

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

6:00 p.m.

Council Chambers

8000 South Redwood Road

West Jordan, Utah 84088

COUNCIL: Mayor Jim Riding, and Council Members Alan Anderson, Dirk Burton, Zach Jacob, Chad R. Lamb, and Kayleen Whitelock. Council Member Chris M. McConnehey was excused.

STAFF: David R. Brickey, City Manager; Rob Wall, City Attorney; Joel Linares, Administrative Services Manager; Melanie Briggs, City Clerk; Scott Langford, Community Development Director; Bill Piper, Finance Director; Travis Johnson, Interim Deputy Parks Director; Brian Clegg, Interim Public Works Director; Clint Petersen, Interim Fire Chief; Kyle Shepherd, Deputy Police Chief; Brock Hudson, Community Preservation Director; Justin Stoker, Deputy Public Works Director; Cecelia Budd, Victim Assistance Coordinator; Lawana Sisam, Victim Advocate; Eric Montanez, Victim Advocate; Kent Andersen, Economic Development Director; Lynze Schoenbrunn, Volunteer and Events Coordinator; Dave Zobell, City Treasurer; Eric Okerlund, Budget Officer; Kent Page, Senior Planner; Steve Holmes, Battalion Chief; and Dave Murphy, Engineering Manager for Capital Projects Manager.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Riding called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Battalion Chief Steve Holmes of the West Jordan Fire Department.

III. PRESENTATION

**RECOGNITION BY APWA OF WENDELL RIGBY FOR RECEIVING
THE 2018 APWA EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR AWARD**

Dave Murphy introduced Marv Allen of the American Public Works Association. They explained that Wendell Rigby had done a great deal for the Public Works profession and was instrumental in implementing new programs and policies that improved public service. Wendell Rigby was presented with the award and made some brief remarks.

2018 WEST JORDAN VICTIM ASSISTANCE STATISTICAL UPDATE

Rob Wall introduced Cecelia Budd, Lawana Sisam and Eric Montanez of the City's Victim Advocate program. He explained that they were as good as any he had worked with in his

career. The group provided various statistics regarding the services they had provided the previous year.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS
CITY MANAGER COMMENTS/REPORTS

David Brickey –

- Explained that the staff was in the process of preparing for the August 14, 2018 Truth in Taxation public hearing

STAFF COMMENTS/REPORTS

Travis Johnson-

- Parks staff was ramping up in preparation for the Western Stampede in Veterans Memorial Park scheduled from June 30 through July 4.

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS/REPORTS

Councilmember Anderson –

- Expressed appreciation to the Parks Department for recently taking care of a tree issue on 4000 West.

Councilmember Jacob –

- Explained that personally, he was adamantly opposed to the gas tax increase that would be imposed upon the citizens by Salt Lake County. He wished to make it clear that when he discussed his position on social media or with reporters, he was not speaking for the Council as a body but only expressing his personal views. He went on to state that every councilmember was free to speak to the press as an individual; however, only the Mayor could speak for the Council and only once a majority of the Council had agreed on a position.

Councilmember Whitelock –

- Expressed a strong desire that the Council meet in a work session about the budget before the Truth in Taxation hearing on August 14.
- Expressed appreciation to the Streets Department and the job it had done in repairing the streets.

Councilmember Burton –

- Was enthusiastic about the upcoming Western Stampede and Rodeo.
- Asked the Council to consider having a City-sponsored scouting program. A majority of the Council was fine placing the item on the agenda for a future discussion.
- Discussed the potential of a bike share program similar to that in other cities. He wished to bring a proposal to the City Council at a future meeting.

Mayor Riding –

- Was interviewed earlier in the day, along with Paul Brockbank of the Fire Department, by Channel 4 to discuss West Jordan's fireworks restriction.

V. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Jeff Siites, described himself as a West Jordan Chamber ambassador, explained that his business was moving to West Jordan-- something that had been made possible through the efforts of the local Chamber and the City's Economic Development Department. He felt that the West Jordan Chamber was very well-organized and held many events.

Cory Payne, also stated he was an ambassador for the West Jordan Chamber. He felt they were interested in seeing that his business succeeded.

Megan Jakes of the Salt Lake County Children's Justice Center, expressed appreciation to the Council for considering a waiver of fees for their annual car show.

Mayor Riding suggested that because City Council meetings were now streamed live, it would be best if, rather than asking citizens to verbally provide their contact information, the speakers should provide that information in writing to the City Clerk.

David Brickey also asked that Ms. Jake's contact information be stricken from the record.

Nancy Franklin, Chairperson for the West Jordan Chamber of Commerce, explained that the Chamber Board had been working on a succession plan, and sought to strengthen economic development within West Jordan. She said that she understood that the Chamber's relationship with the City was key.

Pat Nell, Chamber Ambassador and part-owner of a West Jordan business, pointed out that the Chamber increased economic development in the City by targeting specific industries.

Leland Hocks, Chair-Elect of the Chamber's Board of Directors, stated this was a crucial time for the City as it was poised to become the fastest growing city in Utah. He explained that the Chamber was well aware that the City and Chamber needed to collaborate and build a mutually beneficial relationship. He stated that the positive effect the Chamber had on the City was not quantifiable.

Angela Waterbury, Chamber member and long-time City volunteer, discussed several events that were held by the Chamber.

Mayor Riding asked all those in attendance who were in support of the Chamber of Commerce to stand up so that the Council could be made aware of the number. He also asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak on a matter other than the Chamber of Commerce.

There was no one else who wished to speak. Mayor Riding closed the public comment period.

VI. CONSENT ITEMS

- a. **Approve Resolution 18-113, authorizing the Mayor to execute a General Service Contract, Request Number 6525047, with Rocky Mountain Power to provide electric service for a Water Metering Station and PRV in an amount not to exceed \$3,673.97**

- b. **Approve Resolution 18-114, accepting a warranty deed by the City for a 33-foot wide strip of land, a portion of a telecommunications tower access road, for use as part of a master planned road; namely, for a portion of 7800 South, west of U-111 and New Sycamore Drive**

Councilmember Burton pulled Consent item 6a for further discussion.

MOTION: Councilmember Anderson moved to approve Consent Item 6b. Councilmember Jacob seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 6-0.

VII. CONSENT ITEM DISCUSSIONS

CONSENT ITEM 6a

APPROVE RESOLUTION 18-113, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A GENERAL SERVICE CONTRACT, REQUEST NUMBER 6525047, WITH ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER TO PROVIDE ELECTRIC SERVICE FOR A WATER METERING STATION AND PRV IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$2,673.97

The Capital Facilities Group was designing a Water Metering and Pressure Reducing Station (PRV) at 3200 West 8990 South. This project was needed to supply water to a reservoir located on the Old Bingham Highway. The PRV station required 110 voltage electrical power to operate the lights, sump pump, security system, and SCADA system. Staff met with Rocky Mountain Power to assess the existing power infrastructure and to obtain a quote to deliver power to the PRV. The quote was attached to the staff report. Staff wished to proceed with obtaining power to the site for construction of the meter and PRV.

Councilmember Burton asked for clarification regarding the location of the project.

**MOTION: Councilmember Burton moved to approve Consent Item 6a.
Councilmember Lamb seconded the motion.**

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 6-0.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARING

**RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL
RESOLUTION 18-115, REGARDING A WAIVER OF FEES FOR THE
CHILDREN'S JUSTICE CENTER CAR SHOW AT VETERANS
MEMORIAL PARK, AUGUST 11, 2018**

Travis Johnson explained that The Friends of the Salt Lake County Children's Justice Center was a 501(c)(3) Nonprofit Charity established in 1993 to benefit child victims of crime by supporting the mission and purpose of the Children's Justice Center program. It was a group of concerned citizens that volunteered their time to manage all the non-profit activities.

The main purpose was to **educate** the community about the wonderful services at the Children's Justice Center so that child abuse victims could obtain access to caring help from expert staff.

The second purpose was to **raise funds** to support the program costs, client needs, equipment, furnishings, and facilities. One of their top funding priorities was for the child or teen to tell a trained professional about what happened to support specialized training for new caseworkers, detectives and prosecutors to gain advanced skills in interviewing child victims for their witness statements about the crime. These important interviews were the first experience for them so that healing and justice could begin. When the child or teen felt safe and supported during the interview process they could feel reassured that caring professionals were looking out for their best interest and help them gain access to counseling or expert medical care if needed.

The Day of Hope Car Show was their biggest fundraiser of the year and allowed the CJC to help serve child victims of crime and their families of Salt Lake County.

MISSION

To provide a comfortable, child-friendly atmosphere where children receive coordinated services during the child abuse investigative process.

Child abuse was a traumatic and devastating experience for both children and their families. Victims were often confused and blamed themselves. The Children's Justice Center (CJC) was a home-like, child-friendly facility where children received coordinated services during the child abuse investigative process by decreasing secondary trauma that might be caused by the criminal justice and child protection systems.

The Children's Justice Center was requesting nonmonetary contributions for the Day of Hope Car Show valued at \$3,960 as follows:

<u>Requested Item</u>	<u>Cost/Value</u>
• Police - K9 Demonstration, Vehicles (6 @ \$55 per hour)	\$1,650
• Police Chief and Fire Chief as Judges	\$0.00
• Mayor or designee to select a car award winner	\$0.00
• Fire Apparatus display (\$181 per hour) (5 hours)	\$905
• Post event information on City Website	\$0.00
• Post event information on lobby kiosk	\$0.00
• Display poster in city locations	\$0.00
• Share event information electronically / social media (\$10/boost)	\$20
• Park fees	
○ Deposit	\$500
○ Set up / Cleaning	\$150
○ Park Pavilion rentals:	\$225
○ Staff support (8a – 6p=10hrs) 10hrs x \$25	\$250
• Encroachment permit	\$260
• Permission to park cars on the park grass	\$0.00
TOTAL:	\$3,960

Mayor Riding opened the public hearing.

JayLynn Thomas, West Jordan resident and Victim Advocate of the Unified Police Department, spoke in support of granting the fee waiver on behalf of the children who were helped by the Children's Justice Center.

There was no one else who wished to speak. Mayor Riding closed the public hearing.

The Council and staff discussed clarifying questions regarding the event.

MOTION: Councilmember Burton moved to approve Resolution 18-115, waiving the fees associated with the use of Veterans Memorial Park for the Children's Justice Center Day of Hope Car Show on August 11, 2018. Councilmember Lamb seconded the motion.

Councilmember Jacob spoke in favor of the motion.

Councilmember Whitelock spoke in opposition to the motion, although she supported and appreciated the work of the Children’s Justice Center.

Mayor Riding spoke in favor the fee waiver.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	No
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 5-1.

**RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL
ORDINANCE 18-24, REGARDING A GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP
AMENDMENT FOR 9.47 ACRES OF PROPERTY FROM LOW DENSITY
RESIDENTIAL TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL; AND REZONE
FROM RR-.5D (RURAL RESIDENTIAL ½-ACRE MINIMUM LOTS)
ZONE TO PRD (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL ½-ACRE MINIMUM LOTS)
ZONE FOR BRINKERHOFF BLUFFS LOCATED AT 7653 SOUTH 1300
WEST; CANNON & COMPANY/GARY CANNON, APPLICANT**

Kent Page stated that the property owner Brinkerhoff Family Revocable Trust granted permission for Cannon and Company (Gary Cannon & Boyd Brown) to submit an application to amend the future land use map and an application to rezone property addressed at 7653 South 1300 West. (Exhibit D)

The Planning Commission held a Public Hearing April 17, 2018, but continued the item to the June 5, 2018 meeting.

On June 5, 2018 the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council to approve amending the General Plan’s Future Land Use Map for 9.87 acres from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential and to rezone this same 9.87 acres from RR-.5D to PRD (M) with a Senior Housing Overlay district.

Conditions to the Planning Commission’s June 5, 2018 motion were:

- 1) Applicant to secure the appropriate permission from the property owner. Staff had received this verification. (Exhibit D).
- 2) The concept plan in the (SHO) be modified to reflect a density that was appropriate with a PRD (M) zone with a density between 3.1 and 5.5 units per acre

within the (SHO) zone. (Exhibit E was the Conceptual Development Plan submitted by the applicant in response to this condition. Please see also the larger scale “Conceptual Development Plan” submitted as part of the proposed ordinance.)

3) Staff will make clean up corrections on the (staff) report. (Staff had made corrections.)

Since the April 17, 2018 and June 5, 2018 Planning Commission meetings, staff and the applicant had worked together to better fulfill the desires and requirements of: 1) the Planning Commission; 2) City Public Safety, Transportation, and Engineering standards; and 3) the intentions of the Planned Residential Development (PRD) zone and the Senior Housing Overlay (SHO) zones. (13-5C and 13-6H)

As part of a PRD rezone approval, the City must concurrently approve a concept development plan. (13-5C-2) Exhibit E was the latest concept development plan.

If this conceptual development plan was approved along with the proposed changes to the General Plan Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map, the application would need to demonstrate through a preliminary development plan that the proposed density was justified through 13-5J-10-B-2 & 3 (see section IV of this report).

If the land use map amendment and rezoning were approved, the applicant was proposing to subdivide the property and construct 18 Senior Housing dwellings and 20 single-family dwellings. The approximate density of the overall development (including the dedication of 0.55 acres for public-right-of-way along 1300 West) was 4.26 dwellings per acre. The approximate density of the area within the SHO district was 5.45 dwellings per acre, and the approximate density of the standard Single-family residential area was 3.56 dwellings per acre.

The subject property’s surrounding zoning and land uses were as follows:

	Future Land Use	Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	Research Park	BR-P	Agriculture
South	Low Density Residential & Transit Oriented Development	RR-.5D & P-C	Single-family Residential Apartments under construction
East	Public Facilities	P-F	South Valley Water Reclamation Facility
West	Medium Density Residential	R-1-8B	Single-family Residential

Section 13-7C-6: Amendments to the Land Use Map

According to City Code, Section 13-7C-6, any amendments to the general plan, including maps, shall be approved only if the following were met.

The application addressed all the required findings as a whole in two letters for this proposed Amendment to the Land Use Map and Rezone Findings in the April 17th meeting staff report.

Finding A: The proposed amendment conforms to and is consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the City General Plan.

Planning Staff Review: Statements, goals, and policies in the General Plan supported the current Low Density Residential remaining. (p. 18)

The General Plan said that lower density single-family residential uses were most preferred while a range of residential densities and housing types should be provided (p.23). The General Plan defined “Low density residential as 1 to 3.0 dwelling units per acre (p.24). The Future Land Use Map showed few properties, especially on the eastern side that were still designated for low density residential.

The City retained relatively few acres still zoned low density residential especially on the eastern side. However, given the slopes, natural year-round spring, the electrical transmission lines, and the opportunity to create a Planned Residential Development as presented in this concept development plan, Staff believed this proposed change was worthy to pursue in a Master Development Plan (13-5J-10-B-2 & 3)

Finding: The proposed general plan map amendment did and did not comply with the City General Plan; however, staff and the Planning Commission believed the proposed amendment complied more with than against the City General Plan.

Finding B: The development pattern contained on the land use plan inadequately provides the appropriate optional sites for the use and/or change proposed in the amendment. (See Comprehensive General Plan, pp. 23-32)

Planning Staff Review: The application did not address where else this proposed use could be adequately developed that was already zoned for this use.

It was a General Plan Residential Goal and policy to provide a safe and healthy, living environment for all citizens of the City and to ensure safety, accessibility, and walkability within and between neighborhoods (p.26). The official Future Land Use Map should accurately represent the future land use needs and goals of the City (p.19).

The application’s letters of intent somewhat addressed how the proposed land use amendment would support the goals of walkability to employment, shopping, and transit systems (pp. 27, 30; Exhibit G).

Staff could envision a person or a couple living in the Senior Housing in the same neighborhood as a child and his or her family. The mixes of ages and house sizes could be a good thing! (pp. 21, 30)

The circled street design had the positive feeling of a neighborhood. The concept plan (Exhibit C & D) showed a trail connecting onto the private road in the Colombo Apartments development; it would be nice for this trail to continue north as the City's Trails Master Plan designated on p. 34.

The application's proposal to incorporate a small year-round spring into an open space design, and to encourage a diversity of dwelling unit types and densities was exactly in keeping with the General Plan (pp. 21, 22, 29).

The concept plan demonstrated how design standards and a park could create and maintain an attractive residential sense of neighborhood. The design standards between individual properties should complement but not duplicate. [The Planning Division's Design Guideline Manual should be considered (p.28).] A unified attractive streetscape design should be developed. The Design Review Committee shall be expanded and encouraged (p.29).

The proposed land use amendment supported the General Plan's policy to provide for age-restricted housing (p.32).

Finding: Staff was not aware of other properties that were currently designated as medium density residential that were not already developed and were not also "nearby" a transit station, and which contained similar natural amenities for a PRD.

Finding C. The proposed amendment will be compatible with other land uses, existing or planned, in the vicinity

Planning Staff Review: Staff believed that the proposed amendment would be compatible with other uses, existing or planned, in the vicinity because it was adjacent to medium density residential to the west and transit oriented housing to the south.

The proposed amendment with its open space better utilized the slopes, natural spring/drainage, and high voltage power line areas than keeping the future land use as low density residential. The proposed open space also served as a good buffer between residences and the future land use to the north – Research Park. This proposed concept development plan could be an improvement to the neighborhood.

Staff questioned the desirability of living close to the west of a sewage treatment plant, even if the prevailing winds were from the south and the west.

Finding: The proposed amendment was compatible with other land uses, existing or planned, in the vicinity.

Finding D. *The proposed amendment constitutes an overall improvement to the adopted general land use map and is not solely for the good or benefit of a particular person or entity.*

Planning Staff Review: The application held the burden of proof that the proposed amendment constituted an overall improvement to the adopted general land use map and was not solely for the good or benefit of a particular person or entity.

The application contained the opinion of the applicant that medium density was more in-line with today's residential market demand yet, no market analysis was given.

The application included architecture for the proposed single-family homes (see Exhibit H).

Finding: The application's proposed amendment demonstrated an overall improvement to the adopted general plan.

Finding E. *The proposed amendment will not adversely impact the neighborhood and community as a whole by significantly altering acceptable land use patterns and requiring larger and more expensive public infrastructure improvements, including, but not limited to, roads, water, wastewater and public safety facilities, than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change.*

Planning Staff Review: The proposed amendment would not adversely impact the neighborhood and community as a whole by significantly altering acceptable land use patterns.

Engineering Staff Review: Engineering had no concerns how this proposed land use amendment and latest concept plan will affect utilities.

Finding: The proposed amendment would not adversely impact the neighborhood and community as a whole.

Finding F. *The proposed amendment is consistent with other adopted plans, codes and ordinances.*

Planning Staff Review: Staff was not aware of any other adopted plans, codes, and/or ordinances that were inconsistent with this request.

Finding: The proposed amendment was consistent with other adopted plans, codes and ordinances.

Section 13-7D-7(A): Amendments to the Zoning Map

Prior to making a positive recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Map amendment, the Planning Commission shall make the following findings:

Criteria 1: *The proposed amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the City’s General Plan.*

Planning Staff Review: The rezone application was to change the current RR-.5D (Rural Residential, 20,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area) to PRD (M) [Planned Residential Development, Medium density 3.1 units per acre to 5.5 units per acre (13-5C-3-A)] with a Senior Housing Overlay District Zone.

This question had essentially been answered already under “Finding A” above: the General Plan said that lower density single-family residential uses were most preferred while a range of residential densities and housing types should be provided (p.23).

The 2012 General Plan defined the Medium and Low Density Residential land use designation as follows:

“Medium Density Residential will include development providing for moderate intensity single-family attached/detached units as well as twin and town homes. Areas that should be designated as medium density residential uses should be preferred for infill development that are well buffered from commercial and industrial uses.” (Page 25)

“Low Density Residential will include development providing for low intensity single-family detached residential uses typically found in suburban and traditional neighborhoods.” (Page 25)

The General Plan says that lower density single-family residential uses were most preferred while a range of residential densities and housing types should be provided (p.23). The Future Land Use Map showed few properties, especially on the eastern side that were still designated for low density residential.

The following was the Residential Density table from the General Plan:

Residential Density - Adjusted Net Density		
Density Designation	Density Range (Dwelling Units Per Acre)	Zoning Districts
Very Low Density	Up to 2.0	All A, RR, RE Zones, PC, PRD
Low Density	1 to 3.0	RR, RE, R-1-12, R-1-14, PC, PRD
Medium Density	3.1 to 5.0	R-1-8, R-1-9, R-1-10, PC, PRD
High Density	5.1 to 10.0	RM, R-1-5, R-1-6, R-2, R-3-6, R-3-8, R-3-10, PC, PRD
Very High Density	10.1 and up	R-3-12, R-3-16, R-3-20, R-3-22, PC, PRD

Cr

Planning Staff Review: The application said that the applicant had met with neighboring property owners and that these property owners were supportive of this proposed rezone and concept plan. Staff had also heard that some adjacent property owners believed this rezone was not compatible and would adversely affect adjacent properties.

Finding: Staff believed the concept plan presented was compatible with surrounding land uses due to the terrain of this property, medium density residential to the west, and the P-C zoned, Transit Oriented Housing District to the south. Staff believed even greater compatibility could be achieved with a preliminary and final development plan.

Criteria 3: *The proposed amendment furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City.*

Planning Staff Review:

Staff had asked the applicant to more specifically address this question and to provide more evidence of the market for this rezone. Staff believed it was reasonable to believe that this proposal might possibly further the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City.

As stated earlier, and supported by the General Plan, this rezone's concept plan reasonably provided a safe and healthy living environment for all citizens of the city; however, greater interconnection between land uses was desirable for a concept plan. (p. 26) Detailed design would be required in a preliminary and final plat (p.27-30; 13-5C-7; 13-5J-10-B-2 & 3).

The proposed rezone's concept plan could establish community pride through the creation of an attractive, well-designed, and maintained neighborhood. (p.27)

One concern was what degree of confidence could the City have that the open space area would be "*adequately improved and maintained*" to make it a desirable place to be rather than just an un-kept remnant. (p.29)

Finding: The proposed amendment might further the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City.

Staff anticipated the applicant, staff, and the Planning Commission working through the above stated details if the City Council decided this proposed future land use map amendment and rezone were in the best interest of the City.

A March 27, 2018 letter from the applicant stated:

All interior homes and lots would be completely landscaped front and back and would be maintained by the Home Owners' Association as part of the (HOA).

The exterior single-family homes would include the front yard finished in the purchase price and would also be maintained by the HOA. The rear yards would not be completed at the time of construction or maintained by the HOA. However, they must be completed within 12 months of occupancy and would be able to be customized to individual home owner's tastes.

Great pride was being taken to preserve and maintain the natural amenity of a natural small stream that had run through the property for hundreds of years (from what we were told). We had also designed a two-acre community park that would be maintained by the HOA.

We were also looking at the implementation of the newest trend, "a fenced dog park" and were considering the addition of future gated RV storage on the premises (land permitting).

All interior roads would be built to City standard widths. The frontage along 1300 West would be adequate to meet city standards and all future development to the north and the south. This would help to minimize traffic impact.

The community park would be used by the new project as well as any neighbors within walking distance and would be treated as a walking park. Therefore, no additional off-street parking would be needed or encouraged.

Criteria 4: *The proposed amendment will not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.*

Planning Staff Review:

Engineering staff had commented that "there are no Engineering concerns pertaining to utilities or the latest road and lot layout." The Fire Department said that this concept plan provided adequate emergency access.

Finding: The proposed amendment would not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.

Criteria 5: *The proposed amendment is consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.*

Planning Staff Review:

The application's proposal for a Senior Housing Overlay Zone with a PRD zone was allowed per 13-6H-3.

Finding: The proposed amendment was consistent with the provision of any applicable overlay zoning district.

An application for a PRD shall particularly adhere to the Code requirements in 13-5C-7 and 13-5J-10-B-2&3.

The applicant had met with staff for a pre-application conference.

13-5J-10-B-2 & 3 gave the following instruction:

2. Master Development Plan: Following the initial preapplication conference and review of the conceptual master development plan, a master development plan shall be prepared and submitted. The intent of the master development plan is to illustrate the area(s) within a specific geographic boundary which are intended to be a part of a single, cohesive large development. In general, the master development plan is intended to act as a project's guiding document for all future development (consisting of sub-developments) where more detailed planning will follow with submittal and approval of subarea plans. The Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation to the City Council regarding the master development plan, where in turn, the plan shall then be approved, conditionally approved, or denied by the City Council. Upon approval, the master development plan shall be the sole guiding document for all subsequent development within the defined master plan area.

3. Preliminary Sub-area Development Plan: Following review and approval of the master development plan, the applicant/developer shall submit a subarea development plan, accompanied by all required application information.

It was during the subarea plan review process that bonus density might be awarded. Bonus density awarding and vesting could occur through the following methods:

a. Bonus Density Awarding:

(1) A subarea development plan shall be submitted either following or concurrent with the master development plan. The master development plan must accompany a separate preliminary subarea development plan. The preliminary subarea development plan will provide the framework and detailed information for each specific area (phase) within the project. The density bonus shall be awarded as part of the approval of the preliminary subarea development plan.

(2) To achieve bonus density awarding, the master development plan and/or the preliminary subarea development plan shall include the following information:

(A) Preliminary Subarea Development Plan Report: The preliminary subarea development plan shall cover the overall objective and direction of the proposed project ready for both density bonus awarding and approval.

The plan shall go into full detail of the intent of the project and shall give the City a clear idea of the resulting product. The report shall include the following information:

(i) Scope: An introduction to the development, which explains the land use and zoning characteristics, the overall project area, the number of proposed dwelling units, the number of phases, and the inclusion of mixed use areas, parks, schools, trails and special amenities.

(ii) Location: Location explanation, explaining the overall location of the project (where each phase is located in comparison to the approved master plan), and the location of differing proposed land uses.

(iii) Land Features: Description of the existing physical features of the land, such as the location of drainage canals, irrigation canals, floodplains, steep slopes, existing infrastructure, grade, ditches, easements, etc.

(iv) Improvement and Amenities Installation: Explanation in full detail (also using visual references if possible), concerning the intent to install development improvements and amenities. For those developments seeking density bonuses, improvements and amenities shall be in accordance with section [13-5C-8](#) of this chapter and section [13-5J-6](#) of this article. This portion of the report shall not only list those improvements and amenities to be installed for density bonus purposes, but explanation shall also be given as to how the required development improvements and amenities will be met and to what extent. This portion of the report shall explain which development improvements and amenities are being selected for density bonus purposes by the developer; wherein, it is essential that the report explain what effort will be made to meet each specific criterion. Since percentage points will be given for density bonus purposes based on the type of improvement and amenity being installed in a development, the report shall explain:

(a) Exactly how the criterion is being met.

(b) The purpose of the improvement or amenity.

(c) How the improvement or amenity serves the development and justifies an increase in density.

(d) What is being installed to meet the criterion (giving the number, type and/or placement of each type of improvement or amenity feature, i.e., how many traffic calming devices).

(v) Zoning Regulations: Explain how the City zoning regulations apply to the proposed development, detailing that either: standard zoning setbacks based on the type of structure will be met; or that setbacks will be determined in review of the development and approved by the City Council in their review of the preliminary development plan and/or the subarea development plan and the recording of the subdivision plat. This portion of the report shall also explain:

(a) Minimum and average lot area.

(b) Maximum and average height of each proposed structure type.

(c) Setback information based on garage placement. Upon request by the Zoning Administrator, a plan will need to illustrate how a specific dwelling type fits within the boundaries of a given lot without exceeding bulk and setback standards.

(d) Minimum living area per each proposed structure type.

(e) Maximum and average height of each proposed structure type.

(f) How the zoning requirements of this article and of this title in general are being met.

(vi) Buildings and Structures: Explain in detail the number and placement of each dwelling/structure type (i.e., single-family, two-family, multi-family, etc.). There shall be a direct reference on the plan to specific building types; wherein, building elevations shall be easily referenced.

(vii) Fencing and Wall: Explain all fencing/wall restrictions and/or requirements for the proposed development. Indicate placement, height, type and maintenance responsibilities. An elevation of each type of proposed wall or fence is required.

(viii) Lighting: Explain all pedestrian lighting restrictions and requirements for the proposed development. Indicate placement,

height, style and maintenance responsibilities. An elevation/profile of each type of proposed light, light base and fixture is required.

(ix) Public and Private Use Areas: Explain in detail those areas which will serve as either public or private use areas, be it for recreational, open space, park, school or public utility purposes. This portion of the report shall explain where maintenance responsibilities lie with respect to the use area.

(x) Landscaping: Explain in detail the proposed network of landscaping for the proposed project, identifying the location, amount and purpose of the landscaping (i.e., buffer, passive recreation, etc.).

(xi) Specification of Improvements for Reimbursement: Explain and specify all improvements, facilities and amenities to be funded, constructed and requested for City reimbursements within the development.

b. Preliminary Subarea Development Plan Drawings: Accompanied with the preliminary subarea development plan report, either as appendix items or inserted throughout the report, shall be detailed renderings and drawings of that area within the project ready for approval. The following information shall be provided:

(1) Updated and Approved Concept Plan: The detailed and approved copy of the City Council approved concept master plan. If the overall project is intended to be approved in phases, the attached concept development plan shall illustrate the overall master planned project area while outlining the phase which is being considered for preliminary subarea development plan approval and possible bonus density awarding.

(2) Existing Conditions: The existing land use and zoning surrounding the proposed development, showing the location of all abutting structures within a one hundred-foot (100') perimeter of the site (if any), inclusive of all abutting property owner names.

(3) Site Plan: A detailed preliminary site plan shall be submitted in accordance with this subsection B, and accompanied by the appropriate site plan checklist as provided by the Office of Development Assistance.

(4) Exterior Design: Exterior design drawings for all proposed residential and mixed-use buildings, structures, monuments and gateway features, presented as exterior perspectives or exterior elevations. All sides of every building or structure shall be presented for review and approval purposes. Example exterior elevations should be provided for all proposed structures, where also a building footprint for each lot shall be represented.

(5) Building Envelope: For residential developments, the preliminary development plan shall show the proposed building envelope of every lot in the subdivision, inclusive of lot dimensions.

(6) Street Layout: Street layout system inclusive of renderings of traffic calming measures. The design and cross section of each proposed roadway shall match that as proposed within the approved master development plan.

(7) Parking Layout: Dimensioned parking layout showing the location of individual parking stalls, all ingress and egress areas, emergency lanes, medians, etc.

(8) Existing Services: The location of existing services, including water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer, also indicating the availability of electricity and gas.

(9) Preliminary Subdivision, Condominium Plat: Copy of a legible preliminary subdivision or condominium plat in accordance with [title 14](#) of this Code, and accompanied by the appropriate checklist as provided by the Office of Development Assistance.

This application's proposed Future Land Use Map amendment from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential and Rezone from RR-.5D to PRD (M) shows substantial promise, through the conceptual development plan, in furthering the intent of the General Plan.

The Council and staff discussed clarifying questions.

Councilmember Anderson expressed concern about whether the canal would be able to handle a 100-year storm.

Councilmember Whitelock was concerned that the City was allowing homes to be built too close to the roadway and then requiring residents to give up their homes when the road was expanded in the future.

Kent Page responded that this project was taking the 1300 West expansion into account and that there would be sufficient space for four more lanes for vehicular traffic as well as two bicycle lanes.

Mayor Riding opened the public hearing.

Kelvin Green, West Jordan resident who lived close to the neighborhood in question, spoke in favor of the revised plan.

Jay Thomas, West Jordan resident, spoke in support of the project.

JayLynn Thomas, West Jordan resident, was very appreciative of how receptive this developer was to the neighbors' input and was in favor of the project.

Justin Stoker, West Jordan resident, employee and board member on the South Valley Water Reclamation facility, explained that the facility had some advanced odor-control technology that filtered out some of the smells one would typically expect to find at a waste-water treatment facility. Also, the City's development code required detention facilities, and that code was to be adhered to.

Gary Cannon, applicant and West Jordan business owner, explained that based on the concerns of neighbors and the Planning Commission, the density was reduced. He spoke highly of City staff for their efforts on this, the fifth revision of the project. Finally, he spoke in support of the West Jordan Chamber of Commerce, of which he was a member.

Mayor Riding closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Whitelock indicated that when the "water-wise" landscaping plans for the project were finalized, she wished to ensure that they included more than weeds and rocks.

MOTION: Councilmember Whitelock moved to approve Ordinance 18-24, regarding a General Plan Land Use Map Amendment for 9.47 acres from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential and Rezone from "RR-.5D" (Rural Residential 20,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area) to "PRD (M)" (Planned Residential Development, Medium density 3.1 units per acre to 5.5 units per acre) Senior Housing Overlay District Zone in Brinkerhoff Bluffs located at 7653 South 1300 West. Councilmember Anderson seconded the motion.

Councilmember Lamb spoke in favor of the rezone as long as the project concept did not change.

Councilmember Burton was undecided, wishing that the project would focus on a single type of unit and not be split between single family homes and senior housing.

Councilmember Whitelock pointed out that the mixed use could be ideal for some families.

Councilmember Anderson was in agreement with Councilmember Whitelock.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 6-0.

MOTION: Councilmember Lamb moved for a five-minute recess. Councilmember Whitelock seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The Council recessed at 8:19 p.m. and reconvened at 8:27 p.m.

**RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL
RESOLUTION 18-116, AMENDING THE BUDGETS FOR THE GENERAL
FUND, THE SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS, THE CAPITAL PROJECTS
FUNDS, THE ENTERPRISE FUNDS, AND THE INTERNAL SERVICE
FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-2018**

Bill Pyper turned the time over to Eric Okerlund who explained that several budget adjustments were needed in order to reflect new or revised activities since the development of the 2017-2018 budgets:

- The Police Department wished to appropriate \$80,000 from funding received from the State Asset Seizure program to increase Police Department operating expenditures.
- The Police Department wished to appropriate \$42,262 from funding received from the Federal Equitable Sharing program to increase Police Department operating expenditures.
- The Police Department had received \$3,722 from the Utah K-9 Ballistic Vest program, warranting a corresponding \$3,722 increase in Police Department operating expenditures.
- The City wished to appropriate \$15,000 from reserves to pay the costs associated with a parade float.
- The City wished to transfer \$50,000 from the General Fund to the Community Reinvestment Area 1 Fund as the first of three installments to fund the sales tax incentive that was provided to Smith & Edwards.
- The Police Department had received a grant of \$20,000 from the Utah Alcohol & Drug Free Committee for body or in-car camera systems, warranting a corresponding \$20,000 increase in Police Department operating expenditures.
- The City wished to make a technical correction to the Source of Supply line (purchased water) in the Water Fund in the amount of \$1,540,000. The funding source would be prior year reserves.
- The City had paid an additional amount on the KraftMaid SID bonds, requiring an increase in the amount of \$202,000 in the KraftMaid SID Fund for debt service expenditures.

- The City wished to transfer \$250,000 (\$125,000 grant received in a prior year from Salt Lake County plus an equal matching portion provided by the City) from the Capital Support Fund to the Building Capital Fund. This action would result in a net increase to the Capital Support Fund of \$247,400, since the currently budgeted contribution to reserves of \$2,600 would be eliminated and the use of prior year reserves would be established at \$247,400.

Councilmember Jacob asked if there were any items in this report that the Council had not addressed and approved previously.

Eric Okerlund responded that several had been previously approved but he could not say for certain that all of them had been.

Councilmember Whitelock wished to understand why the KraftMaid line item had increased substantially.

Dave Zobell explained that when KraftMaid moved in, the City had required that they make certain upgrades to the sewer, water and storm drain lines. Because impact fees came in since then, funds had been transferred towards debt service repayment on the RDA bond. Capital Projects had \$235,000 that could be put towards that repayment.

Mayor Riding opened the public hearing. There was no one who wished to speak. Mayor Riding closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Councilmember Jacob moved to approve Resolution No. 18-116, amending the budgets for the affected funds for Fiscal Year 2017-2018. Councilmember Anderson seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 6-0.

IX. BUSINESS ITEM

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST TO AMEND THE GENERAL LAND FUTURE LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT FOR .88 ACRES FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1085 WEST 9000 SOUTH FROM PROFESSIONAL OFFICE TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AND REZONE FROM A-5 (AGRICULTURAL 5-ACRE

LOTS) TO R-1-12 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL 12,000 SQUARE FOOT MINIMUM LOTS) ZONE; RIVER OAKS ESTATES, L.C./ROBERT BARRUS, APPLICANT

Scott Langford explained that this item went before the Council the previous year and that the Council had asked it to be returned to them for consideration in June 2018. There had been no contact from the applicant or property owner in the past year until the City Clerk had recently reached out to them and learned that they were in negotiation with a potential office builder. They therefore asked that the City table the item for one additional month so that negotiations might continue.

MOTION: Councilmember Jacob moved to table the item until the last City Council meeting in July as a Public Hearing. Councilmember Anderson seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 6-0.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RESOLUTION 18-117, REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER RATE INCREASES TO INCREASE REVENUE FOR DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE RATIO

Bill Pyper turned the time over to Dave Zobell who explained that at the direction of City Council, staff had been working to add four new water tanks to the City's system. Last year the City had bonded to purchase property and construct two new water tanks and this year, there were plans to do the other half of the project, and add two more tanks. The City needed to add the tanks in an attempt to eliminate the peaking charges that the City incurred when it had to purchase water during those high demand times of the day in the summer months. As the City increased in business and residential population, the need for additional water storage capacity increased.

Residential: 3/4" & 1" Meter Charge \$26.58 30.83 plus		
0-7,000 gal.	\$1.50	1.74/k gal.
7,001 - 20,000 gal	\$1.73	2.01/k gal.
20,001 and over	\$1.98	2.30/k gal.
Low Income: 3/4" & 1" Meter Charge \$26.58 30.83 plus		
0 - 7,000 gal.	No Charge	
7,001 - 20,000 gal.	\$1.73	2.01/k gal.
20,001 and over	\$1.98	2.30/k gal.
Low Income Discount - persons qualifying under Salt Lake County Circuit Breaker Tax Relief, receive the first 7k gal. each month free.		
Commercial: Meter Charge		
Meter Size	Demand Factor	Monthly Rate
3/4 inch	1.0	\$16.09 18.67
1 inch	2.5	\$40.24 46.68
1.5 inch	3.3	\$63.09 61.59
2 inch	5.0	\$80.46 93.32
3 inch	15.0	\$241.36 279.97
4 inch	32.0	\$614.87 597.25
6 inch	58.0	\$933.22 1,083.54
8 inch	87.0	\$1,399.83 1,623.80
10 inch	127.0	\$2,043.42 2,370.37

The rate increase would need to be implemented as soon as possible to maintain a smaller increase. It was anticipated that the increase would take effect for all utility bills created on or after August 1, 2018.

David Brickey explained that the Public Hearing would take place at a later date but that it was his hope that at this meeting, the Council could narrow down the issues of particular concern to the Council.

Councilmember Anderson pointed out that at \$1.50 per 1,000, West Jordan had the lowest rate in Salt Lake County. He wished to change to a calendar year rather than a fiscal year to help commercial entities budget more effectively. He wished the City to be more proactive rather than reactive. He also asked what the impact would be if the City were to delay the rate increase until the beginning of the calendar year rather than the fiscal year.

Dave Zobell responded that the cost would be just over \$1.75 million and the projects would be delayed by one fiscal year.

Mayor Riding and Councilmembers Whitelock, Lamb and Jacob agreed with Councilmember Anderson that long-term planning was necessary so that both residents and businesses could budget accordingly.

David Brickey stated that based on what he was hearing, it appeared that a public hearing on staff's proposal would be scheduled for the July 11 City Council meeting. He asked that any other questions or concerns held by the Council be brought forth at the current meeting. He also stated that the rate increase, if implemented, would be implemented city-wide simultaneously rather than at different times according to which quadrant of the City the customer was in.

Councilmember Whitelock asked that staff ensure that Dannon was notified by the Chamber.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RESOLUTION 18-118, REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SOLID WASTE RATE INCREASES TO INCREASE REVENUE FOR TIPPING FEES AT THE TRANSJORDAN LANDFILL

Justin Stoker explained that on January 24, 2018, the City Council approved a contract with ACE Disposal for solid waste collection and hauling. The solid waste contract was based upon a monthly per unit collection cost as shown in the following table:

	2013 Collection Rate	2018 Collection Rate	Percentage Increase Over Current Rate
1st Container Garbage	\$ 3.34	\$ 3.75	12%
2nd Container Garbage	\$ 2.15	\$ 3.00	39%
Green Waste	\$ 2.01	\$ 2.15	7%
Recycle	\$ 2.37	\$ 3.35	41%

Dumpsters	\$ 106.93	\$ 117.00	9%
Glass Recycling Roll Offs	\$ 258.24	\$ 350.00	36%
E-waste & Shred Event	Included	\$ 500.00	NA
Christmas Tree Pickup	Included	\$ 2,000.00	NA

Cost	Proposed Cost	Estimated Monthly Quantity	Estimated Annual Quantity	Annual Cost
1st Container Garbage	\$3.75	24,347	292,164	\$1,095,615.00
2nd Container Garbage	\$3.00	3,223	38,676	\$116,028.00
Green Waste	\$2.15	24,347	292,164	\$628,152.60
Recycle	\$3.35	24,602	295,224	\$989,000.40
Neighborhood Dumpsters	\$117.00		3,700	\$432,900.00
Glass Recycling Roll-offs	\$350.00		12	\$4,200.00
E-waste & Shred Event	\$500.00		4	\$2,000.00
Christmas Tree Pick-up	\$2,000.00		1	\$2,000.00
TOTAL:				\$3,269,896.00

Effective July 1, 2018, the City would have a new estimated annual cost of \$3,269,896. This cost was approximately 19% more than the \$2,744,652 annual amount of the previous contract. This was primarily due to the increased costs of recycling which issues had previously been presented to Council.

In addition, the Trans-Jordan Landfill had recently raised their costs for tipping fees at the landfill from \$14 per ton to \$16 per ton effective July 1, 2018. The landfill was also charging the City \$6 per ton of curbside collected green waste where previously there was no charge. These costs in total had increased from approximately \$605,844 per year to \$779,973 per year.

The new costs incurred by the City would become effective July 1, 2018. Based upon the FY17 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) the Solid Waste fund was already operating at an annual loss of \$105,393 per year. The CAFR identified a cash and cash equivalent balance of \$609,966 but an obligation of \$308,827 in accounts payable. That left available cash at \$301,139 as of June 30, 2017. While FY18 audited numbers were still a few months away, it was clear that the Solid Waste enterprise could not support an annual operating loss of approximately \$105,393, an increased amount in collection contract of \$525,244, and an increased amount in tipping rates of \$174,129. It was expected that costs would exceed revenue by \$804,766, based upon FY17 CAFR values. It was estimated that with current revenues and expenses, the Solid Waste enterprise fund would run out of cash in September or October of this year.

For Council reference, the following was a sample of current solid waste rate schedules for nearby cities:

Current Rate Schedule - Solid Waste

Midvale	\$ 12.66	garbage, recycling
Provo	\$ 19.00	garbage, recycling, green
Salt Lake City	\$ 21.00	garbage, recycling, green
Sandy	\$ 13.45	garbage, recycling
SL County (Wasatch Front Waste)	\$ 17.00	garbage, recycling, neighborhood cleanup
South Jordan	\$ 13.50	garbage, recycling
West Jordan (existing)	\$ 12.83	garbage, recycling, green, neighborhood cleanup
West Valley	\$ 14.50	garbage, recycling

* SL County (Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling) includes: Cottonwood Heights, Herriman, Holladay, Millcreek, Taylorsville, portions of Murray and Sandy, and the Metro townships of Copperton, Emigration, Kearns, Magna, and White City, along with unincorporated County.

** With exception of the County and West Jordan, all cities charge for dumpsters

*** Provo and SLC are the only other municipalities with curbside green waste pickup.

The Council had a variety of options to address the increased costs:

1. **Reduce service.** For example, eliminating the neighborhood cleanup programs could save \$432,900, removing the glass recycling program could save \$4,200, removing the e-waste/shred events or the Christmas tree pickup could save \$2,000 for each service eliminated.
2. **Charge for programs.** One option for consideration in new charges for service was again the neighborhood cleanup program. Currently, the program was free to residents. A charge of \$150 per dumpster, for example, could generate \$555,000 based upon the current usage of 3,700 dumpsters per year. Other options could be to charge for Christmas tree pickup, use of the e-waste/shred event, and cart replacement.
 - a. Note that charging for dumpsters would require a significant change in the dumpster program from a traditional neighborhood cleanup to personal cleanup when individual residents were renting the dumpsters. Residents that were renting dumpsters would expect exclusive access to the dumpster where they had traditionally not had such access.
 - b. Similar rentals in the commercial market were about \$400 per rental. All other municipalities that rented 30-yard dumpsters did so with a rental fee of \$130 (Sandy) \$120 + \$39 per ton of waste (Provo), \$170 (Riverton), and \$180 (Midvale).
 - c. West Jordan currently scheduled about 3,700, 30-yard roll off dumpsters per year. It was unclear the impact that charging for dumpsters would have to the quantity of dumpster requested.
 - d. As a sample of what other municipalities charged for special disposal fees included: \$10 for Christmas tree removal (may require an adjustment to the contract to removal three public drop off locations), \$65 for cart replacement, \$25 for use of the e-waste/shred event.

3. **Raise residential collection rates.** If no other options were taken, it was necessary to raise rates to a bare minimum of 23% (from \$12.83 to \$15.75) to continue to meet obligations. A rate increase of 25% or a rate change from \$12.83 per month to \$16.00 per month would be able to cover costs, support cost of living adjustments, and provide a small cash balance of \$100,000 per year, for the next several years.

Discussion and Action by Council:

- Council should first decide if there was the will to reduce any service aspects. Contract with ACE Disposal was written so that we only paid for services that we used.
- Council should then discuss the possibility of charging for services currently included in the service (i.e. Christmas tree pickup, neighborhood dumpster rentals, e-waste/shred drop-offs, cart replacement, etc.). Beyond the current number of 3,700 neighborhood dumpsters, no usage data was available for other services for estimating impact.
- Adjust rates to cover difference. Minimum current balance needed for FY18/19 was estimated at \$804,766. Subtract any anticipated new revenue sources. Adjust rates. Current rate was \$12.83 per month. Each \$1.00 added to solid waste rate added about \$292,000 of annual revenue. Finance Department had asked for at least 30-days to make the necessary material changes before new rates could become effective (meaning the earliest possible change would be August 1, 2018).

The Council and staff discussed clarifying questions regarding various options for solid waste, recycling, glass and green waste pick up.

Mayor Riding suggested that the City conduct a survey of residents to discern which programs were considered the most valuable to them; then present the resulting data to the Council as soon as possible.

MOTION: Councilmember Anderson moved to continue Resolution 18-118, returning to the second meeting in August with options specifically regarding the recycling and dumpster programs. Councilmember Jacob seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	No
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 5-1.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RESOLUTION 18-119, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE MEMBERSHIP AND SERVICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN AND THE WEST JORDAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ON A MONTH-TO-MONTH BASIS

Rob Wall explained that on June 13, 2018 at the request of Councilmember Burton, the City Council considered a renewal of its membership and the continuing of the City with the West Jordan City Chamber of Commerce. The current contract with the Chamber expired June 30, 2018. After discussion by the Council with representatives of the Chamber at the June 13 Council meeting, the City Staff was directed to revise the existing draft agreement to reflect a continued membership of the City in the Chamber on a month-to-month basis with a monthly membership payment of \$4,000.00 (which was the same annualized membership cost of \$48,000 for 2017-2018). On June 13, the Council also (i) voted to revisit the revised agreement during the June 27 Council meeting, and (ii) directed staff to explore and develop alternatives to the current relationship with the Chamber.

The proposed 2018-2019 agreement considered by Council on June 13, contained the same substantive provisions as the 2017-2018 fiscal year agreement currently in place. The revised draft of the 2018-2019 agreement, based upon discussion and direction by the Council given at the June 13 Council meeting.

For ease of review by councilmembers, staff had included two copies of the revised draft to be considered that evening (June 27). One copy showed redline changes made to the proposed 2018-2019 agreement to reflect Council discussion and direction from June 13; the other copy was a clean version of the same changes.

The cost to the City per the terms of the revised draft agreement is \$4,000.00 per month for a Platinum membership; the agreement by its terms could not extend beyond 12 additional months which would be a total expenditure of \$48,000.00, should the City continue its membership for an additional 12 months.

MOTION: Councilmember Burton moved to adopt Resolution 18-119, adopting the amendment of the existing Membership and Service Agreement between the City of West Jordan and the West Jordan Chamber of Commerce (month-to-month). Councilmember Jacob seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 6-0.

MOTION: Councilmember Anderson moved to direct staff to bring back options regarding the City's future agreement with the Chamber of Commerce by the Council to the August 8. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Lamb.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 6-0.

X. REMARKS

There were no additional remarks.

XI. CLOSED SESSION

DISCUSSION OF THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE, OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL; STRATEGY SESSION TO DISCUSS PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION; AND STRATEGY SESSION TO DISCUSS THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY, INCLUDING ANY FORM OF A WATER RIGHT OR WATER SHARES

COUNCIL: Mayor Jim Riding, and Council Members Alan Anderson, Dirk Burton, Zach Jacob, Chad R. Lamb, and Kayleen Whitelock. Council Member Chris M. McConnehey was excused

STAFF: David R. Brickey, City Manager, Rob Wall, City Attorney, and Joel Linares, Administrative Services Manager.

MOTION: Councilmember Burton moved to go into a Closed Session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual; a Strategy Session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and a strategy session to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, including any form of a water right or water shares, and adjourn from there. Councilmember Lamb seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Absent
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 6-0.

The Council recessed at 9:51 p.m. and convened a Closed Session at 9:55 p.m.

STRATEGY SESSION TO DISCUSS PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION

- 9:55 p.m. – 10:08 p.m.: R.W.
- 10:08 p.m. – 10:10 p.m.: A.E.

STRATEGY SESSION TO DISCUSS THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY, INCLUDING ANY FORM OF A WATER RIGHT OR WATER SHARES

- 10:10 p.m. – 10:20 p.m.: Property acquisition

DISCUSSION OF THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE, OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL

- 10:20 p.m. – 10:24 p.m.: Employee #1
- 10:24 p.m. – 10:27 p.m.: Employees #2 and #3
- 10:27 p.m. – 10:35 p.m.: Employee #4
- 10:35p.m. – 10:45 p.m.: Employee #5

XII. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.

JIM RIDING
Mayor

ATTEST:

MELANIE BRIGGS, MMC
City Clerk

Approved this 25th day of July, 2018