WEST VALLEY CITY

City Council Study Meeting
May 12, 2026

THE WEST VALLEY CITY COUNCIL MET IN ELECTRONIC STUDY SESSION ON TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2026 AT 4:31 P.M. AT WEST VALLEY CITY HALL, MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, 3600 CONSTITUTION BOULEVARD, WEST VALLEY CITY, UTAH. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AND CONDUCTED BY MAYOR LANG.

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS WERE PRESENT:

Karen Lang, Mayor
Lars Nordfelt, Councilmember At-Large *(arrived as noted)*
Don Christensen, Councilmember At-Large
Tom Huynh, Councilmember District 1
Scott Harmon, Councilmember District 2
William Whetstone, Councilmember District 3
Cindy Wood, Councilmember District 4

STAFF PRESENT:

Ifo Pili, City Manager
Nichole Camac, City Recorder
John Flores, Assistant City Manager
Eric Bunderson, City Attorney
Colleen Jacobs, Police Chief
John Evans, Fire Chief
Jim Welch, Finance Director
Steve Pastorik, CED Director
Dan Johnson, Public Works Director
Jamie Young, Parks and Recreation Director
Jonathan Springmeyer, RDA Director
Sam Johnson, Strategic Communications Director
Craig Thomas, Community and Culture Director
Paula Melgar, HR Director *(electronically)*
Tumi Young, Chief Code Enforcement Officer
Jake Arslanian, Facilities Director
Harold Moleni, Administrative Analyst
Lauren McPeak, Administrative Analyst
Travis Crosby, IT

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF STUDY MEETING HELD APRIL 28, 2026
The Council considered the Minutes of the Study Meeting held April 28, 2026. There were no changes, corrections or deletions.

Councilmember Whetstone moved to approve the Minutes of the Study Meeting held April 28, 2026. Councilmember Christensen seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken and all members voted in favor of the motion.

REVIEW AGENDA FOR REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 12, 2026
Upon inquiry by Mayor Lang, members of the Council had no further questions or concerns regarding items listed on the Agenda for the Regular City Council Meeting scheduled later this night.

Councilmember Nordfelt arrived at 4:32 PM.

ADOPTION OF THE WEST VALLEY CITY TENTATIVE/INTERIM BUDGET SCHEDULED FOR MAY 26, 2026

A. **AN EXECUTIVE OFFICER OR BUDGET OFFICER OF THE CITY INTENDS TO STATE IN THIS PUBLIC MEETING THAT THE TENTATIVE BUDGET INCLUDES A PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE**
Mayor Lang stated that an executive officer or budget officer of the City intends to state in this public meeting that the tentative budget includes a proposed tax rate increase.

B. **AN EXECUTIVE OFFICER OR BUDGET OFFICER OF THE CITY STATES THAT THE TENTATIVE BUDGET INCLUDES A PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE AND PRESENTS A PROPERTY TAX IMPACT SCHEDULE AS DEFINED IN UTAH CODE SECTION 59-2-924**
Jim Welch, Finance Director, stated that the tentative budget includes a proposed tax rate increase and presents a property tax impact schedule as defined in Utah Code Section 59-2-924.

C. **THE CITY INTENDS TO STATE THAT THE CITY IS CONSIDERING LEVYING A TAX RATE THAT EXCEEDS THE CITY'S CERTIFIED TAX RATE (THE "PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE"). THE CITY WILL ALSO STATE THE APPROXIMATE DOLLAR AMOUNT AND PURPOSE FOR ADDITIONAL AD VALOREM TAX REVENUE THAT WOULD BE GENERATED BY THE PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE. THE CITY WILL ALSO STATE THE APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN AD VALOREM TAX**

REVENUE FOR THE CITY BASED ON THE PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE. THE CITY WILL ALSO STATE THAT IF THE CITY PROCEEDS WITH THE PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE, THE CITY WILL PROVIDE NOTICE OF AND CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING, AS REQUIRED BY UTAH CODE SECTION 59-2-919(4)(C), AT WHICH MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE

Mayor Lang stated that the City intends to state that the City is considering levying a tax rate that exceeds the City's certified tax rate (the "proposed tax rate increase"). She noted that the City will also state the approximate dollar amount and purpose for additional ad valorem tax revenue that would be generated by the proposed tax rate increase. Mayor Lang indicated that the City will also state the approximate percentage increase in ad valorem tax revenue for the City based on the proposed tax rate increase. She added that the City will also state that if the City proceeds with the proposed tax rate increase, the City will provide notice of and conduct a public hearing, as required by Utah Code Section 59-2-919(4)(c), at which members of the public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the proposed tax rate increase.

D. **THE CITY IS CONSIDERING LEVYING A TAX RATE THAT EXCEEDS THE CITY'S CERTIFIED TAX RATE. THE PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE WOULD GENERATE APPROXIMATELY $1,907,662 OF ADDITIONAL AD VALOREM TAX REVENUE TO BE USED TO PAY FOR ADDITIONAL OPERATIONAL AND EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION COSTS. THE PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE WOULD INCREASE THE CITY'S AD VALOREM TAX REVENUE BY APPROXIMATELY 5%. IF THE CITY PROCEEDS WITH THE PROPOSED TAX RATE INCREASE, THE CITY WILL PROVIDE NOTICE OF AND CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING, AS REQUIRED BY UTAH CODE SECTION 59-2-919(4)(C)**

Jim Welch, Finance Director, stated that the City is considering levying a tax rate that exceeds the City's certified tax rate. The proposed tax rate increase would generate approximately $1,907,662 of additional ad valorem tax revenue to be used to pay for additional operational and employee compensation costs. He noted that the proposed tax rate increase would increase the City's ad valorem tax revenue by approximately 5%. If the City proceeds with the proposed tax rate increase, the City will provide notice of and conduct a public hearing, as required by Utah Code Section 59-2-919(4)(c).

E. **BUDGET OFFICER PRESENTS THE PROPERTY TAX IMPACT SCHEDULE**

Mayor Lang stated that the City's Budget officer will now present the property tax impact schedule.

Jim Welch, Finance Director, stated that he is presenting the property tax impact schedule to the Council today. He noted that it has been included in the Council's packets as a separate document from all other budget documents. Jim noted that copies are also available attached to the agenda on the Utah public notice website and on the City website. He added that the property tax impact schedule can also be found on the website at wvc-ut.gov and clicking the truth in taxation button on the main page to find it. Jim stated that copies are also available at the back of the room or upon request to himself or the City Recorder, Nichole Camac.

F. **ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING JULY 1, 2026 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2027**

Mayor Lang informed a public hearing had been advertised for the Regular Council Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 in order for the City Council to hear and consider public comments regarding the Tentative Budget for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2026 and Ending June 30, 2027.

Proposed Resolutions 26-54, 26-55, and 26-56 related to the proposal to be considered by the City Council subsequent to the public hearing, was discussed as follows:

ACTION: RESOLUTION 26-54, ADOPT A TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING JULY 1, 2026 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2027 AND SET AUGUST 11, 2026 AS THE DATE FOR A PUBLIC BUDGET HEARING

Jim Welch, Finance Director, discussed proposed Resolution 26-54 that would adopt a Tentative Budget for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2026 and Ending June 30, 2027 and Set August 11, 2026 as the Date for a Public Budget Hearing.

Written documentation previously provided to the City Council included information as follows:

> This resolution adopts the tentative budget for West Valley City for the 2026-2027 fiscal year and sets a date for public comment at a hearing to be held on August 11, 2026.
>
> West Valley City will adopt a tentative budget that will be made available for public inspection during regular office hours in the City's Recorder's office and gave notice of a hearing to receive public comment, before the final

adoption of this tentative budget for FY 2026-2027.

ACTION: RESOLUTION 26-55, CONFIRM THAT CERTAIN STATEMENTS WERE MADE AND DOCUMENTS MADE AVAILABLE AS REQUIRED BY STATE LAW

Jim Welch, Finance Director, discussed proposed Resolution 26-55 that would confirm that Certain Statements were Made and Documents Made Available as Required by State Law.

ACTION: RESOLUTION 26-56, CONFIRM THAT CERTAIN ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS WERE MADE AS REQUIRED BY STATE LAW AND DIRECT THE BUDGET OFFICER TO NOTIFY THE TAX COMMISSION AND THE SALT LAKE COUNTY AUDITOR OF A PROPOSED TAX INCREASE AND THE DATE, TIME, AND PLACE OF A PUBLIC HEARING AS REQUIRED BY STATE LAW

Jim Welch, Finance Director, discussed proposed Resolution 26-56 that would confirm that Certain Additional Statements were Made as Required by State Law and Direct the Budget Officer to Notify the Tax Commission and the Salt Lake County Auditor of a Proposed Tax Increase and the Date, Time, and Place of a Public Hearing as Required by State Law.

Jim explained that “ad valorem” refers to the value of property and is commonly associated with property taxes. Jim stated that the proposed property tax increase would help fund nine new firefighter positions to improve emergency response in West Valley City, as well as support salary increases needed to retain and recruit employees and maintain essential operations. He noted that the required property tax impact statement is available on the City website and that all related statements and disclosures were reviewed by the City’s attorneys.

Jim also reviewed the proposed general operating budget for the City, totaling approximately $124 million. Similar to prior years, approximately 55% of the budget is allocated to public safety, with the remainder distributed among other City operations. He explained that the proposed budget reflects an increase of approximately $4 million from the previous year, primarily due to salary adjustments, insurance and utility costs, and personnel increases within the Fire and Police Departments. Jim stated that the tentative budget, now referred to as the interim budget under updated requirements, would proceed to a public hearing the following week to allow for public comment prior to adoption.

Councilmember Whetstone asked whether the projected increase in sales tax revenue was unusually high and inquired about the factors used in developing the sales tax forecast. Jim explained that sales tax revenue receives significant attention during the forecasting process because it represents a large portion of the City's revenue. He stated that projections are based in part on prior revenue trends, but broader economic conditions are also a major factor, including inflation rates. Jim noted that recent inflation figures exceeded many economists' projections and are incorporated into the City's calculations. He further explained that commercial retail building permits are also considered as part of the forecasting process. Jim stated that the projections are intended to be reasonable estimates and expressed confidence that the actual revenue would likely fall near the projected range.

Councilmember Huynh asked whether staff had an opportunity to review population trends within the City and determine how many individuals could potentially move into the City each month. Jim responded that the newly established state population committee had recently released updated population estimates for West Valley City, showing the City at approximately 138,000 residents, which was lower than the City's internal projection of approximately 144,000 residents. Jim explained that sales tax distributions are based on the population committee's estimates and noted that the reported decrease in population impacts the City's revenue projections. He stated that there is no appeal process for the committee's determinations. Jim further explained that the estimates rely heavily on new development permits, particularly high-density and residential housing units, as well as countywide population growth figures that are then allocated among individual communities. He noted that the City monitors these estimates closely due to their financial significance. Councilmember Huynh suggested that the City further study population growth and spending trends associated with new residents moving into the community. He referenced discussions with staff and representatives from other cities regarding estimated monthly population increases and expressed interest in developing approximate estimates of the economic impact and spending generated by new residents. Councilmember Huynh stated that having generalized figures and visual data would help provide a clearer understanding of the City's growth and related economic activity. Jim responded that one way to estimate the economic impact of population growth would be to divide the amount of sales tax collected by the City's population to develop a general per-capita estimate. He noted that while he did not have the exact figures available at the time, the calculation could provide a rough estimate tied to population increases. Councilmember Huynh clarified that his interest was specifically related to understanding population growth and increases within the City. Councilmember Huynh stated that population and growth projections can be useful in long-term planning efforts, including evaluating future traffic impacts and infrastructure needs such as roads and bridges. He noted that other agencies and communities use population trend data to project growth over five- and ten-year periods and expressed that this type of information is valuable for understanding and planning for the City's future development.

Councilmember Wood asked what the licenses and permits refer to. Jim explained that a significant portion of the City's licenses and permits revenue is generated through new construction and building permits within West Valley City. He noted that the category also includes other revenue sources such as dog licenses and business licenses, though construction-related activity accounts for the majority of the revenue. Jim also discussed projected decreases in interest earnings, noting that forecasting interest rates is not an exact science. He stated that when preparing the budget, staff recognized the possibility of declining rates and some resulting flexibility in projections. Jim further commented that he did not currently see significant factors pushing interest rates higher and indicated that downward pressure on rates could impact the City's interest earnings from reserve funds.

Councilmember Nordfelt asked about the budget process. Jim explained that the City would be adding a timeline related to the Truth in Taxation process on the City's website as part of a new webpage containing budget and tax-related information. He reviewed changes to the budget adoption process, noting that the City has historically adopted a tentative budget, now referred to under state requirements as the interim budget, which allows for minor adjustments before adoption of the final budget. Jim stated that the interim budget would be adopted in two weeks and would authorize continued City operations until adoption of the final budget. He explained that the final budget would be adopted either at the end of June if no property tax increase is proposed, or in August if a property tax increase is pursued. He further noted that the City traditionally conducts a Truth in Taxation hearing in August related to the judgment levy and explained that the County no longer performs those calculations on the City's behalf, requiring City staff to complete them internally. Jim stated that the anticipated judgment levy is expected to remain under $50,000 unless unforeseen judgments arise. Jim also reviewed updated public hearing requirements, noting there would be multiple public hearings throughout the process, including hearings for the interim budget and the final budget. He explained that under recent legislative changes, any City Council agenda item involving the budget would also require staff to read the property tax impact statement aloud to comply with state transparency and public communication requirements.

Councilmember Whetstone asked what the impact would be if the Council chose not to approve the proposed 5% increase or considered adopting a lower percentage increase instead. Jim responded that the most significant impacts of reducing or not approving the proposed increase would likely affect staffing and hiring commitments already made by the City. He explained that if the City intends to retain newly hired employees and fulfill obligations associated with existing grants, additional revenue would need to be identified or budget reductions would need to occur elsewhere. Jim compared the situation to managing a household budget, stating that funding priorities ultimately require either sufficient revenue or corresponding reductions in expenditures.

Councilmember Harmon asked if anything will be added to the fund balance with this budget. Jim explained that the proposed budget does not include a specific allocation to fund balance, noting that the City has historically relied on year-end balances rather than routinely budgeting additional contributions to fund balance. He stated that the City generally operates with a conservative budget approach and occasionally uses available fund balance for one-time expenditures such as fleet purchases or other important capital needs. Jim further explained that throughout the year, various budget items and one-time expenditures may come before the City Council for consideration. He noted that some of those expenditures may be funded through available fund balance while others may be supported by increased revenues. He added that these actions are part of the City's normal operations and provide the Council with opportunities to review expenditures exceeding established purchasing limits. Councilmember Harmon suggested that it would be helpful to provide a 30- to 60-day forecast estimating the City's anticipated fund balance at the end of the fiscal year on June 30, including whether additional funds may remain available to contribute to the fund balance. Jim explained that final fund balance figures are dependent on the year-end closing process and completion of the annual audit. He stated that although the City's books close on June 30, the audit process typically takes approximately five months to finalize. Jim noted that staff prepares interim estimates to monitor projected balances, but final expenditure totals are often not fully known until the end of August due to outstanding invoices and pending expenses. Jim stated that staff could provide a rough estimate of available fund balance by the end of May and indicated that fund balance projections are regularly monitored and discussed internally. He noted that maintaining adequate reserve funds is an important topic during the City's strategic planning discussions and stated that staff works to keep fund balance projections updated throughout the year.

The City Council will consider Resolutions 26-54, 26-55, and 26-56 at the Regular Council Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR MAY 26, 2026

A. **ACCEPT PUBLIC INPUT REGARDING APPLICATION SA-3-2026, FILED BY WEST VALLEY LAND HOLDINGS, LLC, REQUESTING APPROVAL OF A FIVE-LOT SUBDIVISION WITH A STREET VACATION**

Mayor Lang informed a public hearing had been advertised for the Regular Council Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 in order for the City Council to hear and consider public comments regarding Application SA-3-2026, Filed by West Valley Land Holdings, LLC, Requesting Approval of a Five-Lot Subdivision with a Street Vacation.

Proposed Ordinance 26-17 related to the proposal to be considered by the City Council subsequent to the public hearing, was discussed as follows:

ACTION: ORDINANCE 26-17, APPROVE THE VACATION OF A PORTION OF CONSTITUTION BOULEVARD IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE WASATCH WEST VALLEY SUBDIVISION

Steve Pastorik, CD Director, discussed proposed Ordinance 26-17 that would approve the Vacation of a Portion of Constitution Boulevard in Conjunction with the Wasatch West Valley Subdivision.

Written documentation previously provided to the City Council included information as follows:

> The purpose of this subdivision is to amend two lots from the WVLH Subdivision that was recorded in 2023, as well as take the remaining parcels owned by West Valley Land Holdings, LLC, and create a new subdivision consisting of 5 lots. The subdivision will modify the parcel lines where the current office tower sits and creates 4 additional lots for future commercial land uses. Three parcels recently acquired from the West Valley City RDA will also be incorporated into the new subdivision. Shared access to the subdivision will be gained from Lehman Avenue, which will be handled through an existing easement from the WVLH Subdivision, and from Constitution Blvd through a proposed access easement that will be

maintained in common by the owners of Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4. The subdivision will vacate 314 square feet of right-of-way along Constitution Blvd, in favor of Lot 2. Approximately 1,328 square feet will be dedicated on the same street.

Councilmember Harmon noted that this had been previously discussed when a potential Starbucks was proposed. Steve replied that is correct but noted that it never came to fruition.

The City Council will consider Ordinance 26-17 at the Regular Council Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 P.M.

ORDINANCE 26-18: AMEND SECTIONS 1-2-113, 10-1-110, 10-2-502, 10-2-503, 10-2-504, 10-2-506, 10-2-507, 10-2-508, 10-2-510, 10-2-511, 10-2-601, 10-3-204, 10-3-501, AND 10-3-701 OF THE WEST VALLEY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE TO AMEND CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING ADMINISTRATIVE CODE ENFORCEMENT

Eric Bunderson, City Attorney, presented proposed Ordinance 26-18 that would amend Sections 1-2-113, 10-1-110, 10-2-502, 10-2-503, 10-2-504, 10-2-506, 10-2-507, 10-2-508, 10-2-510, 10-2-511, 10-2-601, 10-3-204, 10-3-501, and 10-3-701 of the West Valley City Municipal Code to Amend Certain Requirements Concerning Administrative Code Enforcement.

Written documentation previously provided to the City Council included information as follows:

The Legal Department and City staff routinely review the City Code to ensure legal compliance and alignment with best practices. The proposed amendments reflect current best practices for efficient governance.

First, the Administrative Appeals Board is no longer necessary. Administration and the City Council are aligned on code enforcement priorities and practices, and the current ALJ serves as an independent third party.

Second, Code Enforcement has requested additional tools to address repeat offenders. Level 2 NOVs have been effective in addressing issues involving rental properties and businesses and would also be useful when applied to individual homeowners.

Third, requiring amendments to the City Code each time departments are reorganized is inefficient. The City Manager already has legal authority to organize departments. Repealing and reenacting Title 3 preserves that authority, along with all other legal requirements, while removing unnecessary codification of specific departmental structures.

Finally, legislation passed during the 2026 legislative session requires that provisions concerning City Council vacancies and disposal of City property be enacted and amended. Vacancies on the City Council are filled in accordance with state law. This ordinance would establish the process of breaking a tie. If a vote results in a tie between two candidates, the winner is determined by a coin toss. If two candidates tie for second place and no candidate has a majority, a coin toss determines who advances. For ties involving three or more candidates, a random card draw is used to eliminate all but the top two candidates. A final vote is then held between the remaining candidates, with any resulting tie decided by a coin toss. This ordinance also simplifies or repeals portions of the code related to disposal of City property.

The City Council will consider Ordinance 26-18 at the Regular Council Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 PM.

ORDINANCE 26-19: REPEAL AND REENACT TITLE 3 OF THE WEST VALLEY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE

Eric Bunderson, City Attorney, presented proposed Ordinance 26-19 that would Repeal and Reenact Title 3 of the West Valley City Municipal Code.

Written documentation previously provided to the City Council included information as follows:

The Legal Department and City staff routinely review the City Code to ensure legal compliance and alignment with best practices. The proposed amendments reflect current best practices for efficient governance.

First, the Administrative Appeals Board is no longer necessary. Administration and the City Council are aligned on code enforcement priorities and practices, and the current ALJ serves as an independent third party.

Second, Code Enforcement has requested additional tools to address repeat offenders. Level 2 NOVs have been effective in addressing issues involving rental properties and businesses and would also be useful when applied to individual homeowners.

Third, requiring amendments to the City Code each time departments are reorganized is inefficient. The City Manager already has legal authority to organize departments. Repealing and reenacting Title 3 preserves that authority, along with all other legal requirements, while removing unnecessary codification of specific departmental structures.

Finally, legislation passed during the 2026 legislative session requires that provisions concerning City Council vacancies and disposal of City property be enacted and amended. Vacancies on the City Council are filled in accordance with state law. This ordinance would establish the process of breaking a tie. If a vote results in a tie between two candidates, the winner is determined by a coin toss. If two candidates tie for second place and no candidate has a majority, a coin toss determines who advances. For ties involving three or more candidates, a random card draw is used to eliminate all but the top two candidates. A final vote is then held between the remaining candidates, with any resulting tie decided by a coin toss. This ordinance also simplifies or repeals portions of the code related to disposal of City property.

Councilmember Harmon clarified that the City Council will still approve the City Manager’s recommendations for Department Heads. Eric replied yes.

The City Council will consider Ordinance 26-19 at the Regular Council Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 PM.

ORDINANCE 26-20: AMEND SECTION 4-2-101, AND REPEAL SECTION 4-5-102 OF THE WEST VALLEY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE TO MAKE UPDATES REQUIRED BY STATE LAW
Eric Bunderson, City Attorney, presented proposed Ordinance 26-20 that would amend Section 4-2-101, and Repeal Section 4-5-102 of the West Valley City Municipal Code to make Updates Required by State Law

Written documentation previously provided to the City Council included information as follows:

The Legal Department and City staff routinely review the City Code to ensure legal compliance and alignment with best practices. The proposed amendments reflect current best practices for efficient governance.

First, the Administrative Appeals Board is no longer necessary. Administration and the City Council are aligned on code enforcement priorities and practices, and the current ALJ serves as an independent third party.

Second, Code Enforcement has requested additional tools to address repeat offenders. Level 2 NOVs have been effective in addressing issues involving rental properties and businesses and would also be useful when applied to individual homeowners.

Third, requiring amendments to the City Code each time departments are reorganized is inefficient. The City Manager already has legal authority to organize departments. Repealing and reenacting Title 3 preserves that authority, along with all other legal requirements, while removing unnecessary codification of specific departmental structures.

Finally, legislation passed during the 2026 legislative session requires that provisions concerning City Council vacancies and disposal of City property be enacted and amended. Vacancies on the City Council are filled in accordance with state law. This ordinance would establish the process of breaking a tie. If a vote results in a tie between two candidates, the winner is determined by a coin toss. If two candidates tie for second place and no candidate has a majority, a coin toss determines who advances. For ties involving three or more candidates, a random card draw is used to eliminate all but the top two candidates. A final vote is then held between the remaining candidates, with any resulting tie decided by a coin toss. This ordinance also simplifies or repeals portions of the code related to disposal of City property.

The City Council will consider Ordinance 26-20 at the Regular Council Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 PM.

RESOLUTION 26-57: APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF SOFTWARE AND RELATED SERVICES FROM CIVICPLUS

Candace Whitaker, Parks and Recreation, presented proposed resolution 26-57 that would approve the Purchase of Software and Related Services from CivicPlus.

Written documentation previously provided to the City Council included information as follows:

> The current software vendor, CivicRec, provides online registration and amenities preferred for operations.
>
> Six qualifying vendors responded to the RFP, and CivicRec scored higher than the others in the requested specifications of services , including price, quality, warranty, and work timeline.

Mayor Lang asked if CivicRec has been used by the City before. Candace replied yes and noted that they are the current provider.

The City Council will consider Resolution 26-57 at the Regular Council Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 P.M

AUTHORIZE CONSENT AGENDA FOR REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 26, 2026
The Council chose to add no items to the Consent Agenda for the May 26, 2026 Regular City Council Meeting at 6:30 PM.

REVIEW AGENDAS FOR SPECIAL REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND MUNICIPAL BUILDING AUTHORITY MEETINGS SCHEDULED MAY 26, 2026
Mayor Lang noted that there would be Special Redevelopment Agency and Municipal Building Authority Meetings scheduled May 26, 2026

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

A. **ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING JULY 1, 2026 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2027**
Mayor Lang informed a public hearing had been advertised for the Special Redevelopment Agency Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 in order for the Agency to hear and consider public comments regarding the Tentative Budget for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2026 and Ending June 30, 2027.

Proposed RDA Resolution 26-03 related to the proposal to be considered by the City Council subsequent to the public hearing, was discussed as follows:

ACTION: RESOLUTION 26-03, ADOPT A TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL

YEAR COMMENCING JULY 1, 2026 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2027 AND SET JUNE 9, 2026 AS THE DATE FOR A PUBLIC BUDGET HEARING

Jim Welch, Finance Director, discussed proposed Resolution 26-03 that would adopt a Tentative Budget for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2026 and Ending June 30, 2027 and set June 9, 2026 as the Date for a Public Budget Hearing.

Written documentation previously provided to the Agency included information as follows:

> This resolution adopts the tentative budget for the Redevelopment Agency of West Valley City for the 2026-2027 fiscal year. A public hearing for the tentative budget has been noticed and scheduled for May 26, 2026. A public hearing and adoption of the final budget has been scheduled for June 9, 2026.
>
> The Redevelopment Agency will adopt a tentative budget that will be made available for public inspection during regular office hours in the City's Recorder's office and gave notice of a hearing to receive public comment, before the final adoption of this tentative budget for FY 2026-2027.

The Redevelopment Agency will consider Resolution 26-03 at the Special Redevelopment Agency Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 P.M.

RESOLUTION 26-04: DESIGNATE A SURVEY AREA TO DETERMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT PROJECT AREA

Jonathan Springmeyer, Economic Development, presented proposed resolution 26-04 that would designate a Survey Area to Determine the Feasibility of Establishing a Community Reinvestment Project Area.

Written documentation previously provided to the City Council included information as follows:

> RDA staff would like the opportunity to study the proposed area for the purposes of creating a Community Reinvestment Area. The Proposed Resolution designates the area in the attached map as a Survey Area for the purposes of creating a Community Reinvestment Area, known as Lake Park CRA.
>
> RDA Staff believes the redevelopment efforts in the Lake Park Business Park can benefit greatly from the creation of a Redevelopment Area Project Area.

State Code requires the adoption of a Survey Area Resolution to study a proposed area as a potential Project Area.

Councilmember Harmon asked if the boundary line could be moved further north. Jon replied that is in an existing project area.

Councilmember Huynh asked how large this area is. Steve Pastorik, CD, Director reported that it was approximately 600 acres. Councilmember Huynh asked if someone request this or if staff is proposing it. Jon explained that redevelopment project areas are sometimes established proactively in hopes of attracting future development and investment opportunities. However, he noted that redevelopment efforts more commonly occur when the City has identified a specific area as a redevelopment priority and has interested development partners willing to participate. Jon stated that in this case, both conditions were present, with interested development parties involved and the project aligning with the City's current redevelopment focus and priorities. Councilmember Huyh asked how many landowners are involved and specifically if the new hospital was part of it. Jon explained that the proposed survey area includes several landowners, including West Valley City as one of the primary property owners. Jon stated that among the private landowners, the largest ownership interest is held by Wasatch through various LLCs and corporate entities, although there are several additional property owners within the area. He noted that a number of buildings in the proposed survey area are experiencing vacancy issues similar to other nearby properties. Jon further explained that the hospital was not included because it is a tax-exempt entity and does not generate property tax revenue. He noted that redevelopment project areas based on property tax increment cannot include properties that do not pay property taxes, similar to the Maverik Center while it remains under City ownership.

Councilmember Nordfelt asked why the portion owned by the school district was not included. Jon stated that he recently met with the business manager for Granite School District. Jon explained that he informed the District that its property was not currently included in the proposed survey area because the District had not previously expressed interest in developing or disposing of the property. He stated that if the District later indicated interest in participating, the City could amend the survey area resolution to include the property either immediately or at a later date. Jon further explained that negotiations with Granite School District would be significant if the project moves forward because the District accounts for approximately 42% of the property tax participation within the area. He stated that he did not want to presume the District wished to participate and noted that the District planned to review the matter with its committee the following week.

The Redevelopment Agency will consider Resolution 26-04 at the Special Redevelopment Agency Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 P.M

MUNICIPAL BUILDING AUTHORITY

A. **ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING JULY 1, 2026 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2027**
Mayor Lang informed a public hearing had been advertised for the Special Municipal Building Authority Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 in order for the Authority to hear and consider public comments regarding the Tentative Budget for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2026 and Ending June 30, 2027.

Proposed BA Resolution 26-02 related to the proposal to be considered by the City Council subsequent to the public hearing, was discussed as follows:

ACTION: RESOLUTION 26-02, ADOPT A TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING JULY 1, 2026 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2027 AND SET JUNE 9, 2026 AS THE DATE FOR A PUBLIC BUDGET HEARING
Jim Welch, Finance Director, discussed proposed Resolution 26-02 that would adopt a Tentative Budget for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2026 and Ending June 30, 2027 and set June 9, 2026 as the Date for a Public Budget Hearing.

Written documentation previously provided to the Authority included information as follows:

> This resolution adopts the tentative budget for the Municipal Building Authority of West Valley City for the 2026-2027 fiscal year. A public hearing for the tentative budget has been noticed and scheduled for May 26, 2026. A public hearing and adoption of the final budget has been scheduled for June 9, 2026.
>
> The Municipal Building Authority will adopt a tentative budget that will be made available for public inspection during regular office hours in the City's Recorder's office and gave notice of a hearing to receive public comment, before the final adoption of this tentative budget for FY 2026-2027.

The Municipal Building Authority will consider Resolution 26-02 at the Special Municipal Building Authority Meeting scheduled May 26, 2026 at 6:30 P.M.

A. 4100 SOUTH FENCING REQUIREMENTS

Steve Pastorik, CD Director, explained that approximately five years earlier, the City Council adopted an ordinance requiring a specific type of fencing for new front yard fences along 4100 South in West Valley City. He stated that the requirement was implemented following a City project along 4100 South between Bangerter Highway and approximately 5600 West, during which the City installed decorative wrought iron-style fencing in front yards and precast wall fencing in backyard areas. Steve explained that the intent of the ordinance was to maintain consistency with the fencing installed as part of the City project when residents construct new fences in the area. He noted that the ordinance has been in effect for approximately five years and referenced a resident who had expressed concerns and requested permission to install a different type of fence.

Mayor Lang asked if this includes side-yards. Steve explained that for corner lots, the backyard-facing portions of the property were typically constructed with precast wall fencing, while the portions facing the front or street frontage utilized the decorative wrought iron-style fencing. He stated that this has been the standard approach used for corner lot fencing within the project area.

Councilmember Wood stated that she had reviewed the fencing requirements along 4100 South and observed that the existing fencing styles throughout the corridor are inconsistent. She noted that while decorative wrought iron fencing had originally been installed as part of the City's beautification efforts, many properties along the corridor currently contain a variety of fencing materials, including vinyl, chain link, wood, precast walls, and stucco fencing. Councilmember Wood explained that the subject property is located west of the Mountain View Corridor, does not directly face 4100 South, and already contains existing vinyl fencing that the property owner wishes to continue. She further noted that east of Bangerter Highway there are also numerous fencing types and very few wrought iron fences remaining. Councilmember Wood expressed concern that the original intent of maintaining a consistent beautification standard along 4100 South has not been consistently achieved in practice. She also noted that the City originally paid for installation of the decorative fencing during the roadway project, whereas property owners are now required to bear the significantly higher cost of installing similar fencing themselves. Councilmember Wood stated that this may create a financial burden for residents and could discourage fence maintenance or replacement. She suggested that the City revisit the ordinance or evaluate fencing applications on a case-by-case basis to determine what is appropriate for individual properties.

Councilmember Harmon stated that portions of the decorative black fencing along 4100 South have been damaged multiple times by vehicle accidents and are currently in poor condition. He commented that while he prefers the appearance of the black decorative fencing and would like to see greater uniformity along the corridor, achieving a completely consistent fencing standard may not be practical.

Councilmember Huynh suggested that the City could consider a long-term beautification effort in which the City assists residents with replacing fencing along 4100 South over time as funding becomes available. He discussed the possibility of gradually improving fencing consistency throughout the corridor over the next several years as part of future City projects and beautification efforts. Councilmember Huynh stated that he likes the appearance of the decorative wrought iron fencing but acknowledged that the fencing along the corridor is currently inconsistent. He also noted that fencing damage appears to occur regardless of fencing type, referencing repeated vehicle impacts to fencing.

The Mayor and Council agreed to review a potential change to this ordinance at a future study meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

B. SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL UPDATE

Salt Lake County Council Chair Aimee Winder Newton presented a Powerpoint presentation summarized as follows:

- History of Salt Lake County
    - Established Cities
        - Salt Lake City (1850)
        - Sandy (1893)
        - Murray (1902)
        - Midvale (1909)
        - South Jordan (1935)
        - South Salt Lake (1938)
        - West Jordan (1941)
        - Riverton (1948)
        - Town of Alta (1970)
        - Draper (1978)
        - Bluffdale (1978)
        - West Valley City (1980)
        - Taylorsville (1996)
        - Herriman (1999)
        - Holladay (1999)

        - Cottonwood Heights (2005)
        - Town of Brighton (2020)
        - Millcreek (2016)
        - Kearns (May 2024)
        - Magna (May 2024)
        - White City (May 2024)
        - Emigration Canyon (May 2024)
        - Town of Copperton (May 2024)
            - *** H.B. 330 (2024) now requires all "islands" to annex or incorporate by July 2027*
- Will Wall-to-Wall Cities reduce the need for the County?
    - Counties are political subdivisions of the state per Utah Constitution Article XI, Section 1
    - Counties deliver state-mandated services.
    - State law differentiates the roles of cities and counties.
    - Cities handle municipal services—counties focus on regional functions.
    - Consolidation into cities reduces duplication and allows counties to maximize efficiency across jurisdictions.
- Examples of Services the County provides
    - CRIMINAL JUSTICE / PUBLIC SAFETY
        - Jail and other criminal justice services, prosecution and indigent defense.
    - ELECTIONS
        - Runs the general election by statute. Contracts with municipalities for municipal elections.
    - HEALTH DEPARTMENT
        - Provides immunizations, saftey protocols for restaurants and businesses, clean up homeless camps and other unsafe environments.
    - AGING & ADULT SERVICES
        - Provides Meals on Wheels and runs senior centers
    - BEHAVIORAL HEALTH
        - Manages mental health/substance abuse services. Partners with providers. Designated by the state to be mental health & substance abuse authority.
    - CULTURE & THE ARTS
        - Administers grants and manages cultural facilities: Abravanel Hall, Capitol Theater, Eccles Theater, etc.
    - CONVENTIONS & TOURISM
        - County-owned convention centers bring in out-of-state conventions that generate sales tax.

    - REGIONAL PARKS & RECREATION
        - Maintains regional parks, trails, and open spaces. Operates recreation centers and sports complexes.
    - LIBRARY SERVICES
        - Salt Lake County Library system serves most of the county, with access to Salt Lake City and Murray libraries.
    - PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATION
    - Collects property tax for all entities, most of which are not part of Salt Lake County, and distributes funds
- Cities can't do what the County does
    - Multiple jails? Multiple health departments? Multiple clerk's offices?
    - Salt Lake County delivers regional services on a scale best served by county government.
    - Duplicating these services would be expensive, inefficient, and create confusion across city boundaries.
- Mayor-Council Form of Government
    - Mayor Jenny Wilson
        - Councilmembers: Laurie Stringham, Jiro Johnson, Ross Romero, Suzanne Harrison, Carlos Moreno, Sheldon Stewart, Natalie Pinkney, Aimee Winder Newton, Dea Theodore
    - Independent Elected Officials
        - ASSESSOR- Chris Stavros
            - Establishes the fair market value of real and personal property ensuring assessments are accurate, fair, and compliant with Utah law.
        - AUDITOR- Chris Harding
            - Financial integrity through audits, annual financial report, certifying property tax rates, and ensuring compliance with budgeting and fiscal policies
        - CLERK- Lannie Chapman
            - Oversees elections, marriage licenses, passports, and maintains official records for the County Council.
        - DISTRICT ATTORNEY- Sim Gill
            - Responsible for legal work, including prosecution of all felony criminal matters in Salt Lake County as well as civil government litigation.
        - RECORDER- Rashelle Hobbs

        - Maintains public land records, relating to real estate, liens, mining, and subdivision plats, to ensure transparency in real estate transactions.
      - SHERIFF- Rosie Rivera
        - Runs the jail operations, manages search and rescue teams, and law enforcement for the unincorporated areas including the canyons.
      - SURVEYOR- Bradley Park
        - Provides quality surveying and mapping services to protect, preserve, and perpetuate property boundary rights.
      - TREASURER- Sheila Srivastava
        - Collects, safeguards, and disburses county funds, including property tax payments, and manages the county's investments.
      - Justice Court Judge- Shauna Graves Robertson
        - The Salt Lake County Justice Court handles small claims, misdemeanors, and traffic cases
          - **This will dissolve June 2027
- What is the estimated 2025 Salt Lake County Budget?
  - $2 Billion (Approx)
    - While this reflects the total amount adopted, only a portion of it falls under the County Council's discretion--some are "pass through" taxes
  - $1.5 Billion (Approx)
    - The net budget represents total revenues minus "pass through" taxes. This is the portion that falls under the County Council's discretion.
- What are pass through taxes?
  - Appear in the budget for transparency, but don't impact county operations.
  - County is middleman. Receives funds and forwards to other agencies.
  - Not truly county funds.
  - Examples: Cities, service providers, federal or state grants, UTA.
  - Council has NO DISCRETION over how these funds are used.
- Special Revenue
  - Source: County controlled funds from taxes or fees.
  - Libraries, TRCC, Behavioral Health, etc.
  - HIGHLY RESTRICTED USE
  - Council has some discretion over use but can only fund certain things within certain funds.

- General Fund
  - Source: Primarily property taxes, sales tax, etc.
  - Core government services—public safety, elections, public heath, and administration.
  - Most flexible.
  - Only fund the council has full discretion.
- Enterprise Fund
  - Source: Fees charged to users through paid services—not taxes.
  - These funds operate like businesses.
  - Golf Courses, Landfill, Public Works
  - Council has limited discretion over how this is used.
- What is the County's largest responsibility?
  - Public Safety accounts for the largest portion of the budget. More than 74% of the county's general fund is allocated to public safety including law enforcement, corrections, and prosecution.
- How property taxes work in Utah
  - State law limits property tax revenue increases to only "new growth" (e.g., new construction or additions).
  - Inflation in property values does not increase revenue—rates are adjusted downward to keep revenue flat.
  - Population growth increases demand for county services.
  - This creates a budget gap, averaging about 1% or $5M per year.
- Declining Trend in Property Tax Rates
- When my property values go up, does my property tax automatically go up?
  - No - it does not. Utah's system is designed so that rising property values alone do not automatically raise your property tax bill. Each year, the County Auditor calculates a *certified tax rate* for every taxing entity (county, city, school district, etc.). That rate is adjusted downward so the entity collects the same total revenue as the prior year—plus new-growth revenue from new construction.
- How has the County responded?
  - The Council has consistently exercised fiscal discipline, cut spending while preserving Salt Lake County's top tier AAA bond rating—the highest available.
  - As part of its commitment to fiscal responsibility, the Council has regular stress testing in each agency to identify financial needs and manage spending.
- Public Safety Needs

- Not a single new bed has been built since 2001, even as the county's population has grown by nearly 300,000 and is expected to grow to 1.4 million by 2040.
- Approximately one-fifth of the jail's beds are in Oxbow, a failing facility that urgently needs to be replaced.
- At the same time, homelessness and mental illness have increased, and our jail has become the state's default mental health provider.
- Over the past ten years, the average person booked into the jail has been booked seven times prior, driving up costs while leaving underlying needs unmet.
- Although beds have increased after opening Oxbow's third pod, the jail continues to operate at or near capacity every day.
- Reopening the third pod at Oxbow added 184 individuals, placing additional pressure on aging infrastructure and maintenance systems.
- Increased enforcement due to SLC Public Safety Plan has meant an increase in bookings and individuals with multiple charges is placing greater demands on judicial processing.
- Goals
  - Rebuild capacity from Oxbow Jail (552 beds) at main facility
  - Add new beds to meet growth and safety demands
  - Expand mental health treatment from 88 → 160 beds
  - Create a stepdown unit (100 beds) for re-entry support
  - Look at a lower-security facility to save on costs to provide mental health, substance use, job training and wraparound services for low-level offenders in order to reduce recidivism.

Councilmember Whetstone asked what services are required under State mandates. County Chair Newton explained that Salt Lake County generally funds services required by state statute through the general fund and property tax revenues. She stated that services considered non-essential or "nice-to-have," such as arts, culture, parks, and recreation programs, are typically funded through tourism-related revenue sources, including TRCC, ZAP, and TRT funds. Chair Newton further explained that the County's goal is to primarily use property tax revenues for statutory services required under state or federal law. She noted that some adult and aging services, including nutrition programs, are federally required and partially supported through federal funding, while additional operational costs, such as senior center services, are supplemented through the County's general fund.

The Mayor and Members of the City Council had no further questions or comments.

C. COUNCIL CALENDAR

Mayor Lang referenced a Memorandum previously received from the City Manager that outlined upcoming meetings and events.

Members of the City Council had no further questions regarding the Council Update.

NEW BUSINESS

A. POTENTIAL FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

N/A

B. COUNCIL REPORTS

COUNCILMEMBER HARMON

Councilmember Harmon attended crossing guard banquet.

COUNCILMEMBER WHETSTONE

Councilmember Whetstone stated that he participated in a training with the new Fire Department recruits.

MAYOR LANG

Mayor Lang stated that she attended a luncheon at Ascent Academy.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Upon motion by Councilmember Huynh all voted in favor to adjourn.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS OF THE WEST VALLEY COUNCIL THE STUDY MEETING ON TUESDAY MAY 12, 2026 WAS ADJOURNED AT 6:04 PM BY MAYOR LANG.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true, accurate and complete record of the proceedings of the Study Meeting of the West Valley City Council held Tuesday, May 12, 2026.

Nichole Camac

Nichole Camac, MMC
City Recorder