



## MAGNA CITY COUNCIL MEETING

FEBRUARY 24, 2026 @ 6:00 PM  
WEBSTER COMMUNITY CENTER  
8952 West Magna Main Street  
Magna, Utah 84044

---

**\*\*DRAFT MINUTES – UNAPPROVED\*\***  
**MAGNA CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**  
**February 24, 2026**

**Council Members Present:**

Mayor Mick Sudbury  
Council Member Audrey Pierce  
Council Member Terry George  
Council Member Steve Prokopis  
Council Member Megan Olsen  
Council Member Michael Jensen (via Zoom)

**Council Member(s) Excused:**

**Staff Present:**

David Brickey, City Manager  
Nathan Bracken, City Attorney  
Claire Gillmor, Deputy City Attorney  
Diana Baun, City Recorder  
Chief Del Craig, Unified Police Department  
Lt. Chris Benedict, Unified Police Department

**Others Present:**

**6:00 PM – PUBLIC MEETING**

**1. Call to Order**

Mayor Mick Sudbury, presiding, called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. He noted that Audrey Pierce was not present, and that Council Member Michael Jensen would be joining online momentarily.

**2. Determine Quorum**

A quorum was present, allowing the meeting to proceed.

**3. Pledge of Allegiance**

---

### MAGNA COUNCIL MEMBERS

MAYOR MICK SUDBURY, COUNCIL MEMBER STEVE PROKOPIS,  
COUNCIL MEMBER MEGAN OLSEN, COUNCIL MEMBER MICHAEL JENSEN,  
COUNCIL MEMBER TERRY GEORGE, COUNCIL MEMBER AUDREY PIERCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

#### **4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

#### **5. STAKEHOLDER REPORTS**

##### **A. Unified Police Department**

Lieutenant Chris Benedict stated that the department had delivered its statistical report during the previous council period and therefore did not have additional statistics to present this evening. Instead, Lt. Benedict introduced a program that the Unified Police Department had partnered on with Gun Safe Families through a federal grant. He explained that the purpose of the program was to promote firearm safety in homes where there may be mental illness, young children, or vulnerable adults, with the goal of ensuring firearms are safely stored during times of crisis and kept inaccessible to small children. Lt. Benedict informed the Council that the department currently had 20 gun safes available at the Magna precinct. Community members could visit the precinct, scan a QR code, and receive a free safe. He further stated that the department had the ability to obtain additional safes if needed. He expressed that the program provided an important opportunity to support community safety and noted that many youth were present in the audience that evening, emphasizing the importance of protecting vulnerable children. Lt. Benedict invited residents to visit the precinct to pick up a safe and encouraged the community to store firearms securely, particularly during times of crisis.

**Council Member Michael Jensen joined the meeting via Zoom**

#### **6. CONSENT AGENDA**

##### **A. Approve City Council Minutes**

1. January 27, 2026 City Council Meeting
2. February 10, 2026 City Council Meeting

**Council Member Prokopis moved to approve the January 27, 2026 and February 10, 2026 City Council Meetings as published. Council Member Olsen seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor. Council Member Pierce was absent from the vote.**

**Council Member Audrey Pierce joined the meeting in person.**

#### **7. PRESENTATION ITEMS**

##### **A. Quarterly Financial Report**

Stewart Okobia, Director of Finance presented the financial report covering the first half of the fiscal year. Mr. Okobia explained that Magna operates on a fiscal year running from July to June, and the report being presented reflected financial activity from July 2025 through

December 2025. He directed the Council to focus on the second column of the report, which reflected the current financial position at the halfway point of the fiscal year. He reviewed the City's net position, describing it as the balance sheet, which included available cash, receivables owed to Magna City, and restricted assets such as funds held in escrow. He highlighted the City's fund balances and noted that these balances are reported to the Council monthly. As of the end of December 2025, Magna City had approximately \$2.58 million in unassigned, unrestricted fund balance. In addition, the City had approximately \$1.9 million in the assigned Capital Fund and \$895,000 in the restricted Corridor Preservation Fund, which is used for right-of-way purchases. He explained that Magna City tracks its finances through multiple funds, with the main operating fund being the primary focus of the report.

Mr. Okobia stated that since the report represented the midpoint of the fiscal year, the Council could use 50% as a benchmark to measure whether revenues and expenditures were on track. He reported that sales tax revenue, the City's largest revenue source, was at 56.3%, which was slightly above the anticipated level for that point in the year. Overall revenues for the main fund were at 50.09%, which He indicated was right on target for the halfway point of the fiscal year. Total expenditures for the same period were at 44%, which he explained was a positive indicator because expenditures were lower than revenues. He briefly reviewed several additional City funds. The Pleasant Green Cemetery Fund was presented separately, with its own balance sheet and restricted fund balance that functions similarly to savings for future appropriations and expenses. He reported that revenues in the cemetery fund were somewhat lower than anticipated, while expenditures were also slightly lower. He then reviewed the CTC, or CARES fund, which is funded through grants and supports the CARES program. He stated that there were no concerns with this fund and reported that it had a fund balance of approximately \$29,000 at the end of December. He also presented information regarding the Community Reinvestment Agency (CRA) funds, explaining that these balances are restricted to specific redevelopment purposes. He noted that all CRA funds are held in the Public Treasurers' Investment Fund (PTIF), which allows the funds to earn interest daily. He explained that the City conducts financial transactions through a checking account and transfers funds from savings as needed so that the majority of funds remain invested and continue earning interest.

Finally, Mr. Okobia reviewed Fund 65, the Magna Council Designated Fund, which includes revenues from Municipal Energy Taxes as well as CARES and other auxiliary funds. He reported that this fund had a balance of approximately \$1.7 million at the halfway point of the fiscal year. He concluded by stating that Magna City's finances were in good condition and that there were no concerns regarding the City's financial position.

Council Member Steve Prokopis stated that he had one request regarding the timing of the report. Council Member Prokopis explained that he had received the report approximately one hour and ten minutes before the meeting, which made it difficult to fully review and prepare questions before the presentation. He acknowledged that Stewart Okobia does not attend every meeting but requested that the report be provided earlier so that Council Members could review it in advance and prepare questions for discussion while Mr. Okobia is present.

Stewart Okobia responded that the report being presented was the same report that had been included to the Council the previous meeting and suggested that it may not have been included in the meeting packet. Mr. Okobia stated that the report had originally been sent around January 19 and that the version sent earlier that day was the same report.

Council Member Prokopis clarified that the report presented reflected financial data through the end of 2025.

Stewart Mr. Okobia confirmed that this was correct and explained that there is a reporting delay in financial reporting, which is why the most current data available was through December 2025. Stewart Okobia thanked Steve Prokopis for the clarification.

## **B. Preliminary Capital Budget**

Assistant City Engineer Tamaran Woodland presented information regarding the proposed 2027 Capital Improvement Projects (CIP). Ms. Woodland began by explaining the process used to develop the project list. At the beginning of January, SmartSheets were distributed to the Council to collect project requests. She noted that during the previous year's process the Council had requested that engineering staff provide recommendations, so that change was implemented for this year. The recommendations provided by engineering staff were based on several factors, including grant opportunities, safety needs, reported issues, and long-range planning considerations. She added that the upcoming Transportation Master Plan, expected to be completed the following year, would help guide future funding decisions. She explained that after project requests are submitted, engineering staff perform evaluations and review submissions from the community. Requests that do not qualify as capital improvement projects are forwarded to the appropriate entities. For example, maintenance issues are directed to operations, while park-related requests are sent to Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation. She stated that the presentation to the Council represented the current stage of the process, where submitted projects for Magna are reviewed. The following month, projects from all participating communities will be combined and ranked into a single list that will be presented to the Municipal Services District (MSD) Board. Each municipality's prioritized projects are combined into a regional ranking, and the MSD Board ultimately determines which projects will receive funding. She also noted that projects may be funded independently through state appropriations, grants, or directly by the municipality.

Ms. Woodland distributed copies of the project list to the Council, noting that the list included the projects previously sent in January along with several additional items. She first discussed two new proposed studies: a Transportation Impact Fee Study and a Transportation Utility Fee Study. She explained that both studies could be combined with the ongoing transportation study currently underway, allowing the City to obtain a reduced rate by conducting them together. Methods Consulting was identified as the engineering firm conducting the work. The Transportation Impact Fee Study would evaluate the potential for implementing a one-time fee on new development to fund transportation infrastructure improvements such as road widening, traffic signals, and bicycle facilities needed to accommodate increased traffic from

development. She stated that Methods Consulting recommended that both Kearns and Magna proceed with this study, while not recommending it for the other municipalities. She then explained the Transportation Utility Fee Study, which would examine the feasibility of implementing a utility-style fee used to finance road networks, similar to how public utilities charge residents and businesses based on usage. She emphasized that this proposal was only for a study to determine whether such a fee would be appropriate in the future. Engineering staff recommended proceeding with the study, and she noted that Copperton was the only municipality that had declined to participate.

Council Member Steve Prokopis asked whether the dollar amount listed for the study represented a total amount to be divided between Kearns and Magna or Magna's portion alone. Ms. Woodland clarified that the amount shown represented Magna's share only.

Ms. Woodland also discussed a project listed for 4100 South, explaining that the City was attempting to secure funding through alternative sources, including state appropriations, but that the project remained on the list due to its importance. She explained that the Municipal Services District typically funds approximately \$3 million in capital improvement projects annually across all communities, and Magna's portion would likely fall between \$1 million and \$1.5 million. She stated that projects would be adjusted and prioritized to fit within that funding range. She highlighted two projects that engineering staff particularly favored due to their relatively low cost and high impact: the restriping of 2820 South and the installation of raised medians on Loudon Grove Drive. She explained that the restriping project would create a center turn lane using existing roadway width, providing a significant improvement with minimal infrastructure changes. She concluded by stating that the order shown on the list represented engineering staff's recommended ranking and asked the Council to notify staff by the following Friday if they wished to adjust the prioritization before the list is combined with projects from other municipalities.

Mayor Mick Sudbury asked whether the widening of 8000 West and the intersection improvements at 2820 South were included on the list. Ms. Woodland responded that those projects were already funded and therefore were not included, as the list only contained new proposed projects. Mayor Mick Sudbury then asked about the 4100 South project related to the new school. Ms. Woodland confirmed that the City was seeking funding through state appropriations, and if that funding were secured, the project could be removed from the list.

Council Member Michael Jensen then asked Ms. Woodland to review several transportation issues and report back with additional information. Council Member Jensen requested that she check the current Regional Transportation Plan covering 2023 to 2050 to determine where the rebuild and widening of State Route 111 between 3500 South and 2700 South appears on the plan, including whether it is scheduled in the first phase, later phases, or listed as an illustrative project. Michael Jensen also asked what plans the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) currently has for 8000 West in relation to State Route 201.

Ms. Woodland responded that staff had met with UDOT earlier that day and that the agency was reviewing a feasibility study regarding potential improvements to 8000 West. She stated that approximately one month earlier, UDOT had mentioned the possibility of not connecting 8000 West to State Route 201 in the long term, and staff had strongly pushed back on that idea, emphasizing the importance of the connection.

Council Member Megan Olsen noted that the connection is included in the Regional Transportation Plan. Council Member Jensen then asked Ms. Woodland to also review the intersection at 9180 West, where a signal had previously been planned but where recent changes now restrict left turns both in and out of the intersection. Council Member Jensen asked whether the change was permanent or a temporary adjustment. Ms. Woodland stated that she would look into that issue as well.

## **8. COUNCIL BUSINESS**

### **A. Discussion and Potential Action Regarding Magna STEAM Academy and a Commemorative Name Change to 3100 South**

Council Member Megan Olsen began by disclosing that her family has connections to Magna STEAM Academy in the interest of transparency. Council Member Olsen then invited Principal Ben Peters to present to the Council.

Ben Peters, Principal of Magna STEAM Academy, thanked Mayor Mick Sudbury and the Council for allowing them to present. Principal Peters brought several members of the school's student council along with a few teachers who assist with the group. He explained that the students wished to present a request for an honorary street name designation for the section of 3100 South between 8400 West and 8560 West, which runs in front of the school.

One of the student council members explained that the Magna STEAM Academy Student Council is composed of fourth and fifth grade students who apply to participate, receive a teacher recommendation, and obtain a family signature. The student council meets monthly and participates in various leadership activities such as promoting kindness, helping with school assemblies and announcements, caring for the school garden, and supporting other school initiatives.

Another student described the process used to select the proposed street name. The student council initially created several possible name options that reflected the school. A survey was conducted among students, and "Bulldog Boulevard" initially received the most votes. However, many students later expressed concern that they had not had an opportunity to participate in the survey. As a result, the student council narrowed the choices to the top two options and conducted a second survey to allow more students to vote.

The next student explained that the second vote resulted in approximately 60.7% of the votes supporting the name "Bulldog Way." Principal Peters added that the first survey had received 118 responses, but the second survey reached approximately 298 students through the online

form, along with additional paper ballots. In total, about 350 students participated out of a student body of approximately 450 students.

Students then read a prepared letter addressed to the Magna City Council requesting the honorary street name designation of “Bulldog Way” for the portion of the street in front of the school. The students explained that the bulldog is the school mascot and represents determination, resilience, leadership, and pride. They stated that the designation would serve as a lasting symbol of the school’s values and strengthen the partnership between the school and the Magna community. The students added that the designation would foster a greater sense of identity and pride among students, families, and staff, while recognizing the role Magna STEAM Academy plays in student learning, leadership development, and community involvement. The students expressed that the recognition would inspire current and future students and thanked the Council for considering their request.

Principal Peters explained that the school had also contacted residents along the affected section of 3100 South in accordance with city code. Students visited homes along the street and obtained one signature from a resident. Principal Peters stated that his business cards were left with the residents they were unable to talk with so they could contact the school with questions. One resident expressed concern that the change might affect mailing addresses. Principal Peters stated that, based on their understanding, an honorary street name designation would not affect mailing addresses and emphasized that the school would not want to create any inconvenience for residents.

Mayor Mick Sudbury responded that he liked the proposal and stated that it promotes school spirit and pride.

Council Member Megan Olsen expressed excitement about the request and asked David Brickey to provide guidance on the next steps and what would be required from both the school and the Council.

David Brickey addressed the Mayor and Council and commented that the students had done an excellent job presenting. Mr. Brickey stated that he would take the information presented and share it with Traffic Engineer Ian Hartman so that staff could analyze the process required to implement the honorary street name. Mr. Brickey said staff would determine the associated costs and bring the information back to the Council for a final decision. He added that when the matter returns to the Council, he would like to invite the students back so they can be recognized. He noted that government processes can take longer than those in the private sector and indicated that the review may take a couple of weeks.

Mayor Mick Sudbury then confirmed whether the matter would likely return in approximately 30 days. David Brickey responded that this timeline was correct. Mayor Sudbury concluded by congratulating the students and stating that it was exciting to see them take pride in their school and community.

## **B. Discussion and Potential Action Regarding Approval of Agreement with MyHometown**

Mayor Mick Sudbury explained that the organization operates programs that assist residents with exterior home improvements and neighborhood cleanup efforts. He stated that My Hometown works with volunteers who help residents with projects such as yard cleanup, exterior painting, fence construction, and some roofing work. The organization does not perform work inside homes and focuses only on exterior improvements. Mayor Sudbury noted that the City of West Valley has worked with the organization previously and has seen positive results. He further explained that the organization also offers community programs, including English language learning, sewing, and music instruction. Council Member Megan Olsen added that some of the programs are similar to home economics–style classes and are intended to support English language learners and other community members.

David Brickey added that a new component of the program would involve assisting the City's Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) with property cleanup issues. He explained that when the Administrative Law Judge identifies properties that require cleanup within a specified timeframe, the organization could assist residents in completing the required work. This support could help residents avoid violations or additional penalties by allowing them to complete cleanup projects more quickly.

Council Member Audrey Pierce stated that she did not have a specific question but expressed interest in discussing additional volunteer-related programs during the upcoming Council retreat. Council Member Pierce requested that the Council delay voting on the agreement until after the retreat so that all volunteer opportunities could be reviewed together.

Mayor Sudbury responded that the proposal had been discussed the previous year without action and that the organization was currently waiting for a decision from the City. He stated that Magna would be next in line to receive the program and recommended that the Council consider approving the agreement that evening.

Council Member Terry George expressed support for moving forward with the agreement. Council Member George stated that the program is intended to help members of the community and is not related to proselytizing or religious outreach.

Council Member Megan Olsen asked how long the contract with the organization would remain in effect. Mayor Sudbury responded that the agreement would continue as long as the City wished to have the organization operating in Magna. Council Member Olsen then asked whether the City would have the ability to cancel the agreement if the program was not working after approximately 12 months. Mayor Sudbury indicated that the City would likely be contributing a small amount of funding to the program but stated that most of the program's funding, approximately 90%, is provided by the organization itself. Council Member Olsen then asked whether the work performed by the organization could reduce the City's costs associated with property abatement, noting that the City already spends funds addressing



property cleanup issues and suggested that assistance from the organization could offset some of those costs.

Council Member Steve Prokopis stated that he appreciated the presentation the organization had previously provided. He expressed openness to trying the program but indicated that he would prefer to approach it cautiously. He suggested implementing the program as a 12-month trial period rather than committing indefinitely. He noted that the City would be providing office space to the organization and that the organization would, in return, provide community benefits such as reducing neighborhood blight and assisting residents who may not have the financial resources to address property maintenance issues on their own. He stated that while he believed the program could provide value to the community, he preferred to move forward gradually since it would be a new program for Magna.

**Council Member George moved to approve authorization for the Mayor to sign the agreement proposed with MyHometown for a trial term of 12 months before reconsidering their partnership. Council Member Olsen seconded the motion; vote was 4-1, majority in favor with Council Member Pierce voting “No”.**

**C. Discussion and Potential Action on Ordinance 2026-O-04, Approving a Surplus Property Policy for the City of Magna**

Deputy City Attorney Claire Gillmor addressed the Council regarding a proposed ordinance establishing a surplus property policy for Magna City. She explained that several of the City’s ordinances are outdated and that the property disposal ordinance is one of the easier ordinances to update. The proposed ordinance would clarify procedures for disposing of surplus property and distinguish between surplus personal property and surplus real property.

Ms. Gillmor explained that the only requirement under state code for a property disposal ordinance is identifying what qualifies as a significant real property parcel and outlining how such property must be disposed of. In the draft ordinance, this requirement is addressed in Section 3.36, located on page five of the document. She noted that most cities define a significant real property parcel as property greater than one acre. If the City were to dispose of such a parcel, it would first need to be formally declared surplus by the Council and then sold or transferred in a manner that ensures the City receives fair market value. She added that fair market value could be determined through various methods. Ms. Gillmor explained that the ordinance also defines surplus personal property, which includes all publicly owned property that is not real property, such as equipment or other city-owned items. She stated that the Council would need to determine a dollar threshold for surplus personal property. For items of minimal value—such as outdated phones or computer equipment—the policy would allow the City Manager to dispose of the items in a way that provides the greatest benefit to the City without requiring the full surplus process. She noted that the intent of setting a threshold is to avoid situations where the City spends more money administering the disposal process than the property itself is worth.

Ms. Gillmor emphasized that, regardless of the threshold established for personal property, the disposal of real property would still go through the City Council for approval. She then asked the Council for guidance regarding the appropriate dollar threshold for surplus personal property so that the ordinance could be finalized. She stated that the Council could either provide feedback immediately, approve the ordinance provisionally subject to revisions, or take additional time to review it.

Mayor Mick Sudbury asked how the policy would apply to items that were acquired when Magna City took ownership of the Webster Center building. He noted that when the building was transferred, some items inside were not included on an official inventory list. Mayor Sudbury asked whether those items would still need to go through the surplus process if the City wanted to dispose of them.

Ms. Gillmor responded that the situation highlighted the importance of maintaining an inventory of public property, which the proposed ordinance would require. She recommended that in the future, when property becomes owned by the City, it should be included on an official inventory to avoid uncertainty. She explained that if the items in question are considered property of Magna City, then they would be subject to the surplus property disposal process. If the items were not owned by the City, staff would work with the appropriate entity that owns the property to determine how to dispose of it.

She also noted that the Council had an upcoming retreat scheduled for Friday and offered to have a more detailed discussion about the ordinance at that time if the Council preferred.

Mayor Sudbury asked the Council whether they would like to postpone further discussion until the retreat. The Council agreed to wait until Friday.

Council Member Steve Prokopolis asked Claire Gillmor to present what would be considered best practices when disposing of surplus property. Council Member Prokopolis indicated that the Council would likely prefer to adopt a policy consistent with established best practices.

Council Member Megan Olsen added that Claire Gillmor works with multiple entities and could likely provide examples from other cities.

Ms. Gillmor confirmed that she could provide those examples. She explained that she had already considered recommending threshold amounts based on Magna's budget but wanted to first determine whether the Council had specific preferences. She stated that she would come prepared at the retreat with recommended thresholds and examples from other municipalities.

#### **D. Discussion and Potential Action Regarding Approval of Lincoln Hill Partners Contract**

City Attorney David Brickey addressed the Council regarding the contract for Lincoln Shurtz, who serves as the City's lobbyist. Mr. Brickey explained that the contract had originally been prepared several years earlier when Magna operated as a metro township. During review of

the current agreement, staff identified and corrected a typographical issue so that the document now properly reflects Magna City. He stated that if the Council was prepared to approve the agreement that evening, the corrected version would be finalized and made available for Mayor Mick Sudbury's signature. Mr. Brickey noted that Lincoln Shurtz has helped secure significant legislative funding for the City in recent years. He explained that he had asked Lincoln Shurtz to continue those efforts during the current legislative session, which was approximately one week away from concluding. He stated that the primary goal for the current session was to obtain assistance addressing the need to construct a road at 4100 South.

Council Member Michael Jensen asked David Brickey what actions had been taken so far during the legislative session. Council Member Jensen stated that he knows Lincoln Shurtz personally and asked whether the City had met with him to outline its legislative priorities. Council Member Jensen also expressed concern that if the project had not yet been included on a transportation funding list, it might be difficult to secure funding at that point in the session.

Mr. Brickey responded that he had met with Lincoln Shurtz on three occasions prior to the legislative session to discuss the City's objectives. He added that he and Mayor Sudbury also met with Lincoln Shurtz shortly before the session began. Since the start of the session, Mr. Brickey stated that he had spoken with Lincoln Shurtz three additional times and had exchanged numerous text messages regarding the City's priorities. Mr. Brickey reported that earlier that day he received a call from Lizel Allen, who had spoken with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). He stated that the UDOT Director indicated a willingness to assist with Lincoln Shurtz's request to prepare a letter outlining the City's needs related to the 4100 South road project. Mr. Brickey also reported that Dave Kelly with DR Horton had confirmed a willingness to testify in support of the City's request for funding. Mr. Brickey stated that he had already shared these updates with Lincoln Shurtz.

**Council Member George moved to approve authorization for the Mayor to sign the agreement discussed with Lincoln Shurtz. Council Member Pierce seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.**

**E. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Selection of Members for the Planning Commission and Traffic and Safety Committee**

David Brickey reported to the Council regarding recruitment efforts for volunteer committee positions, including the Planning Commission and the Traffic and Safety Committee. He explained that the City has been seeking applicants for approximately three months and has promoted the opportunity through Facebook, the City's website, and announcements during meetings. Ms. Brickey added that a recent newsletter was distributed, and as a result the City received several new applications. He stated that in the previous two days alone, seven submissions had been received. Mr. Brickey explained that the responsibility for recommending committee members rests with Mayor Sudbury, with final confirmation provided by the Council. He and the Mayor had discussed sharing the submitted names with the Council

during the upcoming retreat on Friday so that Council Members could review the candidates. Mr. Brickey also noted that one Council Member had already shared input regarding preferred candidates for the Planning Commission and the Traffic and Safety Committee and invited other Council Members to provide similar feedback prior to the retreat if they wished.

Mr. Brickey stated that the goal was to finalize at least the Planning Commission appointments at the March 10 Council meeting. For the Traffic and Safety Committee, he said the Mayor and he had discussed forwarding the submitted names to Chief Del Craig and his team, along with Ian Hartman, so they could review the applicants from a technical perspective and provide input on suitable candidates. Mr. Brickey reiterated that the Mayor would ultimately make the recommendations to the Council, which would then vote on confirmation. He added that the exact timing for finalizing the Traffic and Safety Committee appointments would depend on the review process.

Mayor Mick Sudbury asked whether all applications could be submitted by March 5 so the Council would have time to review them before the March 10 meeting. Mayor Sudbury suggested that the applications be finalized by that date so the Council could review them over the weekend before making decisions.

Mr. Brickey stated that he would contact Maridene Alexander and ask her to post a notice on both the City's website and Facebook page requesting that all applications be submitted by March 5.

Mayor Sudbury clarified that if the submissions were received by that deadline, the Council would have Thursday through the weekend to review the applications before the March 10 meeting.

Mr. Brickey added that the earlier deadline was important because the City must comply with public noticing requirements prior to appointments. He also noted that he had already shared some of the new applicants with the Council, explaining that earlier that day he had sent emails containing three additional names that had been submitted the previous day.

#### **F. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Possible Improvements to the Webster Center**

Mayor Mick Sudbury introduced a discussion regarding possible improvements to the Webster Center building. He explained that the Webster Foundation had previously agreed to transfer the building to Magna City with the understanding that the City would invest approximately \$640,000 into improvements. Mayor Sudbury noted that some minor improvements, such as painting, had already begun. He stated that as the City continues to grow, he would like to see additional offices constructed within the building. He also explained that the building is intended to function as a community center where residents could rent space for events such as parties, funerals, or other gatherings. He expressed a desire to move forward with evaluating improvements to the building, including reviewing the condition of the bathrooms

and electrical systems, which had been identified as potential concerns during earlier evaluations. Mayor Sudbury stated that he believes Magna City's presence should remain on Main Street and asked the Council for approval to proceed with evaluating the cost of improvements while remaining within the agreed investment limit of approximately \$650,000.

Council Member Terry George asked whether there would be a spending limit for the improvements. Mayor Sudbury confirmed that the City's intended limit was approximately \$650,000 and stated that the project should not exceed that amount.

Council Member Audrey Pierce asked whether the design work the City had already paid for included detailed breakdowns for the types of improvements being discussed. Mayor Sudbury responded that staff had not yet contacted the design team for updated information but planned to meet with them the following week. Mayor Sudbury acknowledged that bids could be higher now because the design work had been completed more than a year earlier.

Council Member George stated that the City would first need to finalize a design plan before putting the project out for bids. He suggested that once a design is completed, the City could solicit bids and determine the project's feasibility within the available budget.

Council Member Megan Olsen agreed with Council Member George and also expressed appreciation to Mayor Mick Sudbury for the work already done to improve the appearance of the building. Council Member Olsen stated that the improvements had created a positive aesthetic and that she supported continuing the project.

Mayor Sudbury then asked the Council if they supported moving forward with determining the cost of improvements.

Council Member Steve Prokopis stated that while he supported improving the building, he suggested prioritizing the work rather than completing all improvements at once. Council Member Prokopis listed potential projects such as carpet, paint, electrical upgrades, bathroom improvements, and parking lot resurfacing, and recommended identifying the most important items to address during the current budget year. He noted that the building will remain a permanent asset of Magna City under the agreement with the Webster Foundation and stated that investing in the property would benefit the community long-term.

Council Member Olsen agreed with that approach and stated that the City had made a commitment to invest in the building when it was transferred, and the Council should follow through on that commitment.

Council Member Michael Jensen also supported prioritizing improvements in phases. Council Member Prokopis added that when the building was originally evaluated, the estimated cost for fully renovating the entire building was approximately \$2 million to \$3 million, which is beyond the City's current budget, making a phased approach necessary.

Mayor Sudbury asked whether a formal motion was needed to proceed.

Deputy City Attorney Claire Gillmor clarified that the discussion appeared to be focused on providing direction to staff to investigate potential bids and costs rather than taking formal action that evening.

David Brickey then added that staff could begin evaluating several potential improvements and report back to the Council. He suggested that one immediate priority could be replacing the current microphone system in the meeting room, which he estimated could cost approximately \$16,000 to \$20,000. He explained that a new system would provide individual microphones for Council Members, improve sound projection to the back of the room, and allow individuals participating through Zoom to better hear the meeting.

Council Member Jensen stated that he supported upgrading the sound system, noting that he had difficulty hearing portions of the meeting.

Mr. Brickey also suggested exploring the possibility of converting underutilized space at the front of the building into offices. He stated that staff could work with Ensign Engineering to review the existing plans and provide cost estimates rather than immediately hiring an architect. If necessary, the project could later be formally put out for bid after the Council prioritizes the improvements.

Mayor Sudbury then asked whether the Council would allow Dan Peay to speak on the matter. The Council approved taking the item out of order to allow Mr. Peay to address them.

Dan Peay stated that he had been involved with the building for approximately ten years and had reviewed earlier evaluations. He explained that the building's plumbing consists primarily of copper piping and appears to be in good condition. He also stated that the electrical system was installed when the building served as a senior center and was built to meet public building standards at that time. The electrical wiring is run through conduit and appears to remain in good condition. He added that the main electrical panel still has available capacity for additional circuits if new offices are constructed. He suggested that the City could likely bring in a contractor to review the planned improvements and provide cost estimates based on the existing infrastructure.

## **9. MANAGER/CITY ATTORNEY UPDATES**

City Manager David Brickey provided an update to the City Council regarding several ongoing matters. He stated that the legislative session would conclude on March 6 and explained that the city had been coordinating with both of its lobbyists to monitor legislation that could affect Magna. The lobbyists had been keeping the city informed about bills of concern. He also expressed appreciation for the two members of the LPC who continued to attend meetings every Monday, noting that the commitment required significant time and effort and was often underappreciated.

Mr. Brickey then addressed recent resident concerns regarding a postcard that had been distributed about parking restrictions. He explained that many residents, particularly those living in what he described as “Old Town,” had contacted the city because they believed the notice meant they would no longer be allowed to park in front of their homes. He clarified that this was not the intent of the postcard. The purpose of the notice was to inform residents about updated restrictions related specifically to parking near driveway approaches. Residents were still permitted to park in front of their homes as long as the vehicle was not within five feet of a driveway approach. He also noted that restrictions on parking in the park strip had existed for many years and were not new. He invited residents with further questions to contact him directly or send him an email.

## **10. COUNCIL REPORTS**

Council Member Audrey Pierce stated that she did not have anything to report for the evening’s council report. However, she indicated that she was preparing for the upcoming council retreat and had several items she planned to bring forward for discussion during that meeting.

Council Member Michael Jensen reported that he did not have any items to present during his council report.

Council Member Steve Prokopis provided an update regarding the Unified Police Department (UPD) Board, explaining that the board had met on the 17th. He noted that the organization had entered its budget season and would need to prepare a tentative budget by early May. The board had already begun discussions related to employee benefits, compensation, and salary surveys for officers. Council Member Prokopis stated that preliminary conversations had also started regarding possible budget increases and what levels would be acceptable for the organization. He explained that this budgeting process would continue over the next several months. During the meeting, the board also made several new committee assignments and swore in new board members. He then provided an update regarding the Unified Fire Authority (UFA) at the request of Mayor Sudbury. He explained that UFA was also entering its budget season and had begun making council assignments to subcommittees. The board conducted training for its members and approved several budget amendments. Council Member Prokopis said the organization reminded elected officials that there was still time to register for Fire School 101, which would take place on March 27. He also reported that the board planned to tour the Unified Fire Authority Training Center on the upcoming Friday. He explained that the training center was considered one of the department’s greatest needs because the facility was currently substandard for a department of UFA’s size. The site was used heavily not only by UFA but also by numerous other agencies. A recent study showed that approximately 26 different organizations had trained there in 2025, including UPD, SWAT teams, Rio Tinto Kennecott, the State of Utah, the military, and the National Guard. He stated that the facility was an important regional training asset but had deteriorated over time, and the board would be evaluating the need for investment in improvements during the upcoming budget cycle.

Mayor Mick Sudbury then provided an update regarding the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling District. He explained that there had been significant legislative activity affecting the district, including a bill under consideration that addressed the possibility of entities leaving the district after completing a required study. He noted that the district had been monitoring the legislation closely. Mayor Sudbury added that he would be attending a meeting on Monday related to the matter.

Council Member Megan Olsen reported that she had met with Jen D’Haenens regarding planning for the Independence Day celebration in Magna. She stated that Ms. D’Haenens had sent out letters seeking potential sponsorships and encouraged council members to reach out to local businesses that might be interested in sponsoring the event. Council Member Olsen explained that planning meetings for the celebration would be held at the Webster Center on the first Thursday of each month and that volunteers were still needed to assist with the event. She also reported that she had attended her first meeting of the CTC and was in the process of learning how the committee operates. The group had expressed interest in touring the Lakeridge building, and Council Member Olsen indicated that they were coordinating with Mayor Sudbury to arrange that tour.

Council Member Michael Jensen reported on activities of the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (MSD). He explained that the district had met several times recently and that he served on the audit committee. The committee had reviewed the district’s financial statements for 2025 in detail and found the district to be in good financial condition. Council Member Jensen stated that the district’s board would be meeting again the following day. He also noted that during the previous board meeting the district had approved a study related to immigration matters. He concluded by stating that overall operations at the district were progressing well.

**Council Member Prokopis moved to recess the City Council Meeting at 7:09 p.m., and move into Closed Session to discuss the topics noted below. Council Member Olsen seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.**

**11. CLOSED SESSIONS IF NEEDED AS ALLOWED PURSUANT TO UTAH CODE §52-4-205**

- A. Discussion of the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual.**
- B. Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation.**
- C. Strategy sessions to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property.**
- D. Discussion regarding deployment of security personnel, devices, or systems; and**
- E. Other lawful purposes as listed in Utah Code §52-4-205**

**12. ADJOURN**

**The February 24, 2026 Magna City Council Meeting adjourned immediately following the adjournment of the Closed Session above.**



**This is a true and correct copy of the February 24, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes, which were approved on March 10, 2026.**

**Attest:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Diana Baun, Magna City Recorder**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Mick Sudbury, Magna City Mayor**

UNAPPROVED