CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 PM WORK MEETING
April 7, 2026

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

These meeting minutes were created with the aid of an AI-powered transcription and summarization tool – Otter.ai. The output was used as a draft and was subject to human review, editing, and fact-checking to ensure accuracy and compliance with city standards before publication. The City Clerk is responsible for the final content of these minutes.

PRESIDING: Mayor Pro Tem Megan Ratchford

PRESENT: Councilmember Karece Thompson, Councilmember Nike Peterson, Councilmember Megan Ratchford, Councilmember Dakota Wurth, Councilmember Danielle King

ABSENT: Mayor Mark Shepherd

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager JJ Allen, Community Development Director Stacy Millgate, Assistant City Manager Spencer Brimley, Community Relations Director Shaundra Rushton, City Attorney Stuart Williams, Community Services Director Eric Howes, Community Services Deputy Director Curtis Dickson, Aquatic Center Manager Clint Warnick, Police Chief Kelly Bennett, Public Works Director Adam Favero, Finance Manager Rich Knapp, Senior Accountant Lee Naylor

CITY COUNCIL SITE TOUR OF NEW MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS CENTER

The Council toured the new Public Works Maintenance and Operations Center located at 497 South Main Street. Immediately following the site tour, the City Council reconvened the work meeting at City Hall.

DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSED REVAMP PLAN FOR THE CLEARFIELD AQUATIC & FITNESS CENTER

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, explained that the proposal was the culmination of approximately six months of work, with Council awareness dating back to at least January 16, 2026, and staff work beginning in October. He briefly referenced a slide from a prior Council retreat, which outlined common goals and expectations, and stated that those retreat discussions had been synthesized with JJ Allen, City Manager, into three main goals for the current plan: to improve efficiency at the center, to strengthen management, and to ensure that a full-time employee was present at the facility during all hours of operation.

Mr. Howes then described a series of proposed operational changes aimed at improving efficiency and generating savings to be reinvested in management. First, he outlined changes to concessions. Over time, the center had expanded from two vending machines to offering heated frozen pizzas and other prepared items requiring more staff time. The proposal was to simplify concessions to only pre-packaged items and fountain drinks. This change was projected to reduce the concessions budget by approximately $15,000 annually, leaving an ongoing concessions budget of about $10,000. Associated staffing changes, including reduced need for concessions staffing and some reductions at the front desk during less busy times, were expected to generate an additional savings of a little over $15,000 in front desk operations.

Next, Mr. Howes addressed the elimination of the part-time manager-on-duty (MOD) position. He explained that if the center were to have full-time staff on site at all times, the MOD role as a part-time position was redundant. The MOD position accounted for approximately 70–75 hours per week. Using compensation figures that included average pay, workers' compensation, and FICA, prepared with assistance from the finance team, he reported that eliminating the MOD role would generate an estimated $86,000 in annual savings.

Mr. Howes then reviewed proposed changes to fitness classes. Using a detailed spreadsheet prepared initially by Melissa Haynes and then analyzed by Mr. Howes, staff evaluated all classes based on participation. Classes that were consistently busy and full were retained, low-performing classes were eliminated, and some mid-range classes were combined or removed. Mr. Howes noted that fitness classes were included in memberships and daily admission fees, meaning there was no separate revenue stream tied to individual classes. The intent was to maintain enough class offerings to keep memberships attractive while avoiding an overabundance of classes that complicated operations. The projected savings in this area primarily reflected reduced instructor hours.

Mr. Howes also reported changes related to childcare and program staffing classifications. He explained that the center had previously attempted to operate a preschool program in the space once used for daycare, reclassifying a "specialist" position to a "supervisor" to support that effort. After several years of trying to make the preschool program viable, it had been discontinued. Curtis Dickson, Deputy Community Services Director, clarified that it was the preschool—not daycare—that had been eliminated. Mr. Howes stated that, with the end of the preschool, staff proposed reclassifying the position back from supervisor to specialist to reflect current operations, resulting in a minor reduction in staffing cost.

Mr. Howes then turned to proposed schedule changes for the pool and overall hours of operation. He noted that operating the pool during open plunge required a certain minimum number of paying users to cover lifeguard costs. When asked to confirm the figure, Clint Warnick, Aquatics and Fitness Center (CAFC) Manager, clarified that it required approximately 12 users, including the head guard. Mr. Howes stated that usage data showed that the last hour and a half of open plunge Monday through Thursday did not meet that threshold, so staff proposed eliminating that period, yielding just under $49,000 in annual savings. Because any shift longer than four hours required lunch coverage, removing this late open plunge block would also eliminate the need for additional guards to cover lunches, saving approximately $17,000. Mr. Howes further proposed opening the facility one hour later on Sundays, which was estimated to save about $8,000 annually, with roughly another $6,000 in savings from reduced lunch coverage.

Regarding building hours, Mr. Howes said staff analyzed the number of people in the building by time of day, including both members and daily-fee users. Contrary to his initial assumption, midday usage remained relatively steady at an average of about 18 people, but the final hour of the day, from 9:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday, averaged only 3.8 people. Based on that low usage, staff proposed eliminating that final hour, acknowledging that the change would likely draw complaints from those few regular users but characterizing the adjustment as a modest efficiency measure rather than a major savings driver.

Mr. Howes then addressed the swim team program. He reminded the Council that there had been challenges with the prior head swim team coach, including philosophical differences over the program's direction. The head coach had left the previous summer, and the vacant position had not been filled. Instead, one of the aquatic supervisors had been directly managing the swim team, without a head coach, and overseeing several assistant coaches and a part-time specialist role that had historically existed between the supervisor and the assistants. He stated that this arrangement had reduced some management layers and was functioning reasonably well, though it had increased workload for the supervisor. He indicated that, as part of the broader plan, staff would propose structural changes to support this area and that without those changes it would be more difficult to sustain the elimination of the head coach role. The cost saving associated with eliminating the head coach structure was estimated at $35,000 annually.

Mr. Howes next outlined several customer-service-oriented changes that had minimal or uncertain fiscal impact. First, he described a proposed policy change for swim meets. Currently, spectators were charged the regular gate fee because entry beyond the gate provided access to the entire facility. He acknowledged that was one of the most frequent complaints—that spectators had to pay simply to watch a participant. Staff proposed ending the gate fee for spectators and instead using a visible hand stamp, similar to practices at amusement parks, so that if a stamped spectator attempted to use other parts of the facility, staff could identify and manage that appropriately. Mr. Howes explained that might slightly reduce revenue but was expected to significantly improve customer satisfaction. Second, party packages would be simplified by basing them on the number of participants rather than more complex options, and the center would stop providing food (such as pizzas) with the packages. Instead, customers would be allowed to bring their own food, such as cake, while the center would focus on renting the room and pool space. Finally, Mr. Howes proposed using the newly freed Wednesday night open plunge time for additional private rentals at a minimum rate of $175 per hour. He explained that the projected revenue from thesrentals was left as "unknown" because staff could not reliably predict how many rentals the center would secure in a year, though he provided examples showing that if the facility were rented weekly for 52 weeks, it would generate about $9,800, and if that were doubled, about $18,000.

Mr. Howes summarized that the operational changes presented—concession simplification, staffing adjustments (including the MOD elimination and reduced front desk and class staffing), schedule changes for open plunge and building hours, preschool-related reclassification, and swim team staffing changes—collectively yielded an estimated $287,000 in annual savings. He then transitioned to structural changes intended to strengthen management and invest some of those savings back into leadership capacity at the center.

Mr. Howes first described a plan for increased leadership presence at the center by having himself and Mr. Dickson spend more time working on site. He stated that he and Mr. Dickson intended to occupy the former swim coach's office at the center at least two days per week, with that office equipped with a desk, docking station, dual monitors, keyboard, and mouse. The proposed change would allow them to work at the center as effectively as at city offices. Mr. Howes explained that, following changes made in January to clarify roles, his responsibilities had shifted toward long-term, strategic planning, while Mr. Dickson's role focused more on day-to-day operations across four divisions. Mr. Howes believed it would be relatively easy for him to move many of his meetings and workdays to the center, especially on days other than standing meeting days, whereas Mr. Dickson's schedule, which involved frequent field support, would be more complicated. Mr. Howes stated that the initial plan was for the two of them, collectively, to provide a minimum of two days per week of leadership presence at the center to support the center manager and improve communication, with the exact amount to be refined over time based on experience. He noted that the cost impact of the proposed change was limited to the relatively minor purchase of office equipment, which he expected could be completed within a few weeks.

Mr. Howes then introduced the first proposed "add-back" position, an Assistant Center Manager (ACM). He explained that the role was designed primarily to support Mr. Warnick, the Center Manager, by enabling Mr. Warnick to focus on strategic leadership, overall business operations, community relations, and being the final point of escalation for personnel and customer service issues. The ACM would handle much of the day-to-day supervisory support, including development of policies and procedures, oversight of frontline supervisors, and facilitation of personnel and customer-service processes. Mr. Howes emphasized that a significant part of the ACM's role would be to support supervisors in managing personnel issues more consistently and promptly. He described how most issues currently originated with part-time frontline staff (e.g., at the front desk or in the pool area), whose authority was limited to following existing procedures. When customers were dissatisfied, issues escalated quickly to supervisors, who were responsible both for program planning and for large numbers of part-time staff. Because supervisors' schedules often did not align with those of part-time staff, it was easy for supervisors to delay addressing incidents until they next saw the staff member involved, which could be days later. Mr. Howes stated that the ACM would not replace supervisors' responsibilities but would remind and prompt them to complete necessary documentation and follow-up, ensuring that incident reports and related materials were timely and complete before being forwarded to Human Resources (HR). Mr. Howes noted that HR's main concerns regarding Aquatic Center personnel cases were that they took too long to be submitted and often arrived incomplete. The ACM would also serve as a conduit for HR guidance, sharing lessons learned from HR consultations across all supervisors so that expectations and processes were consistent.

Beyond personnel matters, Mr. Howes explained that the ACM, in collaboration with the Center Manager, would help define customer service goals and then be responsible for training and implementation across the center. The ACM would oversee supervisors' performance evaluations (CDCs) with input from the center manager, help develop supervisors' skills in areas such as risk management and customer service, and centralize training functions that had previously been handled in a more ad hoc manner. Mr. Howes said that the proposal would provide more structured training and oversight and allow the organization to hold supervisors more accountable, since they would clearly have received needed training. The ACM position would also serve effectively as a full-time manager-on-duty during peak hours, ensuring that during busy times there were at least two full-time staff members present at the center, one of whom would be able to make higher-level decisions than a part-time MOD. He concluded that the proposed position would materially strengthen management, improve operational consistency, and better support both HR and customer service outcomes.

Mr. Howes then presented the second proposed add-back position, an additional Aquatic Supervisor. Currently, the center had one Aquatic Supervisor focused on operations (such as lifeguard training, head guard oversight, rotation design, and water quality coordination with facilities) and one Aquatic Supervisor responsible for programs, including swim lessons and swim team, along with a diffuse approach to events and rentals that resulted in no single point of ownership except when the center manager assigned responsibility. Mr. Howes proposed reconfiguring the responsibilities into three Aquatic Supervisors: one concentrating on swim lessons—which he noted was the largest single program at the center, with nearly 6,000 participants annually and ongoing waitlists exceeding capacity—plus events; another focusing on swim team and rentals; and the existing operations-focused supervisor. Mr. Howes reported that staff had previously considered eliminating the swim team entirely, but when they evaluated the program against their business model's five considerations, the program performed well in all but one area: respect and sportsmanship. Mr. Howes attributed much of that struggle to insufficient full-time involvement in the program. Because both swim lessons and swim team were year-round programs and among the City's best-performing programs financially (with swim team alone generating approximately $29,000 to $35,000 in net revenue annually after expenses), Mr. Howes urged for support for the increased full-time oversight in those areas.

Mr. Howes explained that adding a third Aquatic Supervisor would help maintain a full-time aquatics presence in the pool area during nearly all of the center's operating hours, especially given that the center operated around 100 hours per week under current hours and would operate approximately 95 hours per week under the proposed schedule. With only two Aquatic Supervisors, there were significant gaps where no full-time aquatics supervisor was present on deck, particularly during off-peak times when rotation schedules placed supervisors elsewhere. A third supervisor would allow scheduling so that a trained, full-time aquatics professional was on-site most of the time in the pool area, which Mr. Howes described as the center's highest-risk operational zone. He proposed that all three supervisors share common core duties and maintain equivalent aquatic credentials (e.g., CPO or Aquatic Facility Operator certifications), allowing them to cover for each other, respond immediately to incidents, and manage risk consistently. In an incident, the on-duty Aquatic Supervisor—regardless of whether their primary portfolio was operations, swim lessons/events, or swim team/rentals—would be qualified to handle the situation and then communicate with the supervisor directly responsible for the staff member or program involved. This structure would replace reliance on part-time head guards as primary on-site decision-makers in serious situations and, in his view, significantly strengthen risk management.

Mr. Howes also noted that the Aquatics division employed between 100 and 120 part-time staff. Dividing those staff numbers among three supervisors instead of two would reduce each supervisor's span of control and permit better daily leadership, communication, and oversight of part-time employees. He reiterated that with the structural changes, the center would improve leadership presence, formalize ownership of programs and rentals, and increase accountability across aquatics operations.

He then addressed scheduling implications for full-time staff. He noted that staff had already begun a schedule rotation with five full-time personnel, and HR had previously modeled a schedule using four full-time aquatics/center staff plus the center manager filling weekend and gap shifts. Under that four-plus-manager model, there was only one hour per week (Wednesday from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) when all full-time staff were in the building together, which Mr. Howes believed would exacerbate existing communication and coordination challenges. He cautioned that such a schedule would be difficult to sustain long-term, particularly if any staff member resigned or took extended leave, such as parental or medical leave, or if training or vacation needs arose. He contended that an Assistant Center Manager plus an additional Aquatic Supervisor would allow six full-time staff in the rotation (with the center manager participating strategically), enabling a more balanced weekend and evening schedule, better work-life balance, and greater resilience in the face of turnover and absences. In Mr. Howes' view, a rotation with only five full-time staff put quality of life and work-life balance at risk and would be extremely difficult to manage if a single position became vacant for even a month or two.

Mr. Howes concluded the presentation with the financial summary. He reiterated that the operational changes identified earlier produced an estimated $287,000 in annual savings. The ACM position had been preliminarily assigned a pay grade of 12, and he stated that, with the assistance of Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, staff estimated the total personnel cost (including salary at 5% above the midpoint to conservatively overstate expense, plus benefits, FICA, and workers' compensation) at approximately $125,000. After funding the ACM from the projected savings, roughly $161,000 in savings would remain. However, Mr. Howes maintained that the additional Aquatic Supervisor was needed to support the swim team structure and the broader aquatics plan. Accounting for the prior $35,000 in savings from eliminating the head swim coach, he calculated that after funding the ACM and recognizing that swim team-related savings, there would be roughly $121,000 to $125,000 in savings remaining. The additional Aquatic Supervisor was estimated to cost approximately $104,000, which would leave about $57,000 in net annual savings overall if both positions were added. He ended by stating that the proposal, as presented, offered both strengthened management and net budgetary savings.

Mayor Pro Tem Ratchford asked whether the new positions would be salaried or hourly. Mr. Howes responded that the Assistant Center Manager would likely be salaried, while the Aquatic Supervisors would be hourly, similar to other comparable positions.

Councilmember Thompson then expressed concern about the long-term sustainability of the projected $57,000 in net savings, given that adding more staff would increase personnel costs over time through cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) and other pay changes. Councilmember Thompson asked whether the savings projection accounted for ongoing increases and whether, over time, the savings would erode. Mr. Howes acknowledged that, over the long term, the savings would likely narrow because full-time staff and part-time staff would both see wage increases. However, he pointed out that recent changes had moved part-time staff to a fixed annual increase of $0.50 per hour, which meant that part-time costs would eventually catch up in some respects.

Councilmember Peterson then raised a broader question about the goals of the restructuring. She recalled that in January, Council discussions had highlighted significant personnel challenges and friction points, particularly in aquatics. She continued that the possibility of a radical restructuring or divesting the center had been on the table if conditions did not improve. Councilmember Peterson asked Mr. Howes, in broad terms, whether the changes already implemented, combined with the proposed structural changes, would go far enough to address both structural and morale issues and return the work environment to where the City wanted it to be. Mr. Howes responded that the direction given to staff had been to strengthen management and improve efficiency, and he believed strongly that the current plan was the best way to accomplish those objectives. Mr. Howes distinguished between structural changes and potential changes to individual full-time employees, which had been discussed as an option in January but were not the focus of the present proposal. He stated that he did not believe it was fair to place the responsibility for past shortcomings solely on supervisors, given that the organization had not provided them with sufficient development and support. He added that the new structure, with an ACM and more structured training, would address that deficit. Mr. Howes stated that once adequate training and support were in place, management would be in a better position to hold individuals accountable if performance remained inadequate.

Councilmember Peterson followed up by asking how Mr. Howes, Mr. Dickson, and Mr. Allen would define success for these changes and how they would evaluate whether the new structure was functioning as intended. She also asked how and when the Council would be apprised of progress so that Council involvement could eventually recede back to a more typical oversight level. Mr. Howes replied that the structure was designed to address precisely the types of issues the center had been experiencing, particularly in aquatics. He reiterated that much of the prior difficulty had arisen on the aquatics side, including swim team and aquatics fitness classes. Mr. Howes stated that one key indicator would be feedback from HR. He explained that if, within about six months of implementing the ACM role and revised structure, HR continued to see the same problems with timeliness and completeness of personnel cases from the Aquatic Center, that would indicate the new structure was not working. He added if HR reported improvements, that would suggest progress. Mr. Howes stated that many of the supervisors needed to manage the issues that already existed but that was not currently being done consistently, and the restructuring would help ensure they were used effectively.

Mr. Allen then added perspective on the structural requirements being imposed. He described the directive given to Mr. Howes that the center must have at least one full-time employee scheduled from open to close every day, which Mr. Allen characterized as a significant structural change embedded in the schedule rather than in the staffing list. Mr. Allen acknowledged that the requirement would likely make schedules less flexible for full-time staff and be uncomfortable for some employees, but he believed it was necessary to reap the benefits of improved on-site leadership. Mr. Allen also shared a differing view from Mr. Howes regarding the timing of the additional Aquatic Supervisor. Mr. Allen stated that if the decision were solely his, he would approve adding the ACM immediately but would defer adding the third Aquatic Supervisor, at least initially, due to broader fiscal considerations. Mr. Allen explained that in the context of the City's overall budget, capturing the savings now was important, and that creating a new position only to later eliminate it if fiscal conditions worsened would be unfair to the incumbent. Mr. Allen suggested that it would be preferable to implement the ACM and other structural changes first, and, if the new paradigm proved successful and finances allowed, consider adding the additional Aquatic Supervisor later as a second step. He expressed strong support for Mr. Howes and Mr. Dickson spending at least two days per week at the center and noted that the shared office arrangement would also make it easier for Mr. Allen to occasionally work from the center.

Mr. Allen then discussed timeline expectations for reporting back. He suggested that if Council provided direction at this meeting to proceed with hiring an ACM, then in approximately three months staff would likely be in the process of hiring or have just hired someone, but there would not yet be measurable results. After about six months, staff would be able to provide preliminary feedback on how the arrangement was working, and by the time of the next January retreat, staff would be able to report more substantively on whether the changes were effective. Following that he envisioned quarterly updates to the Council on progress at the Aquatic Center.

Councilmember King asked whether the City conducted regular anonymous surveys of employees or members to gauge morale and satisfaction. Mr. Howes responded that while the City had done such surveys in the past, they had not been conducted consistently on an annual basis. Mr. Allen recalled that it had been several years—possibly seven or eight—since the last organization-wide survey. Councilmember King suggested conducting employee and member surveys specifically for the Aquatic Center both before and after the restructuring to measure changes in perceptions over time. Mr. Allen and councilmembers reacted favorably, with Mr. Allen noting that prior city-wide surveys had requested employees to identify their department, which some staff in small divisions feared could compromise anonymity, but that the Aquatic Center's large workforce might mitigate that concern. Councilmembers discussed whether the survey scope should be limited to aquatics or broadened to cover all of Community Services, with some indicating that the structural changes affected the broader division and might warrant a wider lens.

Councilmember Ratchford then asked whether the proposed positions included required certifications such as Certified Pool Operator (CPO), noting that such certifications carried costs. Mr. Howes replied that CPO or similar certifications were already included in the operational budget and that adding another Aquatic Supervisor would add some certification cost but not a major amount. Mr. Howes then commented, in response to Mr. Allen's earlier reservations about adding the supervisor immediately, that the current proposal was unique in that both positions were funded from internally generated savings. Mr. Howes expressed skepticism that, in future years, the City would be able to fund a new Aquatic Supervisor from the general fund budget, given that new Community Services positions historically had to compete against public safety positions in the regular budget process. Mr. Allen confirmed that he and Mr. Howes had previously discussed that point and acknowledged that Mr. Howes' concern was reasonable.

Councilmember King asked whether adding another Aquatic Supervisor would allow the center to expand swim lessons and similar programs. Mr. Howes answered that it would, particularly when combined with the additional evening availability created by the schedule changes. He also noted that there were opportunities to expand programming on evenings not reserved for additional rentals, although he declined to project specific revenue increases, stating that while revenues would likely increase, staff could not reliably quantify the amount in advance.

Councilmembers then discussed the balance between reducing hours and adding administrative overhead. Councilmember Wurth expressed concern about adding two positions while simultaneously reducing the number of hours that the center was open, suggesting that such changes might increase operational overhead while reducing service availability and potentially drive some users to other facilities. Councilmember Wurth pointed out that some of the projected savings relied on maintaining current membership levels and that reducing hours of operation could affect those levels. Councilmember Thompson similarly noted that reduced hours and added staff costs raised questions about whether the City was truly saving money or simply shifting the balance between service and overhead.

Councilmember King responded by emphasizing the importance of customer service quality. Councilmember King argued that if the center improved customer service, staff reliability, and perceived safety, patrons would be more likely to return and recommend the center to others, whereas poor customer service experiences were more likely to drive people away permanently than occasional facility issues. Improving the quality of the experience within the open hours could justify modest reductions in lesser-used hours.

Councilmember Thompson stated appreciation for Mr. Howes' acknowledgement of the need for better supervisor training and support and viewed that as a strong argument in favor of the ACM position. Councilmember Thompson reiterated that the primary concern with the additional Aquatic Supervisor was the risk that, if the position did not produce the desired benefits, the City would face a difficult and personal decision regarding eliminating a filled position. Councilmember Wurth added that some redundancy in the plan was intentional but that government programs were politically and practically difficult to roll back once implemented. The group discussed that if the new supervisor role were later determined not to be necessary, it would be challenging to cut that position.

Mr. Allen then provided additional budget context, noting a recent conversation with the mayor in which Mr. Allen had suggested listing the Aquatic Supervisor position on the state-required "property tax impact schedule" as part of any property tax increase. Mr. Allen explained that under current law, the City was required to inform residents of any intended new property tax revenue and specify what it would fund. Mr. Allen said that the mayor had quickly dismissed the idea of tying a property tax increase to an Aquatic Supervisor position, preferring to reserve that justification for highly visible public safety or similar roles. Mr. Allen stated that staff were actively considering which items to list on the property tax impact schedule for the upcoming budget and implied that the Aquatic Supervisor might not be an easy position to defend publicly as a tax driver.

Councilmember Thompson asked about the status of the bond on the Aquatic Center—specifically, when the bond would be paid off and whether there would be an opportunity to "recapture" that revenue. Mr. Allen responded that the Aquatic Center bond was scheduled to be fully paid in fiscal year 2029 and that, unlike a prior general obligation bond the City had recaptured, the Aquatic Center bond was serviced by Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funds. Mr.

Allen explained that once the bond was paid off, the associated RDA revenues would expire and could not be retained in the same way as a recaptured tax levy.

The discussion then returned to the decision on whether to authorize both positions or only the ACM. Councilmember Peterson summarized that there appeared to be consensus that the ACM position was clearly justified. She expressed confidence that the analysis supporting the additional Aquatic Supervisor was sound and that the position would be effective if added, but questioned whether it was the highest priority compared to other city-wide needs for personnel funding. Councilmember Thompson noted that prior analyses in other areas had sometimes required later revision, making Council cautious about relying too heavily on any single staff proposal. Councilmember King stressed that the City was at a critical juncture with the Aquatic Center, having recently contemplated divesting the asset. Councilmember King argued that the center was an important community resource and that if the City intended to “fix” it, the fix should be comprehensive rather than partial, to avoid another cycle of underperformance leading back to the question of divestment.

Councilmembers discussed the risk that if the additional Aquatic Supervisor were deferred to a future budget cycle, it might never be added due to competition with other priorities. Councilmember Peterson noted that staff had been asked to identify what was needed to correct major deficiencies at the center and had presented a plan fully funded with internal savings and still producing net savings. She expressed concern that approving only part of that plan might leave a known structural gap unaddressed. Councilmember Thompson reiterated that his personal concern lay more with the difficulty of eliminating a filled position later if it proved less critical than anticipated, rather than any doubt about the immediate need.

Mr. Allen suggested a procedural approach to help Council weigh the Aquatic Supervisor against other city-wide needs. He recommended that Council provide clear direction to proceed with the ACM position, while deferring a final decision on the additional Aquatic Supervisor until the following week’s budget work session. Mr. Allen explained that in that session, Council would see the full array of budgetary pressures, cuts, and potential additions across all departments, including items that might be placed on the property tax impact schedule. Seeing that broader context, Mr. Allen suggested, could help Council decide whether to authorize the Aquatic Supervisor position as part of the upcoming fiscal year budget or to delay it. He clarified that the approach would still keep the Aquatic Supervisor “on the table” for decision, but it would not be finalized at the current work session.

Councilmembers discussed the suggestion. Councilmember Ratchford stated support for approving both positions, noting that staff had diligently identified internal savings sufficient to fund them while still leaving some net savings. Councilmember King agreed, stating that Mr. Howes and the team had thoroughly examined the budget and believed both positions were necessary to support the large number of part-time employees and ensure proper supervision. Councilmember Wurth acknowledged that both positions appeared necessary but was persuaded that, as Mr. Allen suggested, the decision on the Aquatic Supervisor should be made within the context of the broader budget discussion. Councilmember Thompson indicated a willingness to support whichever course the group chose but remained cognizant of the personnel impact of any future cuts.

As the discussion converged, Councilmember Peterson framed an "unofficial motion" for the sake of clarity, noting that there would be no formal vote in the work session. She stated that, if this were a voting item, she would support moving forward immediately with the ACM position and would place the Aquatic Supervisor position into the upcoming budget discussion to be evaluated alongside other city-wide staffing needs. Councilmember Peterson indicated that the Council should see the "full spreadsheet" of budget impacts before making a final decision on the supervisor role. Several councilmembers verbally indicated general agreement with that approach, while Councilmember Ratchford and Councilmember King reiterated their view that both positions were substantively warranted and funded through savings.

Mr. Allen summarized the direction as follows: staff would proceed immediately with finalizing the job description and related details for the Assistant Center Manager position in coordination with HR and would begin advertising the ACM position as soon as practicable, assuming Council concurrence. The proposal for adding a third Aquatic Supervisor would remain under active consideration and would be brought back to the Council for further discussion and a decision as part of the next week's budget meeting. Additionally, Mr. Allen and Mr. Howes would continue refining the structural schedule changes, including the requirement that a full-time employee be scheduled on-site from opening to closing each day. Mr. Howes noted that a meeting with current MOD staff was already scheduled for the following day to explain the operational and staffing changes and to begin implementing the new scheduling framework. Councilmembers also expressed support for proceeding with employee and member surveys for the Aquatic Center to establish a baseline and conduct follow-up surveys after implementation of the structural changes, with Mr. Allen and staff to design and administer those surveys.

Participants acknowledged the agreed-upon next steps, including implementation of operational savings measures, increased leadership presence at the center, initiation of the ACM hiring process, design and distribution of surveys, and scheduling of the follow-up budget discussion on the potential Aquatic Supervisor position at the next Council work meeting.

Councilmember Ratchford moved to adjourn, seconded by Councilmember Wurth.

RESULT: **Passed [5 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Ratchford, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Mayor Mark Shepherd

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 12th day of May 2026

/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, April 07, 2026.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder