

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
November 21, 2017

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush	Councilmember
	Nike Peterson	Councilmember
	Vern Phipps	Councilmember
	Tim Roper	Councilmember
	Bruce Young	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	Adam Lenhard	City Manager
	JJ Allen	Assistant City Manager
	Stuart Williams	City Attorney
	Scott Hodge	Public Works Director
	Greg Krusi	Police Chief
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Curtis Dickson	Community Services Deputy Dir.
	Summer Palmer	Administrative Services Director
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
	Wendy Page	Deputy Recorder

VISITORS: Brady Jugler – Planning Commission Chair, Shawn Beus – Davis County Economic Development, Megan Christensen – Davis County Economic Development

CITY COUNCIL TOUR OF THE CITY CENTRE APARTMENTS LOCATED AT 70 SOUTH STATE STREET

Mayor Shepherd, the City Council, and staff participated in a tour on site of the City Centre Apartments located at 70 South State Street.

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

The tour adjourned at 6:32 p.m.

Following the City Council Tour of the City Centre Apartments, the City Council met in the executive conference room located at the Clearfield City Building, 55 South State Street, to convene in a City Council work session.

The Council reconvened at City Hall, 55 South State Street, Clearfield, Utah, at 6:45 p.m.

PRESENTATION BY DAVIS COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Shawn Beus, Davis County Economic Development Manager, reviewed economic development, its approach, affordable housing, how it was measured, the County's plan, the Governor's Economic Clusters, its improvements pyramid, its development tools, and its loan fund. He shared a few thoughts for the City's consideration when planning for local development:

- Main Street improvements
- Façade program had a potential use of money from the loan fund
- Interchange beautification
- Support local small business
- Lifetime expansion – the County would gladly be the City's partner with any upcoming meetings
- Clearfield Station

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, commented during the presentation that affordable housing would be nice to see south of Layton City as was mentioned by Mr. Beus. He added it was an important issue to find balance within the County as well as local cities. Mr. Beus remarked affordable housing had been a hot topic throughout the development community. He informed the Council that when sites were reviewed for mega developments, always an additional component was the discussion of affordable workforce housing.

Councilmember Phipps commented he was surprised that job creation was not one of the metrics used to measure economic development. Mr. Beus indicated it was one of the main and critical things used as measurement and was also surprised it was not included on the presentation spread sheet.

Meagan Christensen, Davis County Economic Development Coordinator, requested awareness of the loan fund be shared with local businesses or those looking to expand, start up, or continue to stay in the community. Mayor Shepherd shared a few examples of local businesses which had benefitted from the loan fund. Mr. Beus indicated the average loan size was \$260,000. He reiterated he was promoting partnership between the City and County in helping economic development grow and thrive on the local level.

DISCUSSION ON A PIPELINE CROSSING AGREEMENT WITH THE UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD FOR THE FREEPORT G STREET SEWER PROJECT LOCATED AT FREEPORT G STREET BETWEEN 3RD AND 5TH STREETS

Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, stated the agreement process with Union Pacific Railroad began several months ago but the City was waiting until a similar project on H Street was ready so the Council could review both agreements at the same time. He indicated due to some design problems with the other project, staff determined to move forward with the Freeport G Street Sewer Project and noticed the agreement included language in the cover letter that after six months it would become void. He noted since the deadline had passed, Union Pacific had been contacted about updating the agreement so it could be executed allowing the City to proceed as initially planned. He mentioned the file would be reviewed and the City should hear back from Union Pacific representatives to know if there would need to be any revisions.

Mr. Hodge explained anytime the City had work that needed to go underneath the railroad it would need to execute a similar agreement. He indicated the sewer project on G Street between 3rd and 5th Streets was the first area of the project and there would be others in the future requiring an agreement at each railroad spur location.

He stated years ago the City installed a 15-inch sewer line at 1000 West and into the Freeport Center and then over the years systematically continued working that line through the Freeport area. Mr. Hodge noted G Street would be the next phase of the project which entailed replacing an 8-inch line with a 12-inch line. He continued in the past the City had volume problems and up sizing the line would allow more capacity for the flow.

Mr. Hodge asked if the Council had any concerns with the agreement. He added it was a standard agreement and others in the future would be similar.

Councilmember Phipps asked if a flagger would be needed for that type of project. Mr. Hodge responded he did not think it would be necessary for the proposed project, but if it was necessary the contractor would pay for those expenditures. Councilmember Phipps commented he found a typing error in the agreement and he would identify it later.

Mr. Hodge commented he was not sure when the agreement would be returned with any revisions, but it was planned as an agenda item during the policy session on November 28, 2017. The consensus of the Council was to move forward as planned with policy session.

DISCUSSION ON THE AMERICOLD MURAL PROJECT LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 755 EAST 1700 SOUTH

Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, reviewed the background, scope, options with examples, questions for consideration, and then sought direction from the Council for the Americold mural project. He explained Americold which was located at 755 East 1700 South and had recently completed construction on a second building to expand its operations. Mr. Cahoon continued that during a site visit JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, asked Americold representatives about the possibility of using the new building's eastern façade which overlooked Clearfield Station for a gateway sign or mural. He added Americold was interested; however, put limitations on the design to help with heat retention and required final approval of the proposed design.

Mr. Cahoon discussed the size of the area, durability of the paint, potential start date during the Spring of 2018, prime exposure, and using a lighter color palate to limit heat absorption. He indicated the building face was 45 feet by 300 feet. He commented one coat of paint for the entire area would require about 45 gallons; however, consideration could be given for only doing a portion of the wall to save money.

Mr. Cahoon highlighted the various options available and the necessary steps to solicit and complete the project. He began with Option A which included a professional artist design and install. He indicated staff would post a request for qualifications (RFQ) on state and national art

boards; however, the artistic style and pricing would be subjective. Councilmember Young wondered why a request for proposal (RFP) would not be the better option to solicit artwork. Mr. Cahoon explained the State recommended an RFQ first and then those that were qualified would submit an RFP in a two part process. He added both requests would also be open to the public. There was a discussion about the criteria, parameters, timeframe, themes, and price ranges which could be included in an RFP that could attract the type of artwork desired.

Mr. Cahoon indicated the price range for Option A would range from \$20,000 to about \$600,000. He asked if there were any additional questions about Option A. Councilmember Phipps wondered if the City did not like any of the proposals, could all be rejected with an option to move the project in a different direction. Mr. Cahoon confirmed that was a possibility.

Councilmember Phipps questioned if there were local examples to obtain a pricing estimate. Mr. Cahoon responded he had talked to Ogden City and done other research anticipating it would cost about \$50,000 or more to have an artist do the project.

Councilmember Bush asked if there were windows on the eastern side of the building. Mr. Cahoon answered there was nothing on that side other than some lighting.

Mr. Cahoon reviewed Option B of having a design contest and volunteers install the artwork. He noted South Ogden City did a similar project for its water tanks. He explained the City would need to determine a cash award amount for the contest winner, send a press release out calling for artists, select the design, coordinate staff or volunteers, and stencil and paint the mural. Mr. Cahoon mentioned with Option B the design would not be as detailed; however, would still require staff time and resources. There was a discussion about equipment needed, volunteers versus staff installation, liability concerns, public access to the building, and potential for graffiti.

Mr. Cahoon stated the budget for using Option B would need to include a cash award amount and costs for materials which would range from \$8,000 to \$10,000. He asked if there were any questions about Option B. Councilmember Phipps asked if the City could contract for the installation rather than having volunteers doing the work. Mr. Cahoon responded contracting the work could always be considered.

Mr. Cahoon reviewed Option C which included having staff design and oversee volunteer installation of a gateway sign that was less detailed. He cautioned the sign had a life expectancy of 15 years and if the City's logo was part of the design it could run the risk of becoming outdated. He described an example he had designed using lighter colors which included the City logo and the Americold logo and was shown to Americold for its approval of the color palate.

Councilmember Phipps questioned if Americold anticipated its logo would also be on the wall. Mr. Cahoon answered Americold was putting its logo on the wall; however, the larger portion of the wall was available for the City to consider for its mural or gateway signage. There was a discussion about copyrights, trademarks, logos, and cost similarities with Options B and C.

Mr. Cahoon stated Option D would be not doing any artwork on the building. The consensus of the Council was to make the most of the wall and use it to beautify the City. There was lengthy discussion about the Americold mural project and the following key points were addressed:

- Project timing with upcoming development at Clearfield Station
- Project involvement levels from the community, local businesses, and/or contracted professionals
- Project goals of establishing a place which could welcome and introduce the City with artwork in an iconic way
- Project budget and funding sources
- Project Options A, B, and C pros and cons
- Project strategy for soliciting artist versus local talent
- Project impacts – changes in the City Code and potential future murals or building artwork
- Project benefits which included pride for the City, advertising, branding and recognition
- Project investment level for the quality desired and \$50,000 was mentioned as a conservative starting point
- Project parameters regarding the City’s rights to owning the artwork, design contest, cash award, and the possibility of having the selected artist oversee completion of the mural.
- Project theme - Clearfield rising was mentioned along with the theme needing to be simplistic, have longevity, and bring in elements of City pride

Mr. Cahoon requested to know the direction the Council preferred in moving forward with the project. The consensus of the Council was to proceed with Option B, having staff set the parameters for the design competition with a cash award valued at \$5,000, involving the media to announce and solicit local artists, utilize community involvement with minimal liability, and in conjunction begin to draft in language for the City Code which defined public art and set guidelines in relation so it could be in place prior to the mural’s creation. Mr. Cahoon emphasized that the Council would select the contest winner, but the City would not be obligated to use the design for its mural and could go another direction in the future if needed.

DISCUSSION ON THE RECREATION COST RECOVERY MODEL

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, stated during a previous work session discussion held on October 3, 2017, the Council requested to know what it would take to have the tackle football program have its self-sufficiency be at 80 percent to align with the cost recovery model. He added the Council also requested to know the cost of the program in comparison to the surrounding communities. He reviewed a few options for consideration and compared the City’s fees for football with others throughout the Wasatch Front.

Mr. Dickson reviewed the option of increasing the fees and discussed the impact of scholarship funds. He explained the scholarship fund was derived by allocating \$1 from every individual registration fee and \$10 from any team registration fee to the fund. He indicated scholarship funds could be viewed as expenditures or break even costs to the City and its determination would control the amount of increase necessary for participant fees. Mr. Dickson noted current fees were \$110 for each participant and \$27.50 for those on scholarship. He acknowledged if scholarships were considered an expense the price for each participant would need to increase to

\$165 or \$41.25 for those on scholarship to be in line with the cost recovery model. He stated if the scholarship program was viewed as a break even cost to the City then fees should increase to \$136 per participant and \$24 for those on scholarship.

Mr. Dickson highlighted the expenses for the football program which included fixed costs from the Wasatch Front Football League (WFFL); controlled costs, mostly for equipment, where the City could make minimal adjustments; and part time staffing levels. He explained full time staff expenditures were not included in the cost analysis. He also noted there would likely be an increase to WFFL costs in 2018 to incentivize good officials to stay in the League.

Mr. Dickson suggested three alternatives for the City's recreation tackle football program.

- Leave the program fees and self-sufficiency as budgeted for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 which was about 50 percent self-sufficiency; however, the category on the cost recovery model was overall at 80 percent.
- Adjust the fees, equipment purchases and staff hours as necessary to better fit the department's overall goals and objectives outlined in the cost recovery model.
- Dissolve the City's tackle football program leaving participants to play elsewhere or form a parent run tackle football program of its own.

Councilmember Phipps wondered what percentage the cost recovery would be if all participants were to pay the full amount for fees rather than the scholarship amounts. Mr. Dickson answered if all participants paid the full amount the tackle football program was still about 63 percent self-sufficient.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if the equipment costs were sufficient. Mr. Dickson responded the City budgeted to allow every four years for new equipment except the helmets which were refurbished each year. He added the jerseys were purchased every year and the children were allowed to keep them at the end of the season.

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, added if the City intended to keep the program, the equipment sheds were in need of replacement and that should also be a consideration factor because of the involved costs. He further requested to know the desire of the Council since the subsidy given towards the football program clearly did not fall within the cost recovery model and there was significant disparity between the cost of each participant and the other recreation programs' costs.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his desire to measure the program in comparison to neighboring communities and recognized the City was in the middle of the range for its football program. Councilmember Young expressed his opinion the program should fall within the 80 percent cost recovery model. Mr. Dickson asked if the goal would be to get each individual program to the percentage of the category rather than the group as a whole. Councilmember Young commented he would prefer to see football in line with the other sport programs. He continued it was an expensive program to subsidize which impacted fewer children yet had greater liability. There was a discussion about increasing the fees, keeping costs within the average range of neighboring cities, and the impact should the City choose to eliminate the program.

The consensus of the Council was to keep the tackle football program by increasing the fees to \$136 per participant and recognizing the scholarship fund would be similar to revenue offsetting those fees for participants which qualified. There was a discussion about allowing and helping teams offset costs for equipment or uniforms by fundraising or obtaining sponsorships.

The consensus of the Council was to bring the self-sufficiency level of the football program in line with the cost recovery model and over the next year let teams know about the pending changes so costs could be mitigated by fundraising, obtaining sponsorships, increased fees and awareness of the scholarship fund for qualified participants. Mr. Dickson commented the City would begin in January to announce the increased fees so teams could plan ahead for impacts associated with next season.

Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in CDRA work session at 8:49 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Young. Voting NO – None.

The minutes for the CDRA are in a separate location

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 9th day of January, 2018**

/s/Mark R. Shepherd, Mayor

ATTEST:

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Clearfield City Council meeting held Tuesday, November 21, 2017.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder