DISCUSSION ON RENEWING THE RECYCLING ZONE

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, stated the State of Utah offered an economic development incentive known as the Recycling Market Development Zone and explained a State tax rebate was provided to companies which were involved with recycling within its operation primarily with manufacturing. He added the City had established a recycling zone a few years ago and reported the designated time frame identified for the incentive’s expiration. He believed the State program would likely not be renewed during the next Legislative session; however, if the City could renew the recycling zone at this time it would be good for another five years.

He stated a resolution had been drafted and referred to the copy provided to the Council. He reviewed the areas which would be included in the recycling zone and emphasized it would not have an effect on land use, it only allowed qualifying companies to be eligible for a State tax
incentive and informed the Council there were businesses in the City which received this advantage. He stated consideration of approval of the resolution would come before the Council on December 13, 2011.

Councilmember Shepherd moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in a special session at 6:54 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Sprague. All voting AYE.

The work session reconvened at 7:25 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON A DAYTIME CURFEW ORDINANCE

Mike Pledger, police officer, stated he was the current resource officer assigned to Clearfield High and reported he had witnessed several young people leaving the school campus and hanging out at either the skate park or Fisher Park. He indicated he had completed research and reported all surrounding cities had a daytime curfew ordinance. He explained the process used by the School District specific to truancy was arduous and indicated this would be another tool.

Councilmember Murray inquired about enforcement of the proposed ordinance in regards to students who have to leave the campus to attend other facilities for their education. Officer Pledger explained how he could verify whether the student would be in violation of the ordinance and shared specific examples illustrating the need for this type of ordinance. He mentioned discretion in enforcement would be necessary as there would be exceptions.

Brian Brower, City Attorney, reported when he was employed with Weber County the daytime curfew ordinance was regularly prosecuted in the Juvenile Court and indicated it had been an effective tool discouraging loitering.

Councilmember Fryer inquired how the ordinance would be publicized once adopted. Mr. Pledger responded he hoped the high school would inform the students through informative posters on outer doors or through morning announcements. Other suggestions for publicity purposes were utilizing the Youth City Council or the City newsletter. Nancy Dean, City Recorder, commented the ordinance would be effective as soon as the approved ordinance was posted; however, students would be out of school until January.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO THE 2011/2012 BUDGET AND FISCAL YEAR 2011 FUND BALANCES

Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, distributed a handout reflecting the FY2011 General Fund balance. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, reviewed the handout with the Council and pointed out the City had exceeded eighteen percent in its fund balance. He stated State law only allowed a maximum eighteen percent in municipal fund balances. Mr. Wylie clarified
the City had an entire year to spend those funds and commented they could be appropriated to the next fiscal year’s budget.

Mr. Wylie distributed a handout reflecting the items which would need to be included with the re-opening of the budget during the December 13, 2011 City Council meeting. He reviewed the items reflected in the handout with the Council. He mentioned the CDBG allotment was reduced by administrative costs and indicated further clarification would need to come from the federal government. He commented the reduction was how the City was addressing the issue at this time until further information could be obtained.

He directed the Council to the bottom portion of the handout and stated Adam would address those listed. Adam distributed a handout which reflected requests in which the excess fund balance could be appropriated and reviewed each with the Council:

- Council Chambers multimedia upgrade
- Public Safety radios
- E-GOV software
- Legend Hills traffic study
- Community Arts Bldg. improvements
- PR/Marketing increase
- Court Audio
- Employee Expense
- Roads
- Lobbyist
- Performance Evaluation Software
- CDBG Administration

Mr. Lenhard emphasized the need for the multimedia upgrade specific to the uses for the Planning Commission and eliminating the need for paper handouts to the Commission and City Council. He shared examples of the benefits which could be recognized with new technology and equipment.

Chief Krusi explained the current radios functioned with an analog signal which would no longer work when the digital signal upgrade was complete. He commented this change in signal was similar to the change recently experienced with the change regarding the television signals requiring consumers to purchase new television sets to accommodate the digital signal. He reported a specific date had not yet been determined. He reminded the Council some funds had been appropriated for this upgrade in previous budgets and expressed the importance of being prepared for the upgrade in the event grant funds were not recognized. He emphasized the radios were currently working at this time and shared scenarios in which it was difficult to obtain replacement parts when repairs were needed.
Mr. Wylie explained how the E-Gov software would assist the City with on-line building permits, business licensing and other functions within the Community Development Department.

Mr. Lenhard reminded the Council of previous discussions specific to the Legend Hills traffic study. He stated this would be instrumental in securing future economic development at Legend Hills.

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, stated the proposed funding would provide for an electrical upgrade, some painting, landscaping and new signage at the Community Arts Center. Mr. Lenhard expressed his opinion these improvements were necessary because the aesthetics would make a difference to those using the facility and would be a great first step in the renovation. A discussion took place to each specific improvement.

Mr. Lenhard reminded the Council the two individuals filling the PR/Marketing positions were part time. He was requesting additional funds to allow an additional five hours added to the work week. He believed this was needed in order to get the marketing campaign off the ground.

Mr. Lenhard stated the City was required by the State of Utah to complete an audio upgrade in the Justice Court and reported the upgrade was in the bid process at this time. He indicated the estimated cost for compliance was approximately $6,000.

Mr. Lenhard reviewed the employee expense with the Council. Councilmember Sprague expressed concern about the timing and any future expectation it might create on behalf of the employees. Mayor Wood suggested the payment was intended to recognize the employees in lieu of not receiving Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) or merit pay in the past several years. Councilmember Sprague commented this would be the second year in which the employees received compensation near the holidays. Mayor Wood stated the one-time payment was more cost effective than merit or COLA and with the City experiencing a budget surplus believed it to be a gesture of gratitude for the employees.

Councilmember Young inquired if job performance was taken into consideration in issuing the one-time payment. Mr. Lenhard responded performance evaluations were the initial factor taken into consideration and all employees qualified. He also reported the City would be implementing a new evaluation system. Councilmember Young believed it said something of the caliber of employees if all employees qualified based on the current evaluation system.

Councilmember Murray mentioned the one-time payment last year was one percent and inquired what amount was proposed for this one-time payment. Mr. Lenhard responded the proposed figure was two and a half percent. He emphasized any of the proposed projects and expenses listed on the handout, with the exception of roads and the lobbyist, were at the discretion of the Council.
Councilmember Murray inquired if funds had been appropriated for maintaining City assets. Mr. Lenhard stated the City had designated capital improvement funds which could be used for future maintenance on the City facilities. Councilmember Murray pointed out even if the Council approved the proposed one-time fund appropriations; the handout still reflected a balance of $54,000 remaining. Mr. Lenhard commented Councilmember Murray was correct and suggested the Council consider those funds for the capital improvement fund. Mr. Lenhard reviewed how personnel cost savings had been recognized.

Councilmember Shepherd stated he didn’t want to discount the employee need; however, he believed there were other needs which should be prioritized before the employees. Councilmember Fryer suggested the Council consider a figure less than the two and a half percent for the one-time employee payment.

Councilmember Elect LeBaron believed public or private entities that had the means should offer some pay increase to the employees in order to retain the talented employees performing their jobs under harsh economic circumstances. Councilmember Young agreed with Mr. LeBaron’s philosophy and stated he was willing to consider a lesser amount than the two and a half percent. He believed it was important to express appreciation to the employees. Councilmember Sprague believed the funds could be better appropriated to higher prioritized needs and didn’t want the one-time payment to become an expectation of the employees.

Councilmember Murray expressed agreement with Councilmember Young that the City should do something which illustrated thankfulness for the work the employees had done; although, she too worried the one-time payment would be considered a Christmas bonus and also wondered why two and a half percent was the figure being considered. She inquired about the difference between two percent and two and a half percent because she didn’t believe it would affect very many employees. Mr. Lenhard responded part-time employees and those hired during the year would be compensated using a pro-rated formula.

Councilmember Fryer expressed her opinion the employees should receive some increase. Councilmember Shepherd expressed concern the proposed amount was more than last year and suggested the Council consider the unemployed or underemployed taxpaying resident in determining how to benefit the employees. He stated the City had completed studies which reflected the employees were being fairly compensated and expressed concern in justifying that expenditure to the citizens of the City.

Mr. Lenhard stated the Council should feel responsible with expenditures; however, he likened the City to that of a large corporation who has to compete for talented employees in both the public and private sector. He reported he had asked the employees to be more efficient and do more with less every day and agreed the City shouldn’t be the leader when it came to salaries and benefits; but believed the City would get what it paid for specifically when a high level of service was expected.
Councilmember Young agreed with Mr. Lenhard’s comments and believed it would be appropriate to benefit the employees when efficiency gains were recognized due to their competency. Councilmember Murray pointed out the Council had consistently appropriated for road projects and other improvement projects and when the employees were credited with recognized efficiencies they should be compensated.

Mayor Wood suggested since the majority of the Council was in favor of a one-time payment the discussion should be focused on the amount and a discussion specific to that took place. Councilmember Murray believed she spent more time at City facilities than other councilmembers and expressed her opinion the employees were hard working and deserved a two percent payment. Further discussion took place and staff was directed to proceed with a two percent benefit.

Mr. Lenhard explained the need to purchase performance evaluation software which would allow efficiency in performing employee evaluations on the City’s network.

Mr. Lenhard commented the last item reflected on the handout was the CDBG Administration costs and reminded the Council staff was looking into that expense.

He directed the Council to the remaining balance of approximately $84,000. Councilmember Murray suggested appropriating those funds to the capital improvement projects. Mr. Wylie explained how the Council could make appropriations from that fund such as: a new boiler, carpet replacement, painting, etc. Councilmember Murray inquired if the funds could be used to clean up public areas. Mr. Wylie responded that use would be more of an operating cost than an improvement project. Mr. Lenhard suggested creating a separate line item specific to maintenance.

Mayor Wood suggested monument signs at City gateways. Mr. Lenhard commented some of the areas were in RDA areas with a separate budget which could be used for that purpose. He suggested appropriating for that expenditure during the budget process.

Mr. Wylie pointed out the funds could be allocated in the FY 2013 budget process and emphasized the monies wouldn’t need to be spent for another eighteen months.

Mr. Lenhard requested Council’s direction on the items listed on the handout. Mayor Wood pointed out Natalee Flynn and Marliss Scott, PR/Marketing/Special Events had expressed the need for an outdoor sound system to be used at City events. Ms. Flynn commented the Storytelling Festival was fast approaching and there was an immediate need for a sound system with IPod capabilities. She reported she had completed research and believed the City’s needs could be met with a system costing approximately $2,100. The Council directed staff to proceed with that expenditure with the others reflected on the handout.
DISCUSSION ON THE MARKETING CAMPAIGN

Marliss Scott, PR/Marking/Special Events, reminded the Council of the marketing campaign which had been discussed during the Council retreat in January 2011. She shared a visual presentation reviewing the previously decided goals and specifics relating to implementation with the Council. She also reviewed a budgetary timeline with the Council directly relating to implementation. A discussion took place regarding signage of the City’s marketing campaign on I-15 compared to State Street or SR 193. The Council directed Ms. Scott to pursue the billboard on I-15.

Mayor Wood inquired about the signage component of the plan. Ms. Scott responded the banner signage was similar to the Vision 2020 which could be displayed on the side of a building and changed every quarter. Councilmember Shepherd suggested banners for the City’s light posts. The Council expressed enthusiasm with the suggestion.

She shared some advertising concepts highlighting businesses located within the City and a discussion took place regarding the marketing campaign specific to promoting those businesses. She pointed out all advertising components would be coordinated regarding the specific business each quarter. She requested direction and approval from the City Council to proceed with the proposed marketing campaign.

A discussion took place regarding how small businesses as well as large companies/manufacturers located within the City could be included in the marketing campaign. Brian Brower, City Attorney, suggested the Council identify specific criteria which would be used in determining businesses used in the campaign. Mayor Wood agreed with that suggestion.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 24th day of January, 2012

/s/Don Wood, 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, November 29, 2011.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder