

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
April 6, 2021

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush	Councilmember
	Nike Peterson	Councilmember
	Vern Phipps	Councilmember
	Tim Roper	Councilmember
	Karece Thompson	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	JJ Allen	City Manager
	Summer Palmer	Assistant City Manager
	Stuart Williams	City Attorney
	Kelly Bennett	Police Chief
	Braden Felix	City Engineer/PW Deputy Director
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Curtis Dickson	Community Services Deputy Dir.
	Spencer Brimley	Community Development Director
	Brad McIlrath	Senior Planner
	Rich Knapp	Finance Manager
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
STAFF PRESENT VIA ZOOM:	Adam Favero	Public Works Director

VISITORS: Con Wilcox, John Warnick – Destination Homes, Brandon Wood, Scott Lalli – Destination Homes, Joe Barber

VISITORS PRESENT VIA ZOOM: Eric Osth – Urban Design Associates (UDA)

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. He explained that he would need to leave early and would turn the meeting over to Mayor Pro Tem Phipps at that point until he returned.

DISCUSSION ON DESTINATION HOMES' CONCEPT PLAN FOR A SINGLE-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT NEIGHBORHOOD LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1550 SOUTH 1000 WEST

Scott Lalli, Destination Homes, introduced the development team. He expressed appreciation for the feedback received from the Mayor, City Council and staff. He explained Destination Homes

had used Urban Design Associates (UDA) for years because the architects know how to design homes in lasting communities.

Eric Osth, architect, shared some of the projects that UDA was involved in with Destination Homes. He presented key elements to building successful developments for the community. He stated the site for the Clearfield project was located at 1550 South 1000 West. He noted the Master Plan included homes, streets, parks and open space. He mentioned there were safe places to play and families could flow out into the park. He noted the design created a sense of community and belonging in the neighborhood. Mr. Osth stated the architectural variety would give the community a unique experience through color and was specific to the area. He explained the design included two-story and three-story homes. He indicated the architectural design had a lot of thought put into it and was meant to create something unique to Clearfield.

Councilmember Bush wondered what the square footage of the homes would be. Mr. Lalli responded 2,100 to 2,500 square feet with garages.

Councilmember Bush asked the size of lots planned for the development. John Warnick, Destination Homes, stated the average lots would be 35 feet. He added the building footprint would be roughly 25 feet.

Councilmember Bush questioned if a homeowner's association (HOA) would take care of open spaces. Mr. Lalli answered yes, there would be an HOA.

Councilmember Peterson was impressed with the proposed layout especially given it was a unique site. She asked about the elevations along 1000 West. Mr. Osth responded it was four-sided architecture. He added the side elevations would be as attractive as the front. He acknowledged people would pay a premium to live on a side. Mr. Osth stated all homes facing 1000 West were two-story units. Councilmember Peterson commented it fit the need to infill with single-family detached homes but also recognized it would need to pencil for the property owner. She expressed her feeling the project was well done and the design was great.

Mr. Warnick expressed his excitement because it was going to be unique. Mayor Shepherd acknowledged Destination Homes was building the project and said they were known as a quality builder. Mr. Lalli indicated one of the things Destination Homes was passionate about was building what had been presented to the Council so it could leave behind a community that helped to improve people's lives.

Councilmember Bush pointed out that the area north of the car wash looked different than other green spaces. Mr. Osth reported it would be a storm water management area. He explained it was a lower area so it would have a natural look to it and sometimes it would be dry but was intended specifically for storm water detention.

Councilmember Phipps loved the open space of the development. He noted some of his earlier concerns had been addressed such as the look and feel of 1000 West so there was no abruptness

and appreciated the developer's vision for aesthetic flow. He felt it would be a community where people would want to live and raise their families.

Councilmember Peterson commented there was commercial to support the growth and the green space was usable.

Mayor Shepherd thanked Destination Homes for its efforts to meet the Council's desires. He turned the meeting over to Mayor Pro Tem Phipps.

Mayor Shepherd left the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

Councilmember Bush wondered how many units were planned for the development. Mr. Warnick responded it would have 101 units.

Councilmember Peterson confirmed the project would need a development agreement because it exceeded the standard of the R-1-6 zone. Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, stated it would require a development agreement to apply development standards outside of what was currently allowable in the Code. Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, pointed out the agenda packet had included the information on lot setbacks, lot sizes, and unit counts. He explained the zoning would not be R-1-6 but rather another zone that would allow an overlay.

Mr. Brimley noted the next step in the process would be a rezone for the property.

Councilmember Peterson questioned if the zone could remain R-1-6 with a condition of development agreement rather than the R-2 zone which denoted a higher density and a negative perception from residents. Mr. Brimley responded the R-2 or R-3 zones would allow flexibility in adjusting lot size and applying development standards. He indicated staff would look at the Code to see what the best fit would be for the proposal. He understood the perception of residents associated with R-2 and R-3 development.

Councilmember Thompson expressed his preference for using a zone that would not have a perception of establishing a precedent.

Councilmember Roper expressed his comfort with a zone with higher density as long as there was a development agreement conditioned with the rezone.

Councilmember Bush stated the R-2 zone allowed for single-family development.

Mr. Warnick stated Destination Homes typically recorded architectural standards with the properties so that everyone would need to abide by the standards in the future. Mr. Brimley indicated staff would work with the developer to find a solution that could allow the construction of the product which was presented.

DISCUSSION ON THE FIRST ADDENDUM TO THE INTERLOCAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH SYRACUSE CITY FOR THE 500 WEST ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECT

Braden Felix, City Engineer/Deputy Public Works Director, stated Clearfield City and Syracuse City entered into an Interlocal Agreement in 2019 to work together for the construction and expansion of the 500 West roadway. He reviewed the project which included construction of 500 West Street from 2010 South to Antelope Drive and from Antelope Drive to C Street in the Freeport Center. He indicated the design was nearing completion and the project would be bid for construction soon.

Mr. Felix explained the City received additional funding from Davis County's Third Quarter Sales Tax Grant and Wasatch Front Regional Council to assist with the costs that had been more than originally anticipated. He noted the additional grant funding would require a match of funding; therefore, Clearfield and Syracuse would need to amend the original interlocal agreement to adjust the match required by each city. He acknowledged the funding match amount would be about \$237,000.

JJ Allen, City Manager, acknowledged the match funds had been programmed into the FY22 Budget.

Councilmember Peterson stated the road was really needed to relieve congestion in other areas.

Councilmember Bush wondered if the design had changed thus adding increased costs to the project. Mr. Felix responded it had not changed but as the project moved along there were things which were discovered that would require additional funding. He acknowledged the City was reaching the final stages of acquiring all the rights-of-way needed for the project.

Adam Favero, Public Works Director, stated the first addendum to the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement with Syracuse City was planned to be on the agenda for consideration during the next policy session on April 13, 2021.

DISCUSSION ON THE DONATION OF THE CITY'S USED FOOTBALL EQUIPMENT TO THE UTE FOOTBALL CONFERENCE

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, stated the City had been working for quite some time with parents and coaches to transition the City's youth tackle football program to the Ute Conference. He noted the City had surplus used football equipment which had been itemized and valued by staff. He explained how the equipment was valued at about 50 percent of the original purchase price at \$36,110.32. He mentioned there would be a public hearing on April 13, 2021 and then the Council could consider action.

Mr. Howes mentioned the Ute Football Conference requested to receive the equipment by April 1, 2021, but due to noticing requirements for a public hearing and time needed for consideration

of the matter, the equipment was temporarily borrowed to the Conference for their assessment so that an order for new equipment could be placed in time for the upcoming season.

Councilmember Thompson asked if residents would have an opportunity for scholarships even though it was not a City run program. Mr. Howes responded the City would continue to offer some scholarships.

Councilmember Thompson wondered if the scholarship opportunities could be communicated to residents. Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion it should be. Councilmember Thompson wanted residents to understand that money should not be a barrier to participation. Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, stated the City had started doing more communications through social media and the local schools.

Councilmember Peterson moved to take a five-minute break at 6:51 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Roper. All voting AYE.

The Council took at break at 6:51 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 6:55 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET

Mr. Allen stated staff formulated questions for the Council's consideration following the prior work session discussion regarding the Fiscal Year 2022 (FY22) budget held on March 30, 2021. He explained the discussion on each of the questions would happen throughout the course of the meeting. He reviewed the following questions for the Council to consider:

1. Are you persuaded by any of the personnel requests?
2. Are we agreed on recapturing the General Obligation (GO) Bond rate?
3. Are we agreed on maintaining the property tax rate?
4. How much, if any, of the GO Bond recapture are you willing to use for operations?
5. To pay off the 2018 Bonds, should we use fund balance plus \$2 million from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA)? Or would you rather refinance?
6. Maintenance Operations Center (MOC) Phase 3:
 - a. Now or later?
 - b. If the answer is now, then should the water / sewer/ storm water portions of the project be funded from ARPA?

Mr. Allen mentioned there were some additional questions asked about property tax and health insurance that staff had researched. He explained staff would report on updates regarding property tax; however, health insurance data was currently being compiled and would be shared at a later date once the research was completed.

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, stated a lot of data was discussed but there was plenty of time for budget meetings in the coming months. He described the MOC Phase 3 project. Mr. Allen wondered how much office space would be included in the new building. Braden Felix, City

Engineer/Public Works Deputy Director, stated there was just a small office for the foreman and a training space. There was a discussion about the struggle to find room for the storage of public works equipment, current needs of the mechanic shop, relevance of cost estimates, and best timing to initiate the project.

Councilmember Thompson expressed his opinion the project could not be delayed.

Councilmember Peterson voiced her reasoning that stimulus money was for one-time projects and the need had been demonstrated that the project should not be delayed. She mentioned it might require value engineering, so the project did not exceed the \$5.3 million.

Councilmember Phipps acknowledged it was good to always be thinking about planning for future growth. He noted the needs of the MOC would grow as the City grew.

Councilmember Peterson expressed her feelings it was important for employees to work in safe environments.

Mr. Allen indicated there appeared to be consensus among the Council about completing the MOC Phase 3 now which was question number six. The Council voiced its support for moving forward with the project because there were concerns that costs would continue to increase and the project would be a qualifying project for use of stimulus money. The consensus of the Council was to use \$3.2 million of the approximate \$5.47 million estimated for the City in stimulus funding from ARPA. Mr. Allen acknowledged the MOC Phase 3 project would be a multi-year project and the allotted funds would not be spent during FY22 because it would need to be designed first; however, the City should be able to spend the full amount before the deadline in 2024.

Mr. Knapp stated Councilmember Thompson had asked to see property tax by source during the work session on March 30, 2021. He reviewed the property tax by source and change from year 2019 to 2020. The property tax sources included: primary residential, secondary residential, commercial and industrial, greenbelt and unimproved, business personal property, and centrally assessed. He noted property tax was the only major revenue source the City had control over.

Councilmember Peterson requested clarification for secondary residential. Mr. Knapp reported it was homes used as vacation rentals or temporary rental purposes. There was a discussion about the property tax types and rates for the various sources.

Mr. Knapp showed the impact of not maintaining the rate since 2016. Councilmember Thompson commented it was helpful to see what the City had missed in revenues by not maintaining the property tax rate but he also wanted to consider the impact on residents. Mr. Knapp responded if the property tax rate in 2021 were 0.0018 rather than the proposed rate of 0.00147 there would be an increase on average of \$51 per household. Councilmember Thompson indicated the data was interesting and helped his understanding. Mr. Allen explained as property tax revenue declined the City relied more on other tax revenue sources where there was not any direct control but changed largely with the economy.

Mr. Knapp highlighted the top 15 revenue sources for all funds. He noted sustainability had played into the growth of sales tax revenue. He mentioned there were some restricted revenue sources. He reviewed the sources of revenues for the General Fund. He pointed out that the City had some indirect control of sales tax and energy use revenue through economic development. Mr. Allen stated it was so difficult to measure and it could take years for investment in economic development to pay off.

Councilmember Thompson wondered how much reliance on those revenue sources was too much since the City did not have control of sales tax or energy use tax. Mr. Knapp agreed and stated that was why it was so important to monitor sales tax revenues each month.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the City's historical operations rate and a few costs by function to analyze their relation to the General Fund revenues. He indicated the funding from property tax was not enough to cover costs for public safety/police. Mr. Allen stated staff was trying to illustrate that property tax received a lot of attention, but it was only a minor component of the revenue side of the budget. He reiterated property tax was the only revenue lever the City could control in the General Fund.

Councilmember Phipps wondered where PARAT tax revenue fit in. Mr. Knapp stated it was in the other taxes category and was very small.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the measure of sustainability. He indicated currently the FY22 budget included \$17.5 million for total operating revenue and ongoing expenditures of about \$17.7 million so the net ongoing surplus was -\$258,524. He acknowledged the ARPA stimulus funding could be used to pay \$250,000 towards debt service. He noted the current ongoing revenues and expenditures did not include the new personnel or the GO Bond recapture portion of property tax revenues. He pointed out that it would be good if the net ongoing surplus was zero; however, that number affected the City's ability to bond.

Mr. Knapp highlighted how various net surplus amounts increased the bonding ability of the City. He stated there would be pressure to use the GO Bond recapture towards operations, but there were also reasons to consider not spending it so there was increased bonding capacity. He reviewed the following potential future general debt:

- Emergency
- Interchange Landscaping
- Clearfield Aquatics and Fitness Center (CAFC) Expansion
- Clearfield Station
- Fiber

Mayor Shepherd rejoined the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Mr. Allen commented staff would not advise using all of the capture from the GO Bond for operations. Councilmember Peterson expressed her hesitancy for shifting the recaptured portion of property tax to operations. There was a discussion on the needful things the GO Bond recapture could be used towards such as a refresh for the CAFC, projects that could benefit neighborhoods, operations, or as risk mitigators. Councilmember Peterson voiced her opinion the

GO Bond recaptured funds should be restricted and dedicated for a specific purposes or projects. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion there would not need to be a formal process to lock down the recaptured funds but an agreement on the uses. Mr. Allen pointed out that the Council would decide the use of the funds.

Mayor Shepherd commented the budget process was a balancing act. He expressed his worry about sustainability and pointed out that simply maintaining the rate would never keep up with inflation. He voiced his opinion much of the GO Bond recapture should be used toward the City's capital needs but personnel needs were also mandatory so there would need to be changes and long-term strategic planning to balance the funding. Councilmember Roper agreed the Council would need to find a balance and plan for future growth.

Councilmember Thompson commented that was his motivation for looking at the history of property tax. He expressed his opinion the current policy was hurting the core functions of the City as far as operations was concerned. He voiced his concern the City would not be prepared to grow at the current pace. He felt the City's fiscal policy should consider planning for growth.

There was a discussion on the juggling of numbers during the budget process and the measures that could be taken during good and bad economic years so revenues and expenditures operationally were balanced or created a surplus. Mr. Knapp pointed out that it would be good to have a surplus greater than zero so the City had the ability to bond if it were needed in the future.

Mr. Allen told Mayor Shepherd while he was gone staff received direction from the Council regarding question number six. He stated there was a compelling reason to fund the MOC Phase 3 using ARPA funds.

Mr. Allen wondered if there was a desire from the Council to pay off the mobile home park bonds. He indicated two options were discussed as payment methods: 1) using fund balance plus \$2 million from ARPA or 2) refinancing the 2018 Bonds. He explained the impact to the draft budget if the bonds were paid off or refinanced.

Mayor Shepherd stated using ARPA funds to pay off the 2018 Bonds would be justified. He noted the direct impact of the pandemic on the plans for Mabey Place and how the City would have been in a different place financially. He expressed his opinion it would be a wonderful use of funds and wholeheartedly supported using some of it to pay the bonds off. Councilmember Bush agreed and stated it would also save about \$250,000 annually. There was consensus from the Council to pay off the 2018 Bonds using fund balance and \$2 million from ARPA.

Mr. Allen acknowledged many of the Council had weighed in favorably during the discussion about recapturing the GO Bond rate. He questioned if the Council desired to recapture the GO Bond rate. The consensus of the Council was to recapture it.

Mr. Allen stated question number three referred to maintaining the property tax rate which would bring in an additional \$95,000 of tax revenue. He explained staff knew of Councilmember Phipps' position on maintaining the tax rate.

Councilmember Phipps commented about 70 percent of the City's expenses were for personnel and those costs should be managed. He voiced his lack of support in getting more money from the taxpayers for personnel costs and insurance costs. Mayor Shepherd acknowledged staff had been asked to do comparisons in personnel costs between the City, State, and other cities. He expressed his desire to be competitive or the City would lose employees. Ms. Palmer stated the raw data was available, but she did not have all the data regarding benefits and would prefer to review it before it was presented. She indicated the City's strategy had never been to lead the market. She explained the City's compensation package was trying to stay even with the market and currently the City was in the middle of the pack. She noted health care costs were rising for everyone.

Councilmember Thompson commented for Clearfield to stay competitive the Council would need to start thinking about things in a different manner. He expressed his concern that if the property tax rate were not maintained it could be detrimental to the City's ability of providing necessary services for the taxpayers in future years.

Councilmember Phipps appreciated staff's effort into the research. He noted property tax was always pointed out as the one revenue lever that the City could control. He continued personnel costs which were a vast majority of the City's expenses could also be controlled. He suggested somehow the City would need to learn how to manage personnel decisions and make tough decisions.

Mayor Shepherd acknowledged personnel costs were the biggest expense. He explained there were several options available to make the necessary shifts to help fund the necessary personnel, services, or programs that would help create a place where people wanted to be. He highlighted some thoughts about the code enforcement program and if the program should be cut, restructured to accomplish different results, or whether there could be a shift with positions that could lend help in other areas such as building inspections. There was a discussion about personnel, programs, services, and the adjustments that could be made in FY22.

Councilmember Phipps commented the discussion reflected the types of discussions which would be necessary as the City continued to address growth. He suggested it would be good to look at cost avoidance because property tax increases would not cover the additional millions of dollars in personnel costs each year. There was a discussion regarding the impacts of decisions and how challenging those were because they affected people and their livelihood.

Mr. Allen stated those types of discussions were anticipated when the hedgehog concept was developed. He stated it would be necessary to make adjustments in order to create a place where people wanted to be.

Councilmember Peterson commented there was an idea that came from budget discussions with staff earlier in the day that she hoped could be discussed in a future budget discussion. She indicated the thought was to have a line item in the budget each year for the Council's discretion which could be utilized to fix smaller issues, sore spots in neighborhoods, or reduce impact on personnel.

Mr. Allen stated the example Councilmember Peterson shared would be a different way to look at how the \$95,000 gained by maintaining the property tax rate could be used. He explained it could be for adding personnel, funding localized projects, or other uses because it would be unrestricted funds. He questioned how the Council felt about maintaining the property tax rate. Mr. Knapp pointed out that property tax received from growth did not pay for the City's growth. Mr. Allen acknowledged the budget entries assumed the tax rate would be maintained, so if that was not the desire of the Council then staff would need to know. Councilmembers Roper and Bush voiced their preference to maintain the tax rate. Councilmember Peterson stated she was leaning towards maintaining the rate but felt it would be a hard year for residents given the large tax increases that would be coming from the North Davis Fire District. Councilmember Thompson expressed his opinion it was good fiscal policy to maintain the rate.

Councilmember Thompson wondered if there had been an approach of looking at lowering personnel costs through attrition. He suggested it would be good to do an attrition study. There was a discussion about the impacts to the organization when people retired, quit, or shifted job duties from one department to another; as well as things that could be done to create more efficiencies with services. Mr. Allen indicated the expressed concerns were always on the minds of staff to help find a better way to do something that was less costly and yet effective.

Mr. Allen asked if the Council was persuaded by any of the personnel requests and if so, how much if any of the \$700,000 GO Bond recapture should be used for operations. Councilmember Phipps responded in talking about the long-term strategy, personnel requests would need to be done at some point in time because of the City's anticipated growth. He expressed his opinion all personnel requests would need to be addressed.

Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion the tier one and two positions discussed during work session on March 30, 2021 should be filled which included the following positions:

Tier 1 – Low Cost

- Public Works Inspector
- PT IT Help Desk
- Dispatch Shift
- Community Services Administrative Assistant

Tier 2 – Pressure Points

- Police Officer
- FT Facilities Maintenance
- Planner

Councilmember Peterson agreed. Mayor Shepherd said the positions in the low cost were important and the pressure points were crucial. He explained the economic development / communications position in tier three could be handled differently. He stated the building inspector also in tier three could be partially addressed with some shifts in code enforcement.

Councilmember Peterson recognized as the City's pressing needs were addressed it was the tip of the iceberg and there remained significant needs. She indicated funding the personnel requests discussed would be one step closer to addressing the needs. She acknowledged the recommended personnel requests would require about \$273,000 as a part of the operational budget. She recognized there were additional needs that did not even make the list.

Councilmember Phipps supported additional help for the Parks staff which was grouped into tier three. He expressed his opinion the request was for an additional \$65,000 but it would improve the parks so much. Mr. Allen explained the request was for two part-time year-round and one seasonal employee to balance out the crews. The consensus of the Council was to fund the parks positions.

Mr. Allen noted adding the parks positions to the other tier one and two personnel requests would round up to almost \$350,000. He wondered if the Council was comfortable committing half of the GO Bond recapture to the operational budget. Mayor Shepherd recommended committing half to the operational budget. The Council appeared comfortable with the recommendation.

Mr. Allen explained the costs were only for personnel; however, there could be additional equipment or vehicle expenses associated with the positions that would be one-time costs. Mr. Allen noted the employee costs were fully burdened and included benefits.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the Council had any concerns about funding the tier one and two positions along with the parks personnel requested. Mr. Knapp pointed out that the bonding capability would be reduced unless cuts in other areas could be done. Ms. Palmer responded it was early in the budgeting process and there were outstanding numbers so things could be adjusted as needed.

Mayor Shepherd requested to hear from the members of the Council their thoughts on his earlier suggestion for making changes with the code enforcement program. He noted the division's operational budget was \$170,000. There was a discussion about whether the code enforcement program should be eliminated, and the following topics were addressed:

- Benefit versus costs.
- Focus was on compliance rather than revenues.
- Revenues trending down in various departments, not just code enforcement.
- Utilizing current personnel in other positions where needed such as building inspector.
- Transitioning personnel to other positions would require time for training and experience levels to develop.
- The results of the current program were not creating a place where people wanted to be.
- Creating a shift in the process so it was more personable.

Mr. Allen stated if the consensus of the Council was that the current code enforcement program was not hitting the mark, then allow staff time to study it out and formulate a proposal and return with ideas for the Council's consideration. He noted it might not have a budgetary impact in the current year, but it could be transitioned in the future. Ms. Palmer mentioned when big initiatives were discussed there was usually a period of time where there would be no budgetary impacts but those were the types of things that should be considered year over year. Mayor Shepherd acknowledged he was not looking to cut the program immediately but felt it could save some money if shifts were made in the future. He suggested it would be good to evaluate the program's effectiveness.

Mr. Allen asked if there were other areas staff should analyze to see if there was a program or reduction needed either on the possible operations cuts, the reductions list highlighted during work session on March 30, 2021, or some other area not addressed.

Mayor Shepherd stated the City's communications department was one of the best; however, it would be good to look to see if there was a way to do it differently. He acknowledged customer service would be another area where improvements could be made. He felt many of the programs should be evaluated to see if they were more effective processes or funds could be used differently. Councilmember Roper suggested it would be good to use the hedgehog tool for the evaluations. Mr. Allen pointed out that many of the programs had a revenue source associated so any cuts to programs had the potential of eliminating the associated revenue.

Mr. Allen summarized the outcome of the discussion regarding the questions presented at the beginning of the meeting with the following responses that were the consensus of the Council:

1. Fund tier one and two plus parks personnel positions.
2. Unanimously agreed on recapturing the GO Bond rate.
3. Majority felt maintaining the property tax rate was the right direction to proceed.
4. There was a willingness to use half of the GO Bond recapture towards operations.
5. Pay off the 2018 bonds with fund balance plus \$2 million of the ARPA funds.
6. Move forward with MOC Phase 3 and use ARPA monies to fund the water, sewer and storm water portions.

Mr. Allen noted there was also some direction provided for staff to study out the following programs or operations to see if changes could be made:

- Code Enforcement – possible transition to assist with building inspections
- Communications – scope of the office
- Customer Service Center – modifications in that area

Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn at 9:04 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Thompson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 23rd day of November, 2021**

/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 6, 2021.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder