



EMIGRATION CANYON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

NOVEMBER 17, 2025, 7:00 PM

UNIFIED FIRE AUTHORITY STATION 119

5025 E. EMIGRATION CANYON ROAD, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84108

****DRAFT MINUTES – UNAPPROVED****

EMIGRATION CANYON CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES November 17, 2025

Council Members Present:

Joe Smolka, Mayor
Catherine Harris, Council Member
Robert Pinon, Council Member
David Brems, Council Member

Council Members Absent:

Jennifer Hawkes, Deputy Mayor

Staff Present:

Cameron Platt, Legal Counsel
Claire Gillmor, Legal Counsel
Diana Baun, City Recorder
Det. Dawn Larsen, Unified Police Department
Chief Bryan Case, Unified Fire Authority
Tamaran Woodland, Engineering Manager
Daniel Hoffman, Senior Accountant

Others Present:

1. Welcome and Determine Quorum

Mayor Joe Smolka, presiding, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and determined a quorum was present, noting that Council Member Jennifer Hawkes was absent from tonight's meeting.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. Recognize Visiting Officials - None

4. Public Comments

Jessica Steed, Resident, addressed the mayor and council regarding the proposed road widening project in the upper portion of Emigration Canyon. Jessica Steed stated that while road widening was often presented as a safety improvement, it frequently resulted in higher vehicle speeds and increased

EMIGRATION COUNCIL MEMBERS

MAYOR JOE SMOLKA, DEPUTY MAYOR JENNIFER HAWKES,
COUNCIL MEMBER CATHERINE HARRIS, COUNCIL MEMBER ROBERT PINON,
COUNCIL MEMBER DAVID BREMS

traffic volume, which could reduce safety rather than improve it. She explained that increased width would likely attract more users, including recreational traffic, leading to greater conflict among vehicles, cyclists, and residents. Jessica Steed stated that residents already experienced difficulty safely exiting driveways and navigating curves and that increased speed and usage would exacerbate those challenges. They further described concerns about the loss of the canyon's natural character, noting that widening would require cutting into steep slopes, removing established trees, and installing engineered retaining walls near the creek, resulting in permanent alteration of the natural corridor. Jessica Steed also stated that the project would directly affect residents by requiring portions of driveways, parking areas, and potentially garage space, disrupting landscaping, access, and daily living. She noted that residents could face years of construction, road closures, impacts to property values, and possible tax implications. Jessica Steed respectfully requested that the mayor pause efforts to secure additional funding until the public better understood the scope of the project and had an opportunity to provide meaningful input, and suggested alternatives such as signage and enforcement to address safety concerns without harming residents.

Laurie Engall, Resident, stated that they had lived in the community for 30 years and expressed appreciation for the community's willingness to engage in issues that did not directly affect all residents. She remarked that while the current issue did not impact them personally, it was still important and demonstrated community involvement. Laurie Engall drew a comparison to potential development along Pioneer Fork Road, explaining that although some residents might feel unaffected, environmental impacts, pollution, noise, construction traffic, and effects on wildlife would ultimately affect the entire community. She stated that the area represented one of the last large undeveloped spaces and emphasized that such matters should be of concern to all residents, not only those living nearby.

Mayor Joe Smolka noted that the preceding comment related to the agricultural zone and asked whether there were any additional public comments not pertaining to the agricultural zone.

Council Member Catherine Harris stated that they had two written public comments to enter into the record. They explained that a resident, Michelle Anderson, who lived near Sunnysdale Lane, had contacted some council members earlier in the summer and did not receive a response, later following up with additional communication. Council Member Harris stated that they had corresponded with Michelle Anderson and copied the full council and noted that the resident raised concerns about the lack of response from council members. Council Member Harris stated that this highlighted the absence of a formal process for acknowledging or responding to resident communications, which they believed should be addressed at a future meeting. Council Member Harris also reported receiving numerous phone calls, texts, and emails from canyon residents who experienced difficulty locating election information and candidate biographies online. They stated that while they directed residents to the appropriate website, the process should not have been so difficult for engaged and informed residents.

City Recorder, Diana Baun explained that the website containing candidate biographies was operated by the state and managed directly with candidates, not by the city, and that the city did not control that content. She stated that she was surprised to learn that ballots and related election paperwork did not include a reference to the website and said she intended to raise this issue with state officials at an upcoming meeting, noting that such information should be included in materials provided to residents.

Council Member Harris added that the link to the state-managed website was also not easily found on the Emigration Canyon website and stated that this issue would need to be discussed with Council Member Hawkes.

David Shurr, Resident, stated that he wished to reinforce the concerns raised by Jessica Steed regarding the road widening project. He expressed concern about a lack of transparency in the development of the plan and supported pausing further action. David Shurr stated that he would like engineers working on the project to present interim versions of the plan to the council and community so residents could better understand the proposal and provide input before the project advanced to a stage where changes would be difficult to make.

5. Presentation Items

A. Quarterly Financial Report

Daniel Hoffman appeared before the council to provide the required quarterly financial presentation in accordance with state regulations. He explained that the city had transitioned from a calendar-year financial system to a fiscal-year system recently, with the fiscal year running from July 1 through June 30, consistent with most government agencies in the state. The presentation covered first-quarter financial activity for the current fiscal year, spanning July through September. Daniel Hoffman stated that the city collected approximately \$132,000 in revenue during the first quarter and incurred approximately \$56,000 in expenses. This represented about 23% of the city's projected annual revenue and about 22% of the allocated annual budget. Daniel Hoffman noted that the figures presented differed slightly from the formal financial statements provided to council because intergovernmental transfer funds between the Municipal Services District (MSD) and the City of Emigration Canyon were removed for clarity, as those transfers represented internal movement of funds rather than true revenue or expenses. He explained that the city's primary source of revenue was sales tax, including sales tax collected on online purchases made by residents within city limits, which were distributed back to the city by the State Tax Commission based on purchaser address rather than zip code or population. Daniel Hoffman stated that the second-largest source of revenue consisted of state road funds, which were allocated based on the number and length of roads within the city. He stated that additional revenue sources included small amounts from engineering fees and building permits, though these were minimal. Major city expenses included payroll, legal fees, website management, utilities, and insurance, with insurance costs appearing higher early in the fiscal year because they were paid annually at the beginning of the year.

Council Member Catherine Harris asked how sales tax revenue was apportioned within the 84108 zip code, given that the zip code included areas outside Emigration Canyon. Daniel Hoffman clarified that sales tax distribution was based on whether a purchaser's address fell within city limits, not on zip code boundaries or per capita calculations. Council Member Harris stated that this clarification was helpful, particularly given the prevalence of online shopping among residents.

Council Member Robert Pinon asked whether the four-digit extension of the zip code was critical for accurate sales tax allocation. Daniel Hoffman responded that allocation calculations were handled by the State Tax Commission and that he would need to confirm the role of the extended zip code with them.

Daniel Hoffman reviewed year-to-date revenue figures, noting that approximately \$79,000 had been collected from sales tax and approximately \$25,000 from various road-related taxes,

including Class B and C road funds. He reviewed expense categories, reiterating that payroll, attorney fees, insurance, and administrative costs comprised the bulk of expenditures. Daniel Hoffman explained the city's fund structure, identifying the main general fund and two additional funds. The Emigration Canyon Community Council fund had minimal activity during the quarter, limited to a small painting-related expense. He also described the council-designated fund, which held money restricted for specific Emigration Canyon purposes, such as grants, and noted that no expenditures had occurred from that fund during the current fiscal year aside from interest earnings.

Council Member David Brems asked when the recently adopted energy use tax and communications tax would begin generating revenue and where those funds would appear in the financial reports. Daniel Hoffman asked for the adoption date, and Cameron Platt stated that the taxes were approved on October 3, with an anticipated start date of January 1. Daniel Hoffman explained that there was typically a one- to two-month delay before funds were received and that revenue would likely begin appearing in March or April. Daniel Hoffman stated that these revenues would be deposited into the council-designated fund because they were specific to Emigration Canyon.

Council Member Brems asked whether the energy use tax and communications tax were collected monthly or annually. Daniel Hoffman responded that collection frequency varied by utility, with energy providers such as Rocky Mountain Power and Questar remitting payments monthly, while some communications providers remitted quarterly.

Daniel Hoffman invited council members to contact him with any additional questions. Joe Smolka stated that members of the public with questions regarding the financials could contact Diana Baun, who would coordinate responses with Daniel Hoffman.

6. Stakeholder Reports

A. Unified Police Department

Detective Dawn Larsen reported on law enforcement activity for the month of October and stated that officers responded to 42 calls for service. Det. Larsen noted that several contacts involved individuals camping in vehicles within the canyon. She reported that officers responded to a lewdness call in Killians Canyon near the fire station turnaround after a complainant reported seeing a naked individual; however, the individual was not located and officers were unable to follow up because the complainant did not return phone calls. She also reported on a Halloween party call in which officers responded to a residence where approximately 40 teenagers were present. The parents were home and claimed they were unaware of underage drinking, but officers detected the odor of alcohol coming from the basement and addressed the situation accordingly. She further reported being contacted by a veteran interested in organizing a motorcycle ride through the canyon in May. Det. Larsen stated that they provided information on the permit process and discussed requirements related to legal operation and noise concerns, and the individual indicated they would comply and planned to apply for a permit for a ride anticipated around mid-May.

B. Unified Fire Authority

Chief Bryan Case stated that the report would be brief and summarized five calls for service handled by Unified Fire Authority. Chief Case reported that one call in late October involved a flood assessment at Camp Kostopulos, noting that the cause of the flooding was identified and the situation resolved on its own without the need for mitigation by fire crews. He reported that another call involved a possible gas leak on Little Mountain, where crews determined the issue was likely a blow-off valve releasing excess pressure and that no hazard was present. Chief Case stated that there was one call for medical assistance and two calls to the same address related to carbon monoxide incidents. He noted that this time of year was a reminder for residents to be attentive to maintaining functional smoke alarms and carbon monoxide detectors in their homes.

C. Salt Lake County Animal Services

Gary Bowen reported that the regular quarterly meeting was held approximately two weeks earlier and that headquarters offices were still undergoing remodeling, though an in-person meeting was possible. Mr. Bowen stated that they attended in person while most participants joined via Zoom. He reported that they received a service-level report related to services performed at Emigration Canyon and forwarded that report to each council member. He stated that the only follow-up after the meeting involved contacting Joe Smolka regarding discussion of pending state legislation. Mr. Bowen explained that a bill sponsored by the area's state senator, who was also a resident of Emigration Canyon, concerned first responders and would elevate animal services enforcement personnel to a level comparable to police, fire, and ambulance services. He stated that it was suggested that Council Member Hawkes be invited to attend one or two council meetings per year to help develop a stronger working relationship and improve communication regarding legislation being considered by the state legislature.

D. Land Use Updates

Claire Gillmor reported that the Planning Commission reviewed a subdivision application submitted by Evan Glassman and voted to continue the item to December 11. Ms. Gillmor stated that the Planning Commission had asked several questions and requested additional information, and that staff were working to provide the requested information for the commission's continued consideration.

7. Project Updates

A. Engineering Updates

Tamaran Woodland introduced herself as the Assistant City Engineer for Emigration Canyon and presented an overview of five active or pending projects in the canyon. Ms. Woodland explained that the purpose of the presentation was to inform the council, noting that some of the projects might be new information. She stated that they would review each project individually.

Tamaran Woodland explained that the first project was the Municipal Services District Transportation Master Plan, which was a comprehensive plan covering all MSD communities. Ms. Woodland stated that a consultant had been contracted and that the benefit of a district-wide plan was the ability to rank and prioritize projects across all participating municipalities, which would assist with future capital improvement budgeting. She stated that an asphalt condition assessment was a key component of the plan and that assessments had begun in the canyon areas first due to elevation and seasonal weather considerations, with the intent to complete as much work as possible before snow. She stated that the most recent update indicated the work would begin within the following week, though a more current status update was expected after an upcoming meeting.

Council Member Catherine Harris asked who the consultant or company performing the transportation master plan work was and noted that residents frequently asked who to contact regarding the project. Ms. Woodland stated that they would email the council with that information and clarified that inquiries should be directed to them. Ms. Woodland confirmed that a report would ultimately be produced as part of the process and emphasized that the project was still in the very early stages.

Tamaran Woodland next discussed the Emigration Canyon road improvement project and acknowledged significant public concern. Ms. Woodland stated that the study had not yet begun and that no consultant had been selected. She explained that the original grant application submitted through the Wasatch Front Regional Council included a scope with both uphill and downhill five-foot bike lanes. They were pushing back on that scope, particularly the downhill bike lane in constrained areas, and were working with the Wasatch Front Regional Council to modify the scope before executing any agreements. She emphasized that no agreements had been signed, no study work had commenced, and no public process had been developed yet. Ms. Woodland stated that a public open house and public information process would occur once the study officially began.

Tamaran Woodland then provided an update on the Emigration Creek culvert projects, stating that plans and specifications were approximately 90% complete and that temporary construction easements were still pending. Ms. Woodland explained that delays were due to staffing constraints and the departure of a former project manager, noting that they were currently responsible for advancing the easement process. She addressed questions regarding why the culverts were being replaced rather than lined, explaining that the issue was not solely related to structural condition but also to capacity. She Woodland stated that flooding events had demonstrated that the existing culverts were undersized and exceeded capacity, necessitating replacement rather than lining.

Joe Smolka asked for clarification on the locations of the culverts. Ms. Woodland stated that the culverts were located on Skycrest Lane, Cedar Loft Lane directly across the street, and a smaller culvert in Killians Canyon. Ms. Woodland stated that the Skycrest Lane and Cedar Loft Lane culverts were substantially larger and that construction was anticipated for the following fall due to the missed construction window earlier in the year.

Tamaran Woodland then discussed the Freeze Creek wall reconstruction project, stating that it had been identified by MSD engineers in January and funded by the MSD. Ms. Woodland stated that no work had occurred yet and that a design contract would be forthcoming. Council Member Catherine Harris clarified that the project was near Marguerite Lane, and Mayor Joe Smolka added that it was located just above where Marguerite Lane ended, in an area where retaining walls had failed. Ms. Woodland concluded by providing an update on the Emigration Canyon FEMA flood map update. The update had been completed and submitted to FEMA and had gone through multiple rounds of revisions in response to FEMA requests. She stated that the process was now awaiting FEMA's response and that delays were occurring at the federal level.

B. Other City Updates - None

8. Consent Agenda

A. Approval of Meeting Minutes

i. October 28, 2025 City Council Meeting Minutes

Council Member Catherine Harris stated that she had attended the previous month's meeting via Zoom and experienced difficulty accessing the meeting, which resulted in missing part of the discussion. Council Member Harris stated that she was trying to locate the minutes and raised a concern about a reference to a comment allegedly made by her in May that did not appear in the printed official minutes. She explained that she did not recall making the specific comment and asked for clarification on what was required to be included in official minutes. Council Member Harris stated that all meetings were recorded and asked whether the recordings constituted the definitive record of what occurred. She noted that the issue had been raised during the first public comment in the referenced minutes and involved a statement attributed to them regarding a process for variances.

Council Member David Brems stated that the reference indicated that Council Member Harris, in the draft notes, was requesting a process for allowing property owners to seek a variance and that this was being cited as coming from the May 26 meeting minutes.

City Recorder Diana Baun stated that the reference was to the May 26 draft minutes, which indicated that Council Member Harris had asked about a process for allowing property owners to seek a variance and that the city attorney had responded. Ms. Baun explained that the concern raised was that these remarks did not appear in the official minutes filed with the State of Utah.

Council Member Harris stated that she was only reviewing what was written in the minutes and reiterated that she did not recall the specific exchange. She emphasized that the question was for their own understanding and related to transparency, noting that all meetings were recorded.

Diana Baun explained that minutes were required to be a summary of the meeting rather than a verbatim record. Ms. Baun stated that while the minutes she prepared for the city tended to be more detailed than those of many other municipalities, they were still summaries. She

stated that council members were welcome to request additions or clarifications to the minutes if something important was omitted and noted that council members had done so in the past.

Council Member Harris stated that the explanation was helpful and reiterated the importance of transparency. She acknowledged that recordings were publicly available and constituted the full record and commented that she believed the minutes were thorough and appreciated the level of detail provided.

Council Member David Brems stated that the minutes reflected what was said and were not a statement of fact, and thanked staff for the clarification.

Cameron Platt, Legal Counsel, clarified that under the Open Meetings Act, minutes were required to summarize what was discussed. Mr. Platt stated that if there was a dispute or discrepancy regarding the content of the minutes, the audio or video recording would be used to resolve it. He explained that council comments were generally not required to be included in detail unless related to voting, ordinances, resolutions, or applications, and stated that the purpose of the minutes was to provide the public with a summary of the meeting, with recordings available for further detail.

Council Member Harris stated that the explanation addressed her concerns.

Council Member Pinon moved to approve the October 28, 2025 City Council Meeting Minutes as published. Council Member Brems seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor with Council Member Hawkes absent from the vote.

9. Public Hearing Items

A. Application for an Agricultural Protection Area

Applicant Ryan Leick addressed the council remotely and apologized for not being able to attend in person due to work travel. Mr. Leick stated that when the agricultural protection area (APA) proposal was first submitted, he did not anticipate it becoming controversial and emphasized that the intent was to protect the property and demonstrate a commitment to stewardship rather than development. He stated that he purchased the property five years earlier and described himself as a fifth-generation farmer and an academic with a professional focus on research, conservation, and watershed protection. He explained that his goals for the property included conservation-oriented agricultural research, limited agricultural production, wildfire risk mitigation, habitat restoration, and allowing controlled recreational uses such as hiking and hunting, consistent with agritourism principles. He stated that preserving water quality within the drinking water source protection zone and minimizing impacts to sensitive watershed areas were primary objectives. He described historic impacts to Emigration Canyon, including long-term sheep grazing, wildfire risk, and invasive weeds, and stated that proposed conservation and agricultural activities were intended to mitigate those impacts. Mr. Leick referenced historic flooding and wildfire events and noted that the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service had funded over \$200,000 in conservation projects on the property, some of which had already been completed. He stated that additional projects had been delayed pending approvals, but emphasized that agricultural use on the property had already

been approved through a permitted use application submitted in 2021, including conservation activities and beekeeping. He stated that future structures and infrastructure would still require site plans and permits and that the APA was not intended to approve new uses, change zoning, or affect access rights. Mr. Leick explained that an APA was a voluntary, owner-initiated designation intended to preserve land for agricultural production and prevent development beyond what was allowed under existing zoning. He stated that the property would remain in the forest recreation zone and that the APA would not interfere with ongoing zoning ordinance updates. The APA would allow the council to impose restrictions on agricultural practices, including limitations on livestock and non-native species. He addressed statutory criteria for an APA and stated that, in his view, the property met those requirements, including current and future agricultural viability, limited but profitable production, and alignment with conservation-focused agricultural trends. Mr. Leick acknowledged concerns raised in the Planning Commission report but stated that agricultural use was already permitted in the current zone and that taxes and required filings had been completed. He stated that he respected the council's discretion to deny the proposal and clarified that his purpose was to explain intentions and address concerns.

Council Member Catherine Harris asked for clarification regarding paperwork shared with the council related to Emigration Improvement District (EID) and whether the document reflected Mr. Leick's presentation or a recommendation from the EID board. Mr. Leick responded that the materials reflected best practices they proposed to address EID concerns and stated that while EID was required to make recommendations due to the drinking water source protection zone, any formal comments would come from the Department of Health, and he was not aware that such comments had ultimately been submitted.

Council Member Harris asked additional questions regarding exhibits related to USDA grant funding and confirmed the approximate funding amount. Mr. Leick clarified that the funding was provided through the Natural Resources Conservation Service and consisted of two grants covering approximately 13 individual projects through 2028, noting that some timelines might be extended due to planning delays. Council Member Harris asked whether the grants were independent of the council's decision. Mr. Leick stated that the grants were in place, subject to required approvals and processes, and that projects tied to the October 3 MSD approval for permitted agricultural use could proceed accordingly.

Council Member Pinon moved to open the public hearing for the item noted above. Council Member Harris seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor with Council Member Hawkes absent from the vote.

Mayor Joe Smolka opened the public hearing and stated that the council had received Ryan Leick's report and the written public comments submitted prior to tonight's meeting. He asked speakers to avoid repeating comments already submitted, indicating the council had read the materials and wanted to focus on any new information.

Paul Brown, Resident, stated he was the current president of the Emigration Oaks Board of Trustees. Mr. Brown stated that Emigration Oaks included approximately 225 homes and lots and was located downhill and downstream from the parcel subject to Ryan Leick's application.

Mr. Brown requested that the council deny Ryan Leick's request to designate the property as an agricultural protection area, citing reasons detailed in written comments submitted by the HOA's legal counsel and additional resident letters opposing the request, and urged the council to consider the Planning Commission's recommendation to deny. Mr. Brown asserted that the application did not meet Utah Code standards for establishing an agricultural protection area, stating that historical grazing had ended decades earlier, the applicant lacked a reasonable expectation of profit, the property was not viable for agriculture, and the described activities were not permitted within the forestry and recreation zoning. He stated that activities such as beekeeping, berry gathering, and sap harvesting did not establish that the applicant operated a farm and argued that the applicant had not provided production costs or a business plan supporting profitability. He stated that if profit expectation were ignored, many properties in Emigration Canyon could potentially qualify, which Mr. Brown said would be inconsistent with state law and the city master plan. He further stated that the parcel was landlocked with no surface access and alleged that Ryan Leick proposed to construct a 12-foot-wide all-weather road using private roads and crossing properties associated with Emigration Oaks, Salt Lake City, and the Emigration Canyon Improvement District along Freeze Creek. Mr. Brown stated that such a road would damage Freeze Creek, increase pollution, and increase wildfire risk, and referenced reports and photographs alleging open fires and a burn barrel on the property. He stated that Emigration Oaks had consistently denied permission for access across its property for purposes including constructing a road, transporting workers or livestock, agritourism activities, or transporting agricultural products, and again urged denial.

Fredrick Albrecht, Resident, stated he could not distinguish the proposal from homesteading and asked what the difference was, and stated agreement with Paul Brown's comments, describing them as rigorous and persuasive.

Mike Hillburg, Resident, characterized the issue as a conflict between an assertion of property rights and the rights of canyon residents. Mr. Hillburg stated that if there was no established legal access, then access was illegal, and asserted it was improper to claim property rights while violating others' rights.

Dave Nimkin, Resident, stated a concern based on their reading of the agricultural protection area statute. Mr. Nimkin stated that the designation appeared to allow an owner to circumvent the authority of regulatory bodies and might limit the ability of the Planning Commission or City Council to regulate future proposals. Mr. Nimkin requested legal clarification regarding the extent of those impacts.

Claire Gillmor, Legal Counsel, responded that Dave Nimkin's observation was accurate and cited Utah Code 17-81-302 regarding limitations on local regulations within agricultural protection areas. Ms. Gillmor stated that a political subdivision could not change zoning designations or regulations affecting land within an agricultural protection area without written approval from all landowners within the agricultural protection area affected by the change, and stated that the city council's ability to change zoning affecting the parcel would be limited without Ryan Leick's consent.

Roger McQueen, Resident, stated that Ryan Leick appeared to be a good person but characterized the proposal as unrealistic. Mr. McQueen stated that Ryan Leick was asking others to support development without existing infrastructure and questioned the need to build a road and accept the associated impacts described in the written materials.

Brad Peterson, Resident, stated he had known Ryan Leick for approximately 10 years through church. Mr. Peterson described Ryan Leick as a nice person and stated that the matter had escalated too far. Mr. Peterson stated that Ryan Leick owned the land and was not leaving, described Ryan Leick as primarily walking to the property and using it personally, and stated they had not previously understood Ryan Leick to be seeking road construction. Mr. Peterson questioned the amount of money being spent on attorney fees and stated that Ryan Leick had offered to pay HOA fees to park in the area. Mr. Peterson stated that the HOA had pushed the situation and that Ryan Leick was being pressured, including by monitoring of license plates when entering the area, and stated that Ryan Leick would likely continue to access the property by other means if access through the HOA remained unavailable.

Leanne Brandt, Resident, stated she lived next to the walking trail and that her family owned agricultural land in another state. Ms. Brandt stated that agriculture was not benign and had significant impacts on neighboring residents and surrounding land and advised the council to treat agricultural designation as a significant allowance.

Mayor Joe Smolka asked the public in attendance if they had any additional comments, and after no response stated that the public comment portion of the public hearing was ready to be closed.

Council Member Catherine Harris requested to speak during the public hearing and thanked Ryan Leick, the Planning Commission, and the public for their participation. Council Member Harris stated that approximately 165 letters had been received, that many were jointly signed, and that the letters were thoughtful and time-consuming for residents to prepare. She stated that Ryan Leick's application was extensive and reflected significant effort. She attended the Planning Commission hearing and expressed appreciation for the commission's work, and stated gratitude for public engagement and attention to community issues. Council Member Harris stated that the council had read every letter and that they had taken notes on each letter. She then requested to ask Ryan Leick a question within the public hearing. She asked what Ryan Leick would be unable to do if the agricultural protection area designation were denied, stating that she had difficulty identifying what activities would be prohibited without the designation, aside from the implications for oversight. Ryan Leick responded that the agricultural protection area designation would not change the agricultural uses proposed because agricultural permitted uses had already been approved in part and remained under review in part. Mr. Leick stated that the primary effect of an agricultural protection area would be to lock in zoning for a 20-year period. He stated that the designation could also allow the city to impose restrictions on agricultural practices that would not otherwise be available through permitted use, including limits on fertilizers and herbicides and restrictions on crop types to avoid non-native introductions. Mr. Leick stated that Terry Camp of the Utah Farm Bureau Federation was present online and could provide additional context.

Terry Camp stated he was the Vice President for Public Policy for the Utah Farm Bureau Federation and stated that Ryan Leick was an active member of the Salt Lake County Farm Bureau. Mr. Camp stated that Utah's agricultural protection area statute was intended to uphold landowner rights to use property for agriculture while respecting environmental and community values. He stated that agricultural protection areas provided protections related to eminent domain, asserting that utilities or infrastructure projects such as power lines and pipelines were subject to additional requirements and public process when affecting agricultural protection areas, including showing there were no viable alternatives. He stated that apiculture, orchards, and related activities constituted agriculture and referenced the importance of beekeeping in Utah. Mr. Camp stated that agritourism was a growing industry in Utah and described it as a way to bring community members onto agricultural lands to learn about agricultural practices. He stated that agricultural protection area designations lasted 20 years and could be reviewed at the end of that period, allowing the landowner and community to reconsider continuation or adjustments based on local input. Mr. Camp cited examples in which agricultural protection areas had influenced routing decisions for transportation projects and stated that such protections could be a consideration for the city.

An audience member asked Terry Camp how many landlocked agricultural areas existed without legal access and questioned how farming could occur without legal access or infrastructure.

Terry Camp responded that it was his understanding that Ryan Leick accessed the property by hiking through Forest Service land but acknowledged that Mr. Leick did not have road access or a private right-of-way across neighboring private land. Mr. Camp stated that the access issue was a valid concern and referenced an ongoing court case, and stated that his remarks were limited to the agricultural protection area designation rather than the access dispute.

Council Member Harris moved to close the public hearing for the item noted above. Council Member Brems seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor with Council Member Hawkes absent from the vote.

10. Council Business

A. Application for an Agricultural Protection Area

Mayor Joe Smolka stated that the next step was for the council to discuss the required statutory factors and determine how to proceed. Mayor Smolka referenced the Planning Commission's comments addressing five areas, including whether the land was currently being used for agricultural production, whether the land was zoned for agricultural use, whether the land was viable for agricultural production, the extent and nature of existing and proposed farm improvements, and anticipated trends in agricultural and technological conditions. He asked council members to comment on those factors.

Council Member Catherine Harris stated that discussion should proceed in the same order as the Planning Commission report and that the council should consider whether it agreed with the Planning Commission recommendation. Council Member Harris stated that she had the Planning Commission report available to share.

Mayor Smolka directed that the Planning Commission report be displayed for the council and public to view on the TV and began with the first factor, whether the land was currently being used for agricultural production. Mayor Smolka stated that Ryan Leick asserted agricultural use was occurring, but he stated that he had been unable to find evidence supporting that claim, including through review of business licenses and the application materials, and stated that no documentation had been provided to substantiate current agricultural production.

Council Member Harris stated that some beekeeping activity was occurring and noted that beekeeping occurred on other properties in the canyon. Council Member Harris stated that they did not know whether the bees referenced were native or imported and stated they were unfamiliar with the “Slovenian bee houses” described in the application. She stated that sap harvesting could be considered agricultural production but expressed uncertainty about the suitability of bigtooth maples for sap production and stated she had no information regarding whether sap collection could damage trees, noting that maple syrup production in the northeastern United States required careful monitoring. Council Member Harris stated concern that approval of an agricultural protection designation would reduce oversight of experimental activities and stated that experimental activities should have oversight.

Mayor Smolka moved to the second factor regarding whether the land was zoned for agricultural use and stated that the property was zoned FR-20 and that agriculture was a permitted use within that zone. Mayor Smolka characterized the request as shifting the practical effect of the zoning designations. Council Member Harris stated for completeness that she agreed with all eight points in the Planning Commission’s discussion of the first factor and added that she did not have a clear definition of agritourism but understood it to involve bringing in nonlocal visitors and suggested that this resembled commercial activity, which the property was not zoned to allow. Council Member Harris stated there was not substantial agritourism occurring currently.

Mayor Smolka noted an error in the Planning Commission report display and read the conclusion under the second factor that the land was not zoned for agricultural use, though agricultural use was permitted under FR-20, and that the applicant’s proposed agricultural industry and business uses were not currently allowed under the city code definition of agriculture. Claire Gillmor stated that there was no definition of “agritourism” in Emigration Canyon code or state law and explained that the zoning analysis depended on the city code’s definition of agriculture, which was limited to tilling soil, raising crops, horticulture, and gardening, and excluded keeping or raising domestic animals or fowl other than household pets and excluded agricultural industry or business uses. Ms. Gillmor contrasted this with the state statute’s definition of “agricultural production,” which referred to commercial production of crops, livestock, and livestock products, and stated that the city’s definition of agriculture was narrower than the state definition relevant to agricultural protection areas.

Council Member Harris asked whether, if an agricultural protection area were designated, the Utah Code definition would supersede the city definition. Claire Gillmor stated that, in her opinion, it would. Ms. Gillmor also stated that the city could impose conditions or restrictions through the approval process, describing those as modifications to the proposal.

Mayor Smolka moved to the third factor, whether the land was viable for agricultural production, and stated that based on the city code definition involving tilling and crop production, the steepness of the hillside suggested it was not viable, though Mayor Smolka stated they were not a farmer. Council Member Harris stated that growing conditions in the canyon were difficult, citing short growing seasons and high water demands, and stated she was not aware of a history of farming at the subject location. She referenced lingering physical remnants from historical sheep-related infrastructure and stated concern that disturbances or development without oversight could leave long-lasting impacts on the landscape. She stated that while some goals described by the applicant were laudable, they did not see the need for a designation that would reduce oversight, and stated agreement with the Planning Commission's points on viability.

Mayor Smolka referenced Planning Commission points under the third factor, including that there was no current access to the subject property for firefighting, emergency services, agricultural operations, or waste removal, and stated that lack of access was significant. Council Member Robert Pinon stated concern with a point in the report regarding biochar and the risks posed by the location and access limitations.

Council Member Harris stated additional concern about proposals for orchards and the potential introduction of non-native plants, describing past difficulties in the canyon with invasive species and stating that introduction of non-native vegetation was a concern, particularly if an agricultural protection designation reduced oversight. An audience member stated that wildlife and agriculture were often incompatible and that wildlife could be harmed by agricultural activity.

Mayor Smolka moved to the fourth factor, the extent and nature of existing or proposed farm improvements. He stated that the applicant provided detailed plans for plantings and layout and that the plans appeared to follow slope contours, but Mayor Smolka stated concern that the slopes were very steep and questioned whether production could be profitable. He stated that improvements and vegetation removal could create long-lasting visible impacts, referencing the continuing visibility of fire cuts from 1988, and stated that cutting trees and removing vegetation would affect the landscape for an extended period.

Mayor Smolka moved to the fifth factor, anticipated trends in agricultural and technological conditions. He stated that the Planning Commission concluded there were no anticipated trends toward increasing agricultural uses in Emigration Canyon, that the general plan did not identify agricultural use as an anticipated trend, and that planning direction indicated a trend toward eliminating agriculture as a permitted use in the forest recreation zone. He stated that agritourism was not an anticipated trend and that the site posed challenges for emergency response for large gatherings. He stated the general plan did not identify agriculture as an important use and characterized the trend as moving away from agriculture.

Council Member Harris stated agreement with the Planning Commission's points on the fifth factor and added broader policy concerns. She stated that, in her understanding, agricultural protection area statutes were intended to protect established farmland threatened by development and expressed concern that applying the designation where statutory

requirements were not met could undermine that legislative purpose. Council Member Harris stated that denial of the designation would not necessarily prevent many activities but would retain oversight. She stated that the council should consider whether creating an agricultural protection area met community needs, citing ongoing challenges related to development, water quality and availability, and the fragility of the landscape. She referenced concerns raised in public comments about wildfire risk and stated that House Bill 48 would increase community costs associated with fire risk. Council Member Harris stated that agricultural production and associated storage and activities could increase fire risk and stated that approving a designation that reduced the city's ability to provide oversight would not serve the community.

Council Member Harris moved to reject the application for an Agricultural Protection Area as noted above. Council Member Pinon seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor with Council Member Hawkes absent from the vote.

B. Resolution R2025-12, Designating Ambulance Service as Required by SB 215

Cameron Platt explained that during the most recent legislative session, Senate Bill 215 amended and streamlined the process by which counties and municipalities designated ambulance service providers. Mr. Platt stated that the statute required the city to designate a 911 ambulance response and transport provider, an interfacility transport provider, and a backup interfacility transport provider. He stated that Emigration Canyon met all statutory requirements through Unified Fire Authority and through Unified Fire Authority's existing contract with Gold Cross. He stated that Unified Fire Authority served as the 911 ambulance response and transport provider for Emigration Canyon. Unified Fire Authority did not provide interfacility transport services, which involved transfers between medical facilities, but that this requirement was satisfied through Unified Fire Authority's contract with Gold Cross. He stated that this contract also provided backup interfacility transport services and noted that although interfacility transport services were rarely needed within Emigration Canyon, the designation was still required by statute. He stated that the code required these designations to be made every four years and that the next required designation would occur in 2028, when Unified Fire Authority's emergency medical services license expired. He stated that the resolution before the council simply designated the existing service providers and did not represent a change in services.

Council Member Brems moved to approve Resolution R2025-12, Designating Ambulance Service as Required by SB 215. Council Member Harris seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor with Council Member Hawkes absent from the vote.

C. Amendment to Legal Contract to include services from a Legal Assistant and an Associate, and address AI use

Cameron Platt explained that Emigration Canyon had an existing contract with Polly McLean and himself for legal services serving as city attorney functions. Mr. Platt stated that the council was being asked to consider an addendum to update the contract to address the increased use of artificial intelligence in legal practice. He stated that the addendum required disclosure

of when artificial intelligence was used, when it was not used, and under what circumstances it could be applied. He stated that artificial intelligence would be used to improve efficiency and reduce costs to the city, but that no artificial intelligence-generated work would be provided without review and verification by a human.

Mr. Platt stated that the addendum also reflected staffing changes, including the addition of an associate attorney and a legal assistant. He explained that much of the work performed for the city did not require an attorney to complete but did require attorney review, and that using an associate attorney and legal assistant would improve efficiency, responsiveness, and reduce costs to the city.

Mayor Smolka asked whether the addendum affected the length of the contract and whether the contract expired in January 2027. Cameron Platt responded that the addendum did not change the contract term and clarified that the original agreement had a three-year term running from July 1, 2024 through July 1, 2027.

Council Member Harris moved to approve the amendment to the current legal contract as presented tonight. Council Member Brems seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor with Council Member Hawkes absent from the vote.

D. Resolution R2025-14, Adopting a Surplus Property Policy

The council discussed their desire to adopt a surplus property policy, however due to a miscommunication there was no surplus policy attached to the proposed resolution. The council expressed their desire to adopt the MSD's current surplus property policy and agreed to hold a decision on this Resolution until the meeting on December 15, 2025 when the City Recorder, Diana Baun, agreed to include a copy of the desired policy from the MSD with the Resolution for consideration.

E. Healthy Utah Designation Updates

Council Member Robert Pinon stated that the application deadline was March 1 and that work was still underway to determine how to propose the three projects. Council Member Pinon stated that there was no substantive update at that time but confirmed that he remained in communication regarding a key project that would serve as the foundation for the overall effort.

F. City Design Standards and Design Guidelines – None

11. City Attorney Updates

12. Council Member Reports

A. Council Member Brems

- 1. Unified Police Department (UPD) & Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Area (SLVLESA)**
- 2. Emigration Canyon Planning Commission**
- 3. Community Renewable Energy Program**

Council Member David Brems reported that the Unified Police Department meeting was scheduled for that week on Thursday. Council Member Brems stated that the report provided at the previous meeting, which was reflected in the minutes, remained the most current information regarding those agencies. He stated that the Planning Commission's work on the agricultural protection area was thorough and expressed appreciation for the effort. He also reported that an update on the community renewable energy program would be presented at the December meeting to provide current information to the council. Council Member Brems noted that the next council meeting was scheduled for December 15 and that the Utah Public Service Commission was expected to issue a decision on the program on December 16, stating that the timing was slightly premature but that the presentation needed to occur before the end of the year.

B. Council Member Harris

- 1. Unified Fire Authority (UFA) & Unified Fire Service Area (UFSA)**
- 2. Watershed Plan**

Council Member Catherine Harris reported that she did not have a specific update related to Unified Fire Authority or Unified Fire Service Area at that time and noted that a board meeting was scheduled for the following day. Council Member Harris stated that there would be an unusually high level of turnover on both the Unified Fire Authority and Unified Fire Service Area Boards, with approximately five new members joining out of a total of 17, which would be significant. She stated that this turnover coincided with budget season and would require substantial board member training. She noted that she would be involved in training efforts, particularly in light of her role as incoming chair of the Unified Fire Service Area beginning in January.

Council Member Harris provided an update related to wildfire issues and requested that an update on House Bill 48 be added to future agendas as part of their monthly reports. She explained that House Bill 48 was passed in the prior legislative session and signed by the governor and was intended to educate homeowners about wildfire risk. She stated that the funding mechanism involved assessing fees on homes located in high wildfire risk areas. She stated that the initial public meeting on the rulemaking had occurred and that she attended the meeting, but that the updated wildfire risk map from Fire, Forestry, and State Lands had not yet been released. Council Member Harris stated that the map was required by law to be released by January 1, 2026, and anticipated that much or all of Emigration Canyon would be designated as high or extreme risk. She noted that the lack of finalized information made it difficult to provide definitive guidance to residents at that time. Chief Bryan Case had offered to help facilitate additional information and potentially a presentation for residents once more details were available, particularly given the anticipated impacts on homeowners insurance.

She stated that staff were monitoring developments closely and awaiting additional information.

Council Member Harris also provided an update on the watershed plan, stating that there was no new information because Sandy Wingard had been heavily involved in the Salt Lake County watershed symposium taking place that week. Council Member Harris stated that they expected additional updates following the symposium.

C. Council Member Pinon

- 1. Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling District (WFWRD)**
- 2. Utah Broadband**
- 3. Update on Possible High-Density Development**

Council Member Robert Pinon stated that their report would be brief and explained that he had attended approximately 40 minutes of the referred meeting held immediately prior to the council meeting. Council Member Pinon stated that the referred meeting focused primarily on the 2026 budget and that the tentative budget was scheduled for approval that evening, with final approval anticipated at the following month's meeting. He stated that operations were going well under the new general manager, Evan, and that coordination had occurred regarding program initiatives.

Council Member Pinon reported that they had coordinated with WFWRD to explore having Emigration Canyon serve as a pilot location for a community dumpster day program. He explained that the concept involved placing dumpsters at a few designated locations for community use during a specific time period. He stated that this approach could replace the prior concept of providing individual dumpsters at residences, reduce overall inventory needs, and improve efficiency by limiting the number of dumpster trailers required. Council Member Pinon stated that additional details would be forthcoming.

Robert Pinon stated that there were no updates regarding Utah Broadband and no updates regarding the previously discussed potential high-density development, which he indicated was likely no longer moving forward.

D. Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- 1. Website (www.emigration.utah.gov)**
- 2. CodeRED**
- 3. Association of Municipal Governments**
- 4. Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT)**

No updates at this time.

E. Mayor Smolka

- 1. Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (MSD)**

2. **Landfill Council**
3. **Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) Transportation Committee**
4. **Council of Governments (COG)**
5. **Legislative Update**

Mayor Joe Smolka reported on Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District matters, noting that the MSD board had invited all board members to a Thanksgiving lunch at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday the 19th at the MSD offices. Mayor Smolka stated that the event was a potluck but that food was typically plentiful and attendees were not required to bring anything. He reported that the MSD board would experience significant turnover, with either four or five members changing out of a seven-member board. He stated that Council Member David Brems had attended a recent MSD meeting online to begin gaining familiarity with how the organization operated.

Mayor Smolka provided an update on the Landfill Council, stating that the council met in early November and would not meet again until December. He reported that landfill revenues were approximately \$900,000 ahead of projections, which was positive because excess funds were being allocated toward final cover costs.

Mayor Smolka stated that the Wasatch Front Regional Council Transportation Committee was not expected to meet again until January. He reported that the Council of Governments meeting was scheduled for later in the week and that there was no new information to report at that time. Joe Smolka referenced earlier comments by Gary Bowen regarding proposed legislative updates from the area's state senator and stated that those developments would continue to be monitored.

Joe Smolka announced that the next city council meeting would be held on December 15 at 7:00 p.m. at the same location.

13. Public Comments

Janet Haskell stated appreciation for the meeting room arrangement, noting improved acoustics and visibility. Ms. Haskell stated intent to contact Diana Baun to request additional detail regarding city expenses and revenues from the accountant. Mayor Joe Smolka responded that the financial information presented would be posted on the city website. Diana Baun clarified that the same financial documents included in the meeting packet and supporting materials would be available online. Council Member David Brems and Council Member Catherine Harris added that the financials were publicly accessible through the meeting agenda and supporting documents.

Lyska Emerson, Resident, described an incident from the prior meeting date in which their vehicle stalled while making a U-turn in the canyon at night, blocking the roadway. Ms. Emerson stated they felt unsafe due to traffic conditions and limited visibility and attempted to contact local fire personnel located nearby. She stated that she called 911 but was unable to get assistance from the nearby fire station and ultimately relied on neighbors and a cyclist for help. She asked what residents should do in similar situations.

Chief Bryan Case responded that the emergency response system was designed to route all requests through the dispatch center so the closest available unit could be sent, regardless of station location. Chief Case stated that dispatch should have gathered the information and sent assistance and expressed concern that this did not occur. He stated that public assistance calls were routinely handled and that calling 911 was the correct action. He explained that residents should not attempt to contact fire stations directly because crews might be unavailable, and dispatch was responsible for determining appropriate response. Bryan Case advised residents to submit feedback to the Valley Emergency Communications Center (VECC) through its website if issues occurred so that operational gaps could be identified and addressed.

Ms. Emerson asked how to provide feedback, and Chief Case identified the Valley Emergency Communications Center as the appropriate avenue. Council Member Harris expressed relief that Ms. Emerson was safe and suggested that residents consider carrying emergency flares due to nighttime safety concerns on canyon roads.

LaNette Smolka commented on the proposed dumpster and trailer program, stating concern that the concept was being oversimplified. Ms. Smolka described prior experience with a similar program in Big Cottonwood Canyon, where shared use of trailers among neighbors resulted in high participation and efficiency. She asked about the cost of renting trailers and how the revised program would function.

Council Member Robert Pinon explained that the broader valley program was eliminating most trailers due to cost and competition with private providers and reducing inventory from approximately 60 trailers to about seven. Council Member Pinon stated that Emigration Canyon would serve as a pilot program, replacing individual trailer rentals with scheduled community dumpster days at designated locations such as Pinecrest and Sunnysdale. Council Member Pinon stated that dumpsters would be available for multiple days, staffed, and rotated as they filled, allowing residents to dispose of items locally rather than traveling to the landfill.

Ms. Smolka described neighborhood coordination efforts used in Big Cottonwood Canyon and asked how the new program would accommodate similar cooperation and logistics. Council Member Pinon stated that the new approach shifted liability away from individual property owners by using centralized drop-off locations on appropriate sites. He stated that dumpsters would be cycled as needed and that the program was intended to encourage community participation while improving efficiency. Ms. Smolka recommended contacting Barbara Cameron for insight based on Big Cottonwood Canyon's experience and asked about timing and communication through the city newsletter. Council Member Pinon stated that Emigration Canyon would be the pilot community, likely beginning in April due to snow conditions, and that the city expected to learn from the initial implementation and adjust as needed.

14. Future Agenda Items

Mayor Joe Smolka stated that additional discussion was needed regarding the upcoming vacancy created when David Brems became mayor in January and asked Cameron Platt to explain the process and how the deputy mayor functioned under the city's form of government.

Cameron Platt explained that when David Brems vacated the council seat and assumed the role of mayor in January, the council was required to select a replacement council member within 30 days of the vacancy. Mr. Platt stated that the appointment would fill the remainder of David Brems's term, which would be two years. Cameron Platt stated that the city would be required to publish a notice requesting candidates to submit their names, and that the council would interview candidates during an open meeting and select the replacement in an open meeting. He stated that including an explanation of the process in the December packet would help residents understand the timeline and requirements and noted that additional statutory details applied if there was a tie or if a majority was not achieved.

Cameron Platt explained that under the city's current form of government, the mayor was also a member of the council and served as chair and official representative of the city. Mr. Platt stated that instead of a "deputy mayor," the applicable role was a Mayor Pro Tem, which was a temporary designation used when the mayor was unavailable. He stated that the Mayor Pro Tem role was not a long-term position and could be designated as needed for specific meetings or functions, depending on which council members were available to chair a meeting while maintaining a quorum. Council Member David Brems asked whether the council had to select a Mayor Pro Tem, and Cameron Platt stated that the council could designate one as needed.

Mayor Smolka stated that this was similar to the Municipal Services District approach and that if the mayor was absent at a meeting, the remaining council members would choose someone present to chair the meeting.

Audience member Janet Haskell asked whether, if the mayor was out of town for an extended period, someone would be appointed for that entire time and whether the public would know who that person was. Cameron Platt stated that a Mayor Pro Tem would generally not be designated unless the mayor was expected to be unreachable or unavailable for official responsibilities, and gave an example of extended unavailability where a designation would be appropriate. Ms. Haskell raised concern about wildfire response during a mayor's absence and stated that residents would want to know who was in charge. Council Member Catherine Harris stated that emergency response operated under incident command and established emergency services procedures and that the mayor was not the operational authority in that context, and Mayor Smolka agreed.

Ms. Haskell asked additional questions about the appointment process for Council Member David Brems's council seat, including the 30-day timeframe. Cameron Platt stated that the appointment had to occur within 30 days of the vacancy, which Mr. Platt indicated would occur on January 6 when the mayoral term began. He stated that the city would publish a vacancy notice and provide instructions for how candidates could submit candidacy.

Diana Baun stated that candidates would be required to come in and declare candidacy through the City Recorder, similar to declaring candidacy for an election. Ms. Baun stated that the city would post the notice on the Utah Public Notice website and the city website, and that they would verify voter registration and complete paperwork in person by appointment. Diana Baun stated that the council would decide whether to require additional materials such as a

resume or responses to questions in advance, and that the council would also determine the interview format and whether to use a scoring method. She stated that the council would need to decide in December the publication date, the length of the application window, and any required materials so the notice could be prepared and reviewed appropriately.

Council Member Harris asked about the effective date of the vacancy given that the council did not meet until later in January and stated that members were not sworn in until a meeting. Diana Baun stated that legal counsel would advise on the applicable interpretation and noted that other municipalities had handled the timing differently. Ms. Baun stated that her understanding was that swearing-in typically occurred at the first meeting when the official would vote, and that the intent would be to address it at the first meeting.

Cameron Platt stated that the vacancy would occur by operation of law when the transfer to mayor took place and that the timing could require a special meeting in some cities, but Emigration Canyon's schedule would likely allow selection at the regular January meeting if the notice was published promptly after the vacancy occurred. Council Member David Brems asked whether a resignation was needed and where the notice would be posted. Cameron Platt stated that a resignation was not necessarily required because the change occurred automatically at the start of the mayoral term and that notice would be posted through standard municipal public notice channels, including the Utah Public Notice website and the city website.

Mayor Joe Smolka suggested that the council could also inform the public at the December meeting that the appointment process was upcoming. Diana Baun reiterated the need for the council to set the dates and procedures in December, including whether to waive any candidacy fee, and explained that the purpose of such a fee in elections was to cover staff time but that any fee decision for an appointment was up to the council and legal counsel. Cameron Platt stated that there was no fee currently anticipated for the appointment. Diana Baun stated that declarations would be by scheduled appointment rather than open filing hours and that all candidate materials would be forwarded to the council for review. Diana Baun stated that examples from other municipalities, including Millcreek, were available to guide the council in deciding what materials to request and how to structure interviews and selection.

15. Closed Session per Utah Code §52-4-205

- A.** Discussion of the Character, Professional Competence or Physical or Mental Health of an Individual.
- B.** Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation.
- C.** Purchase, Exchange, or Lease of Real Property.
- D.** Deployment of Security Personnel.

16. Adjourn

Council Member Harris moved to adjourn the November 17, 2025 Emigration Canyon Council Meeting. Council Member Pinon seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor with Council Member Hawkes absent from the vote.

The November 17, 2025 Emigration Canyon Council Meeting adjourned at 9:30 PM.

The November 17, 2025 City Council Meeting Minutes were Approved by the City Council on the 15th day of December 2025:

ATTEST:

Joe Smolka, Mayor

Diana Baun, City Recorder