



CLINTON CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA

2267 N 1500 W Clinton, UT 84015

January 13, 2026

This meeting may be attended electronically by one or more members.

6:00 PM WORK SESSION

1. Dispatch Consolidation Discussion
2. Title 2 Amendments
3. Department Head Reports

ADJOURN - 6:50 PM

Dated this 6th day of January, 2026
/s/Lisa Titensor, Clinton City Recorder

- *Supporting documentation for this agenda is posted on the Clinton City website at www.clintoncity.com and on the Utah Public Notice Website www.utah.gov/pmn*
- *In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodation (including auxiliary communicative aids and service) during the meeting should notify Lisa Titensor, City Recorder, at (801) 614-0700 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.*
- *This meeting may involve electronic communications for some members of this public body. The anchor location for the meeting shall be the Clinton City Council Chambers at 2267 N 1500 W Clinton UT 84015. Elected Officials at remote locations may be connected to the meeting electronically to participate.*
- *Notice is hereby given that by motion of the Clinton City Council, pursuant to Utah State Code Title 52, Chapter 4 sections 204 & 205, the City Council may vote to hold a closed session for any of the purposes identified in that Chapter.*
- *The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the city council, staff and/or public*

CLINTON CITY COUNCIL

WORK SESSION

STAFF REPORT

2267 N 1500 W, Clinton, UT 84015

MEETING DATE:	January 13, 2026
PETITIONER(S):	Marie Dougherty, Trevor Cahoon, Chief Stoker
SUBJECT:	Dispatch Consolidation Discussion

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council receive this report for discussion purposes only. No action is requested at this time. The intent of this item is to provide background and context on dispatch consolidation discussions currently underway in northern Davis County, identify governance and process concerns, and discuss how the City will proceed.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no immediate fiscal impact associated with this discussion item.

Potential future fiscal impacts could be significant depending on the governance structure, fee methodology, capital replacement obligations, and long-term operational control of dispatch services.

These impacts are not fully known at this time, but initial estimates will range from \$300,000 - \$400,000 annually.

SUMMARY:

For several years, Davis County and participating cities have been exploring options to consolidate public safety answering point (PSAP) services due to staffing, facility, technology, and sustainability challenges. These discussions have largely occurred at the administrative and operational level, with the goal of improving efficiency and service delivery.

As these discussions have progressed, the County has signaled an intent to cease operating the County PSAP and transition services to city-operated PSAPs, most notably a Layton-operated PSAP serving northern Davis County and a Bountiful-operated PSAP serving the southern portion of the county.

Recent developments have raised concerns regarding governance, representation, and process, particularly given statutory changes that prevent the creation of new PSAPs and the essential, life-safety nature of dispatch services. This staff report is intended to explain how the region arrived at this point and why Council involvement is now critical.

BACKGROUND

County Dispatch Model

Historically, Clinton City has received dispatch services through a County-operated PSAP. Under this model:

- Dispatch operations were overseen by the County Sheriff's Office.
- Governance and budget authority rested with the County Commission.
- Clinton residents had indirect representation through their election of County officials, including the Sheriff and County Commissioners.
- The City participated through a contractual relationship, but within a broader county governance framework.

While not without operational challenges, this structure provided a level of democratic oversight for residents receiving the service.

State Statutory Change (2017)

In 2017, the Utah State Legislature amended state law to prohibit the creation of new PSAPs, with limited exceptions. This change was intended to encourage efficiency and consolidation but had significant implications:

- Cities no longer have the ability to establish a new PSAP if an existing arrangement becomes unsatisfactory.
- Exit options from consolidated dispatch arrangements are extremely limited.
- Decisions regarding dispatch consolidation have become effectively permanent once implemented.

This statutory change significantly elevates the importance of governance and oversight in any consolidation decision.

Emergence of Consolidation Discussions

Over time, Davis County and participating cities have faced increasing challenges related to:

- Dispatcher recruitment and retention
- Aging facilities
- Rising technology costs (CAD, radio systems, NextGen 911)
- Increasing call volume and complexity

In response, city managers, chiefs, and County representatives began exploring consolidation options. These discussions were undertaken in good faith and focused primarily on operational and technical considerations.

During this period:

- No formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was adopted establishing the scope or authority of consolidation discussions.
- Elected officials were not consistently engaged early in shaping governance alternatives.
- The County's long-term role as PSAP operator remained unresolved.

CURRENT SITUATION

Shift Away from County Operation

More recently, the County has indicated that it does not intend to continue operating the PSAP. Attention has shifted toward consolidation into city-operated PSAPs, particularly Layton City for northern Davis County and Bountiful City for southern Davis County. This decision was made by the County which did not involve any of their contracted cities in discussions or negotiations.

As this shift has occurred, governance frameworks have been proposed that would:

- Place ownership and operational control with Layton City.
- Provide participating cities with advisory roles only.
- Reserve final budget, fee, and policy authority to the Layton City Council.

Practical Limitations on Alternatives

Although Clinton City is geographically adjacent to Weber County, dispatch through Weber County is not operationally viable due to differences in systems, standards, and interoperability. Transitioning to Weber County dispatch would isolate Clinton City from Davis County agencies during major incidents.

As a result, Clinton City's practical dispatch options are limited to:

- Layton-operated PSAP (north)
- Bountiful-operated PSAP (south)

This effectively creates a constrained environment with no meaningful alternative providers. It is not known if Bountiful would even provide services to the area given the distance from their covered jurisdictions.

GOVERNANCE AND PROCESS CONCERNS

Several concerns have emerged as the consolidation framework has taken shape:

1. **Loss of County-Level Representation**
Moving from a County-operated PSAP to a single-city-operated PSAP shifts authority away from elected County officials toward a city council elected by residents of another municipality.
2. **Advisory-Only Participation**
Participating cities would have limited or non-binding roles in decision-making, including budget and fee setting.
3. **Irreversibility**
State law prevents the creation of new PSAPs, eliminating future corrective options if governance or cost concerns arise.
4. **Process and Authorization**
Consolidation discussions have advanced significantly without a formal MOU or explicit City Council authorization establishing governance expectations or decision-making authority.
5. **Essential Nature of Service**
Dispatch is a core life-safety service, not a discretionary program, increasing the importance of democratic oversight and accountability.

CONCLUSION

The current situation is the result of incremental operational discussions, statutory change, and evolving County priorities. While consolidation efforts have been

undertaken in good faith, the cumulative effect presents significant governance and accountability considerations for Clinton City and its residents.

ATTACHMENTS:

N/A

CLINTON CITY COUNCIL

WORK SESSION

STAFF REPORT

2267 N 1500 W, Clinton, UT 84015

MEETING DATE:	January 13, 2026
PETITIONER(S):	Marie Dougherty, Lisa Titensor, Peter Matson
SUBJECT:	Title 2 Amendments

FISCAL IMPACT:

SUMMARY:

The Utah State Legislature has enacted changes from 2020 through 2025 that include updates to election procedures, GRAMA processes, planning commissions, conflict of interest requirements, ethics training, bonding, annexation policy, and the use of technology in public meetings.

Staff is working to update the current Clinton City Code Title 2 with the changes.

The following amendments are being proposed

1. Conflict of Interest Disclosures (2-7-13)
Candidates for municipal office must file a conflict-of-interest disclosure form at the time of declaring candidacy. If the candidate is an incumbent and filed the form earlier that year, the incumbent may verify that the information remains current. Conflict of interest forms shall be displayed on the City's website in accordance with H.B. 504 (2025). [UCA 10-3-1306; UCA 20A-11-1604]
2. Oath of Office Clarifications (2-7-1 through 2-7-3)
 - Clarify that the oath of office must be filed with the City Recorder before assuming any duties. [UCA 10-3-827]
3. Records Access and GRAMA Updates (2-11-2 & 2-11-3)
 - Update language to specify that Clinton City shall adopt the most current version of GRAMA, including fee waiver provisions and record classification requirements. [UCA 63G-2-203, 63G-2-305]

- Clarify that appeals of records access decisions shall follow the new procedure established by S.B. 277 (2025), whereby appeals are heard by an administrative law judge appointed by the Governor rather than the State Records Committee. [UCA 63G-2-701 to 63G-2-705]
- Ensure consistency with State standards on protected and private records.

Privacy and Data Protection (NEW SECTION 2-11-6) - In accordance with H.B. 444 (2025), Clinton City shall:

1. Identify and report to the State Archives the names of its Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and all designated records officers responsible for privacy compliance.
2. Initiate a privacy program by December 2025 by submitting the required report to the State.
3. Provide annual privacy training to all employees who handle or may handle personally identifiable information.
4. Document and report the City's compliance with these privacy requirements in accordance with state directives. [UCA 63A-19-401.3]
4. Electronic Meetings (2-5-6)
 - Add provision that electronic meetings shall comply with Utah Code 52-4-207, including written determinations, anchor location standards, public access, and notice requirements.
 - Include procedures for recording and storing electronic meetings as part of the official record.
5. Acting Recorder (2-7-8)
 - In the event the City Recorder is temporarily absent, or the office is vacant, the Mayor may appoint an acting Recorder with advice and consent of the Council to fulfill statutory duties until the Recorder returns, or a replacement is appointed. [UCA 10-3-916]
6. Political Sign Regulations (NEW SECTION)
 - Add a section regulating political signs consistent with Utah Code as amended in H.B. 292 (2025): size limits, setback requirements, timeframes for posting and removal, and required disclosures for sponsorship and funding.

7. Public Official Bonding Requirements (2-1-7)

- Amend to reflect updated bonding requirements from H.B. 64 (2025), specifying that officials are deemed bonded under the City's crime/theft insurance and noting minimum limits as established by the State Money Management Council.

8. Election Record Management (NEW SECTION under Chapter 11)

- Create a section detailing the management and retention of election records consistent with H.B. 263 (2024), including secure storage, authorized access, and destruction in compliance with GRAMA and election law.

AI-Generated Political Communication Disclosure (NEW SECTION)

In accordance with S.B. 131S01 (2024), any political advertisement, mass communication, or election-related material created in whole or in part using generative artificial intelligence must include a clear and conspicuous disclosure that the content was generated using artificial intelligence. This requirement applies to any candidate, campaign, or political committee distributing such materials within Clinton City.

9. Planning Commission Updates (Chapter 14A and Supplemental Provisions)

- Confirm that the Planning Commission consists of 5–7 members appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the City Council. [UCA 10-9a-301]
- Stagger member terms for four (4) years, with a maximum of three (3) full terms. [Clinton Code 2-16-3]
- Require annual election of a Chair and Vice Chair.
- Require adoption of bylaws and rules of procedure approved by the City Council.
- Ensure compliance with the Open and Public Meetings Act, including notice and minute requirements. [UCA 52-4-101 et seq.]
- Clarify that the Planning Commission serves in an advisory capacity unless otherwise delegated.
- Define quorum as a majority of appointed members.

Property Tax Code Recodification (NEW SECTION)

Update cross-references in Title 2 to reflect the reorganization of Utah's property tax relief statutes per H.B. 20 (2025). This includes reviewing and amending any citations to the old statutory sections to align with the new codification.

Building Inspector Amendments (NEW OR AMENDED SECTION)

Update provisions in Title 2 relating to building inspectors to reflect H.B. 58 (2025), including updated qualifications and inspection procedures in accordance with current state law.

Local Land Use Amendments (NEW OR AMENDED PLANNING COMMISSION SECTION)

Incorporate changes from H.B. 368 (2025) into Planning Commission duties and land use procedures, including:

- Updated noticing requirements for public hearings and decisions.
- Alignment with new development standards.
- Integration of revised annexation procedures alongside existing S.B. 322 requirements.

Truth in Taxation Public Hearing Requirements (NEW SECTION UNDER 2-10-4 or existing Budget Procedures)

During any Truth in Taxation public hearing, the City Council shall maintain a quorum as defined in the Open and Public Meetings Act. This requirement is consistent with S.B. 95 (2025), which amended UCA 59-2-919.2 to align with quorum definitions in UCA 52-4-103.

- Provide for member removal by City Council majority upon mayoral recommendation.

10. Annexation Policy Plan Requirements (Planning Commission)

- Ensure annexation provisions reflect current law under S.B. 322 (2025), including a requirement for the Planning Commission to include statements on current county zoning and future intended zoning in annexation policy plans. [UCA 10-2-401.5]

In addition to these legislative changes, Mayor Dougherty has requested the following changes to the Planning Commission:

2-8-2 Planning Commission

(1) Creation - Appointment.

(a) There is hereby created a Planning Commission for Clinton City, consisting of seven (7) total members whom are appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the City Council.

(b) Members of the Commission shall be selected from the qualified electors of the City, based on a variety of backgrounds and locations within the City. Moreover, no more than two (2) members shall share the same professional background or area of expertise.

(c) The City shall publish a notice of all vacant seats and expiring terms on the City's website, including an application for interested residents, and give reasonable time for consideration prior to filling any seat.

(d) The name of the individual(s) the Mayor appoints shall be published in the City Council's meeting agenda in preparation for the council's advice and consent.

(2) Terms of Office. Terms of office of the seven (7) citizen members of the Commission shall be staggered at intervals to provide uniformity and continuity of policy. Such appointed citizen members shall serve for a period of three (3) years and at staggered intervals, but in any event, each member of the Planning Commission shall serve until the expiration of the term for which he is appointed and until a successor is appointed and qualified.

(3) Oath of Office. Members of the Planning Commission shall qualify by taking, subscribing, and filing with the City Recorder or authorized appointee an oath of office required by the state constitution.

(4) Removal and Vacancies. Members of the Planning Commission may be removed for cause by the Mayor, with the advice and consent of the City Council. "Cause" may include, but shall not be limited to: violations of the state's Public Officers and Employee Ethics Act, conflicts of interest, and failure to attend a minimum of 80% of meetings. Any vacancy occurring on the Commission by reason of death, resignation, or removal shall be filled by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the City Council for the unexpired term of such member.

(5) Compensation. Planning Commission members shall serve without compensation, except for reasonable expense per meeting attended.

(6) Staff Expenditure. The Planning Commission may request appointment of such employees and staff as it may deem necessary; however, any expenditures of the

Commission shall be first approved by the City Manager as being within the amount budgeted by the City for such purposes for that year.

(7) Procedure. The Planning Commission shall, during its first meeting in January of each year, elect from its membership a chairman. The chairman shall serve for a term of one (1) year, and shall not succeed in said office. The Commission shall also elect other such officers as it may deem necessary and adopt and later change or alter rules and regulations of organization and procedure consistent with the City code and state laws.

(8) Quorum. Four (4) voting members of the Planning Commission shall constitute a quorum. Approval of requests presented to the Planning Commission can occur only by a majority of four (4) favorable votes of the quorum.

(9) Meetings. The Planning Commission shall meet ~~as needed and at least once each month~~ as designated by the Commission in their bylaws. Public hearings of the Planning Commission may be held at such meetings; however, all public hearings shall be held after the regular working hours of the City, upon proper notice to consider any matters within the scope of the Commission's duties as provided by the code or state statute. All meetings and public hearings of the Planning Commission shall be held in a public place designated by the Commission and shall be of sufficient size to ~~ensure insure~~ public access to the operations of the Commission.

Records of Proceedings. The Commission shall keep records of its proceedings, which shall be available to public inspection.