

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
September 15, 2020

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

PRESIDING:	Mark Shepherd	Mayor
PRESENT:	Kent Bush Nike Peterson Vern Phipps Tim Roper	Councilmember Councilmember Councilmember Councilmember
EXCUSED:	Karece Thompson	Councilmember
STAFF PRESENT:	JJ Allen Summer Palmer Stuart Williams Kelly Bennett Adam Favero Eric Howes Curtis Dickson Jackie Christensen Spencer Brimley Shane Crowton Juan Salazar Rich Knapp Trevor Cahoon Nancy Dean	City Manager Assistant City Manager City Attorney Police Chief Public Works Director Community Services Director Community Services Deputy Dir. Recreation Manager Community Development Director Code Compliance Officer Code Compliance Officer Finance Manager Communications Coordinator City Recorder

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

QUARTERLY CODE ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

Juan Salazar, Code Compliance Officer; and Shane Crowton, Code Compliance Officer, reviewed the 2020 statistics for code compliance in the City. Mr. Crowton reported from January 1, 2020 to September 1, 2020 there had been a total of 976 cases. He reviewed the different cases by type and location with the Council. He noted the following violations were the highest ranking so far in 2020: unapproved parking, overgrown weeds/grass, and junk.

Councilmember Roper asked if rock or gravel could be placed in the front yard and then used for parking. Mr. Crowton explained there were landscaping standards that would need to be met. There was a discussion about the City Code and how it related to parking and landscaping standards. Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, explained there was not a breakdown in the landscaping standards for what the percentages of grass or other things should

be; however, if rock were used for landscaping it would need to meet the standard. He noted the Code's language was probably not strong enough to enforce if a resident were to use rock or gravel as landscaping and then park on it as long as it met the standards but that could be reviewed further.

Mr. Crowton highlighted the cases by status for open, default, and compliance. He noted one area of the City had over 274 violations. He explained the compliance efforts were heavily concentrated just one day in that area but it created a backlog of paperwork to process all the violations discovered through proactive enforcement. He expressed his opinion that particular example showed there was plenty of work to justify another code compliance officer.

Mayor Shepherd wondered if the statistics could be broken down further to show which types of violations were found in each area. Mr. Crowton responded the spreadsheet used should allow him to provide a pie chart of each area with the types of violations in addition to the totals. Mayor Shepherd indicated that information would be helpful to see.

Mr. Crowton mentioned about 96 percent of the code cases resulted in compliance and only four percent ended in default. He shared before and after results of several properties in the City. He described efforts of staff to educate and assist residents with code compliance.

Mayor Shepherd acknowledged the efforts of code compliance officers were having an impact and expressed appreciation for their work.

DISCUSSION ON THE SALE OF CITY PROPERTY FORMERLY KNOWN AS CLEARFIELD MOBILE HOME PARK LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 442 SOUTH STATE STREET

JJ Allen, City Manager, stated in October of 2019 the City entered into a Development Agreement with Lotus for the development of the Clearfield Mobile Home Park property which the City owned and would be selling as outlined in the agreement. He acknowledged a real estate purchase contract was prepared for the Phase 1 acquisition and the settlement deadline was set for August 1, 2020.

Mr. Allen pointed out the COVID-19 pandemic unfolded in the spring of 2020 and Lotus soon realized that Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) financing, which was the source of funding for purchasing the property and building the project, would be impacted. He continued Lotus requested in June that the settlement deadline be extended to October 1, 2020 and the City agreed to that addendum. He noted without that funding source the purchase of the property was temporarily on hold; however, Lotus was confident the LIHTC financing would again be available but not until the beginning of 2021.

Mr. Allen said Lotus understood the City had a bond payment due in February so it proposed taking the total of the purchase price and splitting it into two transactions. He acknowledged for the first transaction to purchase the property Lotus would secure a short-term bridge loan and pay nearly \$745,000 to the City. He explained that would happen in January and be enough for the City to cover its first bond payment due in February. He explained the second payment

transaction was planned to occur by April 15, 2021 or sooner if the LIHTC funds became available. He noted that payment would be \$1,940,000 for the remainder of the Phase 1 land, for a total purchase price of \$2.68 million as originally agreed upon.

Mr. Allen mentioned staff felt it would be good to update the Council and obtain feedback before preparing another addendum to the development agreement allowing two transactions for the property's purchase. He asked if there were any questions or concerns with moving forward with the two transactions.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if the COVID-19 pandemic was considered an outside constraint or viable reason for the delay in the project as suggested by the forced majeure provision of the Development Agreement. Mr. Allen responded if the City chose not to extend the deadline then Lotus could point to the forced majeure provision which listed some of the reasons for voiding the contract which could then lead to a legal battle and tie up the land in litigation for an unknown period of time. He pointed out any legal argument would only result in a greater delay and not get the City in any better position.

Mr. Allen stated if the City moved forward with another addendum to the real estate purchase contract and set a hard deadline of April 15, 2021 for the final purchase then there would be no additional extensions provided and language added that would allow for the parting of ways. Mayor Shepherd commented the next addendum should waive the forced majeure provision and not allow for any additional extensions. He expressed his opinion the addendum should have hard deadlines for both purchase dates in January and April. He felt obtaining some money in January would tie the developer into the project even more.

Mr. Allen indicated it would be important to update the addendum language so if the property were not purchased by April as agreed the City could pull back from the agreement and be made whole with all the property for the first phase to do as needed. He explained the same type language was used in the purchase of the properties to the north and could be similarly drafted for the new addendum.

Councilmember Phipps voiced the worst case for both parties would be if the market did not soften so Lotus was unable to obtain financing by February. Mayor Shepherd pointed out Lotus would have to make a payment in January. Mr. Allen indicated Lotus had secured short term funding to make the January payment; however, Lotus did not want to get short term financing for the entire project so the LIHTC financing would be needed by April.

Councilmember Roper commented Lotus had been a good partner thus far.

Councilmember Peterson stated it would be important to get everything in writing because she felt hesitant about it. Mr. Allen noted the next addendum would update the language to allow either party to mutually terminate the Development Agreement if the entire purchase were not made by April 15, 2021. He explained that way if everything were to fall apart the City would have all the land for the first phase and could sell it if necessary.

Councilmember Peterson asked about the earnest money. Mayor Shepherd answered the earnest money had been increased from \$5,000 to \$50,000 and would be non-refundable on October 1, 2020, which was the deadline for payment in the current addendum.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the new addendum would be number two. Mr. Allen acknowledged it would be the fourth addendum and summarized the previous addendums that had already been approved.

Mr. Allen stated if there were no other questions then staff would move forward preparing a fourth addendum as discussed.

DISCUSSION ON THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH DAVIS COUNTY
REGARDING THE PLACEMENT OF A PERMANENT BALLOT DROP BOX

Nancy Dean, City Recorder, indicated the City had in prior elections allowed a temporary ballot box to be placed in the lobby of the City building. She noted Davis County wanted to allow voters better access to a box that could be used 24 hours a day, seven days a week by placing a permanent ballot box on the north end of the property at the City building next to the U.S. Postal mailbox. She explained the intent was to allow residents access all hours of the day to drop off a ballot. She acknowledged the drop box slot would be blocked from use during periods of time when there was not an election so things could not be placed inside inadvertently.

Mayor Shepherd asked if the State was recommending this direction or if it was just the County. He expressed his concern with having an unattended box that could be broken into. Ms. Dean responded she did not know if the direction was from the State but would check with the County for clarification. She indicated the representative from the County had explained once the new library in Clearfield was completed the plan was to move the box to that location. She encouraged it be left at the City property because the access to the drop box would be better for residents.

Councilmember Peterson commented she shared Mayor Shepherd's concern and did not know there was a reason to extend access to a ballot box beyond what had been done in the past. There was a discussion about risks associated with having a permanent ballot drop box and the other options available to voters for casting ballots.

Councilmember Peterson expressed her opinion the reasoning being presented did not appear to outweigh the risk of putting in the box. She explained if there were valid concerns or barriers to voting or even if the State were mandating it then she would be fine with it.

Councilmember Phipps acknowledged there were voters that had concerns using the mailbox on the street or trusting the postal service with their ballots and these people felt more confident bringing it inside City Hall to an attended ballot box. Ms. Dean explained nationwide there had been concerns with the postal service and so the County was looking at ways to allow another option for voters.

Councilmember Phipps felt the risk of fraud was minimal because the signatures of the voters were validated carefully. He expressed his opinion he was not against it but wondered how widespread it would be and what the rationale was for wanting a permanent ballot box that would only be used for a few weeks a year.

Ms. Dean stated the Council was scheduled to consider the Interlocal Agreement during policy session on September 22, 2020 unless a majority of the Council was against having a permanent ballot box. She indicated a representative of the County could be invited to attend and answer additional questions during the meeting. Councilmembers Bush, Peterson, and Roper voiced their opposition in considering it.

The consensus of the Council was not to enter into an Interlocal Agreement with Davis County for a permanent ballot box to be placed on the City's property.

DISCUSSION ON THE CITY'S VOUCHER AND DUMPSTER PROGRAM

Trevor Cahoon, Communication Coordinator, stated in April 2020 there was a massive influx of garbage and other issues during its dumpster drop program which caused the City to terminate the program before it was completed and instead promote the voucher program as an option for residents to dispose of their waste.

Mayor Shepherd expressed his opinion the City should not continue with the dumpster drop program because last spring it evolved into something that was not intended. There was a discussion on whether or not to continue programs the City sponsored that helped residents with waste disposal.

Mr. Cahoon explained the voucher program allowed residents to take waste to the landfill free of charge. He noted the cost to the City was much less at \$5 per voucher than the costs associated with the dumpster drop program.

Councilmember Peterson commented she had been a fan of the dumpsters until last April, but now would prefer to use the voucher program instead. She mentioned liking the fact that the City had recently increased the fees for the neighborhood dumpster program which was also a viable option for residents to obtain a dumpster if needed for larger scale projects.

Councilmember Bush wondered if residents would be allowed only one voucher or if multiple trips to the landfill would be available like last spring. There was a discussion on how the voucher program should be handled and its marketing efforts.

Councilmember Phipps mentioned he had been a fan of the dumpster drop program until he saw what happened last spring. He liked the idea of not sending vouchers out with the utility bill and instead having residents show proof of residency at the landfill during the allotted period of time to have the City charged for waste disposal fees.

Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, indicated previously the time period allowed for residents to take waste to the landfill had been ten days which included two weekends.

Mr. Cahoon confirmed the Council's desire to sponsor ten days both in the spring and fall for residents to dispose of waste at the landfill rather than continuing the dumpster drop program for cleanup efforts.

The consensus of the Council was not to continue the City sponsored dumpster drop program but instead cover the fee at the landfill so residents could discard their unwanted waste if proof of residency was provided to Wasatch Integrated during an allotted time period of ten days both in the spring and fall.

DISCUSSION ON THE CITY'S FOURTH OF JULY AND CENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS

Curtis Dickson, Community Services Deputy Director, explained the City's Fourth of July events had been altered in 2020 from typical years due to the COVID-19 pandemic. He highlighted the following activities that were held: painting of the stars along the trails, patriotic concerts shown on Facebook Live, drive in movies in the park, search the City with stars, parade through the neighborhoods, and streaming of the national anthem at 10:00 p.m. prior to neighborhood fireworks. He pointed out that last year expenditures were around \$118,000 but with the reduced scale of activities in 2020 the expenditures totaled about \$16,845.

Mr. Dickson stated the planning for the City's 2021 Fourth of July celebration would soon be underway. He indicated staff wanted to receive feedback from the Council about the following questions prior to the committee planning:

- Should the fireworks show be expanded in 2021 to make up for not holding a show in 2020?
- Should the City plan to add a Juneteenth Celebration in 2021 in conjunction with its Fourth of July festivities?
- Should the City's Fourth of July events in 2021 be held on another day because the holiday was on Sunday?
- Should the Fourth of July in 2022 be expanded to include the City's centennial celebration with multiple locations for fireworks and/or hold smaller events commemorating the centennial throughout the year?

There was a discussion about the City's upcoming Fourth of July events. The following were highlights of the discussion:

- Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, had reached out to representatives at Weber State University (WSU) to find out if there was a way the City could get involved as part of a regional Juneteenth celebration. He was still waiting to see what options would be possible for the City's involvement.
- Mayor Shepherd suggested Juneteenth was a celebration not only of Black History Month but of diversity and perhaps the City could tie into that celebration by moving its "Everyone Matters" event typically held in April to June and link it all together.
- Encourage WSU to expand the Juneteenth event to its Davis location in Clearfield to include the City's diverse population.
- Last time the Fourth of July was on Sunday in 2010 the City held its activities on Saturday, but some cities held fireworks on Monday.

- The City could follow the pattern of the banks and hold the fireworks on the nationally observed holiday Monday, July 5, 2021 and spread out the other activities such as movies in the park on Saturday and the patriotic concert on Sunday.
- Holding the day long activities and fireworks on Saturday, July 3, 2021 would work best for use of the church parking lot; allowing for community building during smaller neighborhood firework displays on either Sunday or Monday; and leading out with an earlier fireworks show could prevent losing any hype holding it after the actual holiday.
- The patriotic concert could be held on Sunday and it would be an opportunity for inclusion of the interfaith community.
- The plan would be to return to all the normal activities for the Fourth of July unless the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions were still in place.
- Fireworks in 2021 would be launched from the south end of Fisher Park due to the construction and new location of South Clearfield Elementary.

The consensus of the Council was to hold the 2021 Fourth of July celebration beginning on July 2nd with the pool bash and movie in the park; then hold the standard day-long activities on July 3rd; and have the patriotic concert on July 4th.

There was a discussion about the City's upcoming centennial which would be July 17, 2022 and what events should be planned for it. The following were highlights of the discussion:

- The celebration could be done in conjunction with the City's Fourth of July event in 2022.
- There could be smaller monthly events as a year-long celebration leading to the culminating event on the Fourth of July.
- Having the centennial celebration be a longer two-week celebration culminating with the Fourth of July fireworks in 2022.
- Creating a medallion and hold a ribbon cutting ceremony on July 17, 2022 in recognition of the centennial.
- Budget considerations in Fiscal Year 2022 (FY22) and FY23 would be necessary to prepare for the centennial events.
- The possibility of increasing the fireworks display in 2022 to accommodate launching them from multiple locations throughout the City.

Councilmember Peterson left the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

JJ Allen, City Manager, pointed out there had been some talk about increasing the fireworks in 2021 since there had not been a City sponsored display in 2020. He mentioned the contracted supplier for fireworks in 2021 would not be able to provide enough product to facilitate a larger show; however, the staff report noted some modifications could be done to include a small number of larger shells for next year.

Councilmember Phipps suggested a two week celebration be held instead of monthly events in conjunction with the centennial and then the Fourth of July fireworks display in 2022 could serve as the culminating event. There was a discussion about deferring any remaining Fourth of July budget from FY21 towards FY22 and utilizing it for planning the City's centennial celebration rather than making up missed fireworks in 2020.

Mr. Allen asked if the Council would like to create a committee for planning the centennial celebration and involve community members and business leaders. Mayor Shepherd voiced his opinion the City should have a committee for the centennial planning because it would be good to have as much involvement as possible.

Mr. Cahoon recommended the City publicize the centennial year in some fashion monthly to increase awareness of the City's upcoming centennial birthday especially if monthly events were not planned. Councilmember Bush suggested there could be a centennial softball tournament. Mayor Shepherd indicated there would be much planning to do and perhaps a guns and hoses event could be incorporated.

DISCUSSION ON THE RECREATION BUSINESS PLAN

Eric Howes, Community Services Director, explained the City had worked with a consultant to create a recreation business plan. He mentioned so far the implementation had included updating the Clearfield Aquatic and Fitness Center's (CAFC) daily use fees and memberships which was effective on July 15, 2020. He pointed out there had been some good results. He reported the fee for use on grass fields was also adjusted and increased to \$40 per hour after applying the model. He reviewed how the fees for the grass fields were analyzed and how the model could be applied to adjust other fees to ensure each would cover the City's total direct costs. He stated staff was working to apply the model to make additional changes with other fees.

Councilmember Peterson returned to the meeting at 7:21 p.m.

Councilmember Bush wondered if any CAFC memberships declined due to the increase in fees. Mr. Howes responded there had actually been an increase in CAFC memberships than the previous year; however, as memberships renewed during the upcoming year staff might hear more concerns from current members.

Councilmember Peterson stated the City's recent CAFC membership sale waived the \$75 fee in place that assisted with new equipment purchases. She wondered how many memberships came in during that sale and how much revenue was lost that would have been put towards equipment replacements. Mr. Howes answered historically the City had generated enough funds with the equipment replacement fund to cover any equipment replacement needs on an annual basis. He mentioned the promotion had been done for several years to memberships.

JJ Allen, City Manager, asked what percentage of memberships were sold during the recent membership sale. Mr. Howes responded he was not sure of the exact number sold. Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, recalled the sale generated less memberships than the one from January but last year a similar sale had generated about 85 to 100 new memberships. Rich Knapp, Finance Manager, pointed out 14 percent of total revenues for the year at the CAFC were generated in January. Mr. Howes explained the January membership sales offered a significant discount for purchases so in the coming years it would be important to move away from it to avoid further financial damage. There was a discussion about promotions and marketing for the CAFC and switching up the incentive opportunities.

Mayor Shepherd left the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

Mr. Howes stated staff had been working on improvements with marketing because it was one of the goals of the study. He reviewed the seven goals included in the business plan:

- Fair pricing for all
- Fair use of facilities
- Residents vs. non-residents
- Expand sponsorships opportunities
- Marketing, promotions, and communications
- Annual staff retreat
- Enhance existing scholarship program

Mr. Howes pointed out the recreation and arts division offering plan included: minimizing duplication of programs offered by neighboring cities and offering a greater variety of programs that were not offered in other communities. He acknowledged the flag football program was an example of why it could be good to establish new programs. He mentioned if the City offered things that were not offered elsewhere in the region then the fees would not be impacted by the prices of other cities and the City could charge enough to cover its direct costs.

Mayor Shepherd returned to the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Mr. Howes explained staff would like to move forward with new outdoor recreation offerings, more arts programming, and adaptive recreation, or perhaps lacrosse.

Councilmember Bush asked about the demand for lacrosse. Mr. Howes said lacrosse was not offered as a program by many municipal organizations so that or similar offerings could be opportunities to seek in the future.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if some of those new recreation program ideas had been incorporated into the spreadsheets for cost calculations. Mr. Howes explained the numbers could be calculated for recreation and arts programs but felt having an understanding of the philosophy behind the programing choices would be important as well.

Mr. Howes reviewed the criteria that should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of each program:

- 1- Does it meet the City's goals?
 - RISE UP - Respect, Inclusion, Skill Building, Excellence, Unity, and Professionalism
 - Hedgehog - "Creating a Place Where People Want to Be"
 - Policy Priorities – Providing quality municipal services; improving Clearfield's image, livability and economy; and maintaining a highly motivated and well-trained work force
- 2- Participation numbers
 - Measured by total number of participants in a program compared to the projected number of participants

- Cost per participant
- 3- Cost Recovery
 - Total direct costs / Total number of participants

Mr. Howes asked if anything was missed as a key piece of criteria. He stated the Council had mentioned in a previous meeting some considerations not related to recreation that could be used as additional criteria for program evaluations. He suggested if a program did not meet the other three criteria previously mentioned then the following questions could be asked before final elimination of the program:

- If this program were eliminated, would there be other options for participants?
- Does the program reach an underserved population?

He explained these two mitigating criteria might slow the elimination of a program until it could be modified or further adjusted if it was serving an underserved population.

Mr. Howes pointed out the implementation plan recommended in the business plan would be to review the programs each year. He mentioned the consultant that prepared the business plan suggested holding an annual staff retreat. He stated several of the following ideas were recommended by the consultant to be included on the retreat agendas:

- Review of agency mission and vision
- Review of year – which programs to start, stop, or continue
- Program cost review
- Cost recovery percentage changes
- Program pricing change recommendations
- Potential revenue opportunities
- Potential sponsorship opportunities
- Budget formulation

Mr. Howes reported the Community Services department was planning to hold its first annual retreat beginning October 12, 2020 and thought it could take up to three weeks to complete. He reviewed the process planned for the annual staff retreats to be held each fall prior to budget planning season to ensure evaluations were done as suggested by the consultant. He asked if there were any questions or concerns with the planned approach for evaluations.

Mr. Howes reviewed the spreadsheets that would be used to help not only with budgeting but as an evaluation tool to ensure each program met the cost recovery model. He showed how each program spreadsheet would use projection tools, cost recovery calculations, and actual costs to assist with evaluations for the future year. He mentioned the goal was to recoup 100 percent of the total direct costs. Mr. Howes explained the sample sheets provided in the packet had included the actual costs from 2019. He hoped in the future to show a historical year over year accounting similar to what was presented with the budget. He explained the current spreadsheets were not set up for that so it would take some time before it could be prepared and tracked historically. He pointed out 2020 would not provide valuable information for gauging programing costs or participation, so likely in the beginning 2019 data would be used.

Councilmember Phipps wondered if any adjustments were made to fees from 2019. Mr. Howes indicated there might have been some slight adjustments to fees in 2020. He acknowledged the

spreadsheet would be used as a tool moving forward to help with the program and fee evaluations. He continued the review of the spreadsheet with the Council and explained how it was organized and designed to work.

Mr. Howes explained in the past the cost recovery model was reviewed with the Council and then staff would apply the model to make any necessary adjustments to the fees for recreation. He pointed out that if the Council wanted to be more involved in the fee process then the new tool would make that easier. He suggested if the Council desired a more in depth look at the fees each year, staff could easily provide an update in the fall and review the spreadsheet for a better understanding of the fees planned for the following year after the annual evaluation process.

Mr. Howes mentioned new programs would be evaluated so each had been included on the spreadsheet but until there was a budget source it would not be considered for implementation.

He spent time reviewing the City's football program currently provided by the Wasatch Front Football League using the spreadsheet tool for the data. He mentioned the football program was one that would be recommended for elimination based on the criteria established. Mr. Howes pointed out that there had been many challenges with the program over the years and 2020 was no exception. He highlighted each of the criteria and how the program was not meeting any of the desired goals.

Mr. Howes noted there were two options for residents that desired to participate in a football program which included playing with another city as assigned by the WFFL or creating a parent run organization; although, that option would be more expensive and discouraged it as an option. He explained the program might reach an underserved population; however, those same registrants typically signed up for basketball and baseball so there were other options for sports programs. He stated it was his professional opinion based upon the review of all five criteria the City should eliminate the football program but he was open to the direction of the Council.

Mayor Shepherd commented the Council would hear from participants if the program were eliminated. He explained the football program had been an issue for years but it was apparent the goals were not being met based on the review. He added based on the fact the participants could participate elsewhere if the City eliminated its program, he was supportive of doing away with the football program and assisting other cities with equipment for Clearfield residents.

Mr. Howes explained there were many football participants from the City who met the fee obligation with the help of the City's scholarships program. He suggested the City continue to use the scholarship program to assist those residents that could not afford participation in football even if it would go towards the fees of another city. He reviewed how the scholarship fund worked and was detailed on the spreadsheets.

Mayor Shepherd expressed his trust of staff to determine which programs the City should and should not offer. He expressed appreciation for learning the details of how staff was working to gather information and review data for the recreation and arts programs. He noted the elected officials would be the ones to hear about any issues and it would fall to the Council to explain why things were done a certain way. Mayor Shepherd noted the data should speak to why a

program should be discontinued. Councilmember Roper agreed having the data would help in providing any explanations to residents.

Councilmember Bush asked if other cities took all of Clearfield's football participants in 2020. Mr. Howes answered the City was only able to place 60 out of the 78 so there were 18 that were unable to play but it was not for a lack of trying. Mr. Allen noted there was a lot of scrambling at the last minute due to the COVID-19 pandemic concerns of the league and participants so it would not be a fair comparison to what could happen if the league had plenty of notice to place participants. He indicated if the City were to eliminate the WFFL program from its offerings for next year and if a decision was made soon, then there would be plenty of time to let the league know so it could determine how to accommodate the City's residents that desired to participate in the future.

Councilmember Peterson acknowledged when the data was reviewed it was difficult to deviate from clear information. She indicated based on the summary presented by staff; the program failed. She expressed her sorrow that it failed. She stated despite her personal affection for the program it would be hard to advocate for it given the fact that it had failed. She mentioned it would be good to move forward soon so residents would have time to use the other options available to them and hopefully it would make things easier.

Councilmember Phipps commented it would be important to let residents know there was established criteria that was defensible when determining the programming decisions. He stated data and knowing the other parameter of difficulty with staffing was important to him in making the decision to eliminate the football program.

Mr. Howes elaborated on how the consistent turnover of staff had been an issue for many years. He explained staff continuity helped to build the strength of all programs year over year. He noted staffing had been a legitimate challenge the City had faced as a result of the WFFL program.

The consensus of the Council was to follow the recommendation of staff and eliminate the WFFL football program from its offerings because it did not meet the City's goals.

Councilmember Bush moved to adjourn at 8:44 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Roper. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmember Bush, Peterson, Phipps, and Roper. Voting NO – None. Councilmember Thompson was not present for the vote.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 10th day of November, 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, September 15, 2020.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder