CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA AND SUMMARY REPORT
April 12, 2016 – POLICY SESSION

Meetings of the City Council of Clearfield 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 meetings will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

Executive Conference Room
55 South State Street
Third Floor
Clearfield, Utah

6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
Discussion on Gateway Signage
Discussion on the 2016/2017 Fiscal Year Budget
(Any items not fully addressed prior to the Policy Session will be addressed in a Work Session immediately following the Policy Session)

City Council Chambers
55 South State Street
Third Floor
Clearfield, Utah

7:00 P.M. POLICY SESSION

CALL TO ORDER:
Mayor Shepherd
OPENING CEREMONY:
Councilmember Benson
APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
January 29, 2016 – Work Session
February 9, 2016 – Work Session
March 8, 2016 – Policy Session
March 15, 2016 – Work Session
March 17, 2016 – Work Session

PRESENTATION:
1. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE BY SENATOR JERRY STEVENSON

2. VIETNAM VETERANS’ MEMORIAL WALL PROJECT

BACKGROUND: Utah Vietnam Veterans of America desire to bring a permanent replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall to Utah. A representative will explain and describe the project.

SCHEDULED ITEMS:
3. CITIZEN COMMENTS
4. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE PROCLAMATION DECLARING APRIL 12, 2016 EVERYONE MATTERS DAY IN CLEARFIELD CITY

BACKGROUND: Clearfield City residents are comprised of a diverse population in which some individuals may experience judgment and discrimination based on numerous factors. Discrimination and bullying have direct effects on the physical, emotional, mental and financial well-being of an individual and therefore affect the health and well-being of society. The City celebrates its diversity and encourages all residents to recognize others’ contributions and unique individuality.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the Proclamation declaring April 12, 2016 Everyone Matters Day in Clearfield City and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents.

5. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE FREEPORT 3rd STREET SANITARY SEWER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT TO WHITAKER CONSTRUCTION

BACKGROUND: Bids were received from three construction companies for the Freeport 3rd Street Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project. The scope of the work for this project is to increase the sanitary sewer pipe size from a 10-inch to a 15-inch on 3rd Street, from “E” Street to “G” Street. The lowest responsible bid was received from Whitaker Construction with the bid amount of $330,033 but when combined with engineering fees the project costs exceed the budgeted funds. The City Engineer and Public Works staff recommend reducing the scope of work to bring the project costs within budget.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the award of bid for the Freeport 3rd Street Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project to Whitaker Construction for the revised reduced scope of work bid amount of $286,666 and approve funding for the project for the bid amount of $286,666 with contingency and engineering costs of $62,334 for a total project cost of $349,000 and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents.

6. CONSIDER THE APPROVAL OF THE REAPPOINTMENT OF ADAM LENHARD AS THE CITY MANAGER

BACKGROUND: Pursuant to § 1-7-3 of the Clearfield City Code, the City Manager’s term of employment may be renewed by the City Council at any time. The Mayor and Council desire to reappoint Adam Lenhard as the City Manager for a three-year term.

RECOMMENDATION: Reappoint Adam Lenhard as the City Manager and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS:
Mayor’s Report
City Councils’ Reports
City Manager’s Report
Staffs’ Reports
Dated this 7th day of April, 2016.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

The City of Clearfield, in accordance with the ‘Americans with Disabilities Act’ provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens needing assistance. Persons requesting these accommodations for City sponsored public meetings, service programs or events should call Nancy Dean at 525-2714, giving her 48-hour notice.
PRESIDING:  Mark Shepherd  Mayor

PRESENT:  Keri Benson  Councilmember
          Kent Bush  Councilmember
          Nike Peterson  Councilmember
          Vern Phipps  Councilmember
          Bruce Young  Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT:  Adam Lenhard  City Manager
                JJ Allen  Asst. City Manager
                Stuart Williams  City Attorney
                Scott Hodge  Public Works Director
                Greg Krusi  Police Chief
                Mike Stenquist  Assistant Police Chief
                Eric Howes  Community Services Director
                Curtis Dickson  Community Services Deputy Dir.
                Summer Palmer  Administrative Services Director
                Rich Knapp  Finance Manager
                Lee Naylor  Accountant
                Terrence Jackson  IT Manager
                Nancy Dean  City Recorder
                Kim Read  Deputy Recorder

Visitors: There were no visitors.

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order 8:20 a.m.

STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSION – GOALS, BUDGET AND FINANCE

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, announced the implementation of a customer service initiative which would be the focus for 2016. He stated the employees had recently participated in an exercise that demonstrated the importance elements of quality customer service. He indicated the exercise successfully encouraged staff to rethink the way services were provided to customers.

He reminded the Council of the new Strategic Plan which had replaced Vision 2020 and its involvement in identifying the Policies and Priorities and Vision Statement. He explained the next phase of the plan would be to identify long term strategies. He continued the Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) would be an appendix to the Strategic Plan, which listed the items staff was working to accomplish. He stated the CAP consisted of three parts:

- Projects
- Equipment
• Administrative Items

He reviewed the Long Range Strategic Plan and requested input specific to the goals and strategies in the Plan.

**Providing Quality Municipal Services**

Mr. Lenhard reviewed the itemized list of strategies contained in Section A – Providing Quality Municipal Services and the Council. The Council discussed the proposed strategies. The following list incorporates the Council’s suggestions.

*Make timely investments in our facilities and infrastructure to ensure long-term sustainability and lowest cost of maintenance.*

*Safeguard public health through the effective and reliable provision of water, sewer, storm drain and solid waste utilities.*

*Develop a safe, well-maintained and efficient street network.*

*Provide safety and security for the community through professional and caring law enforcement and fire protection services.*

*Facilitate the orderly development of land consistent with the City’s General Plan.*

*Ensure the fair and impartial adjudication of criminal and civil matters.*

*Improve victim advocacy and assistance through a community-wide approach with all stakeholders.*

*Set the standard for parks, recreation, trails, aquatics, open space and arts programs and facilities that are accessible to all people.*

*As elected officials and staff, represent the community with integrity and fairness in our public service and policy-making.*

*Be fair and transparent in our stewardship of taxpayer dollars.*

*Continue to update and implement long-range financial models for capital facility and equipment replacement.*

*Leverage technology to increase the effectiveness, timeliness and transparency of our services.*

*Strive for transparent and honest communications.*

*Enhance the City’s disaster preparedness through proper training and emergency planning.*
In conjunction with the discussion, Councilmember Young asked what a victim’s advocate would do. Mr. Williams explained there were different ways a victim’s advocacy program could be implemented and stated the advocate could provide crisis intervention when police responded to a domestic violence incident in order to provide immediate services such as: victim shelter, protective order, legal aid, etc. and later on would remain in contact with the victim. The advocate would keep the victim safe in the long run and would help them understand the legal system. A discussion took place about whether the advocate would be an employee or a contracted individual and there was concern how that would be funded. Mr. Williams believed there were grants the City could apply for to assist in defraying costs. Mayor Shepherd inquired about the possible use of CDBG funds to help provide the service. He asked why the City was leading the County in domestic violence and what measures could be implemented in the form of prevention. A discussion took place regarding awareness, prevention and education specific to domestic violence.

Councilmember Phipps suggested making the victim advocacy and assistance its own goal and making it a community wide program involving schools and churches. Eric Howes, Community Services Director, mentioned teaching and modeling appropriate behavior should be a component of all recreation programs.

Councilmember Bush expressed his opinion that parks should be included in the strategy about recreation, aquatics and art. A discussion took place and it was determined to also include trails and open space to the strategy.

Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion about the best ways available to keep residents informed. Councilmember Phipps suggested communication should be its own specific goal. Councilmember Bush suggested the City needed to determine what the residents’ needs were in order to meet their communication needs. Councilmember Phipps reiterated enhanced communication should be a goal. Mr. Lenhard commented the issue might be addressed in the next section to determine if it needed to be included.

Mr. Lenhard directed the Council to the next section of the Long Range Strategic Plan.

**Improving Clearfield Image, Livability and Economy**

The following list incorporates the Council’s suggestions.

*Facilitate the revitalization and renewal of the City.*

*Eliminate blight and actively pursue citywide beautification.*

*Incentivize and promote downtown redevelopment to create a vibrant, attractive and healthy urban setting.*

*Pursue a balanced and orderly approach to land use. Support new commercial development and strengthen our manufacturing base.*
Encourage community involvement through a wide variety of unique, high-quality arts and culture programs.

Provide safe and attractive spaces for outdoor recreation and enjoyment. Develop and modernize these spaces with the right amenities and facilities.

Provide and facilitate a variety of outstanding, meaningful and accessible recreational experiences for our residents.

Prioritize community outreach and education to increase community awareness and involvement.

Utilize proven community-oriented policing programs to strengthen relationships and prevent crime.

Promote the 4th of July Celebration as the region’s leading holiday event.

Maximize political influence to support local, statewide, and national policies that will improve and protect Clearfield’s interests.

Support the local economy.

Continue to strengthen our partnership with Hill Air Force Base and work together on mutually beneficial goals.

In conjunction with the discussion, eliminating blight specific to code enforcement was addressed.

Mayor Shepherd believed the City needed to help incentivize redevelopment. Councilmember Bush expressed his opinion to incentivize in more areas than just “downtown.” He believed there were some residential areas which could be targeted as well. Mr. Lenhard explained the strategy was brought over from Vision 2020. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion once downtown was revitalized that revitalization would spread to residential areas. He continued the City needed to incentivize that redevelopment. Councilmember Young suggested the City “promote” redevelopment as well.

Mr. Lenhard led a discussion on the communication component of the Plan. Councilmember Bush suggested including language which provided a means for residents to communicate with staff or elected officials and a discussion followed. Councilmember Peterson suggested small educational videos, one liner or lead-ins which could help educate residents regarding different information or programs. Councilmember Young expressed his opinion residents didn’t think about City government until it directly impacted them and didn’t think they would know where to look for a video. He continued it was important to provide some sort of outreach for whenever it would impact residents. JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, mentioned expanded communication would require additional resources.
Mayor Shepherd shared information about the development of a phone app which the City could purchase and residents would have the opportunity to be notified about specific topics.

The Council took a break at 10:10 a.m.
The meeting resumed at 10:30 am

The Council continued to review the Strategic Plan discussing the communication component. Councilmember Bush expressed his opinion a communication component should be included in Section A of the Plan. He believed it was more of a service and suggested some language similar to, “provide ways for citizens to contact elected officials and city staff”. He continued specific identification of those could take place at a later time. Councilmember Peterson expressed agreement with Councilmember Bush’s remarks. Mr. Lenhard suggested modifying the language and moving the communication strategy to Section A of the Plan.

Mr. Lenhard informed the Council that Rich Fisher, Emergency Services, had recently announced his retirement and the City was evaluating the position and how to improve its efficiency. Councilmember Benson inquired if the City was still forwarding emergency information to neighborhoods. Mr. Lenhard responded that was one of the areas which needed improvement. He suggested the City needed to enhance its ability to partner with emergency preparedness networks already established in the LDS Wards and Stakes. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion emergency preparedness was more of a municipal service and the Council expressed agreement it should be moved to Section A of the Plan.

A discussion took place regarding the City’s 4th of July event.

Councilmember Bush suggested somehow including a buy local component as a strategy. Councilmember Peterson expressed agreed and shared an example of how business networking had resulted in three new Clearfield businesses. Mr. Allen agreed something was missing specific to local small mom and pop type of businesses. Mr. Lenhard assigned Mr. Allen to draft language for a more specific strategy in regard to that type of business development.

Councilmember Young added the City’s business licensing process needed to simplified and streamlined to encourage businesses to locate within the City. Councilmember Phipps shared his knowledge regarding some local professional business owners’ perception of the City and a discussion took place. Mayor Shepherd suggested the City host luncheons inviting local business owners/key personnel to facility the introduction of key City staff.

Councilmember Phipps also mentioned there was nothing in the document which mentioned proximity to Hill Air Force Base as a component. Mayor Shepherd agreed that was necessary. Mr. Lenhard proposed, “Continue to strengthen our partnership with HAFB and work together on mutual goals.” The Mayor and Council expressed agreement with the added goal and a discussion took place.
Mr. Lenhard directed the Council to Section C of the Plan.

**Maintaining a Highly Motivated and Well-Trained Workforce**

The following list incorporates the Council’s suggestions.

*Fund employee pay plans and benefits packages that are competitive, sustainable, and consistent.*

*Provide training and education opportunities that enable employees to develop and refine the skills necessary to succeed in their current and future positions within the organization.*

*Reduce costs and increase the efficiency of staff by utilizing the best equipment, tools and information technology and processes.*

*Cultivate a safe, healthy, and positive workplace where employees want to work.*

*Engage employees through appropriate social activities, events, and recognition.*

*Develop personnel policies that fairly balance the needs of the organization with those of the employee.*

*Foster an environment where the concerns and ideas of all employees will be heard. Provide the flexibility they need to be successful in their public service.*

Mr. Lenhard explained consistency was important to the employees and pointed out how that would impact the budget process. Councilmember Young believed government wage increases should be linked to what is taking place with the current climate of the economy and expressed “consistent” could be dangerous. Mr. Lenhard pointed out the cost of living component for employees hadn’t been addressed in eight years which contributed to the “consistency” concern expressed by employees. He emphasized staff was still looking at a performance based pay structure and a discussion took place.

Mr. Lenhard read the strategy specific to training opportunities and stated the City had significantly decreased travel and training opportunities to employees and pointed out it could be detrimental to the position as the employee might not receive required certification.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion opportunities for training reflected positively on the City. Councilmember Bush pointed out the importance of annual recertification for some positions because it was required by law. Mr. Lenhard emphasized the City had always maintained that priority. JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, indicated there were several professional level employees who were not department heads who were not allowed to attend National Conferences but their peers from other organizations were. He believed that provided the perception that the City was not competitive in that nature and a discussion took place. Mr. Lenhard suggested including “education opportunities” to the strategy.

Councilmember Bush mentioned college classes could also benefit an employee or position and inquired if the City would pay for the registration. Mr. Lenhard responded the City offered a tuition reimbursement program and indicated some employees had received degrees because of
participating in the program making them more valuable to the organization and shared some examples.

The Council agreed with the including training and education in the strategy.

Councilmember Young stated nothing had been identified which addressed hearing the employees and allowing them to provide feedback. He stated it was his perspective that there were great benefits to bottom up communication and he would like to see something which promoted that culture. He wanted management to listen to the employees. Mr. Allen believed Mr. Lenhard did an excellent job at requesting executive staff to solicit employees’ input. Councilmember Young stated that was exactly what he wanted to see and expressed his opinion it was a building block of a good organization. Mr. Lenhard expressed his opinion that morale among staff had significantly improved over the previous few years. Summer Palmer, Administrative Services Director, expressed her opinion staff believed they were being heard.

Councilmember Phipps desired some language be added to allow executive staff to attract and be responsive to employee feedback and a discussion took place. Mr. Lenhard reported he would draft some additional language based on suggestions and ideas shared during the discussion.

The Council took a break for lunch at 11:30 a.m. The meeting resumed at 12:15 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON A COMPREHENSIVE ACTION PLAN (CAP)

Mr. Lenhard directed the Council to the CAP (Comprehensive Action Plan) and requested the Council’s input and direction on the items listed. He informed the Council that he had requested the department heads to identify future items, within the next five years, which the Council should be aware of. He emphasized items which recur annually, Council Neighborhood Open Houses, did not need to necessarily be identified in the list. Councilmember Bush suggested making a section specific to Recurring Events and listing each one. Mr. Lenhard responded he would add that.

Mr. Lenhard reviewed the identified list of projects and discussions took place.

Councilmember Phipps inquired what the Facade Improvement Project was about and Mr. Lenhard explained the program.

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, explained the process used to prioritize items on his list and reviewed it with the Council.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the Gateways project at the 650 North interchange would be impacted by UDOT’s redesign of that interchange which was in the planning stages. Mr. Howes mentioned there was that possibility. Mayor Shepherd didn’t believe there would be any impact because of proposed location for UDOT’s improvements. Mr. Howes also indicated the signage had been designed in such a way that it could be relocated if needed.
Mr. Howes requested direction from the Council regarding the H Street park development of the detention basin and other landscaping projects near that location. A discussion took place regarding possible options. Mr. Lenhard identified the cost of the project was only one of the challenges regarding potential development even with the use of possible PARAT tax revenue. It was determined staff define a landscaping plan for the area.

Mr. Howes discussed Steed Park irrigation improvements. Councilmember Bush inquired about the small shed east of the tennis courts. He asked if it had any specific purpose because it continued to be tagged with graffiti. Mr. Howes agreed it was in disrepair. Mr. Dickson responded it was used to store equipment which wasn’t used on a regular basis. Mr. Lenhard asked if the equipment could be stored at an alternate location in order to demolish the structure. Mr. Howes indicated storage for parks was limited.

– Mr. Howes discussed proposed PARAT Tax projects and indicated the City anticipated to receive $17,000 of revenue from the tax each month. The Council discussed each of the following items.
  - Tables, benches and trash receptacles
  - New signage and landscaping at City Office Building and Cornerstone park
  - Rehabilitate tennis and basketball courts at Kiwanis park
  - New electronic playgrounds at Steed and Barlow parks
  - Ice skating rink
  - Park Signage Replacement
  - Disc golf course for Island View park
  - Continue trail around pond and tie into trail head at Steed Park
  - F-35 and maintenance area playground

Mr. Howes mentioned the location for some of the identified projects such as the skating rink and announced additional research and design was required for the majority of the projects. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion the ice skating rink should not be located anywhere other than Clearfield Station. Councilmember Benson agreed and added Clearfield Station would be a destination place. Councilmember Peterson believed Fisher Park was under “parked” and pointed out the challenges associated with access to the area. Councilmember Bush expressed his opinion the Steed Park tennis courts would be a better location. Mr. Howes clarified the proposed cost of $450,000 was for the skating rink alone and the cost to redo the tennis courts was $350,000.

Mr. Lenhard summarized staff would need to do additional research and be prepared to make formal recommendations and proposed costs to the Council prior to making any other decisions regarding projects.

Mr. Howes continued to review the identified project list in the CAP.

*Island View lighting and pavilions*

Mr. Howes pointed out the bases of the light poles at Island View park were rusting and many of them didn’t work. He proposed replacing the lights along the pathway because lighting was a
challenge. Councilmember Bush added if the disk golf course were developed, adequate lighting would be needed. He also reported the small picnic table pavilions located at the park were in disrepair and requested direction from the Council on removing the structures altogether and just have the picnic tables on a cement pad; or, re-landscaping the area, making fewer table locations with nice pavilions and green space in between.

Councilmember Bush suggested making a decision on the location of the disk golf course. He proposed distributing the new pavilions and tables around the disk golf course if it was going to be designed for Island View Park. Councilmember Peterson was in favor of removing them because she never saw patrons using them. As there was no opposition to that proposal Mr. Howes indicated the pavilions and tables would be removed as weather permitted.

*Steed Electrical Wiring*

Mr. Howes stated some of the wiring was part of the current irrigation project at Steed Park. He reported conduit was being installed to replace the current wire because the existing buried wire was not appropriate for continued use. He suggested the City was fortunate the outdated wiring had lasted so long. He pointed out there was electrical infrastructure under the concrete pads near the building. He suggested the improvements were a high priority because Steed Park generated a significant amount of recreation revenue.

*Train Watch Playground*

Mr. Howes reminded the Council the only remaining amenity at Train Watch Park was a swingset because everything else had been removed four years ago due to safety issues. He believed the smaller park served a portion of the City’s population which had less access to other parks or programs making it a high priority. Mayor Shepherd suggested changing the name of the park. Councilmember Phipps stated the current name was the result of a naming competition. Mayor Shepherd proposed renaming the park in conjunction with the installation of a new playground structure. Councilmember Bush suggested also naming the park referenced as 200 South Street Park. A discussion took place regarding the City’s identified parks and corresponding amenities.

*Fisher Park resurfacing*

Mr. Howes explained the challenge associated with the resurfacing of the playground area at Fisher Park and the different repair options available and a discussion took place. The Council agreed the surface needed to be replaced sometime in the near future given the fact that Mr. Dickson had won a “contribution” of $10,000 from the repair company in a drawing.

Mr. Howes continued to review the list of identified projects which could be completed in Fiscal Years 2017 and 2018.

Mr. Howes explained the Davis Weber Canal Company had contacted the City about extending the Canal Trail along its property and taking it out of residential areas. Councilmember Phipps mentioned at the time the Canal Trail was originally developed there was significant opposition.
Mr. Howes mentioned during one of the neighborhood meetings some of those residents had expressed their concern was relative to screening from their backyards. He believed they were now receptive to the extension of the trail. A discussion also took place regarding the 650 North Trailhead near Days Inn.

The Council took a break at 2:00 p.m.  
The meeting resumed at 2:22 p.m.

Mayor Shepherd announced councilmembers would now have the opportunity to express their concerns and priorities.

Councilmember Peterson expressed some of her priorities:
- Finalize a “Good Will” funding policy
- Dedicate funds to the Development Services Department to be able to identify Small Area Plans and a General Plan update as soon as possible so that staff could then give direction to the Planning Commission and developers for development on a merit review system.
- Communication and how the City could best communicate with its residents.
- Leverage social media.
- Setting goals for educating residents which would encourage involvement.

Mr. Lenhard suggested implementing a marketing communications plan with very specific goals. He mentioned it might be worth bringing in outside people for that specific purpose. Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion it would be critical to understand the different ways to communicate and what each could be used for. She also believed training and policy would need to go along with communication on behalf of the Council and suggested a unified front with predictable expectations would be best. Mr. Allen stated Community Services had encountered some major challenges with marketing programs and facilities and inquired if there was a consensus among the Council that the City needed to overhaul communications in a big way or just implement minor tweaks with the current resources. Councilmember Peterson believed the City was at a real turning point and suggested the City should be willing to take a seismic shift and to do it well. She suggested it would be neither quick nor cheap.

Councilmember Phipps mentioned a lot of the City’s perceived problems were really a lack of communication and suggested attacking the issue with a full commission or committee with expertise to assist in solving the problem. Councilmember Peterson believed a professional individual would be needed. She shared a personal example she experienced using Facebook during her City Council campaign and the Davis School District’s Proposition campaign and believed a small tweak could reap benefits for the City.

Councilmember Young believed the City needed to identify its goal and what would be achieved with the proposed change before he could commit to a substantial change. Councilmember Peterson responded it would bring awareness of the things that were happening within the community as well as be an educational tool providing information. Councilmember Young believed the City could use consultants to help staff learn how to use social media to its fullest
potential and long term resources wouldn’t be necessary. He also suggested listing just one telephone number for residents to call.

Councilmember Benson asked if significant information could be reflected by bullet points on the City’s utility bill. She reported several residents had mentioned they didn’t know how to access the City’s newsletter.

Councilmember Phipps stated the City would need to identify its target audience and then determine the best way to reach them. He reported there were professional communicators that could be used to determine the best method of communication for the residents. Councilmember Bush believed the residents had some responsibility to do their part as well.

Mayor Shepherd believed the issue wasn’t necessarily with the communication itself. He suggested it was more of an image and if residents believed the City was doing all it could to communicate with them. He stated it was important for the people to believe City staff was available to them, that they have a voice and their concern matters. He added it was not what the City was actually doing but the message that was being sent.

Councilmember Benson suggested the out of sight, out of mind mentality and if you’re not seeing it you’re so busy with life that you’re not thinking about it. She expressed her concern about how many of the residents didn’t know where or how to find the newsletter.

Mayor Shepherd asked how the City should measure whether the communication method was effective. Mr. Allen reported he would follow up with internal staff regarding the discussion.

Mr. Allen asked how urgent the Small Area Plans and General Plan update were to the Council. Councilmember Young believed it needed to be a priority because there were areas of focus for development. Councilmember Bush suggested staff should define specific areas using the following criteria to determine the best use: size of the parcels, zoning, etc. Mr. Allen reminded the Council that the City employed one planner that managed a lot of work and believed the issue was a lack of resources and believed a consultant would need to be hired. Mr. Lenhard pointed out the City already had an intern; maybe the work hours could be extended.

Mr. Allen stated the Annual Report which the Council would soon be receiving reflected statistics of the City and reported the City Planner was busier now than in previous years. Councilmember Bush believed there were Planning Commission members that could help with ideas for areas and didn’t believe the City would need to hire a consultant. Councilmember Peterson also didn’t believe a consultant was necessary but she was aware the department needed additional help given the volume of work it was processing.

Councilmember Phipps expressed some of his priorities:
- Concern with the planning division and the need for additional staff/resources.
- He wanted people to enjoy living in Clearfield.
- Look and feel of the City specific to code enforcement.
- Communication and Strategic Planning.
- Great Recreation Programs and Parks.
• Communication/Education.

He reiterated his general concern was that residents enjoyed their local community and the amenities suited their needs. He also emphasized that the City be responsive to their concerns. He indicated his concerns had been well addressed during the meeting.

Mr. Lenhard announced a topic which had been discussed among staff for a long time in helping residents get to the right place with their concerns. He reminded the Council that approximately two years ago staff visited a couple of cities which had created a “Customer Service Center” which was the epicenter for all customer interactions. He continued the City’s current building was designed with eight different front counters, each with its own staff. He shared how each of the visited cities had provided a central location for phone calls. He reported there would be several challenges associated with the City moving in that direction. He asked if the Council felt like it was the right time for Clearfield to implement a “Customer Service Center”. He expressed his opinion that promotions would be inevitable for current employees involved with the proposed solution. Mayor Shepherd expressed concern regarding the cost associated with implementing something of that nature. Mr. Lenhard believed the change would be initially expensive. Mayor Shepherd believed it would be very effective. A discussion took place relative to costs associated with the implementation of a customer service center. Mayor Shepherd directed staff to further explore costs associated with the implementation.

Councilmember Benson expressed some of her priorities:
• Concerns about parks specifically, Fox Hollow, and the care of the trees in the arboretum during the winter months. She suggested some needed to be tied up during the winter and others were overgrown, etc. Some residents have requested an “Adopt a Tree” program
• Service.
• Emergency Preparedness.
• She had a great desire to be involved with the youth and would love to somehow get involved with the high school.
• She had a desire to help the community as a whole during her term.

Mr. Lenhard believed staff and the City Council had been able to come together to get numerous things accomplished during the past year. Mayor Shepherd stated he understood Councilmember Benson’s concern about leaving her “mark” upon completion of her term and stated he would be happy to assign/request her chair or be liaison to something that would fit her skillset.

The Council took a break at 3:48 p.m.
The meeting resumed at 4:05 p.m.

Councilmember Bush expressed some of his priorities:
• Several ordinances needed to be looked at and possibly amended such as ordinances which helped local businesses and enticed new businesses to locate in Clearfield.
• Veterans monument and believed the Arts Foundation could begin collecting tax deductible donations which could be donated for that purpose.
• Community beautification. He suggested resurrecting the Beautification Committee to implement some help in promoting a positive image.
• Communication.
• Streets and Roads.
• Education of residents about how/when it was appropriate to contact elected officials as opposed to City staff. He stated he was unclear on how he should respond to residents’ concerns because he wanted to be responsive but wanted to do it appropriately. He suggested drafting a policy to follow.

Mayor Shepherd stated if a resident was asking for his personal opinion that would be all right but if the resident was looking for a policy or ordinance, the question should be referred to staff. Mr. Lenhard mentioned the importance of the resident receiving consistent information and a discussion took place regarding the recent broken water line incident.

Councilmember Young expressed a desire to continue to see long term financial progress. He complimented staff for the current direction of the City. He wished the City could fund all of Community Services’ requests.

Mayor Shepherd expressed some of his priorities:
• Image of the City.
• Business development. He shared some information about proposed development in Layton and believed it would help the development of the Legend Hills area. He stated a developer would be addressing the Council during a work session on Tuesday, February 2, 2016, regarding proposed development at the site previously known as the Midtown Village parcel. He believed the proposed development combined with the Sandridge development could be a catalyst for future business development in the City. He also mentioned the interchange at 650 North and 700 South could impact development. He shared an update specific to Clearfield Station and announced the developer was aware the first tranche would be activated next year. He indicated UTA would be meeting with Thackeray Garn, developer, to determine how to proceed.
• Communication. He really wanted the residents to be informed and understand the City was communicating with them whether or not they knew who/how to contact the City.

Councilmember Bush inquired about the identified CDBG 350 West project. Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, explained the project would include new infrastructure for culinary water, sewer and storm sewer, as well as the road project. Mr. Lenhard stated the City might not be completing an infrastructure project using CDBG funds in the coming budget year based on Council’s direction from the meeting on Tuesday, January 26, 2016.

Councilmember Bush asked if the identified 300 North asphalt overlay project was east of Main Street. Mr. Hodge responded that was for the area of road from Main Street to 1500 West. He added Questar Gas intended to install a new gas line on 300 North east of Main Street so the City was waiting for that to be completed before completing the overlay project on that section.

Councilmember Phipps inquired about the Sungard software replacement project. Mr. Lenhard stated the Sungard financial software wasn’t sufficient to meet the City’s needs for financial reporting and staff was looking for solutions. He explained the state auditor was asking for new reports and reported the City was one of two cities in the state which didn’t have a compatible
software program to complete the types of reports the auditor requested. He announced staff was looking for an alternative since Sungard could not get the City what it needed. He indicated staff would be looking for a citywide software program and mentioned it would also include a time keeping software component. He believed it would be a huge investment in the very near future.

Mr. Lenhard stated there was good news associated with the City’s budget as revenues were strong. He continued with the passing of Proposition 1 and with the change to the motor vehicle fuel tax, the City would make even more progress on its streets/road maintenance. He indicated one of the City’s top priorities would be a traffic signal at the intersection of 700 South and 1000 West and the complete 700 South to match what had been completed in Syracuse.

Mr. Lenhard reported the Public Works facility was still progressing and the City anticipated it could pay cash for Phase II.

He announced the completion of the Compensation Plan Study was very important for the employees.

He expressed his opinion that the City was doing a fantastic job specific to overall debt and reported the two largest debt obligations had been refinanced resulting in hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax dollar savings. He informed the Council that in July 2019 the City would make the last payment on its General Obligation Bond and explained in addition to losing the high payment, the City would also lose the tax revenue from property tax. He encouraged staff to make an adjustment in the certified tax rate to recapture some of the revenue which would disappear. He announced big expenses were foreseeable and something would need to happen to increase the revenue available in the General Fund.

Mr. Lenhard encouraged the Council to review the remainder of the list and express its concerns with staff. He also mentioned if there was a need or desire to discuss any items they could be addressed during a future work session. He asked if there were any questions and there were none.

Councilmember Peterson expressed appreciation to staff. Mr. Lenhard expressed appreciation to staff and believed the City was headed in the right direction.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
PRESIDING: Kent Bush Mayor Pro Tem
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Vern Phipps Councilmember
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Stuart Williams City Attorney
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VISITORS: There were no visitors.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE GROUND LESSOR’S CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 888 SOUTH UNIVERSITY PARK BOULEVARD

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, reminded the Council of the location of the building which housed AAA and Exeter. He continued a few years ago the owner of the building had negotiated a lease with the City and the CDRA for property to accommodate additional parking at the facility and he shared a visual illustration identifying the building and subsequent parking. He informed the Council that the building had been sold recently and the new owner, identified as 888 Associates, has used the building, along with several other facilities, as collateral against a line of credit. He stated it was a short term loan, approximately eighteen months, and was held by KeyBank. He continued KeyBank required as part of the loan, the Ground Lessor’s Consent Agreement from the City and the CDRA. He clarified the agreement would allow KeyBank to become the lessee in the event 888 Associates defaulted on the loan and foreclosure action was necessary on the building. He reported he and Stuart Williams, City Attorney, had reviewed the agreement at length in addition to having discussions with both the building owner and KeyBank and stated neither one of them had any concerns with the agreement.
Stuart Williams, City Attorney, emphasized this agreement didn’t change any terms of the original lease and should not be considered a new lease agreement. Mr. Allen clarified KeyBank did not have the authority to lien the City’s property but would lien the leases. He asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Phipps asked if 888 Associates defaulted and KeyBank ended up owning the building could it lease the property to another entity. Mr. Allen indicated protection regarding that was included within the original lease agreements.

DISCUSSION ON SR 193 LANDSCAPING

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, reminded the Council how the City had acquired landscaping funds to be used along the SR 193 expansion and reviewed how funds had been used in conjunction with Syracuse City and West Point City. He reported on some of the expenditures and stated there was a remaining balance of almost $141,000 which could only be used for landscaping or landscaping maintenance along the SR 193 corridor. He announced those funds had been divided between the three municipalities based on the linear footage. He stated Clearfield received fifty-five percent which was equivalent to $77,628.41 to either complete additional landscaping or set aside to be used for maintenance. He stated he had options to use the additional funds for the Council to consider.

Councilmember Benson asked if the proposed landscaping project could be completed by City staff. Mr. Howes responded although that appeared to be cheaper and current staff was capable of completing the work, it would take longer.

Mr. Howes shared a visual illustration of the triangle piece of land near the 200 South/Center Street connection to SR 193. He stated it would be very simple to complete the irrigation design and installation for turf with the addition of mulch on the east side near the fence line and use gravel on the west side for ease of maintenance.

Mr. Howes proposed using similar products such as mulch, gravel and larger rock to weave in the area along the 200 South trail on the north side of the soundwall. He mentioned there were some areas along the trail that would be wide enough to place benches and some plantings or boulders. He mentioned turf could be placed in that entire area which would require some maintenance but believed it would be too much green. Councilmember Peterson pointed out green turf wouldn’t set an example relative to water conservation. Mr. Howes explained challenges associated with mowing anything on the south side of the soundwall due to the proximity of high speed traffic near the merge lane from 200 South to SR 193. He suggested the planting of some annual grasses in that area and mentioned anything planted would have to withstand the salt mixture used by UDOT in the winter.

Mr. Howes directed the Council to the illustration and identified the trail area from 200 South to H Street along SR 193 and mentioned that area was very visible to traffic. He pointed out the areas of access to water and stated the challenges with landscaping that area were specific to the proximity to the railroad and again salt mixture used by UDOT. Councilmember Young
suggested trees along the trail would be a nice amenity. Mr. Howes expressed agreement and commented there were several types of drought tolerant trees which could be used.

Mr. Howes reviewed cost estimates for the landscaping project with the Council and stated the irrigation system and sod installation would be completed by a contractor. He proposed staff install the mulch and rock along 200 South.

Councilmember Phipps mentioned the residents living along 200 South didn’t appreciate the view of the soundwall which came with the SR 193 extension and suggested the City be cognizant of those residents when determining how to landscape the area and a discussion took place specific to trees, plantings and benches as an amenity.

Councilmember Benson inquired if there would be enough funds to complete all three presented projects. Mr. Howes responded there were funds appropriated specifically for landscaping the area; however, how that’s accomplished or when would be up to the City Council.

Councilmember Bush asked if the City knew what Syracuse and West Point cities had planned for their portions of the project. Mr. Howes responded Syracuse intended to use its portion of funds toward equipment which could cut whatever grows along the south side of the soundwall. He indicated West Point would be using its funds for signage at 2000 West. He mentioned discussions had taken place regarding the consistency of landscaping along the soundwall.

Councilmember Benson expressed her opinion that landscaping along the trail should be the priority. Councilmember Bush believed the first priority should be landscaping the area near Center Street and SR 193. Mr. Howes clarified if the Council was in agreement to complete the landscaping in the area of Center Street and SR 193 as a first priority then extending along 200 South. A discussion took place regarding vacant private property on the south side of Center Street near the SR 193 intersection. Councilmember Young suggested the City find out how the current property owner intended to develop the property and coordinate the landscaping project with that information.

Mr. Howes summarized the landscaping projects would be completed in the following order:

- Center Street
- 200 South
- H Street trail area

**DISCUSSION ON THE DAYCARE AT THE AQUATIC CENTER**

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, reminded the Council of previous discussions last year related to expanding the daycare at the Aquatic Center. He mentioned the two goals directly related to the expansion were to minimize the subsidization and create more availability. He reported during the expansion process several challenges came to light and staff determined it was not feasible. He also explained why the center couldn’t provide both full time and drop in daycare.
He announced staff then implemented a small pre-school named, Starfish Academy, as a pilot program at the beginning of the school year. He emphasized the same two goals applied to the pre-school that had been identified for the daycare and announced the first goal had already been recognized; it was fully self-supporting. He mentioned the pre-school didn’t address any drop in daycare needs by patrons of the Aquatic Center. Mr. Howes reviewed specifics related to the pre-school:

- The drop in day care was available from 8 a.m. to 12 noon.
- Pre-school was available from 12:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- 3 and 4 year old children could attend.
- Monday & Wednesday only.
- Staffed by an instructor and an assistant.
- $75 per month tuition.
- Enrollment fee was applicable when not a member of the Aquatic Center. He mentioned the first nine participants didn’t have memberships and reported three of those participants had since purchased memberships.
- $45 materials fee.

Mr. Howes reviewed revenues and expenses associated with operating the daycare. He stated supplemental programs for 3 and 4 year old children were offered prior to opening for the day. He stated those programs had also been successful and half of the participants were children already participating in the pre-school. He shared plans for expanding the pre-school program next year. A discussion took place regarding specifics related to the daycare.

Councilmember Young expressed concern the benefit of the daycare wasn’t necessarily for the Aquatic Center’s patrons. Mr. Howes emphasized the daycare had certainly filled a need while at the same time using the Center when patronage was at a low point and pointed out the space used for the program at the Aquatic Center would go unused if the program didn’t exist. A discussion took place regarding the daycare/programs.

Mr. Howes requested direction from the Council on whether the daycare should continue being offered at the Aquatic Center and if it was comfortable with how staff had implemented something to fill a need. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, stated he wanted the Council to know the program was competing with the private sector. The Council discussed pricing and other options regarding drop in daycare.

Councilmember Peterson asked what the initial reason was behind expanding drop in daycare services. Mr. Howes responded it was to entice patronage during the middle of the day when the daycare had not previously been available; however, the drop in service during that time was still not being offered.

Councilmember Benson indicated she didn’t have any objections with the pre-school because the number of children wasn’t too large and it was implemented in the spirit of enticing Aquatic Center memberships. Mr. Howes believed another benefit was the small amount of recognized revenue from the program. He asked if the Council was in favor of continuing the program and requested direction.
Councilmember Peterson believed the pre-school was a service or benefit to the patrons of the Aquatic Center and a discussion followed. Councilmember Young pointed out the City had the building and it needed to be utilized. He continued if this was the best use for space during that time it should continue. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion the fitness facility was providing a need for its patrons and didn’t believe it was competing with the private sector. The Council directed Mr. Howes to continue next year and requested he continue to evaluate.

Councilmember Benson moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in a City Council policy session at 6:58 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. All voting AYE.

The work session reconvened at 7:39 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11, CHAPTER 1, SECTION 10 – PUBLIC NOTICING REQUIREMENTS AND CHAPTER 13 – PAWN AND SECONDHAND BUSINESSES

Spencer Brimley, Development Services Manager, explained staff had recognized some inconsistencies regarding the noticing process and emphasized at no point was the City in violation of either State Statute or City ordinance in processing subdivision applications. He displayed a visual table which identified public notice requirements. He explained the table reflected a 10 calendar day notice for a hearing specific to approval of subdivision preliminary plat. He continued staff had taken it to mean a “public hearing” during a meeting and announced State Statute didn’t require a public hearing unless there was a street vacation or portion of a public right of way, or amending of the subdivision.

He requested direction from the Council to either amend the City’s table to reflect the language as in the State Statute regarding a public meeting or continue with the City’s current practice. He pointed out there was a difference between a public meeting and a public hearing and stated only the public hearing allowed for public comment. He suggested members of the Council express their thoughts and desires specific to the level of involvement when it came to the approval of subdivision plats.

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, suggested amending Title 12, the subdivision ordinance, making it very clear the City was requiring a public hearing if the Council desired to allow public hearings as part of the subdivision approval process.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the change would be more applicable to subdividing a home lot since there weren’t significant areas left to subdivide within the City. Mr. Brimley responded it would be applicable to individual lots as well as small subdivisions. Mr. Allen pointed out it could also be taking several individual lots and creating a new parcel from several such as had been done with the Sandridge development located across State Street from City Hall.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush inquired why a public hearing would be necessary in the approval process. Councilmember Young believed it merely allowed for public input and stated he wouldn’t be in favor of removing that language from the approval process. Mr. Brimley emphasized the public hearing wasn’t a burden to staff but rather how the City would want the item presented. He
mentioned with the public hearing there were additional noticing requirements and explained how it would reduce costs for mailings. Nancy Dean, City Recorder, pointed out the fee could also be reduced if the City wasn’t required to publish the notice in the newspaper which was approximately $150.00.

Mr. Allen stated the City had been holding public hearings for preliminary subdivision plat and mentioned language wasn’t clear specific to final subdivision plat approval and suggested maybe that language was all that needed to be clarified. He suggested the Council consider who the approval authority should be. Mayor Pro Tem Bush believed the subdivision plat was administrative which could be completed by staff or the Planning Commission. Mr. Allen clarified currently the preliminary plat needed approval from the Planning Commission as the land use authority and the City Council approved the final subdivision plat.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, explained the history regarding subdivisions at the State level which, until just a few years ago, required a public hearing for preliminary plats and the City’s ordinance had been drafted to meet that compliance. He continued previously there were many more required public hearings which were eliminated, removing politics from the land use process identifying some as an administrative processes. He emphasized public clamor was not a valid reason to make a land use decision and a discussion took place regarding public hearings and the approval process.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush pointed out if required conditions were met as identified in the City’s ordinance, the Council was obligated to approve the subdivision and questioned the point in allowing the public to comment. He stated it was probably a good idea to notify nearby residents to merely make them aware it was on the Council’s agenda.

Councilmember Phipps believed it was important for residents to have input regarding changes to their neighborhood or community even if the Council was bound by law and was in favor of the public forum. Councilmember Peterson suggested changing some of the language in the notice being sent to residents to clearly state the expectations. Councilmember Young believed the notification to the public didn’t have to reflect a public hearing, it could identify a public meeting. Ms. Dean suggested the mailed notice didn’t have to reflect a public hearing; it could reflect a specific date by which residents could contact an individual at the City in order to provide additional information or ask questions prior to the consideration of a proposed subdivision. The Council responded it liked that suggestion. Mr. Brimley responded the notification sent from his office was similar with the exception of a final date.

Mr. Brimley suggested the land use table could reflect that staff was the recommending body to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission was the approval body, the land use authority, on a preliminary subdivision plat and final plat. He stated the final plat could occur at the staff level between the engineer and the applicant to finalize things.

Mr. Lenhard inquired if the Mayor’s signature would still need to appear on the plat. Mr. Allen responded the Planning Commission, as the land use authority, could recommend approval of the preliminary plat to the City Council, and the final plat could be an administrative function. A discussion took place regarding different options. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion
that if the City Council were to be involved in the approval process, it should be for the preliminary plat. Councilmember Bush didn’t believe the County required the Mayor’s signature on subdivision plats in order for them to be recorded.

Mr. Lenhard commented the amendment to the ordinance would need to proceed through the Planning Commission and staff could move forward in preparing the amendment. He clarified the Council was in agreement to not requiring a public hearing for a conditional use permit or preliminary subdivision plat but still preparing some sort of notice administratively directing residents to staff for comment or questions. He continued the notice would be a courtesy mailed notice and that general posting requirements wouldn’t be needed. He mentioned the fee schedule would also need to be amended. Mr. Brimley responded staff would draft proposed amendments and bring it back to the Council for additional discussion and direction.

Spencer Brimley, Development Services Manager, shared the presentation which had been shared with the Planning Commission regarding pawn and secondhand businesses. He informed the Council that there were currently three pawn shops operating within Clearfield City and identified them on the illustration. He shared another illustration which identified the pawn shop locations but also non-depository lending establishments. He reminded the Council the ordinance had language which mitigated the clustering of these types of businesses in addition to the per capita limitation.

He reported staff had reviewed analysis and reports and from that information concluded there was concern nationwide relative to pawn shops. He stated staff also reviewed police data specific to Clearfield City and reported there was no direct correlation between crime and pawn shops; however, as staff reviewed those reports there was evidence which led to concerns from communities expressing regret they didn’t begin mitigating current problems sooner.

Mr. Brimley reported some of the reports he read, which had already been shared with the Planning Commission, focused on transit corridors and the correlation to crime and staff believed there was a tie to the City’s current conditions.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, reminded the Council it had requested staff to study and evaluate the impact of pawn shops on the City. He informed the Council that the information had been presented to the Planning Commission in November 2015 and the issue was discussed. He stated another meeting with the Planning Commission took place in January to discuss concerns associated with pawn and secondhand businesses which were presented by the public from the 2014 public hearing associated with approval of Pawn Depot.

Mr. Brimley announced staff believed there was enough substantiated evidence that currently there might not be a problem; however, there was the potential for negative impacts in the future if no action was taken. He stated a public hearing took place during the Planning Commission’s February meeting at which time it recommended to adopt additional regulations to the Council. He pointed out the basis for the recommendation:

- Staff looked at cities both within and outside of Utah and those inside the State allowed the use in industrial zones completely removing the use from the commercial zones.
• Varying degrees of distance requirements from different types of businesses and community locations.
• Additional correlation that pawn shops and non-depository lending establishments were similar in business practices and explained they both lent money at a certain rate of interest because the consumer couldn’t obtain financing another way.
• The City’s proposed amendment could be similar.

Mr. Brimley announced the proposed recommendation was to implement a distance requirement for any pawn and secondhand business which located within Clearfield City. He clarified the language would read; “no pawn or secondhand business can be located within one mile of another pawn or secondhand business and 880 feet from any non-depository lending establishment. He directed the Council to the map and pointed out the number of non-depository lending establishments currently exceeded the City’s per capita regulation. He added the reports didn’t substantiate that fact; rather, data reflected regulation should be based more on the clustering of non-retail establishments. He explained the formula used to determine the 880 feet distance requirement.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the City had defined pawn and secondhand business. Mr. Brimley responded the City’s ordinance referred to State Statute for definition. Mr. Allen added the State also required those establishments to have a specific business registration.

Mr. Brimley announced the ordinance amendment would come before the Council as a recommendation from the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 23, 2016. He indicated the language would be a new supplementary regulation within Chapter 13 of the City Code.

The meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.
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Mayor Pro Tem Bush called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush informed the citizens present that if they would like to comment during Public Hearings or Citizen Comments there were forms to fill out by the door.

Councilmember Young conducted the Opening Ceremony.

Councilmember Peterson requested a correction to comments she made during the Communication Items on the February 23, 2016, policy session minutes. Her comments should reflect; the class was being offered free of charge to elected officials with a nominal fee for their spouses.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush stated the March 1, 2016 work session minutes reflected Councilmembers Ron Jones and Mike LeBaron were present and requested they be corrected to reflect Councilmembers Nike Peterson and Vern Phipps.

Councilmember Phipps moved to approve the minutes from the February 2, 2016 work session, the February 23, 2016 work session and the February 25, 2016 work sessions as written, and the February 23, 2016 policy session and the March 1, 2016 work sessions as amended, seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENT ON AMENDMENTS TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET

Staff identified expenditures necessary for City operations which were not included in its current budget. State Code allowed the City to make adjustments to the budget and a public hearing was part of that process.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, directed the Council to the staff report and reviewed the proposed budget amendments with the Council highlighting the following:
  - The first three items were specific to Community Services and referred the Council to Eric Howes’, Community Services Director, staff report for details.
  - Setting up the Foundation for Arts, Parks & Recreation.
  - Fourth of July entertainment costs.
  - Public Works Phase II design.
  - Weber Basin water overage.
  - Items related to the 2200 South water leak and sewer backup incident earlier in the year. He indicated the waterline would be replaced in that area.
  - Expenses in the risk fund for the 2200 South claims.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the City could expect additional future costs specific to the 2200 South sewer back up other than the itemized amendments. Mr. Knapp believed the figures specific to Public Works replacing the infrastructure was an accurate final cost. He mentioned the figures related to reimbursements, specific to the Risk Fund, had been estimated on the high
side. Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, mentioned there was the possibility of an asphalt overlay. Councilmember Peterson asked if those costs would be realized in the 2017 budget. Mr. Hodge expressed his opinion the work could be completed in June so the expenditure would take place in the current budget year and hoped that cost could be absorbed using operational funds.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the proposed new position for Community Services would be reflected as a line item in the future fiscal year budgets. Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, responded that position would be funded using savings incurred since October 2015. She also asked if the repair at Fisher Park would be completed prior to the City’s Fourth of July celebration. Mr. Dickson responded the repair could be completed within eight weeks. She inquired if that would be a final repair at Fisher Park or if there were other needed repairs. Mr. Dickson stated the identified repair would repair everything at Fisher Park.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush requested Mr. Dickson update the Council on implementing the Clearfield Foundation for Arts, Parks & Recreation. Mr. Dickson explained staff had looked for ways to generate revenue to be used for parks, recreation and arts. He reported application had been submitted to the IRS requesting 501c3 status which would allow donations to be tax deductible.

Councilmember Benson asked how the issue with the Fisher Park playground surface had been discovered. Mr. Dickson explained staff had noticed some issues during regular maintenance and stated they had attempted to remedy the issues with small repairs and explained the process which would be used for if the repair were approved as an amendment to the budget.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush requested clarification whether the Foundation could begin accepting donations. Mr. Knapp responded the City could begin accepting donations and reported the City still needed to open a bank account for that purpose. JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, announced staff would be soliciting donations for the Fourth of July and indicated they would be funneled through the Foundation.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the account would be separate from City funds. Mr. Knapp responded in the affirmative and he identified those individuals who served on the Foundation’s Board.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush asked for public comments.

There were no public comments.

Councilmember Young moved to close the public hearing at 7:16 p.m. seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE COMMENT ON THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) ONE YEAR ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEAR JULY 1, 2016 TO JUNE 30, 2017.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush opened the public hearing at 7:17 p.m.
The Council received a copy of the proposed 2016-2017 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) One Year Action Plan. Citizens would have the opportunity to review the One Year Action Plan in the Community Development Department from March 9, 2016 until April 8, 2016. The final copy would be presented to the Council on April 26, 2016.

Spencer Brimley, Development Services Manager, reminded the Council that Stacy Millgate, CDBG Coordinator, had presented possible funding options to the Council during a previous work session. He expressed appreciation to her for her work with the CDBG program. He reviewed the following CDBG funding proposals:

- Family Connection Center - $9,000
- Davis Community Learning Center - $16,964
- Safe Harbor - $5,000
- Housing Rehabilitation - $75,000
- Emergency Home Repairs - $30,466
- Building Lot Purchase - $50,000
- Administration costs $20,000

Councilmember Peterson directed Mr. Brimley to the Internet Outreach section of the report where it specifically called out minorities and other individuals which could be serviced. She asked if it was possible to expand the reach beyond the City’s website as she believed individuals within the poverty threshold wouldn’t know about the resources or know how to go to the City’s website to learn about them. She suggested adding a “social media” component in both English and Spanish.

Mr. Brimley responded he would discuss the issue with staff to determine how that could be accomplished.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush asked for public comments.

There were no public comments.

Councilmember Young moved to close the public hearing at 7:22 p.m. seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

APPROVAL OF THE DeMOLAY PROCLAMATION DECLARING THE MONTH OF MARCH 2016, DeMOLAY MONTH IN CLEARFIELD CITY

Sam Harris, DeMolay, explained DeMolay is a character-building organization consisting of young men between the ages of 12-21 seeking to prepare them to become better leaders within the community. The organization carried out civic services for over eighty years. He shared some of the volunteer opportunities He mentioned some famous people who were past participants in
Mayor Pro Tem Bush asked where the DeMolay group was meeting and how far reaching this chapter served. Mr. Harris responded the Clearfield DeMolay group met at the Clearfield Masonic Temple and stated it served Davis and Weber counties. He mentioned there were three chapters in Utah and one of those chapters was in Ogden.

Councilmember Phipps mentioned he belonged to DeMolay as a young man.

Councilmember Benson asked how it publicized the organization. Mr. Harris stated the chapter participated in the Fourth of July parade but usually new members were recruited by word of mouth.

Councilmember Phipps moved to approve the DeMolay Proclamation declaring the month of March 2016, DeMolay month in Clearfield City and authorize the Mayor Pro Tem’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2016R-08 ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET

Councilmember Peterson moved to approve Resolution 2016R-08 adopting amendments to the fiscal year 2016 budget and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Young. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

APPROVAL OF THE AWARD OF PROPOSAL FOR ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING DESIGN FOR THE CLEARFIELD CITY PUBLIC WORKS FACILITIES PHASE II ADMINISTRATIVE, PARKS AND CEMETERY MAINTENANCE BUILDING TO SCOTT P EVANS ARCHITECT AND ASSOCIATES

The City solicited requests from qualified professional architectural and engineering firms to provide a comprehensive value based building design for the Clearfield City Public Works Facility Phase II Administrative, Parks, and Cemetery Maintenance Building. The City received proposals from eight qualified firms. The selection committee reviewed the proposals and recommended the award of proposal to Scott P. Evans Architect and Associates with a proposal of $199,800.00.

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, reminded the Council the project was part of Phase II of the Public Works Facility. He stated the building would house administrative offices for public works, parks and recreation maintenance shops and facilities. He reviewed the process used by the selection committee in reviewing the eight submitted proposals to recommend awarding the proposal to Scott P Evans Architect for the project.
Councilmember Young moved to approve the award of proposal for architectural/engineering design for the Public Works Facility Phase II Administrative, Parks, and Cemetery Maintenance Building to Scott P Evans Architect and Associates with a proposal of $199,800.00 and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

APPROVAL OF THE AWARD OF BID TO COMPLETE THE 300 NORTH STREET PEDESTRIAN SAFETY SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT TO B. HANSEN CONSTRUCTION

Bids were received from ten construction companies to install concrete sidewalk on the south side of 300 North Street from 825 West to 985 West. The lowest responsible bid was received from B. Hansen Construction with the bid of $57,935.

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, explained the City had submitted a grant application through UDOT for sidewalk installation. He stated the grant required a match on behalf of the City and the City had been successful in receiving the grant. He stated there was a major irrigation box just east of the Maverik on 300 North which would need to be relocated, as well as curb and gutter along the stretch of road. He reported the City didn’t have previous experience in working with the B. Hansen Construction; however, the engineers had checked references.

Councilmember Phipps noted the differences in the bid amounts and mentioned the low bid caused him concern and referenced a specific line item. Mr. Hodge indicated staff also had that same concern and reported personal contact had been made with B. Hansen Construction and they were confident they could complete the project as submitted in the bid.

Councilmember Peterson moved to approve the award of bid to complete the 300 North Street Pedestrian Safety Sidewalk Improvement Project to B. Hansen Construction for the bid amount of $57,935 and approve funding for the project for the bid amount of $57,935 with contingency and engineering costs of $19,065 for a total project cost of $77,000, and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Young. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

APPROVAL OF THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE 1150 WEST WATERLINE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT TO MARSH CONSTRUCTION

Bids were received from five construction companies to install an 8-inch waterline on 1150 West Street from 1045 South to 950 South. The lowest responsible bid was received from Marsh Construction with the bid of $130,552.95.

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, explained the current 6-inch waterline was approximately 30 years old. He mentioned the current standard was 8-inches. He reported the subdivision had been identified on the City’s Capital Facilities Plan for needed improvements. He stated Marsh
Construction had completed previous projects for the City and expressed his confidence they could satisfactorily complete the necessary work on the project.

Mayor Pro Tem Bush inquired if any contact had been made to nearby residents regarding the project. Mr. Hodge didn’t believe a neighborhood meeting had not taken place on the project.

Councilmember Young moved to approve the award of bid for the installation of an eight inch waterline on 1150 West Street from 1045 South to 950 South to Marsh Construction for the bid mount of $130,552.95 and approve funding for the project with the bid amount of $130,552.95 with contingency and engineering costs of $26,447.05 for a total project cost of $157,000 and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2016R-09 AFFIRMING THE CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED THE 2015 MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER PLANNING PROGRAM REPORT FOR CLEARFIELD CITY

Utah Department of Environmental Quality asked the City Council to review and consider Clearfield’s Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for 2015. This resolution affirmed the Council reviewed and considered the report.

Councilmember Phipps asked if there were any consequences to the City for it not being submitted by March 1. Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, responded the State had sent the wrong paperwork to the City; therefore, an extension had been granted.

Councilmember Peterson moved to approve Resolution 2016R-09 affirming that the City Council reviewed and considered the 2015 Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for Clearfield City and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Benson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

Councilmember Bush
1. Informed the Council he had participated in the Downtown Redevelopment meeting on Thursday, February 25, 2016, and indicated several people were in attendance and good ideas had been shared.
2. Mentioned the City Council Open House at Holt Elementary was successful with a lot of residents in attendance. He was hopeful to implement some of the things discussed by residents.

Councilmember Benson – nothing to report.

Councilmember Peterson – nothing to report.

Councilmember Phipps – Announced Wasatch Waste Integrated would no longer be accepting recyclables such as cardboard, paper, metals, etc. because that area was being used by the secondhand store. He mentioned the new conveyor system for residential garbage would soon be implemented at the
burn plant to pull items which didn’t burn well. Councilmember Peterson inquired if household hazardous waste could still be disposed at the facility. Mr. Phipps responded that was still available as well as household electronics.

_Councilmember Young_ – nothing to report.

**STAFFS’ REPORTS**

**JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager**
1. Reminded the Council of the City Council Open House scheduled for Tuesday, March 15, 2016, at Antelope Elementary.
2. Informed the Council that the second workshop for the Downtown Small Area Plan was scheduled for Thursday, March 17, 2016, at the Community Arts Center beginning at 6:30 p.m.
3. Announced the open house scheduled for the 350 West CDBG project was scheduled for Wednesday, March 9, 2016, in the multi-purpose room at City Hall beginning at 7:00 p.m.

**Nancy Dean, City Recorder**
1. Stated Adam Lenhard, City Manager, had emailed his monthly update earlier in the day.
3. Informed the Council that Caucus meetings were scheduled for Tuesday, March 22, 2016; therefore, no City Council meetings were scheduled. She mentioned if something came up a special session would take place on another evening.
4. Announced the first budget work session was scheduled for Tuesday, March 29, 2016.

**Mayor Shepherd** – announced he and Adam Lenhard, City Manager, would come back from the National League of Cities and Towns Conference and share what they learned. He mentioned it had been a good conference.

_Councilmember Phipps moved to recess at 7:50 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. All voting AYE._

The meeting resumed at 8:09 p.m.

**PRESENTATION BY HILL AIR FORCE BASE (HAFB) REGARDING THE AIR SHOW**

Lieutenant Colonel Kris Long from the 75th Air Base Wing addressed the City Council about the Warriors Over the Wasatch Air Show scheduled for June 25 & 26 2016. He shared a visual illustration regarding the upcoming Air Show. He explained the goals of the Air Show and open house and shared expectations for the event related to transportation, parking and busing.

Councilmember Peterson mentioned she had intended to ask about the proposed offsite parking possibilities but based on the presentation it was apparent those decisions were still being made. She also asked when the City could publicize and inform residents about the transportation plans and parking options. Colonel Long stated marketing for the event had already started; however, off-base parking still was being negotiated with neighboring communities and UDOT. He assured the Council that organizers were aware of the parking/traffic issues associated with the Air Show. He expressed his opinion there could potentially be 600,000 people attending the event. He stated UTA had committed to having Frontrunner operational that Sunday.
Colonel Long expressed appreciation to the City and Council for supporting the Air Force and the Air Show in the past. JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, announced funds had been appropriated for the Air Show.

There being no further business to come before the Council, **Councilmember Young moved to adjourn at 8:19 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Benson. Voting AYE – Councilmembers Benson, Bush, Peterson, Phipps and Young. Voting NO – None.**
PRESIDING: Mark Shepherd Mayor

PRESENT: Keri Benson Councilmember
Kent Bush Councilmember
Nike Peterson Councilmember
Vern Phipps Councilmember
Bruce Young Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT: Adam Lenhard City Manager
JJ Allen Assistant City Manager
Stuart Williams City Attorney
Greg Krusi Police Chief
Mike Stenquist Asst. Police Chief
Kelly Bennett Police Lieutenant
Aaron Cox Code Enforcement Officer
Scott Hodge Public Works Director
Dan Schuler Storm Water Superintendent
Mark Baird Water Superintendent
Brad Wheeler Streets Superintendent
Spencer Brimley Development Services Manager
Payden McRoberts Planning Intern
Eric Howes Community Services Director
Curtis Dickson Community Services Deputy Dir.
Summer Palmer Administrative Services Director
Rich Knapp Finance Manager
Natalee Flynn Public Relations/Special Events
Nancy Dean City Recorder


CITY COUNCIL NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE FOR ANTELOPE ELEMENTARY

Mayor Shepherd, the City Council, and staff welcomed residents to the open house highlighting different City services. Residents were provided with information about the budget, economic development, planning and zoning, police department efforts, code enforcement, emergency preparedness, fire safety, utility and road projects and recreational opportunities.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.
CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:30 P.M. WORK SESSION
March 17, 2016

PRESENT:
Kent Bush Councilmember
Vern Phipps Councilmember
Bruce Young Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT:
Adam Lenhard City Manager
JJ Allen Assistant City Manager
Spencer Brimley Development Services Manager
Payden McRoberts Planning Intern
Eric Howes Community Services Director


The meeting began at 6:40 p.m.

DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION AND VISIONING WORKSHOP

Staff discussed the input which was obtained from the first meeting which took place on Thursday, February 25, 2016, and discussed the purpose for the visioning process and explained expectations for the evening. Julia Collins, Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), discussed scenarios which could be implemented in the downtown area. Ted Knowlton, WFRC, discussed the details of each scenario and conducted a key pad polling exercise to obtain input from the group. Participants were polled on a diversity of topics and ideas for the downtown area. Staff concluded by announcing the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, April 28, 2016, and encouraged participants to complete the survey and share it with their neighbors and other stakeholders.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.
REPLICA OF THE VIETNAM MEMORIAL WALL
Will Have a Permanent Utah Home

It is anticipated that nearly 3 million people will visit the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in Washington, D.C., this year, but Utahans who lack the time or funds to travel to our nation’s capital, will find a replica of the memorial within the next few months in Layton.

Layton City and Utah Vietnam Veterans of America officials have announced that Layton will become the permanent home to a large replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall. The 360-foot long replica wall will be placed at the Layton Commons Park, 437 N. Wasatch Drive. It is 80 percent the size of the National Memorial.

The project is expected to cost about $400,000 and will be funded through private donations, grants, and appropriations. This will be an incredible monument to Vietnam Veterans; it will be only the second replica of this size to have a permanent home in the U.S. It will give our Vietnam Veterans a place to remember and honor their fallen comrades, and families to reflect on their loved ones lost to our War.

Construction on the wall is expected to begin in about a year. Personalized bricks, which will be set around the wall, are being sold to help pay for the project. However, donations of any type and amount are welcome. Approximately $10,000 was raised at the “Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Parade,” Sounds of Freedom, in June in Layton, and fundraising is being done on a continuing basis. We hope to see support from community groups, Veterans organizations, and corporations from throughout Utah. The Memorial will belong to all of Utah, not just Layton, and to all Veterans. If each of Utah’s 44,000 Vietnam Veterans donated just $5.00 each, we would be well over half-way home. We appreciate any and all support, and there are several ways to donate to the Wall Project. For information contact Dennis Howland at 801-389-1893.

If each of Utah’s 44,000 Vietnam Veterans donated just $5.00 each, we would be well over half-way home.
VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL

Washington, D.C.
*The memorial consists of three separate parts:
   1. The Three-Service Memorial
   2. Vietnam Women’s Memorial
   3. Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall
*Covers 3 acres of ground
*Maintained by the U.S. National Park Service
*The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall belongs to the people of the United States
*The Wall is made up of 2 sections, each 246’ 9” long.
*There are 70 separate granite panels with names and 4 additional blank panels for future names.
*The fund for the Wall was begun in 1979 and the Wall was completed in 1982
*No federal funds were used; the $9M cost came from private donations
*Currently (as of December 2015) there are 58,307 names on the wall
*Displays names of servicemen who were KIA, MIA, or died while POW
*Those who died in action are denoted by a diamond, those who were POW or MIA are denoted by a cross.
*No civilian names are on the Wall. The memorial is dedicated to the 2.7 million men and women who served in the combat zones.
*The timeline for the names begins in 1959.
*Names are arranged in chronological order according to date of casualty
*The first two names on the Wall are:
   Maj. Dale Buis U.S. Army and Msgt Chester Ovnand U.S. Army; date of casualty was 8 July 1959
*New names are added on Mother’s Day each year

Utah’s Wall
* The Layton Wall will be on a site donated by Layton City and located in Layton’s Commons Park.
* The Wall will be an 80% replica of the Wall in Washington, D.C., that is: each section is 198 feet long.
* The Layton Wall will consist of the Wall, a Flag Area with approximately six flags with personalized Paver Bricks around it.
* The projected cost will be in excess of $400,000.
EVERYONE MATTERS DAY

WHEREAS, everyone has the right to be treated with dignity and respect; and

WHEREAS, everyone should be recognized as an individual and has the right to be who they are, without being shamed, demeaned, attacked or marginalized; and

WHEREAS, judgment and discrimination against others may be based on many factors and may be due to a person’s accent, age, disability, height, weight, nationality, race, religion, sex, gender, gender-identity or sexual orientation; and

WHEREAS, judgment and discrimination leads to bullying, harassment, marginalization and attack that may occur in the workplace, at schools, in social settings and in homes, and online; and

WHEREAS, discrimination and bullying have direct effects on the physical, emotional, mental and financial well-being of an individual, on organizational stability and safe and stable atmosphere in schools and businesses, of a city’s economic vitality and societal stability, and on the health and well-being of society as a whole; and

WHEREAS, everyone of all ages, groups and backgrounds may be victims of bullying, discrimination, harassment, disrespect and attack; and

WHEREAS, the City of Clearfield is comprised of a diverse population of all ages, genders, ethnicities, religions, races, sexual orientations, nationalities, physical and emotional capabilities and personalities; and

WHEREAS, the City of Clearfield celebrates diversity, individuality and respect for each citizen, and embraces the people of the community for who they are, and affirms that all citizens contribute their own unique individuality to what makes our city vital.

NOW THEREFORE, I, Mayor Mark Shepherd, do hereby proclaim April 12, 2016, to be Everyone Matters Day in the City of Clearfield, and encourage all the people of Clearfield City to recognize others for who they are, embrace themselves for who they are, celebrate their own unique individuality, and treat others with respect and dignity. Everyone matters!

Dated the 12th day of April, 2016.

CLEARFIELD CITY CORPORATION                          ATTEST:

________________________________________________     __________________________
Mark R. Shepherd, Mayor                          Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder
**Bid Proposal Tabulation**

Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project on 3rd Street in Freeport Center
modified for no work north of building

**Bid Date:** 3rd March 2016  
**Owner:** Clearfield City  
**Public Works Director:** Scott Hodge

| Bid Item | Description | Quantity | Unit | Allied Underground Technology  
2720 N Mule Ranch Circle  
Corinne, UT 84307 | Whitacker Construction  
44 South 1050 West  
Brigham City, UT 84302 | Counterpoint Construction Company  
1598 N Hill Field Rd Ste A  
Layton, UT 84041 | Unit Price | Total Amount | Unit Price | Total Amount | Unit Price | Total Amount |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A: Open Cut Trench - Sewer Replacement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.</td>
<td>Mobilization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$36,600.00</td>
<td>$36,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.</td>
<td>Saw cutting, removal and disposal of asphalt surfacing and roadbase to sub-base grade.</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>sy.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$9,250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.</td>
<td>Removal and disposal of concrete flatwork.</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>sf.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$685.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.</td>
<td>Removal and disposal of sanitary sewer manhole.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,050.00</td>
<td>$3,150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 5-foot diameter sanitary sewer manhole.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
<td>$16,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 5-foot diameter sanitary sewer drop manhole (Sta 10+20.87 LT 14.74').</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,470.00</td>
<td>$5,470.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 5-foot diameter sanitary sewer drop manhole (15+18.17 LT 19.87').</td>
<td></td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,830.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 6-foot diameter sanitary sewer manhole with beaver slide (Sta 15+47.24 LT 11.97').</td>
<td></td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,080.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 6-foot diameter sanitary sewer manhole (Sta 15+24.87 LT 10.38').</td>
<td></td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,420.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10.</td>
<td>Reconnect 4-inch sewer service lateral.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>$10,800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Allied Underground Technology</td>
<td>Whitacker Construction</td>
<td>Counterpoint Construction Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11.</td>
<td>Reconnect 6-inch sewer service lateral.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,210.00</td>
<td>$1,210.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 4-inch pvc sanitary sewer lateral pipe.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>lf.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 6-inch pvc sanitary sewer lateral pipe.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>lf.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$820.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 10-inch pvc sanitary sewer pipe.</td>
<td></td>
<td>lf.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 15-inch pvc sanitary sewer pipe.</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>lf.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$71.00</td>
<td>$93,507.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16.</td>
<td>Furnish 1&quot; diameter clean gravel pipe bedding materials.</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>ton.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$22,195.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17.</td>
<td>Furnish clean import material for trench backfill.</td>
<td>6,653</td>
<td>ton.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$113,101.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18.</td>
<td>Furnish and install untreated roadbase materials – 12&quot; thick.</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>ton.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$28,380.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19.</td>
<td>Furnish and install bituminous asphalt paving materials – 4&quot; thick.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>ton.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$54,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20.</td>
<td>Adjust manhole ring and cover to finish grade.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
<td>$2,560.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21.</td>
<td>Furnish and install 4-inch thick concrete flatwork.</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>sf.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$3,425.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.</td>
<td>Remove and replace fencing (Sta 0+25.29 LT 25.22 &amp; Sta 8+50.97 LT 1.45).</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>lf.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$3,290.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23.</td>
<td>Remove and replace existing gate and gate controller (Sta 8+56 LT 3.59).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24.</td>
<td>Remove existing tree and grind roots (Sta 8+41.95 LT 10.30).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,120.00</td>
<td>$1,120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25.</td>
<td>Furnish and install new tree (Sta 8+41.95 LT 10.30).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$560.00</td>
<td>$560.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26.</td>
<td>Restore landscaping public/private improvements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7,080.00</td>
<td>$7,080.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEC, Civil Engineering Consultants, PLLC
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Bid Tabulation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Option A:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>425,803.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option B: Pipe Bursting - Sewer Replacement**

1 ls.  
$32,000.00  
$32,000.00  
$36,600.00  
$36,600.00  
$0.00

B2. Saw cutting, removal and disposal of asphalt surfacing and roadbase to sub-base grade.  
382 sy.  
$6.75  
$2,578.50  
$5.00  
$1,910.00  
$0.00

B3. Removal and disposal of concrete flatwork.  
150 sf.  
$5.00  
$750.00  
$1.00  
$150.00  
$0.00

B4. Removal and disposal of sanitary sewer manhole.  
4 ea.  
$675.00  
$2,700.00  
$1,050.00  
$4,200.00  
$0.00

B5. Furnish and install 5-foot diameter sanitary sewer manhole.  
4 ea.  
$4,123.10  
$16,492.40  
$2,970.00  
$11,880.00  
$0.00

B6. Furnish and install 5-foot diameter sanitary sewer drop manhole (Sta 10+20.87 LT 14.74).  
1 ea.  
$6,241.67  
$6,241.67  
$4,780.00  
$4,780.00  
$0.00

B7. Furnish and install 5-foot diameter sanitary sewer drop manhole (Sta 15+18.17 LT 19.87).  
0 ea.  
$4,939.80  
$0.00  
$4,210.00  
$0.00  
$0.00

B8. Furnish and install 6-foot diameter sanitary sewer manhole with beaver slide (Sta 15+47.24 LT 11.97).  
0 ea.  
$5,864.55  
$0.00  
$6,080.00  
$0.00  
$0.00

B9. Furnish and install 6-foot diameter sanitary sewer manhole (Sta 15+24.87 LT 10.38).  
0 ea.  
$5,700.90  
$0.00  
$5,420.00  
$0.00  
$0.00

B10. Reconnect 4-inch sewer service lateral.  
10 ea.  
$2,050.00  
$20,500.00  
$1,260.00  
$12,600.00  
$0.00

B11. Reconnect 6-inch sewer service lateral.  
1 ea.  
$2,670.00  
$2,670.00  
$1,320.00  
$1,320.00  
$0.00

B12. Furnish and install 4-inch pvc sanitary sewer lateral pipe.  
100 lf.  
$46.93  
$4,693.00  
$26.00  
$2,600.00  
$0.00

B13. Furnish and install 6-inch pvc sanitary sewer lateral pipe.  
20 lf.  
$76.49  
$1,529.80  
$41.00  
$820.00  
$0.00

CEC, Civil Engineering Consultants, PLLC
| Bid Item | Description                                                                 | Quantity | Unit | Allied Underground Technology  
2720 N Mule Ranch Circle  
Corinne, UT 84307 | Whitacker Construction  
44 South 1050 West  
Brigham City, UT 84302 | Counterpoint Construction Company  
1598 N Hill Field Rd Ste A  
Layton, UT 84041 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Furnish and install 10-inch pvc sanitary sewer pipe.</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>lf.</td>
<td>$74.99</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Furnish and install 15-inch pvc sanitary sewer pipe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$79.94</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16a</td>
<td>Pipe burst and install 16-inch HDPE sanitary sewer pipe between Sta. 0+25.24 LT 21.20' and Sta. 13+43.17 LT 11.51'</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>lf.</td>
<td>$32.26</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>$143,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16b</td>
<td>Pipe burst and install 16-inch HDPE sanitary sewer pipe between Sta. 13+43.17 LT 11.51' and Sta. 15+24.87 LT 10.38'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52.26</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>Furnish 1&quot; diameter clean gravel pipe bedding materials.</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>ton.</td>
<td>$17.66</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$3,519.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>Furnish clean import material for trench backfill.</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>ton.</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$26,452.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>Furnish and install untreated roadbase materials - 12&quot; thick.</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>ton.</td>
<td>$19.94</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$6,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>Furnish and install bituminous asphalt paving materials - 4&quot; thick.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>ton.</td>
<td>$110.58</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>Adjust manhole ring and cover to finish grade.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ea.</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$320.00</td>
<td>$1,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>Furnish and install 4-inch thick concrete flatwork.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>sf.</td>
<td>$8.87</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>Remove and replace fencing (Sta 0+25.29 LT 25.22).</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>lf.</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$2,585.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>Restore landscaping public/private improvements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ls.</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$7,080.00</td>
<td>$7,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Option B:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$315,428.35</td>
<td>$286,666.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Item Description</td>
<td>Allied Underground Technology</td>
<td>Whitacker Construction</td>
<td>Counterpoint Construction Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2720 N Mule Ranch Circle</td>
<td>44 South 1050 West</td>
<td>1598 N Hill Field Rd Ste A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corinne, UT 84307</td>
<td>Brigham City, UT 84302</td>
<td>Layton, UT 84041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Cut Trench - Sewer Replacement (Option A):</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$425,803.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe Bursting - Sewer Replacement (Option B, with Bid item 16a only):</td>
<td>$315,428.35</td>
<td>$286,666.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe Bursting - Sewer Replacement (Option B, with Bid items 16a &amp; 16b):</td>
<td>$315,428.35</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL BID PROPOSAL AMOUNT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surety Company</th>
<th>Westfield Insurance Company</th>
<th>Western Surety Company</th>
<th>Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City, State</td>
<td>Westfield Center, Ohio</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Security - Bid Bond Amount</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's License Number</td>
<td>9309068-5501</td>
<td>227757-5501</td>
<td>90-249881-0777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>