

CLEARFIELD CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING MINUTES
6:00 P.M. WORK SESSION
May 7, 2019

City Building
55 South State Street
Clearfield City, Utah

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| PRESIDING: | Mark Shepherd | Mayor |
| PRESENT: | Kent Bush | Councilmember |
| | Nike Peterson | Councilmember |
| | Tim Roper | Councilmember |
| | Karece Thompson | Councilmember |
| PRESENT VIA TELEPHONE: | Vern Phipps | Councilmember |
| STAFF PRESENT: | JJ Allen | City Manager |
| | Summer Palmer | Assistant City Manager |
| | Stuart Williams | City Attorney |
| | Kelly Bennett | Police Chief |
| | Scott Hodge | Public Works Director |
| | Mark Baird | Public Works Deputy Director |
| | Adam Favero | Utility Superintendent |
| | Eric Howes | Community Services Director |
| | Spencer Brimley | Community Development Director |
| | Brad McIlrath | Senior Planner |
| | Nick Porter | Management Intern |
| | Rich Knapp | Finance Manager |
| | Trevor Cahoon | Communications Coordinator |
| | Nancy Dean | City Recorder |
| | Wendy Page | Deputy Recorder |

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: Brady Jugler – Chair, Brett McAllister, Kathryn Murray, JaCoby Marston, Nicole Bigelow, Robert Browning, David Bloomfield, Chris Ucardi

VISITORS: Beth Holbrook – UTA, Alex Beim – UTA, Olivia Jaramillo

Mayor Shepherd called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY'S (UTA'S) OUTREACH INITIATIVE
SERVICE CHOICES

Alex Beim, Utah Transit Authority (UTA), explained Service Choices was the community engagement and service planning process to help UTA prioritize the bus services needed for the future along the Wasatch Front. He stated UTA would be asking the public to prioritize how bus

service resources should be distributed; gathering the public's feedback through surveys, events, and community leader workshops; and, developing a bus network plan which incorporated the public's priorities from the engagement process. He reviewed the anticipated timeline for engagement, planning, and implementation.

Mr. Beim encouraged everyone to take the survey and stated it should take approximately five minutes but would only be available until the end of May 2019. He commented the transit service was asked to accomplish many goals; however, there were limited funds to accomplish its goals. He noted the goals could be sorted into two major categories either ridership or coverage. He pointed out the differences in goals. There was a discussion about balancing the needs of the transit service, phases of planning and implementation moving forward, and shifts that might be necessary to best utilize taxpayer dollars to accomplish the needed services.

Mr. Beim mentioned there were four key pieces UTA would consider when planning transit for ridership which included density, walkability, linearity, and proximity. He commented the considerations when planning transit for coverage included service for people with no transportation alternatives, responding to growth, and directly serving taxpayers. He reviewed the current network frequency in the northern, central and southern regions of the Wasatch Front.

Mr. Beim requested the Council share the survey with the community and encourage engagement. He noted UTA would be making efforts to reach out to the general public, community leaders, and elected officials from jurisdictions throughout its service area to encourage participation with the survey and reviewed some of the questions included with the survey. There was a discussion about UTA's services, connections, timing, and survey responses that could provide the optimal feedback. Mr. Beim indicated if an individual was affected by ridership or coverage in multiple areas then multiple surveys should be completed with responses based on the needs for the different areas.

Councilmember Thompson commented the community based feedback might be good, but wondered if analytical data would also be used for future planning. Mr. Beim responded anyone interested in reviewing the data collected for existing services could do so at rideuta.com/service-choices. Beth Holbrook, UTA Board Trustee, stated the data for service usage was being collected for what currently existed; but, community perspective would drive many of the choices for the future because land use was a huge factor in planning and decision making. She agreed good data was important to formulate good decisions. She noted some of the survey was speculative but obtaining perspectives on future growth would also be valuable information for UTA to use going forward.

Mr. Beim indicated all the feedback from data, elected officials, survey results, open house forums, and other means would be used when planning UTA's future services along the Wasatch Front. There was a discussion about UTA's survey, services, challenges in planning, as well as outreach and engagement with employers. Mayor Shepherd pointed out the survey was to help identify where the taxpayer dollars should be directed and to gain feedback on where services needed to be improved. He encouraged everyone to share the survey and encouraged all to take the survey while it was available.

DISCUSSION ON PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Mayor Shepherd indicated the Planning Commission and City Council served two different purposes; however, the goals of each body were similar with an interest in improving the City and making it a better place to live, work, and play. He mentioned there was a great selection of applicants the last time there were Planning Commission vacancies. He acknowledged the Council looked to the Planning Commission as an advisory board and on some matters was the City's land use authority. Mayor Shepherd noted other items were forwarded with a recommendation to the Council for a final decision. He acknowledged the Council tried not to override the decisions of the Planning Commission. He indicated working together, meeting jointly on occasion, and discussing shared vision were important as the City moved forward.

Mayor Shepherd mentioned the importance of reviewing the agenda packets in advance to be prepared for each meeting. He stated there were many decisions coming before the Planning Commission as the City's land use authority in the coming years that would affect the City for decades. He stressed the importance of working together and being thorough so important information was not missed that could negatively impact the City. Mayor Shepherd pointed out there was a recent project that could have been problematic with its parking stalls arrangement because details were missed and caught after the fact by staff. He acknowledged the project luckily needed a development agreement, so the corrections with the parking would be addressed through that process. He cautioned other developments might not have an opportunity for corrections; thus, watching the details carefully at each review was crucial.

Mayor Shepherd thanked the Planning Commission members for their willingness and desire to serve and work with the Council to move the City forward. Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, expressed his opinion the Council and Planning Commission did a great job collaborating and working with staff and each other for the best interests of the City.

UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON CITY LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Spencer Brimley, Community Development Director, introduced his team which included Brad McIlrath, Senior Planner, and Nick Porter, Management Intern. He indicated the team would provide an update and status for the following City initiated projects:

- Form Based Code update – FFKR was the consultant and work was progressing.
- Active Transportation Plan – Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) grant funding of \$100,000 was awarded with a \$10,000 contribution needed from the five participating cities (Clearfield – lead agency, Syracuse, West Point, Sunset, and Clinton) for the purpose of implementing an active transportation plan. The City's portion of the contribution was based on its population and would be \$2,500.
- Moderate Income Housing Plan – staff was engaged in preparation for plan creation. The plan would need to be integrated into the General Plan as well as submitted to the State by the end of the year.
- General Plan Updates – the Fiscal Year 2020 budget proposed \$75,000 to address the transportation and the land use element updates to the General Plan. There might be additional funding necessary; however, for now \$75,000 was proposed to make the

necessary updates to the General Plan needed to incorporate the moderate income plan and address the Small Area or Neighborhood Plans.

- Billboard Amendments – proposed changes to the Code would be reviewed by the Planning Commission at its next meeting and then a recommendation would come to the Council. The amendments proposed would address buffering distances to protect residential areas.
- Conditional Use Permit Updates – research was underway to review the City Code relating to the conditional use permit standards to help with simplifying the language and providing a better administration process that was in-line with the State Code.

Councilmember Peterson asked what the timeframe was for the active transportation plan implementation. Mr. McIlrath responded the timeframe for the planning process would be about one year. He reported the funding would be available on July 1, 2019. He continued consultant selection would begin after funding was available and fall and spring would be planned for public input and feedback.

Councilmember Peterson thanked staff for its efforts in drafting a moderate income housing plan. She expressed her satisfaction with knowing the City was working on the project while other cities were still trying to figure out how to address the new legislation. There was a discussion about the legislation which listed components that would be necessary to include within the City's moderate income housing plan. JJ Allen, City Manager, clarified the City would need to choose four of the listed components in the new legislation rather than three because there was a transit station in the community. Mr. McIlrath added it appeared the future direction of the Legislature would be to support cities that had the moderate income housing plan in place with grant funding opportunities leaving other communities ineligible.

Councilmember Thompson expressed his opinion that education on housing affordability and its impacts would be an important component to share with the community when developing the moderate income housing plan. There was a discussion about market driven pricing, density, and the way the moderate income housing plan would assist with education and reflecting an accurate picture of the needs of the community.

Planning Commissioner Uccardi questioned if the General Plan updates would also include a review of the General Plan and zoning to make sure there were not any issues that could cause negative impacts to the City if left unaddressed. Mr. Brimley responded there might be some additional funding necessary to address any other unusual parcels that could have an impact and the timing would be good since General Plan updates and the moderate income housing plan were being reviewed. There was a discussion about the necessary components to support growth, the need for a holistic approach to planning and zoning, and property value shifts that could affect neighborhoods.

Mr. Brimley and Mr. McIlrath updated the Council and Planning Commissioners on the status of several development projects.

Bravada 193 / Sinclair Station (approx. 788 South 2000 East):

Mr. Brimley indicated the Bravada 193 project was an eleven acre property, formerly known as the site for Midtown Village, which was subdivided into several parcels for a mixed use development. He pointed out there had been an issue discovered by staff with the parking; however, it had been addressed through the development agreement. He mentioned the development agreement was a requirement of the DR (Downtown Redevelopment) zone. There was a discussion on the development agreement negotiations and its concept in phasing the project to ensure the desired commercial development was realized.

Clearfield Junction / Davis County Library (101 North Main):

Mr. McIlrath stated the Clearfield Junction project would be a mixed use development with about 214 residential units, 20,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space, courtyard, and the future location of a Davis County Library. Mayor Shepherd indicated the library was early in the design stages, but anticipated the construction would begin in March 2020. Mr. Brimley stated there were many stakeholders in the project and staff would be working on vetting the necessary agreements for accesses and utilities. Planning Commissioner Jones asked what the plans were for the old library. There was a discussion about the proposed land swap, demolition of the existing library building, and the long term vision for the land to be developed as an amphitheater for the City. Mr. Allen pointed out the renewal of the PARAT tax funding would be critical for the development of the amphitheater because it would be a costly investment.

Clearfield Station (approx. 1250 South State):

Mr. Brimley reported a request for qualified proposals (RFQP) was recently released to the development community so see what interest there would be for developing the Clearfield Station site. Mr. Allen pointed out Utah Transit Authority (UTA) was the lead agency on the RFQP. Mr. Brimley noted staff would be involved with UTA representatives in reviewing and evaluating the proposals which was scheduled for the second week of June.

He indicated another component of the site's future included a pedestrian/bicycle trail that would begin at 700 South/SR 193 and go through the transit station south to Antelope Drive. He stated it would be a \$1.6 million project that was available from grant funding obtained from Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds obtained through the WFRC. Mr. Brimley mentioned the grant funds were originally awarded to the City for a pedestrian bridge but due to the development of Americold the bridge never came to fruition; however, since the funding was still available the City would work to accomplish the newly proposed trail for a north/south connection.

Trade Space (approx. 200 South Center Street):

Mr. McIlrath stated the location was west of the bridge on Center Street and it was planned for office and warehouse space. He noted the language was specific so it could not be developed as a storage rental facility, but rather used for small business purposes.

Depot Crossing (723 South Depot Street):

Mr. McIlrath commented the development was west of the Masonic Temple and would contain 31 townhome units and also a nearly 10,000 square foot two-story office building. He reported staff had been working with the developer to resolve issues with Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) concerning accesses. He mentioned the City would like to have full access and have the three sites interconnected to improve emergency access; however, UDOT had some issues that would need to be addressed with the developer. He stated the developer was working towards final land use approvals.

Planning Commissioner Bigelow asked if there would be a traffic light installed at the location. Mr. McIlrath responded adding a light at that location would likely not be an option because UDOT required a 500-foot distance between traffic signals.

Autumn Ridge Phase 5 (approx. 875 West 300 North):

Mr. McIlrath continued there were four phases of the Autumn Ridge Subdivision already approved and Phase 5 would be the final phase. He indicated it was proposed to have 13 single family lots to match the surrounding area which was in the R-1-Open zone. He stated the rezone and preliminary subdivision plat were recently approved and the developer was working to submit an application in June for final subdivision plat approvals.

MODA Clearfield (approx. 180 South State Street):

Mr. McIlrath noted the developer requested a site plan and preliminary subdivision plat approval in September 2018. He explained the developers were moving forward again to begin the final development approval process. He reported the project included 41 townhomes and complied with the City's Form Based Code for the Town Residential (TR) zone.

Planning Commissioner Uccardi questioned if the developer would be subject to updates which were pending on the Form Based Code. Mr. McIlrath responded the developer would only be subject to the Code standards at the time of its approval; however, it would need to begin construction of the project within a year following land use approvals or it would be subject to the new standards and have to go through the site plan approval process again. There was a discussion on the deadlines for the project and whether or not the developer would complete the land use approvals within the timeframe allotted.

City Plaza Apartments (approx. 452 and 530 South State Street):

Mr. McIlrath stated the City Plaza Apartments project was located in the TR zone directly north of Chariot Auto on State Street. He commented the developer was planning to build two buildings one on the north and one on the south of the Dick Kearsley store for multi-family residential uses. He indicated the developer had applied to have a zoning text amendment to remove the step back required in the FBC, but it was denied. He noted currently the developer was working with the standards to move the project forward and the last concept plan proposed the fourth story be recessed, but have large decks that would extend the exterior area to the full

length of the other building levels. Mr. McIlrath indicated the FBC did not address how the step back should look, so that might need to be something that was addressed in the updates. He continued it would also be important for the updates to consider if a step back was required for residential use buildings and or mixed use buildings which were more common cases in other cities.

Mabey Place (approx. 442 and 435 South State Street):

Spencer Brimley, stated the Mabey Place project was moving forward and there had been ongoing meetings with the developer to create the conceptual plan for the area; however, there had not been any land use applications received yet for any specific project. Mr. Allen pointed out the creation of a community reinvestment project area was running parallel with the development process and would be used as the tool to incentivize the development.

Maverik (approx. 700 South and 1000 East):

Mr. McIlrath noted the Maverik development located at about 700 South and 1000 East was moving forward but it had been stalled while the developer was working with UDOT to obtain its necessary approvals. He pointed out so far the developer had received final engineering approval, land use approvals, and would need to record the final subdivision plat with the County. Mr. Allen questioned if the approvals included a freeway oriented sign. Mr. McIlrath responded it did not, the plans showed the signage but the developer had not yet applied for the signage. He added the development would be within the distance that it could have a sign approved if the application were received.

Planning Commissioner Uccardi noted there was currently vegetation growing on the site. Mr. Brimley responded code enforcement officers were busy, but would take appropriate actions to ensure there was compliance on the site. There was a discussion about the sites development plans including fencing, retaining walls, and gas line relocation. Mr. McIlrath stated Dominion Energy was currently working on its lines along 700 South; however, once that work was completed it planned to move forward concurrently with the Maverik development. He commented there had not yet been any paperwork submitted for the building of the regulator station. Planning Commissioner Bloomfield indicated his understanding was the building was planned for development during the summertime because there would be a temporary gas shut off that would impact portions of the surrounding neighborhood.

Planning Commissioner Marston wondered if any of the other Maverik locations in the City would be closing. Mr. Brimley responded no, all locations would remain operational.

Weaver Meadows (approx. 250 South Main Street):

Mr. McIlrath stated the Weaver Meadows development was located on the east side of Hamblin Park. Mr. Brimley pointed out the developer had initially requested a rezone from R-1-8 (Residential) to R-3 (Multi-family Residential) which was denied, but with the recent General Plan changes allowing R-1-6 (Residential) zone development under circumstances, the developer was requesting it be rezoned from R-1-8 to R-1-6. Mr. McIlrath commented the current rezone

request would be for the purpose of creating a single family residential development. He pointed out the lot sizes would be similar to the neighboring subdivision on the west side of the park.

West Square (approx. 875 South Deport Street):

Mr. Brimley reviewed the progress with the West Square development. He indicated building A was completed, building B was under construction, and permits were or should soon be issued on building C. He pointed out it was initially planned for apartments, but had been updated to condominiums.

Syracuse City's Cemetery Expansion (approx. 700 South 1000 West):

Mr. Brimley stated the parcel of land along 1000 West next to the Syracuse City cemetery was located in the City's boundaries but owned by Syracuse City. He noted staff met with Syracuse City officials and it was negotiated that a large portion of the land would be developed as single family residential with a small portion going to Syracuse City for its cemetery expansion. He reported there were no zoning changes requested yet on the property; however, staff would be working with Syracuse City and there should be items coming to the Planning Commission and City Council in the near future.

Other:

Mr. Brimley asked if there were any questions about any of the development projects. Councilmember Bush asked if Oakmont Townhomes were completed. Mr. Brimley responded yes and so was the Clearfield Business Park. Councilmember Bush questioned what development was going on east of Chris' Café on Antelope Drive. Mr. McIlrath answered a drive through window was desired so the site plan had to be amended and it would be reviewed by the Planning Commission at its meeting on May 8, 2019. He noted the development was called Clearfield Plaza Retail and there would be five unit spaces with a restaurant on each end and retail in between.

Mayor Shepherd commented South Clearfield Elementary was proposing to move its school building to the west in the area which was currently its parking lot. He noted the building would be two stories which would impact the City's future fireworks displays held on the fourth of July; however, it would not need to take any of the City's property as initially anticipated. Councilmember Bush commented the Bernard Fisher plaque would need to be moved to a new location.

Mr. Allen asked for an update about the retail development on Antelope Drive and 300 West. Mr. McIlrath indicated the JNH Subdivision would soon be recorded which had recently requested to combine three lots into one. He stated the developer was still seeking tenants for the site, so there had not been a concept plan or anything submitted to staff. He reviewed the proposed ideas for a gas station or drop-off laundry facility as well as other retail or flex office spaces. There was a discussion about the City's success and recognition received nationwide for being one of the top cities for small businesses.

Planning Commissioner Bigelow questioned if Lifetime Products would be developing on the corner of 1000 West and SR193. Mayor Shepherd answered the Lifetime Products development would be east of 750 West. Mr. Allen explained Utility Trailer would need to vacate that area currently used for storing its trailers, so Lifetime Products could build its distribution facility. There was a discussion about the expansion of Utility Trailer planned to the west as well as the design standards it would need to meet.

Messaging Strategy:

Trevor Cahoon, Communications Coordinator, stated as the City moved forward it would be important to share a unified message about the City and its land uses and development decisions. He facilitated an exercise to help identify a messaging strategy and vision for the City. He encouraged the group not to get into tagline, color scheme, branding or marketing collateral discussions and requested they not hold back with responses.

First round – Question: Who are we?

- Small town big heart.
- A family oriented community. We have a small town feel, with big city convenience.
- A blue and white collar community with a wider range of the socioeconomic ladder than most cities. Sometimes judged by our range of residents without consideration to our growth and overall safety. A true team playing community.
- We are what Sunset wishes they could be.
- We are a blue collar, hard-working City full of residents trying to make their lives better.
- We are a working-class, manufacturing community.
- We are the leaders of the 84015.
- The city on the “hill.”
- Hard working, industrious, families.
- We are a diverse group of people who believe that Clearfield is a great place to be.
- A safe community to live and play.
- A community of family.
- A group of people who provide services to people.
- We are an Air Force and manufacturing community and the gateway to other communities.
- We are a mixture of cultural people living together in a community.

There was a discussion about recurring themes. Mr. Cahoon shared nostalgic photos of City events, places and people. He questioned the group again “who are we” and the following responses were received:

- A phoenix rising from ashes.
- We believe the children are our future. Let them laugh and let them lead the way. Show them all the beauty they possess inside.
- A city of the everyday person. Diverse, thoughtful, and unified when the opportunity is present.
- A community of hard working, family loving people who serve each other.
- A diverse group of families and business coming together.

- Quintessentially American City with a melting pot of backgrounds. We build the industries that drive America and support the mission of Hill.
- Destination City. People are drawn to us for what we offer (4th of July, Aquatic Center, and activities) and ultimately want to stay.
- A diverse, family-oriented City who embraces its heritage of industry, hard work and patriotism.
- Growing, changing, diverse group of hard working people.
- A group of people living in a particular geographic area doing things together and serving each other.
- People who are trying to accomplish coming together as a City.
- A community of people learning and playing together.
- Family, community pride, patriotic.
- Family, Freedom, Fun.

There was a discussion about the key elements found in the expressed ideas: family, patriotic, fun-loving, and serving. Mr. Cahoon asked them to answer the question again but think of what the group agreed upon that the answer would be; then, the following responses were read aloud:

- We are a diverse group of hard working family oriented people.
- We are a diverse, family oriented, industrious City. We are Clearfield.
- Diverse cultures building a place for family.
- We are diverse, hard-working, families that have a strong sense of service.
- Commercial, patriotic, family, home, family.
- Hard working, family oriented, fun loving people who are diverse and love to serve and help each other.
- We are a diverse community working together and serving each other.
- Our community, our family.
- Diverse, patriotic, hard-working, family.
- Hard working, family oriented community.
- We are a diverse family community that prioritizes service and hard work to blend with fun.
- Family, Fun, Love, Service, Hard-Working.
- A blue collar city of diverse family oriented citizens ready to serve play and unify.

Mr. Cahoon asked the question again and requested one word be written to summarize the City's identity; then the following responses were expressed to the group:

- Great
- Community
- Clearfield
- "Welcome Home"
- Diversity
- Diverse
- Diversed
- Hard-working
- Family

- Diverservice
- Americana
- Striving
- Everyone

Mr. Cahoon thanked them for their time and acknowledged many of the shared ideas would be good brainstorming material. He pointed out many in the community would wonder why things were happening and hoped to find a unified message that the Planning Commission, Council and staff could share with those who had questions. He asked them to participate in another ballot style question and respond to the second round question.

Second Round – Question: Why are we doing what we are doing?

- To accommodate a changing community.
- Creating a place we can all enjoy.
- Making Clearfield an awesome place to live.
- Bring order to chaos.
- To improve the general quality of life for our residents and create a safer and more stable environment for positive community and economic growth or it seemed like a good idea at the time.
- Build on the past, to make the future better.
- We adapt or we die. We want this City to rise, renew, and grow. And when we grow, why would we fight for the run-down version of ourselves.
- To develop our vacant properties in a way that will use the land in the most efficient manner to help our existing and future residents to have the best quality of life possible.
- To provide housing and employment for the people who live in this diverse city.
- To improve the quality of life for all who live in Clearfield.
- For opportunity and growth for our citizens and city.
- Growth like tacos, are life. Institutions that don't keep pace with change fall behind and eventually fall.
- To keep our city competitive and growing so we will not die. We also want to fill urgent needs within our city.

There was a discussion about the key takeaways. Mr. Cahoon asked the group to again answer the question based on how the group expressed why the City was doing what it was doing.

- To provide our citizens with a high quality of life.
- To prepare and accommodate for the inevitable change of life.
- To broaden the base.
- To create a future for our City.
- To adapt to the needs of our growing community in an effort to improve the environment and quality of life for our residents.
- We love this City and want to see it renew and grow. We are worth the effort and investment.
- Improve.
- To adapt and improve.
- To control the direction we are going.

- To accommodate a changing and growing community.
- To be better and do better.
- To make our City better.
- Improving where we live so we can grow for the future.
- Helping the residents grow.

There was a discussion about how the City was recently ranked eighteenth in the Nation as one of the top places for small business. Mr. Cahoon explained the exercise was to help identify who the City was and why it was doing what it was doing. He mentioned the messaging would be used to invite others to join the City attracting others so it would be important to find those who fit in with the culture of the community.

Councilmember Thompson left the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

There was a discussion about what happens to cities when things get ignored or struggle to find themselves. Mayor Shepherd reported he often heard others comment they wanted to follow Clearfield and do things in a similar fashion. There was a discussion about how Clearfield was leading the way in a big, bold manner rather than proceeding in a reactionary method with its development.

Mr. Cahoon indicated he would work on the communication items and report back to the group with ideas for unified messaging. He thanked the group for its participation and said he felt there was power in the team approach to vision and messaging for the City's future growth.

Councilmember Peterson moved to adjourn the Joint City Council and Planning Commission work session and reconvene in the City Council work session at 9:07 p.m., seconded by Councilmember Bush. The motion carried upon the following vote: Voting AYE – Councilmembers Bush, Peterson, Phipps, Roper and Thompson. Voting NO – None.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED
This 25th day of June, 2019**

/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, May 7, 2019.

/s/Nancy R. Dean, City Recorder