Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

Rich Knapp, Administrative Services Director, reported changes needed to be made to the Consolidated Fee Schedule and reviewed the following with the Council:

- Reducing cost of first trash can by .50 from $15.25 to $14.75. He stated the recent RFP for solid waste reflected a decrease in cost.
- Increase the cost for the second trash can by .50 from $7.00 to $7.50. He cautioned the Council in believing those changes to be revenue neutral because only thirty percent of the residents had a second can.

Councilmember Jones asked about the margins specific to the proposed recycling containers. Mr. Knapp stated he was forecasting a fifty to seventy-five percent participation rate for a cost of $3.75 by Waste Management. He mentioned he had included a four percent increase to that cost which would allow for a small rate increase if Waste Management increased recycle rates for next year.

Councilmember Young inquired how confident staff was in meeting the fifty percent participation rate by residents. Mayor Shepherd believed it wouldn’t be difficult since the City
would implement recycling with an opt-out option as opposed to opt-in. Councilmember Young mentioned he was aware of more residents who weren’t interested in participating as opposed to those who were. Mayor Shepherd added that based on information from neighboring cities he didn’t believe it would be difficult to meet that participation rate. A discussion took place specific to participation rates and whether the City would continue to offer residents to opt out after the first year.

Councilmember Benson asked how long the opt out period would be available to residents. Mr. Knapp responded initially residents would have somewhere between 45 and 60 days to opt-out of the recycle program. Councilmember Benson suggested designating a 60 day opt-out time frame because if residents vacationed they could determine recycling as a nuisance and 45 days wouldn’t allow enough time to recognize the benefit.

Mr. Knapp asked if the Council needed to have additional discussions regarding the proposed recycling program prior to implementation. The Council believed everything had been discussed and directed staff to proceed with the proposed garbage fees and move forward with the recycle program with a 60-day opt out time frame. Mr. Knapp reported the earliest the recycling program could be implemented was August.

Mr. Knapp reported staff was suggesting changing the name of the disconnect/reconnect fee to Utility Service Fee. He explained a fee was assessed even if the disconnection didn’t physically take place and emphasized delinquent accounts required additional administrative management even if payment was made after the account appeared on a disconnect list due to delinquency.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, suggested also including the language disconnect/reconnect fee in the fee schedule in an effort to reflect transparency regarding the fee. He desired the fee be identified as Utility Service Fee-disconnect/reconnect fee.

Mr. Knapp reported he had completed a cost analysis which reflected the true cost for the service fee was $35 as opposed to the current $25. He reported the more meters the City disconnected the cheaper the cost and stated the break even number was approximately 85 meters. Mayor Shepherd asked how many meters were turned off due to non-payment each month. Mr. Knapp responded approximately 120 meters were turned off the previous two months.

Councilmember LeBaron informed the Council that the purpose of the fee was never implemented to offset costs; rather, it was to encourage residents to pay the utility bill promptly. Mr. Knapp suggested the City shouldn’t implement a punitive fee and believed the City should justify the costs associated with the delinquent payment. He pointed out the City’s fee was still the lowest compared to neighboring cities.

Mayor Shepherd expressed agreement he wasn’t comfortable enacting anything punitive in nature and believed the fee should be cost driven.
Mr. Knapp explained residents would have already been assessed the $10 late fee and when added to the $35 Utility Service Fee-disconnect/reconnect fee, the total late payment fee would be $45. He explained the late notice policy of mailing out delinquent notices and a discussion took place regarding where the delinquent notice should be mailed for rental properties.

The Council directed staff to proceed with the proposed changes.

Scott Hess, Development Services Manager, stated during new residential construction the City had been assessing a $120 deposit for setting up the utility account and water meter and the contractor would pay for water usage during the construction process. He explained once construction was completed the account would be transferred to the new owner. He continued problems had taken place regarding the transfer and reimbursement of the original $120 deposit. He reported staff was suggesting implementing a flat rate fee of $50 for water usage during the construction process which would allow the developer to install a “jumper”. He stated the City’s base water rate was $12 per month and the average construction time was four months and believed there was minimal risk to the City. He emphasized the change would codify a fee which was not currently included in the fee structure. He pointed out the water meter would be installed at final occupancy once the resident established a water account.

Councilmember Benson inquired if this was in lieu of the $120 fee currently being assessed. Mr. Hess responded the fee was in lieu of the $120 to the developer during the building permit process.

Mayor Shepherd asked at what time during the construction would the meter be installed. Mr. Hess responded the City’s building inspector would complete the final inspection for occupancy and notify the utility department a water meter would need to be installed. He mentioned meters installed during the construction process could be damaged and then developers incurred the cost of new water meters.

**DISCUSSION ON CLEARFIELD HIGH SCHOOL SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENTS**

Mayor Shepherd explained the challenges encountered this year regarding the qualifications associated with the City’s scholarship because of the requirement prohibiting the recipient from receiving other scholarships. Councilmember Bush added oftentimes the candidates weren’t aware if another scholarship had been awarded during the application period. Nancy Dean, City Recorder, distributed a handout reflecting the scholarship requirements and reviewed them with the Council. She pointed out most students achieving a 3.5 GPA (Grade Point Average) would likely receive other scholarships. She suggested the Council consider designating a GPA of 3.0. A discussion took place regarding the requirements.

Ms. Dean explained the process in which the City’s scholarship funds were disbursed. Mayor Shepherd suggested eliminating the requirement which stated the recipient may not have accepted any other scholarship offers.

The Council expressed agreement with eliminated requirement #3 that the recipient not have accepted any other scholarships.
Councilmember Bush clarified the recipient would still be required to complete a service project benefitting the City. Ms. Dean responded requirement #4 identified the service project and was still in place.

The meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.
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