Meetings of the City Council of Clearfield City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-207 as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meetings will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

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

7:00 P.M. POLICY SESSION
CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Pro Tem Peterson
OPENING CEREMONY: Councilmember Roper
APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 2018 – Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23, 2018 – Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 2018 – Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2018 – Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2018 – Policy Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6, 2018 – Work Session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC HEARINGS:
1. PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CDBG (COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT) ONE-YEAR ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM YEAR JULY 1, 2018 TO JUNE 30, 2019

BACKGROUND: The Council was provided a copy of the proposed 2018/2019 CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) One-Year Action Plan. Citizens are given the opportunity to review the One-Year Action Plan at the Customer Service Center from March 14, 2018 to April 13, 2018. The final copy will be presented to the Council for consideration on April 24, 2018 at which time a second public hearing will be held.

RECOMMENDATION: Receive public comment.

SCHEDULED ITEMS:
2. OPEN COMMENT PERIOD

The Open Comment Period provides an opportunity to address the Mayor and City Council regarding concerns or ideas on any topic. To be considerate of everyone at this meeting, public comment will be limited to three minutes per person. Participants are to state their names for the record. Comments, which cannot be made within these limits, should be submitted in writing to the City Recorder at nancy.dean@clearfieldcity.org.
The Mayor and City Council encourage civil discourse for everyone who participates in the meeting.

Comments pertaining to an agenda item that includes a public hearing or public input should be given as that item is being discussed during the meeting.

3. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE MAYOR’S PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF EDEN BUSH AS YOUTH AMBASSADOR TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

BACKGROUND: Mayor Shepherd and the City Council expressed a desire to engage the Youth Commission by offering opportunities to serve on various boards of the City in order for the City to gain the perspective of a segment of its population sometimes overlooked. Three youth were interviewed and Mayor Shepherd is recommending Eden Bush be considered for appointment as a Youth Ambassador to the Planning Commission.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the Mayor’s appointment of Eden Bush as Youth Ambassador to the Planning Commission with a term expiring March 31, 2019.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS:
Mayor’s Report
City Council Reports
City Manager’s Report
Staff Reports

**ADJOURN AS THE CITY COUNCIL**

Dated this 7th day of March, 2018.

/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.
DISCUSSION ON AWARDING THE CONTRACT FOR THE CLEARFIELD STATION AREA PLAN

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, reminded the Council of the discussion held about a month ago about creating the Clearfield Station Area Plan in conjunction with the Utah Transit Authority (UTA). He reported a Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued and four proposals were received and evaluated by staff and UTA. He stated the highest scoring proposal was submitted by IBI Group, which was proposing an $80,000 fee. He noted UTA would be providing half the funding for the work.

Mayor Shepherd asked how long it would take to develop the plan. Mr. Allen indicated the contract anticipated completion in July 2018.
Councilmember Phipps stated he liked the proposal. He expressed his pleasure that the IBI Group proposal had caught the vision of the development being a walkable place and not just a transit stop.

DISCUSSION ON CITY CODE § 5-1-3 AND POTENTIALLY RELATED STATE OR CITY CODES

Stuart Williams, City Attorney, reminded the Council that Councilmembers Bush and Roper had asked that there be a discussion on the nuisance ordinance following a prior City Council meeting.

Councilmember Bush asked if the definition for ‘vehicle’ needed to be changed in any way since it didn’t address vehicles without engines. Mr. Williams referred to the ordinance and stated a definition was included for a ‘nuisance vehicle’ which included a reference to vehicles that were partially or fully dismantled and inoperable. He explained that definition would apply to any vehicle in the City.

Councilmember Roper commented he had taken time to read the entire ordinance and was comfortable with it as it was currently written. He wanted to make sure the ordinance was being enforced equitably across the City. Mr. Williams commented staff was working on improving the City’s code enforcement efforts.

Councilmember Thompson arrived at 6:07 p.m.

Councilmember Bush expressed concern that he had received reports of residents being told there was no ordinance that addressed things like old junk, stacked material, weeds and etc. in yards. He stated the ordinance needed to address the maintenance of landscape and yard clean up once a violation was remediated. Mr. Williams commented staff would be discussing the maintenance issue shortly. Mr. Allen added the ordinance clearly defined ‘nuisance’ but there were always some subjectivity issues associated with enforcement. He stated residents should report problems to the police department so they could be addressed.

Councilmember Roper expressed his opinion that code enforcement was an important issue because it helped improve the image of the City. He suggested there was continually a need to look for ways to improve it.

DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY FIREWORKS DISPLAY

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, reported to the Council that the City issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) looking for a company to provide the Fourth of July fireworks display and two companies responded: Lantis and Firestorm. He explained the RFP provided those interested with the City’s budget for the event then asked what each company could provide with that in mind. He continued the City had increased its insurance requirements for the event which affected the number of shells for the overall show. He informed the Council that
staff would likely propose a budget increase for the fireworks in the upcoming budget year to cover the additional costs associated with the insurance requirements.

Mr. Howes explained staff met with both vendors and Firestorm had received the highest score. He continued the fireworks show was performed by Lantis the last few years and commented it had done a good show each year. He stated Firestorm, which also performed Stadium of Fire, had additional safety measures in place, better purchasing benefits allowing the City to have more say in specific colors and how to combine them, as well as an electronically controlled program for both launching the fireworks and coordinating them to music.

Councilmember Phipps asked what the deciding factor was for recommending Firestorm. Mr. Howes responded the decision came down to what additional services Firestorm offered in its proposal. Mr. Howes also informed the Council that the contract would be drafted as a one-year contract with the option for three one year renewals offering the City the opportunity to change vendors if the show didn’t meet the its expectations.

DISCUSSION ON THE PIPELINE CROSSING AGREEMENT WITH UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD FOR THE FREEPORT H STREET STORM SEWER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT – PHASE 1 FROM 3RD STREET TO 5TH STREET

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, informed the Council that whenever there was a public works project that involved work under the Union Pacific railroad tracks the City needed a pipeline crossing agreement. He reported the City was preparing bid documents for the Freeport H Street Storm Sewer Improvement Project – Phase 1 from 3rd Street to 5th Street in the Freeport Center so an agreement was necessary before the bid was released. He noted the proposed agreement was similar to one approved by the Council earlier in the year.

Councilmember Bush asked if the City was removing the old line and replacing it with new. Mr. Hodge responded the old line would be capped and abandoned and a new line installed. He continued the project was one phase of a larger project to improve the line all along H Street. He explained the City intended to do a portion of the project each year, if funds were available, so storm water could be stored in the detention basin on the east end of H Street.

DISCUSSION ON THE AWARD OF BID FOR THE PACIFIC STREET ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, informed the Council that the City recently solicited bids for the Pacific Street Roadway Improvement Project. He indicated the project would improve and develop Pacific Street, parallel to the railroad tracks, from 300 North to approximately 66 South. He stated the project would be surface work and included no utility work. He continued it would also install curb and gutter on the east side of that road. He explained eight bids were received and the lowest responsible bidder was Advanced Paving and Construction with a bid amount of $299,924.75. There was a discussion about the asphalt materials being used for the project.
Councilmember Phipps asked what the City budgeted for the project. Mr. Hodge responded the City budgeted $340,000 plus an additional $42,000 that was being held in escrow from the developer to complete the project.

Councilmember Bush asked if the City would need an agreement with Union Pacific to work in its right-of-way. Mr. Hodge responded staff met with Union Pacific and it was determined a right-of-way access agreement was not necessary for the project because it was outside of the railroad tracks.

Councilmember Bush recommended residents be informed about various projects in the City and any impact the work might have on traffic. Mr. Hodge informed the Council that residents received notices with information about projects in their areas with contact numbers for any questions. JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, recommended the projects could also be highlighted in the newsletter, social media, and in utility bills.

**DISCUSSION ON FLEET REPLACEMENT AND MANAGEMENT POLICY**

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, reviewed the City’s Fleet Replacement and Management Policy. He provided data on how vehicles were classified and tracked in the City’s fleet. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, asked how long the City had been tracking the specific information. Mr. Hodge indicated the classification and tracking had been done for many years. He also explained the fleet rating system and how the classification was used for insurance purposes noting that police vehicles had a lot of idle time on the engines so that wear was factored into the rating system. He indicated the rating system was put in place in 2009 after an independent company was brought in to evaluate the City’s fleet and its replacement schedule. Mr. Hodge commented the rating system adopted by the City was developed by the American Public Works Association and tweaked to more specifically meet the City’s needs.

Councilmember Thompson asked what the objective was for giving vehicles a rating. Mr. Lenhard responded the rating allowed the City to evaluate and prioritize vehicle replacement given a limited number of dollars allocated to that purpose. Mr. Hodge added after the ratings were determined the fleet committee reviewed them and departments were asked to weigh in on which vehicle purchases should be a priority.

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, informed the Council that some cities rotated fleet vehicles more quickly than Clearfield’s current practice. He indicated there might be opportunities to gain a greater return on investment by turning vehicles around on a quicker rotation. He explained the City purchased its vehicles through State contract pricing so after a few years of use some of those vehicles had higher value on the open market. There was discussion about gradually changing a portion of fleet vehicles over to Ford F150 and F250 Lariat version trucks, including police vehicles, because the vehicles had better resale value which would benefit the fleet budget overall. Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, commented the best scenario was to keep the trucks about four years before turning the inventory over. Councilmember Phipps expressed a desire to see the ROI (Return on Investment) under that scenario.
Councilmember Peterson asked how staff time was affected by the more aggressive turn around. Mr. Hodge responded there was staff time used any time a new vehicle needed to be setup. Councilmember Peterson also asked if the scenario would create an offset in maintenance costs. Mr. Lenhard responded maintenance costs might be improved for vehicles still under warranty. There was a discussion about how the City maintained its fleet.

There was a discussion about saving residents money and if the City could provide the same amount of service for less under the proposed scenario. Councilmember Peterson suggested if the Council determined to change its current practice there would need to be an education component to help residents see the value.

Councilmember Peterson asked if there were any guidelines to be considered for selling vehicles purchased through the State contract. Mr. Hodge explained there were not special guidelines and the City’s current practice was to auction the vehicles through the State Public Surplus website.

Councilmember Peterson asked what the time frame would be to transition to trucks in the fleet. Mr. Lenhard responded there would be substantial upfront costs for the transition and it would take at least 3 years before the City would start to recognize the full benefit. Councilmember Peterson asked if the full benefit would be recognized on police vehicles since those vehicles had more wear and tear on them. Lee Naylor, Accountant, commented the current resale value was high on trucks and it was not anticipated to affect the value significantly. Mr. Hodge commented police vehicles had additional equipment installed so there would be some aspects that could affect the resale value.

The Council asked to have additional information on the proposed program at a later date.

DISCUSSIONS WITH AND/OR REGARDING INTERNAL APPLICANTS FOR THE CITY MANAGER RECRUITMENT AND POSSIBLE CONTRACT NEGOTIATION INSTRUCTIONS

Mayor Shepherd informed the Council that the City recently opened an internal recruitment for the position of city manager and one application was received from JJ Allen, current assistant city manager. Mr. Allen addressed the Council and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to assume the role of city manager being left vacant by the resignation of Adam Lenhard. He also updated the Council on the pending internal recruitment for a new assistant city manager. He indicated there were several qualified individuals currently working for the City and the vacancy would provide an opportunity for one of them to use his/her management skills to fill that position, which would provide other employees opportunities for upward movement as well. He asked the Council to be patient and announced his intention to provide open, honest, and frequent communication. He recognized Mr. Lenhard was a good mentor and acknowledged there would likely be differences in his management style.

Councilmember Phipps asked if Mr. Allen saw a need for changes in roles and responsibilities in the administrative organization. Mr. Allen acknowledged there would be changes one of which would be to tailor the assistant city manager’s job description around the skill set of the individual selected. Councilmember Phipps expressed a desire to see a long term commitment to
the city manager position. Mr. Allen announced his intent to foster a good working relationship with the Council as long as he was needed. He expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work for Clearfield City. He expressed his appreciation Council and staff who made Clearfield City a desirable place to work. Mayor Shepherd commented the Council was looking forward to working with Mr. Allen.

There being no further business to come before the Council, **Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn at 7:28 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Bush.** The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Thompson. Voting NO – None.
Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION INTERVIEWS


Eden Bush left the meeting at 6:10 p.m.
Nicole Bigelow left the meeting at 6:23 p.m.
Ashley Gordon left the meeting at 6:32 p.m.
Kaitlynn Thomson left the meeting at 6:40 p.m.
Ruth Jones left the meeting at 6:47 p.m.
Levi Lloyd left the meeting at 6:54 p.m.
Devin Prouty left the meeting at 7:02 p.m.
Tyson Stoddard left the meeting at 7:09 p.m.

Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in policy session at 7:10 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Bush. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

The meeting reconvened at 7:49 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

There was a discussion about the candidates who had been interviewed and how to fill the current vacancies on the Planning Commission. The Mayor and Council complimented the quality of the candidates especially the youth. The consensus of the Council was to consider Levi Lloyd as a regular member with Nicole Bigelow and Ruth Jones as alternate members. There was a discussion about the youth applicants and whether or not the Planning Commission would be favorable to updating the bylaws to include a youth member. There was consensus the role of a youth commissioner would give added perspective to the Planning Commission as well as provide a great learning opportunity for youth to participate in local government. The Council agreed Eden Bush would be the recommended youth candidate; however, until there was further discussion during the joint meeting on February 6, 2018 it would be unclear if a youth position would be available.

DISCUSSION ON THE ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACT PHASE II

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, stated the energy performance project was completed under budget so staff wanted to use the excess funding, as well as rebate money received from Rocky Mountain Power, for a second phase of projects that would improve energy efficiency for the City. He suggested funding a project that would partially zone the HVAC system at City Hall allowing for better control and energy savings in specific areas. He also suggested a project to re-balance the water pressure in the heating and cooling system at the Aquatic Center.

Councilmember Peterson asked what the time schedule would be to complete the proposed projects. Mr. Dickson answered the projects were proposed to be completed by the end of June 2018; however, the measurement verifications to evaluate the garnered savings from the installations would be done in 2019, a year following completion.

Councilmember Bush questioned if the HVAC project would utilize all the remaining money. Mr. Dickson responded it would. He indicated the funding would come from the $20,381.00 remaining in the contingency fund from the previous projects and the rebate savings garnered from Rocky Mountain Power of $68,891.71. Councilmember Bush commented the Community Art Center could use some work and wondered if there would be any remaining funds to help
that building. Eric Howes, Community Services Director, stated energy savings improvements were made to the Community Art Center building in 2011 through federal funding which precluded any further changes for a seven year period so the earliest consideration would be the end of year 2018.

Mr. Dickson asked if the Council had any additional questions. The consensus of the Council was to continue with the projects as described.

DISCUSSION ON THE PARAT (PARKS, ART, RECREATION, AQUATICS AND TRAILS) TAX MASTER PLAN

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, indicated during the work session discussion on November 28, 2017, the Council requested additional investigation on the viability of adventure parks and ropes courses. He recalled the biggest concerns expressed were about costs and revenue generation. He explained traditional ropes courses were usually sequential, guided, group participation events wherein a discussion was generally held afterward to allow participants to process the experience. Mr. Howes mentioned it had been difficult to obtain an existing pricing structure for ropes courses in the state because prices varied by size of group, type of activities, and registering organization. He suggested developing an adventure park after having researched the best option for breaking even or generating revenue. He indicated that option would allow group or individual participation.

Mr. Howes reviewed adventure park pricing, development costs, activities, and design options. He stated the national average price for an individual to attend an adventure park was $47 and the length of stay was typically two hours. He continued development costs were approximately $10,000 per activity which was defined as the space between two poles which included the poles, platforms, a rope activity and the belay system. Mr. Howes described several activities, the size and level options, and the various abilities which could be accommodated with the design. He identified the City had planned $150,000 for the project and that amount could accommodate a design with between 15 to 18 activities depending on the size and scope. There was a discussion about design options, target audience, life span of tree poles or machined poles, impacts to liability insurance, and other cities which were interested in similar structures and bike courses.

Councilmember Phipps asked if an adventure course was built how it would impact the City’s liability insurance. Mr. Howes responded that specific question had not yet been asked. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, answered similar questions had been raised previously with the insurer and the response had been surprising. He continued there may not be much of a material impact if the City posted rules, had policies, and provided safety training. Mr. Howes added statistically there were very few accidents or falls on the courses but rather assistance was given at times when an individual was unable to recover from a slip and get to a platform on their own. He indicated all persons using the course would be provided safety training prior to use of the facility.

Mr. Howes stated since the last discussion on PARAT Tax projects some new ideas had been proposed which included an indoor soccer facility, LED sign board, and a splash pad. He asked
Mayor Shepherd to introduce the idea he had proposed for building an indoor soccer facility at the Clearfield Station.

Mayor Shepherd reported meeting with the land owners of the property previously proposed for the ropes course and bike course and found there was not as much interest in selling as the City had hoped. He mentioned it could be an expensive hassle to acquire the land near H Street and SR-193. He continued the property value at Clearfield Station was already known and doing a project in that area might be a better place to focus efforts for land acquisition. He suggested moving the project location for the bikes and ropes courses, in addition to building an indoor soccer facility at the Clearfield Station area. There was a discussion about building a sports complex which could help draw other commercial development to the Clearfield Station area.

Mr. Howes stated Mayor Shepherd asked him to gather estimates for building an indoor soccer facility. He apologized the estimated costs were not concrete because he had not yet received responses back. He speculated cost estimates would be about $500,000 for the building, $200,000 for a field with indoor artificial turf, and other costs for consideration would be land, staffing, and seating or other amenities. Mayor Shepherd commented it would be an expensive endeavor which could dramatically impact the City; however, expressed his optimism in negotiating with Utah Transit Authority (UTA) for the desired acreage since about three acres of land had initially been intended for a City park. A discussion ensued about the possibility of creating a sports complex at Clearfield Station which included private versus public ownership options, whether or not revenues generated by a sports complex could be used to offset other recreation costs, concerns of competing with the private sector, finding out the profitability through a market analysis process of the Station Area Plan. The Council was favorable towards reviewing the feasibility of having a sports complex at Clearfield Station.

Mr. Howes mentioned the second project suggested was to purchase an LED sign board or marquee for City Hall which would cost between $40,000 to $60,000 depending on its size, resolution, and colors. There was a discussion about whether or not it should be considered as a PARAT Tax project.

Mr. Howes noted the last recommended project was to install a splash pad somewhere other than the aquatic center. He indicated the cost for a moderate sized pad would be about $150,000. He requested the three new projects be added to the score sheets so each could be rated when reviewing PARAT Tax projects. Mr. Howes requested members of the Council to complete the score sheet and return it within a week. He stated once the scores were received he would update the main ratings sheet so it could be discussed, evaluated, and project prioritization could begin.

DISCUSSION ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING

Spencer Brimley, indicated staff had been preparing the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) One Year Action Plan for the 2018/2019 year and in review noticed that funds would need to be reprogrammed from prior years that had not yet been spent. He mentioned James Shoopman and Stacy Millgate were in attendance to assist with the discussion or answer questions if necessary. He expressed the desire for staff to receive feedback with the following 1)
reprograming of unspent funds beginning with the 2014/2015 years forward, 2) programs and policies, 3) review the outreach, and 4) 2018/2019 CDBG program and funding plan.

Mr. Brimley reviewed funds that had not been expended since 2014 that could be reprogramed. There was a discussion about the CDBG excess funds; guidelines requiring money to be spent as specified in the grant request; the cap which allowed only 15 percent of the City’s total grant award to be allocated to various applicants for public services, and the decreased funding trends.

Mr. Brimley indicated the total amount available from previous years for reprogramming was $115,494.42. He recommended reprograming the funds towards the 250 North infrastructure project. JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, wondered when the project would be ready to begin. Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, indicated the City was in the design process but he was unsure how long before the project would bid. Councilmember Phipps asked if the excess funds would cover the full cost of the design. Mr. Hodge answered the total cost was unknown but the City would draw from CDBG funds prior to using other funding sources. He anticipated the total project costs would be about $600,000.

Mr. Brimley commented the CDBG programs of Housing Rehabilitation and Emergency Home Repair were administered by the Davis Community Housing Authority. He stated no funds had been expended yet for the current 2017/2018 year and $89,751 was available. He indicated these were new programs but moving forward the programs might need to be re-evaluated if the funding remained unused.

Mr. Brimley indicated $50,000 had been allocated in the 2017/2018 year for the purchase of a single vacant lot in the City. He suggested those funds could be reprogrammed in the future and should be considered for any adjustments when planning for the 2018/2019 program year. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion the $50,000 for the 2017/2018 program year should be reprogrammed because the City was still working with Have a Heart to have the home built on the last lot purchased with CDBG funding. James Shoopman, Planner I/CDBG Specialist, announced Nilson Homes planned to begin the home building process in March of 2018. There was a discussion about publicizing, timeframes, and awareness of the project which could be helpful for the CDBG program.

Mr. Brimley stated the he expected the City to receive approximately $178,544 for the 2018/2019 program year. He reviewed the plans for allocating funds towards administrative costs, capped at 20 percent, and the public service program which had a 15 percent cap both totaling $46,781. He anticipated funding Open Doors, Davis Community Learning Center, and Safe Harbor with the public service portion which would be consistent with previous years. Mr. Brimley requested feedback from the Council on how the remainder of the funds should be allocated for the upcoming program year. There was a discussion on how best to use the funding dollars which would provide the programs and services most needed in the community. The consensus of the Council was to forgo funding a vacant lot purchase in the 2018/2019 program year as well as Emergency Home Repair and Housing Rehabilitation programs because there were still funds available from the 2017/2018 year. The Council recommended the remaining estimated funds of $131,763 for program year 2018/2019 be allocated towards capital projects.
Mr. Brimley reviewed the CDBG program policies including the Down Payment Assistance Program (DPAP); Emergency Home Repair; Housing Rehabilitation, Vacant Lot Purchase; Capital Improvement Projects and each program’s background, limitations, and future options. The consensus of the Council was to implement the following changes to each program:

- **Down Payment Assistance Program**
  - Raise the sales price cap of the home to $250,000 which was consistent with the Davis County cap.

- **Emergency Home Repair**
  - Allow limited items such as water heater, furnace, etc. for owner occupied townhomes and mobile homes to be eligible for funding.
  - Promote awareness of the program.

- **Housing Rehabilitation**
  - Allow owner occupied townhomes to be eligible.
  - Promote awareness of the program.

- **Vacant Lot Purchase**
  - Hold off on funding for the 2018/2019 program year.
  - Re-evaluate the allocated amount in the future if a qualifying lot was identified for purchase.

- **Capital Improvement Projects**
  - Reprogram unspent funds from 2014/2015, 2015/2016, and 2016/2017 program years totaling $115,494.42 towards the 250 North Street Improvement Project.
  - Reprogram $50,000 currently allocated for vacant lot purchase in the 2017/2018 program year towards the 250 North Street Improvement Project.
  - Resume funding capital improvement projects for the 2018/2019 program year.

Mr. Brimley reviewed the marketing and outreach efforts for the various CDBG programs. He indicated brochures were created, distributed and available at various locations around the City. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion having code enforcement officers distributing brochures while in the neighborhoods was a great way to spread awareness. Mr. Brimley stated staff had begun promoting CDBG programs on the City website, in its newsletters, on social media, and through outreach efforts with ecclesiastical leaders of churches throughout the City. He acknowledged community outreach and education would be an asset moving forward.

Trevor Cahoon, Communication Coordinator, reported staff was currently in the process of redoing the new resident information packets and the brochures promoting CDBG programs would be included with it. Mr. Brimley indicated in the future there were plans to celebrate the use of CDBG funding by placing yard signs at the project sites which would help spread awareness in the community.

He thanked the Council for the feedback on how to reprogram unspent funds; updating program policies and programs; outreach and marketing efforts; and direction provided for the 2018/2019 program year. Mayor Shepherd commented on the funding process for the public service programs and mentioned there had been a decline in applicants. He indicated those programs which had the greatest impact to the City were selected for allocated funds. Mr. Brimley concluded with the limited and decreased funding available it was important to review and determine those programs that would best benefit the community. Mayor Shepherd reported
CDBG program funding had not yet been eliminated from the President’s budget as initially anticipated.

There being no further business to come before the Council, Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn at 9:52 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Thompson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper and Thompson. Voting NO – None.
CLEARFIELD CITY AND SYRACUSE CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
January 30, 2018
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Mark Shepherd   Mayor

PRESENT:
Kent Bush   Councilmember
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VISITORS: Kenny Conners – Wasatch Association of Realtors, Alex Conners, Paul Ray – Utah House of Representatives District 13

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:11 p.m.

REAL ESTATE MARKET UPDATE

Kenny Conners, Wasatch Association of Realtors, presented real estate market reports for each city which included facts and figures from 2016 and 2017 for a comparison intended to help with future planning. He reviewed current economic conditions in Utah, housing shortages, the real estate forecast for Davis County, top ten states in population growth as well as job growth, and median home price increases in Davis County. He encouraged city officials to share the information and contact him if reports or presentations were desired annually.

DISCUSSION ON CLEARFIELD CITY’S 700 SOUTH 1000 WEST INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

JJ Allen, Clearfield Assistant City Manager, stated the intersection at 700 South 1000 West was pertinent to both cities as an access point to both residential neighborhoods and Syracuse High School. Scott Hodge, Clearfield Public Works Director, explained Clearfield City’s pending project to the 700 South 1000 West Intersection and roadway. He indicated the project recently bid and the preconstruction meeting was held on January 29, 2018. He summarized the project would consist of installing a traffic signal at the intersection of 700 South 1000 West in addition to completing and connecting curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the road. He commented the water, storm drain, and irrigation lines would also be replaced or installed in the area.

Mr. Hodge stated the City had contracted with Wardell Construction for the project and had worked indirectly with the contractor previously. He explained the project would require the road be closed except to local traffic and detour signs would be posted.

Syracuse Councilmember Savage arrived at the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Brody Bovero, Syracuse City Manager, asked if there was a connection to the storm system in Syracuse City. Mr. Hodge responded there was not a connection at this point in time. He explained the piping would run down 700 South to 1350 West and then head south to Jacobson Park which tied into Syracuse City’s existing storm drain.

Mr. Allen asked when the project was expected to be completed. Mr. Hodge recalled it was a ninety day project but weather conditions might affect the project’s timeline. He commented the contractor was anxious to begin work.

DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED FUTURE EXPANSION OF 500 WEST AND THE 500 WEST ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

JJ Allen, Clearfield Assistant City Manager, stated 500 West south of Antelope Drive was a border between Clearfield and Syracuse and did not connect to Antelope Drive terminating on
the north end of Clearfield’s Barlow Park. He indicated staff from both cities coordinated efforts to obtain grant funding to help with construction of the road extension. He explained the extension would not only reach Antelope Drive, but also move farther north into the Freeport Center. Mr. Allen noted the project would necessitate relocating the traffic signal at Antelope Drive and 300 West to a new intersection at 500 West. He explained grant funds would not be available for a few more years; however, local funds had to be used to pay for the required environmental analysis. Scott Hodge, Clearfield Public Works Director, commented Clearfield City was taking the lead on procuring the services for the environmental study. He indicated a request for proposal (RFP) was issued and four proposals were received and would be reviewed by both cities.

Robert Whiteley, Syracuse Public Works Director, stated the project evaluation period would take about nine months and was necessary because the extension was a new roadway with additional impacts to Barlow Park, the power corridor, and some historic properties. He expressed a desire to minimize potential impacts with the proposed road by providing safe access points with a traffic signal for residential neighborhoods and the Freeport Center traffic entering Antelope Drive. Mr. Whitely indicated the proposed road was projected to continue south for two and a half miles into Layton. He commented there were developers with plans to complete sections of it in Layton as well. He explained the road would be an 84-foot right-of-way and was proposed to handle larger volumes of traffic as a collector street.

Mr. Hodge stated Clearfield City would also be conducting a traffic study for the area. Syracuse Councilmember Anderson asked if the traffic study would give insight into the speed limit for the road which was currently 25 miles per hour. Mr. Hodge answered the speed limit recommendations would be part of the analysis.

Clearfield Councilmember Peterson identified the strip of land on the west side of 500 West and wondered if it was anticipated to be used for road widening. Mr. Hodge confirmed Clearfield City had a 66-foot right-of-way and that additional footage would help widen the road in that area. Mr. Whiteley added Syracuse City also had an 18-foot right-of-way which had been reserved in preparation for the widening of the road.

Mr. Whiteley commented another key point of the study would be to solicit public input. He noted both councils and mayors would be advised about items before a public meeting was conducted.

Syracuse Councilmember Maughan questioned why a traffic signal would be moving rather than just adding a new signal. Mr. Hodge answered there were spacing requirement between traffic signals along state roads and the distance would not be suitable to install a new traffic signal so it was recommended to move the signal. Mr. Whiteley added Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) required half-mile distances between traffic signals on Antelope. He noted the proposed connection to 500 West was exactly that distance between Main Street and 1000 West.

Mr. Hodge stated a majority of the funding for the project would be provided by a federal grant. He explained Wasatch Front Regional Council would administer the grant. He indicated the grant application was submitted a few years ago in order to get the roadway extension on the list
of projects. He continued the funding was projected to be available in 2022. Mr. Hodge explained having the environmental study completed ahead of that time would increase the likelihood in obtaining the funding.

Mr. Allen wondered what the local match to the grant would be. Mr. Whiteley responded the required local match was at 6.77 percent, but there was also the possibility of UDOT entertaining the idea of a funding swap. Mr. Hodge explained a funding swap would be to use state money rather than federal money and eliminate some of the federal requirements to keep costs down.

Mr. Allen commented staff had been strategic when applying for the grant. He continued staff from Clearfield and Syracuse worked jointly in preparing the application; however, Clearfield submitted the application since Syracuse had been a grant recipient for funding on another project. He added Clearfield also took the lead with the RFP process but each city would be sharing the costs equally for the survey. Mr. Whiteley estimated the roadway extension would cost about $4,000,000 to complete. He noted each city would likely contribute less than four percent of the total project cost due to grant funding and shared cost savings.

DISCUSSION ON A SYRACUSE/CLEARFIELD COMBINED YOUTH COURT

Brody Bovero, Syracuse City Manager, explained youth court was to provide an alternative to juvenile court for first-time minor offenders. He continued the youth court system followed the restorative model of justice, which emphasized the beliefs of repairing harm done to victims as well as providing youth with the resources to make better decisions in the future. He stated Syracuse had an established youth court and met with Clearfield staff to discuss the possibility of working together with a combined youth court since both cities had residents attending the high school in the other city’s limits.

Mr. Bovero reviewed how the Syracuse Youth Court currently functioned, the status of involving Clearfield, and the commitment of funding as well as volunteer staffing that would be required for a joint effort. He commented once a memorandum of understanding (MOU) was executed between the two cities, Clearfield could begin referring youth offenders to the court. He stated those juveniles referred to youth court by police or school officers would be required to pay a $40 participation fee, a portion of which would be refunded upon completion of the program.

Mr. Bovero noted recruitment from Clearfield High students could also commence to fill the team of those serving on the youth court allowing for equal participation from each school. He indicated a team consisted of sixteen members and anticipated each school could equally participate with eight members. He identified there were admission standards to serving on the youth court which included a requirement of being in good standing with the school. Mr. Bovero stated meetings were held weekly and generally lasted about two hours. He noted there were also annual training meetings for the participants held at varying locations around the State.

Mr. Bovero continued Syracuse City planned to continue the coordination of training for all participants; however, Clearfield City would be responsible to pay for the training costs associated with participants and chaperones that attended from Clearfield. He added Clearfield
City’s portion of registration, food, and lodging would be billed after Syracuse City had paid and coordinated the trainings.

He explained each jurisdiction would have a resource officer assigned to attend youth court; however, attendance and responsibility could be alternated each week or shared. Mr. Bovero indicated all adult advisors and chaperones would need to have a background check completed. He reiterated the only thing necessary prior to Clearfield City’s participation would be to adopt and execute an MOU.

Clearfield Councilmember Phipps asked how the offenders were referred. Mr. Bovero answered either the school or police department could refer minor offenders in order to avoid the judicial system. He added the requirement for participation was to be a first time offender. Clearfield Councilmember Phipps questioned if that was why the program was school rather than municipality based. Mr. Bovero responded the school didn’t recognize jurisdictions and currently members serving on the youth court team resided in various cities including West Point, Clearfield, and Syracuse.

Clearfield Councilmember Roper wondered if the applicants for the youth court team were selected by the school or the city. Syracuse Councilmember Anderson responded an application was submitted to the youth court advisors. Mr. Bovero noted advertisement for volunteers would be done through the schools, but the application and selection process would be done by the adult youth court advisors.

Clearfield Councilmember Phipps asked what the term of service was for those serving on the youth court team. Syracuse Councilmember Anderson indicated many start serving while in 10th grade and could continue until graduation from high school; however, she noted many participants discontinued service during their senior year. Syracuse City Mayor Gailey shared his experience when he recently attended a youth court meeting. There was a discussion about how the youth court operated, the success of the program for offenders, and the possibility of combining for a joint effort.

JJ Allen, Clearfield Assistant City Manager, stated the Clearfield Council could further discuss the topic at a later date. Stuart Williams, Clearfield City Attorney, indicated Syracuse City’s Attorney was working to prepare an MOU which would likely answer additional questions that were not discussed. Syracuse Councilmember Anderson noted the important question would be to know the budget impacts. Steve Marshall, Syracuse Finance Director, stated the cost for Syracuse City was about $5,600 annually and of that $4,000 were costs associated with training.

Clearfield Councilmember Phipps asked if there was any consideration given to extend the opportunity to access the youth court to youth who were homeschooled or attending other nontraditional schools.

Syracuse Councilmember Anderson answered a current member of the youth court was attending Northern Utah Academy for Math, Engineering and Science (NUAMES); however, the standards would have to be revised if a homeschooled student desired participation since a current report
card was required with the application. She suggested advisors could consider whether or not homeschooled youth could be participants on the youth court team.

Mr. Allen wondered if Councilmember Phipps’ question had been answered or if he had been asking about youth offender’s participation. Councilmember Phipps responded the root question was about the offenders, but it was helpful to understand how youth were selected to be members of the youth court as well. Mr. Bovero responded referrals of minor offenders eligible to participate in youth court would come from the police departments and schools.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Paul Ray, Utah State Representative, reviewed some of the topics being discussed in the current legislative session. He explained during the first few weeks budget planning was the main focus. He noted leadership had asked for all budgets to be cut by two percent and he had been able to cut four percent from those for which he had oversight.

Brigham Mellor, Syracuse Community Development Director, asked about the possibility of receiving funding or having money appropriated during the current session for the design and environmental study needed to extend and connect State Road (SR) 193 to the West Davis Corridor. He estimated the project cost would be about one million dollars. Representative Ray asked if he had already discussed the request with the appropriate legislators for the area. Mr. Mellor responded he had sent a recent lobbying message to both Mike Schultz and Karianne Lisonbee. Representative Ray stated that communication with representatives during the legislative session could be difficult, so he offered to speak with both about the funding. He responded with optimism and committed to making this project a priority for the 2018 budget year.

JJ Allen, Clearfield Assistant City Manager identified Clearfield City' concern with the proposed legislation to exempt manufacturing from sales during the first three years of business. He noted the City was not in any way anti-manufacturing; however, the impact on Clearfield’s budget would be catastrophic. There was a discussion about Senate Bill 37 “Sales and Use Tax Amendments” and the drastic impacts it would have on manufacturing cities. Clearfield City Mayor Shepherd requested if the State desired to forfeit its portion of sales tax dollars from manufacturers then at least allow for municipalities to be held harmless. Representative Ray indicated he would address that topic during the Northern Area Caucus meeting on Friday, February 2, 2018, to create awareness and potential defense against such legislation.

There was a discussion about proposed and potential legislation ideas which included addressing the way the tax rate was figured in regards to property tax and municipal services, interior bolts on school doors, raising residency rates for election candidates, enacting term limits, and recalling legislation. Representative Ray explained the process for proposed legislation in the separate legislative bodies (Senate and House of Representatives). He added legislation often changed as it moved through the process so it was not uncommon for one body to wait to review proposed legislation until the other body passed it on. He mentioned serving previously on the Clinton City Council. He identified with local government and its issues as did many of the legislators representing Clearfield and Syracuse.
Brody Bovero, Syracuse City Manager, stated SR193 was the premiere east to west corridor in Davis County. He thanked Representative Ray for his work in securing funds for the project. Representative Ray indicated it was a great model for cities, counties, and Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) working together. He concluded Davis County was represented well on the State level with participation by many legislators on good leadership teams which allowed for success in the area.

Clearfield City Mayor Shepherd thanked Representative Ray for his attendance.

**DISCUSSION ON THE MONTEREY TRAIL LOCATED IN THE VICINITY OF 700 SOUTH AND 1500 WEST**

Brody Bovero, Syracuse City Manager, provided a brief update on the Monterey Trail located near 700 South and 1500 West. He reviewed its connectivity and location as well as amenities, trailhead, parking, landscaping and design. He explained the project had been a joint effort with the Ninigret Group, developers of the industrial development located on 1000 West and SR-193; Ivory Homes; and Syracuse City’s use of impact fees from growth in the area. He noted Syracuse City staff, along with community volunteers, had worked hard on its design and installation for the betterment of the area.

**DISCUSSION ON SYRACUSE CITY’S PARCEL OF PROPERTY ADJACENT TO ITS CEMETERY**

Brody Bovero, Syracuse City Manager, stated Syracuse City previously purchased land adjacent to its cemetery, which was located in Clearfield City limits. He explained the current staff and council of Syracuse were not in place when the property was acquired and wondered if there would be a problem with Syracuse City using it for future expansion of the cemetery.

JJ Allen, Clearfield Assistant City Manager, commented Clearfield City’s concerns with developing the parcel as a cemetery centered on the fact that the General Plan’s Future Land Use Map identified the property as residential. He noted that designation had been in place for many years. He explained the property was meaningful to Clearfield because the City was landlocked and had no room to expand through annexation. He added the adjacent neighborhoods were older and didn’t have room for new single family development.

Mr. Bovero commented Syracuse City respected the municipal power for general planning and zoning. There was a discussion about the parcel being one of the only areas left for single family development in Clearfield; the benefit for Clearfield that would be provided by a residential subdivision with 50 to 60 homes, and the unique land ownership. Clearfield City Mayor Shepherd mentioned Syracuse City had previously requested a boundary adjustment to accommodate the development of the cemetery, but that was viewed detrimental to the needs of Clearfield given its future land use designation. A discussion continued about potential uses and options which would be favorable to both cities. Syracuse City Mayor Gailey reminded the intent of the discussion was not to create a barrier between the cities.
Clearfield Councilmember Phipps asked if the entire lot was purchased for cemetery expansion. Syracuse Councilmember Maughan responded the historical accounts from Syracuse City indicated the parcel was purchased for its cemetery expansion. There was a discussion on permissible uses for the property which might require persuading the Clearfield City Council there was a significant need to amend its General Plan and approve a zone change. Clearfield City Mayor Shepherd concluded the City viewed residential development more favorably because that land use was previously identified.

**DISCUSSION ON THE WEST DAVIS CORRIDOR AND ITS DESIGNATION AS A SCENIC BYWAY**

Brody Bovero, Syracuse City Manager, updated both councils on the West Davis Corridor, its planned alignment, and interchanges in Syracuse. He mentioned the unplanned interchange which was mentioned during the discussion with Representative Ray was the effort to complete a connection and add an interchange with State Road (SR) 193. He indicated it was not currently budgeted; however, Syracuse was working to obtain the appropriations necessary to begin the process. Mr. Bovero noted the proposed connection would also be helpful for Clearfield by offering a second connection from the west side for transportation especially to the Freeport Center.

He explained all the cities along the West Davis Corridor passed resolutions designating the West Davis Corridor as a scenic byway as an extension of the Great Salt Lake Scenic Byway which was Legacy Highway. There was a discussion about restrictions to truck traffic and speed that were in place for Legacy Highway but were currently not planned for the West Davis Corridor. Mr. Bovero indicated the scenic byway restrictions would only be tied to prohibiting billboards and/or off premise signs along the corridor.

Syracuse City Mayor Gailey concluded the meeting sharing memories of Clearfield and Syracuse cities from his youth. He expressed interest in meeting annually, working together to build the northern communities of Davis County, and fostering relationships conducive to doing what was right for the area as a whole. He thanked Mayor Shepherd and the Clearfield City Council for the invitation to join in the meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Councils, Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn at 8:00 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Thompson. The motion carried upon the following vote: All Voting AYE.
CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
February 20, 2018

PRESIDING: Mark Shepherd Mayor

PRESENT: Kent Bush Councilmember
          Nike Peterson Councilmember
          Vern Phipps Councilmember
          Tim Roper Councilmember
          Karece Thompson Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT: JJ Allen City Manager
                Summer Palmer Assistant City Manager
                Stuart Williams City Attorney
                Curtis Dickson Community Services Deputy Dir.
                Spencer Brimley Development Services Manager
                Trevor Cahoon Communications Coordinator
                Nancy Dean City Recorder

VISITORS: Ruth Jones – Planning Commissioner, Jerry Preston – developer, Bryson Thurgood – Castle Creek Homes

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. at which time the Council traveled to West Haven to tour the One West Apartments.

TOUR OF ONE WEST APARTMENTS, 2112 WEST 3300 SOUTH, WEST HAVEN, UTAH

Mayor Shepherd informed the Council that the developer for the property located at approximately 1900 East 700 South wanted to build a mixed-use development. He explained the proposed development would include multi-family dwellings in the form of three to four story walk-up apartments. He stated the developer arranged for his builder to allow the Council to tour apartment complexes similar to those proposed to be built as part of the development.

Bryson Thurgood, Castle Creek Homes, led the tour of the One West Apartments. At the conclusion of the tour the Council traveled to Farmington to tour the Avanti Farmington Apartments.

TOUR OF AVANTI FARMINGTON APARTMENTS, 736 WEST STATE STREET, FARMINGTON, UTAH

Ruth Jones arrived at the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Bryson Thurgood, Castle Creek Homes, led the tour of the Avanti Farmington Apartments. Mr. Thurgood shared the conceptual design for the proposed development in Clearfield. He emphasized the developer’s intent was to build a quality product similar to those toured. JJ
Allen, City Manager, asked the Council to think about what had been seen and forward any comments to him by the end of the week so staff could get back to the developer with suggestions on the proposed plan.

There being no further business to come before the Council, Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn at 7:29 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Roper. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper and Thompson. Voting NO – None.
PRESIDING: Mark Shepherd Mayor

PRESENT: Kent Bush Councilmember
Nike Peterson Councilmember
Vern Phipps Councilmember
Tim Roper Councilmember
Karece Thompson Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT: JJ Allen City Manager
Summer Palmer Assistant City Manager
Stuart Williams City Attorney
Brie Brass Assistant City Attorney
Scott Hodge Public Works Director
Greg Krusi Police Chief
Eric Howes Community Services Director
Spencer Brimley Community Development Director
Lee Naylor Accountant
Trevor Cahoon Communications Coordinator
Nancy Dean City Recorder
Wendy Page Deputy Recorder

VISITORS: Bob Bercher

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Mayor Shepherd informed the audience that if they would like to comment during the Public Hearing or Open Comment Period there were forms to fill out by the door.

Councilmember Bush led the opening ceremonies.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 9, 2018 WORK SESSION AND THE FEBRUARY 13, 2018 POLICY SESSION

Councilmember Phipps requested to have the February 13, 2018 policy session minutes amended from “Councilmember Phipps expressed his support of Mr. Allen and this new responsibility to staff the City with individuals which would best meet the needs of the City” to “Councilmember Phipps expressed his support of Mr. Allen’s appointment as it was now his responsibility to staff the City with individuals which would best meet the needs of the City.”

Councilmember Roper moved to approve the minutes from the January 9, 2018 work session, as written, and the February 13, 2018 policy session, as amended, seconded by
Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper and Thompson. Voting NO – None.


Mayor Shepherd opened the public hearing at 7:04 p.m.

Mayor Shepherd asked for public comments.

There were no public comments.

Councilmember Bush moved to close the public hearing at 7:05 p.m. seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

OPEN COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

Mayor Shepherd – announced his acceptance into the Alliance of Defense Communities Leadership program.

Councilmember Bush – attended the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) semi-annual meeting on February 26, 2018. He indicated the focus was vision planning for Wasatch Choice 2050 in which transportation and land use were discussed with local officials to help formulate plans for the future.

Councilmember Peterson – nothing to report.

Councilmember Phipps – announced Wasatch Integrated should begin the transfer station construction during the late spring or early summer of 2018. He explained the Board’s goal was to minimize landfilling things and recycle as much as possible.

Councilmember Roper – spoke at a recent CIRCLES meeting about getting involved by voting and getting to know the local officials.

Councilmember Thompson – participated on a panel with the Emerging Leaders Institute and received many questions about Clearfield. He expressed his appreciation for the support and information he received as a member of the City Council and shared his love for the City.

STAFF REPORTS

JJ Allen, City Manager
1. Expessed appreciation for the feedback from Council after the apartment tours on February 20, 2018. He indicated staff was able to share the feedback with the property owner which was helpful. Councilmember Bush commented he sat with Hill Air Force Base representatives at the WFRC meeting
and understood office space was needed off base but in close proximity for over 400 new employees. He requested the developer be advised of the need for office space as commercial development was being considered for the property along SR-193 and Legend Hills.

2. Reported staff budget meetings were underway and Council would be presented with the tentative draft budget at its meeting planned for March 27, 2018.

3. Announced Donna Russell’s retirement and extended an invitation to attend her retirement party which would be held on March 1, 2018 in the collaborative work space at 2:00 p.m.

_Nancy Dean, City Recorder_ – reported information had been sent by email about the Utah League of Cities and Towns conference in St. George and requested to know those planning to attend so registrations could be completed. She reviewed the Council’s schedule:

- Work Session on March 6, 2018 would be an open house meeting at the Clearfield Aquatic Center. She encouraged the Mayor and Council to like or share the Facebook Event that Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, was creating for the meeting announcement.
- Policy Session on March 13, 2018
- Work Session on March 20, 2018
- Policy Session on March 27, 2018

Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn the policy session and reconvene in work session at 7:12 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE: Councilmembers Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Thompson. Voting NO – None.
Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.
Councilmember Phipps arrived at 6:25 p.m.

CITY COUNCIL NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE AT CLEARFIELD AQUATIC AND
FITNESS CENTER LOCATED AT 825 SOUTH STATE STREET

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.
TO: Mayor Shepherd and City Council Members  
FROM: James Shoopman, Planner/CDBG Coordinator  
MEETING DATE: Tuesday, March 13, 2018  
SUBJECT: Program CDBG funds for 2018-2019 program year

OBJECTIVES
Hold Public Hearing and open 30-day comment period for the CDBG 2018-2019 One Year Action Plan

BACKGROUND
Attached is a copy of the proposed 2018-2019 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) One Year Action Plan. Citizens are given the opportunity to review the One Year Action Plan in the Community Development Department from March 13, 2018 until April 24, 2018. The final copy will be presented to City Council April 24, 2018.

Staff met with City Council in a work session on January 23, 2018 to discuss and receive direction on how to program an estimated $178,544 of CDBG funds for the upcoming 2018-2019 program year.

City Council directed staff to program estimated funds as follows:

- **Open Doors (Family Connection Center) - $10,000** Food Services to at-risk low income persons and families.
- **Davis Community Learning Center - $11,781** Administrative expenses in order to offer ESL, GED completion, parent involvement classes, citizenship, and computer classes. The salaries will help fund two part-time employees at Holt and Wasatch Elementary.
- **Safe Harbor - $5,000** Case management, self-sufficiency support, educational and supportive groups, like skills classes, and connections to other resource agencies.
- **Capital Improvements – $131,763** Replacing asphalt, curb, gutter, sidewalk, water lines, and storm water systems.
- **Administration - $20,000** Administrative expenses in order to oversee the CDBG program at Clearfield City.

Additionally, City Council directed staff to continue the Emergency Home Repair, Housing Rehabilitation, and Down Payment Assistance programs into the 2018-2019 program years utilizing unspent previous year funds.

Identified capital improvement projects included replacing asphalt, curb, gutter, sidewalk, water lines, and storm water systems along 250 North Street between/connecting Main Street and 300 North Street.

ATTACHMENTS
2018-2019 CDBG One Year Action Plan  
Davis LHCC 2017 PIT
Executive Summary

**AP-05 Executive Summary - 24 CFR 91.200(c), 91.220(b)**

1. **Introduction**

Clearfield City expects to receive $178,544 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for the **July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019** funding cycle. This is 5% less in CDBG funds than Clearfield City received from the last funding cycle. No other federal, state or county funds are anticipated. Over the next year CDBG funds will be utilized as follows:

- **Open Doors (Family Connection Center) - $10,000** Food Services to at-risk low income persons and families.
- **Davis Community Learning Center - $11,781** Administrative expenses in order to offer ESL, GED completion, parent involvement classes, citizenship, and computer classes. The salaries will help fund two part-time employees at Holt and Wasatch Elementary.
- **Safe Harbor - $5,000** Case management, self-sufficiency support, educational and supportive groups, like skills classes, and connections to other resource agencies.
- **Capital Improvements – $131,763** Replacing asphalt, curb, gutter, sidewalk, water lines, and storm water systems.
- **Administration - $20,000** Administrative expenses in order to oversee the CDBG program at Clearfield City.

If the award amount is higher than $178,544 the Davis Community Learning Center will receive the additional amount that would be allowed under the 15% public service cap. However, if the grant amount is lower than $178,544 its funding allocation will be reduced to the necessary amount. Other funding adjustments will be made to the Capital Improvements project allocation.

2. **Summarize the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan**

The Strategic Plan outlines the following priority needs. These needs are based on the information from the needs assessment and market analysis that was conducted in 2015.

Consolidated Plan Priority Needs:

- Case Management and Supportive Services - Low
- Homeless Prevention - Low
• Affordable Housing for Extremely and Very Low Income Households - High
• Job Creation and Retention - High
• Public Improvements - High
• Public Services - High

3. Evaluation of past performance

Each year, Clearfield City reports its progress in meeting the five-year and annual goals in the Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER). The CAPER is submitted to HUD within 90 days after the start of each new program year. At that time, HUD reviews the CAPER report and feedback is provided. The most recent feedback provided indicated "Overall, Clearfield City appears to be making strides in providing affordable housing and addressing its community development needs." It also stated "the City has carried out its program substantially as described in its Consolidated Plan as approved and amended and has the continuing capacity to carry out its approved program in a timely manner."

4. Summary of Citizen Participation Process and consultation process

Clearfield City has adopted a Citizen Participation Plan that is implemented in conjunction with the One Year Action Plan. The Citizen Participation Plan is designed to provide for public input into the allotment of CDBG funds granted to Clearfield City. The Participation Plan seeks to reach out to minorities and others by putting notice of the public hearing on diverse location in the community. Also, notice of the public hearing is published in the Ogden Standard-Examiner, which is the local newspaper. Anyone can freely attend the public hearing and give comment on the One Year Action Plan. The first public hearing on the One Year Action Plan was held on March 13, 2018. Another hearing, to adopt the final plan, was held on April 24, 2018.

The notice of the public hearing was published in the newspaper at least 14 days before the hearing. In addition to the publication, public notices are posted at the Clearfield Post Office, Davis North Library Branch, Freeport Center Post Office, Clearfield City Hall, and on the City’s website. Prior to adoption of the One Year Action Plan, the City informed the public of the anticipated amount of federal funds expected from HUD, and the range of activities that may be undertaken, including the estimated amount that will benefit persons of low and moderate income. This information is always available in the Community Development Department of City Hall.

Residents of public and assisted housing developments, predominantly moderate or low income neighborhoods, minorities, non-English speaking persons, and persons with disabilities are especially encouraged to participate in the One Year Action Plan. In an
effort to broaden participation, public hearing notices on the One Year Action Plan were provided to households on the utility bill, as well as posted on the City’s website.

5. **Summary of public comments**

The public comments received through the Community Needs Assessment Survey, which was conducted in 2015, can be found in the Citizen Participation section of this plan. Public comments received as follows:

30-day comment period from March 13, 2018 to April 24, 2018:

Public hearing held on March 13, 2018:

Public hearing held on April 24, 2018:

6. **Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them**

Comments received are listed above.

7. **Summary**

This most recent Consolidated Plan used broad participation and outreach efforts in order to identify the City's future housing, community, and economic development needs. All of the comments from the Community Needs Assessment Survey, which was conducted in 2015, were reviewed and categorized into common or recurring themes in order to help establish funding priorities and goals.

This Plan also outlines a strategy for implementing the goals and objectives identified in the Plan. The City will utilize CDBG funds to leverage other public and private investments to implement priority goals.
**PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies – 91.200(b)**

1. **Agency/entity responsible for preparing/administering the Consolidated Plan**

Describe the agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Administrator</td>
<td>CLEARFIELD</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 – Responsible Agencies**

**Narrative (optional)**

The City of Clearfield’s Community Development Department is the lead agency for preparing and administering the Consolidated Plan, One Year Action Plans, and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Reports (CAPER).

**Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information**

Clearfield City Corporation  
Community Development  
55 South State Street  
Clearfield, Utah 84015  
Telephone: (801)525-2785  
Email: Spencer.Brimley@clearfieldcity.org
AP-10 Consultation – 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l)

1. Introduction

The City of Clearfield conducted outreach and consultation efforts with citizens, local municipal officials, non-profit agencies, public housing agencies, governmental agencies, private organizations, and the Continuum of Care in preparing the Consolidated/Annual Plan.

Provide a concise summary of the jurisdiction’s activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(l))

In order to enhance coordination efforts between the City and the public housing providers, private industry, governmental health, mental health, and other service agencies the City sought their feedback and suggestions. The City incorporated these suggestions into the Annual Action Plan.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness.

Utah has 3 Continuum of Care’s (CoC): Salt Lake and Tooele, Utah Balance of State, and Mountainlands. The City of Clearfield is part of the Balance of State CoC. The City is supportive of existing and future efforts and activities that are accomplished through the following service providers that address the needs of homeless persons: Balance of State Continuum of Care, Open Doors, and the Davis Community Housing Authority. One such effort is the Regional Coordinated Assessment plan. The plan allows for a coordinated effort among providers in order to prioritize the needs of their clients across organizational boundaries. Each provider uses the same assessment tool when individuals and families are in need of services. All persons are assessed by acuity. Those persons with the highest need, or that have the most vulnerability, are prioritized. Those with the highest priority of need are given the first opportunity to receive housing with supportive services. The providers in Davis County that currently participate include: Open Doors, Safe Harbor, Davis Behavioral Health, and the Davis Community Housing Authority.

The City of Clearfield does not operate any homeless facilities or provide homeless services directly. However, in addition to the efforts above, the City supports the programs and
facilities offered by other local and state agencies through sales tax re-distribution. The City levies a 1% sales and use tax on all transactions in the City. The state withholds a small portion of this tax from Clearfield City to be distributed for the benefit of emergency food and shelter programs. Additionally, over the next several years, the City will increase coordination efforts by participating in the County's Local Homeless Coordinating Committee meetings. This will help ensure that local and regional goals and objectives are met, efforts are not duplicated, and communication is improved.

**Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the jurisdiction's area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards for and evaluate outcomes of projects and activities assisted by ESG funds, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the operation and administration of HMIS**

The City of Clearfield does not receive ESG funds.

In Utah, membership of the Balance of State Continuum of Care (of which Davis County is a member) is comprised of Local Homeless Coordinating Councils (LHCC) of which Clearfield City participates. Each region’s LHCC is inclusive of stakeholders committed to the goal of ending homelessness. These include prevention, outreach, shelter, housing providers, ESG recipients and funders, faith organizations, government agencies, and law enforcement. Needs, service trends, HMIS and PIT data, HEARTH requirements, and goals are also discussed. CoC priorities and goals are discussed and information is provided to CoC leadership to incorporate into CoC wide plans. CoC staff provides training and support to the LHCCs to ensure that the makeup of the Council is reflective of the local community.

2. **Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdiction's consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities**

Refer to Table 2 below.
### Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization</th>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization Type</th>
<th>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</th>
<th>Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open Doors</td>
<td>Services - Housing</td>
<td>Housing Need Assessment</td>
<td>City representatives met with agency representatives and the organization participated in the Needs Assessment Survey. Improved coordination can take place through the efforts of the Local Homeless Coordinating Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services - Children</td>
<td>Public Housing Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services - Homeless</td>
<td>Homeless Needs - Families with children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services - Education</td>
<td>Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services - Employment</td>
<td>Homelessness Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services - Fair Housing</td>
<td>Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-poverty Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead-based Paint Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Midtown Community Health Center</td>
<td>Services - Health</td>
<td>Housing Need Assessment</td>
<td>Participated in the Needs Assessment Survey that was conducted in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization</td>
<td>Davis County Health Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
<td>Services - Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services - Elderly Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services - Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</td>
<td>Housing Need Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Housing Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless Needs - Families with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-poverty Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead-based Paint Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization</td>
<td>Davis School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
<td>Services - Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other government - County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</td>
<td>Housing Need Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Housing Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless Needs - Families with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-poverty Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization</td>
<td>Davis Community Learning Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
<td>Services - Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services - Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization</th>
<th>Alzheimer's Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
<td>Services - Elderly Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services - Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</td>
<td>Housing Need Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Needs - Veterans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</td>
<td>Participated in the Needs Assessment Survey that was conducted in 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization</th>
<th>Davis County Senior Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
<td>Services - Elderly Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services - Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services - Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</td>
<td>Housing Need Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</td>
<td>Participated in the Needs Assessment Survey that was conducted in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization</td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment  
Public Housing Needs  
Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless  
Homeless Needs - Families with children  
Homelessness Needs - Veterans  
Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth  
Non-Homeless Special Needs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</td>
<td>Participated in the Needs Assessment Survey that was conducted in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Group/Organization Type</td>
<td>Services - Homeless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment  
Public Housing Needs  
Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless  
Homeless Needs - Families with children  
Homelessness Needs - Veterans  
Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth  
Homelessness Strategy  
Non-Homeless Special Needs  
HOPWA Strategy  
Anti-poverty Strategy |
<p>| Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | City representatives met with agency representatives and the organization participated in the needs Community Needs Assessment Survey. Improved coordination can take place through the efforts of the Local Homeless Coordinating Committee. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization</th>
<th>Davis Community Housing Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | Agency/Group/Organization Type | PHA  
Services - Housing  
Services - Homeless  
Services - Education  
Services - Fair Housing |
|   | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment  
Public Housing Needs  
Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless  
Homeless Needs - Families with children  
Homelessness Needs - Veterans  
Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth  
Homelessness Strategy  
Non-Homeless Special Needs  
HOPWA Strategy  
Anti-poverty Strategy  
Lead-based Paint Strategy |
|   | Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | City representatives met with agency representatives and the organization participated in the needs Survey. Improved coordination can take place through the efforts of the Local Homeless Coordinating Committee. |
| 12 | Agency/Group/Organization | Wasatch Front Regional Council |
|   | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization  
Planning organization  
Business Leaders  
Civic Leaders  
Business and Civic Leaders |
|   | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Non-Homeless Special Needs  
Market Analysis  
Economic Development |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Plan</th>
<th>Lead Organization</th>
<th>How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care</td>
<td>Utah Balance of State Continuum of Care</td>
<td>Homelessness services and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearfield/Layton Circulator Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Metro Analytics</td>
<td>Transportation and infrastructure services and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis County 2011-2016 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Davis County</td>
<td>Housing, homelessness, non-housing community development needs and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing</td>
<td>Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Utah</td>
<td>Housing, special needs, homeless services and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy</td>
<td>Wasatch Front Economic Development District</td>
<td>Housing, non-housing community development and economic development strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearfield City, Utah Annual Plan</td>
<td>City of Clearfield</td>
<td>Housing, non-housing community development and economic development strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts
AP-12 Participation – 91.105, 91.200(c)

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation

Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

One of the City's initial goals was to encourage broad participation in order to create a well-rounded priority needs and target area assessment, increase coordination among partners, leverage activities, expand upon existing efforts, increase citizen feedback, and seek feedback on the Consolidated Plan. To this end, the City of Clearfield encouraged and sought broad participation but especially encouraged participation from low and moderate income persons, residents of slum and blighted areas, residents of predominantly low and moderate income neighborhoods, minorities, non-English speaking persons, persons with disabilities, public housing residents, local and regional institutions, businesses, developers, nonprofit organizations, philanthropic organizations, and community or faith based organizations. The City used a variety of participation tools including an online and paper copy Community Needs Assessment Survey (2015), interviews, public hearing, utility billing, online tools, and a public open house.

The City's largest minority population is made of Hispanic and/or Latino persons. In order to encourage participation from these minorities, the public hearing announcement was published in the newspaper in both Spanish and English. Efforts were made to make the Survey available in Spanish and resources for translators were made available at the public hearing.

An online Community Needs Assessment Survey was created in 2015 to seek additional participation. The City delivered paper copies of the Survey to the senior center, health department, Open Doors, and the family resource centers in order to encourage participation from persons with disabilities.

The feedback and input the City received from the consultation and citizen participation was vital in identifying the Plan's goals and objectives. The input was sorted into common themes or recurring needs which were then used to identify strategies and objectives.
## Citizen Participation Outreach

See Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort Order</th>
<th>Mode of Outreach</th>
<th>Target of Outreach</th>
<th>Summary of Response/Attendance</th>
<th>Summary of Comments Received</th>
<th>Summary of Comments not Accepted and Reasons</th>
<th>URL (If Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>The City held a public hearing in conjunction with the City’s Council meeting on March 13, 2018. The public hearing was noticed in the City’s newspaper of general circulation, the Ogden Standard-Examiner, the City’s website, the City Hall building, the Freeport Center Post Office, and the Davis North Library branch. The notice was published in both English and Spanish in order to garner as much participation as possible from the City’s largest minority group. The intent of the hearing was to inform persons of the amount of federal assistance the City expects to receive and the range of activities the CDBG program can fund, and to provide a forum for residents, local officials, and others to contribute to the Plan.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Comments can be found under section AP-05, number 5.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments can be found under section AP-05, number 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort Order</th>
<th>Mode of Outreach</th>
<th>Target of Outreach</th>
<th>Summary of Response/Attendance</th>
<th>Summary of Comments Received</th>
<th>Summary of Comments not Accepted and Reasons</th>
<th>URL (If Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Newspaper Ad</td>
<td>Minorsities</td>
<td></td>
<td>The notice was published in the Ogden Standard-Examiner in both English and Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-English Speaking - Specify other language: Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-targeted/broad community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Utility Billing</td>
<td>Minorsities</td>
<td></td>
<td>A notice of public hearing went out to all residents that receive a utility bill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-targeted/broad community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residents of Public and Assisted Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Internet Outreach</td>
<td>Minorsities</td>
<td></td>
<td>A notice of the hearing was posted on the City’s website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-English Speaking - Specify other language: Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort Order</td>
<td>Mode of Outreach</td>
<td>Target of Outreach</td>
<td>Summary of Response/Attendance</td>
<td>Summary of Comments Received</td>
<td>Summary of Comments not Accepted and Reasons</td>
<td>URL (If Applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>The City held a public hearing in conjunction with the City's Council meeting on April 24, 2018. The public hearing was noticed in the City's newspaper of general circulation, the Ogden Standard-Examiner, the City's website, the City Hall building, the Freeport Center Post Office, and the Davis North Library branch. The notice was published in both English and Spanish in order to garner as much participation as possible from the City's largest minority group. The intent of the hearing was to inform persons of the amount of federal assistance the City expects to receive and the range of activities the CDBG program can fund, and to provide a forum for residents, local officials, and others to contribute to the Plan.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach
Expected Resources

**AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.220(c) (1, 2)**

**Introduction**

The following anticipated resources from the CDBG program will be available during the 2018/2019 program year.

**Priority Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Year 1</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Annual Allocation:</strong> $</td>
<td><strong>Program Income:</strong> $</td>
<td><strong>Prior Year Resources:</strong> $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>public - federal</td>
<td>Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services</td>
<td>178,544</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 - Expected Resources - Priority Table
Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

Though matching funds are not required in order to receive CDBG dollars the public service projects will leverage additional resources. See below for a more detailed description of the funding resources.

Open Doors total project cost is $768,374. Open Doors will leverage the $10,000 CDBG dollars with $620,390 from State programs, $60,000 from Davis County, $34,000 from Cities and $53,984 from private donors. In all, the FCC leveraged $758,374 in additional resources.

The Davis Community Learning Center’s total project cost is $21,809.88 and the CDBG program will fund $11,781 of the project. The additional funding will need to be leveraged with other sources or the scope of project will be adjusted to fit in with the funding amount.

The Safe Harbor’s total project cost is $68,468. The Safe Harbor will leverage the $5,000 CDBG dollars with $6,634 from other federal sources, $24,559 from the State of Utah, $1,279 from Davis County, $20,907 from private donors, and $10,089 will be other in-kind/volunteer hours. In all the Safe Harbor leveraged $63,468 in additional resources.

In all, the leveraged resources totaled $821,842.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan
## Annual Goals and Objectives

### AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives - 91.420, 91.220(c)(3)&(e)

#### Goals Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort Order</th>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Goal Outcome Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDBG: $26,781</td>
<td>Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 9300 Persons Assisted Homelessness Prevention: 100 Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Infrastructure Project</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Non-Housing</td>
<td>Public Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDBG: $131,763</td>
<td>Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 – Goals Summary
Goal Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Goal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>The City’s 2018 goal is to fund service providers in order to prevent homelessness, reduce poverty, stabilize families, provide essential case management and self-sufficiency support, child abuse prevention and awareness, and educational support and life skills classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The City will allocate $158,544 towards an infrastructure project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 – Goal Descriptions

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.215(b):

Through the Housing Rehabilitation and Emergency Home Repair Program the City estimates the following families to be served:

**Extremely Low** -Income: 5

**Low**-Income: 5

**Moderate**-Income: 5
Introduction

The following projects will be funded in 2018 using CDBG dollars:

- **Open Doors** - $10,000 Food Services to at-risk low income persons and families.
- **Davis Community Learning Center** - $11,781 Administrative expenses in order to offer ESL, GED completion, parent involvement classes, citizenship, and computer classes. The salaries will help fund two part-time employees at Holt and Wasatch Elementary.
- **Safe Harbor** - $5,000 Case management, self-sufficiency support, educational and supportive groups, like skills classes, and connections to other resource agencies.
- **Capital Improvements** – $131,763 Replacing asphalt, curb, gutter, sidewalk, water lines, and storm water systems.
- **Administration** - $20,000 Administrative expenses in order to oversee the CDBG program at Clearfield City.

Table 8 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

The funding priorities have not changed from those outlined in the Strategic Plan. The City does not foresee any obstacles in addressing the needs of the underserved.
## Projects

### AP-38 Projects Summary

#### Project Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9 – Project Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th><strong>Project Name</strong></th>
<th>Safe Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals Supported</strong></td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs Addressed</strong></td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>CDBG: $5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>The Safe Harbor project will provide funds that will allow for case management, self-sufficiency support, educational and supportive groups, life skills classes, and connections to other resource agencies to victims of domestic violence. - (05G Battered and Abused Spouses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Date</strong></td>
<td>6/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</strong></td>
<td>The Safe Harbor expects to assist 50 persons during the program year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>Crisis Center, 660 West Mutton Hollow Road, Kaysville, Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Activities</strong></td>
<td>The Safe Harbor will use the CDBG funds to offer support services, shelter, intervention, and education to victims of domestic violence. The Center’s clients will have access to the following services: protective shelter, case management, psycho-educational groups, 24-hour crisis services, safety planning, outreach services, children's services, food, clothing, and all other services that the Center offers designed to assist in ending the cycle of domestic violence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4</strong></th>
<th><strong>Project Name</strong></th>
<th>CDBG Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals Supported</strong></td>
<td>Planning/Administration of CDBG Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs Addressed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>CDBG: $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>The City of Clearfield will use CDBG funds to cover the planning and administrative expenses related to administering the CDBG program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Date</strong></td>
<td>6/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Description</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Activities</strong></td>
<td>The City of Clearfield will use CDBG funds to cover the planning and administrative expenses related to administering the CDBG program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>4</strong> | <strong>Project Name</strong> | Infrastructure Project |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals Supported</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>CDBG: $131,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The CDBG funds will be using these funds towards an infrastructure project in an income qualified area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Date</td>
<td>6/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities</td>
<td>10-20 households, depending on the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Activities</td>
<td>The CDBG funds will be used towards an infrastructure project in an income qualified area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.220(f)
Description of the geographic areas of the entitlement (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

The City did not identify a geographic target area as a basis for funding allocation priorities.

Geographic Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Area</th>
<th>Percentage of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 10 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

The City did not identify a geographic target area as a basis for funding allocation priorities.
Affordable Housing

**AP-55 Affordable Housing – 91.220(g)**

**Introduction**

The City of Clearfield plans to prevent homelessness by assisting 50 persons fleeing domestic violence by funding the Safe Harbor program’s shelter and shelter services. This program is not reflected below as the services will not support rental assistance, nor the acquisition of units, new units, or rehabilitation of units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special-Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Production of New Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab of Existing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Existing Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type*
Introduction

The City of Clearfield does not have action items planned in 2018 to address public housing needs.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

Not applicable.

Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

Not applicable.

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

Not applicable.
AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.220(i)

Introduction

The City plans to work closely with and collaborate with the region’s Local Homeless Coordinating Council and Continuum of Care.

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including

See below for the specific actions that the City will take to reduce and end homelessness.

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

The homeless person Point in Time Count, which was completed in January 2017, shows the total headcount as 71, during 2016 the total headcount was 68 and in 2015 it was 72. Therefore, the total headcount has been pretty consistent during the past three years. This report can be found attached. Over the next year, City staff will connect and coordinate services with the Balance of State Continuum of and Davis County Local Homeless Coordinating Council in order to identify and assess the individual needs of unsheltered homeless persons in the City.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Victims of domestic violence are the primary type of person in need of an emergency shelter and transitional housing. Therefore, the City will fund the only domestic and sexual violence service provider, Safe Harbor/Davis Citizens’ Coalition Against Violence. The project will allow Safe Harbor to offer a protective shelter, case management, psycho-educational groups, crisis services, safety planning, outreach services, children’s services, food, clothing, and other necessary services designed to assist this vulnerable population.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from
becoming homeless again

The City of Clearfield will work with the Davis Community Housing Authority in order to continue to assist homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. Though the City continually works with service providers, the City does not plan to allocate 2018 funding toward this activity.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs.

The City of Clearfield will continue to consult and coordinate with the Balance of State Continuum of Care, Davis County Local Homeless Coordinating Council, Safe Harbor, Davis Mental Health, County School District and Sheriff’s Office, and Davis Community Housing Authority in order to continue to assist homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. Though the City continually works with these organizations, the City does not plan to allocate 2018 funding toward this activity.
Introduction

The following barriers have been identified via conversation with the local public housing authority as well as based on data from the Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice - Davis County and the City's former consolidated plan.

- The current Redevelopment Agency policy no longer requires that new developments include an affordable housing piece. Only one of the three RDA programs, the Urban Renewal Areas (URA) program, whose purpose is to remove blight sets aside a portion of the tax increment financing for affordable housing.
- The City's current ordinance does not allow for group homes, nursing homes, accessory dwelling units, or single room occupancy units. Zoning ordinances should make allowances for all types of housing, namely senior housing in the City, as well as increase density to make it happen.
- The City does not have a standard or requirement for new housing to be accessible, i.e. accessible or ‘visit-able’ by persons with disabilities. Therefore, developers should be encouraged and educated in order for more homes to be designed with accessibility standards.

The City's Good Landlord program has pros and cons. The program gives discounts on a required rental license to landlords that participate in "good landlord" training. The training provides information on fair housing topics and laws. However, some view the program as an impediment for certain persons to not receive fair housing opportunities, such as persons convicted of crimes.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment

One strategy that would remove an affordable housing barrier is to update the City's Moderate Income Housing Plan. The Moderate Income Housing Plan provides a detailed analysis of the City's housing inventory, affordability, and need. This Plan is currently being revised and should be updated by the end of the year. Another possible barrier is the somewhat limited variety of housing due to the City’s housing ordinances. This is not a significant barrier but one strategy could be to allow for a more broad variety of housing. This means the City would need to revise their ordinance and allow other housing types.
such as residential care facilities (6 or fewer), second or accessory units, and single room occupancy units. Incentive zoning is another tool that the City can use to stimulate affordable housing. This type of zoning incentivizes smart growth land use patterns by combining incentives for affordable housing with incentives for building higher density housing near public transit and preserved open space.
**AP-85 Other Actions – 91.220(k)**

**Introduction**

The City Plans to undertake the following activities in order to carry out the strategies outlined in the plan.

- Review the results from the AI and work toward a plan for implementation that will help address the obstacles to meeting the needs of the underserved population.
- Work with service providers from around the City and region in order to facilitate strategies that meet the needs of the underserved.
- Continue investing in the improvement and rehabilitation of older housing stock, namely renter occupied households.
- Work toward creating more housing opportunities throughout the City to ensure housing is available to persons no matter their life cycles.
- Fund Open Doors which will allow the Center to provide emergency food and case management to at-risk and low income families.
- Fund the Davis Community Learning Center in order to provide funding to two volunteer and resource coordinators at two Title 1 schools, Wasatch and Holt Elementary.
- Fund Safe Harbor in order to provide case management, self-sufficiency support, educational and supportive groups, life skills classes, and connections to other resource agencies to victims of domestic violence.
- Reach out to the Public Housing Agency, Davis Community Housing Authority, the Local Homeless Coordinating Committee, Open Doors, and Safe Harbor in order to create an ongoing opportunity to coordinate activities and resources.

**Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs**

The City of Clearfield updated its Analysis of Impediments in 2015. Since then the City has reviewed the results from the AI and are working toward a plan for implementation that will help address the obstacles to meeting the needs of the underserved population. Additionally, the Community Development Department will work with service providers from around the City and region in order to facilitate strategies that meet the needs of the underserved.

**Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing**

The City will continue investing in the improvement and rehabilitation of older housing stock, both owner and renter occupied households. The City will also work toward creating more housing opportunities throughout the City to ensure housing is available to persons no
matters their life cycles.

**Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards**

The City will reach out to the County Health Department to identify a one-year strategy that could be implemented in 2018.

**Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families**

The City will fund Open Doors which will allow the Center to provide emergency food and case management to at-risk and low income families. The funding will provide emergency assistance and educational efforts that will help youth, elderly, and low income persons escape poverty and homelessness.

The City will also fund the Davis Community Learning Center in order to provide funding to two volunteer and resource coordinators at two Title 1 schools, Wasatch and Holt Elementary. The resource coordinators will connect families in need or in crisis with various resources in the community. The coordinators will then follow up with the clients to ensure they received the services they needed. Some of the services include: tutoring, After School programs, tutoring English Language learners, Sub for Santa collection and distribution of coats, backpacks, school supplies, etc.

**Actions planned to develop institutional structure**

The City does not have a plan to develop the institutional structure in 2018.

**Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies**

In order to enhance the coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies, the City will reach out to the Public Housing Agency, Davis Community Housing Authority, the Local Homeless Coordinating Committee, Open Doors, and Safe Harbor in order to create an ongoing opportunity to coordinate activities and resources. City staff will coordinate internally to identify programs and other resources that can be coordinated in order to achieve common goals.
Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.220(l)(1,2,4)

Introduction

The City of Clearfield plans to do the following actions in 2018:

- The City plans to prevent homelessness by assisting 50 persons fleeing domestic violence by funding the Safe Harbor program’s shelter and shelter services.
- The City staff will connect and coordinate services with the Balance of State Continuum of Care and Davis County Local Homeless Coordinating Council in order to identify and assess the individual needs of unsheltered homeless persons in the City.
- The City will fund the only domestic and sexual violence service provider, Safe Harbor/Davis Citizens’ Coalition Against Violence. The project will allow Safe Harbor to offer a protective shelter, case management, psycho-educational groups, crisis services, safety planning, outreach services, children’s services, food, clothing, and other necessary services designed to assist this vulnerable population.
- The City of Clearfield will work with the Davis Community Housing Authority in order to continue to assist homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. Though the City continually works with service providers, the City does not plan to allocate 2018 funding toward this activity.
- The City of Clearfield will continue to consult and coordinate with the Balance of State Continuum of Care, Davis County Local Homeless Coordinating Council, Safe Harbor, Davis Mental Health, County School District and Sheriff’s Office, and Davis Community Housing Authority in order to continue to assist homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. Though the City continually works with these organizations, the City does not plan to allocate 2018 funding toward this activity.
Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)
Reference 24 CFR 91.220(l)(1)

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed 6,800
2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee’s strategic plan. 0
3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements 0
4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan 0
5. The amount of income from float-funded activities 0

Total Program Income: 6,800

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities 0

2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan. 90.00%
Davis County LHCC

Local Workforce Services
Employment Centers

Clearfield
(866) 435-7414
1290 East 1450 South
Clearfield, UT 84015

South Davis
(866) 435-7414
763 West 700 South
Woods Cross, UT 84087

Chair
Commissioner Jim Smith
Davis County Commissioner

Vice-Chair
Kim Michaud
Deputy Director, Davis Community Housing

Homeless Housing and Shelter Providers

- Davis Behavioral Health
- Davis Citizens Coalition Against Violence (DCCAV)
- Davis Community Housing Authority
- Family Connection Center

Homeless Subpopulations:
2017 Single Night Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence (all persons)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence (adults)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental illness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically homeless veterans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically homeless families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically homeless persons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of a youth parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2017 Housing Inventory

#### Number of Beds

- **Emergency Shelter:** 72
- **Transitional Housing:** 31
- **Permanent Supportive Housing:** 36
- **Rapid Re-Housing:** 34

### 2015 - 2017 PIT Summary

#### Headcount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 BOS CoC Total</th>
<th>2017 State Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheltered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of adult and minor</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households only children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households no children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>2,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsheltered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of adult and minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households only children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households no children</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of adult and minor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households only children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households no children</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>2,852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 BOS CoC Total</th>
<th>2017 State Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheltered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of adult and minor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households only children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households no children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsheltered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of adult and minor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households only children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households no children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of adult and minor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households only children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households no children</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Households no children total may not match the headcount if more than one adult is present.

Due to the nature of reporting structures and de-duplication methods within HMIS, the individual totals of each LHCC within the Balance of State Continuum of Care may not add up to the sum total of all LHCCs within the Balance of State.
TO: Mayor Shepherd and City Council Members
FROM: Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director
MEETING DATE: March 13, 2018
SUBJECT: Youth Ambassador Appointment to the Planning Commission

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Consider approval and consent to the Mayor’s proposed appointment of Eden Bush as the Youth Ambassador to the Planning Commission.

DESCRIPTION / BACKGROUND

Mayor Shepherd and the City Council expressed a desire to engage the Youth Commission by offering opportunities to serve on various boards of the City in order for the City to gain the perspective of a segment of its population sometimes overlooked. They interviewed three youth in January to be considered for such appointments. Following the interviews it was recommended that the Planning Commission consider amending its rules and regulations in such a way as to provide an opportunity for youth to serve in some capacity. It was also recommended Eden Bush be considered for appointment as a Youth Ambassador if those rules and regulations were amended by the Planning Commission. The City Council and Planning Commission met in joint work session on February 6, 2018, to discuss the nuances of that particular amendment to the rules and regulations. On February 7, 2018, the Planning Commission amended its rules and regulations to provide an opportunity for a youth ambassador to serve a one-year term.

IMPACT

a. FISCAL
   n/a

b. OPERATIONS / SERVICE DELIVERY
   n/a

ALTERNATIVES

n/a

SCHEDULE / TIME CONSTRAINTS
n/a

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- Planning Commission amended rules and regulations
Article 1: Planning Commissioners, Youth Ambassador, and Alternate Commissioners

A. Planning Commissioners

1. Number of Commissioners:
   a. The City will attempt at all times to have seven appointed Qualified Elector Commissioners, and a single Youth Ambassador.

2. Appointment:
   a. Pursuant to Clearfield City Code, Title 3, Chapter 2, each of the Qualified Elector Commissioners shall be appointed by the Mayor, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council.

3. Training:
   a. Planning Commissioners shall be expected to complete the necessary training to fulfill their appointment. Said required training shall be determined, in collaboration, by the Planning Commission and Mayor, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council, with final approval by the Planning Commission.

B. Qualified Elector Commissioners:

1. Qualified Elector Commissioners:
   a. The City will attempt at all times to have a minimum of seven Qualified Elector Commissioners appointed to the Planning Commission.

2. Appointment:
   a. Pursuant to Clearfield City Code, Title 3, Chapter 2, a minimum of seven Qualified Elector Commissioners shall be appointed by the Mayor, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council.

3. Minimum Qualifications:
   a. Qualified Elector Commissioners must reside within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City.
   b. Qualified Elector Commissioners shall be selected for appointment based on those qualities determined by the Mayor and City Council to best serve the needs of the City.

4. Length of Appointment:
   a. Qualified Elector Commissioners are appointed for five year terms.

5. Unexpired Terms of Appointment:
   a. Should a Commissioner no longer be able to fulfill their responsibilities during the term of appointment due to death, resignation, removal, disqualification, etc., the Mayor, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council, may
elect to appoint an Alternative Commissioner, or any other qualified individual to fulfill the unexpired portion of the term.

6. Oath of Office:
   a. Duly appointed commissioners shall take the oath of office prior to sitting on the Planning Commission.

C. Youth Ambassador

1. Youth Ambassador:
   a. A Youth Ambassador may be appointed to the Planning Commission.
   b. The Youth Ambassador is not a voting member of the Planning Commission.
   c. Except for the act of voting, the Youth Ambassador shall carry the same responsibilities and participate in the meetings as all Planning Commissioners.

2. Appointment:
   a. A Youth Ambassador may be appointed by the Mayor, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council.

3. Minimum Qualifications:
   a. The Youth Ambassador shall be selected for appointment based on those qualities determined by the Mayor and City Council to best serve the needs of the City.
   b. The Youth Ambassador is not required to be a duly qualified elector.
   c. The Youth Ambassador should be an eleventh or twelfth grade student or between the age of fifteen and eighteen years at the time of appointment.
   d. The Youth Ambassador must primarily (greater than fifty-percent) reside within the jurisdictional boundary of the City during the term of appointment.

4. Length of Appointment:
   a. The term of a Youth Ambassador appointment shall be for a twelve month period, and should begin and expire as determined to be in the best interest of the City.
   b. A Youth Ambassador may finish a term of appointment past the age of eighteen.

5. Unexpired Terms of Appointment:
   a. Should a Youth Ambassador no longer be able to fulfill their responsibilities during the term of appointment due to death, resignation, removal, disqualification, etc., the Mayor, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council may elect to appoint a new Youth Ambassador to fulfill the unexpired portion of the term.

6. Oath of Office:
   a. A duly appointed Youth Ambassador shall take the oath of office prior to sitting on the Planning Commission.
D. Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioners

1. Number of Alternate Commissioners:
   a. The City should attempt at all times to have three appointed Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioners.

2. Appointment:
   a. Pursuant to Clearfield City Code, Title 3, Chapter 2, each of the four Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioners shall be appointed by the Mayor, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council.

3. Minimum Qualifications:
   a. In addition to those qualities determined by the Mayor and City Council to be in the best interest of the City, the four Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioners must reside within the City.

4. Length of Appointment:
   a. Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioners are appointed for five year terms.

5. Unexpired Terms of Appointment:
   a. Should an Alternate Commissioner no longer be able to fulfill their responsibilities during the term of appointment due to death, resignation, removal, disqualification, etc., the Mayor, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council may elect to appoint an Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioner, or any other qualified individual to fulfill the unexpired portion of the term.

6. Oath of Office:
   a. Duly appointed Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioners shall take the oath of office prior to sitting on the Planning Commission.

7. Miscellaneous
   a. Although Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioners do not vote on or participate in the deliberation of issues as regular commissioners unless the alternate member is filling the position of a regular member due to absence, excused or otherwise, during that meeting, alternate members may of course address the Planning Commission on issues when appropriate as would the general public or other residents.

   b. When an Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioner is sitting as a regular member of the Planning Commission due to an absence, then that Alternate Qualified Elector Commissioner assumes all of the duties and responsibilities of a regular Commissioner during that meeting.

E. Attendance Requirements for Planning Commissioners, Youth Ambassador, and Alternative Qualified Elector Commissioners

1. Commissioners, Youth Ambassadors, and Alternate Qualified Elector
Commissioners are expected to attend Planning Commission meetings regularly. Any commissioner may be removed by the City Council for cause, including but not limited to, a poor attendance record.

2. Pursuant to Title 3, Chapter 2, Section 8 of the Clearfield City Code, any member of the Planning Commission may be removed for three consecutive unexcused absences.

F. Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

1. Selection Process:
   a. The Planning Commission shall annually elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson at the first regularly scheduled meeting in January by majority vote after taking nominations from the body.

2. Term as Chairperson or Vice-Chair:
   a. The term will be for a period of one year, with a maximum of five consecutive terms.

3. Unexpired Term of Chairperson or Vice-Chair
   a. If the chairperson is no longer able to fulfill the responsibilities of their position, for any reason, the vice-chairperson shall serve as the acting chair until a new chairperson is elected by the body to fulfill the remaining portion of the chair’s unexpired term.
   b. The Planning Commission need not wait until the annual election in January in order to replace a chairperson.
   c. If the vice-chairperson is no longer able to fulfill the responsibilities of their position, for any reason, the chairperson shall select an acting vice-chair until a new vice-chairperson is elected by the body to fulfill the remaining portion of the vice-chair’s unexpired term.
   d. The Planning Commission need not wait until the annual election in January in order to replace a vice-chairperson.

4. Minimum Qualifications:
   a. Chairperson
      (i) A commissioner must serve on the Planning Commission for at least one year before being eligible to be elected as the chairperson.
      (ii) Time spent serving as an alternate member of the Planning Commission does not count as time served as a regular member of the Planning Commission for the purpose of qualifying to serve as the chairperson.
      (iii) A Youth Ambassador is not eligible to serve as the chairperson.
      (iv) Time appointed as the Youth Ambassador may count for the one year of prior service before being eligible to be elected as the chairperson.

   b. Vice-Chairperson
      i. All commissioners, except a Youth Ambassador is eligible to serve as the vice-chairperson.
G. **Duties of the Chairperson**

The Chairperson has the following duties and responsibilities:

1. To preside at all meetings of the Planning Commission and provide general direction for the meetings;

2. To call the Planning Commission to order and proceed with the order of business;

3. To announce the business before the Planning Commission in the order in which it is to be acted upon;

4. To receive and submit, in the proper manner, all motions and propositions presented by the members of the Planning Commission;

5. To put to vote all questions which are properly moved, or necessarily arise in the course of proceedings, and to announce the result thereof;

6. To inform the Planning Commission, when necessary or when referred to for that purpose, on any point of order or practice. In the course of discharge of this duty the Chair shall have the right to call upon Legal Counsel for advice.

7. To authenticate by signature when necessary or when directed by the Planning Commission, all acts, orders, and proceedings of the Planning Commission;

8. To maintain order at meetings of the Planning Commission;

9. To move the agenda along, hold down redundancy, reference handouts and procedures in a sensitive way during meeting; and

10. **Recognize speakers and commissioners prior to receiving comments and presentation of physical evidence, i.e., plans and pictures.**

11. The chair will remain impartial on issues and not participate in the voting process unless called upon to break a tie-vote or if the chair’s vote is necessary in order to have a quorum.

12. It is recommended that the chair attend the staff plan review meeting.

H. **Vice-Chairperson**

When the chairperson is absent, the vice-chairperson assumes the duties and responsibilities of the chair for that meeting.

I. **Chairperson Pro-Tem**

In extraordinary cases where both the chairperson and vice-chairperson are absent from the meeting or hearing, the remainder of the commissioners shall elect a chairperson pro-tem, by majority vote, to act as the chair for that meeting. A Youth Ambassador
shall not be permitted to serve as chair pro-tem.

J. Gifts and Favors

Gifts, favors, or advantages must not be accepted if they are offered because the receiver holds a position of public responsibility. It is very important that Planning Commissioners are fair and impartial in their dealings with the public and that they serve all citizens equally. It is not enough to avoid favoritism. They should strive to avoid even the appearance of giving preference to one citizen or business over any other.

K. Treatment of Information

It is important to differentiate between planning information that belongs to the public and planning information that does not:

1. Reports and official records of a public planning agency must be open on equal basis to all inquiries.

2. Information considered private, controlled, or protected, that is learned in the course of performing planning duties, must be treated in confidence if specifically requested by the applicant. Such information becomes public when an application for official action, such as a change in zone classification or approval of a plat is submitted.

3. Pre-arranged private meetings between a commissioner and applicants, their agents, or other interested parties, are prohibited. Partisan information or communications on any application received by a commissioner, whether by mail, telephone, or other communication, shall be made part of the public record.

Article 2: Planning Commission Staff Duties

A. Community Development Office

Serve as staff of the Planning Commission and Chief Administrative Officers regarding planning, development, and redevelopment; coordinate and supervise work by staff; prepare all documents for presentation to the Planning Commission; assist the chairperson and secretary of the Planning Commission in the exercise of duties.

B. Secretary

Assure the construction and maintenance of the public record; record the proceedings of all hearings and meetings; prepare the minutes of the meetings as necessary; prepare and distribute agenda.

C. Legal Counsel

The City Attorney, or designee, should serve as legal counsel; prepare memoranda of law as requested by the Planning Commission; review drafts of ordinances, resolutions, and guideline amendments regarding planning and development.
Article 3: Meetings of the Commission

A. Place

All meetings of the Planning Commission shall be held in the Clearfield City Council Chambers, 55 South State Street, Clearfield, Utah (Third Floor) or at such other place in Clearfield City as the Planning Commission may designate.

B. Agenda Setting

The chairperson may change the order of the business or consider matters out of order, if there is no objection from any member of the Planning Commission, or by a majority vote of the Planning Commission.

C. Regular Meetings

Regular meetings of the Planning Commission are anticipated to be held once a month, typically the first Wednesday of each month or at the request of the chair when necessary and after properly noticed. All noticed official meetings are open to the public. The purpose is to obtain information, deliberate, and vote on specific matters. Written and recorded minutes will be kept.

D. Work Meetings

Work meetings shall be held at such a time when needed. Work sessions are noticed, official meetings open to the public to discuss specified matters. The intent of the work meeting is informational. The Planning Commission may not take any formal action or vote during such work meetings. A record will be kept stating the date and general items that are discussed.

E. Public Hearings

A noticed official meeting, the express and limited purpose of which is to provide an opportunity for the public to offer input. The Planning Commission may not vote during the hearing.

F. Field Trips

A noticed official meeting, open to the public, for the purpose of visiting specific sites. Public comment may be taken, but the Planning Commission will take no vote or formal action during the field trip.

G. Training Meetings

A noticed official meeting, open to the public, for the purpose of training planning commissioners.
Article 4: Form and Character of Motions

A. Making of Motions

Upon review of the full public record pertaining to an application or request and following due deliberation among the members of the Planning Commission, any member of the Planning Commission, except the chairperson, may make a motion. The motion shall include not only the direction of the motion, but also specific findings, conditions as applicable, denial, and also the recitation of specific findings supporting such motion.

B. Second to the Motion Required

A second to the motion shall be required for each motion citing compatible findings. A motion shall die in the absence of a second.

C. Withdrawing a Motion

After a motion has been seconded, it shall be deemed in the possession of the Planning Commission, but may be withdrawn at any time before decision or amendment by the unanimous consent of the Commission.

D. Motion to Table

A motion to table an agenda item for further study should be accompanied by specific reasons for continuing the matter, and whenever possible, a specific date to re-hear the matter should be scheduled.

E. Amending Motions

When a motion is pending before the Planning Commission, any member may suggest an amendment, at any time prior to the final vote, in order to amend the stated motion. The author and the second may choose whether or not to accept the amendment.

F. Substitute Motions

A substitute motion, which when seconded serves to replace the original motion, may be made prior to a vote on the original motion.

G. To Rescind a Motion

A motion to rescind or make void the results of a prior motion may take place when the applicant and other persons directly affected by the motion have not materially changed their position in reliance on the Planning Commission’s action on the motion.

H. To Reconsider a Motion

To recall a previous motion for further evaluation and/or action, a motion for
reconsideration may be made by a commissioner who voted with the majority. The motion to reconsider must pass with a majority vote. If it is determined that the motion should stand as previously approved, no formal vote is necessary. If the former motion is to be amended or made void, the motion shall be put to a formal vote of the Planning Commission. Motions to reconsider a previous motion must take place during the same meeting the motion was made or when the minutes containing that particular item are approved.

I. Motion to Close Hearings

When the Planning Commission is acting in a quasi-judicial capacity as an appeal authority pursuant to the City Code or state statute, the deliberation portion of a hearing may be closed if authorized by law. In order to close a portion of a hearing for deliberation by the body, a motion shall be made by a commissioner prior to discussion and voting on the matter. Open meetings may only be closed pursuant to Utah law and legal counsel should be consulted prior to doing so.

J. Motion to Recess

A motion shall be made to break for a specific purpose while also stipulating a specific time to reconvene the meeting. The time to reconvene must be during the same day as the meeting in which the motion to recess was made.

K. Motion to Adjourn

A motion to adjourn the meeting shall be made at the end of each planning commission meeting. No second is required to the motion to adjourn.

Article 5: Quorum and Voting Requirements

A. Majority Required

A majority of the seven (7) appointed planning commission members, which may include alternate members and the chair when an otherwise insufficient number of regular commissioners are present, shall constitute a quorum for all hearings and meetings. Ex-officio may not be counted as part of the quorum. The voting body shall include a minimum of four (4), but no more than seven (7) members. At least four (4) votes are required to carry a motion or take any official action. If only four (4) members are present, the voting must be unanimous in order for the motion to carry.

B. Tie-Votes

Tie-votes shall be broken by the chairperson casting a vote.

C. Abstention from Voting

A Commissioner should abstain from deliberation or consideration of an issue when a conflict prevents that Commissioner from being completely fair, unbiased and deciding an issue based wholly on the merits. Abstention from voting shall not be counted in the
determination of the motion, but shall be noted on the record.

Article 6: Requirements for Submission of Requests

A. Forms

The Planning Commission shall adopt standard forms for the submission of requests, and these forms shall include advance time requirements.

B. Completion of Forms

The Planning and Zoning Administrator shall certify the completeness, or lack thereof, of all requests.

C. Items Scheduled

Upon a complete submittal and full review, the request(s) will be scheduled for the next available planning commission meeting, after ensuring required public notification has been completed.

Article 7: Administrative Calendar

A. Public Notice

Notice for all public hearings, work sessions, and regular meetings shall conform to requirements of the Utah Code.

B. Yearly Meeting Schedule

The regular meeting schedule for the next calendar year shall be determined at a meeting of the Planning Commission in November.

C. Annual Meeting

The Planning Commission shall have an annual public meeting to review the work of the previous year and decide the work program for the coming year and to elect officers for the coming year as necessary.

Article 8: Conduct of Members of the Planning Commission

A. Meeting Preparation

Members of the Planning Commission shall take such time as necessary to prepare themselves for hearings and meetings.

B. Conflict of Interest

A planning commissioner to whom some private benefit may come as the result of a planning commission action shall not participate in that action.
1. The private benefit may be direct or indirect, create a material or personal gain, or provide an advantage to relations, friends, or to groups and associations which hold some share of a person’s loyalty. However, membership itself in a group or organization shall not be considered a conflict of interest as to Planning Commission action concerning such group unless a reasonable person would conclude that such membership by itself would prevent an objective consideration of the matter.

2. A planning commissioner experiencing a conflict of interest shall declare that interest publicly on the record in the meeting where the item or issue creating the conflict will be under consideration. If a conflict of interest is of such a degree that a commissioner will be unable to fairly consider the issue based wholly on the merits and offer an unbiased position on the matter, then that commissioner must abstain from voting on the action and shall be excused from the dais during discussion and consideration of that issue. That commissioner shall not discuss the matter privately with any other commissioner. An alternate member of the Planning Commission may take the place of a commissioner when the commissioner has been recused for that issue.

3. No planning official shall engage in any transaction in which the official has a financial interest, direct or indirect, with the agency or jurisdiction that the official serves unless the transaction is disclosed publicly and determined to be lawful.

Article 9: Adoption and Amendment of Guidelines

A. Legal Review

Guideline adoption or amendment may only be made following review by legal counsel to the Planning Commission.

B. Majority Vote

The Planning Commission guidelines shall be adopted or amended upon a vote of a majority plus one of the appointed members. Such shall take effect immediately after successful vote to adopt or amend.