CLINTON CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MINUTES
2267 N 1500 W Clinton UT 84015

Date: July 14, 2026

Time: 6:00 PM

Location: 2267 N 1500 W, Clinton, UT 84015

Staff present: City Manager Trevor Cahoon, Fire Chief Jason Poulsen, Public Works Director Dave Williams, Finance Director Cory Christensen, Police Chief Shawn Stoker, Deputy Recorder Amy Durrans, and Recorder Lisa Titensor.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Marie Dougherty called the work session to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Council Members present included Dane Searle, Jennifer Christensen, and Spencer Arave. Adam Larsen attended electronically. Chris Danson was excused.

2. TUF STREET IMPROVEMENT DISCUSSION

Mayor Dougherty opened the discussion by explaining that the Transportation Utility Fee (TUF) had been placed on the work session agenda at the request of Councilmember Jennifer Christensen following the previous Council meeting. She stated that the purpose of the discussion was to identify Council concerns and determine what information staff should obtain through the upcoming Zions Public Finance study before any decisions are made. She noted that the study is expected to take approximately two months and that the discussion would help staff identify the information the Council needs before considering implementation.

Mayor Dougherty also conveyed comments and questions submitted by Councilmember Chris Danson, who was unable to attend the work session. She explained that Councilmember Danson asked the Council to consider whether a Transportation Utility Fee should ultimately be viewed as a long-term funding source or whether, following the required statutory review period, roadway maintenance could eventually transition to property tax funding. He also questioned whether street maintenance is more appropriately funded through property taxes or through a dedicated Transportation Utility Fee. These questions served as the basis for much of the Council's discussion regarding long-term funding strategies and the appropriate funding mechanism for transportation infrastructure.

Mayor Dougherty

Mayor Dougherty encouraged Council members to discuss the issues they wanted addressed through the upcoming study and asked what information would help them make an informed decision. She suggested that, if legally permissible, the City consider developing a multi-year Transportation Utility Fee schedule that would provide residents with predictable, incremental increases rather than significant one-time adjustments. She stated that publishing a long-term funding roadmap would improve transparency and allow residents to understand how the City intends to meet its roadway maintenance obligations over time.

The Mayor further emphasized the importance of establishing a reasonable level of service for the City's street system before determining fee levels. She stated that the previously discussed forty-year pavement replacement cycle appeared to represent a practical balance between accepted engineering practices and the City's financial limitations. She also stressed that public education would be essential so residents understand the need for a dedicated transportation funding source and how future rates would be determined.

In response to Councilmember Danson's questions, Mayor Dougherty shared her opinion that relying solely on future property tax increases to replace the Transportation Utility Fee would not be sustainable given the City's numerous General Fund obligations. She noted that transportation infrastructure represents an ongoing responsibility and that a dedicated fee would likely provide a more stable long-term funding source.

Councilmember Dane Searle

Councilmember Searle expressed support for establishing a dedicated funding source for street maintenance. Drawing on experience from another community, he noted that while capital improvement fees have been used elsewhere, he believed a Transportation Utility Fee was a more appropriate mechanism for roadway funding. He stated that his primary concern was understanding how the City could realistically generate sufficient revenue to address both immediate deficiencies and long-term maintenance needs.

He supported developing a long-range funding roadmap for future councils and observed that delaying implementation would only increase costs because of inflation. He indicated that he would prefer to see the City work toward eliminating the current funding deficiency within approximately three to five years, subject to the financial analysis provided by the upcoming study.

Councilmember Jennifer Christensen

Councilmember Christensen stated that it would be important for residents to understand that any Transportation Utility Fee would be supported by documented need rather than serving as an arbitrary charge. She observed that although the fee could legally be reconsidered in the future, roadway maintenance represents an ongoing obligation and should be presented to the public as a long-term investment in the City's infrastructure.

She also agreed that the proposed forty-year replacement cycle represented a reasonable maintenance standard given the City's available resources and that dedicating the fee specifically to transportation improvements would provide transparency by clearly identifying the purpose of the revenue collected.

Councilmember Adam Larsen

Councilmember Larsen stated that before determining fee amounts, the Council should first establish the desired level of service for maintaining the City's streets. He recommended identifying the annual funding necessary to maintain that service level and then creating a phased implementation plan that gradually increases revenues until the City reaches its long-term funding objective. He felt this approach would provide residents with a clear understanding of both the City's transportation needs and the rationale behind future rate increases.

Councilmember Larsen also noted that dedicating transportation revenues specifically for roadway maintenance would help protect those funds from being redirected to other municipal priorities in future years, thereby creating a more stable and reliable funding source for transportation infrastructure.

Councilmember Spencer Arave

Councilmember Arave expressed support for utilizing a Transportation Utility Fee rather than relying solely on property taxes to fund street maintenance. He observed that a utility fee would require tax-exempt properties, which also use the City's transportation system, to contribute toward roadway maintenance. He further commented that a dedicated transportation fund would help ensure that roadway improvements remain a priority and are less likely to be deferred in favor of competing budget needs.

Council Consensus

Council members generally agreed that the Transportation Utility Fee study should provide:

- An analysis of the appropriate roadway level of service.
- Revenue required to sustain that level of service.
- Options for phased implementation over several years.
- Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) calculations for residential and commercial properties.
- Revenue projections under various fee scenarios.
- Funding strategies to address both the existing maintenance backlog and long-term infrastructure preservation.

The Council agreed that no policy decisions should be made until the Transportation Utility Fee study is completed and reviewed. Staff was directed to proceed with the study and return with funding alternatives and recommendations for future Council consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 PM.