

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 PM WORK SESSION
June 10, 2025

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

PRESIDING: Mayor Mark Shepherd

PRESENT: Councilmember Karece Thompson, Councilmember Nike Peterson, Councilmember Tim Roper, Councilmember Megan Ratchford, Mayor Mark Shepherd, Councilmember Dakota Wurth

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager & Economic Development Director Spencer Brimley, Community Services Director Eric Howes, Police Chief Kelly Bennett, Assistant City Attorney Amy Jones, Community Relations Director Shaundra Rushton, Public Works Director Adam Favero, Finance Manager Rich Knapp, City Recorder Nancy Dean, Deputy City Recorder Chersty Titensor, Planner Tyson Stoddard, Victim Advocate Teresa Vigil

VISITORS : Tony De Mille, Danielle King

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

CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENTS – NORTH DAVIS SEWER DISTRICT

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, came before the Council to discuss the need to update the City's Consolidated Fee Schedule to reflect the anticipated increases from North Davis Sewer District. He said the first \$2.50/month increase in residential sewer user fees per connection would take effect July 1, 2025, and then in two years it would increase an additional \$2.50/month. The current rate was \$21.50 which would increase to \$24.00 July 1, 2025 and then \$26.50 July 1, 2027. He said commercial use per thousand rates would be increased from the current \$2.15 per thousand gallons to \$2.40 per thousand gallon July 1, 2025, then up to \$2.65 per thousand gallons July 1, 2027.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the increases covered the capital improvements and operational increases that all entities were dealing with. Councilmember Thompson said the North Davis Sewer District used a model to arrive at the amounts. Councilmember Wurth asked if the increases were to maintain the infrastructure and not for new projects. Councilmember Thompson said they were trying to maintain the current level of service. JJ Allen, City Manager, said the item would be on the June 24, 2025 policy session agenda.

DISCUSSION ON FISCAL YEAR 2025 BUDGET AMENDMENTS

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, presented the anticipated Budget Amendments to the FY2025

budget. Mr. Knapp explained the increases the City faced with Express Bill Pay and other bank credit card services in the Finance, Customer Service and CAFC divisions. He said the agreement with Express Bill Pay started out with an approximate \$0.40 charge per transaction and then seven months into the agreement they raised it to \$0.72 charge per transaction. He was looking into alternative services, though the City did not want to leave them. There was a discussion on the advantages of the Express Bill Pay service.

He explained the proposed amendment to the PARAT fund by saying the Skate Park update was over what had been estimated, but a pavilion project had been under what had been estimated leaving an anticipated net increase of \$27,000. He said there was a chance it would change before the June 24, 2025 policy session.

In the Capital Projects budget, Mr. Knapp explained that the Clearfield Station project was facing a cash shortfall in the amount of \$1,345,924 but that there were future monies coming from Davis County and from the land sale to UTA. Including an additional estimated \$200k worth of expenses, he said the planned deficit was \$307k. Mr. Knapp said the City had approximately \$1M in earned interest from the 2020 bond that could be used to cover the shortfall. He also said there was the idea of using impact fees that needed to be used in the next couple of years as well.

Councilmember Peterson asked to confirm that the budget on the project was still okay when they factored in the UTA sale and extra interest. Mr. Knapp said they would not have been fine if it were not for the interest. Mr. Allen said when the bonds were issued the City thought they would cover the costs, but the costs just escalated. Mr. Knapp said they were asking for \$1.2M more on the expense side – but did not need to budget for revenue rather needed permission to use budget monies. The Council appeared to approve the use of the budget monies for these expenditures.

DEPARTMENT UPDATES

PROPERTY TAX – DAVIS COUNTY UPDATE

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, said he had received the corrected property tax values from the County and said the City's proposed property tax rate was 0.001288 to meet the aggregate revenue in the budget discussions. Councilmember Peterson asked for the County's certified rate. Mr. Allen said the County's certified tax rate was 0.001218.

Mr. Knapp provided some statistical information regarding property tax in Clearfield City:

- He reported that the total taxable value of the City increased 3.7%
- The average residential property value had risen from \$481,000 last year to \$497,000 this year, a 3.3% increase
- The average residential tax increase for the year would be \$19.13
- He said the average increase for a resident was \$32 which included a \$13 increase from average values and \$19.13 from the City's added amount

Mr. Knapp showed the average home value historically over the last five years. He showed an example of the notice of proposed tax increase. Mr. Knapp showed historical information comparing the change in assessed value in Clearfield to surrounding cities in Davis County.

Mr. Allen stated that the truth in taxation public hearing was scheduled for August 26, 2025. Councilmember Wurth said the County was also pondering a 6% increase on its end.

4TH OF JULY UPDATE

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, provided the timeline of activities for the 4th of July Festival.

LEGAL UPDATE – ADA COMPLIANCE

Amy Jones, Assistant City Attorney, announced that she had obtained her certificate to be an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance Officer. She said there were four ADA officers: Ricki Miller (internal), Nancy Dean (external), Amy Jones (catch all), and Christina Arbogast (courts).

She said they had created an “iSpeak” form to help the Customer Service Center figure out what language they would need to try to communicate in. She said they had started the process of getting access to a stand-alone-interpreter hub which would allow for quicker translating services. Ms. Jones said the Customer Service Center had a copy of Ms. Jones’ certificate should anyone inquire.

Councilmember Peterson asked how often employees were interfacing with either First Amendment or ADA Audits. Kelly Bennett, Police Chief, said they were experiencing them at least weekly if not a couple of times a week. Councilmember Thompson asked if Staff was including any Alzheimer-informed training both at the Customer Service Center and in the Police Department. Ms. Jones was not aware of any specific training for Alzheimer’s, but said a lot of the course was focused on providing individualized customer service to make individuals more comfortable.

VOCA GRANT UPDATE – 2025-2027

Teresa Vigil, Victim Services Coordinator, informed the Council of the award amount for the 2025-2027 time period. She had requested \$302,765.08 but was awarded \$236,623.81. She said the Housing Program would suffer the most from the cutback. She said the City would still have money to give to victims, approximately \$43k, and then would have to remove the Housing Advocate position. She said they would continue with the Victim Services program and would focus the funds to assist Clearfield and HAFB connections.

Ms. Vigil said due to increases in rental amounts; there would likely be fewer awards but more meaningful contributions that kept people in their housing. Mr. Allen said with the conclusion of the part-time housing advocate Ms. Vigil would handle that position as well. Ms. Vigil said there would not be a lot of extra assistance in navigating barriers, but she would do everything she could to help them and make sure they were connected to other resources. Mayor Shepherd asked what Federal Fund the grant came through. Ms. Vigil said it was through the Victims of Crime Act. She said they had redirected and made a fix so she hoped in a couple of years it would go back up.

Councilmember Thompson asked how many victims were getting restitution as they went

through the process. Ms. Vigil did not have the information readily available, but said she helped individuals when there was the ability to request restitution or if they had crime victim reparations, but she did not think there was a high rate of receipt. Ms. Jones said restitution was the first to get paid before fines in the court system. After a certain point when the case would close with an outstanding balance, the balance would be forwarded to the Office of State Debt Collection to be collected.

Councilmember Thompson asked about the level of requests for protective orders. Ms. Vigil said she had been seeing a rise in the number of protective orders over the last six months. Chief Bennett said that correlated with what the Police Department was seeing as well. It had been answering an increased number of calls related to domestic violence. Mr. Allen informed Ms. Vigil that a candidate for City Council, Danielle King, wanted more information about the available victim services.

LAKESIDE/MABEY POND ADJUSTMENT

Spencer Brimley, Assistant City Manager & Economic Development Director, provided an update to the Lakeside Square/Mabey Pond development agreement. He said in recent conversations with the developer, they had a local partner that was concerned about the specificity of the live/work units within the project and how they were being articulated in the agreement. The developer had asked that the live/work units still be allowed, but asked the City to allow flexibility with where they were located – whether on Water Front Way or State Street. He said Staff did not have objections either way.

Mr. Brimley said when this information came in, Staff had contemplated an amendment to the development agreement but then determined that since the request was substantially similar to what had been approved, and that Form Based Code allowed for up to a 10% adjustment to the site plan, the process could be handled through an administrative site plan adjustment. He said the applicant would submit an application for the proposed site plan adjustment for review by the Zoning Administrator.

He showed the proposed plan and explained that because the use and intensity was consistent, nothing had changed with regulatory compliance and operational obligations remained unchanged. There would be no new adverse impacts, and the design intent remained the same so Staff was able to review the proposed changes to the development agreement. Mayor Shepherd mentioned that the commercial would shift toward where the live/work were to keep the commercial together on Water Front Way. Mr. Brimley explained that the local partner wanted to prioritize the commercial/retail space over live/work, but did not want to lose it. He said Staff was waiting on an application from the developer and was looking at Fall 2025 for demolition of the site.

CLEARFIELD CITY GENERAL PLAN

Tyson Stoddard, Planner, said updates and feedback from the Council and Planning Commission had been incorporated into the draft General Plan document and presented to the Planning Commission May 21, 2025 where it recommended approval of the Draft General Plan. There was one dissenting vote, but it was not due to the content, but the length of the document. He

explained that because it was a long range document the length was typical. The General Plan consultant, Susan Petheram from FFKR Architects presented and reviewed the planning process thus far. She reviewed the eleven key themes & priorities which were:

- Amenities
- Centers/Sense of Place
- Community/Character
- Diverse Economy
- Housing & Neighborhoods
- Infrastructure
- Jobs/Employment Hub
- Multi-Modal Transportation
- Stewardship
- Standards & Regulations
- Innovation & Funding

She reviewed the structure and general content of each section in the General Plan as outlined in the presentation. She asked if the Council thought more review was needed before scheduling the public hearing which was anticipated for July 8, or July 22, 2025.

Spencer Brimley, Assistant City Manager & Economic Development Director, lauded the ongoing efforts put forth by FFKR and Staff and expressed his belief that FFKR had created a great document, acknowledging that no General Plan would ever achieve perfection. He wanted to make sure the General Plan overall addressed the community appropriately, planned for the future, and that the maps spoke to those ideas. He said Staff needed feedback from Council to finalize the General Plan so the City could be clear with the community and developers about its expectations and desires. He thought it was time to move forward with what was created as long as there were no fatal flaws.

Mr. Stoddard pointed out that General Plans were now required to include a water element. They had attempted to include it with the draft General Plan but still needed to do outreach with the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District. He said there were specific requirements and outreach as part of the legislative requirements. He announced the City was awarded a grant to complete the water element through FFKR. He said the water element needed to be adopted before the end of this year. He thought it would be through the Planning Commission and ready for adoption by Fall 2025.

Mayor Shepherd pointed out an element that had not been discussed in the General Plan that needed to be addressed, based on an announcement of the closure of Job Corps. He thought it was important to future plan the land use for that parcel of land. He thought that even though the court system might preserve it in the short term, it was evident it would be eliminated in the long-term. He said the City needed to be prepared and it needed to be in the General Plan. He anticipated there being a push for a homeless shelter if measures were not taken.

Mr. Stoddard said the existing General Plan had designated it as Manufacturing, but the proposed draft General Plan had the area designated as Community Space. Mr. Stoddard read the description of Community Spaces on page 99 in the draft General Plan. Mr. Stoddard said the category was for current or future sports facilities, recreation centers, educational, and public

service uses such as libraries, police and fire stations, public works and government facilities. He continued saying areas that were currently utilized as parks might be designated as community/civic use if a future facility was envisioned or needed for an area. Corresponding zones were P-F.

Mayor Shepherd thought the area should be designated as mixed use. He thought it should be designated as Manufacturing on the back ten acres where there were already two buildings that mirrored Freeport and Freeport West. He envisioned the remainder of the sixty-two acre property likely mixed use with some residential. Mr. Stoddard asked the Council if, with the Mixed Use designation, there were opportunities for parks and open space. Mayor Shepherd said yes, the City could designate parks and open space in a mixed use community. Mayor Shepherd pointed out the property was directly on the corridor and was deep enough for any business. Councilmember Peterson spoke to the frustration with legacy-era buildings due to the lack of continued investment from current ownership. She wondered if the property could offer the opportunity to move toward modern manufacturing with commercial treatment on the frontage, while giving tenants needing up-to-date manufacturing the opportunity to remain in Clearfield City. Mr. Allen saw this as a catalyst opportunity for the Freeport Center generally. Councilmember Thompson envisioned some type of job-creation opportunities. Mayor Shepherd said he had spoken with Congressman Blake Moore about Job Corps as a whole and land use, and said he was prepared to make the fight with the Department of Labor to turn the property over to Clearfield. He doubted the Department of Labor would give it to Clearfield without some sort of payback. He suggested the City could control the use of the property with the promise of housing and job creation because the City had the ability to do what was necessary. That might not be possible if the acreage was sold to the public. There was a discussion about being prepared with land use designations intact in the unfortunate event the facility were closed.

Ms. Petheram asked if the Council was talking about the Flex Industrial Zone. Mayor Shepherd was more concerned about eliminating the possibility of a specific use. He wanted to ensure that whatever future land use was designated, it precluded the property being used as a homeless center. Ms. Petheram explained that Flex Industrial allowed residential but only in partnership with a mix of uses so the property could not just have residential as an isolated project. Mr. Brimley advised the Council to be mindful of what zoning types were tied to that land use. He said the zoning was the Commercial/Residential. Councilmember Ratchford read the parameters of that zone. Councilmember Peterson asked if there would be any benefit to split where it would be heavier industrial and flex out front. It was decided that south of B Street would be changed to Flex Industrial and then between B Street and E Street designated as Manufacturing. Mr. Allen thought there was an opportunity for redevelopment west of 7th Street. Mayor Shepherd thought those designations would provide the most protection for the City. Mr. Brimley asked if those land use designations called for new zoning districts. Ms. Petheram said Flex Industrial did, but made a note that it could correspond with the CR zone. Mr. Brimley clarified that currently, the Land Use called it Industrial and Zoning called it Mixed-Use, and that the City wanted more of the Flex-Industrial south of B Street, and north of it Manufacturing (M-1).

Mr. Stoddard called attention to the tree farm properties that were designated as Neighborhood Residential on the proposed land use map, which was not consistent with the Station Area Plan.

He explained that the reason it was showing residential was because the designation was done by parcel, so they would have to create a separate polygon to reflect that the State Street portion was designated Commercial.

Councilmember Peterson asked to review a designation on the south end of the City. There was a Transitional section on the south end of Main Street that designated some properties as townhomes that were two and three stories. She said it was inconsistent with the established neighborhood. Mr. Stoddard said the idea behind that was that there were not additional types of housing at the south end of the City. He said there could be an option to have different housing types off Main Street. Councilmember Peterson said it would be inconsistent because they had infill on agriculture lots that had been single-family detached. She reminded Staff that the Council had been very consistent with being aggressive with density and range of housing in City Centers, but in established neighborhoods where there were established height, use and established street networks it was glaringly inconsistent. She thought there would have been a push to create a transitional area on the long rectangle parcels. She pointed out that the existing zone was R-1-6 except the agricultural areas in the power corridor. She said she could see a rough equivalency of an R-1-4, but there was an established grid and network, and it was completely surrounded by built-out homes that were two stories. Councilmember Peterson pointed out that entry level housing was missing and the City needed to be careful that the message was not density at all costs. Ms. Petheram thought that the idea of the Transitional Residential was to support the small lot single-family as well as townhome use but she thought the Neighborhood Residential went down to the smaller lots as well. Mr. Stoddard said small lot, single-family could go in both designations. Councilmember Peterson insisted that the orange Transitional designation be removed completely from that area and that it be R-1-6 – Neighborhood Residential. Ms. Petheram said that was an area where the Conservation Overlay designation was used to support the smaller lot single family with some open space.

Councilmember Peterson pointed out that the Conservation overlay designations were not defined and needed to be if it would be referenced. Mr. Stoddard indicated that the Conservation Overlay was defined with the neighborhood overlays. She recommended ensuring the photos used in the document actually reflected the section they were within.

Councilmember Thompson recommended that the green areas be strategically planned, by creating defensible fire spaces, he said it was important that the land use documents spoke to resilience, and outlined mitigation strategies so that as bond investors reviewed the City, they could feel that the “product” and investment was safe. Councilmember Thompson brought up the report completed by Hill Air Force Base in 2019 that reported on potential climate issues and the potential of increased desertification of the area so he thought it would be wise to be proactive and address future possibilities.

Councilmember Thompson asked that Staff and FFKR have discussion about drought policy in the water element as they had discussions with the Division of Natural Resources. He said that the credit rating agencies were looking for water planning for drought resilience in the land use documents as well. Mr. Stoddard said the water element would be completed in the Fall 2025. Mr. Allen asked if the General Plan would be revised once the water element was completed. Ms. Petheram said once it was completed, they would determine if it could be integrated easily

into the General Plan document. She said if the structure of the document was different, or if the State was going to require periodic updates to the water element, then it might make sense to keep it as a separate document. She said they were trying to get more feedback from the State for the next steps. Mr. Allen asked for the statutorily required elements for a General Plan. Ms. Petheram said land use, transportation, water use, preservation, and moderate-income housing. She said State requirements might change. Mr. Stoddard asked the Council whether another work session was needed or if a public hearing could be scheduled.

Councilmember Peterson made a number of suggested revisions to some areas in the document where policy statements were made that she felt went too far in encouraging different types of housing types and densities within established neighborhoods and zoning. Mr. Stoddard confirmed it was related to infill development and Staff was looking for guidance on how that could be addressed. Councilmember Peterson said the Council had already made that decision and that infill development was to be consistent – not necessarily complementary as stated in the draft document – with whatever was surrounding it. Mr. Stoddard pointed out that any change in in-fill development would require the adoption of a new zone which would require specific details of the development be adopted by the Council. Councilmember Roper asked to have language in the document that specified keeping the identity of a neighborhood. Councilmember Peterson liked the idea of saying ‘preserving or maintaining the integrity of the area.’ Councilmember Thompson said any time you brought in new development it would affect a neighborhood – he felt complementary might be too broad of a term. Mayor Shepherd liked the idea of complementary because it focused on complementary but attainable and affordable.

Councilmember Peterson took issue with the statement within the document of enhancing and expanding amenities within neighborhoods, because the City had a hard enough time funding the current parks and amenities. She recommended the document say ‘maintain or sustain service levels’ instead. Councilmember Thompson pointed out that the Form Based Code already added more park space. Councilmember Thompson said it was important to be conscientious when talking about growing park spaces because it could increase the need for greater taxation.

Councilmember Wurth thought the purpose of the General Plan was to create a vision for the future. He mentioned that “amenities” were not necessarily open space but there were opportunities for different types of amenities in neighborhoods. He commented on the recurring theme of historical precedent regarding density and infill. He mentioned the document was the perfect opportunity to have a re-centered conversation because if the Council was cognizant of the infrastructure costs to continue to participate in suburban sprawl through less dense zones, then it had to acknowledge that the City had to grow its tax base elsewhere. Councilmember Peterson did not agree because Clearfield was so built out. Councilmember Wurth said homeownership was the goal for every housing type in the City because of the benefits of generational wealth and other economic impacts. He thought the subject of where density would be allowed in the City needed to be revisited to determine if that was still the direction the Council as a group believed in. Councilmember Thompson mentioned that density of housing made an impact on City services, for example in policing, which was what influenced his view of density. Councilmember Wurth thought because the City was mostly built out, not allowing development of infill properties with different types of housing perpetuated the housing crisis and thought it warranted a larger discussion because townhomes and duplexes were the modern

equivalent of a starter home. Councilmember Thompson thought if he were to change his mind it would have to be deed-restricted properties. Mayor Shepherd brought up that on in-fill pieces of property, if the lot were vacant, there would be a very different conversation. He did not want to create an opportunity for developers to walk into neighborhoods and buy multiple properties to tear down and build something completely different, right in the middle of a neighborhood. Councilmember Wurth said the City should preserve historical housing that was more attainable. He said the high level, general conversation that needed to be had.

Councilmember Peterson asked that the reference to establishing a city-wide beautification program be removed because there was a commission already in place with the Parks & Recreation committee that was already doing a great job. Additionally, she did not want things inside the document that would be unfunded and require additional taxing. Councilmember Peterson thought the references to community programs and gardens should be removed because she did not feel it was the City's purview and thought the programs came at a cost and she would rather see policies that protected the City. Mr. Stoddard said the concept was to have a land use policy that allowed a community to improve an unutilized space for a garden at no cost to the City. Councilmember Peterson was okay with it if it did not require additional cost to the City. She pointed out other language that mentioned the City participating in a project and did not want to burden Staff with running additional programs. She suggested it did not need to be part of the General Plan. Councilmember Wurth pointed out that the document was idealistic and referred to language in the community section that was being discussed that stated that the section reflected a framework of potential options, and the Council was not beholden to do any of it. He said they were things that could be done to reinforce the Council's desire to move forward with the general ethos. There was a discussion on the Healthy Utah program, and while it would not require City funds, it would take Staff time. Mayor Shepherd agreed that it did not hurt to include options for community programs. Councilmember Roper recommended that the wording be altered to not call out specific programs.

Mr. Brimley called attention to the fact that none of the General Plan was regulatory, and it was all idealistic. He thought the Council worried about the obligation that was being created with what was included in the document. He asked the Council to question what they were trying to accomplish – stay the same, make changes, consider alternate perspectives. He reminded the Council that it decided what obligations were created in the future. He also explained that the policy statements on housing were meant to be broad because when they get too detailed it would enter the realm of zoning, but zoning and land use were two separate pots that the Council needed to be mindful of, so it did not create regulatory language in a document that was meant to be advisory. Councilmember Thompson was concerned that the broader the document the more chance that the courts would lean toward the developer. Mr. Brimley said with code yes, but not with the General Plan. He said the Council needed to be mindful that they were not calling things regulatory that were advisory ways for the community to rise to the next level.

Councilmember Peterson asked whether the strategy to create an Economic Development Plan had already been achieved. Mr. Brimley said the Economic Analysis had been budgeted, but had not yet been accomplished. He said if this was taken out there was no encouragement to move to the next level. Councilmember Peterson called out a section that referred to roadways and types of infrastructure that were out of the City's control. Ms. Petheram explained that UDOT was

very specific that cities needed to specify what context-sensitive design was and what the City envisioned. She said UDOT had an obligation to work with cities to develop context-sensitive roadways, but if there was no guiding language specifying what it was UDOT would default to the standard.

Councilmember Peterson conveyed her concerns with the visuals within the document. She pointed out that 40% of the document was photos and most were duplicates, unflattering, grainy, or underdeveloped. Councilmember Roper said the visuals should reflect Clearfield City, and that the document was the City's image.

Ms. Petheram asked if the Council needed to get back together again or if she could send the Council an updated document to review. The Council thought they could review the document and offer feedback without a meeting. The public hearing would be held on July 22, 2025.

Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn at 8:21 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Wurth.

RESULT: Passed [5 TO 0]

YES: Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Roper, Councilmember Ratchford, Councilmember Wurth

NO: None

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 22nd day of July 2025

/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, June 10, 2025.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder