

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
May 4, 2021

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush	Councilmember
	Nike Peterson	Councilmember
	Vern Phipps	Councilmember
	Tim Roper	Councilmember
EXCUSED:	Karece Thompson	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	JJ Allen	City Manager
	Summer Palmer	Assistant City Manager
	Stuart Williams	City Attorney
	Kelly Bennett	Police Chief
	Adam Favero	Public Works Director
	Braden Felix	City Engineer/PW Deputy Director
	Curtis Dickson	Community Services Deputy Dir.
	Brad McIlrath	Senior Planner
	Rich Knapp	Finance Manager
	Lee Naylor	
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder

VISITORS PRESENT VIA ZOOM: Jonathon Ward – Zions Public Finance

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON CONSIDERING A PARAMETERS RESOLUTION SPECIFIC TO THE
ISSUANCE OF DEBT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND BEAUTIFICATION PURPOSES

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, stated the parameters resolution specific to the issuance of debt for infrastructure and beautification purposes had been a topic of discussion during the budget season. He indicated Jonathon Ward with Zions Public Finance was in attendance and worked as the City's financial advisor.

Jonathon Ward, Zions Public Finance, reviewed the bonding process which generally took about three months. He explained the resolution would start the process to issue "Series 2021" sales tax revenue bonds by setting parameters that would constrain the bonding process. He noted it was a super parameters resolution which allowed for flexibility by setting broad parameters to meet contingencies, authorized publishing of the intent and public hearings in the newspaper, and

authorized certain officers to delegate authority to be able to execute the bond documents and lock in the final transaction. He highlighted the following parameters of the bond:

- Not to exceed \$19,500,000
- Maturity in not more than 25 years
- Sold at a price not less than 98 percent of total principal
- Interest not to exceed 5.5 percent

Councilmember Phipps commented the bond debt was planned to be paid off by taxing increment finance (TIF) revenue and some General Fund. He asked if that would make it more complicated. Mr. Ward responded it did because of the source of security. He noted it was harder to sell and it could have a higher interest rate if the pledge was related to TIF for a future project; however, the City anticipated selling the bonds with a City sales tax pledge to get better rates and provide more security for the buyer. He acknowledged the payment source was expected to be from the TIF.

Councilmember Phipps questioned the payment schedule and wondered if it was negotiable. Mr. Ward replied it was negotiable and was built in there as a protection for the City. He explained the first three years of no cash from coffers was meant to allow the City time to wait for Clearfield Station to mature, grow, and develop so it could produce enough increment to make the payment rather than impact other projects by needing to make the debt service sooner.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the debt service after the five-year period would be one and one quarter million. JJ Allen, City Manager, stated Lewis Young Robertson and Burningham (LYRB) created a model to determine the tax increment available. Councilmember Peterson questioned given the model used how much buffer was built into it. Mr. Ward explained they had modeled the payment structure to match the cash flow model. He acknowledged they could build some flexibility in the model but generally the models were conservative. Mr. Allen reported the models had been conservative, but the City could create an extra cushion if desired.

Councilmember Peterson expressed her concern about the City's ability to meet the projections if there were any delays to the phases of the project. There was a discussion about the projections, the funding, and the investment opportunity.

Mr. Knapp asked if the model was extra conservative could the City put the money into the bond or set it aside. Mr. Ward responded if the bonds were sold publicly, it usually limited the ability to prepay for up to ten years. He noted there was the possibility for a private investor which would provide more flexibility on prepayment. He reviewed the options available if there were a private investment and the benefits to the City.

Mr. Allen reviewed the model created by LYRB. There was a discussion on the bonding timetable, the noticing period, and impacts of SB 201 with noticing requirements.

DISCUSSION ON CONSIDERING A REIMBURSEMENT RESOLUTION FOR THE
OPTION OF ISSUANCE OF DEBT FOR POTENTIAL UTILITY CAPITAL PROJECTS

Jonathon Ward, Zions Public Finance, explained a reimbursement resolution allowed the City to reimburse itself with tax exempt bond revenue for utility projects in the future. He stated it might be overly cautious to include engineering costs or land acquisition costs, but the City could go back and reimburse itself otherwise the IRS would require the City to issue taxable bonds. He acknowledged the resolution declared the intent to reimburse itself and provided flexibility in the future if the City wanted to use tax exempt bonds for those purposes.

Councilmember Peterson asked if there was any kind of expiration period. Mr. Ward stated usually it was three years or eighteen months after the expense had been incurred whichever was later. He noted it was a long period and it created flexibility. He indicated \$10 million had been built into the resolution; however, it was broad and flexible to allow for long-term planning.

Mayor Shepherd thanked Mr. Ward for his attendance and the information provided.

DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE CLEARFIELD CITY COMMUNITY
ARTS CENTER REMODEL PROJECT

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, reviewed how the Art Center renovation was proposed to be funded. He highlighted the following funding sources from multiple fiscal years and budgets:

- \$150,000 from fiscal year 2021 capital project fund as a set aside
- \$150,000 in the proposed fiscal year 2022 capital project fund
- \$250,000 in the proposed fiscal year 2022 PARAT tax fund
- \$65,000 in the proposed fiscal year 2022 capital project fund for the Art Center roof project

He explained the total funding was \$615,000 but \$21,370 had been spent on architectural and engineering plans so the remaining project balance was \$593,630.

Mr. Dickson reported the City bid the Art Center remodel and four contractors submitted bids. He reported the low bid contractor had worked for the City previously and there had been a good relationship plus they had done good work. He noted the contingency proposed was \$81,522 which was 15.9 percent, but if the Council desired to have 20 percent contingency there would be an additional \$20,900 needed. He reported staff was comfortable with the proposed contingency amount because there had not been too many needs arising from past projects when working with the same contractor.

Mr. Dickson reviewed the renovation plans for the Art Center with the Council. He highlighted the tentative timeframe for the project. He noted the award of bid would be considered during policy session on May 11, 2021. He added the project was planned to be finished mid to late October and the contractor would have incentives in the contract to complete the work on time.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the City planned to lock in construction costs right away. Mr. Dickson answered the contractor had already locked in their pricing with subcontractors.

Councilmember Bush wondered if the band room acoustical work would help with the sound. Mr. Dickson responded besides the acoustical work to be done the project also included carpet which would help with the sound.

DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE DOG PARK FENCING PROJECT

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, stated the dog park fencing project would be funded from the Parks, Arts, Recreation, Aquatics, and Trails (PARAT) Tax revenue in the amount of \$50,000 included in the Fiscal Year 2021 budget. He reported the City bid the project and two contractors responded. He reviewed the bid proposals with the Council which included pricing for the south and north areas. He noted there was a disparity in the pricing because one of the bidders planned to subcontract the fencing. He highlighted the project for the Council. Mr. Dickson indicated staff was not recommending doing the second phase or north end of the project because it would cost more not only for the fencing but to landscape the area. He added it would be better to wait since there would be land coming to the City as part of the 500 West expansion project that could also impact the north end of the project area.

Councilmember Bush asked if the north end acreage could be used for another use. Mr. Dickson responded there was not enough acreage for a soccer field, but it could be developed as another dog park or used as green space.

Mr. Dickson stated the bid award was planned to be considered by the Council during its policy session on May 11, 2021. He reviewed the timeframe planned for the project and its anticipated completion by the end of June. He highlighted the following options for the Council's consideration:

- Fund the project as outlined in the FY21 budget and fence in the south area and use remaining funds for dog park amenities. (Staff's recommendation)
- Use an additional \$4,866 of capital funds to fence both the north and south areas and have no amenities in either area with the north area having no landscaping.
- Fence both areas and add funding to develop the north area with turf and irrigation and provide amenities to both fenced areas.
- Not fund the project.

Councilmember Phipps stated it made sense to wait on the north area. Mayor Shepherd and Councilmember Peterson agreed.

DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE PARK OUTDOOR COURT RESURFACING PROJECT

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, stated the funding for the park outdoor court resurfacing project was included in the FY21 budget for capital projects and totaled \$40,000. He noted the City bid the project and also requested contractors submit a line item bid for each outdoor court in the City's park system. He indicated only one contractor submitted a bid and it was the same contractor that built the City's pickleball courts. He reviewed the line-item pricing for all the courts. He stated staff recommended completing the court resurfacing at Fisher and Barlow parks which had been budgeted. Mr. Dickson explained there was the option

of adding funding through a budget amendment for other parks to have the courts resurfaced. He noted Kiwanis was last resurfaced in the late nineties. Mr. Dickson highlighted the current condition of all courts throughout the City's park system. He indicated the scheduled timeframe for completion of the projects at Kiwanis and Fisher Parks would be by the end of June.

Councilmember Peterson liked the idea of adding one or two additional courts if there was a little money. She expressed her desire to see the courts at Barlow added especially with the dog park coming because there would be an increase in attendance at that park and it would make a visible difference having the two upgrades. Mr. Dickson responded staff felt it would be good to do the courts at Jacobson for the same reasoning because that park was scheduled for new playground equipment in the FY22 budget. Mayor Shepherd voiced his support for resurfacing the courts at Barlow.

There was a discussion about the needs and uses at the various parks. Mr. Dickson asked if there would be any concerns with financing the additional park or two. Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, expressed his opinion it would be good to resurface all the courts because funding was available.

There was a discussion about using PARAT Tax revenue to fund the additional courts desired. Councilmember Bush asked what the plans were for the City's park impact fee money because those funds had a limited time for use. Mr. Dickson explained the areas with the courts currently would not be able to use the park impact fees because the improvements were not growth related.

Councilmember Peterson suggested using PARAT Tax revenue to fund the court resurfacing projects and to do all of them before costs increased. Mayor Shepherd agreed.

Councilmember Phipps indicated it fit the paradigm where recently PARAT Tax revenue was used to replace playgrounds and currently there was an opportunity to resurface all the courts.

Councilmember Peterson commented the project would be good marketing for renewing the PARAT Tax because it would have a visible impact throughout the City.

There was consensus to resurface all the courts and use PARAT Tax to fund the additional needs. Mr. Dickson suggested \$40,000 additional could come from PARAT Tax which would leave some excess for contingency. Mayor Shepherd agreed it would be a good way to get all the projects accomplished.

There was a discussion about how to mark the courts so the residents knew they were funded with PARAT Tax.

DISCUSSION ON THE NORTH DAVIS COUNTY ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, explained the City had been leading the efforts in creating the North Davis County Active Transportation Implementation Plan (ATIP). He stated Wasatch Front Regional Council had been the primary funding source along with smaller investments from the participating cities which included Clearfield, Syracuse, West Point, Clinton and

Sunset. He explained the purposes and needs for having an ATIP which would be used as a guiding document for future planning as it related to transportation and the user experience. Mr. McIlrath reviewed the timeline, funding, coordination, and public involvement in the plan's creation. He explained the project was intended to be completed in the spring of 2021 because there had been some delays due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr. McIlrath reported safety was an important aspect of the ATIP especially as it related to bicyclists and pedestrians. He reviewed the following plan goals:

- Increase the availability, quality, and use of active transportation connections within and between their communities.
- Create safe and comfortable active transportation facilities and enhance access to existing high-quality trails.
- Build family-friendly facilities suitable for all ages, abilities, and use groups (including pedestrians as well as bikes, scooters, strollers, and other modes/devices).
- Build a network that connects neighborhoods to community amenities and expands opportunities for outdoor recreation.
- Improve commuting routes and access to transit stops and stations in areas near regional transit services and employment centers.

Mr. McIlrath reviewed the public outreach efforts. He reported there were hundreds of public comments received and many stakeholder meetings held with Utah Transit Authority (UTA), Military Installation Development Agency (MIDA), Davis School District, Freeport Center Associates, and Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). He reviewed the following ways that routes were identified.

- Prior plans and studies
- Public comments and ideas
- Stakeholder interviews
- Analysis of network gap
- Collaborative work sessions between communities

Mr. McIlrath highlighted the following North Davis County ATIP network as it pertained to implementation:

- Tiers 1-3 for near, mid, and long-term projects (no time period given before implementation was necessary as it would likely be contingent on grant funding)
- Bicycle Facility Types
 - Neighborhood Byway
 - Bike Lane
 - Buffered Bike Lane
 - Protected Bike Lane
 - Share-Use Path
- Pedestrian Facility Types
 - Sidewalk
 - Shared-Use Paths

Mr. McIlrath reviewed examples of bicycle facility types. He highlighted the project network and crossings along with the tier associated with each. He noted there were 66 new connections

and 20 crossing improvements which were proposed in the ATIP which were ranked based on how well they met the plan goals.

Councilmember Peterson asked how, following the conversation from the work session on April 27, 2021, on street parking for State Street would be implemented in the plan. Mr. McIlrath stated staff talked with WFRC and the project team and some options were discussed. He stated one option would be to remove the bicycle lane from the roadway onto the sidewalk area but then widening the sidewalk area to accommodate the pedestrian and cycling uses. He acknowledged that option would require an update to the City's FBC to accommodate for the wider sidewalks. He said another option was using Depot Street as a secondary option for bicyclists to get to the Frontrunner Station. He noted one item pointed out was that the Regional Active Transportation Plan included bike lanes from Weber County to Layton Parkway. He added State Road 126 (SR 126) was one of the projects included in the ATIP; however, local context could be decided by the governing body. He reported meeting with Layton City representatives following the previous Council meeting and learned Layton was recently awarded a grant to create an ATIP. He stated it was expressed that Clearfield had concerns about pedestrian and bicyclist safety along SR 126. Mr. McIlrath inquired what Layton's plans were for that street. He reported Layton City planned to keep the bicycle facility in place and continue the bicycle network along SR 126. Councilmember Peterson requested to return to that part of the discussion following staff's presentation.

Mr. McIlrath explained the plan provided a cost analysis for the proposed projects. He reviewed the following two major projects identified in the plan:

- State Street (SR 126) "Boulevard Renovation"
 - Creating Downtown Clearfield Small Area Plan and Downtown Clearfield Form Based Code with removal of on-street parking, Urban Core and Gateway Corridor Arterial, and buffered bike lanes.
 - WFRC's Regional Transportation Plan 2019-2050 included bikes lanes on SR 126 from Marriott-Slaterville (Weber County) to Layton Parkway (Davis County)
- Antelope Drive (SR 108) with shared use path and on-road facilities to accommodate the varying level of users and comfort.

Mr. McIlrath stated the City's biggest demands were on those two routes. He reviewed the projects and concept renderings for each project included in the ATIP. Braden Felix, City Engineer/Public Works Deputy Director, noted the clear distinction planned for the bike lanes at the future Station Boulevard (State Street and 1150 South). Councilmember Peterson acknowledged safety at the station needed to be happening outside of the station as well to get people there safely. She related her experience of traveling by bicycle recently into Layton and how her mindset had changed since the prior discussion. She noted that if the City did not go far enough to make the road safe by implementing changes it would not happen.

Councilmember Phipps expressed concern of seeing bicycle lanes implemented but not being utilized as anticipated. He commented he would love to see an example where a municipality implemented those types of projects which were actually used. Councilmember Roper stated municipalities continued to design cities around vehicles which was part of the problem. Mayor Shepherd reported many areas in downtown Los Angeles were designed for pedestrians and

cyclists. Councilmember Phipps would like to see something more comparable to Clearfield. There was a discussion about transportation planning challenges and benefits.

Mr. Felix explained the ATIP was not something that had to be done within a certain timeframe. There was a discussion about Clearfield as it related to increases in density, cycling trends, as well as the planning and timing best suited to accommodate the transportation needs and safety.

Mr. McIlrath stated WFRC had done studies over the pandemic to see the impacts. He indicated the study showed that active transportation usage had gone up 150 percent. He stated many were working from home, but there was something that should be gleaned from the study.

Councilmember Bush commented he was not against bike lanes anywhere. He suggested it would be good for the City to determine what its purpose should be and where the best connections should be located perhaps giving more focus on east to west connections.

Councilmember Peterson wondered if the Council should revisit its parking strategies which had been to reduce parking and encourage cycling or pedestrian travel and make sure the infrastructure designed would match the vision.

Mr. Allen pointed out that the Frontrunner Station was not the only place people would travel in the City because there were destination areas as well, so it would be important to be cognizant of all the needs.

Mr. McIlrath continued his review of the Antelope Drive project and its concepts included in the ATIP. There was a discussion about the need for a connection along Antelope Drive.

Mr. McIlrath explained the next steps towards adoption of the ATIP by the five involved communities. He noted there would continue to be collaboration with UDOT and although staff identified some challenges, each meeting was helping build relations for long-term planning. He explained staff would continue to seek for funding opportunities for the highest priority projects. Mr. McIlrath stated the ATIP would be reviewed by the Planning Commission in the next couple of months and then be presented to the Council for its consideration.

Councilmember Phipps stated the City was at a crossroads but planning for the future was necessary. Mr. Felix pointed out the opportunities for funding if the City implemented plans that were supported by the Regional Transportation Plan.

DISCUSSION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, stated staff had received rates from Waste Management for FY22. He noted in July of 2020 the City raised its rate for an additional trash can to \$10; consequently, the City was below the increased costs of Waste Management which was good. He stated the only cost the City was charging below the cost was for recycling. He stated the City charged \$4.80 currently and the new rates would increase the cost to \$4.93. He proposed raising the recycling fee to \$4.95 beginning July 1, 2021. The consensus of the Council was to pass the increase forward.

Councilmember Peterson requested the messaging let residents know it was a pass-through charge and not any fault of the City.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the following larger items proposed for the FY22 operations budget:

- Planning – Title 11 and 12: \$175,000 (one-time expense)
- Community Services – Centennial Celebration: \$75,000
- Community Services – contracted project planning: \$50,000

JJ Allen, City Manager, explained the contracted project planning costs would be to have concepts designed ahead of time to aid in decision making and better budgeting for those projects which materialized. Mr. Knapp added typically the Public Works projects included the costs of engineering. Mr. Allen indicated if there was a pot of money available for project planning it could create a more efficient process for Community Services projects.

Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion \$50,000 was too high for contract project planning. She recommended starting with half that amount. She liked the idea of having flexibility to plan but wanted to be more conservative and if there was a need down the road it could be revisited.

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, stated concepts would be helpful in determining the budget estimates. Councilmember Phipps agreed it would be best to start low and then have staff come back if it appeared to be too little.

There was a discussion about the costs and efforts that would go into the City's centennial.

Mr. Knapp continued his review of the larger items proposed for the operations budget.

- Election: \$42,000
- Police – AR15 Rifles: \$38,000 for 35 rifles
- Removed CED Administration expense of \$37,000 from the FY22 budget because there was a need to further define Military City, Utah
- Business License and Other Fees' Study: \$24,000 (one-time cost, last study was in 2008)
- Computer replacement: \$24,000
- Additional cameras at Clearfield Aquatic and Fitness Center (CAFC): \$20,000

Mayor Shepherd requested more information about the Title 11 and 12 updates budgeted at \$175,000. Councilmember Peterson stated she advocated for General Plan updates; however, she felt the deliverable had not met her expectation. She expressed her opinion it had been a frustrating project which caused her concern and she did not want the Title 11 and 12 updates to be another experience like that one. She indicated it would be good to take the lessons learned on the General Plan process and make sure the project was not completely outsourced.

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, stated staff did not want to be too separated from the Code update. He explained there was expertise and skills that consultants brought but they did not know the day-to-day issues in applying the Code. Mr. McIlrath indicated there were options to accomplishing the project which included increasing staff resources to help manage the project or even have the contracted efforts applied to the initial analysis. He mentioned it might be good to break up the ordinances into sections of priority or even have the funding appropriated over two years; but, overall, those options would allow staff to be more heavily involved in the process.

Mr. Allen said it was a tough decision because it was very expensive. He asked if the Council wanted to wait one year to proceed. Councilmember Peterson answered it would be good to have a break and wait another year to let the dust settle before beginning another large project. Mr. McIlrath reviewed the following reasons behind the request:

- The last largescale update was done in 2009.
- Minor changes over the years had created conflicts or issues.
- Ongoing issues with the use of R-3 zoning for “multifamily.”
- Create consistency with existing City documents/plans.
- Impacts of legislative changes on land use.

There was a discussion about updates needed to Title 11 and 12 and how those could best be accomplished. Councilmember Bush suggested picking some of the chapters to work on.

Councilmember Phipps commented there might be some things that could be fixed quickly that were the source of the current pain points. He wondered if addressing the pain points and list of legislative actions would require outsourcing and additional funds to complete that work. Mr. McIlrath stated the City would always have things coming from the legislature every year which would require updates. He highlighted the bills from the 2021 legislative session which impacted Title 11 and 12.

Mayor Shepherd agreed with the Council that it would be good to wait for another year before major updates were done.

Mr. Allen summarized the comments heard were to let the General Plan updates get finished, wait another year before beginning the process of major updates to Titles 11 and 12, and for staff to work on the updates necessary to comply with recent legislation and other issues that dealt with items that could not be put off for another year.

Councilmember Peterson liked that approach especially because there were issues that would continue to come up like housing. She expressed her opinion it would not be unbearable to wait another year for certain things; however, she hoped staff could address the ongoing issues related to R-3 housing sooner.

Mr. Knapp continued the review of larger items proposed for the FY22 operations budget.

- Code Enforcement – proactive nuisance abatement: \$10,000
- Dispatch – 911 shared phone system with Davis County: \$9,900
- City Hall – holiday decorations for west entrance pillars: \$9,000
- Council – chair replacement in chambers: \$9,000
- CAFC – replace wood doors in pool area: \$7,500
- CAFC – portable pumps: \$7,500
- Art Center – tables: \$7,000
- City Hall – additional camera: \$5,000
- Police – conference room chair replacement: \$6,000
- Water, Sewer, Storm – rate study: \$5,000 each or \$15,000 total
- Water, Sewer, Storm – Maintenance Operations Center (MOC) office furniture and file storage: \$11,000
- Water – SCADA interface upgrade: \$12,000 (one-time expense)
- Water – backflow program software: \$5,000 (on going expense)
- Water – tank inspection every 2 years: \$8,000
- Storm – storm water management program: \$3,000 (yearly expense)

Mr. Knapp highlighted the historic fleet expenses. He noted the 2009 Capital Plan recommended \$500,000 per year be allocated for street surface treatment. He highlighted the following vehicles included in the proposed FY22 Budget:

- Police – five Ford Explorers at \$49,400 each: \$247,000
- Police – one unmarked F-150: \$40,000
- Parks – F-250 replacement: \$42,000
- Community Development – F-150: \$37,000
- Water – F-150: \$38,000
- New F-150 for Public Works Inspector: 38,000

Mr. Knapp stated the City desired to test the market for a three year replacement of trucks to see if it could reduce the loss amount. He noted last year a test was conducted after several discussions on the matter, but it was a difficult test year because of the pandemic. He acknowledged the City probably lost about \$2,000 which would be less than the depreciation amount but was not as much as anticipated yet good overall. He indicated the FY22 budget proposed a three-year market test for four vehicles, so the budget accounted for \$1,000 loss per vehicle. Mr. Knapp stated the test would be done on Public Works vehicles because it did not pencil to do it for Police vehicles especially those that were marked. He mentioned the test would only be done in FY22 if it was in the best interest of the City because it was not necessary to do if the numbers did not pencil.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the following machinery and equipment proposed to be included in the FY22 budget:

- Replace dump truck with a new Bobtail: \$151,000
- Replace backhoe: \$97,000

- Replace backhoe in Parks: \$97,000

Mr. Knapp explained staff was proposing to have a two-year replacement of the backhoes. He indicated in the FY22 budget there would be a large cash out which had already been programed into the numbers but based on studies once the replacement plan was in place the City should be able to break even. He continued reviewing the machinery and equipment proposed in the FY22 budget.

- Replace asphalt roller: \$47,000
- Replace wheel loader with equivalent: \$150,000 (proposed for a break-even 2-year replacement program)
- Replace mini excavator in Parks: \$55,000 (proposed for a break-even 2-year replacement program)
- CAFC – treadmills 12 at \$7,000 each: \$84,000
- CAFC – auto pool vacuum: \$6,000
- Streets – V-plows for F-250s two at \$7,000: \$14,000
- Parks – replace Ferris 61-inch mower: \$14,500
- Parks – replace Turf Tidy: \$26,000
- Parks – addition of pull-behind aerator: \$8,500
- Parks – new, but used woodchipper: \$10,000
- Parks – replace Kubota RTV: \$25,000

Mr. Knapp explained the tentative FY22 budget would be considered by the Council on May 11, 2021. He noted staff desired to treat the tentative budget as the final budget and begin to move forward with planning even though the final budget would not be approved until August because of the City's intent to initiate the truth in taxation process. Mr. Allen mentioned the lead time for ordering a new vehicle was lengthy so it would be in the City's best interest to get them ordered sooner than later. Adam Favero, Public Works Director, stated the lead time on equipment could be worse than vehicles.

Councilmember Peterson requested staff inform the Council before money was spent on FY22 budget larger items, equipment, or vehicles prior to the budget's adoption so it was aware and not surprised as things moved forward. Mr. Knapp asked for clarification. Mr. Allen mentioned July 1, 2021, the City would begin operations as if the tentative budget were the adopted budget; however, if money was spent prior to July 1, 2021, staff should let the Council know about those large expenditures or orders placed.

Mayor Shepherd asked if there were any other concerns.

Councilmember Phipps asked about the \$440,000 increase to property tax revenue and thought before it had been about \$90,000. Mr. Knapp explained it represented the \$90,000 from maintaining the property tax rate and the GO Bond revenue recapture together.

Councilmember Phipps asked since the Cemetery expansion was included in the FY22 budget would that mean the project would be started. Mr. Dickson explained the design was back with the engineers to get the sewer line designed. He added the project would go back to bid once it was finished and staff hoped to have the results prior to final budget adoption so if an adjustment was necessary, it could be handled prior to avoid a budget amendment.

Mr. Knapp stated traditionally the employee Christmas gift had been a \$50 gift card for full-time employees and \$25 for those that were part-time. He mentioned due to inflation those gift card values were proposed to be increased in the FY22 budget to \$75 and \$35 if the Council was agreeable. Mr. Allen asked if there were any concerns with the increased amounts. Councilmember Peterson answered no.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the Council's training and registration budget could be discussed. Mayor Shepherd indicated the only change in the FY22 budget was the cost added back into the budget because somehow it was missed the prior year for the Airforce Defense Community trainings. Mr. Allen pointed out that the Youth Commission trip to Washington DC for the National League of Cities (NLC) was moved from a separate line in the Council's budget to the training and registration line item. Councilmember Peterson requested a breakdown of the expenses included in the budget for Council. Mr. Knapp highlighted the expenses included for training and registration. Councilmember Peterson acknowledged there was a conservative approach to the training budget for the NLC Summit. She expressed her opinion since it was to be held in Salt Lake City it would be a good opportunity for the entire Council to attend. Mayor Shepherd reported the FY22 budget also included registration for Mr. Allen to attend, but that allocation was found in the City Manager's budget.

The Council reviewed the line items included in the Council's expense budget. Councilmember Peterson wondered if there would be a reduction to the public meeting expenditure due to the changes in meeting notice publication requirements. Nancy Dean, City Recorder, answered the public meeting expenditure in the Council's budget was for the meals. She explained the public noticing expenditure was accounted for in the city recorder's budget. She continued there would need to be some changes to the City's Code before publications in the newspaper were no longer needed. She noted staff would be working towards those changes. She acknowledged once the changes were implemented, staff anticipated there would be a reduction in those costs.

Mayor Shepherd recognized there were many expenses in the Council's budget that were not funded the prior year due to the pandemic. Councilmember Peterson thanked staff for allowing time for a review of the line items. There was a discussion about the cost of memberships and the benefits of participating in various groups.

Mr. Allen mentioned some of the items planned for a joint discussion with the Planning Commission. He stated the next meeting would include time for a work session discussion on the budget prior to the policy session where the tentative budget would need to be adopted. He asked if there would be a need to meet prior to the policy meeting. The consensus of the Council was a work meeting would not be necessary.

Mr. Knapp stated staff did not plan on presenting any new material on the budget prior to the final budget adoption in August. He encouraged the Council to request any future discussions on the budget if there was a need or any concerns. Mr. Knapp reported the Community Renewal and Development Agency (CDRA) would hold a public hearing and needed to adopt a final budget in June even though the City would be initiating the truth in taxation process and not adopting its final budget until August.

Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn at 9:18 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, and Roper. Voting NO – None. Councilmember Thompson was not present for the vote.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 22nd day of February 2022**

/s/Mark R. Shepherd, Mayor

ATTEST:

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Clearfield City Council meeting held Tuesday, May 4, 2021.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder