

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA AND SUMMARY REPORT
January 22, 2013 – REGULAR SESSION
Revised January 18, 2013

Clearfield City Hall
55 South State Street
Multi Purpose Room
2nd Floor
Clearfield, Utah

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

6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION

Discussion on the Park Capital Facilities Plan and Park Impact Fee Analysis

(Any items not addressed prior to the Policy Session will be addressed in a Work Session immediately following the Policy Session)

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

7:00 P.M. REGULAR SESSION

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor Wood

OPENING CEREMONY:

Councilmember Murray

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

December 4, 2012 – Work Session

December 11, 2012 – Work Session

January 8, 2013 – Work Session

January 8, 2013 – Regular Session

SCHEDULED ITEMS:

1. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**
2. **CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE REAPPOINTMENT OF RON JONES TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

BACKGROUND: Ron Jones appointment to the Planning Commission would expire in February 2013. Staff recommends Ron Jones be reappointed as a member of the Planning Commission for a term expiring in February 2018.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the reappointment of Ron Jones to the Planning Commission for a term to expire in February 2018 and authorize the Mayor's signature to any necessary documents.

3. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2013R-01 SUPPORTING PROGRAMS OFFERED AT CLEARFIELD JOB CORPS

COMMUNICATION ITEMS:

Financial Reports
Mayor's Report
City Councils' Reports
City Manager's Report
Staffs' Reports

****COUNCIL MEETING ADJOURN****

Dated this 18th day of January, 2013.

/s/Kimberly S. Read, Deputy 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.

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
December 4, 2012

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| PRESIDING: | Don Wood | Mayor |
| PRESENT: | Kent Bush | Councilmember |
| | Kathryn Murray | Councilmember |
| | Mike LeBaron | Councilmember |
| | Bruce Young | Councilmember |
| PRESENT: VIA TELEPHONE: | Mark Shepherd | Councilmember |
| STAFF PRESENT: | Adam Lenhard | City Manager |
| | JJ Allen | Assistant City Manager |
| | Brian Brower | City Attorney |
| | Greg Krusi | Police Chief |
| | Bob Wylie | Administrative Services Director |
| | Steve Guy | City Treasurer |
| | Jessica Hardy | Accountant |
| | Sean Montierth | IT Manager |
| | Chris Bateman | Management Intern |
| | Eric Howes | Community Services Director |
| | Scott Hodge | Public Works Director |
| | Valerie Claussen | Development Services Manager |
| | Nancy Dean | City Recorder |
| | Kim Read | Deputy City Recorder |

VISITORS: Brandon Stanger – Planning Commission

Mayor Wood called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION INTERVIEWS

Councilmember LeBaron conducted the interviews of the Planning Commission candidates. The City Council interviewed Tim Roper and Keri Benson for consideration for the Planning Commission vacancies.

DISCUSSION OF PLANNING COMMISSION VACANCIES

Councilmember LeBaron pointed out there were currently two vacancies for alternate positions on the Planning Commission. He expressed his opinion either candidate would be an asset to the Planning Commission. Mayor Wood stated he personally knew Ms. Benson and the way in which she made herself available to meet her commitments. Councilmember LeBaron directed

Valerie Claussen, Development Services Manager, to move forward in appointing both candidates to alternate positions on the Planning Commission.

The Council took a break at 6:37 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 6:48 p.m.

Brian Brower, Greg Krusi, Bob Wylie, Steve Guy, Jessica Hardy, Sean Montierth, Chris Bateman, Scott Hodge, Eric Howes, Nancy Dean arrived at 6:48 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE FINDINGS OF THE UTILITY RATE STUDY

Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, introduced Chris Bateman, Management Intern, and explained he would be sharing a presentation regarding a rate proposal specific to utility rates. He mentioned it had been six years since the City completed an analysis of the utility rates.

Chris Bateman, Management Intern, stated he had been working on a utility rate structure for the last three months and reported he would be sharing results of the analysis with the Council. He stated the proposed rate increase would take place beginning January 2013. He shared a visual presentation with the Council.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, inquired if secondary water provided by some of the cities was accounted for in the analysis. Mr. Bateman responded that had been accounted for in the comparison of water bill costs. He reviewed the proposed rates for 2013 specific to culinary water, sewer and storm sewer with the Council. He pointed out the proposed rates would cover all operating expenses while also allowing for capital project improvements. He added the rate increase would also keep the water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer funds solvent.

Mr. Wylie emphasized out the proposed increase would also cover the expenses needed to keep up with capital and infrastructure improvements. Mr. Lenhard added the increase would also allow the City to pay for the capital improvements identified in the Capital Improvement Project Plan. Councilmember Bush inquired if the proposed increase covered any potential increases with Weber Basin Water. Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, commented there were generally no rate increases associated with Weber Basin. He continued the City had entered into a contract with Weber Basin for a specific amount of water to cover the City's water needs. He pointed out the City was locked into purchasing a certain amount of water every year.

Councilmember Bush stated he would like to know where the City would be reflected in a comparison with neighboring cities after the proposed rate increase. Mr. Wylie responded an average increase would be approximately seventy cents based on average consumption. Mr. Wylie emphasized the \$8 increase associated with the sanitary sewer portion of the utility bill was the pass through specific to the North Davis Sewer District's increase. He added the

remainder of that fee covered the City's operating expenses and infrastructure specific to the City.

Councilmember Murray requested clarification about the rates specific to multi-units within the City compared to single family. Mr. Wylie pointed out demand for multi-units was taken into consideration in determining water rates. He emphasized the infrastructure to provide water to multi units was different than what was needed for single family homes. Mayor Wood inquired if future growth had been considered in proposing the new water rates. Mr. Wylie responded water impact fees would be used for those purposes. Brian Brower, City Attorney, pointed out the future water demands had been considered during the most recent negotiation with Weber Basin Water.

Mr. Wylie distributed the portion of the Consolidated Fee Schedule specific to Utilities which reflected the proposed rates and pointed out the proposed increase for the refundable security deposit associated with establishing utility services. He stated the average bill for shut-off of services was approximately \$113 and explained a higher deposit would assist in recovering more of the amount owed. He emphasized the deposit was refunded if the resident was current on the utility account for 12 consecutive months.

Mayor Wood inquired if the City completed a credit check when residents signed up for utility service. Mr. Wylie responded a credit check was not completed and reported there were approximately six accounts which were sent to collections for nonpayment every month.

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, inquired if a resident requesting new service which had previously gone to collections or left due to delinquency could request new service if they moved back to the City. Mr. Wylie responded the City allowed them to establish a new account; however, a double security deposit was required. A discussion regarding the number of accounts for delinquency and shut-off for service took place. Mayor Wood inquired how many were repeat offenders. Mr. Wylie believed the utility staff was familiar with residents/accounts that were regularly paid late every month.

Mr. Wylie stated the proposed rate increase would come before the Council at the December 11, 2012 City Council meeting and would be effective for the bill due in February for January service.

Mr. Wylie distributed a handout illustrating the new statements reflecting the increases for the utility bills to the Council and pointed out the new features.

Councilmember Bush suggested the security deposit be increased to \$120 and proposed a ten percent escalating charge for reconnection of service. Councilmember Murray and Mayor Wood expressed their opinion that would not be a deterrent and a discussion followed regarding the number of shut-offs and shut-off procedures. Mayor Wood believed the deposit should be

increased to cover any potential loss to the City. Mr. Wylie explained the loss associated with sending bad debt specific to utility accounts to collections.

Mayor Wood inquired how the proposed increases over the next three years could potentially impact some of the City's larger commercial users. Mr. Bateman responded he hadn't completed that analysis but expressed a willingness to do that. Mr. Wylie stated that data could be compiled and provided to the Council at a later date. Mayor Wood requested that be emailed to him and the Council. The Council directed staff to increase the security deposit to \$120. Mr. Lenhard expressed appreciation to Mr. Bateman and complimented him for his presentation

Mr. Bateman left the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

The Council took a break at 7:35 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 7:45 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON ESTABLISHING A NEW MIXED USE (MU) ZONE IN THE CITY

Valerie Claussen, Development Services Manager, explained the proposed zoning text amendment would come before the Planning Commission for approval at its meeting on Wednesday, December 5, 2012. She stated the amendment would establish a new Mixed Use zoning district for the City which would enable development at UTA's (Utah Transit Authority) TOD (Transit Oriented Development) site. She indicated there was currently no Mixed Use (MU) zone within the City. She pointed out this would enable the developer to submit a Master Development Plan identifying specific uses which would outline the processes for obtaining zoning. She continued this would also allow the Planning Commission to be objective in making its findings in approving future development. She stated approval for the proposed zoning text would come before the Council at the December 11, 2012 City Council meeting.

Mayor Wood expressed concern regarding the designation of the minimum 40 acres requirement associated with the zone that it might be too restrictive and therefore the zone could not be used in other areas of the City. Councilmember LeBaron reported the Planning Commission had also expressed the same concern the proposed MU zone would only be applicable to the UTA property. Ms. Claussen responded the MU zone was intentionally written with that parcel because some of the findings were specific to a transportation component and another mixed use development wouldn't meet other criteria designated in zone. She mentioned the CR zone could be used for smaller parcels or developments within the City.

A discussion took place regarding other zones and their allowable uses within the City. Councilmember Young commented the proposed text mentioned the impact specific to roads and utilities and inquired if the impact regarding schools should also be included. Ms. Claussen stated that would be an appropriate addition. Mayor Wood inquired why the verbiage reflected "may" as opposed to "shall" regarding submission of the Development Agreement. Ms. Claussen

responded the Master Development Plan would be the Ordinance for the zoning. She stated the intermixing development agreements with zoning could be complicated. Brian Brower, City Attorney, explained the Master Development Plan would become the binding document which guaranteed the "project". He continued this would also allow the City to discuss financial arrangements associated with the development.

Councilmember Shepherd expressed concern regarding the residential design requirements specific to materials. Ms. Claussen indicated the residential design standards would be addressed at a later date when the developer approached the Planning Commission and City Council for approval and indicated the standards could be addressed at that time. Councilmember Shepherd believed it would be better to state exactly what the City desired initially rather than later. Mr. Brower emphasized the Council could not approve the rezone without submission of the master development plan. Councilmember Young expressed his opinion this would allow the developer to present more than one option to the Council.

Ms. Claussen explained how being too specific might not be in the best interest of the City and believed the current developer already had a vision as to what the development would look like. Councilmember Young believed the uses were more important than design standards or aesthetics. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, believed the goal in creating the ordinance identifying the MU zone would be the enabling statute which would allow the City and the developer to proceed through the master planning process which the current ordinance didn't allow. Ms. Claussen clarified the Master Development Plan would create the zoning district. Mr. Lenhard summarized the ordinance would be the avenue to complete what Councilmember Shepherd was suggesting. Ms. Claussen expressed agreement with Mr. Lenhard's summarization. She reviewed the process which would be required by the City from the developer and believed the City still had some leverage when it came to requesting significant changes such as quality or density.

Councilmember Shepherd believed these same controls should be considered for smaller parcels as well given the flexibility of the proposed zone. Ms. Claussen responded she had been conservative in designating parcel size for the ordinance and indicated the MU zone could be implemented throughout the City as opposed to the TOD site. Councilmember LeBaron suggested allowing this zone specifically for the TOD site and see how it worked prior to conforming it to smaller parcels. Mr. Brower pointed out the City was dealing with a large scale developer in addition to UTA and agreed with some of the reservations expressed by Councilmember LeBaron. He believed the City was confident the end product would be successful at the TOD site and expressed concern with how well the proposed zone would work elsewhere within the City. He stated the discussion on behalf of the Planning Commission had been very thorough. Councilmember Murray stated she interpreted the end result of the Planning Commission's discussion was due to the uniqueness of the property the MU zone was appropriate and suggested revisions be considered for CR zone which could be implemented in smaller parcels.

Councilmember Murray expressed concern if smaller parcels were identified in the text that left the City vulnerable for the creation of four projects each consisting of 10 acre projects. A discussion took place regarding possible zoning options within the City. Mr. Brower believed it wouldn't be difficult for the City to implement something similar in which the CR zone couldn't accommodate.

Ms. Claussen reiterated this ordinance would come before the Planning Commission for approval during its meeting scheduled for Wednesday, December 5, 2013. She indicated if approved by the Planning Commission a public hearing would then take place at the December 11, 2012 City Council meeting. She mentioned any modifications to the CR zone could be addressed in the future.

DISCUSSION ON THE CITY BUDGET AND RE-OPENING THE BUDGET SCHEDULED FOR THE DECEMBER 11TH POLICY SESSION

Bob Wylie, Administrative Services Director, distributed a handout reflecting items which would be addressed during the re-open of the 2013 budget and reviewed them with the Council.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, stated he would lead the discussion regarding fund balance appropriations and directed the Council to documents received by email earlier. He reported the General Fund balance had exceeded the allowable excess of eighteen percent by \$1.9 million dollars in unappropriated unreserved funds. He directed the Council to the handout reflecting proposed expenditures identified by departments and reviewed it with the Council.

Mayor Wood inquired if the City had an understanding of the utilization of Train Watch Park specifically of playground usage. Eric Howes, Community Services Director, responded since the playground equipment had been removed from the park he had received phone calls about the lack of amenities at the park. A discussion took place about the replacement of playground equipment at the park. Mayor Wood expressed concern whether the park was used enough to justify the expense for the park improvements. Mr. Lenhard expressed similar concern about natural barriers and access from surrounding areas to Train Watch park. Councilmember Shepherd believed the park was primarily surrounded by rental units and suggested funds could be better spent to benefit the City as a whole. Mayor Wood suggested staff determine the number of youth who would benefit from the playground equipment being placed in Train Watch Park. Councilmember Bush suggested the City also consider placing benches near the playground equipment to accommodate parents.

Councilmember Bush inquired if the bleachers at Steed Park had been replaced. Mr. Howes believed safe playground equipment was more of a priority as opposed to benches and responded the bleachers had not yet been addressed. Mayor Wood suggested replacement of the bleachers

might be a higher priority as opposed to replacement of the playground equipment. Further discussion took place regarding additional identified proposed projects.

Mr. Lenhard pointed out the City was in a great financial position due to conservative efforts of the Executive staff and requesting more from the employees. He emphasized the City had two years to appropriate the excess funds and requested input and direction from the Council.

Councilmember Young inquired about the leisure pool repair. Mr. Howes responded a proposal was forthcoming. Councilmember Young expressed his opinion the safety issues associated with the City parks should be addressed due to liability concerns. Councilmember Bush commented some of the Christmas decorations could be replaced. Mr. Lenhard directed staff to discover alternative options for light pole decorations. Councilmember Shepherd suggested the current pole decorations could be decorated with red, white and blue and use to advertise the Fourth of July. Councilmember Murray suggested the Christmas decorations should be more "traditional" in nature.

Mayor Wood inquired about the Community Arts Center window improvements compared to the soffit improvements and a discussion took place. Mr. Howes commented the costs associated to replace the small windows were significantly higher than replacing the large windows.

Councilmember Murray suggested the appropriation of funds Phase I to the Public Works Shops should be made with some of the revenue. Mr. Lenhard also reminded the Council of previous discussions in which the Council might desire to designate funding such as: a demolition fund, the Wasatch Wing Fest, land acquisition or other economic development incentives and landscaping the I-15 entryways. Councilmember Bush suggested a Welcome to Clearfield sign or water feature be placed at West Park Village. Mr. Lenhard believed it would be in the City's best interest to involve an architect to design some consistent signage for the City's gateways.

Mr. Lenhard reported the CDRA fund balance was approximately one million dollars. He mentioned UTA had approached the City regarding its participation in a transportation study and added CDRA funds could be used for this purpose. Mr. Lenhard reminded the Council it had previously expressed a desire to appropriate funds for Phase I of the Public Works Shops improvements and staff was proposing a five way split between each of the Enterprise Funds and the General Fund for \$120,000 each fund. He stated each of the funds could accommodate that request. Mayor Wood commented he was not in favor of investing the required funds for the Public Works Shops facilities at its current location.

Councilmember Murray believed the City's improvements would benefit the area. Mayor Wood believed it would be premature to invest a significant amount of funds when a better location might be determined at a later date and shared an example with Ogden City to illustrate his point. A discussion took place regarding the Public Works facility's improvements.

Mr. Lenhard suggested staff complete a more formal SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis to consider possible alternative locations for the City's Public Works facilities. Councilmember Young stated he would like to see a list of other optional locations within the City. Councilmember Bush expressed caution the City wouldn't want to move the facility to a different location which would be prime commercial property in the future. Councilmember Young believed the proposed improvements were not aesthetic but rather improving efficiencies. Councilmember LeBaron stated he was in favor of appropriating funds for this purpose because the Council needed to provide the means for the staff to provide service to the residents. Councilmember Shepherd didn't believe there was a better location for the Public Works facilities to be located and expressed support for the appropriation.

Mr. Lenhard stated specifics associated with the CDRA budget would be addressed at a later date and asked if there was anything the Council desired to remove from the identified list. Councilmember Bush suggested the Train Watch Park improvements needed further evaluation. Councilmember Murray stated she was in favor of tables and benches near playground equipment in the City parks but expressed concern about placing garbage cans near the UTA bus locations. Mr. Lenhard stated placing trash cans in the parks could also be added to the list for additional consideration. Councilmember Murray expressed her opinion City employees were deserving of the proposed merit increase.

DISCUSSION ON THE AUTHORIZATION AND EXECUTION OF CONTRACTS

Brain Brower, City Attorney, directed the Council to the proposed Ordinance 2012-14 and reviewed the proposed changes with the Council. He emphasized the Mayor was only allowed to sign on behalf of the City when authorized by law or directed by the City Council.

- Resolutions and ordinances were specified to be signed by the Mayor
- Licenses would no longer require the Mayor's signature
- The City Manager would be authorized to sign change orders in accordance with the procurement process
- The inclusion of Section C to 2-3-1
- Modifications of Section D identifying dollar amounts in which items would require approval by the City Council

Mr. Brower pointed out the proposed changes were reflective of current practices and clarified the circumstances in which the Mayor could sign documents on behalf of the City. Councilmember Young expressed concern regarding modifications to paragraph D and the potential for inflating the budget of a project which could then allow the department head to appropriate funds within its own department. Nancy Dean, City Recorder, pointed out the current process in which there was oversight of every contract by both the City Attorney, Brian Brower, and the Administrative Services Director, Bob Wylie.

Councilmember Young also expressed concern about the potential of a department head creating several projects under \$5,000 which it could then determine how City funds could be spent and shared a hypothetical example. Both Mr. Brower and Mr. Wylie agreed with Councilmember Young's concern and a discussion took place as to whether a percentage as opposed to a dollar amount would be more appropriate. Mr. Brower requested direction from the Council specific to the dollar figure specified in the ordinance.

Mayor Wood expressed his opinion the proposed changes allowed for flexibility at the same time bringing potential scrutiny to department heads. Councilmember Young suggested the addition of the City Manager's signature and then the Mayor's based upon the dollar amount and a discussion took place. Councilmember LeBaron believed the proposed ordinance was an improvement from what previously existed and pointed out this practice was more in line with the private sector. Councilmember Murray expressed her opinion the Council should have input to prioritize projects and direct expenditures. Mayor Wood summarized that the Council, as elected officials, desired the oversight for the reallocating of any remaining funds from completed projects.

Mr. Brower suggested the elimination of paragraph D3 specifically allowing the Mayor to authorize expenditures between \$10,000 and \$25,000 without authorization from the City Council. Mayor Wood stated he desired the Council's approval for expenditures of that amount. Mr. Brower believed the department heads needed some latitude in approving small contracts and change orders. Councilmember Young expressed agreement department heads needed to be allowed to do their jobs; however, anytime the amount of the contract changed the nature or scope of the budget, oversight should be required. Councilmember LeBaron suggested the addition of the language "any project within the scope of the budget" as the boundary condition as it would clearly be defined.

Ms. Dean requested clarification of the verbiage "general operations" in the proposed ordinance and suggested that also be more clearly defined. A discussion took place and Mr. Howes pointed out there were maintenance issues which was difficult for him to determine specific needs during the budget process and expressed his desire to authorize needed expenditures for that purpose. Mr. Wylie suggested the inclusion of the fixed asset definition of anything over \$5,000 for an operating expense.

Councilmember LeBaron suggested drafting the proposed ordinance based upon the suggestions and present to the Council on December 11, 2012 for approval.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 1, CHAPTER 6 – ADMINISTRATION,
MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

Brian Brower, City Attorney, indicated this proposed change was specific to the Mayor Pro Tem. He continued the changes to the ordinance were in line with current practice.

Mayor Wood clarified the proposed change in designating the Mayor Pro Tem would still require the consent of the City Council while allowing the Mayor flexibility to appoint the Mayor Pro Tem just like any other appointment. Councilmember Murray asked what the current ordinance stated. Mayor Wood responded the current ordinance referred to an election of the City Council to determine the Mayor Pro Tem at that specific meeting. Mayor Wood expressed his opinion the specification of a time frame allowed the Mayor to make adjustments due to other assignments or commitments. A discussion took place as to what would happen if the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem were not available to conduct the meeting. Mr. Brower believed the Mayor would still have the opportunity to designate the Mayor Pro Tem at any time but would include verbiage to reflect that.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, commented about the previous discussion specific to the reopening the budget. He indicated there would be one additional expenditure of \$80,000 from the fund balance to Capital Projects because when the Council approved the \$400,000 expenditure for road projects, \$80,000 of that Capital Project expenditure went to the 1000 West street improvement project.

Councilmember LeBaron moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in a special session at 10:23 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Murray. All Voting AYE.

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
December 11, 2012

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| PRESIDING: | Don Wood | Mayor |
| PRESENT: | Kent Bush | Councilmember |
| | Kathryn Murray | Councilmember |
| | Mike LeBaron | Councilmember |
| | Mark Shepherd | Councilmember |
| | Bruce Young | Councilmember |
| STAFF PRESENT: | Adam Lenhard | City Manager |
| | JJ Allen | Assistant City Manager |
| | Brian Brower | City Attorney |
| | Greg Krusi | Police Chief |
| | Eric Howes | Community Services Director |
| | Scott Hodge | Public Works Director |
| | Valerie Claussen | Development Services Manager |
| | Steve Guy | City Treasurer |
| | Bob Wylie | Administrative Services Director |
| | Nancy Dean | City Recorder |
| | Kim Read | Deputy City Recorder |

VISITORS: Curt Oda – State Legislator, Hal Johnson - UTA

Mayor Wood called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON EXPLORING MASS TRANSIT OPTIONS IN THE CITY

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, stated UTA (Utah Transit Authority) had approached the City requesting its interest in its participation of a feasibility study regarding bus rapid transit. He explained the rapid transit system would have stops at the Frontrunner Station, Freeport Center, HAFB (Hill Air Force Base), Weber State University and MIDA (Military Installation Development Authority) or Falcon Hill. He indicated UTA would be willing to contribute half of the funds and expressed optimism the City's contribution would be approximately \$10,000.

Councilmember Bush suggested contacting the State of Utah to request it also contribute to the study. Councilmember LeBaron inquired if the study would include the demand of such a system and a suggested estimated user price to the consumer for its use. He expressed concern these issues were currently being experienced by Frontrunner and its lack of riders. Mr. Allen responded the City could request these specifics be included in the scope of work within the study.

Councilmember Oda believed the issues being experienced with Frontrunner was because the current UTA routes were inadequate to accommodate the ridership of Frontrunner.

Mr. Allen mentioned the study could also address the potential impact of a pedestrian bridge connecting the TOD site to Freeport Center. Councilmember Bush requested clarification if the UTA study would address other transportation options from the TOD to HAFB other than bus rapid transit. Mr. Allen responded the study would specifically address larger forms of mass transit such as light rail, streetcar or bus rapid transit, other than regular bus service.

Councilmember Bush inquired exactly how the bus rapid transit system would operate on City streets. Mr. Allen explained a barrier of some sort would be constructed down the middle of the street and the study would also look at impacts to businesses.

Councilmember Shepherd believed some transportation option was needed for the success of the TOD and expressed support of the study if the City's contribution would be no more than \$10,000. Mr. Allen agreed there was a transportation need associated with major concentrations of employment or people. He indicated the Weber State Davis Campus had significant projections of people as well as possible future development within the City. Mayor Wood pointed out the importance of providing a means of transportation from the TOD site to destination places such as employment centers.

Councilmember Young believed it would be worthwhile to participate in the study especially given the "buy in" from important shareholders and those who would benefit from mass transit. Councilmember Bush expressed agreement mass transit should be studied but didn't believe the City should contribute anything more than \$10,000. Councilmember LeBaron indicated he could support the City's participation in the study as long as an effective cost structure was included in the study. He pointed out a study could reflect the need; however, if the cost to use the transit system was more than driving he believed the project would be ineffective. Councilmember Murray expressed her opinion contributing to the study would be a waste of City funds.

Mayor Wood directed staff to proceed with the mass transit feasibility study. Mr. Allen emphasized the City wouldn't commit to contributing anything more than \$10,000 for the study. Councilmember Bush inquired about the time frames associated with the study. Mr. Allen responded he was hopeful the study would be performed spring of 2013.

Hal Johnson, UTA, arrived at 6:20 p.m.

Councilmember LeBaron emphasized his desire the study reflect cost structure, why there was the need for a mass transit system, and whether or not the transportation system would be used at an identified rate structure cost.

Mr. Johnson responded the study would identify the purpose for the mass transit system. He continued details for action would also be included as well as price points for using the system.

He added the study would also identify which type of mass transit system would be most successful. He explained bus rapid transit was a higher level of investment than busses. He stated it looked just like light rail system except it used busses. He also explained another option for consideration would be what was currently being used at 35th South in Salt Lake City in which there were limited stop, stations and the bus schedule coincided with the TRAX schedule. He continued the busses would have a priority for street lights in addition to dedicated lanes. Mr. Allen inquired if the study would include traditional bus service. Mr. Johnson believed current services would be included in the study in addition to the needed supplements which would better serve the employment centers near the commuter rail. He expressed his opinion mass transit could better serve needs for the employees of these clusters of employment centers.

Mr. Oda inquired if the feasibility study would be coordinated with UDOT so as to not create a poor traffic situation associated with traffic signals. Mr. Johnson indicated a significant amount of work would be dedicated to create a positive result with the use of traffic signal prioritization. He assured Mr. Oda the models which would be used with timing rhythms were scientific and expressed confidence in those models.

Mr. Johnson left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

UPDATE ON THE FOURTH OF JULY FESTIVITIES

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, reported cost estimates associated with the Wasatch Wing Festival were approximately \$100,000. He mentioned the wing fest could potentially recognize some revenue but emphasized there would be a significant gap between the expenses and the revenues.

Councilmember Shepherd stated no hard commitments had been finalized regarding sponsorships; however, he believed the main stage sponsorship for \$20,000 would come to fruition in the near future with the other stage sponsorship of \$10,000 also being considered. He expressed optimism the sponsorships would be recognized. He explained the problems associated with timing of the marketing materials and business' budgeting parameters which generally happens in late summer for the next year.

Mr. Allen inquired what level of subsidy for the wing festival was the Council comfortable with. Mayor Wood asked if visits had been made to neighboring communities regarding their local events to determine successes associated with sponsorships of this magnitude. Councilmember Murray requested clarification if staff was requesting a commitment of \$30,000 now and an additional \$100,000 appropriated for the Fourth of July to see the wing festival to fruition. Mayor Wood believed staff was requesting \$50,000 plus an additional \$100,000. Mr. Allen responded the baseline cost for the Fourth of July events was approximately \$50,000 without the inclusion of the wing festival.

Mayor Wood inquired why the City would want to incur the cost of the wings to be purchased from the participating vendors. He believed the restaurant vendors would already have

established channels to provide the wing product. He pointed out the City ran the risk of purchasing excessive amounts of wing product since this was the first year of the wing festival and had no idea how much product would be needed. Mr. Allen responded the City could structure the event differently and require the vendors to provide their own chicken wing product. He mentioned many of the local vendors who had expressed interest in participating in the wing festival had indicated they didn't have the capability to provide their own product and therefore would probably choose to not participate in the event.

Mr. Allen reported the Chili's restaurant in Layton, and if needed the Riverdale restaurant, had committed to allowing the City to purchase the wings from them which would be transported to the park in hot boxes. He continued each participating vendor would then provide the sauces. Mr. Allen pointed out the one drawback to this would be that some vendors might prefer a different cooking method than what was being provided. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, pointed out electricity was another issue which would need to be considered if each vendor cooked their own chicken wings. Eric Howes, Community Services Director, emphasized power at the park for the Fourth of July events had been a significant issue in past years. Mr. Allen expressed his opinion the best way to ensure success for the wing festival would be for the City to provide the cooked wings to the vendors. He continued after the initial event the City could modify the event based on the successes and what was learned.

Councilmember Shepherd shared his experience from attending a wing fest in Salt Lake City during which the promoter had ran out of wings. He emphasized a key element to the success of the event would be in having enough wings for all vendors. Councilmember LeBaron suggested consulting with a caterer to solicit an opinion on what would be needed to ensure success of the wing festival. Mr. Allen suggested having a restaurant representative on the planning committee. Councilmember LeBaron also suggested the inclusion of an individual familiar with offsite cooking experience be part of the planning committee. Mr. Allen reported on what Natalee Flynn, Special Events, and Marliss Scott, Special Events, had experienced specific to the cooking of wings while attending wing fest events in Buffalo and Nashville.

Mayor Wood asked the Council if it was prepared to absorb the risks associated with an expenditure of \$150,000 for the wing festival event. Councilmember LeBaron reminded the Council it had agreed to an expenditure of \$60,000 above and beyond what was normally appropriated for the Fourth of July event last spring. He continued if the City could recognize \$40,000 in sponsorships with approximately \$20,000 already committed, he believed the event was close to being funded. Mayor Wood asked what would be the point of no return for the Council. A discussion took place regarding a timeline and at what point would the Council want to determine to proceed. Mr. Allen reviewed his process in calculating figures regarding the amount of wings needed and the costs.

Curt Oda commented since this was the first year for the event it would be difficult to know how successful it would be and believed the City, vendors and other participants would need to be

patient regarding expectations. Councilmember Shepherd pointed out there would be an impact to the City which couldn't be measured such as the notoriety of the event.

Mayor Wood suggested contact be made to Barbara Riddle from the Davis County Convention and Visitors Bureau regarding the event. He believed she would be an asset to the planning committee and indicated she would have significant insight in managing events on a large scale. Councilmember Young stated he would like the event to be revenue neutral in future years. Councilmember Shepherd reported the Fallen Heroes Scholarship Foundation had committed to being associated with the wing festival.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

DRAFT

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:30 P.M. WORK SESSION
January 8, 2013

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| PRESIDING: | Don Wood | Mayor |
| PRESENT: | Kent Bush | Councilmember |
| | Kathryn Murray | Councilmember |
| | Mike LeBaron | Councilmember |
| | Mark Shepherd | Councilmember |
| | Bruce Young | Councilmember |
| STAFF PRESENT: | Adam Lenhard | City Manager |
| | JJ Allen | Assistant City Manager |
| | Brian Brower | City Attorney |
| | Greg Krusi | Police Chief |
| | Eric Howes | Community Services Director |
| | Scott Hodge | Public Works Director |
| | Valerie Claussen | Development Services Manager |
| | Nancy Dean | City Recorder |
| | Kim Read | Deputy City Recorder |

VISITORS: There were no visitors.

Mayor Wood called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE TITLE 11, CHAPTER 15 – SIGN REGULATIONS

Mayor Wood pointed out the dates of Filing for Candidacy had been changed from July to June 1, 2013 through June 17, 2013 for the Primary Election which created the potential for political signs being placed in the City for a prolonged amount of time.

Brian Brower, City Attorney, distributed a copy of the City's current sign ordinance and reviewed it with the Council which allowed the placement of political signs 30 days prior to the Primary Election and remain in place until the Monday following the General Election. He added signs could be placed 45 days prior to the General Election if there was no Primary Election. He reported it also indicated candidates losing a Primary Election must remove any political signage by the Monday following the election. He reiterated the changes would allow for placement of signs beginning July 13, 2013.

Mr. Brower shared the results from his research on the topic of political signage with the Council. He cautioned the Council in restricting political speech and suggested the Council not reduce the time limit associated with political signs. He stated he had conducted a sampling from other municipalities and reported most had no time restrictions except for removal following the election.

Councilmember Bush remarked this issue was discussed during the Utah League meetings in September and Dave Church, Attorney, expressed his opinion political signage couldn't be any more restrictive than regular signage. Mr. Brower stated he was aware of that opinion and suggested if any changes were made to the City's ordinance it would be his recommendation they be more liberal as opposed to being more restrictive.

Councilmember Shepherd believed the City's ordinance regarding political signage was the most restrictive in the area.

Mr. Brower expressed concern about the verbiage in the ordinance requiring the removal of a sign following the Primary Election if a candidate didn't advance to the General Election. He continued the candidate might desire the signage remain in order to conduct write in campaign. Nancy Dean, City Recorder, responded a candidate would have to file with the City Recorder as a write in candidate 45 days prior to the General Election. Mr. Brower reiterated if any modifications were made to the current sign ordinance regarding political signage it would be his recommendation to change that requirement. A discussion took place regarding the City's response to complaints regarding the placement of political signs.

Councilmember Shepherd believed the ordinance should remain as it is. Councilmember Young believed the free speech component superseded the time frame and believed that should be eliminated from the ordinance. Councilmember Bush agreed with Mr. Brower's comments regarding removal of the signage following the Primary Election in the case of a write-in campaign. Mayor Wood believed if the language requiring the removal of the signs following the Primary Election was in the ordinance it encouraged the candidate to do so. Councilmember Murray inquired if candidates were informed of the City's sign ordinance when they declared candidacy. Ms. Dean responded the sign ordinance was provided in the candidate packet and the ordinance was discussed during candidate orientation.

Councilmember LeBaron suggested modifying the time by eliminating the number of days for the signage prior to the Primary Election. Ms. Dean indicated early voting would begin two weeks prior to the election and discouraged restricting signage during that time.

A discussion took place regarding the difference between political signs and temporary signs. Councilmember Murray stated she was in favor of keeping the ordinance as it was currently written. Councilmember LeBaron suggested if a change to the ordinance was needed in order to eliminate clutter reducing the time associated with the Primary Election would be appropriate. Councilmember Shepherd was in agreement to leave the ordinance as it currently was but believed suggested recommendations could be made during the candidate orientation regarding when the signs should be removed.

Mr. Brower requested direction from the Council as to how the ordinance should be modified and believed any modifications should be more liberal as opposed to more restrictive. Councilmember LeBaron requested Mr. Brower draft a defensible ordinance based upon the

discussion to bring before the Council for approval. Mr. Brower responded given that direction, the ordinance would not have any restrictions prior to the election. Adam Lenhard, City Manager, pointed out public hearings were required and a recommendation to the City Council from the Planning Commission would also need to happen prior to amending the ordinance. Councilmember Bush expressed his opinion there were other issues with the sign ordinance which should be addressed at the same time. Mr. Lenhard responded it would be in the best interest of the City to update the sign ordinance at a later date in the year. Mr. Brower indicated he would make his recommendations specific to political signage to the sign committee during their discussions pertaining to amending the sign ordinance.

The meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

DRAFT

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
7:00 P.M. REGULAR SESSION
January 8, 2013

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| PRESIDING: | Don Wood | Mayor |
| PRESENT: | Kent Bush | Councilmember |
| | Kathryn Murray | Councilmember |
| | Mike LeBaron | Councilmember |
| | Mark Shepherd | Councilmember |
| | Bruce Young | Councilmember |
| STAFF PRESENT: | Adam Lenhard | City Manager |
| | JJ Allen | Assistant City Manager |
| | Brian Brower | City Attorney |
| | Scott Hodge | Public Works Director |
| | Greg Krusi | Police Chief |
| | Eric Howes | Community Services Director |
| | Valerie Claussen | Development Services Manager |
| | Nancy Dean | City Recorder |
| | Kim Read | Deputy City Recorder |

VISITORS: Brayden Burt, Zeb Daw, Kayson Adams, Samuel Emerson, Gabe Dybas, Jay Baird, Sam Lovell, Kendra McKenzie, Tyson Daw, Brad Baxter, Ryan Haugen

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

City Councilmember Bush conducted the Opening Ceremony.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 4, 2012 SPECIAL SESSION AND THE DECEMBER 11, 2012 REGULAR SESSION

Councilmember Shepherd moved to approve the minutes from the December 4, 2012 special session and the December 11, 2012 regular session as written, seconded by Councilmember Young. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, LeBaron, Murray, Shepherd and Young. Voting NO – None.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2013-01 APPROVING TEXT AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11 – LAND USE, ESTABLISHING A NEW MIXED USE (MU) ZONING DISTRICT

The proposed amendments to Title 11 – Land Use, establishing a new Mixed Use (MU) zoning district in the City had been presented and discussed during the December 4, 2012 City Council work session. The public hearing for the proposed ordinance took place on Tuesday, December 11, 2012 and no public comments were received. The Planning Commission also held a public hearing on the amendments Wednesday, December 5, 2012 and unanimously recommended approval.

Valerie Claussen, Development Services Manager, shared a presentation reviewing previous presentations and discussions associated with the proposed text amendment to Title 11 and also reviewed the components associated with the new Mixed Use (MU) zone. Brian Brower, City Attorney, pointed out additional language had been included since the last discussion with the Council which clarified the appeal process specific to the development plan.

Councilmember LeBaron moved to approve Ordinance 2013-01 Approving text amendments to Title 11 – Land Use, Establishing a New Mixed Use (MU) Zoning District in accordance with the Planning Commission’s recommendation, and authorize the Mayor’s signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Murray. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, LeBaron, Murray, Shepherd and Young. Voting NO – None.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS:

Mayor Wood

1. Announced Councilmember Young would be the Mayor Pro Tem for calendar year 2013.
2. Revealed he would be out of state the last week in January and requested he participate in the scheduled work session electronically.
3. Stated the Youth City Council (YCC) had an opportunity to visit the Legislature and encouraged the Council’s support in attending with the YCC. He indicated Councilmember Shepherd would be participating in the Mayor’s stead.
4. Requested members of the Council prepare for participation in the budget work session scheduled for Tuesday, January 15, 2013. He suggested each review the Vision 2020 strategic plan when identifying each of their goals and projects for the next year.

Councilmember Bush

1. Complimented the Employee’s Association on the success of the Employee Christmas Party.
2. Commented the “Welcome to Syracuse” sign which had recently been placed within the Clearfield City boundary had been moved and was now in Syracuse City.

Councilmember LeBaron – Wished everyone a Happy New Year.

Councilmember Murray – nothing to report.

Councilmember Shepherd – nothing to report.

Councilmember Young – nothing to report.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager – nothing to report.

STAFFS' REPORTS:

Nancy Dean, City Recorder –

1. Reminded the Council to RSVP for the dinner social in conjunction with the budget retreat on Tuesday, January 15, 2013.
2. Informed the Council Local Official's Day at the Legislature was scheduled for Wednesday, January 30, 2013. She requested those desiring to attend let her know and the Recorder's office would complete their registration.
3. Reviewed upcoming meeting schedule: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 Budget Retreat work session, Policy Session on Tuesday, January 22, 2013 and another work session scheduled for Tuesday, January 29, 2013.

There being no further business to come before the Council **Councilmember LeBaron moved to adjourn at 7:23 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Shepherd. All voting AYE.**

CLEARFIELD CITY RESOLUTION 2013R-01

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING CLEARFIELD CITY'S SUPPORT OF CLEARFIELD JOB CORPS

WHEREAS, since 1966 Clearfield Job Corps has been providing valuable educational and career training opportunities for young people who need such instruction in order to become independent and productive members of their respective communities; and

WHEREAS, Clearfield City Corporation and many other employers throughout the region greatly appreciate and value the contribution Clearfield Job Corps provides as a key learning and vocational training institution in northern Davis County; and

WHEREAS, over the past 47 years Clearfield Job Corps has played a significant part in establishing Clearfield City as a major manufacturing and industrial center in the intermountain area; and

WHEREAS, Clearfield City believes any reduction in the funding for or enrollment at Clearfield Job Corps would likely result in significant detrimental impacts to the local economy, both through the loss of employment opportunities for the facility's support staff as well as having fewer well-trained graduates available to serve the staffing needs of local employers; and

WHEREAS, Clearfield City and the Clearfield Job Corps enjoy a cooperative relationship providing direct benefits to the City, its businesses and residents through various community partnerships resulting in the completion of important projects for the City while simultaneously giving valuable training opportunities to Clearfield Job Corps students; and

WHEREAS, the Clearfield City Council wants to officially express its appreciation and support for the Clearfield Job Corps center and to urge continued full funding for this very valuable asset to the community;

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

- 1) Clearfield City Corporation expresses its appreciation for and support of the Clearfield Job Corps center; and
- 2) The City urges the continued financial support of and full funding for Clearfield Job Corps and its programs.

Passed and adopted by the City Council at its regular meeting on the 22nd day of January, 2013.

ATTEST

CLEARFIELD CITY CORPORATION

Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

Donald W. Wood, Mayor

VOTE OF THE COUNCIL

AYE:

NAY:

Clearfield City Revenues

December - 50% of Fiscal Year

| Fund Level ▲ | Fiscal Year | Account Code ▲ | Account Title | YTD Budgeted Revenue | December Revenue | YTD Through December | YTD Revenue % |
|--------------|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| 10 | 13 | 311001 | CURRENT GENERAL PROPERTY | \$1,111,131.00 | \$112,145.34 | \$989,801.40 | 89.08% |
| | 13 | 311002 | VEHICLE VALUE BASED TAX | \$180,000.00 | \$6,693.51 | \$61,376.61 | 34.10% |
| | 13 | 312001 | DELINQUENT TAXES PRIOR YR | \$120,000.00 | \$5,411.78 | \$15,295.53 | 12.75% |
| | 13 | 313001 | GENERAL SALES & USE TAXES | \$3,315,226.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,515,554.79 | 45.71% |
| | 13 | 313002 | ENERGY USE TAX | \$2,112,683.00 | \$0.00 | \$885,556.26 | 41.92% |
| | 13 | 314002 | CATV FRANCHISE TAXES | \$115,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$31,151.40 | 27.09% |
| | 13 | 314003 | UTILITY FRANCHISE TAXES | \$318,000.00 | \$24,572.10 | \$191,554.59 | 60.24% |
| | 13 | 314004 | MUNI TELECOM LICENSE TAX | \$425,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$139,663.26 | 32.86% |
| | 13 | 315001 | TRANSIENT ROOM TAX | \$7,800.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,019.82 | 25.90% |
| | 13 | 321001 | BUSINESS LICENSES | \$126,500.00 | \$49,400.00 | \$70,381.50 | 55.64% |
| | 13 | 321002 | LANDLORD REGISTRATION | \$60,000.00 | \$26,771.75 | \$36,404.75 | 60.67% |
| | 13 | 322002 | SIGN PERMITS | \$2,500.00 | \$25.00 | \$682.00 | 27.28% |
| | 13 | 322101 | BUILDING PERMITS | \$65,000.00 | \$4,948.15 | \$31,622.40 | 48.65% |
| | 13 | 322102 | ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING & GAS | \$9,000.00 | \$528.22 | \$6,444.29 | 71.60% |
| | 13 | 322103 | EXCAVATION PERMITS | \$2,500.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,143.00 | 45.72% |
| | 13 | 322104 | DEMOLITION PERMITS | \$450.00 | \$0.00 | \$150.00 | 33.33% |
| | 13 | 322105 | INSPECTION FEES | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$587.50 | |
| | 13 | 322401 | CEMETERY & BURIAL PERMITS | \$14,000.00 | \$900.00 | \$7,100.00 | 50.71% |
| | 13 | 331001 | GENERAL FEDERAL GRANTS | \$170,528.00 | \$1,011.50 | \$97,954.36 | 57.44% |
| | 13 | 331006 | CDBG GRANT REVENUE | \$217,184.00 | \$108.00 | \$12,187.22 | 5.61% |
| | 13 | 331007 | DAVIS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTR | \$14,087.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 334001 | STATE GRANTS | \$56,360.00 | \$0.00 | \$39,456.84 | 70.01% |
| | 13 | 335001 | CLASS "C" ROADS | \$750,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$110,306.75 | 14.71% |
| | 13 | 335002 | LIQUOR FUND ALLOTMENT | \$43,000.00 | \$39,850.93 | \$39,850.93 | 92.68% |
| | 13 | 341001 | ZONING & SUBDIVISION | \$12,000.00 | \$80.00 | \$10,687.00 | 89.06% |
| | 13 | 341002 | PLAN CHECKING FEE | \$7,000.00 | \$997.00 | \$4,834.00 | 69.06% |
| | 13 | 342001 | SPECIAL POLICE SERVICES | \$8,500.00 | \$1,903.50 | \$4,993.50 | 58.75% |
| | 13 | 342002 | DAVIS SD POLICE PROTECTIO | \$56,996.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 342003 | DUI/SEATBELT (OVERTIME RE | \$18,000.00 | \$4,420.42 | \$9,836.73 | 54.65% |
| | 13 | 342004 | E-911 SERVICE FEES | \$139,800.00 | \$0.00 | \$66,969.96 | 47.90% |
| | 13 | 342006 | DISPATCH SERVICES | \$85,000.00 | \$7,084.00 | \$42,504.00 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 347001 | AQUATIC CENTER | \$1,351,020.00 | \$82,956.05 | \$573,920.64 | 42.48% |
| | 13 | 347003 | RECREATION | \$362,930.00 | \$3,336.45 | \$146,202.15 | 40.28% |
| | 13 | 348001 | CEMETERY PLOTS | \$9,500.00 | \$400.00 | \$3,290.00 | 34.63% |

Clearfield City Revenues

December - 50% of Fiscal Year

| Fund Level ▲ | Fiscal Year | Account Code ▲ | Account Title | YTD Budgeted Revenue | December Revenue | YTD Through December | YTD Revenue % |
|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 10 | 13 | 349002 | FIRE DISTRICT BILLING | \$915.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 351001 | FINES | \$820,000.00 | \$52,905.46 | \$388,938.50 | 47.43% |
| | 13 | 351003 | CODE ENFORCEMENT FINES | \$1,325.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,520.00 | 114.72% |
| | 13 | 353001 | COURT FILING FEES | \$2,500.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 353002 | COURT SECURITY FEES | \$20,000.00 | \$1,588.20 | \$12,307.41 | 61.54% |
| | 13 | 353003 | MISC COURT COST REIMB | \$4,600.00 | \$181.85 | \$692.55 | 15.06% |
| | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$39,800.00 | \$2,138.63 | \$7,017.88 | 17.63% |
| | 13 | 362001 | COMMUNITY SERVICE RENTALS | \$63,450.00 | \$7,972.50 | \$40,965.00 | 64.56% |
| | 13 | 364001 | SALE OF FIXED ASSETS G/L | \$0.00 | \$4,878.05 | \$7,301.19 | |
| | 13 | 369001 | MISC REVENUES | \$18,200.00 | \$145,309.57 | \$152,125.40 | 835.85% |
| | 13 | 369003 | DONATION REVENUE | \$112,756.00 | \$3,279.27 | \$9,547.56 | 8.47% |
| | 13 | 369004 | RETURN CHECK FEES | \$900.00 | \$140.00 | \$620.00 | 68.89% |
| | 13 | 369007 | CLAIMS AND DAMAGES | \$8,400.00 | \$168.00 | \$5,613.17 | 66.82% |
| | 13 | 371007 | FIRE PROTECTION FREEPORT | \$97,500.00 | \$8,490.00 | \$50,373.35 | 51.66% |
| | 13 | 381002 | TRNF RDA SALES TAX BOND | \$810,310.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 381003 | TRNF EF SALES TAX BOND | \$75,777.70 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 381008 | FUND BAL. APPROPRIATION | \$1,822,772.00 | \$873,100.00 | \$873,100.00 | 47.90% |
| | 13 | 382001 | TRNF FROM RDA | \$260,944.00 | \$9,160.42 | \$54,962.52 | 21.06% |
| | 13 | 382002 | EF(S) OVERHEAD ALLOC | \$677,830.37 | \$56,485.86 | \$338,915.16 | 50.00% |
| 13 | 382003 | PAY IN LIEU DAVIS COUNTY | \$3,190.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% | |
| 10 | | | | \$16,127,865.07 | \$1,539,341.51 | \$7,093,482.87 | 43.98% |
| 20 | 13 | 311101 | EDA # 1 | \$398,638.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 311102 | EDA # 2 | \$388,034.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 311103 | EDA#3 - ATK | \$1,023,688.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 311106 | RDA #6 | \$259,032.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 311107 | RDA # 7 | \$329,680.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 311108 | RDA # 8 | \$265,055.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 311109 | RDA # 9 | \$317,573.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 311110 | RDA # 10 | \$353,466.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 337001 | LOCAL GRANTS | \$800.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$10,972.00 | \$1,751.10 | \$12,048.96 | 109.82% |
| | 13 | 361004 | INTEREST ON LOANS | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$118.69 | |
| | 13 | 362002 | RENT REVENUES | \$51,091.56 | \$4,257.63 | \$25,545.78 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 369001 | MISC REVENUES | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,000.00 | |

Clearfield City Revenues

December - 50% of Fiscal Year

| Fund Level ▲ | Fiscal Year | Account Code ▲ | Account Title | YTD Budgeted Revenue | December Revenue | YTD Through December | YTD Revenue % |
|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 20 | 13 | 381008 | FUND BAL. APPROPRIATION | \$276,850.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 382004 | OVERHEAD ALLOCATIONS | \$206,254.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| 20 | | | | \$3,881,133.56 | \$6,008.73 | \$38,713.43 | 1.00% |
| 31 | 13 | 311001 | CURRENT GENERAL PROPERTY | \$718,728.00 | \$76,041.07 | \$650,140.46 | 90.46% |
| | 13 | 381005 | TRNF FROM EF | \$371,922.00 | \$0.00 | \$151,543.57 | 40.75% |
| 31 | | | | \$1,090,650.00 | \$76,041.07 | \$801,684.03 | 73.51% |
| 40 | 13 | 323004 | PARK IMPACT FEES | \$7,000.00 | \$853.00 | \$10,236.00 | 146.23% |
| | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$92.00 | \$102.56 | \$729.64 | 793.09% |
| | 13 | 381004 | TRNF FROM GF | \$50,000.00 | \$50,000.00 | \$50,000.00 | 100.00% |
| | 13 | 381008 | FUND BAL. APPROPRIATION | \$181,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$26,971.35 | 14.90% |
| 40 | | | | \$238,092.00 | \$50,955.56 | \$87,936.99 | 36.93% |
| 45 | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$0.00 | \$390.71 | \$261.53 | |
| | 13 | 381001 | TRNF OTHER FUNDS | \$200,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 381004 | TRNF FROM GF | \$825,359.00 | \$904,335.39 | \$909,165.30 | 110.15% |
| | 13 | 381008 | FUND BAL. APPROPRIATION | \$0.00 | \$58,644.92 | \$66,815.08 | |
| | 13 | 382001 | TRNF FROM RDA | \$202,400.00 | \$108,805.28 | \$141,051.61 | 69.69% |
| 45 | | | | \$1,227,759.00 | \$1,072,176.30 | \$1,117,293.52 | 91.00% |
| 50 | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$1,150.00 | \$101.95 | \$3,998.81 | 347.72% |
| | 13 | 369006 | LATE FEES/PENALTY | \$130,685.00 | \$11,447.70 | \$66,011.19 | 50.51% |
| | 13 | 371005 | WATER SERVICE FEES | \$18,500.00 | \$425.00 | \$15,315.00 | 82.78% |
| | 13 | 375001 | UTILITY ASSISTANCE | (\$525.00) | (\$45.32) | (\$276.11) | 52.59% |
| | 13 | 375002 | MILITARY DISCOUNTS | (\$1,000.00) | (\$18.82) | (\$441.69) | 44.17% |
| | 13 | 381005 | TRNF FROM EF | \$125,709.48 | \$2,927.58 | \$34,681.92 | 27.59% |
| 50 | | | | \$274,519.48 | \$14,838.09 | \$119,289.12 | 43.45% |
| 51 | 13 | 323001 | WATER IMPACT FEES | \$50,000.00 | \$3,822.00 | \$49,686.00 | 99.37% |
| | 13 | 331003 | HIGHWAYS & STREETS | \$0.00 | \$59,132.15 | \$190,404.48 | |
| | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$35,400.00 | \$4,068.72 | \$27,027.95 | 76.35% |
| | 13 | 371001 | WATER CHARGES | \$3,283,122.00 | \$202,457.82 | \$1,961,968.92 | 59.76% |
| | 13 | 371003 | WATER METER FEE/CONNECTIO | \$5,500.00 | \$233.00 | \$3,129.00 | 56.89% |
| | 13 | 371006 | FIRE HYDRANT RENTAL USE | \$500.00 | \$49.90 | \$1,265.40 | 253.08% |
| | 13 | 381008 | FUND BAL. APPROPRIATION | \$1,014,500.00 | \$194,505.09 | \$298,975.85 | 29.47% |
| 51 | | | | \$4,389,022.00 | \$464,268.68 | \$2,532,457.60 | 57.70% |
| 52 | 13 | 323002 | SEWER IMPACT FEES | \$0.00 | \$2,072.00 | \$24,864.00 | |
| | 13 | 331003 | HIGHWAYS & STREETS | \$0.00 | \$5,816.00 | \$326,037.06 | |
| | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$11,700.00 | \$1,563.03 | \$13,579.82 | 116.07% |
| | 13 | 369001 | MISC REVENUES | \$0.00 | \$20.00 | \$240.00 | |

Clearfield City Revenues

December - 50% of Fiscal Year

| Fund Level ▲ | Fiscal Year | Account Code ▲ | Account Title | YTD Budgeted Revenue | December Revenue | YTD Through December | YTD Revenue % |
|--------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 52 | 13 | 372001 | SEWER CHARGES | \$2,367,387.00 | \$207,627.54 | \$1,235,292.50 | 52.18% |
| | 13 | 381008 | FUND BAL. APPROPRIATION | \$680,000.00 | \$16,445.64 | \$389,542.64 | 57.29% |
| 52 | | | | \$3,059,087.00 | \$233,544.21 | \$1,989,556.02 | 65.04% |
| 53 | 13 | 323003 | STORM SEWER IMPACT FEES | \$60,000.00 | \$1,432.00 | \$17,184.00 | 28.64% |
| | 13 | 331003 | HIGHWAYS & STREETS | \$0.00 | \$12,232.50 | \$494,611.09 | |
| | 13 | 331008 | UDOT REVENUE | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$13,656.25 | |
| | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$10,330.00 | \$1,470.07 | \$6,592.59 | 63.82% |
| | 13 | 373001 | STORM SEWER CHARGES | \$873,257.00 | \$71,145.03 | \$425,248.48 | 48.70% |
| | 13 | 381001 | TRNF OTHER FUNDS | \$209,400.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 13 | 381008 | FUND BAL. APPROPRIATION | \$380,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$376,641.21 | 99.12% |
| | 13 | 382001 | TRNF FROM RDA | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$135.00 | |
| 53 | | | | \$1,532,987.00 | \$86,279.60 | \$1,334,068.62 | 87.02% |
| 54 | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$6,000.00 | \$672.06 | \$4,043.05 | 67.38% |
| | 13 | 374001 | GARBAGE CHARGES | \$1,224,794.00 | \$102,127.27 | \$614,533.38 | 50.17% |
| | 13 | 381008 | FUND BAL. APPROPRIATION | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$12,423.66 | |
| 54 | | | | \$1,230,794.00 | \$102,799.33 | \$631,000.09 | 51.27% |
| 61 | 13 | 344001 | FLEET CHARGES FROM GF | \$115,022.00 | \$9,585.15 | \$57,510.90 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 344002 | FLEET CHARGES FROM WATER | \$32,810.00 | \$2,734.15 | \$16,404.90 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 344003 | FLEET CHARGES FROM SEWER | \$13,664.00 | \$1,138.65 | \$6,831.90 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 344004 | FLEET CHARGES STORM SEWER | \$13,821.00 | \$1,151.74 | \$6,910.44 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 344005 | FLEET CHARGES UTILITY ADM | \$3,015.00 | \$251.23 | \$1,507.38 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 345001 | CONSUM. CHRGS FROM GF | \$239,050.00 | \$12,714.38 | \$110,940.73 | 46.41% |
| | 13 | 345002 | CONSUM. CHRGS FROM WATER | \$34,000.00 | \$4,014.79 | \$15,716.80 | 46.23% |
| | 13 | 345003 | CONSUM. CHRGS FROM SEWER | \$20,100.00 | \$1,098.99 | \$5,373.41 | 26.73% |
| | 13 | 345004 | CONSUM. CHRGS STORM SEWER | \$17,100.00 | \$337.45 | \$4,453.08 | 26.04% |
| | 13 | 345005 | CONSUM. CHRGS UTIL ADMIN | \$5,650.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,063.04 | 18.81% |
| | 13 | 345006 | CONSUM. CHRGS OUTSIDE SER | \$4,500.00 | \$133.61 | \$1,269.00 | 28.20% |
| | 13 | 346001 | VEHICLE REPLACEMENT GF | \$236,000.00 | \$75,583.33 | \$148,499.98 | 62.92% |
| | 13 | 346002 | VEHICLE REPLACEMENT WATER | \$63,760.00 | \$5,313.33 | \$31,879.98 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 346003 | VEHICLE REPLACEMENT SEWER | \$49,437.00 | \$4,119.75 | \$24,718.50 | 50.00% |
| 13 | 346004 | VEHICLE REPLACEMENT STORM | \$23,000.00 | \$1,916.66 | \$11,499.96 | 50.00% | |

Clearfield City Revenues

December - 50% of Fiscal Year

| Fund Level  | Fiscal Year | Account Code  | Account Title | YTD Budgeted Revenue | December Revenue | YTD Through December | YTD Revenue % |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| 61 | 13 | 346005 | VEHICLE REPLACEMENT UTIL | \$3,502.00 | \$291.83 | \$1,750.98 | 50.00% |
| | 13 | 364001 | SALE OF FIXED ASSETS G/L | \$11,895.00 | \$8,600.00 | \$11,650.00 | 97.94% |
| | 13 | 365001 | FUEL CHARGES | \$0.00 | \$1,045.11 | \$6,313.81 | |
| | 13 | 369001 | MISC REVENUES | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$146.24 | |
| | 13 | 369007 | CLAIMS AND DAMAGES | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$81.47 | |
| 61 | | | | \$886,326.00 | \$130,030.15 | \$464,522.50 | 52.41% |
| 63 | 13 | 344006 | RISK MGMT CHARGES - GF | \$196,554.00 | \$17,654.21 | \$105,925.26 | 53.89% |
| | 13 | 344007 | RISK MGMT CHARGES - WATER | \$20,649.00 | \$2,283.75 | \$13,702.50 | 66.36% |
| | 13 | 344008 | RISK MGMT CHARGES - SEWER | \$8,450.00 | \$1,720.75 | \$10,324.50 | 122.18% |
| | 13 | 344009 | RISK MGMT CHARGES - STORM | \$10,352.00 | \$704.16 | \$4,224.96 | 40.81% |
| | 13 | 344010 | RISK MGMT CHARGES - UTILI | \$28,243.00 | \$212.49 | \$1,274.94 | 4.51% |
| | 13 | 344011 | RISK MGMT CHARGES - FLEET | \$4,130.00 | \$344.16 | \$2,064.96 | 50.00% |
| 63 | | | | \$268,378.00 | \$22,919.52 | \$137,517.12 | 51.24% |
| 70 | 13 | 348002 | PERPETUAL CARE | \$9,000.00 | \$500.00 | \$3,400.00 | 37.78% |
| | 13 | 361001 | INTEREST EARNINGS | \$1,000.00 | \$107.29 | \$959.91 | 95.99% |
| 70 | | | | \$10,000.00 | \$607.29 | \$4,359.91 | 43.60% |
| 14 | Summary | | | \$34,216,613.11 | \$3,799,810.04 | \$16,351,881.82 | 47.79% |

Clearfield City Spending

December 50% of Fiscal year

| Fund Level▲ | Budget Unit▲ | Budget Unit Title | Fiscal Year Budgeted Amount | December Spending | YTD December | YTD Spending % | Remaining Budget | Fiscal Year |
|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| 10 | 104111 | MAYOR & COUNCIL | \$190,045.48 | \$15,690.40 | \$92,057.67 | 48% | \$97,987.81 | 13 |
| | 104121 | JUSTICE COURT | \$385,466.73 | \$25,387.23 | \$161,271.12 | 42% | \$224,195.61 | 13 |
| | 104131 | CITY MANAGER | \$366,938.27 | \$28,069.11 | \$164,725.63 | 45% | \$202,212.64 | 13 |
| | 104132 | CITY RECORDER | \$162,403.73 | \$14,324.89 | \$72,194.47 | 44% | \$90,209.26 | 13 |
| | 104133 | LEGAL | \$262,747.53 | \$20,171.49 | \$113,214.78 | 43% | \$149,532.75 | 13 |
| | 104141 | HUMAN RESOURCES | \$264,118.40 | \$22,730.81 | \$109,928.83 | 42% | \$154,189.57 | 13 |
| | 104142 | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES | \$697,450.64 | \$88,604.86 | \$379,864.45 | 54% | \$317,586.19 | 13 |
| | 104143 | FINANCE | \$560,264.93 | \$42,334.62 | \$249,392.08 | 45% | \$310,872.85 | 13 |
| | 104151 | INTERDEPARTMENTAL SERVICE | \$1,168,706.00 | \$125,732.60 | \$479,075.44 | 41% | \$689,630.56 | 13 |
| | 104161 | BUILDINGS & PLANTS | \$491,271.44 | \$24,142.19 | \$214,515.95 | 44% | \$276,755.49 | 13 |
| | 104172 | ELECTIONS | \$400.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$400.00 | 13 |
| | 104211 | POLICE ADMIN | \$690,295.22 | \$54,216.78 | \$302,372.94 | 44% | \$387,922.28 | 13 |
| | 104212 | PATROL & INVESTIGATIONS | \$2,846,716.89 | \$214,794.52 | \$1,302,346.14 | 46% | \$1,544,370.75 | 13 |
| | 104213 | EMERGENCY SERVICES | \$48,021.10 | \$1,608.65 | \$10,712.69 | 22% | \$37,308.41 | 13 |
| | 104214 | CODE ENFORCEMENT | \$120,395.02 | \$7,188.82 | \$46,543.71 | 39% | \$73,851.31 | 13 |
| | 104215 | DISPATCH | \$559,487.19 | \$39,726.55 | \$232,876.15 | 42% | \$326,611.04 | 13 |
| | 104216 | COMMUNICATIONS, E-911 | \$142,092.00 | \$4,891.61 | \$65,147.10 | 46% | \$76,944.90 | 13 |
| | 104218 | LIQUOR LAW ENFORCEMENT | \$84,963.87 | \$108.15 | \$25,474.77 | 30% | \$59,489.10 | 13 |
| | 104411 | PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN | \$80,183.86 | \$5,136.28 | \$28,979.97 | 36% | \$51,203.89 | 13 |
| | 104413 | ROADWAYS | \$710,128.84 | \$27,268.55 | \$404,860.50 | 57% | \$305,268.34 | 13 |
| | 104511 | COMMUNITY SVCS ADMIN | \$221,309.98 | \$16,718.99 | \$106,766.96 | 48% | \$114,543.02 | 13 |
| | 104521 | PARKS | \$798,962.57 | \$48,869.18 | \$324,231.54 | 41% | \$474,731.03 | 13 |
| | 104561 | RECREATION | \$647,721.95 | \$20,047.64 | \$262,271.18 | 40% | \$385,450.77 | 13 |
| | 104565 | AQUATICS CENTER | \$1,588,773.23 | \$113,161.33 | \$662,034.57 | 42% | \$926,738.66 | 13 |
| | 104591 | CEMETERY | \$4,659.00 | \$1,378.66 | \$1,916.94 | 41% | \$2,742.06 | 13 |
| | 104612 | MARKETING/PR | \$181,008.97 | \$10,367.31 | \$100,608.33 | 56% | \$80,400.64 | 13 |
| | 104613 | BUSINESS LICENSES | \$54,857.01 | \$4,131.10 | \$22,632.73 | 41% | \$32,224.28 | 13 |
| | 104632 | CDBG | \$72,061.59 | \$2,586.21 | \$19,989.51 | 28% | \$52,072.08 | 13 |
| | 104641 | PLANNING & ZONING | \$133,562.19 | \$9,601.89 | \$55,079.25 | 41% | \$78,482.94 | 13 |
| | 104642 | INSPECTIONS | \$97,918.26 | \$8,361.83 | \$44,582.04 | 46% | \$53,336.22 | 13 |
| 104643 | PERMITS | \$56,038.42 | \$4,603.92 | \$23,209.67 | 41% | \$32,828.75 | 13 | |
| 104711 | SALES TAX BOND | \$995,343.75 | \$0.00 | \$753,581.27 | 76% | \$241,762.48 | 13 | |
| 104810 | TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS | \$1,391,459.00 | \$954,335.39 | \$959,165.30 | 69% | \$432,293.70 | 13 | |
| 10 | | | \$16,075,773.06 | \$1,956,291.56 | \$7,791,623.68 | 48% | \$8,284,149.38 | |
| 20 | 204611 | CED | \$535,339.56 | \$51,373.66 | \$170,741.04 | 32% | \$364,598.52 | 13 |

Clearfield City Spending

December 50% of Fiscal year

| Fund Level ▲ | Budget Unit ▲ | Budget Unit Title | Fiscal Year Budgeted Amount | December Spending | YTD December | YTD Spending % | Remaining Budget | Fiscal Year |
|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| 20 | | ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| | 204615 | RDA #9 | \$317,572.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$317,572.00 | 13 |
| | 204616 | RDA #6 | \$259,032.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$259,032.00 | 13 |
| | 204617 | RDA #7 | \$329,680.00 | \$0.00 | \$603.98 | 0% | \$329,076.02 | 13 |
| | 204618 | RDA #8 | \$266,255.00 | \$2,000.00 | \$8,440.50 | 3% | \$257,814.50 | 13 |
| | 204619 | RDA #10 | \$353,466.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$353,466.00 | 13 |
| | 204621 | EDA #1 | \$398,638.00 | \$108,805.28 | \$141,186.61 | 35% | \$257,451.39 | 13 |
| | 204622 | EDA #2 | \$388,034.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$388,034.00 | 13 |
| | 204623 | EDA #3 | \$1,033,117.00 | \$0.00 | \$9,430.00 | 1% | \$1,023,687.00 | 13 |
| 20 | | | \$3,881,133.56 | \$162,178.94 | \$330,402.13 | 9% | \$3,550,731.43 | |
| 31 | 314711 | GO SERIAL BOND | \$1,090,650.00 | \$0.00 | \$177,825.00 | 16% | \$912,825.00 | 13 |
| 31 | | | \$1,090,650.00 | \$0.00 | \$177,825.00 | 16% | \$912,825.00 | |
| 40 | 404521 | PARKS CAPITAL PROJECTS | \$238,092.00 | \$53,521.09 | \$84,092.16 | 35% | \$153,999.84 | 13 |
| 40 | | | \$238,092.00 | \$53,521.09 | \$84,092.16 | 35% | \$153,999.84 | |
| 45 | 454142 | CAP PROJ - IT | \$144,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$144,000.00 | 13 |
| | 454161 | CAP PROJ - BUILDINGS | \$102,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$102,000.00 | 13 |
| | 454410 | CAP PROJ - STREETS | \$1,318,500.00 | \$5,650.70 | \$211,779.60 | 16% | \$1,106,720.40 | 13 |
| | 454632 | CAP PROJ - CDBG | \$159,359.00 | \$1,119.50 | \$3,739.00 | 2% | \$155,620.00 | 13 |
| 45 | | | \$1,723,859.00 | \$6,770.20 | \$215,518.60 | 13% | \$1,508,340.40 | |
| 50 | 505011 | UTILITY ADMINISTRATION | \$181,034.86 | \$8,747.25 | \$75,007.10 | 41% | \$106,027.76 | 13 |
| | 505012 | UTILITY METERS | \$93,484.29 | \$5,391.82 | \$44,030.02 | 47% | \$49,454.27 | 13 |
| 50 | | | \$274,519.15 | \$14,139.07 | \$119,037.12 | 43% | \$155,482.03 | |
| 51 | 515101 | WATER DEPARTMENT | \$3,374,522.38 | \$1,155,991.26 | \$2,177,082.72 | 65% | \$1,197,439.66 | 13 |
| | 515110 | WATER CAPITAL PROJECTS | \$1,014,500.00 | \$247,068.74 | \$456,175.88 | 45% | \$558,324.12 | 13 |
| 51 | | | \$4,389,022.38 | \$1,403,060.00 | \$2,633,258.60 | 60% | \$1,755,763.78 | |
| 52 | 525201 | SEWER DEPARTMENT | \$2,379,087.12 | \$181,020.94 | \$1,177,329.26 | 49% | \$1,201,757.86 | 13 |
| | 525210 | SEWER CAPITAL PROJECTS | \$680,000.00 | \$109,486.04 | \$751,290.24 | 110% | (\$71,290.24) | 13 |
| 52 | | | \$3,059,087.12 | \$290,506.98 | \$1,928,619.50 | 63% | \$1,130,467.62 | |
| 53 | 535301 | STORM SEWER | \$943,587.30 | \$72,668.79 | \$415,900.41 | 44% | \$527,686.89 | 13 |
| | 535310 | STORM SEWER CAPITAL PRJCT | \$589,400.00 | \$7,711.75 | \$731,002.82 | 124% | (\$141,602.82) | 13 |
| 53 | | | \$1,532,987.30 | \$80,380.54 | \$1,146,903.23 | 75% | \$386,084.07 | |
| 54 | 545401 | SOLID WASTE | \$1,230,793.78 | \$58,111.18 | \$529,220.98 | 43% | \$701,572.80 | 13 |
| | 545501 | SOLID WASTE | \$0.00 | \$30,634.53 | \$30,634.53 | | (\$30,634.53) | 13 |
| 54 | | | \$1,230,793.78 | \$88,745.71 | \$559,855.51 | 45% | \$670,938.27 | |

Clearfield City Spending

December 50% of Fiscal year

| Fund Level ▲ | Budget Unit ▲ | Budget Unit Title | Fiscal Year Budgeted Amount | December Spending | YTD December | YTD Spending % | Remaining Budget | Fiscal Year |
|--------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------|
| 61 | 614441 | FLEET MANAGEMENT | \$825,326.48 | \$64,448.25 | \$633,293.69 | 77% | \$192,032.79 | 13 |
| 61 | | | \$825,326.48 | \$64,448.25 | \$633,293.69 | 77% | \$192,032.79 | |
| 63 | 634443 | ISF - RISK MANAGEMENT | \$268,378.00 | \$5,246.08 | \$243,977.96 | 91% | \$24,400.04 | 13 |
| 63 | | | \$268,378.00 | \$5,246.08 | \$243,977.96 | 91% | \$24,400.04 | |
| 70 | 70 | PERPETUAL CEMETERY FUND | \$10,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$10,000.00 | 13 |
| 70 | | | \$10,000.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0% | \$10,000.00 | |
| 15 | Summary | | \$34,599,621.83 | \$4,125,288.42 | \$15,864,407.18 | 46% | \$18,735,214.65 | |

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA AND SUMMARY REPORT
January 22, 2013 – REGULAR SESSION

Clearfield City Hall
55 South State Street
Multi Purpose Room
2nd Floor
Clearfield, Utah

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

6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION

Discussion on the Park Capital Facilities Plan and Park Impact Fee Analysis

(Any items not addressed prior to the Policy Session will be addressed in a Work Session immediately following the Policy Session)

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

7:00 P.M. REGULAR SESSION

CALL TO ORDER:

OPENING CEREMONY:

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Mayor Wood

Councilmember Murray

December 4, 2012 – Work Session

December 11, 2012 – Work Session

January 8, 2013 – Work Session

January 8, 2013 – Regular Session

SCHEDULED ITEMS:

1. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**

2. **CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE REAPPOINTMENT OF RON JONES TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

BACKGROUND: Ron Jones appointment to the Planning Commission would expire in February 2013. Staff recommends Ron Jones be reappointed as a member of the Planning Commission for a term expiring in February 2018.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the reappointment of Ron Jones to the Planning Commission for a term to expire in February 2018 and authorize the Mayor's signature to any necessary documents.

3. **CONSIDER APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2013R-01 SUPPORTING PROGRAMS OFFERED AT CLEARFIELD JOB CORPS**

COMMUNICATION ITEMS:

Mayor's Report
City Councils' Reports
City Manager's Report
Staffs' Reports

*****COUNCIL MEETING ADJOURN*****

Dated this 17th day of January, 2013.

/s/Kimberly S. Read, Deputy 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.