

the design of the roadway as it intersected with Antelope Drive. He explained at the point where the expansion of 500 West would move through Antelope Drive further north to D Street in the Freeport Center, a signalized intersection would be created and the signal at 300 West would be eliminated to assist with flow of traffic along Antelope Drive. He noted it had been negotiated with UDOT to maintain full movement at the 300 West intersection which could be a benefit to the City. Councilmember Bush wondered if the City would want to close off the access at 300 West going into Freeport so everyone had to go to 500 West to enter the Freeport Center. Mr. Nuesmeyer responded the negotiations with UDOT would allow the City to have a choice; however, UDOT had reserved the right to make it a right in and right out only area if there was a pattern of traffic accidents at that location in the future. He added it was expected vehicles would use 500 West because of the signalized intersection. He recommended leaving full access at 300 West and changing it later if necessary. Councilmember Peterson agreed. She noted allowing for added mobility options would help reduce the impact for businesses in the area where owners had expressed to her some trepidation about removing the traffic signal at 300 West. She expressed appreciation for the negotiation efforts with UDOT. Councilmember Bush acknowledged it would be good to wait and see.

Councilmember Bush recognized a lot of the property from an impound lot would be utilized in the expansion near 1700 South where the roadway continued north into the Freeport Center. He wondered if the road could be reconfigured to reduce the impact on that specific property. Mr. Nuesmeyer responded he had met with the business owner and property owner and they were excited about the project and its current design. He continued the current design was configured to allow for the necessary curve radius.

Mr. Favero indicated there had been multiple discussions about the 300 West access and the best approach; consequently, the plan not to restrict travel seemed like the best approach.

Mr. Felix reported Tom Royslance, UDOT, was also in attendance for the electronic meeting. He noted the City was initially able to acquire about four million dollars of funding to assist with the 500 West expansion project. He noted once the project moved further north it was determined there would be some additional costs. He mentioned the City was able to acquire additional funding of about one million dollars through the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) to help with the project. Mr. Felix stated it was anticipated three million dollars of the funding would be required in right-of-way acquisitions. He indicated the estimates were identified and some were conservative, but it was estimated the City would need another one to one and half million dollars to fund the project. He explained staff hoped to be able to acquire some of that money through an application for funding from the Davis County third quarter sales tax. JJ Allen, City Manager, commented staff believed the odds of obtaining additional funding were good. Mr. Favero added Syracuse would join efforts and staff was hoping to get Layton City's participation as well to increase the chances of securing the necessary funding.

Councilmember Peterson asked what cities were anticipated to funnel traffic along 500 West towards Antelope Drive. Mr. Favero responded Layton, Syracuse, and Clearfield had been involved with the project and the road would capture traffic from each of those cities. He continued Syracuse had already proposed the road be called Sandridge Parkway.

Councilmember Peterson mentioned some of the residents along 500 West and the far west area of Melanie Acre Subdivision had inquired about some of the particulars of the project. She reviewed some of the questions which included: 1) whether or not the strip of unimproved roadway on the west side of the existing side of 500 West would be used for additional road width as part of the project; 2) what the finished roadway width would be; and 3) once construction began what time was anticipated for the build out of the project. Mr. Nuesmeyer described the roadway improvements on the south end of the project as well as some additional phases for future projects along 500 West. He explained in response to question two there would be twelve foot travel lanes and a twelve foot median all along 500 West except for a slight deviation when connecting into the existing asphalt where it would narrow slightly. He answered the timing would be driven by following the federal process because of the nature of the funding. Mr. Nuesmeyer pointed out the first thing to happen would be to acquire all the necessary rights-of-way. He mentioned the rough schedule was to bid the project next year with the intent of beginning construction the summer of 2021, contingent on right-of-way acquisitions. He indicated WFRM managed a lot of projects and the project was identified to fund in fiscal year 2022 (FY22) so it could begin after July 1, 2021; however, staff was working with WFRM to see if any funding would be available sooner should everything else be ready to go.

Mr. Nuesmeyer expressed his opinion that the project would be a great one for the contractor and anticipated it would be a three to four month construction timeframe. Mr. Favero stated there could be a small amount of time added to the project for a few utility additions and a City waterline and sewer line that would extend from Antelope Drive to the south and be added to the scope of work for the contractor.

Councilmember Phipps wondered what was expected for an impact on Barlow Park. Mr. Nuesmeyer answered he did not anticipate significant impacts to Barlow Park.

Councilmember Bush asked if the project was going to affect the storm drain line that ran down that street. Mr. Favero responded it would be designed around the storm drain. Councilmember Bush questioned what the plans were for the unusable piece of property on the west side where the road curved around the powerline pole. Mr. Favero indicated there had been some discussion about landscaping for the east side of the property but nothing yet had been determined for the west side; however, Syracuse would be responsible for any maintenance along the west side.

Councilmember Bush commented there could be additional traffic into the neighborhoods as the road created an access at Jenny Lane and 1900 South. He asked if the residents had been notified about the plans. Mr. Nuesmeyer replied the property owners would have been given notice of the open house during the environmental phase but since then there had not been additional public outreach. Councilmember Bush asked if there had been any concerns voiced during the open house period. Councilmember Peterson stated the people who attended the open house during the environmental phase seemed more curious about the project but appeared to collectively think it would be a good thing for the neighborhood. She explained extending the roadway would inherently increase traffic but would also relieve traffic, safety, and visibility concerns being experienced in other areas.

Councilmember Peterson suggested it was imperative to be proactive in talking to residents in that area about the project. Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, mentioned staff would be budgeting for the City's outreach efforts in conjunction with the its projects to allow for sending out postcard notifications, setting up text message alerts, and posting to social media.

Kelly Bennett, Police Chief, expressed his concern with the possibility of 500 West becoming a raceway once it was expanded. He agreed the road was needed and there were some advantages, which included having increased response times for first responders to access to neighborhoods in the area. He indicated traffic enforcement would be analyzed as the project moved forward. Councilmember Peterson asked if Chief Bennett thought 500 West would have traffic conditions similar to South Main. Chief Bennett responded it would likely be similar, yet thought it could reduce some of the traffic along South Main.

DISCUSSION ON THE CITY'S CLEARFIELD PIPELINE SHARES

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, stated the City currently owned six water shares in the Clearfield Pipeline Corporation (CPLC) within the Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company (DWCCC). He pointed out the shares were originally used to irrigate the Clearfield City Cemetery; however, the City had since moved to a culinary watering system for its irrigation of the cemetery.

Mr. Dickson reviewed the options for the City related to the water shares which included: selling its shares on the open market; reallocating the shares to another pipeline within DWCCC; and if the shares were reallocated to DWCCC they could be used in the DWCCC rental pool.

Councilmember Bush stated his understanding was if the shares were kept with the CLPC those shares could not get water to Steed Pond; consequently, the shares would need to be converted to the DWCCC for access to water for Steed Pond. Mr. Dickson confirmed the shares would need to be converted to the DWCCC for use in any of its pipelines. He reported the current conversion rate was that six CLPC shares would convert into two DWCCC shares.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the City was currently using water shares for Steed Pond. Mr. Dickson answered the City had 24.5 DWCCC shares allocated to Ditch 18 which was used to fill and maintain the water level at Steed Pond; however, it was only using about 18 of those shares to do so. Councilmember Phipps confirmed the conversion of shares would not affect the water intake into Steed Pond. Mr. Dickson said it would not, but conversion of the shares to the DWCCC would reduce the amount of meetings which staff attended and increase productivity.

Councilmember Peterson commented water shares had great value and she was fine with converting them for use or rental. She pointed out that the thought of selling the shares on the open market seemed shortsighted. She felt it was critical to maintain the water shares in some fashion. She said she was in favor of converting them and allowing staff the discretion of using them to the benefit of the City. Mr. Dickson indicated staff's recommendation would be to rent the additional shares to help offset annual fees associated with having them.

Councilmember Bush wondered if there would be a cost to convert the water from CLCP to DWCC. Mr. Dickson stated it would not cost anything. He explained the only requirement was a resolution by the Council authorizing the transfer of shares. Councilmember Bush agreed transferring the shares appeared to be the best approach. He added if the City was not using all of its shares it should be renting any excess. Mr. Dickson agreed.

Adam Favero, Public Works Director, pointed out the 200 South well currently fed water into Mabey Pond, but if the State were to ever shut down the well it would be a good option to have access to water from the DWCCC for that location. Councilmember Phipps thanked staff for identifying the option of potential uses as a compelling reason for converting the shares.

The consensus of the Council was to convert CLPC water shares to DWCCC shares. Mr. Dickson stated a resolution would be drafted for consideration at a future policy session.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11, CHAPTER 13, SECTION 34 OF THE CLEARFIELD CITY CODE REGARDING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR LIGHT MANUFACTURING AND LIMITED DISTRIBUTION

Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, indicated the applicants wanted to develop property along 1700 South at 300 West with buildings that would fall under the design and use standards of light manufacturing and limited distribution uses. He stated the manufacturing and distribution services and buildings were a permitted use in the M-1 (Manufacturing) zone, but were conditional uses in the C-2 (Commercial) zone with those limitations outlined in the Supplementary Regulations of the City Code. He noted as adopted in 2015, Section 34 of the Supplementary Regulations, light manufacturing and limited distribution buildings and uses were not “allowed on parcels that have frontage on, are adjacent to, or have direct unobscured visibility from main transportation corridors in the city.”

Mr. McIlrath indicated the applicants for the zoning text amendment recently rezoned their properties and based on market demands were seeing a request for office space or flex office and wanted to move forward with that type of development. He continued the property owners recognized a need for high quality construction and the proposal did include that acknowledgement.

He reviewed a map with the streets of the City where light manufacturing and limited distribution uses would be prohibited adjacent to a property zoned C-2 (Commercial). Mr. McIlrath highlighted the applicants’ proposal for the zoning text amendment. He shared an example of a project in Bountiful that was similar to what the applicants were proposing which had not been provided to the Planning Commission or included in the agenda packet of the Council.

Mr. McIlrath indicated based on the discussion with the Planning Commission at its meeting on April 1, 2020, there had been some adjustments to the language, which had been proposed by staff. He outlined the changes to the proposed language of staff desired by the Planning Commission. He stated the Planning Commission recommended the Council approve staffs proposal with the following updates:

“11-13-34: LIGHT MANUFACTURING AND LIMITED DISTRIBUTION USES:

- A. Neither light manufacturing nor limited distribution uses will be allowed on parcels which have frontage on, are adjacent to, or have direct unobscured visibility from main transportation corridors in the city including: State Street, Main Street, 800 North, 300 North, 200 South, SR-193, 700 South, 1700 South, South Main Street, 100 West, 1000 East, 1500 East, 2000 East, or Depot Street. The official map will be available with the City.
- a. Light manufacturing or limited distribution uses may be considered along 1700 South when directly adjacent to other M-1 zoned properties on the same side of a street. A higher standard of design is required when considering these uses. Added enhancements shall include brick on all front facades and all street facing facades visible from 1700 South. The brick shall be broken up by windows, changes in brick pattern, or another material at a minimum of thirty feet (30’). A minimum of 25% of the front and street facing facades shall be provided with glazing/transparency. When overhead doors are used on the front façade they must be glass paneling.
 - b. In addition to the standards listed above, light manufacturing and limited distribution developments shall comply with the commercial site and building standards outlined in the Design Standards Chapter (Chapter18) of this title.
- B. A structure housing light manufacturing or limited distribution uses must not be more than thirty thousand (30,000) square feet in size.”

Councilmember Bush proposed the language regarding façades should state “all facades visible from 1700 South” rather than referencing street facing facades because some facades might not be facing the street yet remain visible to the street. Mr. McIlrath asked if it should be written to say “Added enhancements shall include brick on all front facades and all facades visible from 1700 South.” Councilmember Bush replied yes.

