No Additives)	CY	\$ 60.00	\$ 59.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				
8	Portland Cement Concrete Material (Class A)	CY	\$ 92.00	\$ 91.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				
9	Portland Cement Concrete Material (Class C)	CY	\$ 89.00	\$ 88.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				
10	Ready Mix, "Short Load Quantity"	CY	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				
11	Road Chips (2,000 Ton +/-) Type I per Cedar City Specifications	TON	\$ 14.50	\$ 14.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14.50				
11a	Road Chips (2,000 Ton +/-) Type II per Cedar City Specifications	TON	\$ 17.50	\$ 16.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17.50				
12	Graders Type II (200 Ton Minimum)	TON	\$ 60.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -				
13	Leach Rock	TON	\$ 10.00	\$ 8.50	\$ 7.50	\$ -	\$ 10.00				
14	Top Soil	TON	\$ 7.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.80	\$ 3.00	\$ 7.00				
15	1" Minus Rock	TON	\$ 10.00	\$ 8.50	\$ 7.50	\$ -	\$ 10.00				
16	Pea Gravel	TON	\$ 3.75	\$ 4.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3.75				
17	6" Minus Rock	TON	\$ 10.00	\$ 14.00	\$ 8.00	\$ -	\$ 10.00				
18	12" Minus Rock	TON	\$ 10.00	\$ -	\$ 8.00	\$ -	\$ 10.00				
19	Pitrun	TON	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 2.25	\$ 3.50	\$ 3.00				

Low Bidder on each item is highlighted and shown in bold above

NOTE: Last Year's Low Bids per Item: 1=\$4.00; 2=\$3.00; 3=\$68.00; 4=\$90.00; 5=\$140.00; 6=\$68.00; 7=\$54.00; 8=\$88.50; 9=\$85.50; 10=\$40.00; 11=\$14.50; 12=\$5.00; 13=\$8.75; 14=\$2.00; 15=\$8.75; 16=\$4.00; 17=\$9.00; 18=\$9.00; 19=\$3.00

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)

CRACK SEALANT/ASPHALT CHIP SEAL OIL MATERIALS SUPPLY AI

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	MAXWELL PRODUCTS SLC, UT		ASPHALT SYSTEMS, INC, SLC, UT		CALUMET/ MOUNTAIN STATES ASPHALT TOOLE, UT		CRAFCO, INC.	
				UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT
1	Provide and Transport CRS-2h Asphalt	TON	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 369.00	\$ 36,900.00	\$ -	\$ -
2	Provide and Transport PMCRS-2h Asphalt	TON	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3	Provide and Transport LMCRS-2h Asphalt	TON	400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 419.00	\$ 167,600.00	\$ -	\$ -
4	Provide and Transport P.A.S.S.	TON	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,166.00	\$ 1,166.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	Provide and Transport COS-1h 2:1 Dilution	TON	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 323.00	\$ 32,300.00	\$ -	\$ -
6	Provide and Transport LMCOS-1h 2:1 Dilution	TON	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 456.00	\$ 45,600.00	\$ -	\$ -
7	Provide and Transport PMCOS-1h 2:1 Dilution	TON	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8	Provide and Transport CSS-1H Asphalt 2:1 Dilution	TON	300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 450.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 299.00	\$ 89,700.00	\$ -	\$ -
9	GSB-88 Emulsified Sealer/Blinder 2:1 Dilution	TON	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 830.00	\$ 83,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	Elasto-Flex 650 or Equivalent	TON	100	\$ 870.00	\$ 87,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 818.00	\$ 81,800.00
11	Transport Stand-By Time	HOURL	30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125.00	\$ 3,750.00	\$ -	\$ -

Low Bidders are highlighted and shown in bold above  
 Items 2 & 7 No Bid

NOTE: Last Year's Low Bids per Item: 1=\$177,600; 2=No Bid;3=\$51,300; 4=\$118,200; 5=\$36,600; 6=\$38,000; 7=No Bid; 8=\$130,400; 9=\$89,200

**CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)**

**CHIP SEAL ASPHALT/OIL APPLICATOR CONTRACT**

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	J & T PETERSEN,		TOTAL AMOUNT
		UNIT	UNIT COST	
1	Applicator Hourly Rate	HOUR	\$ 185.00	\$ 185.00
2	Applicator Stand-By Rate	HOUR	\$ 185.00	\$ 185.00
	<b>TOTAL BID</b>			<b>\$ 370.00</b>

*Low Bidder: J & T Petersen, Inc.*

*NOTE: Last Year's Low Bidder: J & T Petersen, Inc. at \$370.00*

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)  
 ASPHALT STREET CRACK SEAL PROJECT

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	STRAIGHT STRIPE		SPENCER ASPHALT		TOP JOB, LLC	
				UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT
1	Mobilization, Permits, Payment and Performance Bond	LS	1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 7,000.00
2	Installation of City Provided Crack Seal Material per Specifications	TON		\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 584.00	\$ 584.00	\$ 584.00	\$ 584.00
	<b>TOTAL BID</b>				<b>\$1,500.00</b>		<b>\$584.00</b>		<b>\$7,700.00</b>

*Low Bidder: Spencer Asphalt*

*Last Year's Low Bidder: Spencer Asphalt \$1,520.00*

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)

TREE TRIMMING SERVICE

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	PROFESSIONAL TREE SERVICE, INC.	TOTAL AMOUNT
			UNIT COST	
1	1-10 Trees	HOUR	\$ 75.00	\$ 75.00
2	11-20 Trees	HOUR	\$ 68.00	\$ 68.00
3	21-50 Trees	HOUR	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00

*Only One Bidder*

*Low Bidder: Professional Tree Service, Inc.*

*NOTE: Last Year's Low Bidder: Professional Tree Service, Inc 1-10 Trees = \$75/hr; 11-20 Trees = \$75/hr; 21-50 Trees = \$60/hr*

CEDAR CITY CORPORATION  
 BID TABULATION  
 BLANKET CONTRACTS FY 2016 (JULY 2015 - JUNE 2016)  
 TOWING SERVICE

ITEM NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	BRADSHAW CHEVROLET UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT	DISPATCH & TRACKING SOLUTIONS UNIT COST	TOTAL AMOUNT
		EA	YES		YES	
1	Cost Per Towed Vehicle	EA	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00
2	Meet All Requirements	YES/NO	YES		YES	

*Low Bidder: Bradshaw Chevrolet*

*NOTE: Last Year's Low Bidder: Bradshaw Chevrolet at \$35.00 per Tow*

**CHAPTER 26  
PLANNING AND ZONING  
ARTICLE I. INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS**

- Section 26-I-1. Purpose
- Section 26-I-2. Interpretation
- Section 26-I-3. Scope
- Section 26-I-4. Definitions

This Chapter shall be entitled THE PLANNING AND ZONING ORDINANCE OF CEDAR CITY, UTAH, and may be so cited and pleaded.

**SECTION 26-I-1. Purpose.**

This Chapter is hereby declared to be enacted for the purpose of promoting the health, safety, convenience, morals, and general welfare of the inhabitants of Cedar City, Utah, and:

- (A) To encourage and facilitate the orderly growth and development of the City.
- (B) To promote sanitation and the health of the inhabitants.
- (C) To promote safety from fires, floods, traffic hazards, panic and other dangers.
- (D) To lessen congestion in the streets, to provide adequate light and air, prevent the over-crowding of land and avoid undue concentration of population.
- (E) To secure economy in municipal expenditures and to facilitate adequate provisions for transportation, water, sewage, schools, parks, and other public requirements.
- (F) To stabilize and improve property and prevent obsolescence and degeneration of buildings.
- (G) To increase the security of home life, improve the morals, and preserve and create a more favorable environment in which to rear children.
- (H) To promote the development of a more wholesome serviceable and attractive city, and,
- (I) To maintain or improve the quality of life for present and future inhabitants.

**SECTION 26-I-2. Interpretation.**

In the interpretation and application, the provisions of this Chapter shall be held to be the minimum requirements adopted for the promotion of public health, safety and welfare.

**SECTION 26-I-3. Scope.**

It is not intended by this Chapter to repeal, abrogate, annul or in any way impair or interfere with existing provisions of other laws or ordinances, except those specifically repealed by this Ordinance, or with private restrictions placed upon property by covenant, deed, or other private agreement, or with restrictive covenants running to which the City is a party. Where this Chapter imposes a greater restriction upon land, building, or structures than is imposed or required by

such existing provisions of law, ordinance, contract or deed, the provisions of this Chapter shall control.

#### **SECTION 26-I-4. Definitions.**

**(A) Purpose:** For the purpose of this ordinance certain words and terms are defined as follows: Words used in the present tense include the future. Words in the singular number include the plural and the plural the singular. The word district is synonymous with the word zone. And the word Zoning Administrator synonymous with the word Building Inspector. Words not included herein, but defined in the Building Code shall be construed as defined therein.

**(B) Definitions:** The following definitions shall apply for this chapter.

(1) Accessory Use or Building: A subordinate use or detached building clearly incidental to and located upon the same lot occupied by the main building; also a building clearly incidental to an agriculture or animal care land use located on a lot in an agriculture zone, which lot meets the minimum lot size and is not under one acre.

(2) Adult Daycare Facility: An adult daycare facility means any building or structure furnishing care, supervision, and guidance for three (3) or more adults unaccompanied by guardian for periods of less than twenty-four hours per day.

(3) Agriculture: The tilling of soil, raising of crops, horticulture and gardening but not including the keeping or raising of domestic animals or fowl, and not including any agricultural industry or business such as fur farms, animal hospitals, farm equipment sales, or similar uses.

(4) Airport: A landing area used regularly by aircraft for receiving or discharging passengers or cargo.

(5) Alley: Any public place or thoroughfare which affords generally a secondary means of vehicular access to abutting lots and is not intended for general traffic circulation.

(6) Alley Line: The boundary which separates the right-of-way of an alley from the abutting property.

(7) Alteration: As applied to a building or structure, a change or rearrangement in the structural parts or in the existing facilities or an enlargement, whether by extending on a side or by increasing in height, or the moving from one location or position to another.

**SECTION 26-III-13. CC Central Commercial Zone.**

**(A) Objective and Characteristics:** The CC Central Commercial Zone has been established as a district in which the primary use of the land is for business purposes. The area covered by this zone is now and is intended that it shall continue to be the dominant shopping and financial center of the City and surrounding territory. For this reason the zone has been located where the street pattern makes the business buildings readily accessible to all parts of the City and surrounding region where business and shopping activities can be carried on with maximum convenience. The CC Zone is characterized by wide, clean, well-lighted streets, ample pedestrian ways and vehicular parking lots for the convenience and safety of the public. Attractive, inviting and well-maintained shops, stores, offices and other buildings are also characteristic of this zone. Representative of the uses in this zone are banks, hotels, office buildings, theaters, and a wide variety of retail outlets. Conversely, uses which tend to create business dead spots, cause undue scattering of business and generally tend to thwart the use of the land for its primary purpose have been excluded from this zone. In order to accomplish the objectives and purposes of this ordinance and to promote the characteristics of this zone, the following regulation shall apply in the CC Zone, Central Commercial Zone:

**(B) Use Regulations:** See Section 26-III-21.

**(C) Lot Area Requirements:** There shall be no minimum lot area requirements for commercial lots used for a commercial use permitted in the zone except for gas pumps and off-street parking area requirements. For buildings arranged, intended, or designed exclusively for residential use, the minimum lot area requirements shall be the same as for dwellings in the R-3 zone, except that no lot area requirements shall apply when the dwellings are located above the ground floor and said ground floor is devoted exclusively to a commercial use permitted in the zone.

**(D) Lot Width Requirements:** There shall be no minimum lot width requirements for commercial lots used for a commercial use permitted in the zone except for gas pumps and off-street parking area requirements. For buildings arranged, intended, or designed exclusively for residential use, the minimum lot width requirements shall be the same as for dwellings in the R-3 zone, except that no lot width requirements shall apply when the dwellings are located above the ground floor and said ground floor is devoted exclusively to a commercial use permitted in the zone.

**(E) Building Setback Requirements:**

(1) **Side Setback:** Any commercial building adjacent to a street right-of-way shall be set back 20 feet therefrom. No other side setback shall be required for buildings having fire resistive walls in compliance with the Building Code except

that all buildings adjacent to a lot zoned residential shall be set back at least twenty (20) feet from the lot line of the adjacent residential property.

(2) **Front Setback:** The front setback shall be twenty (20) feet from the front lot line.

(3) **Rear Setback:** No rear setback shall be required for commercial buildings having fire resistant walls in compliance with the building code, except that all buildings adjacent to a lot zoned residential shall be set back at least twenty (20) feet from the lot line of the adjacent residential property.

(4) **Non Fire Resistant Building Setbacks:** For non-fire resistant buildings, regulations as contained in the Building Code shall apply, except all buildings and structures, including but not limited to gasoline pumps, shall be set back at least twenty (20) feet from the street right-of-way line.

(5) **Residential Use Building Setbacks:** For buildings arranged, intended, or designed exclusively for residential use, the setback requirements shall be the same as for dwellings in the R-3 zone.

(F) **Building Height Requirements:** The maximum height of any building with a commercial use shall be fifty (50) feet except buildings arranged, intended, or designed exclusively for residential use, the maximum height requirement shall be the same as for dwellings in the R-3 zone.

(G) **Building Size Requirements:** No requirements.

(H) **Special Provisions:**

(1) All off-street parking space shall be hard surfaced.

(2) All merchandise, equipment, and other materials (except for vehicles in running order) shall be stored within an enclosed building or within a sight obscuring enclosure.

(3) No dust, odor, smoke, vibrations, or intermittent light, glare, or noise shall be emitted which is discernible beyond the premises.

(4) Landscaping - See Article VII, Landscaping

(I) **Supplementary Regulations:** See Article IV, Supplementary Regulations to all zones.