

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
April 27, 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
	Adam Favero	Public Works Director
	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
	Lee Naylor	Accountant
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON THE 700 SOUTH INTERCHANGE CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, stated staff had been working with JUB Engineering to develop a conceptual design for the freeway interchanges. He reviewed the preliminary landscape concept for the 700 South Interchange. He explained the design concepts could be applied to any of the interchanges. He noted if the Council was comfortable with the conceptual design the next step, contingent upon funding, would be to have the project designed. Mr. Howes mentioned the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) project that was currently utilizing the off-ramp area as a storage ground was supposed to be finished in the fall. He indicated staff hoped to bid the landscaping over the winter and be ready to construct in the spring of 2022.

Councilmember Bush asked if the concept included any lighting. Mr. Howes answered no.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if UDOT owned the land and if so, would there need to be a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to accomplish the work. Mr. Howes responded the land was owned by UDOT and the City currently had an MOU in place for the maintenance of the land. He explained another MOU would be necessary to allow for its landscaping. He noted UDOT had been receptive to the concept plan and the City's desire to landscape the interchanges in order to prevent the areas from being used as a layout yard for UDOT's future projects.

Councilmember Phipps asked if maintenance costs had been estimated for time and labor over the years. Mr. Howes answered it had not been estimated; however, it would likely compare to the current costs. He explained the preliminary concept tried to minimize the future demand of maintenance in the conceptual design.

Councilmember Peterson questioned if the native grass would need irrigation. Mr. Howes responded irrigation would only be needed to establish the native grass during the first year. He addressed the challenges of establishing the landscaping.

Councilmember Peterson wondered if there would be a problem to establish the landscaping if there was a reduction in water usage. Mr. Howes explained staff had already discussed with Layton City about using their nearby connection, but it would only support the drip system planned not a complete irrigation system. He noted if there was a reduction to water usage it could create challenges for the first year while the vegetation was being established but a truck and water pump could be used if necessary.

Councilmember Phipps commented the landscaping would raise the image of Clearfield immensely. All agreed.

Councilmember Peterson asked if there was an estimated cost for design. Mr. Howes responded it would likely cost around \$250,000 for the design services. He noted staff planned to have the project designed so it could be bid in January of 2022 and then completed during the spring and summer seasons.

DISCUSSION ON THE FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT FOR WEAVER MEADOWS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY AT 90 WEST 200 SOUTH

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, stated the Weaver Meadows Subdivision was located at 50 West 200 South next to Hamblin Park. He indicated the property was recently rezoned from R-1-8 to R-1-6 and it was a nine-lot single-family subdivision. He mentioned preliminary subdivision plat approval was granted in April of 2020.

Mr. McIlrath reviewed the zoning and subdivision plat. He stated the lot frontages of lots five and six had already been amended by the developer but those would be submitted for engineering and public works approvals once final subdivision plat approval was received by the Council. He acknowledged the Planning Commission reviewed the plat at its meeting on April 7, 2021, and recommended approval with the six conditions outlined in the staff report. He noted one of the conditions that had been a discussion during the Planning Commission meeting related to the six-foot non-climbable fence which would need to be installed on the east property lines

adjacent to the railroad tracks. He indicated the fencing would be an attempt to provide safety because unfortunately there was no guarantee a fence of any type was not climbable.

Councilmember Bush asked if the storm water needed to be extended and if it would be surface flowed out of the cul-de-sac into the City's system. Mr. McIlrath reviewed the original submitted plans and noted those had been revised so there would be a retention basin on one of the lots. There was a discussion about the options available for the storm water retention. Mr. McIlrath reported the developer had added an additional catch basin so there would be two.

Councilmember Bush recalled it had been a wet area. Mr. McIlrath explained even some of the standing water had made its way into Hamblin Park which was challenging. He noted the developer had to revise its geotechnical report and do some more drilling in that area to identify the type of soil and compaction needed to handle the foundations of the homes. He added the developer's current proposal was that none of the homes would have basements because of the high ground water.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the rail line to the east was owned by Union Pacific. Mr. McIlrath responded yes it was the main spur into the Freeport Center and was currently used.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if Union Pacific Railroad was aware of the proposed nine homes in that area or had safety concerns. Mr. McIlrath answered notice had been sent to Union Pacific regarding the project, but no comments had been received.

DISCUSSION ON BIKE LANES ALONG STATE ROUTE (SR) 126 IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE NORTH DAVIS ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, reviewed the timeline and planning done by the City over the years which included the adoption of the Downtown Clearfield Small Area Plan (SAP) in 2016, the Downtown Clearfield Form Based Code (FBC) in 2020, and the North Davis County Active Transportation Implementation Plan (ATIP) in 2021. He highlighted the current standards of the Downtown SAP and FBC for State Route 126 (SR 126). He noted throughout the planning processes over the years, the City had been discussing its plans with Utah's Department of Transportation (UDOT). He explained UDOT after many discussions decided to do a study of SR 126 from Roy to Layton. He acknowledged there were differing opinions about SR 126 and the State was not planning to fund any improvements for bike lanes.

Mr. McIlrath stated the bicycle infrastructure was supported by all the City's current plans, it could fit within existing rights-of-way, and it would connect bike lanes already along SR 126 which had been okay with UDOT until recently. He indicated on-street parking was not supported or included in the City's current plans. He added on-street parking was supportive of commercial uses, but it would require additional right-of-way in some areas to accommodate the 9-foot minimum parking width plus some buffer spacing from the travel lanes.

Mr. McIlrath reviewed the boulevard renovation concept included in the SAP. He highlighted some of the existing conditions and proposed conditions of areas along SR 126 which included 300 North, Center Street, and the Mabey Place areas. He indicated the FBC essentially mimicked

the boulevard renovations included in the SAP. He noted UDOT had been favorable of the roadways because it provided access management, but then after conducting the traffic study UDOT changed its opinion. He continued the mixed messages from UDOT over time had made it difficult when working with developers.

Mr. McIlrath reviewed the North Davis County ATIP and its recommendations for the Urban Core Arterial and Gateway Corridor Arterial. He highlighted the existing conditions in comparison to the Plan's proposal for separated bike lanes or recommendation for interim treatment buffered bike lanes. He stated staff desired to know what the vision of Council was regarding bike lanes and if there was a desire for staff to continue its efforts toward implementation of bike lanes especially considering the lack of cooperation from UDOT in those efforts.

Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion bike lanes from a visual standpoint was a much more appealing option along SR 126 than having on-street parking. He noted it would cause an issue for City Center and Clearfield Junction with limited on-site parking. He pointed out bike lanes along SR 126 could also create a challenge if scooter usage was more prevalent in the City because it was illegal on State Street. Mr. McIlrath stated the City and its staff wanted to make sure the commercial spaces were viable yet needed to operate within the constraint of rights-of-way. He highlighted some of the issues related to having on-street parking along SR 126.

Mayor Shepherd voiced his opinion it made sense to have bike lanes from Center Street going south; however, it concerned him to eliminate the on-street parking north of Center Street because of the impacts it would have on Clearfield Junction. There was a discussion about long-term planning as it related to parking ratios and walkable development areas.

Councilmember Phipps commented bike lanes could be problematic. He indicated Salt Lake City installed bike lanes in the downtown area; however, those were rarely used. He acknowledged SR 126 was a major thoroughfare so bikers that were commuting would likely find an alternate path such as the City's trails if the bike lanes did not connect to neighboring communities. He expressed his opinion that if the City was not going to have a bike lane that extended beyond the community it would probably not get used like those in downtown Salt Lake.

Councilmember Thompson voiced his support of having on-street parking to keep the mixed-use development viable. Mayor Shepherd commented the aesthetics was something to keep in mind as the City developed and on-street parking could be less attractive along the downtown areas than trees and bike lanes. He noted developers would need to accommodate for their individual parking needs. Councilmember Thompson expressed his desire to extend parking opportunities since there had been a reduction to parking requirements in the FBC areas by trying to create a more walkable downtown. He understood the aesthetic argument but felt the City needed to find balance.

Mr. McIlrath stated staff had been looking to see what improvements could be made to the roads within the current constraints. He explained the analysis that went into the North Davis County ATIP and noted those recommendations that had stemmed from it.

Councilmember Peterson talked about how Ogden approached traffic in the Junction area. She acknowledged the bike areas were on the side streets rather than busier roads. She stated there might not be a need to have bike lanes city-wide or on the corridor, but it would be important to plan safe routes to get bicyclists to the trails and Frontrunner station.

Councilmember Roper agreed he would rather make sure there was access to the trails and Frontrunner than have dedicated bike lanes along SR 126.

There was a discussion about transportation needs for the City. Mayor Shepherd admitted he was swayed to believe parking was more important along SR 126 and there were other places where bike trails were more appropriate.

Councilmember Bush stated the planted medians proposed would reduce accesses along SR 126. Mr. McIlrath acknowledged UDOT was supportive of the medians because it wanted to limit left-turn movements. He noted UDOT did not have a preference on if they were landscaped; however, the City desired for the medians to be planted for beautification purposes.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the center median would remain as proposed. Mr. McIlrath answered yes, staff's understanding was that UDOT was comfortable with the center medians but was not willing to allow a reduction of the travel lanes from 12 feet to 11 feet; regardless of the type of facility the City used for bike lanes or on-street parking. There was a discussion about the current restrictions being imposed by UDOT related to street widths and medians.

Mr. McIlrath stated there appeared to be consensus of the Council for on-street parking rather than a buffered bike lane along SR 126. He noted if the City proceeded with that option of on-street parking additional rights-of-way would be necessary to meet standards in some areas.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the Council agreed that parking was more important than bike lanes would it have to allow on-street parking in pinch areas where there was not currently enough width. Mr. McIlrath answered it would not be required. Mr. Allen stated if a developer wanted on-street parking then they could choose to donate the needed rights-of-way as part of development costs. There was a discussion on the options available for traffic patterns and mobility throughout the City.

Mr. McIlrath summarized staff understood from the discussion that the emphasis when it came to boulevard renovation would be to have medians and travel lanes but not widen for on-street parking and bike lanes unless a developer wanted to take that on in the areas between 300 North and 700 South.

FINANCIAL UPDATE ON THE 2021 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET

Rich Knapp reviewed the current status of revenues and expenditures in the FY21 budget. He reported the third quarter data was from July 1, 2020, through March 31, 2021. He noted the FY21 budget planned to reduce reserves by about \$2.4 million; however, the core revenue projections were about \$1 million higher than budgeted. He explained actual expenses compared to the budget would likely be lower than normal.

Mr. Knapp pointed out that the revenues were so much higher because of the \$2.2 million in Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding which was built into the budget as well as the \$740,000 for sale of land and the other majority was from increases in sales tax revenues. He reviewed the following key revenue numbers:

- Sales Tax – July to January was \$339,000 above last year during the same period.
- Energy Tax – July to March was \$250,000 below budget.
- Building Permits – \$288,000 above budget. There was a discussion about current development projects.
- Excavation Permits – \$130,000 above budget due to Fiber install.
- Clearfield Aquatic and Fitness Center (CAFC) – \$19,000 above last year and it had been the highest March since 2011 but it was projected to be \$155,000 lower than budget by year-end. Mr. Knapp said even though the CAFC was projected lower than budget it was trending higher which was a step in the right direction.
- Recreation – only 12 percent difference from 2019 (pre-pandemic) so even though it was projected for the year-end to be \$142,000 less than budgeted it was also trending in the right direction.
- Fine/Forfeitures – March matched 2019 and the projection for year-end was \$177,000 less than budgeted. There was a discussion about the trending reduction of fines and forfeitures.
- Fees/Costs/Contempt – \$42,000 less than last year for the same period and the early projection was for it to be \$97,000 less than budget by year end.

Mr. Knapp pointed out that the overall projections for year-end revenue was net \$1.05 million which would help the General Fund balance. He stated expenditures were tracking under budget and he had not included the CARES funds in the data presented so it would be less confusing. He highlighted the following key expenditures:

- Recreation – \$107,000 less than third quarter last year.
- Court – \$50,000 less than third quarter last year.
- Travel and Training expenses were down.
- Public Works over-time was historically low.
- Police vehicle was totaled and would need replacement. Chief Bennett indicated the new vehicle had been ordered.

Mr. Knapp pointed out there was the potential for paying off the 2018 Bonds which could also be an expense for FY21. There was a discussion on the impacts of the pandemic on the court system and its future as well as the administrative services and impacts.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if the net surplus of one million dollars in revenues was related to the CARES Act funds since \$900,000 was allocated towards public safety but the CARES Act fund expenditures were not included with the data presented. Mr. Knapp responded the surplus of one million dollars was in addition to those CARES Act funds. Councilmember Phipps indicated he might need to review the information with him later in more depth.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the United States and Utah economies. He reported Utah's economy was the third strongest in the nation. There was a discussion about the price for housing and whether

it was sustainable. Mr. Knapp reviewed the Utah and Clearfield Quarterly Point of Sale data. There was a discussion about how the COVID-19 pandemic could impact the point-of-sale data in the State as well as locally.

DISCUSSION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, stated the Clearfield Aquatic and Fitness Center (CAFC) had potential for a refresh; however, the project details were not ready to bring to the Council but staff wanted the Council to be aware of its options when considering the Fiscal Year 2022 budget. He reported it would be discussed in more detail later in the meeting.

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, mentioned the Art Center project was recently bid and the bid received was right in line with the budgeted amount. He noted FY21 had a set aside for the Arts Center remodel of \$150,000 and the FY22 budget also had planned \$150,000 from the General Fund plus an additional \$250,000 from Parks, Arts, Recreation, Aquatics, and Trails (PARAT) Tax revenue. He stated the contractor wanted to secure pricing from its subcontractors; therefore, wanted to get moving as soon as possible. Mr. Dickson explained staff wanted to see if the Council was willing to preauthorize the funds planned into the FY22 budget for the Art Center remodel because of the uniqueness of the situation with multi-year budgeting and the need of the contractor to stay under budget and get the supplies coming before the budget would be approved later in the year. There was a discussion about the project which included plans and preparations taking place in anticipation of the remodel. JJ Allen, City Manager, stated if any of the Council had reservations or concerns about moving forward with the project to share them. The consensus of the Council was to move forward with the project by including funding as planned in the FY22 budget for the Art Center remodel.

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, explained a future capital project at the CAFC had several options and the costs varied based on the amenities and potential for aquatic expansion. He reviewed the needs at the CAFC which had been identified by patrons who participated in a survey. He reviewed the amenities along with their construction costs, soft costs, and total cost of about \$5.85 million with no expansion of the center. Mr. Howes highlighted the conceptual plans for the proposed amenities which included a new elevator, locker room remodel, expansion and relocation of the weight room, reconfiguration of the fitness area, relocation or expanding the fitness studio, teen center, and outdoor patio. He mentioned there were three options for an aquatic expansion and reviewed the following options, costs, and advantages of each:

- Option 1: maintain existing indoor pool and expand outdoor aquatic opportunities – \$10.7 million.
- Option 2: expand indoor aquatics and provide expanded outdoor opportunities – \$14.1 million.
- Option 3: expand indoor aquatics to accommodate a 50-meter pool and provide expanded outdoor opportunities – \$18.9 million.

Mr. Howes explained Option 3 was the preferred option for the School District; however, Options 1 and 2 would be better for the City.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the cost projections considered the loss of revenue during the construction period. Mr. Howes responded it did not account for any closure time.

Mr. Allen indicated the School District had options and had been in discussions with various municipalities, yet he was not sure when the City would receive any input as to the District's needs. Councilmember Peterson expressed her hope the actions of the Council would bear favorably as far as the District looking to participate and work on behalf of the students in the District by considering some type of investment. There was a discussion about the City's current relationship with the District in comparison to other municipalities.

Mr. Allen explained one reason staff needed to present the CAFC future capital project during the meeting was to help provide vision which might be helpful as the Council discussed recapturing the General Obligation (GO) Bond revenue. He stated there was potential to leverage it for future investments, but if the City slowly allocated those funds towards other things such as operations, it would reduce its ability to fund a project such as the CAFC expansion.

Mr. Knapp wondered if the Council was interested in setting aside funding or committing the remaining GO Bond recapture towards any of the options presented. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion the costs seemed extreme. There was a discussion about the facility improvements needed, return on investment (ROI) versus the number people served, the associated costs, and subsidy it would be for the City.

Councilmember Phipps acknowledged he did not have an opinion yet about the investment but did have some concerns. Mr. Knapp noted the facility was aging. Mr. Allen acknowledged the reality was that the CAFC was a quality-of-life amenity which was not built to recoup costs so it would never recoup costs put into it. There was a discussion about the project, the services offered, the survey results, marketing tactics, wants versus needs of the users, and CAFC fees designed for current service levels and facility capacity.

Mr. Knapp commented the fee model at the CAFC was designed to capture the cost of operations; however, the building would be covered with taxing increment funding (TIF). Mr. Allen proposed a hypothetical question wondering what the City would desire if the School District wanted to participate in a partnership to expand the CAFC. Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion the District would then need to fund the capital improvement.

Mayor Shepherd spoke about the sentiments of many regarding the CAFC. He noted Layton City recently extended the life of its facility. He loved the CAFC; however, in his opinion the ends would need to justify the means. Mr. Allen expressed appreciation for the input.

Mr. Howes expressed the need to do something at the center to keep it viable for the long-term.

Mr. Allen confirmed the Council had not expressed an interest in programming any funding into the FY22 budget to pursue the CAFC renovations as presented. The consensus of the Council was to do nothing for now.

Mr. Knapp stated staff was hoping to obtain direction from the Council by having the following questions answered concerning the FY22 budget:

- Did the Council want to commit the remaining GO Bond recapture revenue towards a specific use?
- Did the Council want to increase the water base charge by seven percent on July 1, 2022?
- Was there an interest in bonding for the Utility funds to keep projects going?
- Was there anything in the budget a member of the Council would like modified, postponed, cut, and or added?
- Would another meeting next week be helpful?

Mr. Knapp highlighted the changes since the last budget discussion which included:

- Medical insurance increase of seven percent totaling about \$85,000 which included the new positions and was less than the original estimate of a 12 percent increase.
- Grant revenues were updated which changed the budget numbers in a positive direction.

Summer Palmer, Assistant City Manager, reviewed the health benefits, negotiated tactics, and modifications to the percentage paid by the City and employees which would be an 85/15 percent split. She reported on the benefit renewal history and the attempts of staff towards keeping the health insurance renewals as low as possible. She noted some of the attempts included switching plans, or changes to the plan, or cost sharing changes. Ms. Palmer reviewed comparisons of the City in contrast to other annual premiums for single and family coverages.

She highlighted the 2021-2022 compensation recommendations from the third-party consultant. She had attempted to get comparable data regarding compensation but explained only 14 entities had responded to the survey. She noted those that responded to the survey were providing a two percent cost of living adjustment (COLA) and three percent merit on average which totaled a five percent average increase. Ms. Palmer stated staff recommended adjusting grades M-W to stay marketable and offering merit increases of four percent for those who qualified. She asked if there were any questions or concerns with the recommendations. No concerns were voiced by the Council.

Mr. Knapp stated the GO Bond recapture revenue would be about \$700,000 and so far only \$200,000 had been moved to operations. He wondered what the Council desired to do with the GO Bond recapture revenue and if it should continue for the coming years to be identified that way. He reported it could be added to the General Fund and be used towards anything whenever it was needed, or it could build the net surplus, or it could also be committed towards something specific by the Council.

Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion it would be nice to have it carved out for something and identified as such so it was separate from other revenues. Mayor Shepherd agreed. He felt the GO Bond recapture revenue could come in handy for the aquatic refresh or some other project; however, if it was not committed for something and instead put into the City's surplus a future Council might not know its intended purpose. Mr. Knapp reviewed how committed funds would work and be separated from the restricted fund balances. He mentioned how easily it could be shifted to unrestricted funds if there was a need. There was consensus of

the Council to proceed by committing the GO Bond recapture revenue until there was a need and desire by the Council to utilize the funds.

Mr. Knapp stated the end unrestricted Fund Balance for the FY22 budget was at 17.7 percent of the unrestricted revenues. He anticipated it would be closer to 25 percent because the FY21 revenues were expected to be higher, and the expenses would likely be lower. He acknowledged the State recently increased the allowed number of reserves to be 35 percent.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the Revenue Bonds, retire years, and impacts of each on the FY22 budget. He explained the first bond payment of \$508,000 was due in October of 2022 for the UTOPIA fiber and its funding source was Excise Tax. He mentioned the 2018 Bonds for the Clearfield Mobile Home Park would be paid off in FY21 so there would not be any payments necessary in FY22.

Councilmember Thompson asked if things had slowed down with UTOPIA and wondered if the City would be able to make the take rate or have to subsidize some of the costs associated with Fiber. There was a discussion on the UTOPIA project and its impacts. Ms. Palmer reported the City's take rate should be met and things were moving forward and when power was available more areas would be ready than initially projected.

Mr. Knapp mentioned the 2021 Sales Tax Bond for the Clearfield Station project would have its first payment due in FY22. Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion she was comfortable with the landscape of the interchanges project if a portion of the Clearfield Station bond revenue could be used to fund the projected two-million-dollar expenditure. Mr. Allen acknowledged the payment for the Clearfield Station Bonds would come from tax increment; however, the payments for the portion used to landscape the interchanges would come from the General Fund. He clarified it was from the same bond issuance, but the sources for servicing the debt would be different. There was a discussion about bonds, debt, tax increment, and how it would all be managed responsibly.

Councilmember Peterson commented at the onset of the budget season the Council was cautioned about spending funds towards projects or other things because there were shortages in staffing. She worried about spending such a large amount for landscaping if there were other needs. Mr. Allen explained the purpose for including the landscaping of the interchanges in with the bonds for Clearfield Station. He added a portion of the GO Bond recapture revenue could be used to service the debt for landscaping of the interchanges. Councilmember Peterson expressed appreciation for the clarification.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the following factors which limited the City's bond capacity:

- Pledged revenues – Sales Tax and Energy Tax were pledged paying it off could free up some bond capacity.
- Net operating limits – \$500,000 operating surplus meant the maximum that could be borrowed equaled \$7.2 million or if used for interchange landscaping it would leave \$5.2 million available in bonding capacity.
- Low available cash/fund balance – lower rating equaled higher rates and less bond capacity.

Mr. Allen acknowledged the City was drawing down money in the Enterprise Funds for projects; yet the City planned to issue debt as a way of reimbursement for those projects. He explained a resolution for the issuance of debt would be needed in the future to facilitate using those funds. He reported staff was working with its financial consultant to prepare the resolution which would likely be ready for the Council's consideration in May.

Mr. Knapp highlighted some of the options available for future debt that included the Infrastructure Bond, Water Bond, as well as the option of an Aquatic Center Refresh Bond which, as discussed, would not be included in the FY22 budget.

Councilmember Thompson moved to adjourn at 9:19 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Peterson. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper, and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 22nd day of February 2022**

/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, February 22, 2022.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder