

CLINTON CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

2267 North 1500 W

Clinton UT 84015

MAYOR

L. Mitch Adams

CITY COUNCIL

Councilmember Blair Bateman

Councilmember Joanne Hansen

Councilmember Brice Mitchell

Councilmember Cheri Reed

Councilmember Anna Stanton

Clinton City Council	October 22, 2013	Call to Order: 7:00 P.M.
Staff Present	Community Development Director Lynn Vinzant, and April Touchin recorded the minutes.	
Citizens Present	Mike Houtz, Kent Draayer, Laura Adams, Rachel Jenkins, Karen Jenkins, James Bateman, Michael Petersen, Barbara Patterson, Bryce Wilcox, Gerrit VanVliet, Erik Craythorne, Madison Saddler, Kaylee Kendall, Steven Thayne, Garrett Seeds, Tiana Evans, Aaron Limb, Emily Price, Tony Thompson, Karen Peterson, Karen Ballif, Art Ballif, Taylor Devoe, Don Devoe, Jiheylyon Whitlow, Julie Chilson, Bill Chilson, Debbie Barlow, Jeff Reading Josh Reading, Trent Limb, Kim Limb, Bruce Logan, Jamie Pengelly, Carla Parsons, Shelby Hughes, Ronnie Duncan, Gary Stokes, Geraldine Farrell, Marilyn Diamond, John Diamond, W. Scott Ashley, Jayna Rice, Michael Rice, Brendon Simonsen, Corbin Simonson, Jorge Lopez, C. Halter, Austin Burnett, Jordan Ryan	
Pledge of Allegiance	Jiheylyon Whitlow	
Prayer or Thought	Steven Thayne and Madison Saddler gave a quote by Audrey Hepburn.	
Roll Call & Attendance – Excused Were:	Councilmember Brice Mitchell was excused. City Manager Dennis Cluff was excused.	
A. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER, 2013 – JAMIE PENGELLY		
Petitioner	Dennis Cluff, Carla Parsons	
Discussion	<p>City Treasurer Carla Parsons said she is pleased to nominate Jamie Pengelly as Employee of the Month for the month of August 2013. She said Jamie has a very pleasant personality and works exceptionally well with the public. There have been times when customers have asked where she is when she isn't at the front desk. She does an outstanding job assisting the utility clerk with the delinquent utility lists and preparation of the shut off lists. She negotiates payment plans with customers in order to ensure timely payments are made which helps keep them off the shut off list. She also responds to customer questions, complaints and explains service procedures, city policies, and answers a variety of questions regarding status of accounts.</p> <p>Ms. Parsons went on to say that Jamie's position includes a variety of clerical and accounting functions, including assisting with returned checks and general ledger entries. She said some of the wonderful qualities that impress her most about Jamie are her dedication, attitude and ability to help customers. She exhibits outstanding dependability and dedication in all aspects of her position. She puts forth her very best on a daily basis and does an outstanding job representing the City. Jamie has been an exceptional employee for Clinton City since she was hired three years ago. She takes pride in her work which is exhibited in both the quality and quantity of work she does. She said she feels very fortunate to have Jamie working in the Treasurer Department.</p> <p>Mayor Adams commented that he is impressed with Jamie's work ethic. Clinton City is fortunate to have such outstanding employees.</p> <p>Jamie said she appreciates working with the individuals in her department and</p>	

	<p>she has the best boss to work with. She appreciates being recognized with this honor.</p> <p>Mayor Adams presented Jamie with a gift card and a certificate in recognition of her efforts.</p>
--	---

B. DEPARTMENT HEAD OF THE THIRD QUARTER 2013 – POLICE CHIEF BILL CHILSON

Petitioner	Dennis Cluff
Discussion	<p>Mayor Adams stated Chief Bill Chilson has been a police officer with Clinton City since August 1984, which is over 29 years. He has been the Chief of Police since 1992. He enjoys his work, and it shows in his daily activity. Bill almost always has a positive and helpful attitude. He sets a great example for his Police staff, especially in working with the public. He readily accepts assignments and promptly follows through on them. Bill is an excellent employee and an important member of Clinton’s leadership team. Mayor Adams went on to say that Mr. Cluff has said how grateful he is to have Chief Chilson’s help in managing the City.</p> <p>Mayor Adams expressed appreciation to Chief Chilson for his hard work and dedication. He presented him with a gift card and certificate in recognition.</p> <p>Chief Chilson said he appreciates working in Clinton City and being recognized. He appreciates the support of his Department and City staff in addition to his wife.</p> <p>Councilmember Stanton said she appreciates Chief Chilson for his willingness to go above and beyond.</p> <p>Councilmember Bateman said he appreciates Chief Chilson’s positive attitude. He oversees and excellent department.</p> <p>Councilmember Hansen said she appreciates the good job Bill has done as the Police Chief.</p>

C. EMPLOYEE SERVICE AWARDS FOR THE THIRD QUARTER OF 2013

Petitioner	Dennis Cluff
Discussion	<p>Mayor Adams identified that Kevin Sorensen and Trent Limb have both completed five years of service to Clinton City. He said he appreciates their dedication and looks forward to many more years.</p> <p>The Council expressed their appreciation.</p> <p>Mayor Adams presented Trent Limb with a \$25 check in honor of his service.</p> <p>Kevin Sorensen was not present, so Mayor Adams asked staff to present Kevin with is award.</p>

D. RECOGNITION OF PAST PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Petitioner	Mayor L. Mitch Adams
Discussion	<p>Mayor Adams said that over the past four years the City has had a number of turnovers and changes to the Planning Commission. He said he would like to recognize the past Planning Commissioners as great members of the community and thank them for their unselfish and dedicated service. Each individual has served the community well, some for many, many years. Their actions, proposals and advice have been invaluable to the City Council. He identified the following individuals to be recognized and expressed his appreciation for their time and dedication:</p> <p>Brett Butler Sam Cooper</p>

	<p>Ronnie Duncan Fred Mitchell Mike Rice Nathan Schow Gary Stokes</p>
<p>E. APPEAL TO THE DECISION OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR RELATED TO INTERPRETATION OF THE SIGN ORDINANCE</p>	
<p>Petitioner</p>	<p>John Diamond, Clinton Nursery</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>The City Council was provided the following information in the staff report:</p> <p>John Diamond, Clinton Nursery, is appealing the decision of the Community Development Director, for a building permit for a sign, as stated in the Site Plan Review. Mr. Diamond’s appeal request arrived at the City October 8, 2013, within the 15 days required for an appeal.</p> <p>Mr. Diamond is appealing the decision of the Director based upon the height requirements of the sign ordinance.</p> <p>Decision of the Director.</p> <p>The decision of the Director is based upon standing interpretation of the ordinance as it has been enforced on other sign permits issued within the City since the ordinance was adopted May 25, 2004.</p> <p>Text of the Ordinance:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">24-4-2(5) Monument Signs. The following standards shall apply:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) Monument signs are allowed for any size parcel provided that the parcel has thirty (30) feet of street frontage. The sign area allowed is determined by the following formula: thirty-two (32) square feet plus one (1) square foot per 3.125 lineal feet of street frontage over fifty (50) feet, maximum size is sixty (60) square feet. Parcels with two street frontages are allowed a sign on each street. However, the signs must be separated by at least one hundred (100) feet as measured diagonally across the property from center to center of both signs or only one (1) sign will be allowed. Signs within the visibility triangle may be allowed with the permission of the Clinton City Engineer.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(e) Monument signs must have at least a one (1) foot pedestal, and the illuminated cabinet may not exceed five (5) feet for a total of six (6) feet. The height to the top of the sign as measured from the street curb may vary depending upon landscaping, but the combined height of the sign and berming/landscaping may not exceed nine (9) feet. The entire frontage of the property must be randomly bermed for this to occur, not just where the sign is to be positioned. The sign base shall be landscaped.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(f) Reader boards (changeable copy areas) and electronic message centers may be allowed, however, such devices shall not exceed 50% of the total sign area.</p> <p>The Director has interpreted this section, related to sign height, based upon the Councils discussion during the writing, adoption and continued practical use of the sign ordinance. These are the tools used when approving a sign:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum height for any sign is 6-feet, unless associated with planned centers of 10-acres or more. • All signs are to be on a minimum 1-foot high pedestal. • The illuminated cabinet, on top of the pedestal, may not exceed 5-feet in height.

- If the sign is on a berm the sign is measured from the highest point of the berm but the sign can not be higher than 6-feet above the berm counting the pedestal.
- The total height of the berm and sign can not exceed 9-feet.
- The berm is to be associated with the street frontage of the property and not just the sign.
- The illuminated cabinet includes any portion that is changeable copy; this interpretation goes back to when letters could be applied to the illuminated cabinet. By using this guideline LED type reader boards are treated the same as the changeable letter type cabinets.
- If there were no illuminated cabinet, if the sign were lit from an external source, the maximum height of the sign would be 6-feet including a minimum 1-foot high pedestal.
- The sign requires a landscape area around the base of the sign.
- Since this particular sign ordinance was adopted, May 2004, there have not been any exceptions given to the standards established.
- The City has interpreted the sign ordinance to state that the maximum height of a sign is 6-feet, which is why the City has designed its sign to be side by side design rather than an over under design.
- A review of all of the building permits issued for monument signs, under the 2004 ordinance, reveals that all of the signs meet the requirements of the ordinance. Among these signs are some of those mentioned by Mr. Diamond including: McDonalds, Les Schwab, Kapp Auto, Quick & Clean, Comfort Dental, Mountain America CU, Panda Express, Lock It Up Storage, and West Side Medical.

John Diamond stated that he has been working on this issue since June 11th; he would like to reach a conclusion.

He explained the problem comes in the interpretation of the sign ordinance. There are many conflicts in the ordinance.

He sent the sign company to the City to get a copy of the Ordinance and make sure they met compliance. When he came back for a permit, there were questions that arose in disagreement with the interpretation of the ordinance.

He said there are many signs in the City that are not in compliance.

His interpretation, the sign companies, his attorney's and his engineer's interpretation has discrepancies with staff's interpretation, in particular with monument signs.

He read from the ordinance:

(e) Monument signs must have at least a one (1) foot pedestal, and the illuminated cabinet may not exceed five (5) feet for a total of six (6) feet. The height to the top of the sign as measured from the street curb may vary depending upon landscaping, but the combined height of the sign and berming/landscaping may not exceed nine (9) feet. The entire frontage of the property must be randomly bermed for this to occur, not just where the sign is to be positioned. The sign base shall be landscaped.

He presented the Council with some pictures of the sign he has had constructed and would like to have installed in front of his business.

He said his sign is well within the criteria of the sign ordinance in regards to the illuminated cabinet. His sign does not exceed 9 feet.

He read again from the ordinance:

(f) Reader boards (changeable copy areas) and electronic message

	<p>centers may be allowed, however, such devices shall not exceed 50% of the total sign area.</p> <p>He said his sign is not higher than 9 feet.</p> <p>He went on to say that the sign ordinance is 35 pages of fluff. Other sign ordinances in surrounding cities is six to 19 pages, Clinton has 35 pages. There are too many conflicts in the ordinance that allows for misinterpretation.</p> <p>Clinton City Attorney Mike Houtz said he does not feel there is ambiguity in the interpretation of (e) regarding monument signs. The way he reads it is the total height of the sign can be 6 feet with a 1 foot pedestal. There can also be an illuminated cabinet and a reader board that can't be more than 50% up to the 9 feet with a berm which is identified in (f). There is a requirement for a 1 foot minimum pedestal. The City Council determined the height requirements when they passed the ordinance back in 2004.</p> <p>Councilmember Reed commented that she has studied the sign ordinance in detail. She referred to a section in the monument sign section regarding the standard; the ordinance states that the total area can be between 32 to 60 feet depending on the width of the parcel; it doesn't appear to give height requirement, just the square area. According to (b), she feels Mr. Diamond has sufficient frontage. She referred to the section on free standing building and said she sees how the interpretation could be confusing. The berming and landscaping requirements could be confusing. She suggested referencing height requirements in the monument sign section.</p> <p>Mr. Diamond said he has 330 feet of frontage.</p> <p>Councilmember Stanton was pleased to hear that staff highlights sections that applicants need to pay attention to in the ordinance when they are applying for a permit.</p> <p>Councilmember Bateman asked for the areas of conflict to be specifically identified for this discussion.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant responded 24-4-2(5) is in question. The height is the only thing in conflict.</p> <p>Mr. Diamond said he gave two scenarios, the second should meet the sign ordinance; it will be 7 feet and well within requirements of the square footage.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant identified that in section 5 monument signs, (e) applies. The discrepancy is in illuminated cabinet.</p> <p>Mr. Diamond explained the discrepancy is in what the illuminated cabinet is and the reader board.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant said (f) identifies the requirement of the illuminated cabinet and the reader board.</p> <p>Mr. Diamond said that the confusion is because illuminated cabinet and reader board are in two different paragraphs.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant clarified the total height of the sign cannot exceed six feet. He said if Mr. Diamond will put the sign and the illuminated cabinet side by side it will meet the ordinance requirements. It can be a total of 9 feet if the 6 foot sign is put on a berm.</p> <p>Mr. Houtz stated that his advice to the City Council is to follow the ordinance.</p> <p>Mr. Diamond referred to a report he has that many signs in the City are not in compliance with the ordinance.</p> <p>The Council expressed concern over the verbiage <i>randomly berm</i> in the ordinance.</p>
--	--

	<p>Mr. Diamond stated there is no curb and gutter or sidewalk, there is ingress and egress for loading docks and he has irrigated pasture. He would be willing to berm in the parking area.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant responded that if Mr. Diamond goes with a berm, landscaping will be required.</p> <p>Scott Ashby, General Manager for Clinton Nursery asked where the 6 feet should be measured from.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant responded six inches above grade level or edge of asphalt. The sign could be 6 feet 6 inches high allowing for the 6 inches the curb would be.</p> <p>During the discussion of the appeal, it was discussed and mutually agreed upon that a side by side arrangement of the sign would comply with the ordinance. The conceptual drawing will be submitted to the City for approval.</p>
<p>CONCLUSION</p>	<p>Councilmember Hansen moved to uphold the interpretation and decision of the Community Development Director related to the applicants building permit application, the Clinton City Sign Ordinance. The motion includes a clarification that the top of curb is measured six inches above the edge of asphalt. Councilmember Bateman seconded the motion. Voting by roll call is as follows: Councilmember Hansen, aye; Councilmember Reed, aye; Councilmember Stanton, aye; Councilmember Bateman, aye.</p>
<p>Action Item</p>	<p>The Council directed staff to ask the Planning Commission to review and evaluate the sign ordinance.</p>
<p>F. ORDINANCE 13-07, AMENDING CITY CODE SECTION 2-4-8 – RECONSIDERATION</p>	
<p>Petitioner</p>	<p>Community Development</p>
	<p>Mayor Adams explained that in December of 2009 the Council voted to revise Section 2-4-8, Reconsideration, to state solely what is in the State Statute. It has been determined that this Section needs more clarification in order for the process to work more effectively. Sub-section (2) is basically the old language and sub-sections (1) & (3) contain the new language.</p> <p>Basically it states that anyone who voted as part of the majority vote can ask for a reconsideration of the agenda item voted on. It can be at the same meeting, or set for the subsequent meeting of the Council. If set for the subsequent meeting and if a special meeting is called where the reconsideration will be heard, then at least the same number of City Council members must be present at the special meeting as were at the original meeting where the item was approved. The main reason for only reconsidering a vote at the current meeting or the next is to not unduly delay the possibility of a decision change on an already approved agenda item.</p> <p>The vote for Reconsideration is really a vote on whether or not to disregard the original vote. If the “Reconsideration is approved, then the original issue previously voted upon is as if no vote had been taken and the City Council has the same options available to it as it originally had.</p> <p>2-4-8. Reconsideration.</p> <p>(1) Any request for reconsideration of the vote of an approved Council agenda item must be made by at least one of the City Council members who voted in the majority of the action taken. Such request may be made at the same meeting as the vote, or made to the Mayor <u>in writing</u> prior to the subsequent meeting for inclusion in the agenda.</p> <p>(2) Any action taken by the City Council shall not be reconsidered or rescinded at any special meeting unless the number of members of the City Council present at the special meeting is equal to or greater than the number of members present at the meeting when the action was approved.</p>

	<p>(3) If the request for reconsideration is voted upon and approved by a majority vote of the City Council, the effect will be as if the original vote was never taken. The item can then be handled in any proper manner desired by the majority vote of the City Council.</p>
<p>CONCLUSION</p>	<p>Councilmember Bateman moved to adopt Ordinance 13-07, Amending City Code Section 2-4-8 – Reconsideration, requiring any request for reconsideration of the vote of an approved Council agenda item must be made at the same meeting as the vote, or made to the Mayor <u>in writing</u> prior to the subsequent meeting. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion. Voting by roll call is as follows: Councilmember Reed, aye; Councilmember Stanton, aye; Councilmember Bateman, aye; Councilmember Hansen, aye.</p>
<p>G. OPEN PUBLIC HEARING – TABLED FROM OCTOBER 8, 2013 – ORDINANCE 13-06Z CITY COUNCIL ACTION CONCERNING A REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 948 N 3000 W FROM A-1 TO R-1-15</p>	
<p>Petitioner</p>	<p>Erik Craythorne, representing Jacqueline Wallmann</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Mayor Adams identified the public hearing has remained open from the last meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area is designated on the Master Land Use Map as R-1-15 • The property to the North is R-1-15, to the South is R-1-15, and to the East is R-1-15. The property to the West is West Point and it is zoned R-1-10. <p>Erik Craythorne stated this property is a 1 acre lot that is currently owned by Jackie Wallmann. Ms. Wallmann has approached him about purchasing the property from her. All the surrounding property is zoned R-1-15. He is looking to rezone the property from A-1 to R-1-15. There will be two additional lots that will face 960 North.</p> <p>Geraldine Farrell commented that she lives on the south side of this property. She would like to know the intentions of the developer. She asked if there will be three lots.</p> <p>She went on to say that she has a legal right to the roadway behind her house and claim to the right of way for access to her sheds. She said she does not want a tall house built next to her that can look into her home. She is upset because she heard about this from a neighbor, not the developer.</p> <p>Mr. Craythorne responded the rezone request does not include the right of way. He will sit down and talk with Ms. Farrell. He intends to have a three lot subdivision. The plan will work with or without the roadway. Q2 llc owns the roadway.</p> <p>Mayor Adams said he is concerned for the citizens; he would like to see Mr. Craythorne and Ms. Farrell come to a mutual agreement on the roadway.</p> <p>Councilmember Reed said she would like to table this item until an agreement can be made between Mr. Craythorne and Ms. Farrell.</p> <p>Mr. Craythorne said the easement is a legal issue between he and Ms. Farrell; it does not involve the City. He is asking for a rezone of the one acre, not the roadway.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant clarified there are three ways to approach developing this property in the R-1-15 zone. One, amend the existing subdivision to include this one acre, which allows averaging for the entire subdivision and would most likely add three lots. The second is to use the one acre as a stand alone subdivision with two lots. The third would be to include the 33’ piece of property (road as referred to above) as a stand alone subdivision which would accommodate three lots.</p> <p>Mrs. Farrell said she is willing to work with Mr. Craythorne. Her concern is the right of way and she would like to know how the property will be developed. She doesn’t want a tall house that can look into her windows so she has no privacy.</p> <p>Mayor Adams asked for additional public comment.</p>

	<p>Emily Price said she lives on the road. She was happy to hear about the rezone request. She would like to see the property developed because currently it is full of weeds and stickers. She is looking forward to a nice neighborhood.</p> <p>Mayor Adams closed the public hearing at 9:17 p.m.</p>
<p>CONCLUSION</p>	<p>Councilmember Reed moved to adopt Ordinance 13-06Z changing the zoning of property located at 948 North 3000 West from A-1 to R-1-15 with the stipulation that prior to any approval of a subdivision of this property, that includes the 30-foot ± section on the south edge of the rezoned property, the applicant will have resolved issues with the owner of property located at 912 N 3000 W. Documentation of agreement will be presented with the application for a subdivision. Councilmember Bateman seconded the motion. Voting by roll call is as follows: Councilmember Stanton, aye; Councilmember Bateman, aye; Councilmember Hansen, aye; Councilmember Reed, aye.</p>
<p>H. HOOPER 4300 WEST PROJECT AND THE 3000 WEST PROJECT, ALTERNATE FUNDING AVAILABILITY</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Mr. Vinzant reported Hooper and Clinton have been provided an opportunity to move up funding for the 4300 W - 6000 S to 2300 N and 3000 W - 2300 N to 1300 N projects. Through cooperation with UDOT the WFRC is able to convert federal funding into State funding for these two projects and the West Point and Syracuse projects. The conversion rate is 85% of the total estimated cost of federal funding including inflation costs estimated for 2017 and 2019 construction. By accepting this alternative the City share will change from 6.77 % to 10%.</p> <p>He reviewed the following information included in the staff report with the City Council:</p> <p>This may not sound like a good deal for the City, taking 85% of the funding and paying more in matching funds, but there will be significant project savings; the inflation factor alone, of between 20% and 30%, along with the cost reductions related to getting away from the federal standards for development, UDOT oversight and project complexity make this decision easier to understand.</p> <p>Timing, the projects will need to be advertised for construction by June 2015.</p> <p>When the City applied for the 3000 W - 1300 N to 2300 N project we also applied for 3000 W - 1800 N to 2300 N. To get the 3000 W project an agreement between WFRC and the City was reached to award the City the 1800 N to 2300 N project with the understanding that Clinton could use any savings from the 4300 West project to extend to the south along 3000 W and then use the 1800 to 2300 N funding to extend as far as possible toward 1300 N and that the City would not request more funding for the project 3000 W area. Staff studied this option and determined that, worse case scenario, the street projects without any of the usual embellishments such as sidewalk along undeveloped ground, streetlights, and landscaping all the way to 1400 N where the improvements have been installed could be done.</p> <p>The economics of the projects are outlined in the attached spreadsheets. But the real benefit is that there will be a combined \$1,079,593 that is anticipated project savings within the two projects. The project savings are due to moving the funding up and savings from not having to deal with federal requirements.</p> <p>The project savings will enable the City to complete the 3000 West project from 1300 North to 2300 North and to insure that the approach to 3000 W along 1300 N and 2300 N are fully developed within the scope of the project.</p> <p>Staff fully anticipates that there will be more than adequate flexible match for the 4300 W Hooper project to cover the match with additional flexible match going toward a match for use of the project savings that will be used to extend south along 3000 W toward 1800 N. These soft match funds are from the Weber County (right-of-way acquisition and match), donated property on the Davis County side, City property and staff time. This has been brought to the Council at this time because a commitment on the part of the City is required to go forward with these projects and the “swap” of funds. The formal Interlocal Agreement, with UDOT and WFRC, will be brought back to the Council at a later date but</p>

the item goes before the State Transportation Commission the end of October.

Hooper has agreed with the proposal.

This will not necessitate a change to the Interlocal Agreement with Hooper City.

The 3000 W 1300 N to 2300 N project matching funds will need to come from the street impact fees, storm drain impact fees, and what is left from the UDOT account after the West Point 3000 W 300 N to 1300 N.

There is approximately \$112,000 of City funds remaining on deposit with UDOT left from the 800 North project.

Staff suggests that, if any additional funding is necessary for match that the HoDag funds be considered. They can be paid back with transportation and storm drain impact fees appropriately.

Staff will look for any way possible to cut project costs.

JUB Engineer Brice Wilcox reviewed the following funding summaries with the City Council:

Hooper 4300 West: 6000 South to 2300 North

Funding Summary

Current Funding Amounts

Total \$ 3,748,793

Wasatch Front Regional Council STP Funds - 93.23% \$ 3,495,000

Local Match - 6.77% \$ 253,793

Funding Amounts With State Funds

Total \$ 3,300,833

State Funds - 90% \$ 2,970,750

Local Match - 10% \$ 330,083

Project Estimate With State Funds

Construction \$ 1,481,041

Engineering, Management, and Land Acquisition \$ 642,050

Contingency (25% Total Above) \$ 530,772.75

Total \$ 2,653,864

Project Breakdown

Total Project Cost \$ 2,653,864

State Funding - 90% \$ 2,388,477

Local Match - 10% \$ 265,386

Estimated Flexible Match for 4300 West \$ 282,000

Potential Available at Completion \$ 646,970

Clinton 3000 West: 2300 North to 1800 North

Funding Summary

Current Funding Amounts

Total \$ 2,986,163

Wasatch Front Regional Council STP Funds - 93.23% \$ 2,784,000

Local Match - 6.77% \$ 202,163

Funding Amounts With State Funds

Total \$ 2,629,333

State Funds - 90% \$ 2,366,400

Local Match - 10% \$ 262,933

Project Estimate With State Funds

Construction \$ 1,226,368

Engineering, Management, and Land Acquisition \$ 531,000

Contingency (25% Total Above) \$ 439,341.99

Total \$ 2,196,710

Project Breakdown

Total Project Cost \$ 2,196,710

	<p>State Funds - 90% \$ 1,977,039 Local Match - 10% \$ 219,671 Potential Available at Completion \$ 432,623 Total Hooper and Clinton Project Savings \$ 1,079,593</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant explained that bottom line; the savings of managing these projects on a state level rather than a federal level will be between 25% - 30% and the scope of the project may be expanded.</p> <p>Mr. Wilcox added that the inflation factor alone will make a significant difference. UDOT is swapping out federal for state dollars. This is a good opportunity to have the roadway built sooner and take advantage of the savings.</p> <p>Councilmember Bateman concerned about using HoDag and borrowing from other funds.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant responded the funds would be paid back with impact fees.</p> <p>Councilmember Reed expressed concern that repayment to the HoDag funds could take a long time. She also expressed her concern that the City would need to come up with funds to make embellishments to the roads at a later time. She asked if future or current impact fees would be used.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant responded both current and future would be used; he is confident those funds would come back. The intent is to stretch the money as far as it will go and complete as many improvements as possible.</p> <p>Councilmember Bateman said he still has concerns over the finances. He would prefer not to borrow from the HoDag funds.</p> <p>Councilmember Stanton commented that she likes the idea that Clinton has more say.</p> <p>The Council was in consensus to move forward with this project.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant said he will bring back more information at the next meeting.</p>
--	---

I PRESENTATION OF THE 2013 GENERAL PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL

<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Debbie Barlow on behalf of the Clinton City Planning Commission presented the 2013 Clinton City General Plan to the City Council and Resolution Numbers 18-13, 19-13 and 20-13 dealing with the Clinton City Water Master Plan, October 2013, the Clinton City Moderate Income Housing Plan, October 2013, and the Clinton City General Plan, October 2013.</p> <p>She said the General Plan Committee took their task very seriously and worked hard to represent the wishes of the citizens.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant identified that Resolution 19-13 dealing with the Clinton City Moderate Income Housing Plan, October 2013 needs a motion of rejection so the Plan can go back to the Planning Commission for reconsideration. During the presentation before the Planning Commission an older draft of the plan was presented for correction rather than the final draft. A new Resolution will be brought before the Planning Commission November 5, to discuss the correct version of the Plan.</p> <p>He explained the General Plan Committee spent well over a year on this project and the Planning Commission went over it with a fine tune comb. They all did a very good job and they are ready to hand it over to the City Council</p> <p>Councilmember Bateman complimented the Planning Commission for their work on the General Plan. He thanked them for following the citizens' wishes.</p> <p>Councilmember Hansen told the General Plan Committee what a good job they did and they have exceeded what was anticipated.</p>
--------------------------	--

	<p>Councilmember Reed said she appreciates the work that was put into the General Plan and she is very pleased with the result.</p> <p>Councilmember Stanton said she appreciates the General Plan and Planning Commission as well for their hard work.</p> <p>Mr. Vinzant identified the General Plan and supporting resolutions will be on the November 12th, 2013 Agenda.</p>
Approval of Minutes	Councilmember Bateman moved to approve the October 8, 2013 City Council Meeting minutes as written. Councilmember Hansen seconded the motion. Councilmember Stanton abstained because she was not present at the meeting. All others present voted in favor of the motion.
Accounts Payable	Councilmember Hansen moved to pay the bills. Councilmember Stanton seconded the motion. All those present voted in favor of the motion.
Planning Commission Report	Councilmember Bateman reported on the October 15, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting as recorded in the minutes.
City Manager Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excused.
Mayor Adams Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing at this time.
Councilmember Bateman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> He stated he is not in favor of granting the crosswalk for Voyage Academy. He feels the cost to the City is too extensive and was not a part of the original agreement. <p>Mr. Vinzant responded it has been evaluated by the City Engineer who has recommended that for sound practice the crosswalk be installed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> He stated for the record he is not in favor of granting final plat approval at the same meeting that preliminary plat approval is addressed if there are conditions of the preliminary plat approval to be addressed. There are three new Eagle Scouts.
Councilmember Hansen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing at this time.
Councilmember Mitchell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excused.
Councilmember Reed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councilmember Reed said Community Enhancement is planning a class on the Affordable Care Act.
Councilmember Stanton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sewer Board adopted a new impact fee raise of \$256 per residential house which will most likely go into effect on January 1, 2014. The Administration Fees will be adjusted as well.
Mr. Vinzant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike Fisher has accepted the position of Building Official. He will start in November.
ADJOURNMENT	Councilmember Hansen moved to adjourn. Councilmember Stanton seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:53p.m.