Councilmember Bush wondered why in paragraph B it was limited to 30,000 square feet per structure and whether or not the standards would be applied if there were multiple buildings. Mr. McIlrath responded the Code had limited the structure size to 30,000 square feet; however, it would not matter if there were multiple buildings as long as the total did not exceed 30,000 square feet. There was a discussion about having a distinction in structure sizes between zones, parcel sizes, and other standards and how it would affect what was allowed in any zone. Councilmember Peterson suggested she would be in favor of reducing the size from the 30,000 square feet threshold. She questioned what the height restrictions were in the C-2 (Commercial) zone and wanted to make sure there would be a transition. Mr. McIlrath answered the height restriction for the C-2 (Commercial) zone was thirty-five (35) feet without getting a conditional use permit.

Councilmember Peterson asked if anything not considered as part of the zoning text amendment would be addressed in the supplementary design standards Chapter 18 of Title 11 in the City Code. Mr. McIlrath responded he believed the design standards would encourage high quality development.

Councilmember Bush wondered if Councilmember Peterson was recommending the structure size be reduced to 20,000 square feet or 25,000 square feet. Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion that the form should be consistent with the commercial zone sizes and footprints to keep things consistent along the corridor. There was a discussion about whether or not the structure size should be reduced. Mr. McIlrath indicated there was no maximum building size in the C-2 (Commercial) zone. Mayor Shepherd expressed his hesitation to limit the size any further. Councilmember Bush wondered why there should be a restriction size if there was not a maximum requirement in the C-2 zone. Councilmember Peterson expressed her desire for more articulation, consistency, and higher standards. Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, shared context in relation to sizes and pointed out the applicants for the project had imposed design standards that articulated more and broke up the façades which could look better than other commercial buildings. Councilmember Peterson commented she would not insist the size be reduced from 30,000 square feet.

Councilmember Bush questioned his understanding of what language additions and removals were planned for the proposed ordinance. Mr. McIlrath stated based the discussion staff would update the language initially proposed by staff to include the recommendations discussed from the Planning Commission and language suggested by Council regarding the facades. He mentioned the proposed ordinance would be prepared for consideration by the Council following the public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2020.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11, CHAPTER 9, ARTICLE F, SECTION 5, PARAGRAPH I OF THE CLEARFIELD CITY CODE REGARDING PARKING STANDARDS FOR THE STORAGE OF BOATS, CAMPER, TRAILERS, ETC.

Brad McIlrath, stated the applicant wanted to expand and add some additional mobile home spaces to Cambridge Court Mobile Home Park which would require additional recreational space as well as storage space. He explained the request would not be possible with the current park area and City Code requirements. He reported the applicant would like to have the development standard for boat, camper, trailer, etc. storage in mobile homes parks removed from City Code.

Mr. McIlrath indicated staff had reviewed municipal codes of cities in Weber, Davis, and Salt Lake counties and several of those standards had been included with the packet for the Council's review. Mr. McIlrath noted only those communities with an ordinance were included in the summary. He reviewed the standards in surrounding communities. He indicated, staff was proposing alternative language which would be more specific as to the amount of storage space rather than eliminating it as the applicant had proposed.

Mr. McIlrath mentioned the City currently had four mobile home parks. He stated keeping the regulations in place would be important not only to add an amenity for the mobile home park but also to improve the image of the City by ensuring storage was kept in a specific place.

He reviewed the ordinance proposals from the applicant and staff:

- *Applicant Proposal*
 - I. Parking: See [chapter 14](#) of this title. ~~In addition, space shall be provided for the storage of boats, campers, trailers, etc.; one such space shall be provided for every three (3) mobile home spaces in the park.~~
- *Staff Proposal*
 - I. Parking: See [chapter 14](#) of this title. In addition, space shall be provided for the storage of boats, campers, trailers, etc.; at the amount of eighty (80) square feet of storage space for every one such space shall be provided for every three (3) mobile home spaces in the park.

Mr. McIlrath commented the zoning text amendment had been discussed on April 1, 2020 with the Planning Commission and a recommendation of approval for the text amendment proposed by staff was forwarded.

Councilmember Bush wondered what the property owners would do with the space if there was a reduction to an 80 square foot minimum. Mr. McIlrath responded he didn't know if any of the other mobile home parks in the City would want to reduce the size of their storage areas, but it was important to note there were already minimum requirements in place and there was no obligation to make adjustments.

Councilmember Phipps stated the exiting Code just said space; therefore, defining the size and making it a specific square footage would be more protective. Mr. McIlrath agreed.

Councilmember Thompson said he was in favor of having storage space but questioned what the motivation was for having it be 80 square feet rather than a smaller number. Mr. McIlrath responded after looking at the standards of other communities 80 square feet appeared to be a middle point between the standards in place in Layton and North Salt Lake.

Councilmember Thompson wondered if the mobile home park wanted to add more density. Mr. McIlrath answered yes. He stated based on his estimation if the new ordinance language were adopted the mobile home park would be able add no more than two or three homes.

Mayor Shepherd stated storage space was an amenity for the mobile home park residents. He expressed his opinion that the storage space standard be removed from the Code entirely to allow the additional mobile home units. He indicated that would allow for local control by the property owners or managers of the parks. There was a discussion about the image and aesthetics of the storage trailer parking area, the role of the City in creating standards, the impact on the mobile home park residents if the standard were to be removed, future parking impacts, and the continued desire of the Council to raise the development standards when provided an opportunity.

Councilmember Roper asked if there was a standard that addressed fencing or screening requirements for the storage areas. Mr. McIlrath responded there were none identified in that section of Code and he was not aware of any other standards that would apply related to fencing or screening.

Mayor Shepherd proposed reducing the required storage to 80 square feet but requiring fencing of the storage areas. There was a discussion about a compromise to allow for the reduced square footage of the storage areas but also including language providing standards for mobile home park storage areas to have hard surfaced material and be fully enclosed by an opaque fence to screen the storage from the surrounding mobile home spaces. Mr. McIlrath stated language would be prepared for the Council's consideration on April 14, 2020.

DISCUSSION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2021 BUDGET

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, reviewed the budget summary for Governmental Funds and Enterprise/Utility Funds. He mentioned all the numbers were continually changing as revenues, operating expenditures, and capital expenditures were altering the change in available cash. He indicated the budget committee met with each department to identify the requests for expenditures in fiscal year 2021 (FY21) and many that had been initially included had been stricken due to the anticipated effects of COVID-19.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the following personnel expenditure requests for FY21:

- Head count increase for a full-time finance clerk to assist with utility billing alleviating pressures on the Customer Service Center and to follow the auditor's recommendation for additional segregation of duties in the finance department – \$78,000 in total but only a small net effect on the General Fund.

JJ Allen, City Manager, pointed out the finance clerk position was being considered for the FY21 budget; however, wondered if the Council would be in favor of putting the position in place sooner and addressing it with a budget amendment for FY20. There was a discussion about whether or not the Council was comfortable making a head count change prior to the FY21 budget for the finance clerk position; the distorted job market due to COVID-19; and multiple headcount changes that had been cut because they were not affordable at the present time. Councilmember Peterson voiced being in favor of the headcount increase for a full-time finance clerk and doing a budget amendment to fund it sooner than FY21.

Mr. Knapp continued the review of personnel expenditure requests for FY21:

- Increase the part-time Emergency Preparedness Manager from 20 to 25 hours per week - \$5,000
- Increase the Parks and Recreation Commission stipend - \$1,000
- Increase the police recruitment incentive - \$7,500
- Contract excess plan review and inspections - \$30,000 (it would offset the revenue generated for the service)
- Increase from FY20 where only a half year was budgeted for the full-time Community Resource Officer - \$95,000 (full year) half of the expense would be paid with grant funding

Mr. Allen explained the City's building official, Tyler Seaman, was having a difficult time keeping up with the demands of the development activity in the City and all plan reviews and inspections were falling on him. He noted staff determined to explore outsourcing the services to keep up with the increased demands and had just completed a review of the quotes received for contracting services for plan reviews and inspections. He mentioned the need was immediate and an email would be sent to the City Council soon with more details. He indicated it would mean a \$30,000 budget amendment for FY20 to get the help in that area as soon as possible.

Councilmember Phipps wondered why there was an increase to the Parks and Recreation Commission stipend. Eric Howes, Community Services Director, indicated it would be to offset the additional joint meetings with the City Council. Mr. Allen added it would not be an increase to the stipend per meeting, simply cover the cost of additional meetings held.

Mr. Knapp explained the following personnel expenditure requests had been cut for now from the FY21 budget:

- Increase contracted nuisance and abatement - \$25,000
- Personnel contingency (money set aside for instances when someone left the City to offset the leave which had been accrued) - \$100,000

Mr. Knapp pointed out the numbers related to medical insurance had recently been negotiated and it amounted to less of an increase than expected. Summer Palmer, Assistant City Manager, explained United Health Care initially quoted a sixteen percent (16%) increase but after negotiations was willing to partner with the City for another year with a seven percent (7%) increase if the City agreed not to seek for other bids. She stated it was her opinion now was probably not the best time to solicit healthcare bids nor would the City obtain a better offer based on its prior year's activity. Mayor Shepherd stated it would be good to accept the offer from United Health Care and lock in on the seven percent (7%) increase. Councilmember Phipps agreed. There was a discussion about the City's medical insurance services and the levels of employee participation in health incentive programs.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the following personnel compensation expenditures currently in FY21:

- Medical insurance increase of seven percent - \$105,000 (General Fund)
- Merit increase of one percent - \$67,000 (General Fund)
- Pay grade shift / market adjustment varied by position - \$243,000 (General Fund)
- Public Safety URS Tier II required contribution two percent - \$16,000
- Public Safety URS Tier II employer or employee contribution of 2.27 percent
 - Public Safety only - \$17,000
 - Public Employee - \$23,000

Councilmember Phipps expressed his concern related to the timing of budget increases for compensation based on the compensation study. He felt it was not something to consider with the current economic uncertainty related to the worldwide pandemic. Mr. Knapp stated the budget increase for compensation in FY21 was planned as a 2.1 percent increase from FY20 but wondered if Councilmember Phipps was thinking it should be removed from the budget. Councilmember Phipps expressed his opinion it should be removed from the budget. He said he

was fine with the one percent merit increase for now, but once the dust settled and the future stabilized then the compensation study recommendations could be revisited and discussed further. Mr. Allen indicated the department heads had discussed keeping it in the budget but waiting for implementation until January 1, 2021 rather than July 1, 2020. There was a discussion about how to structure and implement the market adjustment and whether the budget was conservative enough given the unstable market. Mayor Shepherd and the Council expressed mixed feelings about whether or not to keep the \$243,000 budgeted for the market study included or strike it until the topic could be revisited at a future date. Mr. Knapp commented there was still time before a decision needed to be made on the matter because if the City were to pursue a truth-in-taxation process it would have until August to approve the budget, otherwise the deadline for budget approval was in June.

Ms. Palmer highlighted the increasing contribution required for URS Public Safety Tier II retirement of two percent. She pointed out there was a 2.27 percent increase for URS Tier II employees which could be picked up by either the employer or employee. She acknowledged there were both public safety and public employees within the organization at the Tier II retirement level and expressed her opinion all employees should be treated equally within the organization so if the City picked up the contribution for public safety it should do it for all Tier II employees. Mr. Allen commented if the City choose not to contribute the 2.27 percent for public safety it would be difficult to retain good officers in such a competitive field. The Council appeared to be in favor of the City contributing the \$56,000 in total for the Public Safety URS Tier II contributions in FY21.

Mr. Knapp indicated there was an option for head count reduction not previously mentioned. He indicated an offer was made for the staff engineer position but the City could rescind that offer and have budget savings to the General Fund. The consensus of the Council was to keep the staff engineer position.

Mr. Knapp reviewed the metrics used for the measurement of sustainability and security. He explained the numbers were always changing; however, the total operating revenue minus the total ongoing expenditures and debt had a net ongoing surplus of \$7,592 which could be higher if the increases based on the market study were not included in the budget. He indicated the City was could sustain just over two months of operating expenses with its reserves. He pointed out that the City was in a good position and it helped provide a measure of security for times of uncertainty like those currently being experienced.

Mr. Knapp commented it was difficult to project the revenues and the budget assumptions were as close as could currently be determined. He reviewed the historic General Fund balances. He highlighted the budgeted FY21 top fifteen revenue sources, but stated all data was estimated prior to COVID-19. He pointed out that the sales tax projections would be reduced. He explained the property tax revenues had been estimated based on maintaining the tax rate. He reviewed the scenarios of maintaining the rate as the City's General Obligation (GO) bonds expired.

Councilmember Phipps asked if the revenue from the Clearfield Aquatic and Fitness Center (CAFC) presented had reflected the anticipated reduced revenue as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Mr. Knapp stated it had not been reduced because he had assumed the CAFC would

be open by July 1, 2020; however, the revenues of FY20 would be heavily impacted because of the CAFC shutdown.

Councilmember Phipps expressed his objection to maintaining the property tax rate at 0.001437 in such difficult economic times. He explained maintaining the rate for the GO Bond was understandable because those revenues would be necessary for the Mabey Place project and the net effect on the taxpayer would be zero. Mayor Shepherd expressed his concern that without maintaining the rate the City would dig itself into a hole. He expounded there was not a lot of growth and the City had not maintained the rate for three years; therefore, he would be hesitant in not maintaining it for the coming budget year. Councilmember Thompson stated he was in favor of maintaining the rate last year but unsure about it for the coming budget year because of the unprecedented economic times being experienced. Councilmember Bush indicated he was always in favor of maintaining the property tax rate because it was not a property tax increase but a property value increase that benefited every property owner in the City. He reiterated it was not a tax increase and the rate in 2016 was 0.0018, then in 2020 it was 0.001148, so for FY21 maintaining the rate at 0.001437 would be a rate in the middle range. There was a philosophical discussion about whether maintaining the tax rate should be considered a tax increase or not.

Councilmember Peterson stated the increase per household had been estimated at \$11 for the year if the tax rate were maintained. She continued after the review of what expenses the City would need to set aside for FY21 and knowing the amount of money in the General Fund, her concern was about impact on the residents if there was a loss of service because of a lack in revenues. She reasoned it would be important to weigh out where the most impact on residents would be felt, whether in potential lack of services or the nominal increase per household. Councilmember Roper commented everyone was a stakeholder. He expressed his opinion the City would need to maintain its property tax rate for the coming budget year. Councilmember Peterson added it might appear to be the wrong time to hold the rate, given the economic conditions; however, sacrificing and working together to keep basic government services going did not seem unreasonable. She continued the City was trying to cut back in some areas, but there was an added responsibility to provide basic needs in a crisis. She expressed her worry about putting the City in a position that would create a hardship in recovering. Councilmember Thompson commented he had advocated for taking growth in the past but was inclined to look at things from the view of the current economic climate for the coming budget year. Councilmember Phipps reminded the Council that fluctuation in sales tax had the largest impact on revenues which was also concerning during times of uncertainty.

Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion that the City should follow the example of other communities and hold a truth-in-taxation public hearing to determine whether to maintain the tax rate or not because it would allow more time and perhaps more insight into the economic impact of the current environment. He indicated with the late hour the remaining items planned for the budget discussion should be reserved for discussion at the next meeting.

Councilmember Bush pointed out a few of the projects that the Council should consider when reviewing materials for the next meeting. He identified one of the projects for a waterline on State Street had a question mark about the possible use of impact fees for funding. He expressed his opinion that if impact fees could be used for that project they should be used. He suggested

PARAT Tax revenue should also be used for some of the parks projects such as Center Street Restroom and also Kiwanis Park. He commented there was a possibility of getting a donation from the Kiwanis Club to help offset some of the project costs at Kiwanis Park.

Councilmember Thompson moved to adjourn at 9:30 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 12th day of May, 2020**

/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 7, 2020.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder