CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA AND SUMMARY REPORT
October 13, 2026 - POLICY MEETING

Meetings of the City Council of Clearfield City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-207 as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meetings will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

55 South State Street
Third Floor
Clearfield, Utah

7:00 P.M. POLICY MEETING

CALL TO ORDER:
Mayor Mark Shepherd

OPENING CEREMONY:
Pledge of Allegiance
Solemn Moment of Reflection
Council Member King

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
September 22, 2026 – policy meeting

PRESENTATIONS:

1. SWEARING IN OF NEW CLEARFIELD POLICE OFFICER CARTER BURRELL

2. PRESENT WINNERS OF THE 2026 YARD OF THE YEAR CONTEST

BACKGROUND: The Parks & Recreation Commission has selected the winners of the annual "Yard of the Year" contest and staff and Council are pleased to recognize these residents for their efforts in doing their part to beautify the community:

- First Place Winner: Michael and Lori Shreeve
- Runners Up: Aaron Roth and Bruce Finch

SCHEDULED ITEMS:

3. OPEN COMMENT PERIOD

The Open Comment Period provides an opportunity to address the Mayor and City Council regarding concerns or ideas on any topic relevant to city business. To be considerate of everyone at this meeting, public comment will be limited to three minutes per person. Participants are to state their names for the record. Comments, which cannot be made within these limits, should be submitted in writing to the City Recorder at nancy.dean@clearfieldcityut.gov.

The Mayor and City Council encourage civil discourse for everyone who participates in the meeting.

4. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2026-14 AMENDING TITLE 3, CHAPTER 2 – PLANNING COMMISSION WITH RECENT CHANGES TO STATE LAW

BACKGROUND: Clearfield City Code Title 3, Chapter 2 establishes the City's Planning Commission and provides requirements concerning its membership, terms of office, qualifications, compensation, powers and duties, rules and procedures, quorum, and records. Utah Code § 10-20-301 requires each municipality to establish a planning commission by ordinance and identifies specific matters that must be addressed in the ordinance. Recent amendments to Utah law added requirements concerning the appointment, removal, recusal, authority, bylaws, and procedure for planning commissions. The proposed ordinance updates Clearfield City's Planning Commission chapter to address these statutory requirements and to clarify the City's existing practices and procedures.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve Ordinance 2026-14 amending Title 3, Chapter 2 – Planning Commission with recent changes to State Law and authorize the mayor's signature to any necessary documents.

5. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE PROCLAMATION DECLARING OCTOBER 18-24, 2026 UNITED AGAINST HATE WEEK IN CLEARFIELD CITY

BACKGROUND: Clearfield City is committed to fostering a community where every resident, business owner, visitor, and member of our military community can live free from intimidation and where all individuals are encouraged to contribute to the success and well-being of our City. The City is joining communities throughout Utah and across the nation in recognizing United Against Hate Week as an opportunity to reaffirm our shared commitment to civility, respect, inclusion, and the rejection of the hatred in all its forms.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the Proclamation declaring October 18-24, 2026 United Against Hate Week in Clearfield City and authorize the mayor's signature to any necessary documents.

COMMUNICATION ITEMS:

A. Mayor's Report
B. City Council's Reports
C. City Manager's Report
D. Staff Reports

*****ADJOURN AS THE CITY COUNCIL*****

Posted on October 6, 2026.

/s/Chersty Titensor, Deputy City Recorder

The City of Clearfield, in accordance with the 'Americans with Disabilities Act' provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens needing assistance. Persons requesting these accommodations for City sponsored public meetings, service programs or events should call Nancy Dean at 801-525-2714, giving her 48-hour notice.

The complete public notice is posted on the Utah Public Notice Website - www.utah.gov/pmn/, the Clearfield City Website – ClearfieldCityUT.gov, and at Clearfield City Hall, 55 South State Street, Clearfield, UT 84015. To

request a copy of the public notice or for additional inquiries please contact Nancy Dean at Clearfield City, Nancy.dean@clearfieldcityut.gov & 801-525-2700.

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
7:00 PM POLICY MEETING
September 22, 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 and ChatGPT. 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 Mark Shepherd

PRESENT: Mayor Mark Shepherd, Councilmember Nike Peterson, Councilmember Karece Thompson, Councilmember Dakota Wurth, Councilmember Danielle King

ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager JJ Allen, Assistant City Manager Spencer Brimley, City Attorney Stuart Williams, CDBG Coordinator Allison Barnes, Assistant Police Chief Devin Rogers, Community Services Director Eric Howes, Public Works Director Adam Favero, Community Development Director Stacy Millgate, Associate Planner Tyson Stoddard, Communications Manager Shaundra Rushton, City Recorder Nancy Dean, Deputy City Recorder Chersty Titensor

VISITORS: Taylor Alvarez, Cristy Zabrosky, Ron Clements, Frank Zobrosky, Roget Nessen, Michael Christensen

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. and explained the process for submitted comments during public hearings and the open comment period.

Councilmember Wurth led the opening ceremonies.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
September 8, 2026 – Work Meeting
September 8, 2026 – Policy Meeting

Councilmember Wurth moved to approve the September 8, 2026 work and September 8, 2026 policy meeting minutes, seconded by Councilmember King.

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

DRAFT

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) 2025-2026 CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT (CAPER)

Allison Barnes, CDBG Coordinator, presented the 2025–2026 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER). She reported that Open Doors, Safe Harbor, and the Davis Community Learning Center had each spent their allotted $10,342. She stated that $134,466 had been allocated for the City Hall elevator project, with an additional $26,000 added from prior program years, and $41,373 had been allocated for program administration.

Ms. Barnes reported that Open Doors served 125 Clearfield residents, Safe Harbor served 310, and the Davis Community Learning Center served 689, for a total of 1,124 participants. Of those participants, 390 were categorized as extremely low income, 602 as low income, and 132 as moderate income.

Mayor Shepherd opened the public hearing and invited comments regarding the CDBG performance evaluation report. No public comments were provided.

Councilmember Peterson moved to close the public hearing at 7:07 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Thompson.

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE CITY-INITIATED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO REMOVE TRAILER SALES AS A PERMITTED USE IN THE T-C ZONE (TOWN MIXED COMMERCE) AND ESTABLISH TRAILER SALES AS A CONDITIONAL USE IN THE M-1 ZONE (MANUFACTURING)

Tyson Stoddard, Associate Planner, explained that trailer sales were currently permitted in the Town Commerce (TC) Zone within the downtown Form Based Code area. He stated that trailer sales had not originally been permitted when the downtown Form Based Code was adopted in 2020. The use was added in 2025 following uncertainty regarding whether trailer sales fell within the City's motor vehicle sales definition and discussions involving a prospective business, the Property Rights Ombudsman's Office, and the City Council.

Mr. Stoddard stated that staff subsequently continued evaluating trailer sales in relation to the City's downtown character and mixed-use vision. Staff determined that trailer sales constituted a distinct use from motor vehicle sales and had operational characteristics more compatible with the M-1 Manufacturing Zone and less compatible with a mixed-use, walkable downtown.

Mr. Stoddard explained that the proposed amendment would establish a specific definition for trailer sales, remove trailer sales as a permitted use in the TC Zone, retain applicable Form

Based Code development standards for the existing trailer sales business as a legal nonconforming use, and establish trailer sales as a conditional use in the M-1 Manufacturing Zone. He identified the TC areas within downtown and the M-1 area encompassing much of the Freeport Center. He reported that the Planning Commission had recommended approval based on the findings contained in the staff report.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Michael Christensen, Resident, expressed concern regarding the precedent of amending the code to allow a particular trailer sales business and then subsequently removing the use from the zone, thereby making the existing business nonconforming. He questioned whether the change could effectively leave one business as the only trailer sales operation allowed in that zone. He also questioned whether the TC Zone realistically had demand or space for multiple trailer sales businesses and whether removing the use was necessary.

Councilmember Wurth moved to close the public hearing at 7:12 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson.

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT REQUEST TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 2.6 ACRES OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1000 EAST ANTELOPE DRIVE FROM M-1 (MANUFACTURING) TO C-2 (COMMERCIAL); AND APPROXIMATELY 5 ACRES OF THE SOUTHERN SIDE OF THE PROPERTY TO R-3 (RESIDENTIAL)

Tyson Stoddard, Associate Planner, presented a zoning map amendment request for property located near 1000 East and Antelope Drive/1700 South. He stated that the overall property consisted of approximately 7.62 acres and was currently zoned M-1 Manufacturing. The property contained a residential dwelling near the northeast corner, while most of the property was used for commercial storage of camping trailers and recreational vehicles.

Mr. Stoddard explained that the applicant requested approximately 2.6 acres nearest Antelope Drive be rezoned from M-1 Manufacturing to C-2 Commercial and the remaining approximately five acres be rezoned to R-3 Residential. The applicant's conceptual plan showed approximately 28,000 square feet of commercial office space and 67 townhomes on the residential portion, representing approximately 13.4 residential units per acre. Mr. Stoddard emphasized that the plan was conceptual and that the matter before the Council was the rezone rather than approval of a specific development plan.

Mr. Stoddard reported that the Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company had submitted written comments stating that irrigation lines along Antelope Drive and 1000 East would need

to be protected during future development. Residents from a neighborhood east of the property in Layton had also raised concerns regarding traffic on 1000 East, particularly during morning and afternoon peak periods and when trains blocked the nearby railroad crossing, as well as pedestrian safety due to incomplete sidewalk infrastructure.

Mr. Stoddard stated that development of the property would provide an opportunity to complete the sidewalk along the Clearfield side of the property. He also reported that Layton City had received a federal Safe Routes to School grant for a pedestrian bridge across the railroad tracks. Layton City's goal was to complete the bridge by approximately the end of 2028, with completion required under the grant by the end of 2030.
Mr. Stoddard reported that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezone subject to execution of a development agreement. He explained that development agreements had typically been used for mixed commercial and residential projects to establish expectations regarding the timing of commercial development. The applicant had indicated willingness to work through a development agreement addressing development timelines, design standards, site layout considerations, potential owner-occupancy requirements, and the amount or square footage of commercial development.

Mr. Stoddard explained that the proposed rezone was generally consistent with the City's General Plan and Station Area Plan. The General Plan designated the property as General Commercial, where commercial development was the primary consideration but residential development could be considered as part of a mixed-use project. The Station Area Plan similarly contemplated commercial development near the corner and potential residential development on the remainder of the property. He stated that changing the M-1 zoning could also better align the property with the City's long-term land use vision, which concentrated manufacturing uses primarily north of Antelope Drive in the Freeport area and contemplated transitions to commercial and residential uses south of Antelope Drive.

Councilmember Thompson asked how the proposal was considered generally consistent with the General Commercial designation when approximately five acres were proposed for residential development and approximately two acres for commercial development. Mr. Stoddard explained that the General Plan identified commercial as the primary consideration but did not prescribe a specific percentage of a property that must be commercial. Determining whether the proposed commercial component satisfied the City's vision was ultimately a legislative decision for the City Council.

Councilmember Thompson asked whether the term "primary consideration" had a more defined standard or was it subject to the Council's interpretation. Mr. Stoddard responded that the General Plan served as a guide and did not establish a specific acreage or percentage requirement. The Council, acting as the legislative body, would determine whether the proposal was consistent with its vision for the area.

Councilmember Thompson then discussed the relationship between the Station Area Plan and the more recently adopted General Plan and asked about water use implications associated with changing the anticipated land uses. Councilmember Thompson noted that residential development represented ongoing water demand and asked how the equivalent residential unit

usage of the proposed development might compare with development under the existing or planned designations.

Mr. Stoddard explained that the property's current water use was likely relatively low because it contained one residence and was otherwise primarily used for trailer storage. Development with approximately 67 townhomes and an office building would increase water consumption compared with the current use. However, he noted that the property was currently zoned M-1 Manufacturing and certain manufacturing uses could also consume significant amounts of water. Consequently, actual water consumption would depend on the type of development constructed, and it was not possible at that stage to determine whether residential development would consume more or less water than a hypothetical manufacturing use.

Councilmember Thompson suggested that future staff reports involving redevelopment or land use changes include information comparing equivalent residential unit water demands where possible. Councilmember Thompson stated that the information would assist the Council in considering land-use efficiency, commercial viability, redevelopment, and infrastructure impacts together rather than considering zoning decisions in isolation.

City Manager JJ Allen added that the City's Water Master Plan contemplated future land uses and that infrastructure, impact fee, and water-rate planning should account for anticipated redevelopment. Mr. Allen believed the property had likely been considered for development generally consistent with a mixture of commercial and residential uses but deferred to Public Works Director Adam Favero for confirmation.

Mr. Favero confirmed that Public Works had worked extensively with planning staff during preparation of the water planning documents. Future land uses and zoning changes, particularly along corridors expected to redevelop more quickly, had been considered in the City's water modeling and planning.

Councilmember Thompson stated that the additional information was helpful and reiterated an interest in understanding the infrastructure and economic impacts associated with future land use decisions, including potential tax base benefits from commercial development.

Mayor Shepherd opened the public hearing. No public comments were provided.

Councilmember Thompson moved to close the public hearing at 7:35 p.m., seconded by Councilmember King.

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

DRAFT

PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE CITY-INITIATED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11 OF THE CLEARFIELD CITY CODE FOR RESIDENTIAL DESIGN AND PARKING REGULATIONS

Tyson Stoddard, Associate Planner, presented proposed amendments to Title 11 of the Clearfield City Code intended to bring the City's residential development standards into compliance with Utah Code §10-20-618. He explained that state law limited municipal authority over certain residential building-design elements and parking standards applicable to single-family, two-family, and townhome dwellings.

Mr. Stoddard stated that the amendments would reduce City requirements for minimum finished floor area where existing requirements exceeded 1,000 square feet; address restrictions on requiring garages for housing meeting the statutory definition of affordable housing; and amend parking and garage dimensional standards. He explained that the City could not require uncovered residential parking spaces larger than nine feet by 20 feet or covered parking/garage spaces larger than 10 feet by 20 feet, although the City could require covered parking areas to remain unobstructed.

The amendments would also add a definition of "townhome" to Title 11 and identify townhomes as a permitted use in the R-2 and R-3 Zones. Proposed design standards would limit connected townhome units to six per building, consistent with the City's existing vision for townhome development.

Mr. Stoddard reported that during the Planning Commission public hearing, a resident expressed support for making garages optional in all residential zones and expressed concern regarding the statutory definition of affordable housing, which referenced housing priced at 80 percent of the county median home price. Mr. Stoddard clarified that the affordable housing definition came from state statute rather than Clearfield City Code and that the purpose of the proposed amendments was specifically to bring the City's ordinance into compliance with state law rather than undertake a broader reconsideration of garage requirements.

Mr. Stoddard further reported that, following the Council's work session discussion, the proposed townhome definition had been revised by changing the word "may" to "shall" in one sentence. The Planning Commission had recommended approval based on the findings in the staff report.

Mayor Shepherd opened the public hearing. No public comments were provided.

Councilmember Peterson moved to close the public hearing at 7:41 p.m., seconded by Councilmember King.

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

DRAFT

OPEN COMMENT PERIOD

Cristy Zobrosky, Clearfield resident, expressed concern about additional townhome and apartment development and stated that residents wanted additional retail services, including a grocery store and pharmacy. Ms. Zobrosky recalled businesses that had historically operated in the area and questioned the type and scale of businesses that might occupy commercial spaces beneath residential development. Ms. Zobrosky also raised concerns regarding water use, public notification of proposed developments, increasing traffic, garbage collection, and the effect of additional residential development on existing neighborhoods. Ms. Zobrosky encouraged the City to pursue a grocery store and other businesses desired by residents.

Mayor Shepherd responded that the Council would support a grocery store proposal but explained that the City itself did not construct grocery stores.

Ron Clements, Clearfield resident, expressed concern about continued apartment development and stated that more effort should be directed toward attracting businesses to Clearfield. Mr. Clements stated that residents frequently spent money in surrounding communities and expressed concern about increasing demands on police and fire services associated with additional development. Mr. Clements encouraged the City to pursue economic development that would retain spending within Clearfield and expressed concern that redevelopment was allowing developers to determine the City's future rather than focusing on attracting businesses and preserving limited resources, including water.

Michael Christensen, Clearfield resident, had submitted a comment form but did not provide additional comments when called.

APPROVAL OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) 2025-2026 CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT (CAPER)

Councilmember King moved to approve the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) 2025-2026 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) and authorize the mayor's signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Thompson.

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2026-17 A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT REQUEST TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 2.6 ACRES OF FRONTAGE OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1000 EAST ANTELOPE DRIVE FROM M-1 (MANUFACTURING) TO C-2 (COMMERCIAL); AND APPROXIMATELY 5 ACRES OF THE SOUTHERN SIDE OF THE PROPERTY TO R-3 (RESIDENTIAL)

Councilmember Wurth moved to approve Ordinance 2026-17 a zoning map amendment request to rezone approximately 2.6 acres of the property frontage located at 1000 East Antelope Drive from M-1 (Manufacturing) to C-2 (Commercial), and approximately 5 acres of the southern side of the property to R-3 (Residential); and authorize the mayor's signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Peterson. Councilmember King voted nay, stating the vote was consistent with a preference to retain a primarily commercial use for the area. Mayor Shepherd stated that the proposed development represented a good opportunity and acknowledged concerns regarding the amount of commercial development but believed the property's layout and topography supported the proposal.

RESULT: **Passed [3 TO 2]**
YES: Mayor Shepherd, Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Wurth
NO: Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember King
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2026-15 A CITY-INITIATED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO REMOVE TRAILER SALES AS A PERMITTED USE IN THE T-C ZONE (TOWN MIXED COMMERCE) AND ESTABLISH TRAILER SALES AS A CONDITIONAL USE IN THE M-1 ZONE (MANUFACTURING)

Councilmember Thompson stated that while there was validity in considering downtown walkability and the desired appearance and character of the City, there was continued concern about limiting potential economic opportunities based on those considerations. Councilmember Thompson stated that additional businesses could benefit residents and that trailer sales could generate tax revenue.

Councilmember King moved to approve Ordinance 2026-15 a city-initiated zoning text amendment to remove trailer sales as a permitted use in the T-C Zone (Town Mixed Commerce) and establish Trailer Sales as a Conditional Use in the M-1 (Manufacturing) Zone and authorize the mayor's signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Wurth.

RESULT: **Passed [3 TO 1]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: Councilmember Thompson
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2026-16 THE CITY-INITIATED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11 OF THE CLEARFIELD CITY CODE FOR RESIDENTIAL DESIGN AND PARKING REGULATIONS

Councilmember Wurth stated that requiring garages could affect housing affordability and expressed concern regarding the State's definition used to determine affordable housing. Councilmember Wurth acknowledged, however, that the proposed amendments were

DRAFT

necessary to comply with state law and that state requirements limited the City's discretion.

Councilmember Wurth moved to approve Ordinance 2026-16 the city-initiated zoning text amendments to Title 11 of the Clearfield City Code for residential design and parking regulations and authorize the mayor's signature to any necessary documents, seconded by Councilmember Thompson.

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Mark Shepherd

- Mayor Shepherd addressed comments regarding economic development and stated that the City was actively working to attract businesses. Mayor Shepherd reported that staff had met that afternoon with the County's economic development group and a developer familiar with Clearfield to discuss potential development opportunities. Mayor Shepherd stated that the City continued to pursue grocery store opportunities and that he and Spencer Brimley, Economic Development Director, regularly attended a national retail convention to recruit retailers to Clearfield.
- Mayor Shepherd discussed challenges experienced by previous grocery stores in Clearfield and stated that businesses needed sufficient community support to remain viable. Mayor Shepherd also discussed previous efforts to attract Costco to the Legend Hills area, noting that available land, financial incentives, and property ownership affected the City's ability to compete for large retailers.
- Mayor Shepherd stated that quality of life for Clearfield residents remained a primary consideration and that the development discussed during public comment had been approved several years earlier and was approaching construction. The City was also working on commercial development associated with that project.
- Mayor Shepherd reported attending a September 11 remembrance event at Hill Air Force Base and described presentations offering different perspectives on the events and impacts of September 11.
- Mayor Shepherd also reported attending the Eradicate Hate Global Summit in Pittsburgh and stated that, despite presentations addressing serious issues including online threats to children and hate, the conference emphasized hope, dignity, and treating others respectfully.
- At the conclusion of the City Council reports, Mayor Shepherd thanked Councilmembers Peterson and Wurth for clarifying the City's existing grocery options and sales tax implications of delivered online purchases. Mayor Shepherd recognized Rancho Markets as an important Clearfield business and reiterated the importance of existing commercial development. Mayor Shepherd also cited a multimillion-dollar golf facility and restaurant in Legend Hills as an example of recent commercial investment in the City.

CITY COUNCIL'S REPORTS

DRAFT

Councilmember Peterson

- Councilmember Peterson reported that there were no significant updates from Wasatch Integrated Waste Management and noted that a major waste conference would occur the following week.
- Councilmember Peterson clarified that Clearfield currently had two grocery stores, Rancho Markets and Winegar's, and encouraged residents to support both.
- Councilmember Peterson also discussed changes in sales tax sourcing associated with online purchases and home delivery and stated that purchases ordered from within Clearfield and delivered to Clearfield could generate sales tax revenue for the City even when fulfilled by businesses outside the City.
- Councilmember Peterson emphasized the importance of supporting existing local businesses, noting that some local businesses had reported difficulty remaining viable because residents chose businesses outside Clearfield. Councilmember Peterson encouraged residents to support existing businesses while the City continued efforts to attract additional commercial development.

Councilmember Wurth

- Councilmember Wurth reminded residents that the North Davis Fire District Fire Prevention Open House would be held the following Monday at Station 42 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Councilmember Wurth also reported participating in the swearing-in of five new firefighters and the promotion of two firefighters and recognized the regional assistance provided by district firefighters to neighboring communities.
- Councilmember Wurth reported that the Youth Commission had recently held a suicide-prevention workshop and panel following its previous advocacy regarding youth homelessness and suicide prevention. Councilmember Wurth stated that approximately 30 people attended and commended the Youth Commission for continuing its community advocacy.
- Councilmember Wurth also addressed the earlier economic-development comments, noting changes in consumer shopping habits and increased online purchasing. Councilmember Wurth stated that these trends created challenges for small businesses and traditional retail establishments.
- Regarding housing, Councilmember Wurth stated that Clearfield's limited undeveloped land required consideration of vertical development and that housing affordability was a significant statewide challenge. Councilmember Wurth acknowledged residents' concerns and offered to continue discussing the issues after the meeting.

Councilmember King

- Councilmember King announced that Communities That Care North Davis planned to hold Red Ribbon Night at Clearfield High School on either October 26 or October 27. Councilmember King explained that the prevention event would focus on teen drug use and community awareness, including a "Gray Matters" campaign addressing marijuana's effects on adolescent brain development. The organization was seeking donated raffle prizes from local businesses. Councilmember King reported that Jason Kilmer from the University of Washington was expected to speak.
- Councilmember King also reported on a voluntary "We Card" campaign involving Communities That Care volunteers and Police Chief Bennett to encourage retailers and adults not to provide vaping products to minors. Councilmember King stated that prevention information indicated youth were beginning to vape at younger ages and often obtained products from adults.
- Councilmember King reported attending a Job Corps graduation and luncheon and recognized the opportunities the program provided to young people and the support shown between

current students and graduates.

- Councilmember King also reported that Mosquito Abatement had obtained a replacement rental aircraft following the loss of its previous aircraft. Councilmember King stated that a West Nile virus case had been identified in Davis County but that the disease-carrying mosquito population was declining. Mosquito Abatement continued nighttime and dusk spraying and drone treatments for mosquito eggs.

Councilmember Thompson

- Councilmember Thompson reported that the North Davis Sewer District had recently completed an audit with one primary finding involving accounts that had not been properly included in financial reports. The district intended to correct the issue, and Councilmember Thompson stated that the district otherwise remained financially healthy.
- Councilmember Thompson announced the Utah State Treasurer's Office Women in the Money Conference scheduled for October 22–23, 2026, and stated that complimentary tickets could be available for City employees. Councilmember Thompson described the conference as focused on financial and economic education, particularly financial viability, economic progress, and upward mobility for women, and noted efforts to include domestic-violence outreach.
- Councilmember Thompson also reported working on a presentation regarding future economic development and employment opportunities, including potential opportunities associated with the robotics industry. Councilmember Thompson stated that the research was also prompting consideration of future water and electrical demands when evaluating development proposals.
- Councilmember Thompson expressed concern that newly constructed townhomes could be priced beyond the income levels of many current Clearfield residents and suggested exploring economic-development opportunities capable of attracting higher-paying jobs so residents could better afford available housing.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

JJ Allen, City Manager

- Mr. Allen stated that redevelopment often generated differing opinions and could not satisfy every interest.
- He reported that Councilmember Ratchford had been unable to attend because of a work emergency and had sent apologies.
- Mr. Allen reported that Mayor Shepherd, Spencer Brimley, and he planned to meet with future legislators the following week to discuss their respective priorities and objectives.
- He also reported that the City's employee-appreciation carnival had been successful and thanked the elected officials who attended in support of employees.

Spencer Brimley, Assistant City Manager

- Mr. Brimley reminded the Council of the upcoming Civic and Town Center charrette. He explained that the process would begin Monday with a staff core team meeting, followed by a public facing event from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. that evening. The event had intentionally been scheduled in conjunction with the Fire District's event to encourage attendance. He stated that the Planning Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission, and staff were invited to participate Tuesday morning from 10:00 a.m. to noon, followed by a City Council workshop Tuesday evening from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The charrette would conclude Wednesday afternoon when the consultant would synthesize the information received and develop concepts and opportunities for consideration. Mr. Brimley clarified that outreach for the charrette was deliberately focused on businesses, tenants, and property owners within and adjacent to the approximately 10-acre Civic and Town Center study area rather than being promoted as a broad citywide planning exercise. Staff and the consultant had been contacting affected

DRAFT

property owners and businesses directly, including owners of properties recently identified as being for sale. Mr. Brimley asked Councilmembers who had not received meeting invitations to notify him.

STAFF REPORTS

Stacy Millgate, Community Development Director

- Ms. Millgate expressed appreciation for Tyson Stoddard's work as the City's sole planner for approximately 18 months and announced that he had accepted a position with Kaysville City and would remain with Clearfield through the following Friday.

Tyson Stoddard, Associate Planner

- Mr. Stoddard expressed appreciation for the opportunity to work for Clearfield City, the City Council, and City staff. He stated that leaving brought mixed emotions but that he and his family would continue to reside in Clearfield. Mr. Stoddard thanked the Council for its service and stated that working for the City had provided an opportunity to observe the thoughtfulness and deliberation involved in Council decisions. Councilmembers and Mayor Shepherd thanked Mr. Stoddard and wished him well in the new position.

Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

- Ms. Dean reminded the Council that the Davis County Local Government Information Meeting would be held the following evening beginning at 5:00 p.m. and stated that the event information had previously been distributed by email.
- She also reminded the Council of the Civic and Town Center charrette the following week.
- She announced that there would not be a council meeting on October 6 but anticipated a work and policy meeting for October 13.
- She encouraged councilmembers who had not yet informed Chersty whether they would attend the League meetings to do so as soon as possible.

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

RESULT: **Passed [4 TO 0]**
YES: Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Thompson, Councilmember Wurth, Councilmember King
NO: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Megan Ratchford

DRAFT

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This day of 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, September 22, 2026.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

DRAFT

CLEARFIELD
UTAH'S MILITARY CITY

STAFF REPORT

TO: Mayor Shepherd and City Council Members

FROM: Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder

MEETING DATE: October 13, 2026

SUBJECT: DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CITY CODE TITLE 3, CHAPTER 2 - PLANNING COMMISSION

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve Ordinance 2026-14 amending Title 3, Chapter 2 – Planning Commission with current State Law requirements.

DESCRIPTION / BACKGROUND

Clearfield City Code Title 3, Chapter 2 establishes the City's Planning Commission and provides requirements concerning its membership, terms of office, qualifications, compensation, powers and duties, rules and procedures, quorum, and records. Utah Code § 10-20-301 requires each municipality to establish a planning commission by ordinance and identifies specific matters that must be addressed in the ordinance. Recent amendments to Utah law added requirements concerning the appointment, removal, recusal, authority, bylaws, and procedure for planning commissions. The proposed ordinance updates Clearfield City's Planning Commission chapter to address these statutory requirements and to clarify the City's existing practices and procedures.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The proposed ordinance would amend and reorganize Title 3, Chapter 2 of the Clearfield City Code. The significant changes are described below.

Section 3-2-2 retains the three-year terms and existing nine-year service limitation established by Ordinance 2025-07. The section also establishes a procedure for filling vacancies.

When a vacancy occurs, applications will be publicly solicited. Following the application period, the applications will be reviewed and potential candidates will be interviewed by the Mayor and City Council.

Following the review and interviews, the Mayor may recommend a qualified candidate for appointment to the Planning Commission, subject to the advice and consent of the City Council. The appointment becomes effective upon approval by the City Council at a regular meeting and is for the unexpired portion of the vacant term. This procedure provides an open and consistent process for identifying and appointing individuals to Planning Commission vacancies.

Section 3-2-3 retains the requirement that a Planning Commission member be a qualified elector of Clearfield City, unless otherwise permitted by applicable law. The section also continues to require members to take, subscribe, and file the oath of office with the City Recorder. The proposed amendment further clarifies that Planning Commission members are subject to applicable requirements governing municipal officers, including the Municipal Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act.

A new Section 3-2-4 establishes requirements concerning conflicts of interest and recusal. Utah Code § 10-20-301 requires the City's Planning Commission ordinance to provide requirements for when a Planning Commission member must recuse themselves from deliberating or voting on certain land use applications.The proposed section requires a Planning Commission member to disclose an actual or potential conflict when disclosure is required by law or City ordinance. The section also identifies circumstances requiring recusal, including circumstances involving:

- a financial or other conflict of interest;
- a violation of applicable ethics laws;
- a personal, financial, professional, or other interest that prevents the member from acting impartially; or
- circumstances creating actual impermissible bias or an unacceptable risk of impermissible bias in the member's administrative or quasi-judicial duties.

A member who recuses from a matter must disclose the basis for the recusal on the record to the extent permitted by law and may not deliberate or vote on the matter except as otherwise permitted by law. The provision also clarifies that a member should not use recusal requirements simply because the member disagrees with a proposed land use decision.

New Section 3-2-9 establishes procedures and causes for removal of Planning Commission members. Utah Code § 10-20-301 requires the City's ordinance to provide procedures for removing a Planning Commission member and to identify specific causes for removal. The proposed ordinance identifies the causes required by state law, including:

1. Using public funds for a political purpose in violation of the Political Activities of Public Entities Act (UCA § 20A-11-12);
2. Violating the Municipal Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act (UCA § 10-3-13); and
3. Acting with the intent to influence a land use decision or appeal of a pending land use application in a manner that creates actual impermissible bias or an unacceptable risk of impermissible bias in the member's administrative or quasi-judicial duties.

The proposed section also provides that deliberating about a specific pending land use application with municipal staff, an elected official, or the land use applicant during a Planning Commission

meeting is not, by itself, grounds for removal.

CONCLUSION

The proposed amendments to Title 3, Chapter 2 will update the City's Planning Commission ordinance to address current Utah law and clarify the City's procedures for Planning Commission membership and vacancies. The most significant additions are provisions concerning the public solicitation and appointment of members, conflicts of interest and recusal, rules of procedure, and removal from office.

CORRESPONDING POLICY PRIORITIES

- Improving Clearfield's Image, Livability, and Economy

HEDGEHOG SCORE

Not applicable, State Statute Requirements

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed amendments are not expected to have a fiscal impact on Clearfield City. The appointment and vacancy procedures can be administered through existing City staff resources.

ALTERNATIVES

Consider making additional amendments.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- Planning Commission Amendments Powerpoint
- Ordinance 2026-14

Proposed Amendments to the Planning Commission Ordinance

Why Are We Updating the Code?

- *Update the Ordinance to include current Utah Law changes for the Planning Commission; and*
- *Establish procedures for vacancies, recusal, and removal*

Filling Planning Commission Vacancies

- *Applications are publicly solicited.*
- *Applicants are reviewed after the application period closes.*
- *Potential candidates may be interviewed by the Mayor and City Council.*
- *Mayor may recommend a qualified candidate.*
- *City Council provides advice and consent.*
- *Appointment is approved by the City Council at a regular meeting.*
- *Appointment is for the unexpired portion of the term.*

What was added to the Qualifications

- *Members must comply with applicable requirements governing municipal officers.*

- *Includes reference to being subject to the Municipal Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act.*

Conflicts of Interest and Recusal

- *Adds a new section addressing conflicts of interest and recusal as required by State Law.*
- *Requires members to disclose conflicts of interest and defines the types of conflicts.*
- *Addresses the necessity of recusal when applicable.*

Removal From Office

- *Adds procedures and causes for removal.*
- *Using public funds for political purposes in violation of applicable law.*
- *Violating the Municipal Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act.*
- *Improperly attempting to influence a pending land use decision or appeal through impermissible bias.*

CLEARFIELD CITY ORDINANCE 2026-14

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF CLEARFIELD CITY, UTAH, AMENDING TITLE 3, CHAPTER 2 OF THE CLEARFIELD CITY CODE REGARDING THE PLANNING COMMISSION; PROVIDING FOR MEMBERSHIP, TERMS, VACANCIES, COMPENSATION, POWERS AND DUTIES, RULES OF ORDER AND PROCEDURE, QUORUM, REMOVAL, RECUSAL, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Clearfield City has established a Planning Commission pursuant to Utah law and Clearfield City Code; and

WHEREAS, Utah Code § 10-20-301 requires each municipality to enact an ordinance establishing a planning commission and establishes requirements concerning the commission's membership, terms, appointment, vacancies, removal, recusal, authority, bylaws, and organization; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to update Clearfield City Code Title 3, Chapter 2 to conform to current Utah law and to clarify the organization and authority of the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the amendments contained in this Ordinance are in the best interest of the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of Clearfield City;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF CLEARFIELD CITY, UTAH, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF TITLE 3, CHAPTER 2.

Title 3, Chapter 2 of the Clearfield City Code is hereby repealed and reenacted in its entirety to read as follows:

CHAPTER 2
PLANNING COMMISSION

SECTION:

3-2-1: **Created; Membership**
3-2-2: **Term Of Office; Vacancy**
3-2-3: **Qualifications; Oath Of Office**
3-2-4: **Conflicts of Interest: Recusal**
3-2-5: **Compensation**
3-2-~~5~~6: **Powers And Duties**
3-2-~~6~~7: **Chairperson; Rules And Regulations**

3-2-78: Quorum; Record Of Proceedings
3-2-9: Removal From Office:

3-2-1: CREATED; MEMBERSHIP:

Pursuant to the provisions of state law, there is hereby created a planning commission for the city. The planning commission shall consist of seven (7) members and up to three (3) alternate members, to be appointed by the mayor, with the advice and consent of the city council, from the duly qualified electors of the city. (Ord. 2014-01, 2-11-2014)

3-2-2: TERM OF OFFICE; VACANCY:

A. Each member shall be appointed for a term of three (3) years with a maximum number three (3) terms or nine (9) years (consecutive or nonconsecutive). A member that has served a combined total of nine (9) years (consecutive or nonconsecutive) may be reappointed to the planning commission following a reapplication, review and approval by the city council. A member serving as a full commissioner at the conclusion of nine (9) years of service shall be considered for reappointment as a full member and not an alternate if the member chooses to reapply. ~~Any vacancy occurring during the term of any member of the planning commission filled by the city council for the unexpired portion of the term.~~

B. **Vacancies.** Applications must be publicly solicited. Following review of the applications and interviews, the mayor may recommend a qualified candidate for appointment to the Planning Commission, subject to the advice and consent of the city council. The appointment shall become effective upon approval by the city council at a regular meeting and shall be filled for the unexpired portion of the term.

3-2-3: QUALIFICATIONS; OATH OF OFFICE:

~~A member of the planning commission must be a qualified elector of the city and shall qualify by taking, subscribing and filing with the city recorder the oath of office required by the constitution of the state.~~

A. A member of the Planning Commission must be a qualified elector of Clearfield City unless otherwise permitted by applicable Utah law.

B. Each member shall qualify for office by taking, subscribing, and filing with the City Recorder the oath of office required by the Constitution of the State of Utah.

C. A member shall comply with all applicable requirements governing municipal officers, including applicable provisions of the Municipal Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act.

3-2-4: CONFLICTS OF INTEREST; RECUSAL:

A. **Duty to Disclose.** A Planning Commission member shall disclose on the record any actual or potential conflict of interest concerning a matter before the Planning Commission when disclosure is required by applicable law or City ordinance.

B. **Mandatory Recusal.** A Planning Commission member shall recuse from deliberating or voting on a land use application when required by applicable Utah law or City ordinance, including when:

1. The member has a financial or other conflict of interest that prohibits participation;
2. The member's participation would violate the Municipal Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act or other applicable law;
3. The member has a personal, financial, professional, or other interest in the matter that would prevent the member from acting impartially; or
4. Circumstances exist that create actual impermissible bias or an unacceptable risk of impermissible bias in the member's administrative or quasi-judicial duties concerning the matter.

C. A member who recuses shall disclose the basis for the recusal on the record to the extent permitted by law.

D. A recused member shall not deliberate or vote on the matter from which the member has recused, except as otherwise permitted by law.

E. A member shall not use recusal requirements to avoid participation in matters solely because the member disagrees with a proposed land use decision.

3-2-45: COMPENSATION:

The remuneration paid to members of the planning commission, including the youth commission ambassador (per meeting which the member attends) shall be seventy-five dollars ($75.00), the vice-chair of the planning commission (per meeting which the vice-chair attends) shall be eighty-five dollars ($85.00), and the chair of the planning commission (per meeting which the chair attends) shall be one hundred dollars ($100.00) for their services rendered. Upon approval of the city council, members may be reimbursed for reasonable expenses actually incurred.

3-2-56: POWERS AND DUTIES:

A. General Plan:

1. Preparation: It shall be the function and duty of the planning commission to prepare and submit to the city council for its approval, a general plan for the physical development of the city, including other areas outside of its boundaries which, in the planning commission's

judgment, bear relation to the planning of the city. The planning commission may, from time to time, amend, extend or add to the general plan, or carry any part or subject matter into greater detail. The plan shall be prepared in accordance with Utah code title 10, chapter 9a, as amended.

2. Surveys And Studies: In preparing the general plan, the planning commission shall make careful and comprehensive surveys and studies of the existing conditions and probable future growth of the city and its environs. The plan shall be made with a general purpose of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the city in accordance with existing and future needs.

3. Reports And Recommendations: The planning commission may make reports and recommendations relating to the plan and development of the city to public officials and agencies, public utility companies, civic, educational, professional and other organizations and citizens. In general, the planning commission shall have such powers as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions and promote municipal planning.

B. Zoning:

1. Recommendations For Changes: The planning commission, through its own initiative, may, or by order of the city council shall, make recommendations for changes in the zoning map or in the text of the zoning and planning provisions of this code and shall have all powers granted by law or by these provisions in the preparation of zoning maps and the recommendations for zoning in the city.

2. City Council Action: After receiving the recommendations of the planning commission, the city council may amend the zoning map and/or the zoning or planning regulations. No substantial change (as determined by the city council) shall be made in said amendment as recommended by the planning commission, unless the same shall be resubmitted to the planning commission, which shall be returned to the city council within thirty (30) days.

C. Subdivisions: It shall be the duty of the planning commission to review and approve, or disapprove, all subdivisions of land as outlined in Title 12. No plat of a subdivision or land lying within the city shall be filed or recorded in the county recorder's office until it shall have been approved in accordance with the terms of Title 12 and entered in writing on the plat by the chairperson of the planning commission and the mayor for the city council, or other designated members or employees.

(1966 Code § 3-1-5; amd. Ord. 2025-07, 2-25-2025)

3-2-67: CHAIRPERSON; RULES AND REGULATIONS:

The planning commission shall elect from its membership a chairperson and shall recommend adoption of by-laws to the city council, subject to the provisions of the laws of the state and the zoning and planning regulations of the city to provide for the regulation of its procedure and the conduct of its duties, and may amend such rules from time to time upon final consent and

approval by the city council. All such rules and amendments shall be reduced to writing and shall be filed with the city recorder.

3-2-~~7~~8: QUORUM; RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:

A. Quorum: At least four (4) members of the planning commission must be present to constitute a quorum to conduct any official business of the planning commission. (1966 Code § 3-1-6)

B. Minutes: The planning commission shall keep minutes of its proceedings in accordance with Utah Code Annotated section 52-4-203, which shall be filed with the city recorder.

3-2-9: REMOVAL FROM OFFICE:

A. **Removal Authority.** A Planning Commission member may be removed only in accordance with applicable Utah law and this section.

B. Subject to any delegation of authority permitted by Utah law, the City Council may remove a Planning Commission member.

C. **Causes for Removal.** Except as otherwise provided by applicable law, causes for removal shall include:

1. Using public funds for a political purpose in violation of Title 20A, Chapter 11, Part 12, Utah Code, Political Activities of Public Entities Act;
2. Violating a provision of Title 10, Chapter 3, Part 13, Utah Code, Municipal Officers' and Employees' Ethics Act; or
3. Acting with the intent to influence a land use decision or an appeal of a pending land use application in a manner that creates actual impermissible bias or an unacceptable risk of impermissible bias in the Planning Commission member's administrative or quasi-judicial duties.

D. **Additional Causes.** Subject to applicable law, a Planning Commission member may also be removed for other causes established by ordinance or applicable law, including failure to satisfy the qualifications for office, failure to maintain required eligibility, or other conduct constituting cause for removal under applicable law.

E. **Deliberation on Pending Applications.** A Planning Commission member deliberating about a specific pending land use application in a Planning Commission meeting with municipal staff, an elected official, or the land use applicant is not, by itself, cause for removing the Planning Commission member from the Planning Commission.

Section 2. Repealer: Any provision or ordinances that are in conflict with this ordinance are hereby repealed.

Section 3. Effective Date: This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its posting in three public places within Clearfield City.

Passed and adopted by the Clearfield City Council this 22nd day of September, 2026.

ATTEST: CLEARFIELD CITY CORPORATION

Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder Mark Shepherd, Mayor

VOTE OF THE COUNCIL

AYE:

NAY:

PROCLAMATION

United Against Hate Week October 18–24, 2026

WHEREAS, Clearfield City is proud to be a welcoming community where neighbors from many backgrounds live, work, worship, learn, and serve together with a shared commitment to making our city a safe and thriving place for all; and

WHEREAS, Clearfield City is home to residents and families who have come from across our nation and around the world through military service, making mutual respect, unity, and service to others defining characteristics of our community; and

WHEREAS, our community is strengthened by treating every person with dignity, respect, and kindness, recognizing that our differences of background, experience, and perspective enrich our city; and

WHEREAS, acts of hatred, intimidation, discrimination, bullying, and violence undermine the trust, safety, and sense of belonging that are essential to a strong and united community; and

WHEREAS, Clearfield City believes that respectful dialogue, personal responsibility, compassion, and a willingness to listen to one another are fundamental to resolving differences and building stronger neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, Clearfield City is committed to fostering a community where every resident, business owner, visitor, and member of our military community can live free from intimidation and where all individuals are encouraged to contribute to the success and well-being of our city; and

WHEREAS, education, cooperation, civic engagement, and service to one another help prevent hatred and strengthen the bonds that unite us as neighbors; and

WHEREAS, Clearfield City joins communities throughout Utah and across the nation in recognizing United Against Hate Week as an opportunity to reaffirm our shared commitment to civility, respect, inclusion, and the rejection of hatred in all its forms.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Mark Shepherd, Mayor of Clearfield City, Utah, do hereby proclaim October 18-24, 2026, as **UNITED AGAINST HATE WEEK** in Clearfield City, and encourage all residents, businesses, schools, civic organizations, and community partners to promote understanding, practice kindness, engage in respectful dialogue, and work together to ensure Clearfield remains a community where every person is treated with dignity and respect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Clearfield to be affixed this 13th day of October, 2026.

CLEARFIELD CITY CORPORATION

_____

Mark R. Shepherd, Mayor