

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
March 27, 2018

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush	Councilmember
	Nike Peterson	Councilmember
	Vern Phipps	Councilmember
	Tim Roper	Councilmember
	Karece Thompson	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	JJ Allen	City Manager
	Summer Palmer	Assistant City Manager
	Stuart Williams	City Attorney
	Scott Hodge	Public Works Director
	Devin Rogers	Police Lieutenant
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Curtis Dickson	Community Services Deputy Dir.
	Spencer Brimley	Community Development Director
	Rich Knapp	Finance Manager
	Lee Naylor	Accountant
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
	Wendy Page	Deputy Recorder

VISITORS: Adam Hughes – Better City, Bryan Wrigley – Lotus Company, Donovan Gilliland – DG Construction Services, Dave Gracey

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE CITY CEMETERY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1050 SOUTH STATE STREET

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, explained the current budget included \$35,000 to design the undeveloped portion of the City cemetery. He wanted to make sure the Council was still agreed with expanding and investing funds toward the expansion of the cemetery. He mentioned there had been previous discussions about needing more land for the Stadler project; however, he was uncertain if land was still necessary for any future development of the Clearfield Station area. Mr. Howes noted the City would be out of plots within the next four to six years. He acknowledged the City would be maintaining the cemetery indefinitely, but if offering burial plots to residents was the desire of the Council it would require a large capital investment likely phased over the next several years. He reviewed the costs differences associated with purchasing a burial plot in the City verses another city or private place and the impacts for residents.

Mr. Howes asked if there were any concerns with moving forward with developing the west half of the City cemetery. Mayor Shepherd acknowledged there was no longer a need for the land to be used for the Clearfield Station area development.

Councilmember Bush asked how many acres would be available to expand the cemetery. Mr. Howes answered the City had five acres and there was an option to acquire one additional acre owned by the mortuary as well.

Councilmember Bush questioned what the design would entail. Mr. Howes responded the design would include landscaping, trees, roads, plan for a space to have a maintenance building with public restrooms, and the proper layout for the irrigation system.

The consensus of the Council was to move forward with plans to expand the cemetery.

DISCUSSION ON THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH LOTUS COMPANY REGARDING THE REDEVELOPMENT OF MABEY PLACE LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 442 SOUTH STATE STREET

JJ Allen, City Manager, acknowledged Adam Hughes with Better City and Bryan Wrigley with LOTUS Company were in attendance. He noted the purpose of the discussion was to gauge the Council's interest in moving forward with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with LOTUS for the redevelopment of Mabey Place. He summarized the MOU was not binding; however, it would set forth the understanding of how both parties would proceed.

Mr. Allen explained the MOU outlined LOTUS would prepare all the plans including site plans, civil drawings, and conduct necessary studies; acquire the Lakeside Square property; and purchase the mobile home park from the City in the future. He indicated the City and/or Community Development Renewal Agency (CDRA) would also have costs for designing the public places such as the plaza, promenade, and pond improvements. He acknowledged LOTUS had requested the City incentivize the project by selling the mobile home park at a discount. Mr. Allen mentioned the CDRA would be the only entity able to sell the property at a discount; however, a project area could be created for collecting tax increments to make the CDRA whole over time.

Councilmember Bush asked if there would be a reason for selling the mobile home park at a discount now. Mr. Allen answered Adam Hughes would speak to that and explain why the request had been made. He noted there were pros and cons to both approaches.

Mr. Allen indicated as news spread about the City's purchase of the mobile home park many developers contacted the City about redevelopment; however, LOTUS was the only one proposing an MOU and vetted by the consultant Better City, as well as having understood the vision of the City and what would be required for redevelopment.

Adam Hughes, Better City, stated this was a specialized redevelopment project because it was creating a downtown and there were few developers in the State of Utah that understood place making development and then could do it well. He reviewed the efforts to date which included

conducting a feasibility study for the site to determine the market opportunities and potential uses for the property by contacting over 50 developers and seeking for those with focus on revitalization, urban product, and vision. He mentioned the economic challenges with redevelopment and indicated all interested developers were expressing a need for incentives. Mr. Hughes noted a key component to getting the private sector engaged in the project was for the City to be willing to bond so a market rate of return could be earned by the development community.

He acknowledged catalytic redevelopment had project economic challenges which included increased costs for land, costs associated with demolition, higher construction costs for a nicer product, and lease rates which lagged behind investment. Mr. Hughes indicated the factors resulted in a low return on investment for redevelopment projects; however, the incentives could help balance the equation. He reviewed cost comparisons between a redevelopment and a greenfield project to help emphasize the differences and how incentives would create parity between the two types of projects.

Councilmember Phipps wondered why costs for construction would be higher on a redevelopment rather than a greenfield project. Mr. Hughes explained vertical mixed use construction and having a nicer finish or high quality product would cost more.

He explained the City had a unique opportunity with its downtown area because there was a great amount of acreage that could be redeveloped, especially if it combined the Lakeside Square project with the mobile home park redevelopment. He reviewed the pros and cons to splitting the projects as well as the benefits to combining them. Mr. Hughes stated the City would need to transition which could take time as it created a sense of place in its downtown; consequently, it would be important to partner with a developer to build for the future rather than to the market of today. He mentioned the recommended redevelopment option would be for the City to combine Lakeside Square and the mobile home park redevelopment into one synergistic project which would also provide the investor of the development community with a blended return on investment because it would desire both projects were successful.

Mr. Hughes indicated the tax increment incentives were less valuable to an investor because it was an investment over time. He continued the CDRA had the ability to incentivize up front when the investment would be most valuable and impactful to the project. He stated the recommended approach as contemplated in the MOU would be to have one developer for both project areas. He emphasized incentive for Lakeside Square would be necessary for the development community and the City or CDRA could provide those incentives to the developer through a discounted land price for the mobile home park. He noted the CDRA could see the payback of the incentive over time through tax increment. Mr. Allen added the City's objective was not to make a profit on the land it planned to acquire, rather to accomplish the goal of community development.

Mr. Hughes recommended LOTUS as the project's developer based on its values, experience, and vision. He added LOTUS would be a great fit for the project and would help to create something unique. Mayor Shepherd mentioned meeting with other developers recently who hadn't shared the City's vision for the downtown area.

Councilmember Bush expressed his desire had always been to combine as one project Lakeside Square and the mobile home park redevelopments. He mentioned other properties along State Street would also be needed for the project and wondered how all of that would work through an MOU. Mr. Allen responded the MOU would allow the City to work with the developer to determine if the developer or City would play a role in property acquisition and those conversations had not yet taken place. Councilmember Bush questioned if the MOU needed to specify other properties were desired for the project. Mr. Allen answered that point was understood, but it could be addressed specifically in the MOU, if desired.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if the bond the City had in place would be sufficient for the project. Mr. Hughes responded the initial figures for the incentive levels were projected between one to two million dollars which could be made up over time; however those numbers, without having construction costs or lease rates, were just preliminary. He explained the incentive level would be supported by proformas. He suggested having the City's financial advisor run the numbers for the tax increment to make sure the coverage ratio was appropriate but anticipated the bonded amount would be sufficient for the project.

Councilmember Phipps asked what was meant in the obligations section of the MOU when it mentioned development by a third-party. Mr. Hughes indicated LOTUS would act as the main developer but there could be some obligations that could be sold off for a specific use and LOTUS would serve as the one to work with those other third-parties.

Mr. Hughes pointed out the renaissance experienced in Ogden because of redevelopment. He hoped the redevelopment planned for Clearfield would be better due to the insight and lessons learned from that project. He expressed his opinion those goals would best be realized by partnering with LOTUS.

Bryan Wrigley, LOTUS Company, expressed he was humbled at being invited to discuss the possibilities of a partnership with the City and CDRA. He explained his philosophy and vision; reviewed LOTUS Company's notable projects in Ogden, Salt Lake, and Pleasant Grove cities; and identified the company's vision to invest, create, and develop something beautiful that wasn't there before, similar to the lotus flower that began in the swamps. He expressed his excitement for the Lakeside Square redevelopment when he visited the site with Better City and realized the pond had masterpiece characteristics and if done right and methodically would be great. Mr. Wrigley emphasized LOTUS Company had the credit capacity, great reputation, and if partnered with the City, would love the opportunity of aiding in the creation of its downtown.

Councilmember Peterson wondered what experience LOTUS had with the commercial side of redevelopment which would benefit the downtown area components which were not residential in character. Mr. Wrigley responded LOTUS had completed 50,000 square feet and was currently doing another 150,000 square feet of commercial development. He mentioned his intent as a master developer would be to collaborate and create something unique for the area which would enhance the lifestyle and sense of community within the City. He anticipated a large percentage of the development would have a residential component; however, noted LOTUS had a great track record for creating boutique residential and boutique commercial developments.

Mr. Allen asked if there were any concerns with considering the MOU at an upcoming policy session. There was a discussion about things which should be addressed in the MOU including ancillary property acquisition and updating the CDRA Chair signature line. Councilmember Peterson requested further information as a component to the MOU about how the City could be made whole for its purchase of the mobile home park. The consensus of the Council was to move forward in partnership with LOTUS Company through the MOU process.

Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn the work session and reconvene in policy session at 7:00 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Thompson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

The Mayor and Council participated in a press conference regarding the City's purchase of the Clearfield Mobile Home Park following the policy session.

Councilmember Thompson moved reconvene in work session at 8:11 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Phipps. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

DISCUSSION ON CLEARFIELD JUNCTION, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF VACANT LOTS LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 17, 51, AND 101 NORTH MAIN STREET

JJ Allen, City Manager, indicated about a year ago the CDRA acquired about four acres of land on the northwest corner of Center and State streets. He informed the Council that DG Construction Services currently was under contract to purchase the adjacent property formerly known as Albion Labs. He mentioned Donovan Gilliland with DG Construction Services had proposed to develop all the vacant land in that vicinity as one project. Mr. Allen reviewed the proposed concept for vertical mixed use with ground floor retail, about 244 residential units, and a library as an anchor on the southeast corner of the properties.

Councilmember Bush asked how serious the County was about building a library on the proposed site. Mr. Allen acknowledged the deal was not done; however, the County was very interested in the site for its new location. He continued the County's plans were to design in 2018 and begin building in 2019; however, completing the Syracuse Branch was its first priority. There was a discussion about the Library's relocation, the County preparing the first iteration of an MOU, differences in land values, and rumors about putting off library projects due to a rise in construction costs and budget restraints. Mr. Allen indicated in meeting with the County all discussions have been moving forward with planning for a new building because it would be too costly to rebuild, the current facility because it was deteriorating and had liability risks associated with it, and the location near Center and State Street was more advantageous.

Mr. Allen continued reviewing the proposed concept plans. He noted the property was proposed to have surface parking rather than structured parking. He explained the circumstances surrounding the timing for the project was a bit tricky. Mr. Allen noted DG Construction

Services was anxious to move the project forward; however, the Form Based Code would not be in place before a due diligence period expired so Mr. Donovan needed a level of assurance of the project's approval in order to close on the purchase of the property and begin its coordination for development. He recommended if the City was interested in a joint effort and moving the proposed project forward, then staff could draft a development agreement which incorporated the key components of the Form Based Code because it likely would not be adopted before formalization of the Clearfield Junction project was needed.

Councilmember Bush asked what the scheduled timing was for considering adoption of the Form Based Code. Mr. Brimley responded the Planning Commission and Steering Committee had one more meeting scheduled and if it was ready the Planning Commission and City Council could likely consider its adoption in May so it would be ready for implementation in June of 2018.

There was a discussion about the language of the development agreement, the drafted Form Based Code, the developers request for incentives, and the possibility of joining efforts for the Clearfield Junction project.

Councilmember Bush expressed his desire for the lower level commercial space to be used for retail which would generate tax revenues rather than office space. Mr. Allen indicated the drafted Form Based Code (FBC) allowed for office space; however, it was not permitted on the ground level so if the development agreement were drafted with language similar to FBC then office space on the lower level would not be permitted.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his concern with the development of high density residential which had impacts on schools, traffic, and infrastructure and in his opinion would not increase the sense of community or be desirable for those wanting to have longevity in the area.

Councilmember Peterson shared her excitement for the proposed true mixed use concept with all the components including retail space, library, and housing, which could utilize the space and location at its potential.

Councilmember Thompson voiced his understanding of the influx of people coming to the State and their need for housing. He suggested keeping the urban or high density housing along the corridor and building a community where people wanted to stay if the option for a housing purchase became available.

Mayor Shepherd stated the revitalizing of the City needed to begin and a development similar to what was proposed appeared to fit the vision for development along the City's downtown corridor. He reviewed the obstacles in developing the property solely as commercial and separately; however, expressed his opinion combining of the properties opened opportunities for development which would be an asset to the City's civic center.

Donovan Gilliland, DG Construction Services, reviewed the components of the proposed project with its synergy, challenges of parking and the potential to gate off commercial parking areas, spoke to the concerns about demographics noting the units were smaller and not attractive to families with many children, and suggested a condo element could be considered. There was a

discussion about components which could be added to make the project appealing to the area which included senior housing, noise attenuation, trees, restaurants, boutique retail, common areas, and other amenities.

Mr. Gilliland described the additional steps needing to be completed before the property purchase was completed and discussed the planned street and entry access points. He stated the proposed FBC had been reviewed and could be used as an exhibit to the development agreement if that was acceptable to the City. He explained his lending source was requiring a development agreement be in place to move forward with the project.

Councilmember Peterson questioned if it the agreement were approved would the project be a single phased approach. Mr. Gilliland responded based on the demand for multi-family residential across the street it would be a phased approach adding the frontage buildings first which would mean retail space with the housing above and then adding the additional housing afterwards. He explained the possibility of subsidizing rent initially for the retail space because having it filled would make filling occupancy of the residential component more attractive.

Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, reviewed the approval process for a similar project if the form based code were in place. He mentioned it would allow a developer increased flexibility and all necessary site approvals and permitted uses would be handled by the Planning Commission. He noted in certain circumstances there would need to be additional approvals needed such as plat approvals, consolidations of properties, and when necessary development agreements would continue to be approved by the Council. Mr. Allen asked if there would be any discomfort moving forward with DG Construction to formulate a development agreement as proposed prior to having the Form Based Code in place.

Councilmember Phipps asked how key the construction of a library was to the concept which was presented. Mr. Gilliland indicated the library was a desired amenity; however, recognized it could be a while before it was in place. He planned to move the parking and infrastructure improvements forward with the hope it would help the County finalize its consideration of the site for a new library. There was a discussion about Utah Department of Transportation being an essential component to the site plan approval process with street accesses.

The consensus of the Council was to have staff move forward in preparing a development agreement with DG Construction in a joint effort to develop the proposed Clearfield Junction.

DISCUSSION ON FUTURE LANDSCAPE PROJECTS

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, stated the budget for fiscal year 2018 included funds for construction of three projects which were 1) landscaping along the retention basin near H Street and State Road (SR) 193; 2) Rail and Canal Trail landscaping intended for the Steed Pond area; and 3) the rebuilding of the west entry stairs at City Hall. He explained the proposed projects had changed scope and reviewed the proposed plans as discussed previously during work sessions with the Council. He suggested staff was proposing to repurpose the budgeted funds from the construction of the improvements to actually designing the proposed projects. Mr. Howes mentioned there were remaining funds of about \$53,000 from the SR-193 landscaping

project which could be utilized to design the project along SR193 or potentially be used to design the Veterans Monument.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his excitement to have the areas designed which would improve the uses and appearance of each area. He requested the proposed addition of a sign for the front of City Hall be included with the proposed designs. Mr. Howes indicated staff typically prepared many designs in house; however, felt the magnitude of the proposed projects would be better served to contract for the design work to allow for a better bidding process.

The consensus of the Council was to begin the design process and plan for the projects as proposed.

DISCUSSION ON THE 2018/2019 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, reviewed the following: purpose and process for budgeting; the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 proposed budget summary of governmental funds and enterprise funds; major operational expense changes and assumptions for FY19; the General Fund unrestricted balance or available cash; revenues; and major capital projects and expenditures. He noted the proposed budget included personnel expenditures for adding a Deputy Public Works Director, a reduction of one full-time police officer, and the requests for additional personnel which were not included in the proposed budget numbers. There was a discussion about the personnel impacts and justification behind those decisions.

Councilmember Peterson asked for clarification about reducing one full-time police officer position to make sure there would be adequate services for the community and no one would be losing a job. Devin Rogers, Police Lieutenant, explained the position had been available to implement a traffic division but recently with changes in legislation regarding traffic citations and quotas, it would be difficult to justify having a traffic division as originally planned; additionally, the position was not currently staffed and over the past year funds had gone unused for that position.

Mr. Knapp mentioned the proposed budget was always changing and when costs or revenues were more definitive the numbers would be adjusted until the deadline for its adoption. He reviewed the compensation plan and potential increases for medical insurance, merit increases, and pay grade shifts. He indicated the figures in the draft budget were only estimated at this point in the process and many of the numbers were based on assumptions. He noted the General Fund revenues and expenditures had a net operating surplus which was projected to be \$130,724 and reflected the proposed budget was sustainable.

JJ Allen, City Manager, noted the FY19 budget planned to spend down excess fund balances of about 1.3 million dollars towards one time capital projects. He mentioned in the coming years if the budget were spent according to plan there would not be excess funds and consequently a decrease in capital projects which were an allowed one-time use of those funds. Mr. Knapp explained the General Fund operational allowance recommendation was to maintain an unrestricted fund balance of no less than two months of regular General Fund operating

expenditures. He continued the State allowed for a General Fund balance in the amount equal to 25 percent of revenue.

Councilmember Phipps asked to understand more about the Mabey Place bonds which were identified in the General Fund Budget Summary. Mr. Knapp stated there were monies from the Mabey Place bonds which would carry over from the FY18 to the FY19 budget and were restricted funds. He noted those funds could be used as defined in the parameters resolution but as restricted funds would need to be paid back according to the terms. He reviewed the unrestricted fund balance yearly comparisons from 2011 through 2017 and the projections for 2018 and 2019 fiscal years; the top budgeted revenue sources; General Fund revenues historic summary for FY15 to present; and the specific changes from the FY18 budget revenues related to taxes, licenses and permits, inter-governmental, charges for services, fines and forfeitures, miscellaneous revenue, as well as contributions and transfers.

Mr. Knapp acknowledged the draft budget planned for an increase to sales tax; however, with the passing of Senate Bill 235 sales tax revenue projections were reduced by 1.8 percent to account for the revenue which would be allocated to assist those municipalities with homeless shelters. He projected the impact for the bill on the City's FY19 budget would be an approximate decrease of \$80,000 in sales tax revenue.

Mr. Knapp anticipated there would be a decrease in property tax revenues and mentioned the draft budget was drafted under the assumption of maintaining the current certified tax rate which was roughly projected to be .001745 percent amounting to about \$60,000 in revenues. There was a discussion about bills which had negative fiscal impacts for the City, accepting the certified tax rate or maintaining the tax rate with associated pros and cons, notification requirements which may have changed for truth in taxation, and the estimated annual impact for residents would be an additional \$5 per household in property tax if the Council decided to maintain the rate. Mr. Allen recognized there was not consensus from the Council on the subject of maintaining the tax rate and suggested it could be discussed in more detail during the course of the budget process.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the major new capital projects included and cut from the proposed budget. There was a discussion about the capital projects and estimated costs.

Councilmember Phipps wondered why the 300 North Pedestrian Crossing Signal was included in the FY19 budget because he recalled it was in the FY18 budget. Mr. Knapp indicated crossing signals for two projects were included in the FY18 budget, one for 300 North and one near Clearfield High School (CHS) on 1000 East; however, the project costs were estimated too low, consequently, only one project was completed with the budgeted FY18 funds. Councilmember Bush asked if payments had been made by the Davis School District or LDS Church to assist with the pedestrian crossing signal installed near CHS. Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, answered he had discussions with both parties and each seemed likely to contribute funds but the City had not received the final bill to distribute a portion of the totals costs to the school and LDS Church yet.

There was a discussion about the \$40,000 budgeted for holiday decorations which was cut from the proposed budget. Mr. Allen mentioned holiday decorations were initially included in budget

planning until the latest round of cuts. He indicated purchasing holiday decorations was a discussion topic during the strategic planning work session held on December 5, 2017 and if it was still a priority could be added back in and other cuts made. The general consensus of the Council was to hold off on holiday decorations unless some of the other priority capital projects were completed and there were funds available due to cost savings in other areas.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the historic fleet spending from FY08 to present, the vehicles proposed for replacement with the FY19 budget funds, and a cost comparison for purchasing a new street sweeper versus contracting for those services.

Councilmember Phipps mentioned there had been previous discussions about purchasing trucks and rotating the fleet in a shorter period of time while resale values were optimal to help the City save funds on vehicle costs year to year. Mr. Knapp indicated staff was gathering data and would share the information with the Council at a later date during the budget process. He summarized the information showed a large initial investment to purchase new trucks; however, it was anticipated after about four years the City would no longer be losing money.

Mr. Knapp continued reviewing the FY19 proposed costs for vehicle replacement. He acknowledged replacement of the street sweeper was included for \$240,000 because it would be cheaper for the City to purchase a sweeper rather than to contract for those services. There was a discussion about street sweeping services, the data used for the comparison between contracting for sweeping services and providing the service in-house, and current and future services provided to residents. Staff explained having the street sweeping services provided in-house would provide an increased quantity of street sweeping services to the residents, provide better control for response to problem areas, and be more cost effective over the ten year period analyzed.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the data took in to account the total cost of ownership including maintenance. Mr. Knapp responded the data was based on the total cost of ownership including maintenance. Councilmember Phipps asked what services were provided under the scenario where the City contracted for the services. Mr. Allen explained there were a couple of companies that provided street sweeping services. He indicated those companies provided all the equipment and labor based on a certain service level established by the entity receiving the service. Councilmember Phipps asked what kind of service level was used for the data comparison. Lee Naylor responded the data point reflected three sweep cycles per year at 110 hours of service to cover the entire City with an additional 200 hours of other sweep usage like water main breaks, resident complaints, etc. He indicated 530 hours of contract time was compared to the cost of in-house services which included the machine, maintenance, labor costs, etc. Scott Hodge, Public Works Director, also indicated the contract for services was based on \$150 per hour.

Councilmember Phipps expressed concern that sweeping the streets three times a year might appear excessive. He remarked he didn't realize his street was swept three times a year. Mr. Hodge indicated streets weren't swept three times last year because the City did not have working equipment to provide the service.

Councilmember Peterson asked if a new street sweeper would come with a warranty. Mr. Hodge answered there would be a warranty and it would likely be a standard two or three years. She expressed her opinion the investment needed the assurance gained by guaranteeing functional equipment. Mr. Hodge also explained the current equipment was different from the one being proposed for purchase. He continued the current equipment had water features with it and couldn't be used during certain temperatures because the water lines would freeze. He stated the model being proposed would be mechanical, belt driven, and available for use earlier in the year.

Councilmember Phipps asked how old the current equipment was. Mr. Hodge replied approximately twelve years old. Mr. Allen added the proposed purchase of the street sweeper would be an increase to the City's current level of service. Mr. Knapp added performing the service in-house provided the City more control in responding to needs which would also improve the City's level of service. Councilmember Phipps stated if everyone else was okay with the purchase but expressed concern about spending \$250,000 for the equipment.

Mayor Shepherd stated he had received numerous complaints from residents about the rocks and loose gravel on the roads. Councilmember Peterson agreed and indicated the complaints centered on street treatments and the amount of gravel left behind. Councilmember Bush agreed. Councilmember Roper stated he had multiple neighbors express concern to him about the condition of the roads. Councilmember Peterson indicated that many of the residents living in cul-de-sacs had mentioned the need for better street sweeping services.

Staff continued with the budget review.

Mr. Knapp highlighted the information technology capital expenses planned for the FY19 budget and those which were not included. There was a discussion about those items cut from the budget which included a secondary storage array back-up and camera installation for the 200 South Park. Councilmember Peterson expressed her desire to have security cameras in City parks to protect assets, monitor safety and uses of equipment, and have a deterrent for criminal activity. There was a discussion about the playground equipment uses, potential for vandalism, possible insurance liabilities, risks versus cost of equipment replacement, and other sources of funding so the security camera could be included in the FY19 budget. The consensus of the Council was to leave the camera out of the FY19 budget because the cost of equipment replacement was less than the risk, potential liabilities, and cost for camera installation.

Mr. Allen asked the Council for feedback regarding the decision not to include the request for two communication interns for website redesign. There was a discussion about the current website, website redesign practices, uses of interns, benefits of having an in-house design rather than contracting for website services, redesign timeframes, and the priority ranking of designing a new City website in comparison to other items cut from the budget. The consensus of the Council was to consider including expenditures for redesigning the City's website above other options if budget numbers shifted and it were feasible, because it could provide added customer service.

Councilmember Bush wondered when the City would know if additional budget cuts were required. Mr. Allen responded a key milestone would be for the City to get the insurance renewal

quote in the next couple of weeks. He acknowledged during the budget process there was continual review and updating to provide the most accurate and responsible numbers. He expressed his opinion the numbers were good and included a target for maintaining the unrestricted fund balance of the General Fund with two months of operating expenses at 18 percent of the revenues.

There being no further business to come before the Council, **Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn at 10:15 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Thompson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Thompson. Voting NO – None.**

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 8th day of May, 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, March 27, 2018.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder