

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
September 12, 2017

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

VISITORS PRESENT: Kathryn Murray, Robert Stotts

Mayor Pro Tem Bush called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE INTENT TO REORGANIZE
THE NORTH DAVIS FIRE DISTRICT AS A LOCAL DISTRICT SERVICE AREA

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, stated the North Davis Fire District (NDFD) Administrative Control Board passed a resolution on August 17, 2017, recommending the City Council, as the governing body, authorize a change in NDFD's governing structure from a special service district to a local district service area. He explained the main change resulting from the reorganization was the NDFD Administrative Control Board would be the governing body instead of the City Council. Mr. Lenhard reminded the Council that the primary reason Clearfield was originally set up as the governing body was because it contributed a large portion of assets to the District when it was organized. He stated reorganization would impact the City by

simplifying administrative processes for staff; however, the Council would no longer have input on the District's tax rate except through its representatives on the Administrative Control Board.

Councilmember Peterson requested Kathryn Murray share some founding perspectives with the Council. Kathryn Murray indicated Councilmember Phipps was also serving on the City Council when the NDFD was organized. Councilmember Phipps, who was actually involved shortly after the creation of the NDFD, said there were many items considered during the formation period. He recalled concerns about how the board would be configured, non-elected versus elected officials as board members, customer base for each city, and assets contributed by the City to the District. He acknowledged most of the concerns from the beginning were no longer relevant.

Councilmember Phipps asked what the legal difference was between a Special Service District and a Local Service District. Mr. Lenhard responded it would simply mean Clearfield City would no longer act as the governing body for the District.

Councilmember Peterson stated she did not have any concerns about the District being organized as a local service district; however, she expressed concerns with the timing especially while there was uncertainty about Sunset City's annexation into the District boundaries. She suggested waiting until after the annexation process was completed or authorizing the reorganization under the condition that Sunset City was annexed into the District. Councilmember Peterson voiced her concern about reorganizing the District if Sunset City's Annexation failed. She stated it seemed better to remain the governing body with a controlling vote under a two city configuration even though it required more administrative work on the part of the City. Councilmember Peterson mentioned the Administrative Control Board had been discussing what representation there would be on the Board and what factors (tax base, population or equality) would be considered as it transitioned to a local service district.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the reorganization was needed or timed specifically to be compatible with the annexation process. Nancy Dean, City Recorder, explained the protest period for the annexation would be completed by the end of November and anticipated the entire process, if approved, would finalize by mid December 2017. She mentioned the action to consider reorganization of the NDFD was not planned for discussion until after the annexation process. Councilmember Phipps questioned if the structure of the new board would need to be determined before the reorganization. Mr. Lenhard stated no; however, the Council should consider if it might be in the best interest to have some control over those decisions while the City was still the governing body. There was a discussion about how the board could be configured.

Councilmember Peterson indicated that members of the board had differing opinions regarding the structure of the board after reorganization. She mentioned there had been discussions on whether or not there should be board member representation based on population of comprising cities or if it would be better for the District's expansion to have equalized board membership without a controlling entity. Councilmember Peterson acknowledged there were many possibilities being considered some included restructuring the board each time a new city was added to the district, equalizing board members, or keeping a controlling body. Councilmember Phipps asked if non-elected officials would be on the board. Councilmember Peterson

anticipated it would only be elected officials because legislators were working towards doing away with “at large” positions.

Nancy Dean, City Recorder, explained the reorganization would be required to be adopted by resolution and language on the structure of the board or specific representation from each city could be included in the proposed resolution. Councilmember Young suggested waiting until the structure of the board was determined before considering the action for reorganization. Councilmember Peterson noted the City could outline conditions before it would agree to the reorganization. Councilmember Phipps stated if it was in the best interest of the taxpayers of the three communities to have its own District then the board should be allowed to determine its configuration. There was a discussion about differing board structures, whether or not there was a need for the Council to stipulate conditions for the reorganization, the annexation process and timeline, and what formalities were involved with reorganization.

Councilmember Young mentioned as the current governing body for the District there was still an opportunity to make decisions based on what was in the best interest of the City and its residents. Councilmember Peterson asked if there were any concerns she should address with the Administrative Control Board for the District. Councilmember Young pointed out it would be advantageous for the City if the board structure was based on population; however, other boards had equal representation and were just as effective when working towards a specific goal.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the Council was concerned with letting the District’s board determine its own configuration. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion Sunset City, if annexed into the District, should also be included in the decision of how the board would be structured. Councilmember Peterson explained Sunset City would not have a vote unless the annexation was completed; however, it had been invited to comment throughout the process. She continued Sunset City Council had not determined who would be an ex officio member to participate with the board under its current configuration. Councilmember Phipps reasoned if the City imposed a structure for the board it could change the structure once it was allowed to operate as a local district. Councilmember Young expressed his desire to know the board structure prior to approving the reorganization.

Councilmember Peterson expressed she did not want to formalize the NDFD reorganization until the will of the Sunset City voters was determined and the annexation process was completed. There was a discussion about potential opposition to the annexation from Sunset residents and the petition process. Councilmember Phipps asked if there was any reason why the annexation and reorganization were being done at the same time. Councilmember Peterson answered it was not necessary to complete them at the same time; however, due to the length of time needed for a reorganization it seemed appropriate to move forward because of the potential annexation.

Councilmember Young stated announcing intent to reorganize the Fire District and holding a public hearing were only the first steps in the process. He continued the decision about reorganization could be delayed if necessary until the Council was ready.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the vote from the District’s board to reorganize was unanimous. Councilmember Peterson indicated West Point City was in favor of the board operating

independently and proposed the idea for consideration. She continued West Point City had been in favor of reorganization for a while and was pushing to have equal representation from each city for the District's board.

Councilmember Phipps stated it was unclear if the Council desired to take action on the reorganization prior to knowing the configuration of the board. Councilmember Young acknowledged the Council could express intent to reorganize and expect to have some clarification on questions or details of the structure prior to allowing the reorganization. He also noted announcing intent to reorganize would allow the public to voice concerns during the process which could also lead to developing the final structure of the board.

TOUR OF THE CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTER

The Council participated in a tour of the Customer Service Center located on the first floor of the City Building at 55 South State Street. Summer Palmer, Administrative Services Manager, guided Council around the work area of customer service clerks and discussed many of the services which would be provided at the Customer Service Center.

Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in policy session at 6:54 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Young. All voting AYE.

The work session reconvened at 7:20 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2017/2018 BUDGET

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, stated all of the proposed budget amendments except one were rolled over from fiscal year 2017. He asked Terrence Jackson, IT Manager, to explain more about the Spillman mapping software update which was the only new item. Mr. Jackson noted a software update was needed for Spillman which was the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) software used in the dispatch center for police and fire calls. He explained the budget amendment would allow Spillman software to be updated to a version that would be compatible with the City's Geographic Information Systems (GIS) which was where all the maps were stored. He added Sunset City maps were not yet in the CAD system and dispatchers needed those to assist North Davis Fire District responding to fire calls. He concluded State Road (SR) 193 and other new developments within the City were not accessible with the current software, but purchasing the update would allow all the necessary maps and compatibility between the GIS and CAD programs.

Councilmember Peterson stated it was a good way to spend money.

Mr. Knapp indicated all other items were roll over funds highlighting the proposed budget amendments as follows:

- Spillman Mapping Update
- 3M Finger Print Scanner
- Eventide Recorder System
- Re-key City Hall

- Arts Center Architectural Design

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, asked if the Council needed any further information about the budget amendments that were proposed.

Councilmember Phipps asked why the items were not included in the current budget. Mr. Knapp responded the budget needed to be approved by June 22, 2017 and all except the Spillman Mapping Update were approved expenditures in last year's budget; however, the projects were not able to be completed prior to the end of the fiscal year, so they needed to be approved as amendments to be moved to the new record books for the 2017/2018 fiscal year budget.

Councilmember Bush asked if the Art Center Architectural Design was for the interior of the building. Mr. Howes answered affirmatively that electrical was the first part of the process and it included the first floor and part of the second floor interior.

DISCUSSION ON THE INDIGENT DEFENSE GRANT APPLICATION

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager stated a group called the Sixth Amendment Center completed a report analyzing the State of Utah court system's ability to provide quality indigent defense for those that needed a public defender. He explained the study showed contracts with public defenders which had fees based on a flat rate per month regardless of the number of cases as problematic. He continued if there was a high case load and an attorney was paid a flat monthly fee there might be less motivation to provide quality service to clients.

Mr. Allen noted when the City last updated its contract with a public defender it changed from the flat rate monthly fees to per case fees for services. He mentioned previously the public defender contract was based on a flat rate fee totaling \$13,800 annually. He continued there was not a full year of data to review with the new contract based on per case fees; however, costs were tracking towards \$56,000.

He commented another outcome of the study by the Sixth Amendment Center was the State of Utah established the Indigent Defense Commission and provided it with some money to help the court systems deal with the funding problem. He remarked the City was eligible for grant funding; however, it would not be ongoing funding. Mr. Allen stated the matching grant money would cover the difference between what the prior contract dollar amount was and the increased expenditure under the current contract which could total about \$50,000.

Mr. Allen announced the Indigent Defense Commission (IDC) opened up the grant process and was taking applications. He noted Juab County had been awarded a grant because the IDC recognized that Juab County and Utah County were working together and was supportive of regionalization. He expressed his impression after communications with the IDC there could be some funding available for the City to become the poster child because of its efforts to move forward with per case fees; however, it was unclear if the IDC would be a stickler for regionalization within the area before awarding any funding to the City. Mr. Allen stated the application would require a resolution be adopted by the Council wherein it would be required to allocate the grant funding for quality indigent defense and representation. He continued the IDC

recognized it was requesting data that could not be generated or replicated and methods for tracking were not yet designed. He mentioned the court software system “CORIS” did not track cases that had been assigned a public defender. Mr. Allen explained the data requested could be produced manually; however, reliability and reproducibility would be difficult. He expressed his opinion that CORIS needed to assist with the tracking.

He wondered if the Council would be in favor of staff preparing the grant application for IDC funding and a resolution which could be considered during a future policy session. Mr. Allen asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the grant was State funded. Mr. Allen responded it was one time funding from the legislature and could be requested again; however, the funding might not be available in the future.

Councilmember Peterson questioned if the State was planning to update CORIS so data could be more reliable and less labor intensive for reporting purposes. Mr. Allen stated he was unsure if CORIS would be updated. He mentioned Kodi Nelson, Court Administrator, communicated regularly with CORIS requesting functionality and was more familiar with that probability.

Councilmember Young wondered if it would be possible or feasible to have regionalization by selecting a public defender that could work full time and move around to the areas that needed assistance. Mr. Allen speculated the IDC probably would be moving towards control of public defense but was uncertain how or if that would happen. There was a discussion about the fiscal impacts for the State of Utah to fund a public defense system, local versus state control, and how the IDC might be instrumental in working with CORIS to have additional functionality for reporting as it pushed forward with the goal of providing quality indigent defense services.

Councilmember Phipps asked if other cities had moved from paying a fixed price for public defenders. Mr. Allen responded other courts could be waiting to act until mandated to do so and some smaller justice courts did not provide indigent defense services. There was a discussion about movement towards a state run system, case load, and grant funding options.

Mr. Allen stated the IDC had grant funds available for either matching or emergency needs. He explained the City qualified for the matching grant. Councilmember Phipps asked if the grant was funded at 50 percent matching funds. Mr. Allen answered the matching grant could cover up to the increase in spending. He continued the City’s costs for indigent defense were about \$14,000 and increased to approximately \$56,000, so the matching grant application would be for the difference in those costs. Mr. Phipps asked how much funding was available. Mr. Allen recalled about \$400,000 was allocated for grant funding; however, it was one time money.

The general consensus of the Council was to move forward with the grant application and resolution preparation while funds were available. Mr. Allen indicated the City would have a commitment of reporting the data should grant funding be awarded.

DISCUSSION ON THE UPDATE TO THE CITY'S TRAILS MASTER PLAN

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, acknowledged updates were forthcoming to the City's Trails Master Plan and staff had engaged JUB Engineering to begin the process. He explained maps had been updated to include those not in the 2004 version of the plan. He briefly reviewed the contents of the original plan which included the introduction, methodology, existing conditions, trails beyond Clearfield, trail routes, citizen input, development standards, trail implementation, funding, references, and appendix. Mr. Howes explained the differences in Class I, Class II, and Class III designations for the trails.

Councilmember Phipps asked if JUB Engineering would be updating the plan. Mr. Howes responded some of the text would require updates and JUB Engineering would be assisting with that process. Councilmember Phipps wondered if public input would be received as part of the update to the plan. Mr. Howes responded there was a public open house scheduled to receive input for the City's Trails Master Plan on September 13, 2017. He acknowledged another meeting could be held if needed because there was not a strict timeframe for completing the updates.

Mr. Howes stated the structure of the plan was in place and the main trail locations extending from Davis County to Weber County through the City should only require some minor connection updates. He reviewed the existing trails noting specifically the Canal Trail which had multiple trail class designations along the route from 200 South to 300 North including mostly sidewalks and streets. Mr. Howes indicated with the canal now underground in the area, the Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company was amenable to the City developing the trail along the canal corridor in exchange for the City's continued maintenance of the property. He continued reviewing the existing and proposed trail maps with the Council.

Councilmember Phipps questioned if the Steed Park area trails would be included on the maps or if those were considered pathways rather than trails. Mr. Howes explained trail systems were considered routes to get you from one place to another. He noted the trails around Steed Park could be included but were not previously because they did not connect to other places. He stated many of the parks had similar trail systems which could be reflected in the updates.

Councilmember Bush wondered if Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company (DWCCC) would allow the City to pave the canal trail. Mr. Howes responded it could be paved; however, there would be challenges to work out with residents and the DWCCC which would propose a barrier between the property lines and the trail. Councilmember Bush suggested planting trees along the trail.

Councilmember Young asked if the trail near 700 South and 1350 West was privately owned or if it was a City trail. Mr. Allen, Assistant City Manager, recalled the trail head was located in Clearfield; however, the trail was in Syracuse City. Councilmember Young wondered if the City's Trails Master Plan should include the Syracuse City trail showing total connectivity or at least the location of the trail head. Mr. Howes agreed the trail head should be included on the existing and proposed trail maps.

There was a discussion about whether or not 1000 West, SR-193 and other busy roads should be classified as trails. Mr. Howes explained the trails were identified on the map and the plan was to look at existing areas trying to find where it made sense to tie areas together for connectivity. He noted there might not be any good options for trails going east to west. He mentioned the process would require working with the public, the consultants, and another review with the Council before final approval.

Councilmember Phipps mentioned in a prior discussion there was a desire to have connectivity from the future ropes and challenge course to the Rail Trail and wondered if that was included on the proposed trails map. Mr. Howes directed attention to the map and answered that it could be easily connected because there was already a trail near the location.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the trail classifications (Class I, Class II, and Class III) were terminology used regionally or only by the City. Mr. Howes answered the classifications were broadly accepted and based on national standards.

Councilmember Phipps questioned if the Powerline Trail was in the City's future plans and if there was funding available for its construction. Mr. Howes indicated the Powerline Trail was included as a proposed trail in the City's and Davis County's and Weber County's master plans; however, it was not included in the City's long term funding goals. Councilmember Young asked if the lands under the power lines were already being used for other purposes. Mr. Howes responded Rocky Mountain Power had multiple lease agreements along the powerline corridor which was the main reason nothing had further developed with that specific trail. Councilmember Phipps wondered if Davis County had allocated funding for the Powerline Trail. Mr. Howes answered he was not aware if the County had any funding for that trail.

Mr. Lenhard asked what the process would be to update the plan. Mr. Howes commented the goal moving forward would be to gather feedback from the Council, the public, and involve the Parks and Recreation Commission with the help of the consultant to consolidate that feedback into the updated plan. He explained the intent was not to start over with the plan but rather update the plan already in place and hopefully improve the connections running east to west.

There was a discussion about the fiscal perspective of the Council which would be an essential component for plan implementation. Councilmember Peterson suggested adding a proposed trail along Depot Street which would provide connectivity as had been discussed in previous meetings while planning for development at the Clearfield Station. There was a discussion about funding options for trail development which included grants and impact fees. Mr. Allen commented park impact fees were a possible funding source; however, the park impact fee study would need to be updated to include trails so those facilities could be eligible for impact fees.

Councilmember Young asked if there was a priority schedule for the proposed trails. Mr. Howes acknowledged the trails implementation section was included in the plan and it would need updating. He explained the priorities listed from 2004 were near or substantially complete. He stated the Powerline Trail was on the list of priorities; however, it would require further coordination efforts with other cities before trail development would be useful. There was a

discussion about possibly including trails which led to places in the City that were planned for development and included in the Small Area or Station Area Plans.

It was the consensus of the Council to have the Parks and Recreation Commission move forward with updating the City's Trails Master Plan and bring its recommendations to the Council at a later date.

DISCUSSION ON CELLULAR TOWER PLACEMENTS

JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, explained staff was approached earlier in the year by a cell tower company, Vertical Bridge, about the possibility of leasing space at Steed Park for the construction of a cell tower which would improve its service area. He acknowledged staff entered into discussions with the company from the perspective of a landlord. He indicated the optimal site for the tower was on the south east end of Steed Park where a maintenance shed had recently been removed. Mr. Allen stated a draft lease agreement had been prepared which was under review with Vertical Bridge and its attorneys.

He reviewed the highlights of the agreement with the Council which included the following:

- Vertical Bridge would have an option to lease for up to two years on the 2,500 square foot premises until it decided to move forward with construction, at which point the lease would commence.
- The lease would allow for up to 10 five-year terms (the initial term plus nine automatic renewals). This would allow Vertical Bridge to align the land lease with the leases it would have with service providers on the tower, which were also typically five-years.
- Rent for the option would be \$1,000 per year. Rent for the lease would be \$1,250 per month, with an annual escalation factor of two percent.
- The City would be allowed to place on the tower some small communications equipment, improving its connectivity between City facilities.
- Vertical Bridge would install a paved driveway from the parking lot to the leased premises, and would reconfigure the walking path in that vicinity.
- The City would be precluded from leasing any other portion of the South Steed park parcel to another cell tower company.
- The tower would be a monopole design, similar to others in the City.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his concern about having enough room for a paved driveway from the parking lot running along the tennis courts. Mr. Howes, Community Services Director, explained there was about thirty (30) feet between the trunks of the trees and the fences. Councilmember Bush asked if the area surrounding the tower would be fenced. Mr. Allen responded the area would be completely fenced and secured.

Mr. Allen reported the original design presented was a stealth pole tree design; however, staff opted to have the tower be a monopole design which would generate greater revenue from rental fees than a disguised pole. Councilmember Bush questioned if the height of the tower was known. Mr. Allen acknowledged the initial requested height was 100 feet but thought more recent discussions included a proposal for an 80 foot tower. Mr. Brimley commented due to

limitations with code and not yet knowing the exact location of the pole to compare with other surrounding structures, the tower would likely not be the desired 100 feet tall.

Mr. Allen recognized the park was zoned Public Facilities (PF) and communication towers were permitted uses in those zones. He explained there would not be a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or public hearing; however, the site plan would still require approval. He stated given the circumstances there would not be any notification of the project to the neighbors unless the City chose to announce it.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his concern about not wanting to impact usability of the trail. He wondered what the impacts would be and if there were any details about how it would be rerouted. Mr. Howes responded he met with company representatives on site and described the proposed plans to reroute the trail through the trees on the east side of the tennis courts which would continue to allow for connection to the Rail Trail. Councilmember Phipps wondered if the trees would be removed. Mr. Howes responded all the trees would remain in place but the lower branches would need to be pruned.

Mr. Allen noted the primary tenant would be T-Mobile. Councilmember Young wondered if there were any other market bidders. He acknowledged the City had not advertised the leasing option. He noted that any interested competitors would have a desired radius in which to locate a tower; therefore, the City had not pursued soliciting bids for leasing portions of land.

Mr. Allen asked if the Council wanted staff to continue pursuing the opportunity. The consensus of the Council was to move forward with negotiations and begin the site plan approval process. Councilmember Phipps wondered if the commercial value of the lease was appropriate. Mr. Allen responded the amount of \$1,250 per month was average for leasing the land. He explained if the City owned the vertical structure the lease amount could be higher. Mr. Lenhard, City Manager, commented there was potential to lease an existing tower in the City in addition to the site at Steed Park and both were being considered.

Mr. Allen requested feedback about how the City should proceed with notification to the neighborhood about construction of a tower. There was a discussion about notification which included communication with construction details, contact information for questions, and timing notification after the site plan approval yet prior to construction, and considering earmarking the money generated from revenues for City beautification projects.

The Council took a break at 8:25 p.m.

The Council reconvened at 8:31 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PLAN (EOP)

Adam Lenhard, City Manager, stated Laura Lewis, Emergency Preparedness Manager, approached him about updating the Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) document because it contained some dated information. He explained several items were fixed and brought to Council for review during work session on August 22, 2017. He indicated historically the EOP was

essentially inherited from the State of Utah and Davis County with minor updates as necessary to customize it for the City of Clearfield. Mr. Lenhard said the EOP was originally drafted as a condition for the City's eligibility for emergency management grant funding. He commented the document had been in place for several years and would be adequate; however, after receiving feedback from Council he wanted to discuss the approach Council would recommend in either crafting or amending the document to accomplish a finished product that would be of value to staff, the Council, as well as businesses and residents of the City.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his concern with the hazards that were unique to the City. He noted envisioning the EOP as a document which would offer details of how to respond to and recover from emergency situations specific to those hazards. He stated a plan should include hazards, stakeholders, actions, roles and responsibilities. There was a discussion about the desired components which should be included in the City's EOP. JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager, made a list which highlighted the discussion topics essentially as follows:

- Hazards unique to Clearfield – Freeport Center, railroads, Hill Air Force Base, and Interstate (I-15)
- Actionable plan – description of roles in common terms (City Council, staff, stakeholder responsibilities)
 - “How to” steps
- Council wanted to understand its role
 - Is it just dissemination of information
- Three versions of the plan or at least sections within the plan for specific roles which indicated what should be done when an emergency happened
 - Legalese for the emergency managers
 - Internal plan for staff and Council in everyday language – 5-10 pages; practical; cliff notes; graphics; check lists; social media kit
 - Action plan at the resident level; how residents interface with the City; what the public needs to know; animal plan; resource descriptions (FEMA, State, City, Red Cross, etc.)
- Once the plan was adopted it would be important to have educational or communication component to help with training
- Budgetary impact of creating a new EOP, educational pieces, outreach, etc.
 - Outsource; internal staff; or a coordinated effort
 - 311 in budget; it would cost \$1,200 per month
 - Training in Emmitsburg, Maryland
- EOP needed to be customized for and specific to Clearfield; former document was too generic
- Victim advocate needed to be addressed in the EOP. The role in an emergency was outside the scope of the City's victim advocate but there were affiliate organizations which could be a resource
- How should the City address social needs (mental and emotional health)

- Coordination with other jurisdictions, schools
- Plans and protocols that were relatable to the public
- How should the City help train residents
- Train and practice; simulate in a meaningful way that was not abstract
- Communications challenges in the middle of an emergency – factual information versus rumors spread on social media
- Teach the public to know where to look for information, resources, and training
- 5 Ps – Five action steps to preparedness; Be Ready
- City’s role in interacting with the public; what should the public expect from City staff
- Train Community Emergency Response Team(CERT) volunteers to implement the plan
- Identify contacts the City would be working with – schools, county, state, etc.
- Communications – key stakeholders on social media (news media, prominent social media moguls, neighborhood groups)

The general consensus of the Council was to craft an EOP from scratch which would still integrate with the County and State plans to allow for optimal regional coordination. Mr. Lenhard reviewed highlights from the discussion to clarify the components and scope of work necessary for crafting an EOP. He summarized the EOP for the City should include the following items:

- A statement of authority
- Procedure for which the plan would be activated
- Responsibilities, in non-jargon actionable items, for staff and stakeholders such as schools, HAFB, and Freeport Center
- Organizational structure (current and in an emergency) – listing roles and titles referencing the National Incident Management System (NIMS) framework
- Detailed analysis of hazards specific to the City but also including a regional depth where necessary
- Emergency Support Functions (ESF) which would address communication, best method to advise residents, where to evacuate, how to evacuate, where to shelter, who provides the shelter, and animal control plans
- Location of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and when and where to convene a backup location
- Goals – minimize loss of life and damage to property, continuity of government, continuity of operations, continuity of public service, cleanup and repair
- Include a component of the plan which was specific to City residents and how they could help their families – good resources were available such as Be Ready, 5 Ps, and other organizations.
- It would need to integrate with County and State or regional plans

Mr. Lenhard stated considerations for staff, contracted services, or a phased approach would be necessary to move forward with crafting an EOP. He advised the City would need to coordinate efforts to roll the EOP out to residents, have more realistic training, and schedule for updates of the plan.

Councilmember Young suggested residents' interaction with City staff and officials which gave clear expectations would also be an important component to the plan.

Councilmember Peterson requested efforts be coordinated with CERT volunteers both past and future to incorporate training specific to the EOP and its implementation. She recommended having a schedule in place for continual updates to the plan to ensure contact persons were up to date.

Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, identified it was important to understand the key stakeholders on social media (new media, prominent social media) which would be an important resource when sending out information during a disaster. He stated stakeholders could include neighborhood groups, church groups, schools, and businesses. Councilmember Young wondered if it was possible to boost a post on social media to disseminate to a wider audience during a disaster. Mr. Cahoon responded it was possible at an additional cost. There was a discussion about the importance of communication during an emergency situation.

Mr. Lenhard asked if there were any other suggestions or feedback. He announced staff would begin to work on a schedule and timeframe for crafting an EOP which included the elements discussed.

There being no further business to come before the Council, **Councilmember Young moved to adjourn at 9:16 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Peterson, Phipps, and Young. Voting NO – None.** Councilmember Roper was not present for the vote.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 14th day of November, 2017**

/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, September 12, 2017.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder