Mission Statement: To provide leadership in advancing core community values; sustain safety, security and health; and provide progressive, caring and effective services. We take pride in building a community where individuals, families and businesses can develop and thrive.

4:30 P.M. WORK SESSION
Interviews with Development Services Manager Candidates

(TENTATIVE) The Council will consider a motion to enter into a Closed Session for the purpose of a strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual. Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-204 and §52-4-205(1)(a)

Discussion on Increases to the North Davis Sewer District User Fees
Discussion on the Award of Bid for Recreation Software
Discussion on the Design for the Entry Way of the Community Arts Center
Discussion on the Revenue from the Sale of Surplus Exercise Equipment
Discussion on an Outreach Program with Clearfield High School’s Student Government
Discussion on the Creation of an Ethics Commission

(Any items not 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. SPECIAL SESSION
CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Wood
OPENING CEREMONY: Councilmember Bush
APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
July 9, 2013 – Work Session
July 9, 2013 – Regular Session
July 30, 2013 – Work Session

SCHEDULED ITEM:
1. CITIZEN COMMENTS

2. CANVASS THE RESULTS OF THE MUNICIPAL PRIMARY ELECTION HELD ON AUGUST 13, 2013

BACKGROUND: State Law requires the governing body verify the results of the primary election, which was held on Tuesday, August 13, 2013.
3. **RECOMMENDATION:** Verify the official primary election results.

3. **CONSIDER APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2013-10 AMENDING THE CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE**

**BACKGROUND:** The North Davis Sewer District completed a utility rate study which identified the need to raise its fees for sewer services over the next several years. The City’s Consolidated Fee Schedule needs to be amended to account for those increases as a pass-through fee to users.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve Ordinance 2013-10 amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents.

4. **CONSIDER APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2013R-16 AFFIRMING THE CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED THE 2012 MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER PLANNING PROGRAM REPORT FOR CLEARFIELD**

**BACKGROUND:** Utah’s Department of Environmental Quality has asked the City Council to review and consider Clearfield’s Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for 2012. This resolution affirms the Council reviewed and considered the report.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve Resolution 2013R-16 affirming that the City Council reviewed and considered the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for Clearfield and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents.

**COMMUNICATION ITEMS:**
- Mayor’s Report
- City Councils’ Reports
- City Manager’s Report
- Staffs’ Reports

**ADJOURN AS THE CITY COUNCIL AND RECONVENE AS THE CDRA**

2. CONSIDER A PROPOSED LEASE AGREEMENT WITH ROCKET FUEL COFFEE COMPANY LLC FOR THE BUILDING LOCATED AT 50 SOUTH DEPOT STREET, CLEARFIELD

**ADJOURN AS THE CDRA**

Dated this 16th day of August, 2013.

/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.
Mayor Wood called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

DISCUSSION WITH WEBER BASIN WATER REGARDING DROUGHT CONDITIONS

Scott Paxman, Weber Basin Water, explained Weber Basin Water was concerned with how the demand for water would be impacted by future population growth. He informed the Council it was Weber Basin Water Conservancy District’s goal to stay ahead of the population growth specific to water development. He announced the most important development project was conservation. He reported it was Governor Herbert’s goal, as well as the District’s, for twenty-five percent conservation per capita by the year 2025. He pointed out conservation criteria would differ depending on geographical location as well as whether the residents would accept more desert landscaping similar to Arizona.

Mr. Paxman informed the Council the second project would be converting agriculture water supplies to residential use once the agricultural land was residentially developed. Councilmember Bush requested clarification if the District required the farmer to sell the water rights associated with the agriculture property to the developer. Mr. Paxman explained the District had agreements with municipalities which had a large amount of agriculture irrigation needs which had ordinances requiring a water allotment for the next use or development.
Mr. Paxman stated another area the District was studying was known as Aquifer Recharge and Recovery. He explained this was groundwater recharge in which reservoirs were built and filled with water taken from the Weber River which supplemented the groundwater. He explained the aquifer acted as a reservoir for the District. He emphasized it was the District’s responsibility to meet the demand for water as opposed to developing huge water infrastructure projects and believed the current supplies were sufficient until 2035.

He announced the next large water project would be the Bear River Project in Box Elder County which would be the next big importation project for drinking water. He reported the project would cost more than one billion dollars and stated it was necessary to conserve and reuse as much water as possible. He also pointed out discussions were taking place with the Division of Water Resources about several possible reservoir sites as well as possible pipeline alignments. He reviewed the water allocations designated by the Legislature and explained the challenges in capturing water from the Logan River. He mentioned the Willard Bay reservoir was shallow and experienced a significant amount of evaporation.

Mr. Paxman explained in addition to water development projects the District also needed to address water infrastructure projects. He stated the current infrastructure was over sixty five years old and reported the projected cost to complete the needed improvements was also approximately one billion dollars.

Mr. Paxman reminded the Council the previous winter was long and cold with a significant amount of snow; however, most of the snow was in the valleys and not in the upper elevations. He pointed out the snow pack in the Wasatch Back was less than seventy percent of normal. He explained the challenges associated with the public’s perception of the current drought and available water resources. He reported estimates of the amount of water stored in the reservoirs for this water year were less than what was used last year and added it had always been the goal of the District to have a fifty percent carryover of reservoir capacity following summer usage. He emphasized if the same amount of water was used this summer there would be nothing to carry over. He stressed the need for conservation and suggested a reduction in water use for landscaping and indicated residents watered landscaping twice as much as what was needed.

He reported the conservation efforts since the campaign was implemented in 2000 had recognized a significant decrease in water usage and figures estimated a reduction of approximately twenty percent. He expressed confidence the residents of Utah had responded positively to the conservation campaign. He stated it was the opinion of the District that most irrigation systems were poorly designed, operated and maintained.

Mr. Paxman reported there were conservation programs available to the public:

- The Learning Garden
- Public Education Component
- Secondary Water Metering
- Rebate Program
He pointed out a few of the handouts and programs available to the public:

- List of low water-use plants
- Turf management information
- Soil information
- Landscape products
- Irrigation hints
- Presentations specific to water conservation at the garden and indoor facility
- Water check program for residents

Mr. Paxman informed the Council the current water restriction enforced by the District was for no outdoor watering between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. He stated this was strictly being enforced and after three warnings of violation the water would be turned off. He informed the Council there were several links on the District’s website which provided water conservation suggestions. He also mentioned there were several classes advertised on the website specific to irrigation, design, pruning, plants, soils and gardening. He stated the District also sponsored Garden Fairs twice a year during which outdoor vendors were available for questions/answers and products. He commented tours of the Water Conservancy facilities were also available.

Mr. Paxman reported the District had been working towards a secondary water metering program for at least a decade and reported several prototypes had been tested with unsuccessful results. He shared the history of the devices and reported all new subdivisions approved after 2010 were required to install secondary water meters. He explained the challenges of installing them at existing homes and reported a sampling was installed in various areas with great success. He believed secondary water metering was essential to encouraging conservation. He stated the District had the capabilities to provide a water usage report reflecting water usage patterns compared to landscaping needs which was another tool to assist residents with conservation efforts.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, inquired what the District’s recommendation for water conservation would be for Clearfield City since it didn’t have many secondary water users. Mr. Paxman responded the City should consistently encourage the residents to conserve water. Mr. Lenhard inquired if the City should implement strict measures to residents at this time. Mr. Paxman suggested the City continue with education and conservation efforts for the time being.

DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE FREEPORT E STREET SEWER PROJECT

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, reported the sewer improvement project was located at the western portion of the Freeport Center. He explained a sewer outfall line was installed about five years ago from the Freeport area to 1000 West. He continued the project would be taking that outfall sewer line and continuing it further east in Freeport Center. He stated the current sewer line was flowing at capacity and the new larger line would accommodate more volume. He informed the Council future projects would continue the larger line even further east.
He announced five bids were received and the lowest responsible bid was received from Brinkerhoff Excavation. He stated the proposed cost of the project was within budgeted parameters and indicated the item was on the Council’s Agenda.

Councilmember LeBaron inquired how the two different sized lines would accommodate the velocity changes. Mr. Hodge explained that as more pipe was installed farther up the line that problem was reduced because the larger pipe could easily accommodate the flow.

**DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE BARLOW STREET STORM DRAIN PROJECT**

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, explained the storm drain project would take place on the northern portion of Barlow Street near 600 North and end at Barlow Circle. He continued the subdivision had minimal storm drains and the project would tie into a connection which emptied into Steed Pond.

He informed the Council seven contractors had bid on the project and Leon Poulson submitted the lowest bid. He mentioned the company had completed projects for the City in the past and informed the Council the cost for the project was within the budgeted parameters.

He explained the pipe for the project would begin with an eighteen inch pipe continuing to a fifteen inch pipe size and reviewed specifics of the project with the Council.

**DISCUSSION ON STREET LIGHT PURCHASES AND LED CONVERSION**

Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, reported he had been involved in previous discussions regarding the replacement of street lights with new LED lights. He was informed of study results which indicated a return of investment and savings for the new LED lights. He had requested a copy of the study and reviewed the results with the Council.

He informed the Council 146 street light poles were owned by the City and 641 were owned by Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) and explained the poles owned by RMP had a different billing schedule from those owned by the City. He reported he had contacted Lewis Young Robertson and Burningham (LYRB) to inquire about the study because they were responsible for completing the study and requested it research Clearfield’s street lights to determine the best course of action for the City. He pointed out the study would be conducted at no cost.

He mentioned the study also included the interior and outside lighting at City Hall and the Aquatic Center to determine if any savings could be recognized. He reported Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, and Eric Howes, Community Services Director, were also involved with LYRB representatives.

Mr. Wylie briefly reviewed the study. He stated the cost to replace the poles currently owned by RMP as well as those owned by the City with LED lights was approximately $500,000 and the savings in energy costs to the City would be approximately $141,000 per year. He summarized the return on investment would be approximately four years with an annual savings to the
General Fund after that time of $141,000. He reported the estimated life expectancy for the LED lights was twenty years which equated to a life savings of $3,086,000.

Councilmember Shepherd clarified the proposed costs included the cost for converting the lights to LED. Mr. Wylie responded in the affirmative and explained the costs included purchasing the light poles from RMP, replacing lights with LED fixtures, and the inclusion of a rebate by RMP. A discussion took place regarding shared usage of light poles from other utility companies with RMP.

Councilmember Bush announced both Syracuse and Layton cities had recently approved such a conversion. Brian Brower, City Attorney, reported Syracuse City’s return on investment had been greater than anticipated.

Mr. Wylie reported the net cost to convert the lights to LED at the Aquatic Center was approximately $90,000 with the first year’s electrical savings of $42,817. Eric Howes, Community Services Director, reminded the Council of previous discussions regarding humidity issues specific to systems at the Aquatic Center. He emphasized the humid environment had affected the lighting fixtures and believed the investment in replacing the current fixtures with LED fixtures would be recognized within two years. He explained the current challenges associated with replacing the lights at the Aquatic Center. Mr. Wylie emphasized the return on investment at the Aquatic Center would be recognized much more quickly. He suggested the expenditure be addressed during the reopen of the budget.

Councilmember Murray inquired if the project would have to be completed all at once. Mr. Wylie suggested completing the Aquatic Center first. Mr. Howes reported the Community Arts Center had not been included in the study because the City had already used energy grant funds to replace the lighting during the remodel. Mr. Wylie stated LYRB would work directly with RMP to obtain the rebates for the City.

The Council directed staff to move forward with the LED light replacement.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.
PRESIDING: Don Wood Mayor

PRESENT: Kent Bush Councilmember
Kathryn Murray Councilmember
Mike LeBaron Councilmember
Mark Shepherd Councilmember
Bruce Young Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT: Adam Lenhard City Manager
JJ Allen Assistant City Manager
Brian Brower City Attorney
Greg Krusi Police Chief
Bob Wylie Administrative Services Director
Scott Hodge Public Works Director
Kim Dabb Operations Manager
Eric Howes Community Services Director
Valerie Claussen Development Services Director
Nancy Dean City Recorder

EXCUSED: Kim Read Deputy City Recorder

VISITORS: Joy Brown – American Legion, Brianne Olsen – West Davis Corridor EIS, Becky Brooks

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

Councilmember Young conducted the Opening Ceremony.


Councilmember LeBaron moved to approve the minutes from the June 25, 2013 work session and the June 25, 2013 regular session as written, seconded by Councilmember Shepherd. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, LeBaron, Murray, Shepherd and Young. Voting NO – None.
Brianne Olsen, UDOT, updated the Council on the West Davis corridor Draft EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) recently prepared by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). She explained Davis County was growing rapidly and expected to have a 63 percent increase in population by the year 2040 as well as a 90 percent increase in housing and a 50 percent increase in local employment. She stated the increased growth would lead to increased traffic congestion and traffic delays significantly affecting the productivity of the workforce. She explained it was important for UDOT to address alternatives for keeping traffic moving as the growth expanded. She indicated the purpose of looking at alternatives was to improve visual mobility and enhance peak period mobility.

She recapped the process that UDOT was using to address the growth and resulting traffic issues. She stated the process began in early 2010 with a series of open houses where public input was sought to identify the needs and problems that currently existed and create possible alternatives for future development. She commented 46 alternatives to the current system were identified during the open house phase which included transit options and route configurations. She explained following the open houses UDOT looked at the alternatives and reviewed which ones best addressed the traffic needs and in November 2010 it presented 14 alternatives which included widening existing roadways and new alignments. She stated the 14 alternatives were then analyzed to determine which ones had the least impact and then those alternatives were taken to the public through an open house process. She commented the open houses were well attended and there was a lot of public comment on the alternatives. She stated following the open houses three alternatives were identified as viable. She reported that UDOT took the three alternatives and did further study that included each alternative’s impact to wetlands which process reduced viable alternatives to two in number.

She reported UDOT released the Draft EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) in May of 2013. She explained the Draft EIS contained three years of study and data and milestones. She stated the Draft EIS was available for review on UDOT’s website. She added UDOT was conducting open houses and public hearings on the study through the comment period that would end August 23, 2013. She stated the Final EIS document would be compiled and released late winter of 2013 at which time a final record of decision on the study would be released in 2014 by the Federal Highway Administration.

Ms. Olsen reported that UDOT was recommending the Glover Lane Option in southern Davis County, the B1 Option in Syracuse and the 4100 West Option for northern Davis County and southern Weber County. She encouraged stakeholders to submit comments on UDOT’s recommended options through the end of the comment period on August 23, 2013. She explained the fastest and easiest way to submit comments was through UDOT’s West Davis Corridor website.

Mayor Wood asked how the new roadway would affect traffic congestion on I-15. Ms. Olsen responded UDOT was anticipating a significant reduction in traffic congestion when the roadway
was completed. Mayor Wood asked what the prospects were for funding the project once the Final EIS was released. Ms. Olsen stated there currently was no funding in place for the project and that would be decided by the Utah Legislature sometime after the final alignment was determined. She explained the Wasatch Front Regional Council projected completing the project to Antelope Drive by 2020 and beyond that by 2030. She reiterated the schedule would be dependent on funding but there were homeowners that would be impacted by the alignment so there might be a need to acquire properties along the corridor before construction began. Mayor Wood asked if there was a timeframe for the results of the EIS to expire. Ms. Olsen explained an EIS generally had a shelf life of five years but UDOT could keep the results valid longer by taking action on the project which action could include the purchase of properties along the corridor.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

UPDATE ON THE NORTH DAVIS SEWER DISTRICT BY COUNCILMEMBER BUSH

Councilmember Bush represented the City on the Administrative Board of the North Davis Sewer District. He shared a visual presentation and updated the Council regarding issues and/or projects specific to the Sewer District.

Councilmember Bush pointed out the sewer equipment and infrastructure were not sufficient to serve the current population and reported the Sewer District had not increased its sewer rates to residents in eleven years. He announced in order to upgrade the facilities it would be necessary to increase the rates every year for the next few years to build up a reserve fund in addition to completing some infrastructure projects. He reported a recently completed study reflected the current rates were significantly lower than surrounding areas.

He reminded the Council of the three products provided by the Sewer District:

- Grey water that was drained into the Great Salt Lake.
- Gas which was used to power portions of the operating plant at the District.
- Sludge which was previously sold to residents to be used in gardens as “fertilizer”.

Councilmember Bush mentioned the sludge product had been discontinued a few years ago because an additional process was required for residential use as opposed to agriculture use. He reported a Weber County farmer was currently purchasing all sludge produced by the District for his agriculture farm. He informed the Council that there was not enough land at the current facility to keep the sludge because of the increased amount being produced by the current population. He reported the District had been looking to purchase property for the purpose of storing sludge.

He explained the current buyer of the sludge proposed storing the sludge at his property and the District was currently in the process of negotiations for that purpose and reported the agreement could potentially save the District approximately $1.8 million by eliminating the need for land
acquisition. He reported the District would continue with additional improvements for sludge storage.

He informed the Council the need to replace aging sewer pipe infrastructure and explained a new product similar to a “lining” would allow for installation without digging up the entire road and replacing the entire pipe. The “lining” would be placed inside and adhere to the current pipe and shared an illustration with the Council.

He announced the District was also in the process of installing new mixers and heaters in the secondary digestive mixers. He shared an illustration identifying the new equipment. He stated another mixer would be installed sometime in September.

He reported construction of a sludge thickening building would soon begin and another building was currently under design.

APPROVAL OF THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE BARLOW STREET STORM DRAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECT TO LEON POULSEN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

Bids were received from seven construction companies to install a new 24 inch storm drain on Barlow Street from Barlow Circle to 600 North Street. The lowest responsible bid was received from Leon Poulsen Construction Company with the bid of $161,743.75.

Councilmember Young moved to approve the award of bid to Leon Poulsen Construction Company for the Barlow Street Storm Drain Improvement Project for the bid amount of $161,743.75 and approve funding of the project for the bid amount of $161,743.75 with contingency and engineering costs of $48,256.25 for a total project cost of $210,000.00; and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember LeBaron. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, LeBaron, Murray, Shepherd and Young. Voting NO – None.

APPROVAL OF THE AWARD OF BID EXCAVATING FOR THE FREEPORT SANITARY SEWER PIPELINE REPLACEMENT ON “E” STREET FROM 1ST STREET TO 3RD STREET TO BRINKERHOFF

Bids were received from five construction companies to make the sanitary sewer improvements on “E” Street in the Freeport Center from 1st Street to 3rd Street. The proposed improvements consist of installing a new 12 inch PVC sewer line to replace the existing 10 inch sewer line. The lowest responsible bid was received from Brinkerhoff Excavating with the bid of $181,760.00.

Councilmember LeBaron moved to approve the award of bid to Brinkerhoff Excavating for the Freeport “E” Street sanitary sewer improvement project for the bid amount of $181,760.00 and approve funding of the project for the bid amount of $181,760.00 with contingency and engineering costs of $50,240.00 for a total project cost of $232,000.00; and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Shepherd. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, LeBaron, Murray, Shepherd and Young. Voting NO – None.
APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2013R-14 AUTHORIZING THE COOPERATION AGREEMENT WITH THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (UDOT) ALLOWING THE CITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STATE PEDESTRIAN SAFETY SIDEWALK PROGRAM

Clearfield City recently submitted an application to the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) Region One to receive State Pedestrian Safety Sidewalk funding to install sidewalk on the north side of SR 107 (300 North Street) from 75 West to 94 West. The City received notification from UDOT it was approved to receive $5,625.00 for the installation of the sidewalk. The City is required to enter into an agreement with UDOT to receive the approved funding for the sidewalk improvements on SR 107 from 75 West to 94 West.

Councilmember Young moved to approve the Cooperative Agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for the Pedestrian Safety Sidewalk Program to allow the installation of sidewalk on SR 107 from 75 West to 94 West and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Murray. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, LeBaron, Murray, Shepherd and Young. Voting NO – None.

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2013R-15 APPOINTING POLLWORKERS AND SETTING THE POLLING PLACES FOR THE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS BEING HELD IN AUGUST AND NOVEMBER

State Law (U.C.A. § 20A-5-602 and § 20A-5-301) required the City Council to appoint poll workers and set the polling places prior to a municipal election. The Municipal Primary Election would be held August 13, 2013 and the Municipal General Election would be held on November 5, 2013.

Councilmember Shepherd moved to approve Resolution 2013R-15 appointing poll workers and setting the polling places for the Municipal Elections as recommended by the City Recorder and allow the City Recorder to make additions and corrections as needed and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember LeBaron. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, LeBaron, Murray, Shepherd and Young. Voting NO – None.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

Mayor Wood
1. Informed the Council that Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, had accepted a position with Draper City. He indicated this would be the last City Council he would be attending. He reported the City had received numerous awards while Mr. Wylie was with the City and commented they were displayed on a wall in the finance department. He mentioned Mr. Wylie would have the opportunity to spend more time with his family and continue with his humanitarian work with a shorter commute.
2. Informed the Council Valerie Claussen, Development Services Manager, would also be leaving the City. He reported Ms. Claussen had a Master’s Degree in Public Administration and had accepted a
position in Pleasant View as the Assistant City Administrator. He mentioned this opportunity would be beneficial to her long term career plans.

3. Reported Tracy Hollinshead, Administrative Assistant, would also be leaving Clearfield City due to a transfer associated with her husband’s employment.

4. Reported Lana Bingham, Court Clerk, was also presented with another employment opportunity with the Juvenile Court and would be leaving employment with the City.

5. Expressed appreciation to staff and Council for their efforts associated with the July 4 celebration. He specifically mentioned Councilmember Shepherd as he was the liaison for the City Council on the committee, Councilmember Murray and Pat Murray for their efforts for assembling three floats for the Parade.

6. Expressed appreciation to the Council for their participation in the dinner with dignitaries from Hill Air Force Base. He encouraged future staff and elected officials to continue with the tradition of inviting leadership from the Base to set off the fireworks display.

7. Informed the Council he had attended a luncheon at Job Corps. He announced the new authorized capacity at the facility was 800 students with 600 currently attending. He stated their enrollment was contingent upon referrals as they weren’t allowed to advertise for students. He expressed Job Corps’ concern the new capacity could be changed to 600 if additional students didn’t enroll. He reported the Center had expressed a desire for female students and indicated there were many educational opportunities for women offered at the Center. He emphasized the students didn’t have to live at the Center to participate in the educational opportunities offered there; they were allowed to reside at home or off campus, if they desired.

**Councilmember Bush**

1. Stated he enjoyed attending the Fourth of July events and indicated he enjoyed watching the pie eating contest and expressed appreciation to Eric Howes, Community Services Director, and his staff.

2. Reported he had attended the Robin Hood production at the amphitheater and stated it was an enjoyable performance. He requested his thanks be passed on to the appropriate employees.

3. Stated the sod recently installed at the West Park Village Park looked very nice.

4. Expressed good luck to Bob Wylie and Valerie Claussen in their new employment endeavors.

5. Reported the Wasatch Front Regional Council would be accepting public comment at open houses regarding the local and regional transportation improvement plans. He mentioned the 300 North road was included in the plans. He announced the open houses were scheduled for Thursday, July 18, 2013 in Farmington, July 22, 2013, Weber County Commission, and August 1, 2013, Salt Lake County.

**Councilmember LeBaron**

1. Expressed thanks to Councilmembers Shepherd and Murray for their efforts for a successful Fourth of July celebration. He stated he loved the entertainment.

2. Expressed appreciation to Eric Howes, Community Services Director, for the efforts of his staff that worked on the Fourth of July to ensure a successful celebration.

3. Wished Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, and Valerie Claussen, Development Services Manager, success in their new employment opportunities. He complimented each one mentioning their professionalism and skill set brought to their positions.

**Councilmember Murray** – nothing to report.

**Councilmember Shepherd**

1. Expressed appreciation to everyone involved in a successful Fourth of July celebration. He believed the overall feedback from members of the community was overwhelmingly positive and shared an email he received complimenting the City’s fireworks display. He indicated he had also received positive feedback specific to the entertainment. He mentioned the Clearfield celebration was the cover page for Royal Bliss’s webpage.
2. Stated he would miss working with Bob Wylie and Valerie Claussen and wished each of them good luck with their new employment endeavors.

_Councilmember Young_
1. Thanked the staff for their efforts for a successful Fourth of July.
2. Expressed appreciation to those who were leaving the City for other employment opportunities.

_Adam Lenhard, City Manager –_
1. Mentioned the monthly update sent to the Council earlier in the day contained information regarding personnel changes in the City. He stated it also contained results from the Justice Court audit.
2. He expressed appreciation to Bob Wylie and Valerie Claussen for all they had done for the City and expressed congratulations to them both.
3. Expressed appreciation to all City staff for its efforts to ensure a successful Fourth of July.

_STAFFS’ REPORTS_

_Nancy Dean, City Recorder_
1. Informed the Council of the following meeting schedule:
   - The work session planned for Tuesday, July 16, 2013 might be cancelled because it would be contingent on the outcome of the Planning Commission meeting.
   - The policy session scheduled for Tuesday, July 23, 2013, was tentatively cancelled due to a lack of items.
   - No meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, July 30, 2013 at this time.
   - Announced a work session was scheduled for Tuesday, August 6, 2013.
2. Reminded the Council election signs would be allowed to be displayed beginning Sunday, July 14, 2013.
3. Announced Early Voting would begin in City Hall on Tuesday, July 30, 2013 and the Primary Election would take place on Tuesday, August 13, 2013. She announced the polling locations were City Hall, Holt Elementary and Antelope Elementary.

_Brian Brower, City Attorney_ – Announced he would be out of town the week of July 14, 2013 – July 21, 2013 and reported he would not have cell phone service.

_Valerie Claussen, Development Services Manager_ – Expressed appreciation for the opportunities she had in working with each member of the City Council and members of staff. She hoped she was leaving Clearfield City better than how she found it due to her best efforts in planning and community development. She stated it had been a privilege to work at Clearfield City and indicated the opportunity ahead of her made leaving bittersweet.

_Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director_ – Expressed appreciation for the 9 ½ years he had been employed by the City and thanked members of the City Council for the opportunity. He reported he calculated he had driven one quarter of one million miles during that time. He stated he had enjoyed his time at Clearfield City and expressed appreciation to all employees. He expressed his confidence in the employees of the finance department and believed they would see the audit was successfully completed. He also expressed confidence in human resources and information technology staff for a smooth transition. He stated he was glad to be leaving the City in good financial shape.

There being no further business to come before the Council Councilmember Shepherd moved to adjourn at 8:08 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Murray. All voting AYE.
Mayor Wood called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON CLEARFIELD STATION, THE UTA (UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY) SITE DEVELOPMENT

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, reviewed the previous history regarding the UTA TOD (Transit Oriented Development) site. He introduced Mike Christensen, Thackeray Group to members of the Council and Planning Commission. Mr. Christensen reviewed what had previously taken place regarding Thackeray’s design of the site to address possible options regarding its development. He mentioned it was critical to the development of the project for Davis Schools to approve the creation of a CDA (Community Development Area). He reviewed the proposed site
plan with the Council and mentioned an architect had not yet been selected. He explained the reason for reconfiguring the flex business park from the original site plan was due to topography issues. He shared a visual presentation illustrating the components and traffic flows associated with the new proposed site plan. He pointed out the specific changes associated with reconfiguring 1000 East and how the project would proceed until that road could be reconstructed. Mr. Christensen reviewed the proposed phasing of the development emphasizing the importance of marketing each of the commercial/industrial areas. He emphasized the initial phasing and its specific criteria would be identified in the Development Agreement. He requested direction and discussion from members of the Planning Commission and Council.

Councilmember Bush requested specifics regarding commercial development of the site. Mr. Christensen stated commercial development was limited and explained the process used by Thackeray to determine how much retail development the site could successfully accommodate. Councilmember Bush expressed his opinion the proposed development didn’t bring significant tax revenues to the City. Mayor Wood believed the demand for office space was significant at a transit site and suggested that area was different than other office space within the City. He pointed out the close proximity of vacant retail space and believed the City should recognize the failure of the retail space surrounding the TOD site.

Councilmember Bush reported on the information he had obtained from regular riding customers of Frontrunner indicating their desire for a gas station, coffee shop, sandwich shop, a place to quickly purchase milk, etc. Mr. Christensen pointed out the specific parcels identified for commercial/retail development on the site plan. A discussion took place regarding the location and placement of the housing component and the charter school in the proposed development.

John Dorney, Horrocks Engineers, explained specifics of the road construction and its association to identified phases of the proposed development. A discussion took place regarding the proposed vehicle access plan and traffic flow in conjunction with development of the site. Mr. Christensen pointed out the Development Agreement would specify the completion of residential development in conjunction with retail/commercial development and its associated traffic flow.

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, reviewed the proposed timeline associated with the proposed project. He explained the Planning Commission would consider the current application for the rezone during the meeting of September 4, 2013. He continued if the Planning Commission took action that evening approval could then come before the City Council during the September 24th meeting.

The following points of concern were expressed during the discussion:
- The amount of retail/commercial space
- The area identified for the residential component
- The location and layout of the residential component in conjunction with State Street
- The reconfiguration of 1000 East
- The traffic flow in and near the TOD site and when the roads would be constructed/completed
• Ensuring the retail/commercial component was completed appropriately with the residential component in conjunction with the phasing of the project

A break was taken at 7:30 p.m.
The meeting resumed at 7:40 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, distributed a handout specific to amending the General Plan regarding multi-family housing and pointed out the use was allowed in only a few zones. He explained the necessity to amend the General Plan to allow multi-family housing in the MU (Mixed Use) zone to accommodate the Clearfield Station development. He announced it was staff’s recommendation to amend the General Plan to include the MU zone which would allow Clearfield Station to proceed with its rezone application.

Councilmember Murray expressed her opinion all other verbiage should remain the same and the City should only authorize additional multi-family housing in the MU zone. She believed the City shouldn’t generalize the use or make the General Plan more liberal with the amendment.

Mr. Allen explained an application had been received and considered by the Planning Commission for future development of an R-2 zone with multi-family housing. He stated this was in conflict with the General Plan; therefore, it couldn’t be recommended for approval. He believed there might be support for the project from some members of the Planning Commission and City Council; which would require amending the General Plan. He cautioned the Council in specifically discussing Wilcox Farms and suggested the discussion or subsequent amendments be general in nature.

Planning Commission Chair Peterson expressed agreement with Councilmember Murray’s comments. She expressed concern about discussions on amending the General Plan being project specific. She pointed out the Clearfield Station development was in the MU (Mixed Use) zone and that inclusion would be an appropriate amendment to the General Plan and believed the MU zone was created with the similar intent of the CR (Commercial Residential). She expressed concern additional amendments made to the General Plan intended for a specific project might not be in the best interest of the entire City. She suggested the General Plan should be considered as a guiding document to be used when allowing certain projects. Mr. Allen mentioned Clearfield Station was originally anticipated as a CR project and as it evolved the MU zone became a more appropriate zone for the development. He requested direction from members of the Council and Planning Commission.

Commissioner Butcher expressed concern the Wilcox Farm property was isolated lacking street frontage and therefore didn’t have many options for its development. He inquired what provisions were available regarding development for property owners with property of a similar nature. He emphasized he understand the purpose of the General Plan; however, development options should be available for landlocked parcels. Chair Peterson believed the General Plan needed to be implemented to the City as a whole, as opposed to specific development. She
expressed concern how such a change could negatively impact future development of other parcels within the City.

Mayor Wood reviewed the previous history specific to R-2 medium density (multi-family) zoned properties. Councilmember Bush commented he agreed with Chair Peterson as well as Commissioner Butcher in that there were properties located within the City in which the General Plan restricted development. He believed there should be some flexibility with future language in the General Plan.

Mr. Allen suggested if the Planning Commission and City Council desired the discretion to consider development on a case by case basis, language could be eliminated in the General Plan which would allow that circumstance. Chair Peterson expressed her concern with that philosophy and believed the City should have a document which justified the Planning Commission’s and City Council’s actions. Mr. Allen clarified the Planning Commission and Council desired language only be modified specific to the MU zone.

Councilmember Shepherd moved to adjourn as the City Council and reconvene as the CDRA in a work session at 8:00 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Young. All voting AYE.

**The minutes for the CDRA are in a separate location**
CLEARFIELD CITY ORDINANCE 2013-10

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE FOR CLEARFIELD CITY CORPORATION.

PREAMBLE: Ordinance 2008-06 enacted a consolidated fee schedule for utilities, recreation, licensing, permits, impact fees, building rental, etc. for Clearfield City Corporation. A recent analysis of cemetery fees identified that certain amendments to the fee schedule are warranted, which shall be enacted as outlined below.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL:

Section 1. Enactment: Title 2, Chapter 5 of the Clearfield City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:
Section 2. Effective Date: This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon posting.

Section 3. Repealer: Any Ordinance or sections or portions of ordinances previously enacted by the Clearfield City Council which are in conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby repealed and replaced by this Ordinance.

Dated this 20th day of August, 2013, at the regularly scheduled meeting of the Clearfield City Council.

CLEARFIELD CITY CORPORATION

___________________________________
Donald W. Wood, Mayor

ATTEST

_________________________________
Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

VOTE OF THE COUNCIL

AYE:

NAY:
CLEARFIELD CITY RESOLUTION 2013R-16

A RESOLUTION AFFIRMING THE CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED CLEARFIELD’S MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER PLANNING PROGRAM REPORT AND DIRECTING THAT SAID REPORT BE SUBMITTED TO UTAH’S DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

WHEREAS, as part of Utah’s Wastewater Planning Program, each year the state’s Department of Environmental Quality (“DEQ”) requests each municipality which generates wastewater to submit a “Self-Assessment Report” for the municipality to be submitted to the DEQ’s Division of Water Quality; and

WHEREAS, the Clearfield Public Works Department has prepared the City’s annual Self-Assessment Report for the 2012 calendar year regarding Clearfield’s Municipal Wastewater Planning Program; and

WHEREAS, the DEQ asks that the City Council affirm to the Division of Water Quality and the Water Quality Board that the Council reviewed the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report and submit said affirmation via resolution along with the report by September 1st of this year; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has reviewed and considered Clearfield’s Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for the 2012 calendar year (attached as Exhibit “A”);

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Clearfield City Council that:

1) the Council hereby affirms it has reviewed and considered the City’s Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for 2012; and
2) City staff is hereby directed to submit said report together with this Resolution to the DEQ’s Division of Water Quality and the Water Quality Board by September 1, 2013.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of August, 2013.

ATTEST: CLEARFIELD CITY CORPORATION

______________________________  ______________________________
Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder  Don W. Wood, Mayor

VOTE OF THE COUNCIL

AYE:

NAY:
STATE OF UTAH

MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER PLANNING PROGRAM

SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

FOR

CLEARFIELD

2012
Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP)
Financial Evaluation Section

Owner Name: CLEARFIELD

Name and Title of Contact Person:

Scott Hedge

Public Works Director

Phone: 801-526-4430

E-mail: Hedge@Clearfield.org

PLEASE SUBMIT TO STATE BY: September 1, 2013

Mail to: MWPP - Department of Environmental Quality
c/o Paul Krauth, P.E.
Division of Water Quality
195 North 1950 West
P.O. Box 144870
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4870
Phone: (801) 536-4346
NOTE: This questionnaire has been compiled for your benefit by a state sponsored task force comprised of representatives of local government and service districts. It is designed to assist you in making an evaluation of your wastewater system and financial planning. Please answer questions as accurately as possible to give you the best evaluation of your facility. If you need assistance please call, Emily Cantón. Utah Division of Water Quality: (801) 536-4342.

I. Definitions: The following terms and definitions may help you complete the worksheets and questionnaire:

User Charge (UC) - A fee established for one or more class(es) of users of the wastewater treatment facilities that generate revenues to pay for costs of the system.

Operation and Maintenance Expense - Expenditures incurred for materials, labor, utilities, and other items necessary for managing and maintaining the facility to achieve or maintain the capacity and performance for which it was designed and constructed.

Repair and Replacement Cost - Expenditures incurred during the useful life of the treatment works for obtaining and installing equipment, accessories, and/or appurtenances necessary to maintain the existing capacity and the performance for which the facility was designed and constructed.

Capital Needs - Cost to construct, upgrade or improve the facility.

Capital Improvement Reserve Account - A reserve established to accumulate funds for construction and/or replacement of treatment facilities, collection lines or other capital improvement needs.

Reserve for Debt Service - A reserve for bond repayment as may be defined in accordance with terms of a bond indenture.

Current Debt Service - Interest and principal costs for debt payable this year.

Repair and Replacement Sinking Fund - A fund to accumulate funds for repairs and maintenance to fixed assets not normally included in operation expenses and for replacement costs (defined above).
Part I: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Complete the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are revenues sufficient to cover operation, maintenance, and repair &amp; replacement (OM&amp;R) costs at this time?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the projected revenues sufficient to cover operation, maintenance, and repair &amp; replacement (OM&amp;R) costs for the next five years?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the facility have sufficient staff to ensure proper O&amp;M?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a dedicated sinking fund been established to provide for repair &amp; replacement costs?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the repair &amp; replacement sinking fund adequate to meet anticipated needs?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PART I =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Complete the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are present revenues collected sufficient to cover all costs and provide funding for capital improvements?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are projected funding sources sufficient to cover all projected capital improvement costs for the next five years?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are projected funding sources sufficient to cover all projected capital improvement costs for the next ten years?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are projected funding sources sufficient to cover all projected capital improvement costs for the next twenty years?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a dedicated sinking fund been established to provide for future capital improvements?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO = 25 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PART II =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part III: GENERAL QUESTIONS**

Complete the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the wastewater treatment fund a separate enterprise fund/account or district?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points  NO = 25 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you collecting 95% or more of your sewer billings?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points  NO = 25 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a review, at least annually, of user fees?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points  NO = 25 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are bond reserve requirements being met if applicable?</td>
<td>YES = 0 points  NO = 25 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PART III =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part IV: PROJECTED NEEDS**

Estimate as best you can the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of projected capital improvements (in thousands)</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>526</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Point Summation**

Fill in the values from Parts I through III in the blanks provided in column 1. Add the numbers to determine the MWPP point total that reflects your present financial position for meeting your wastewater needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP)
Collection System Section

Owner Name: CLEARFIELD

Name and Title of Contact Person:

Scott Hodge
Public Works Director

Phone: 801-525-4430
E-mail: SHodge@ClearfieldCity.Org

PLEASE SUBMIT TO STATE BY: September 1, 2013

Mail to: MWPP - Department of Environmental Quality
c/o Paul Krauth, P.E.
Division of Water Quality
195 North 1950 West
P.O. Box 144870
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4870
Phone: (801) 536-4346

Form completed by
Part I: SYSTEM AGE

A. What year was your collection system first constructed (approximately)?
   Year \text{\underline{19}40}\text{\underline{}}

B. What is the oldest part of your present system?
   Oldest part \text{\underline{73} years}\text{\underline{}}

Part II: BYPASSES

A. Please complete the following table:

| How many days last year was there a bypass, overflow or basement flooding by untreated wastewater in the system due to rain or snowmelt? | 0 times = 0 points  
1 time = 5 points  
2 times = 10 points  
3 times = 15 points  
4 times = 20 points  
5 or more = 25 points |
|---|---|
| How many days last year was there a bypass, overflow or basement flooding by untreated wastewater due to equipment failure? (except plugged laterals) | 0 times = 0 points  
1 time = 5 points  
2 times = 10 points  
3 times = 15 points  
4 times = 20 points  
5 or more = 25 points |
| TOTAL PART II | 0 |

B. Please specify whether the bypass(es) was caused a contract or tributary communities, etc.

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
**Part III: NEW DEVELOPMENT**

A. Please complete the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has an industry (or other development) moved into the community or expanded production in the past two years, such that either flow or wastewater loadings to the sewerage system were significantly increased (10-20%)?</th>
<th>No = 0 points</th>
<th>Yes = 10 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No = 0 points</td>
<td>Yes = 10 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there any major new developments (industrial, commercial, or residential) anticipated in the next 2-3 years, such that either flow or BOD₅ loadings to the sewerage system could significantly increase (25%)?</th>
<th>No = 0 points</th>
<th>Yes = 10 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No = 0 points</td>
<td>Yes = 10 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PART III =**


B. Approximate number of new residential sewer connections in the last year

260 new residential connections

C. Approximate number of new commercial/industrial connections in the last year

2 new commercial/industrial connections

D. Approximate number of new population serviced in the last year

852 new people served
Part IV: OPERATOR CERTIFICATION

A. How many collection system operators are currently employed by your facility?

3 collection system operators employed

B. What is/are the name(s) of your DRC operator(s)?

Mark Baird
Zachary Larton
Doug Cummings

C. You are required to have the collection DRC operator(s) certified at Grade III.

What is the current grade of the DRC operator(s)? III

D. State of Utah Administrative Rules require all operators considered to be in DRC to be appropriately certified. List all the operators in your system by their certification class.

Not Certified
Small Lagoons
Collection I
Collection II
Collection III
Collection IV

Mark Baird, Zachary Larton, Doug Cummings

E. Please complete the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Total Part IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is/are your DRC operator(s) currently certified at the appropriate grade for this facility? (see C)</td>
<td>Yes = 0 points, No = 50 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many continuing education units has each of the DRC operator(s) completed over the last 3 years?</td>
<td>3 or more = 0 points, less than 3 = 10 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PART IV =</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part V: FACILITY MAINTENANCE

A. Please complete the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes = 0 points</th>
<th>No = 30 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you follow an annual preventative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it written?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a written emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have an updated operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and maintenance manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a written safety plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PART V = 0

Part VI: SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION

This section should be with the system operators.

A. Describe the physical condition of the sewer collection system: (lift stations, etc. included)

   **Gravity collection system - No lift or pump stations.**

B. What sewerage system improvements does the community have under consideration for the next 10 years?

   **Upgrade undersized and deteriorate collection lines.**
C. Explain what problems, other than plugging, have you experienced over the last year.

D. Is your community presently involved in formal planning for system expansion/upgrading? If so explain.

E. How many times in the last calendar year was there sewage in basements at any point in the collection system for any reason, except for plugging of the lateral connections?

There were ___ total basements with sewage in them in 2012.

How many different times different did flooding occur? ___

F. Does the municipality/district pay for the continuing education expenses of operators?

ALWAYS X  SOMETIMES _____  NO _____

If they do, what percentage is paid?

approximately ___% 

G. Is there a written policy regarding continuing education and training for wastewater operators?

YES X  NO _____
H. Any additional comments? (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Fill in the values from Parts II through V in the blanks provided in column 1. Add the numbers to determine the MWPP point total that your wastewater facility has generated for the past twelve months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Director Bush requested a correction to the April 16, 2013 work session minutes. He stated the minutes reflected councilmember as opposed to director.

Director Young moved to approve the minutes from the April 16, 2013 Clearfield Community Development and Renewal Agency (CDRA) work session as amended, the May 7, 2013 work session and the May 14, 2013 regular session as written, seconded by Director LeBaron. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Directors Bush, LeBaron, and Young. Voting NO – None. Chair Murray was not present for the vote.
PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE COMMENT ON THE CDRA 2013/2014 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

Utah Code required a public hearing regarding the adoption of the CDRA’s upcoming fiscal budget. Staff had prepared and submitted to the Board a balanced tentative budget for the fiscal year 2013/2014 which would begin July 1, 2013 and ends June 30, 2014. The submitted tentative budget was adopted on May 14, 2013 and included all funds.

Vice Chair Shepherd declared the public hearing open at 7:52 p.m.

Vice Chair Shepherd asked for public comments.

There were no public comments.

Director LeBaron moved to close the public hearing at 7:53 p.m., seconded by Director Young. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Directors Bush, LeBaron, and Young. Voting NO – None. Chair Murray was not present for the vote.

SET A PUBLIC HEARING TO RE-OPEN THE 2012/2013 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

The Board requested that the budget be re-opened on a semi-annual basis to add items that have become necessary expenditures but were not budgeted for in the original budget. A public hearing was required to re-open the budget. The staff was recommending the public hearing be set for June 25, 2013.

Director Bush moved to set a public hearing for June 25, 2013, at 7:00 P.M., to re-open the 2012/2013 fiscal year budget, seconded by Director LeBaron. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Directors Bush, LeBaron, and Young. Voting NO – None. Chair Murray was not present for the vote.

There being no further business to come before the Community Development and Renewal Agency, Director LeBaron moved to adjourn as the Community Development and Renewal Agency at 7:54 p.m., seconded by Director Bush. All voting AYE. Chair Murray was not present for the vote.
PRESIDING: Mark Shepherd Vice-Chair

PRESENT: Kent Bush Director
         Mike LeBaron Director
         Don Wood Director

EXCUSED: Kathryn Murray Chair
         Bruce Young Director

STAFF PRESENT: Adam Lenhard City Manager
               JJ Allen Assistant City Manager
               Brian Brower City Attorney
               Greg Krusi Police Chief
               Bob Wylie Administrative Services Director
               Steve Guy City Treasurer
               Scott Hodge Public Works Director
               Kim Dabb Operations Manager
               Eric Howes Community Services Director
               Curtis Dickson Community Services Deputy Dir.
               Nancy Dean City Recorder
               Kim Read Deputy City Recorder

VISITORS: There were no visitors.

Vice-Chair Shepherd called the meeting to order at 7:42 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING TO RE-OPEN AND CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO THE CDRA 2012/2013 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

State Law required a public hearing before the Board approved amendments to the CDRA budget. Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, presented amendments for the 2012/2013 fiscal year budget.

Vice Chair Shepherd declared the public hearing open at 7:44 p.m.

Vice Chair Shepherd asked for public comments.
There were no public comments.

Director Bush moved to close the public hearing at 7:45 p.m., seconded by Director Wood. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Directors Bush, LeBaron and Wood. Voting NO – None. Chair Murray and Director Young were not present for the vote.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2013R-02 AMENDING THE CDRA 2012/2013 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

Director LeBaron moved to approve Resolution 2013R-02 adopting amendments to the CDRA 2012/2013 fiscal year budget and authorize the Chair’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Director Bush. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Directors Bush, LeBaron, Shepherd and Wood. Voting NO – None. Chair Murray and Director Young were not present for the vote.

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2013R-01 ADOPTING THE CDRA 2013/2014 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

The Board held a public hearing on the proposed CDRA budget on June 11, 2013. Utah Code required cities to hold a public hearing relating to the approval of the upcoming fiscal year budget. City staff had prepared and submitted to the Board a balanced final budget for fiscal year 2013/2014 which would begin July 1, 2013 and end June 30, 2014.

Director Wood moved to approve Resolution 2013R-01 adopting the CDRA 2013/2014 fiscal year budget and authorize the Chair’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Director LeBaron. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Directors Bush, LeBaron, Shepherd and Wood. Voting NO – None. Chair Murray and Director Young were not present for the vote.

There being no further business to come before the Community Development and Renewal Agency, Director LeBaron moved to adjourn as the CDRA at 7:47 p.m., seconded by Director Wood. All voting AYE. Chair Murray and Director Young were not present for the vote.
DISCUSSION ON THE LEASE OF THE TACO TIME PROPERTY FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, reminded the Board it owned the property currently leased by Clearfield Auto Parts as well as the vacant Taco Time building. He commented although discussions had taken place with developers, there was currently no interest in redeveloping the parcels in its entirety at this time. He reported recent interest had been expressed to lease the old
Taco Time building on a temporary basis. He announced the individuals would be presenting their proposal to the Board.

Matt Jones and Joe O’Keefe introduced themselves to the Board and announced they were owners of Rocket Fuel Coffee Company. He explained their plans to locate the coffee shop business to the old Tri-Mart location at the corner of 300 North and Main Street which had been vacant for approximately ten years. He shared a visual presentation of architectural renderings reflecting how the property might look upon completion. He mentioned the property wasn’t currently compliant with City Code and the process to become compliant would require permission from British Petroleum (BP) to allow the underground work specific to the fuel tanks. He believed Clearfield was the best location for the business and believed the Taco Time building could be used as a temporary location. He pointed out three advantages to leasing the Taco Time property:

- Starts the business immediately in Clearfield City
- Allows the proper time necessary to acquire the 329 North Main Street property
- Allows them to move the business without losing customers

Mr. Jones emphasized he was aware of the risks associated with the short term lease should a developer express a desire to redevelop the City’s property in its entirety and believed the reward outweighed the risks for the business.

Director Bush inquired if Mr. O’Keefe and Mr. Jones currently owned the property located at 329 North Main. Mr. Jones responded they were under contract with the current owners. Director Wood expressed concern the businessmen were willing to invest time and money for the temporary location. Mr. Jones believed the businesses need for a short term lease for not longer than six months had been the biggest challenge in trying to find a location. A discussion took place regarding other possible locations that had been considered by the business owners and the potential lease agreement with Clearfield. Director Shepherd commented he liked the businessmen’s ideas and pointed out the City was in a similar agreement with Clearfield Auto Parts. A discussion also took place regarding the process to obtain the 329 North property and complete the necessary requirements to open the business. Director Young expressed his support of the project because Mr. Jones and Mr. O’Keefe were completely aware of the risks. Director Bush also expressed support of the project.

The CDRA Board directed staff to proceed with a lease agreement for the Rocket Fuel Coffee Company and bring it to the Board for approval at a later date.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.