

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
8:00 A.M. WORK SESSION
June 18, 2021

Weber Basin Water Conservancy District
Water Efficiency Research Center (WERC) Building
2837 East Highway 193
Layton, Utah 84040

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
	Devin Rogers	Police Assistant Chief
	Eric Howes	Community Services Director
	Curtis Dickson	Community Services Deputy Dir.
	Spencer Brimley	Community Development Director
	Brad Wheeler	Streets Superintendent
	Rich Knapp	Finance Manager
	Trevor Cahoon	Communications Coordinator
	Nancy Dean	City Recorder
	Wendy Page	Deputy Recorder
EXCUSED:	Adam Favero	Public Works Director

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

TEAMBUILDING, FUTURE PLANNING, AND PRIORITY REVIEW

Leadership Lessons – Part 1

Councilmember Thompson joined the meeting at 8:20 a.m.

JJ Allen, City Manager, explained the retreat would begin by getting inspired. Prior to the retreat meeting, he had requested each attendee to come prepared with a leadership or motivational thought. The elected officials and staff members present were randomly selected to share their thought and the rest of the group was encouraged to discuss or share insights on each of the topics. The first session included ideas such as learning from failure, knowing where you want to go so you can help others, being inclusive, not fearing hard conversations, and being brief.

Fiscal Sustainability

Summer Palmer, Assistant City Manager, stated fiscal sustainability analysis was a Tier 1 priority of the Council in 2019. She noted staff had been working towards efforts and summarized those efforts to date which included contracting with Zions Public Finance; presenting the initial analysis and model in 2020; turning the model over to finance to use moving forward; and reviewing the residential/staff growth components or inputs of the model during the January 2021 kick-off meeting. She explained Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, had updated the remaining components for new growth and development, inflation rates, and estimated capital costs for the next ten years.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the sustainability model spreadsheet and the data that had been gathered to project the next 10 years. He stated the assumptions compounded year over year so if one assumption was off early on, then the issue compounded. He mentioned the inputs included new growth and development, inflation rates, and capital costs and timing for streets, facilities, and parks. He indicated the three controllable financial strategies that could be used when working with the General Fund included property tax rates, capital project timing, and bonds.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if the sustainability model assumed that the Parks, Arts, Recreation, Aquatics, and Trails (PARAT) Tax would be continued. Mr. Knapp responded it was one of the assumptions and there were also some disclaimers that would be highlighted later in the presentation. He indicated it assumed PARAT Tax was approved when again on the ballot in 2024.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the rate could be changed for the PARAT Tax. Mr. Allen answered the rate could be changed but there was a cap. He explained the rate adopted in 2014 was at the highest capped rate.

Mr. Knapp acknowledged the components of the forecast had the following assumptions:

- \$500,000 property tax General Obligation (GO) Bond recapture was not restricted.
- Revenues and expenses would match the budget – historically revenues were higher, and expenses were lower.
- Clearfield Station and UTOPIA debt were self-sustained.
- Increases to revenues and expenses would correlate to the five-year historical data.
- PARAT was renewed.
- No economic cycle – steady increase.
- Tax Increment Financing (TIF) was going offline was not yet built into the model – more general property tax.
- Commercial growth timing was built in at a constant rate.

Councilmember Bush asked if property tax was built into the model. Mr. Knapp responded yes.

Councilmember Thompson asked if the model sensed gaps and forecast for a percentage of inflation or other things such as trends and taxation that would come from development and

might pay for impact, but the revenues might not keep up with the baseline of the City and not putting money away for other things. Mr. Knapp said it did.

Ms. Palmer added there was currently no new census data so the model calculated from the numbers presented in January about development and residential counts and then projected them for the next ten years. She indicated the census could come back much higher and staff would need to adjust the model accordingly. She reported modifications were not made because staff wanted the date to match what was presented to the Council in January; however, both could be adjusted with the 2020 census data when it was available.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the new growth impacts projected for the next ten years for revenues and expenditures. He explained new growth ended up producing more money than it cost so it paid for itself. There was a discussion about the measures used to determine the algorithms that resulted in the model calculations.

Councilmember Phipps pointed out that it created more revenues than expenses from property taxes. Mr. Allen noted revenues were based on all taxes not just property tax which were greater than expenditures. Councilmember Phipps expressed his interest in the algorithms used to create the model.

Mr. Allen pointed out that the City's growth was slower than the State but its portion of the pie was getting bigger, therefore, the City's portion was larger than it used to be.

Councilmember Bush wondered if the model considered the population of surrounding cities. He suggested that as their populations grew it helped the City's sales tax. Mr. Knapp answered the model did not go that deep to include others. He noted 70 percent of sales tax revenue came from the pie or how well the State was doing.

Councilmember Thompson wondered if the sales tax growth accounted for the inflationary aspect of the product. Mr. Knapp responded yes. He noted as the inflation and purchases increased the City received more sales tax. Councilmember Thompson questioned because the forecasting was not represented in a curve. Mr. Knapp explained it was because the accuracy was less trustworthy the further out you go in the model.

Councilmember Phipps stated there was an implied increase in commercial and asked if there was a proportional increase in sales tax revenue. Mr. Knapp responded he was not sure and could look at it. Councilmember Thompson felt it would be good and interesting to forecast that way. Mr. Knapp agreed it would be fun but maybe not the best use of resources.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the General Fund projection summary for new growth over ten years to forecast the net operating revenues. He also highlighted the General Fund projection summary with calculations based on maintaining the rate for year one only, which included operating revenues, operating expenses, debt service, bond proceeds, capital projects, net revenues, year-end cash, and the cash percent of revenue. He reiterated the data was the less accurate the further out it went.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his surprise the growth numbers were not higher with all the high-density projects upcoming. Mr. Knapp reviewed the projects and how density was calculated on the spreadsheet and inputs related to growth. He explained the model projected the growth of population in 10 years totaled 11,505 individuals. Ms. Palmer noted there were many variables that could determine the growth which were unknown.

Mr. Knapp explained all the year-end cash projections included all the cash from the General Fund, impact fees, and all cash balances related to capital projects.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if PARAT Tax was included with the operating revenues. Mr. Knapp responded yes.

Mr. Knapp mentioned the projections showed the City was in the hole in fiscal year 2031 about \$2.4 million. He noted the growth reserves were also plugged into the model. He reviewed the capital projects summary that included a three percent per year construction inflation. He highlighted the projects planned for the next ten years. Councilmember Phipps stated the detail was impressive.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if there was any funding in the model for an emergency or unplanned cost. Mr. Knapp stated there was not. Mr. Allen acknowledged that would be the General Fund balance and why it was often referred to as the rainy-day fund. Mr. Allen noted the level of detail included with the capital projects spreadsheets showed how much planning went into preparing for the future.

Mr. Allen pointed out that the City did not have impact fees for streets or public safety and if it was of interest to the Council it could be explored. Councilmember Bush asked how the amount would be assessed. Mr. Allen responded the City would need to establish its current level of service and then calculate what the costs would be to maintain that level of service and plan accordingly. There was a discussion on if impacts for streets or public safety should be implemented. The consensus of the Council was to explore the options and see if it would be something to consider in the future.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the data that supported the personnel growth formula which accounted for the cost per capita, increases in population, and inflation. He provided examples of how costs were calculated and projected. He explained there was a sensitivity calculation to account for other areas served as well.

Councilmember Phipps asked if it was matched to the data provided by Ms. Palmer in January. Mr. Knapp responded the data aligned well. Ms. Palmer added it took into consideration some additional factors that model prepared in January did not and it could easily be adjusted as more updated information was available.

Mr. Knapp highlighted the comparisons between maintaining the rate versus not maintaining the rate year over year. He noted the difference in cash revenues would be \$7.87 million by 2031 if the rate were not maintained. Mr. Allen reiterated the Council should keep in mind the model projections were more difficult the further out it went.

Councilmember Thompson wondered if staff knew what the impact on the average household would be if the tax were maintained. Mr. Knapp replied it was not calculated after the first year, but it could be projected.

Mr. Knapp noted property tax was one of the levers the City had control over. He explained maintaining the rate for 2021 would result in a \$31.56 or 16 percent increase for the average homeowner from last year. He continued the truth in taxation notice would read \$48.92 or 27 percent increase from what it could have been this year because it would not show the comparison to last year. Mr. Allen explained the difference was related to the GO Bond portion.

Mr. Knapp mentioned the calculated property tax rate if not maintained would have resulted in a \$327,000 decrease to the City with only the GO Bond recapture. He stated if the rate were maintained the rate would equate to \$256,000 of new money or a 10 percent increase in property tax beyond the GO Bond recapture. He noted the tentative budget projected \$95,000 in new money.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the City's following financial strategies:

- Property tax – maintain rate
- Capital projects timing
- Bonds

Mr. Knapp highlighted the drafted language for the City's Fiscal Management Practices. He noted some of the Council had provided mixed messages about the statement so it was unclear if the statement was fine or should be changed.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion the budget should be evaluated every year with a zero-based approach to determine if the property tax should be maintained. He expressed his concern with creating a policy rather than something that could be used as a tool or guiding document. He worried it was not appropriate to bind a future City Council to a specific policy.

Mr. Allen noted the document was not written as a policy but as its title suggested it was for fiscal management practices. There was a discussion about if there should be some type of policy or practice to help guide management practices related to property tax rates.

Councilmember Peterson liked the idea of having a guiding policy that addressed inflationary costs and principles that could be helpful to guide budgeting practices.

Councilmember Thompson expressed his opinion that having a similar policy in place when he joined the Council would have prepared him mentally for the budget process. He suggested a new first sentence option so it was not assumed the rate would be maintained. There was a discussion on the interpretation of the drafted language. Mr. Knapp noted the fiscal management statements typically were based on values.

Councilmember Phipps commented the goal of the Council should be to pass a balanced budget and there should not be an expectation that the property tax rate would need to be maintained

each year to have a balanced budget. He stated maintaining the rate could be a tool that was used if there was not another way.

Mayor Shepherd suggested some of the language could be adjusted to lessen the expectation of maintaining the rate. He added it could be addressed to say it was anticipated the rate would be maintained but should the surplus number exceed a certain percentage or place a cap where the rate would not need to be maintained. He agreed it should be reviewed each year because assumptions could change.

Mr. Allen asked if the Council was willing to look at language like what Mayor Shepherd described. Mr. Knapp pointed out that “truth in taxation” was not necessary but it was one of the ways to keep up with inflation.

Councilmember Thompson felt Mayor Shepherd’s suggested change was a way to find the middle ground and not build up an exorbitant amount in the General Fund balance unnecessarily.

Mayor Shepherd indicated it would be good to find balance and maintain the level of service as well as keep up with inflation.

Councilmember Peterson stated the language made sense to her because of what the City currently was modeling for the next 10 years. She noted keeping pace with inflation and taking care of commitments to projects was contingent on maintaining the rate. She felt the policy was not binding but a tool that put the City toward hitting the mark within the budgeting process.

Mayor Shepherd acknowledged the practices were an assumption to maintain the rate and keep the service levels and address the growth that was coming. Councilmember Peterson added it addressed keeping the same level of service for the expected growth not an increased number of services. There was a discussion about how the language could be articulated to best reflect the goals of the Council to maintain service levels and respond to growth by addressing the fiscal management practices.

Mr. Knapp asked if the Council felt it would be good to add some language after the word strive to better articulate the “why” behind maintaining the rate. Councilmember Peterson responded either articulate the “why” or add language that it was based on 10 years of projections and modeling for financial sustainability. Councilmember Thompson suggested using the word forecasting and making it a more general statement that ensured the services and accounted for growth.

Councilmember Peterson acknowledged there had been much work and effort already done to obtain the projection data. Ms. Palmer noted the model and projection data would be updated and could be reviewed every year. Councilmember Thompson liked the term forecasting. Councilmember Peterson agreed.

Ms. Palmer asked if any language should be added as justification for a tax increase. Councilmember Peterson stated no she would not support it.

Mr. Knapp stated the language would be reworked and come back to the Council with all the fiscal management practices.

Mr. Allen stated staff favored maintaining the tax rate because it would put the City in a healthier position by helping the General Fund balance which had been dwindling but the decision would be the Councils. Ms. Palmer stated staff was seeing the effects of inflation on the projects and did not anticipate it would end anytime soon. Mr. Allen noted unless the Council directed otherwise, staff would plan to proceed and prepare the proper notifications for maintaining the tax rate.

Mr. Knapp stated staff would proceed with the truth in taxation noticing and reword the fiscal statement. He asked if the Council wanted staff to research the possibility of any other governmental impact fees such as streets or public safety. Councilmember Peterson suggested it would be good to investigate it. Mr. Allen mentioned a study would need to be done and it would not have any impact on the current budget year.

The Council took a break at 10:19 a.m.

The meeting resumed at 10:30 a.m.

Code Enforcement 3.0

Mr. Allen stated code enforcement had been through many iterations over the past several years. He thanked the Council for its input on a survey which had helped staff generate some alternatives for Code enforcement. He highlighted the following five alternatives along with the goals and potential impacts of each approach:

- ***RE/PE (Reactive Enforcement and Proactive Education)***
 - Goal – spend less time enforcing and more time educating
 - Would use current ordinance / process, but issue Notice of Violations (NOV) only in response to complaints received
 - Could result in retaliatory / vindictive complaints
 - Tunnel vision or “blinders on” approach
 - More emphasis on educating property and business owners
 - What the code requires / prohibits and why
 - Seek to foster positive peer pressure to improve properties – should funding be allocated for grants to promote beautification on private property
- ***The Feel-Good***
 - Goal –assume the best of others and be as lenient as possible
 - “Enforcement” to take on a new identity of promotion and advocacy
 - Still proactive with “boots on the ground” in the neighborhoods, but seeking to have positive in-person interactions to build groundswell of community pride and willingness to improve property
 - No more Notice of Violation (NOV) – replace with Request for Compliance
 - Add a step in the process for door knock / door hanger

- Exercise more patience; assess fines as last resort
 - Promotion and advocacy would also involve other channels of communication
 - Would require ordinance changes
 - Inherent risk and flaws with engaging in-person on private property
- ***It's Just Business***
 - Goal – unapologetically and proactively enforce compliance
 - Systematically and uniformly issue NOVs, but with focus
 - Number of NOVs issued and cases brought into compliance become the key indicators of success
 - Must identify top priorities (types of violations) to focus on
 - Don't sweat the small stuff
 - Don't overreact when pushback comes
 - The process is designed with flexibility to provide the property owner with ample opportunity to come into compliance without a fine
- ***The Hit List***
 - Goal – intense focus on the most visible problem properties to make a noticeable difference
 - Identify the properties (not types of violations) that were the most egregious, and focus enforcement efforts on them until resolved
 - As properties come into compliance, others would rise to the top of the list
 - Other enforcement efforts would be reactive (in response to a complaint) and be secondary in priority
- ***Simply Water***
 - Goal – focus efforts on the current water crisis
 - Enact water conservation restrictions and use Code Enforcement personnel to help educate, remind, and enforce as necessary
 - Complaints about irresponsible watering had been coming in steadily
 - Temporarily suspend other code enforcement actions
 - Take more time to study options for long-term revamp

Mr. Allen asked for the Council's reaction on the options presented for code enforcement. He explained none were run through the hedgehog tool by staff because it needed to be a Council decision. There was a discussion about the following topics or ideas:

- Efforts had changed over the years from leniency to tougher enforcement.
- It was a challenging problem to solve.
- A goal should be that neighbors were able to like where they were living.
- Code enforcement was the need to find balance between private property rights, impacts to neighbors, and local control or regulations.
- Understanding the need for a measuring stick to meet the City's goal to improve image and livability.
- Hit List approach was not the best long-term solution but could be middle ground and get some (a dozen) of the problem properties that were highly visible under control.
- Residents seemed to weigh the Council's effectiveness on a handful of properties so it would help if those were cleaned up with the hit list approach.
- Health and safety risks should be a high priority.

- There were a handful of properties that enforcement efforts had not been able to get any traction on and some property issues remained unresolved despite the efforts over the years.
- Arbitrary approaches to code enforcement would be challenging for staff.
- Issue NOVs for obvious violations but other potential concerns or small issues could be addressed through education.
- Improve the image of an area by focusing on one house or was targeting a specific code violation and address all within the neighborhood most effective.
- Not exclusively doing the hit list approach but augmenting it with another approach.
- The current system in place was not broken, but some adjustments could be made to improve it.
- Adjustments in the process could be altered so people were less frustrated and more educated.
- Examples were discussed where NOVs had been issued and residents had complained.
- Escalation process might need to be adjusted in the issuing of notices so there was more documentation of interactions before a higher discipline was enforced.
- Language of the NOV had been adjusted over time, but many residents had expressed concern the NOV currently felt like a citation rather than a curtesy notice.
- First notice could be called a Request for Compliance, but if further enforcement was necessary a NOV could be issued to start the compliance timeclock.
- Skill of exercising discretion was needed by compliance officers.
- Typically, a resident's complaint would be passed along to a particular department head, but code enforcement issues seemed to be handled differently by the Council.
- Using a customer service approach which could help create discretion with an added layer of contact before a NOV was issued, but it could also prolong the tracking and time that issues were unresolved.
- Important to find a way that could help reduce the administrative burden for the NOV process.
- The ordinance currently was written that the responsibility was on the property owner to fix the issue before fines or fees were assessed; however, it could be changed to require staff make an additional visit to check for compliance.
- There were various levels of review or screening that occurred when code enforcement was housed in the police department that did not exist under its current system.
- Focus resources on enforcement of highly visible areas so it could help create a place where people wanted to be.
- Clearly marking the NOV that it was not a citation, so it was less scary.
- Tweak current process by adding new wording on the NOV, changing the ordinance so staff returned for an inspection after the 14-day period for compliance, and focus on the highly visible areas of the City but continue as needed to react to complaints from residents within the neighborhoods.
- Concerns were expressed about relying too heavily on neighbors to report issues which created conflicts.
- Code enforcement focus on corridors and main transportation areas and then move into the neighborhood progressively.
- There was a review of the current procedural process which seemed to be working.

- Council should not get in the middle of the process but calm residents, provide help understanding the process, and refer complaints to the department head.
- Education for code enforcement officers and residents could help each better understand the middle ground approach between the carrot and the stick.
- Discontinue referring to the NOV as a citation.
- Perceptions varied and public relations could help educate the residents.
- The best reactions would come from initial contact rather than issuing a NOV.
- Individuals that called to report a code violation were kept private and not released as public records.

Mr. Allen stated it had been a good discussion. He noted there were a wide range of opinions but not sure that any conclusions could be drawn from the discussion. He noted code enforcement had always been problematic because it would continue to be viewed differently and some would continue to be upset. He mentioned the discussion had first focused on the hit list, then the feel-good approach, or other variations of both. He asked what the action items were that staff should take away from the discussion.

Councilmember Thompson liked the idea of a hybrid approach to the hit list by looking to focus on the corridors as a priority.

Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, stated his notes from the discussion were for staff to increase the contacts when noticing property owners of non-compliance with door hangers and change the verbiage of the notices so it was a request for compliance before it went to a default judge. He indicated another thing staff could do was put additional emphasis on corridors.

Councilmember Peterson stated she did not want to put more burden on staff with additional notices. She commented the discussion showed it was a terrible idea for the Council to get involved and give staff a punch list of items for the day-to-day operations. She agreed working on softer language, staying the course, and focusing on visible corridors would be good moving forward. Councilmember Bush agreed and stated visible corridors and especially those places which were visible to the public.

Councilmember Phipps voiced his opinion nothing was needed other than having more compassionate enforcement. He did not want the City to be heavy handed and did not personally have any issues with the language of the current notice.

Mr. Allen noted the other thing that might be helpful would be to have the two compliance officers vet each other's notices of violation so there was a check in place. Mr. Brimley felt it would be better for an outside or third party or supervisor to provide that check so there would be an additional perspective.

Stuart Williams, City Attorney, asked if there was an interest on giving a focus on what to enforce. Mayor Shepherd responded the Council wanted to avoid doing that because the officers used discretion.

Mr. Allen asked if any good had come from the discussion. Mr. Brimley responded it had been helpful and there was better understanding from staff and the Council about the struggles each was facing when it came to code enforcement. He added staff was struggling to meet the expectations of the Council, but the Council was also struggling with how best to approach it. He felt the process would be better knowing everyone was on the same page.

Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, created a graphic that represented what the code enforcement process for residents should look like: Fix it, call to tell when fixed, do not call the Council.

Hill Air Force Base (HAFB)/Falcon Hill Update

Mayor Shepherd reported on the Utah Defense Alliance presentation provided during a recent meeting. He indicated the Ground Based Strategic Deterrence (GBSD) program was formerly known as the Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles program. He explained the GBSD program would replace the rockets, navigation systems, command and control that were 60 years old.

Mayor Shepherd reviewed the current situation and future for HAFB with the GBSD program being awarded in 2020 that would bring new jobs, people and money to the area. He explained the Utah Defense Alliance had recently completed two studies to better understand the economic impacts and run various models. He mentioned the goal of the studies was to determine community impacts. He reviewed the growth assumptions, economic impacts, future growth plans and salary ranges for the United States Air Force and Northrop Grumman Corporation. He acknowledged the current housing inventories in Davis and Weber counties, as well as the building capacity.

Mayor Shepherd reported on the following land use items:

- New I-15 Off ramp on north side of the base near the museum was approved.
- Military Installation Development Agency (MIDA) planned to build four new office buildings on the north side of the base.
- There had been conversations with three planning offices of cities in Davis County and there was very little land left in Davis or Weber counties to build.
- Rezoning was not possible with most communities so it would mostly be infill in both Davis and Weber counties.

He highlighted the HAFB employment and economic impact per year for inflation plus 2020 growth, total future salary growth, and future economic impact. Mayor Shepherd indicated the 2025 HAFB economic impact was recently revised to be \$7.2 billion per year. He explained the biggest issue was housing because currently there would be long-term assignments for base employees rather than shorter term assignments. He also reviewed the plans for the interchange at 1800 North.

Councilmember Bush wondered if the Air Force anticipated how much office space was needed. Mayor Shepherd responded it would be a lot. He explained the two firms that had been contracted for the maintenance of the system required about 200,000 square feet of space.

Councilmember Phipps reported with a project like this people would not be able to work from home but needed a facility which was secure. He explained the offices would need to have locked doors, secure access, and visitor control.

Councilmember Bush wondered if HAFB anticipated building more housing. Mayor Shepherd responded HAFB was looking for ways to provide housing allowances, but the inventory and rents would be challenging.

Mayor Shepherd reviewed the timeline of events and expansion planned for the 5600 South gate area.

Councilmember Bush asked what was planned for 650 North. Mayor Shepherd said there was no room until the 1200 series buildings were removed which would be well into the future.

Mayor Shepherd spoke about the Union Pacific Rail Trail that would be extended and end up lining up with the Canal Trail which would be wide enough for public and biking. He explained the City had received praise for its development actions that would help with what was coming to the base and the surrounding communities.

The Council took a break at 12:18 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 12:55 p.m.

The Council took a tour of the Conservation Learning Garden at 1:00 p.m.

Leadership Lessons – Part 2

The elected officials and staff members present were randomly selected to share a leadership or motivational thought and the rest of the group was encouraged to discuss or share insights on each of the topics. The second session included ideas such as being curious and not judgmental, growth came from opportunities which could be messy or risky, not making judgements on future leaders but understand where you come from, leadership required coordination and could be filled with mistakes, and a leader was someone who could take a vision and transform it into reality.

Downtown Redevelopment – Messaging the “Why”

Mr. Cahoon stated when talking about messaging, it should be based on the core of the City’s branding. He provided an analysis of the last 4.5 years in communications and what it had entailed. He highlighted a few ways the communications team had worked to engage the residents and get out the City’s messages. He indicated there were some areas that needed to be emphasized in more depth.

Mr. Cahoon reviewed the following efforts of the City over the past few years to generate public participation and awareness:

- Pop up parties

- Form Based Code
- Enhanced City events to generate more public participation
- Search the City
- Dived deeper into the Planning and Zoning efforts
- Open Houses

He noted the various messaging efforts had resulted in developing a relationship with the City's residents. Mr. Cahoon felt the people were currently more vocal and cared about where they lived.

Mr. Allen stated there were four questions for Mayor Shepherd and the Council about downtown redevelopment messaging and the why. He requested the mayor and each member of the Council write answers and not group think but help answer the questions which would then be discussed as a group.

Questions and Answers:

- What are you hoping to achieve with more messaging and who is the audience?
 - Getting information to residents to help them accomplish a good quality of life; audience is everyone who lives or comes to Clearfield.
 - A message that everyone can understand because the audience is passionate and diverse.
 - Keeping the conversations going with the residents; residents are the audience.
 - Tell the story and explain why we are doing what we are doing; residents are the audience.
 - I hope residents can tell the story of why their city is changing; audience: particularly homeowners.
 - Convince the skeptical that the City is moving in the right direction and prevent the criticism.

There was a discussion about the common theme from the responses where residents were suggested as the primary audience. The comments included making sure the audience encompassed those that live in the City, as well as those that worked or visited and even the neighbors on Hill Air Force Base.

Mr. Allen wondered if there was a measurement that would show the City accomplished its messaging goal. There was a discussion about the audience and messaging as it related to the City's broad demographics, keeping the messaging consistent, providing logical responses for the sceptic, specific versus broad messaging, explaining change so people understand why, and reaching the passionate or engaged individuals with clear messaging.

Ms. Palmer acknowledged it sounded like the discussion suggested the why message was for the skeptical, long-term homeowner. There was a discussion about the importance of determining the audience because it would impact the messaging.

Councilmember Peterson stated in the absence of information it was easy to survey the scene and draw a conclusion on your own merit. She expressed her opinion the City needed to guide the

messaging and explain why the Council was making decisions and how those decisions would impact the City rather than letting those that were passionate or unhappy about what they were seeing tell the story without all the facts.

Mr. Cahoon explained the importance of hitting the target audience and how to keep it broad enough to be effective but narrow enough to hit the right audience. Councilmember Thompson expressed his opinion the message needed to be clear for the supporter and not just targeted for the skeptic. There was a discussion about messaging and how to help the audience understand where it could get accurate information.

Mr. Allen summarized the discussion reiterating that messaging should persuade or inform the engaged audience. Ms. Palmer noted providing a logical response was mentioned as well. Councilmember Peterson stated the messaging should not be responsive as it had been in the past, but it should be switched to proactive messaging with the City as the one driving the conversation. The consensus of the Council was to have messaging be provided and informative for the targeted audience.

Mr. Allen asked the Mayor and Council and department heads to write their individual responses to the following question:

- What really is the “why?”

Mr. Allen requested the department heads share their responses to the question. The following responses were mentioned:

- Because it mattered.
- To change the way Clearfield was viewed as a community.
- To redevelop the downtown so it was clean and a place where people wanted to be.
- Clearfield was more than a reputation and its current reputation did not represent the City well. People needed to understand there was a lot more to the City.
- Change was needed. The City had been the underdog for long enough and it needed to change in order to dispel past perceptions.
- We need to do something to change because the City cannot keep doing the same things and expect different results.
- Because if we are not growing; we are dying, and this time we are growing intentionally, and this time we are acting instead of being acted upon.

Mr. Allen reviewed the following responses from the Mayor and City Council to the question what really is the why:

- The why is not just an issue of a strictly local issue but regional so the why had to be approached from what could we do to improve our image and economy as we address the issues of Clearfield now.
- Because people asked questions, and we needed to be able to answer.
- This was the best future for the City within existing social and economic constraints.
- To keep Clearfield viable and sustainable for the future.
- For decades Clearfield was the place to be, but it had lost its way over time. We are investing in our City and downtown again because we believe the best days are in front of us, not behind.

- Clearfield had a hay day in the 60's and 70's. It was the place people would go when they were going to town. We stopped progressing and got passed by. We are bringing life and residents back to Clearfield. We are creating a vibrant walkable city. It takes time but we will get there.

Mayor Shepherd said the answers to the why all tied in well together. He liked what was said about image which was external and internal. He commented about the history of the City and its nostalgia, but recognized the City had died and so change was needed.

Mr. Cahoon suggested the synopsis of the why was that Clearfield was better than people thought; but it was changing intentionally to capture the growth that was coming to Utah so the City did not die again.

Councilmember Phipps recommended the audience be considered. He mentioned it would be important to help them understand the logic and address their question of why we are doing this thing in this way. There was a discussion about tactics that could be used to explain the why. Mr. Cahoon said if the City knew the goal and how it planned to accomplish it, then that could steer the messaging being delivered in the future and help provide the public with those answers and make that information available and have a way to articulate it.

Mr. Cahoon asked if the Council felt the target audience remained correct for the message of the why that had been articulated. Councilmember Peterson commented the City was a place that was at the heart of things, but when the market changed the City did not. She noted lessons were learned and moving forward when the market shifted the City needed to be willing to change. She expressed her opinion the City would be better because the Council was intentional about doing what it was doing. She voiced her love of the City and hoped people would understand the City would be better because of the decisions that were being made.

Mr. Allen commented if the why was to be bold, affect change, and keep the City vibrant and alive; and the audience was the engaged residents who are chattering about the topic then it seemed to fit. There was a discussion about the tactical approach that would provide messaging of fact to help dispel the myths. Mr. Allen noted the fact that there were no challengers in the current municipal election was an indication there seemed to be general acceptance and buy in from the community.

Mr. Cahoon stated one of the strengths in the messaging of the past few years was breathing life into the community by getting the community out and engaged, allowing residents to get out to touch and feel the City they lived in and experiencing the things that were already here and then letting them know what was in store and preparing them for the future. There was a discussion about messaging related to events, connectivity, and understanding there would always be people that disagreed.

Mr. Cahoon indicated it would be important as the Mayor and Council responded to the next couple of questions to think about how the City could show its residents that message rather than tell them. Mr. Allen requested the Mayor and City Council write their individual answers to the following question:

- How much are you willing to spend on this message?
 - I honestly would like to see proposals and get an idea on options and scope.
 - It is difficult to put a dollar amount, but it sure is worth investing in.
 - I don't have a dollar amount but enough to adequately ensure the job is satisfactorily done right.
 - \$25,000
 - Take the hours responding to resident questions times the hourly rate and there is the dollar amount.
 - Willingness to spend must coincide with the ranking of the objective of fiscal prudence.

Mr. Cahoon indicated the current communications budget expenses were \$175,000. He explained if the City contracted services the costs could range from \$24,000 to \$74,000 but other public relations firms would charge between \$175 to \$250 per hour depending on the level of expertise. He explained a brochure might cost about \$1000 if it were contracted.

Mr. Allen suggested the last question be answered to aid in further discussion. Mr. Cahoon agreed and asked the Mayor and City Council to respond to the following question:

- What are the best strategies to accomplish the goal?
 - I think it depends on the situation or event some things may work better than others.
 - (1) develop an FAQ in a prominent place; (2) use that as a basis for education methods; (3) do a proactive direct campaign.
 - Outsource a single project/message to create a website page handful of graphics with one or two videos and then use existing staff to handle every day.
 - Social media needs to continue to be engaging and informative as well as anything that directs them to correct information.
 - Supporting internal talent with outsourcing.
 - Increase the budget/salary for the communications department to allow the work to be performed in house by those who know and can tell the story.

Mr. Allen acknowledged the diversity of the responses. Mr. Cahoon stated staff was confined with the current budget, but priorities could shift. He explained even if there were items that could be outsourced there would continue to be an impact on staff time. He noted staff time had been tight and many departments were utilizing the communications department for messaging. Mr. Cahoon suggested as requests for messaging continued to come from departments, one thing that would be helpful was for the requestor to frame the why and integrate it into the message. He reviewed the costs associated with creating a website for frequently asked questions (FAQs) which was about \$20,000. There was a discussion about how to best create content for the why messaging and implement it on the City's website and what City resources would be most beneficial to accomplish the work.

Mr. Cahoon mentioned it would be good to have information internally that was readily available and to help answer questions. He noted it would be good to direct those people with questions to a tidy place that stored information. He suggested the best thing to help with messaging the why would be to create more opportunities to get into the conversations such as having more

Facebook live or popup party events to share information with the people who are engaged and show up.

Mr. Allen acknowledged there was a static side and active side to messaging. He explained it sounded like there was a desire to create static content to refer people to information and the active side where there were interaction opportunities. He noted the static side would take money to get it together, whether it was staff time or outsourced.

Mr. Cahoon suggested ideas for doing tactical messaging for the General Plan update and ways to make it feel like an environment that the updates were designed to create. Councilmember Phipps liked the approach used by the Fire District with its flyer announcing its truth in taxation public hearing with all the facts listed that people would need to know. He suggested a bulk flyer could be prepared for residents when everything was ready, and it could be sent out with the City's URL and information about where they could go to get answers.

Councilmember Peterson suggested perhaps the Council could create a list of the five most frequently asked questions of residents and those answers could be addressed in the information. She felt the messaging should be consistent.

Mr. Allen commented staff now had a better understanding of the messaging; however, the timing would be tricky with Mr. Cahoon leaving and the transitioning that would happen. He worried there had been some urgency with messaging but wondered if that urgency had changed due to the election.

Councilmember Peterson responded timing was her top priority, but the expediency was tempered since there had been a shift with the election; however, she still felt it should be a pressing issue.

Mr. Cahoon wondered when the General Plan updates would be ready for adoption. Mr. Brimley indicated it would likely not be ready until the fall. Councilmember Peterson commented her opinion on the General Plan updates had changed and she felt the noticing should meet the requirements of the law. She expressed her opinion the General Plan updates should not be the engagement touch point to focus on and instead message about creating places where people wanted to be and the why behind it.

Mr. Allen stated with Mr. Cahoon leaving, the executive team would need time to prepare a proposal on how to accomplish it and explain what it would cost. He explained there were many variables to consider, and things were currently unknown about the future of the communications division and its staffing. Councilmember Peterson noted it would be interesting to see what that operation looked like with the growth planned for the City as well. There was a discussion about some of the variables to be considered when organizing the future communications team once Mr. Cahoon left the City.

Mr. Allen summarized it sounded as if the expansion of human resources for the division was not off the table and could be included in the possible options to consider as future approaches for communications. Councilmember Peterson confirmed it was not off the table. She expressed her

opinion the City's messaging of the why would be better handled with internal hands on it so there would need to be a shift since the current configuration was already maxed out.

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, acknowledged the message of the why could not be possible without a shift in resources because his department alone had been maximizing the time of the communications division for its own uses. He noted the ability and skills that Mr. Cahoon had provided the City would be missed.

Mr. Cahoon thanked everyone for their support and recognized his job opportunity would not have been possible without the experience gained by working for the City and with such great people.

Mr. Allen expressed appreciation for the good discussion.

Current Development Projects

Mr. Brimley highlighted through a google earth presentation the current or potential development projects within the City which included:

- Canterbury Court Townhomes
- Woods Court
- Autumn Ridge Phase 5
- Hamblin Estates
- Weaver Meadows
- Mayfly Rise Townhomes
- Clearfield Junction
- Davis County Library Clearfield Branch
- Sand Ridge Village Townhomes
- Hillside Estates Mixed-Use
- Marq Apartments and Townhomes Phase 1
- City Plaza Apartments
- Union Townhomes
- Depot Street Townhomes
- Depot Crossing Townhomes
- Depot Crossing Commercial
- Indigo Eight80 Townhomes
- South Clearfield Elementary
- Bravada 193
- Towers at Legend Hills
- Phoenix Services
- Clearfield Station Transit-Oriented Development
- Outback Subdivision
- Alvey Subdivision
- The Landing
- Antelope Center / Clearfield Flex
- Lifetime Products Distribution Center

Wrap Up and Adjourn

Mr. Allen expressed appreciation to all for their attendance and participation. He indicated the facility closed at 4:30 p.m. and in lieu of having a social event during the evening, gift cards for ice cream would be distributed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 28th day of June 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, June 18, 2021.

/s/ Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder