Minutes of the
Millcreek City Council
June 8, 2026
6:30 p.m.
Work Meeting
7:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

The City Council of Millcreek, Utah, met in a public work meeting and regular meeting on June 8, 2026, at City Hall, located at 1330 E. Chambers Avenue, Millcreek, UT 84106. The meeting was recorded for the City's website and had an option for online public comment.

PRESENT:

Council Members
Cheri Jackson, Mayor
Silvia Catten, District 1
Thom DeSirant, District 2
Nicole Handy, District 3
Bev Uipi, District 4 (electronic, arrived at 7:07pm)

City Staff
Mike Winder, City Manager
Elyse Sullivan, City Recorder
John Brems, City Attorney
Kurt Hansen, Facilities Director
Francis Lilly, Assistant City Manager
Lisa Dudley, HR-Finance Director
Rita Lund, Communications Director
Zack Wendel, Planner
Sean Murray, Planner
John Miller, Public Works Director
Erica Okada, Public Information Manager
Fred Lutze, Deputy City Engineer
Aaron Roberts, Stormwater Ops & Construction Manager
Jim Hardy, Building Service Director

Attendees: Council Member Suzanne Harrison, Kara Trevino, Allen Parkinson (electronic), Tyler Affleck (electronic), Rick Hansen, Laura Renshaw, Rob Peterson, Nancy Peterson, Christian Larsen, Sheryl Martin, Maddie Clements, Andrei Tarassov, Gary Hanneman, Kristian Buchman, Thomas McMurtry, Linda Zenger, Linda Milne

WORK MEETING – 6:30 p.m.
TIME COMMENCED: 6:32 p.m.

Mayor Jackson called the work meeting to order and excused Council Member Uipi.

1. Salt Lake County Council Presentation on County Budget, Services, and Key Priorities; Council Member Suzanne Harrison

Salt Lake County Council Member Suzanne Harrison provided an overview of the county's structure, statutory responsibilities, and regional services. She explained that Salt Lake County has evolved through multiple waves of municipal incorporation and now functions primarily as a regional government entity supporting cities throughout the county, including Millcreek. Council Member Harrison noted that the county is required by state statute to provide core services, with approximately 75% of the General Fund dedicated to public safety functions, including the Sheriff's Office, District Attorney's Office, jail operations, and indigent defense services. She also highlighted the county's role in administering elections on behalf of municipalities, providing public health services, and serving as the behavioral health authority for lower-income residents and individuals needing mental health or substance use treatment.

Council Member Harrison further described additional county responsibilities, including adult and aging services such as Meals on Wheels and senior centers, cultural arts programming and facilities, regional parks and recreation funded largely through tourism revenues, and library services supported through a dedicated property tax levy. She also noted the county's administration of tourism, convention, and recreation programs, which she stated helps reduce the average household tax burden while supporting local businesses and economic activity. Additional functions include property tax collection and distribution for all taxing entities within the county and management of enterprise funds such as golf courses, landfill operations, and public works, which are funded through user fees rather than taxes.

Council Member Harrison explained that the county operates under a mayor–council form of government with nine council members and several independently elected officials. She also referenced upcoming structural changes, including the planned dissolution of the County Justice Court in June 2027 as municipal courts increasingly assume local jurisdictional responsibilities. She concluded by noting that while the county's overall budget appears large due to pass-through funds such as transit and sales tax distributions, the portion under direct county control is significantly smaller, with the General Fund primarily supporting mandated public safety and core government services.

Council Member DeSirant asked why the libraries are considered special revenue and not an enterprise fund. Council Member Harrison said the library does not pay for itself with fees and that is why it is based on property tax.

Mayor Jackson asked about Public Works being an enterprise fund. Council Member Harrison said services provided by Public Works are paid by fees for that service, it is not paid out of the General Fund or subsidized by the General Fund. The county is responsible for providing public works services for unincorporated Salt Lake County. The funding for that goes through the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (MSD) and cities that contract with SLCo PW is fee-based.

Kara Trevino, Salt Lake County Legislative Affairs Director, clarified the service and funding structure for unincorporated areas within Salt Lake County and the MSD. She explained that services are funded directly through revenues generated from the unincorporated areas, and that residents and properties in those areas effectively pay for the services they receive without subsidy from other jurisdictions. Trevino noted that the MSD provides certain services directly, such as planning and code enforcement, while other services, including public works functions, are provided through contracts with Salt Lake County. In these arrangements, the County serves as the service provider, while funding is administered through the MSD using tax revenues collected from unincorporated areas. It was further clarified that all unincorporated areas fall within the MSD service structure, which coordinates and delivers municipal-type services through a combination of direct provision and contracted County support.

Council Member Harrison emphasized the significant costs associated with providing core public safety services at the county level, noting that jail operations alone cost approximately $120 million annually. She highlighted that public safety represents the county's largest general fund expenditure and a shared bipartisan priority among elected officials. Council Member Harrison discussed Utah's "truth in taxation" framework, explaining that property tax revenues do not automatically increase with inflation or rising property values, which often leads to public misunderstanding. She noted that the county generally receives the same base revenue each year, with increases only occurring through new growth or voter-approved adjustments, while costs for services such as senior nutrition programs, infrastructure, and employee compensation continue to rise. She added that the county has maintained fiscal discipline and is proud of its AAA bond rating, one of only a limited number held by counties nationwide.

Council Member Harrison also outlined several key challenges and priorities moving forward, including the need to address jail capacity constraints following more than two decades without expansion despite significant population growth. She noted that the county's jail system is currently at capacity and faces operational inefficiencies due to aging infrastructure and split facilities between the Metro Jail and Oxbow Jail. She explained that these challenges, combined with increasing behavioral health and substance use treatment needs among the population, have prompted efforts to both expand jail capacity and improve access to appropriate mental health services. Harrison referenced ongoing work with national partners specializing in criminal justice and behavioral health reform to better align services with treatment needs rather than incarceration alone. She concluded by expressing appreciation for the opportunity to meet with the council and reaffirmed her commitment to continued collaboration with local municipalities.

Council Member Catten asked about the budget being impacted with the closure of the Salt Palace Convention Center for several years. Council Member Harrison noted that the loss of the venue over a multi-year period—potentially up to three years—will present significant challenges. She explained that following the renovation, the facility is expected to have increased capacity and the ability to accommodate concurrent or "double-booked" conventions, which should enhance long-term economic activity. In the interim, she stated that the county is working to offset the impact by expanding event and tourism opportunities across Salt Lake County, including increased collaboration with Sports Salt Lake and continued use of other venues such as the Mountain America Expo Center. She noted a particular focus on youth sports tourism, including the development of additional tournaments and events throughout the county. She concluded that while the temporary closure will have a meaningful economic impact, these efforts are intended to help mitigate losses and position the county for stronger performance upon completion of the renovation.

2. Staff Reports
There were no reports.

3. Discussion of Agenda Items, Correspondence, and/or Future Agenda Items
There was none.

Council Member DeSirant moved to adjourn the work meeting at 6:57 p.m. Council Member Catten seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR MEETING – 7:00 p.m.
TIME COMMENCED: 7:01 p.m.

1. Welcome, Introduction and Preliminary Matters

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Jackson called the meeting to order and led the pledge of allegiance. She noted Council Member Uipi would participate electronically.

1.2 Public Comment

Kristian Buchman asked about city hall having fiber service. Mayor Jackson said staff would reach out to answer his question.

Mandie Clements from Congressman Owen's office introduced herself to the council.

Laura Renshaw, Millcreek Library Manager, provided an update on Millcreek Library programming, highlighting several ongoing summer initiatives. She reported that the Summer Reading Program is off to a strong start, with approximately 1,700 participants recorded within the first nine days. Renshaw encouraged continued participation and completion of the program, noting that participants receive prize drawing entries, books, and various incentives, including gift cards and passes to local attractions, with opportunities for additional rewards through bonus reading rounds. She noted that the program runs through the end of July and may be completed at any library branch. Renshaw also highlighted the library's partnership with the Millcreek Business Council to distribute "Welcome to the Neighborhood" materials to new library cardholders, which include community event information, coupons, and listings of free local activities. She added that staff are working to expand the inclusion of programming from other community partners, such as the senior center and recreation center, to provide a more comprehensive resource for residents. She discussed the library's "Tiny Art Show," a community engagement project featuring small-scale artwork created by residents of all ages. She noted that 150 art kits were distributed for June with displays scheduled for July, and an additional 150 kits will be distributed in July for an August exhibit. Renshaw emphasized the program's popularity and its role in encouraging community participation, creativity, and engagement within the library.

A Millcreek resident addressed the council noting they would be seeing more of him.

Council Member Catten moved to reorder the agenda moving item 3.7 just before planning matters. Council Member DeSirant seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Business Matters

3.7 Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 26-15, Approving Appointments to the Planning Commission

Francis Lilly reported that the council was being asked to approve appointments to the Planning Commission, including one new appointment and two reappointments. He explained that the nominating committee recommended Robert Peterson to fill the vacancy previously held by Nils Lofgren. Lilly noted that Peterson is an accomplished architect and an active member and former president of the Canyon Rim Citizens Association. He also stated that the resolution includes reappointments of commissioners Christian Larsen and Jacob Richardson. The new and reappointed terms are scheduled to begin on July 1, 2026, and conclude on June 30, 2030.

Robert Peterson expressed appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the commission.

Council Member DeSirant moved to approve Resolution 26-15, Approving Appointments to the Planning Commission. Council Member Catten seconded. The Recorder called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Planning Matters

2.1 Discussion and Consideration of Ordinance 26-41, Rezoning Certain Property Located at Approximately 2785 East 3300 South from the Residential Mixed (RM) Zone and the Commercial (C) Zone to the Commercial (C) Zone

Zack Wendel presented a rezone application for the property located at 2785 East 3300 South, describing it primarily as a zoning cleanup to consolidate a split-zoned parcel. He explained that the property is currently divided between a residential mixed zone and a commercial zone, and the applicant is seeking to rezone the residential mixed portion to commercial in order to create a single, unified commercial designation across the entire site. Wendel noted that the property contains an existing approximately 5,400-square-foot commercial building constructed around 2000, currently used as a medical office with 21 surface parking stalls, and that no changes to the existing structure or use are proposed as part of the application.

Wendel further explained that the request is intended to simplify future development and regulatory review by aligning zoning across the parcel, particularly in light of recent updates to the city's zoning ordinance that changed permitted uses and development standards within the residential mixed zone. Staff was unable to determine a definitive reason for the original split zoning, though it may have resulted from prior county-era consolidation when the zones had more similar use allowances. Wendel added that the proposal is consistent with the Mixed Use 1 future land use designation, which allows for a mix of commercial, office, retail, and potential medium-density residential uses. He reported that the proposal received a positive public review process, including a few comments at the open house, a unanimous recommendation from the East Mill Creek Community Council, and a unanimous recommendation from the Planning Commission. He concluded that the application does not propose any new development and is solely intended to establish consistent zoning across the property for clarity and future use.

Council Member Handy moved to approve Ordinance 26-41, Rezoning Certain Property Located at Approximately 2785 East 3300 South from the Residential Mixed (RM) Zone and the Commercial (C) Zone to the Commercial (C) Zone. Council Member DeSirant seconded. The Recorder called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

2.2 Discussion and Consideration of Ordinance 26-42, Rezoning Certain Property Located at Approximately 765 E 4500 S from the Residential Mixed (RM) Zone to the Commercial (C) Zone

Sean Murray presented a rezone application for the property located at approximately 765 East 4500 South. He explained that the site currently contains a small home and garage that have been converted to office use for several years and is occupied by Think 10 Creative, a business that has outgrown the existing space and is seeking the ability to redevelop the property with a larger office building. Murray noted that the current Residential Mixed (RM) zoning does not allow for demolition and reconstruction of a standalone office building, and therefore the applicant is requesting a rezoning to Commercial to permit the proposed use.

Murray further explained that the surrounding area includes existing office and residential uses, with commercial uses located nearby, and that the property is adjacent to a mix of residential and non-residential development along 4500 South. Murray noted that a recent zoning code update shifted the RM zone toward a more residential-focused designation, moving office and similar uses primarily into commercial zones, which contributed to the applicant's request. He stated that the proposal is consistent with the city's General Plan future land use designation of Mixed Use 1, which supports office, retail, and medium-density residential uses, as well as broader policy goals encouraging established businesses to reinvest and remain within Millcreek.

Murray described a conceptual site layout showing a future office building with parking primarily located to the rear and limited customer parking in the front, noting that the design is preliminary and subject to future administrative site plan review for compliance with applicable zoning, landscaping, fire, and engineering standards. He reported that a neighborhood meeting and open house were held with minimal public attendance and no substantive concerns raised. The proposal received a 5-0 recommendation of approval from the Millcreek Community Council and a unanimous recommendation of approval from the Planning Commission. Murray concluded by noting that the application is currently before the Council as a rezone request and, if approved, would proceed to administrative site plan review for detailed development standards compliance.

Council Member DeSirant moved to approve Ordinance 26-42, Rezoning Certain Property Located at Approximately 765 E 4500 S from the Residential Mixed (RM) Zone to the Commercial (C) Zone. Council Member Catten seconded. The Recorder called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Business Matters Continued

3.1 Transportation Utility Fee Presentation; Public Works Department
John Miller introduced the Transportation Utility Fee (TUF) Report and noted that the effort represented more than two years of work by staff and consultants. He explained that improving the condition of the city's roadways had been established as a key performance objective and that approximately 85 percent of public works complaints received by the city are related to pavement conditions. To address these concerns, staff evaluated a range of funding options, including maintaining the status quo, bonding, and implementing a transportation utility fee. Miller noted that the council had previously authorized funding for an independent third-party study to provide a more comprehensive analysis than could be obtained through staff research and discussions with other municipalities. He stated that the report presented to the council was the culmination of that study, along with extensive public outreach efforts.

Miller introduced Thomas McMurtry of Avenue Consultants, the firm selected to conduct the study due to its experience completing similar transportation utility fee analyses for several municipalities throughout Utah. He noted that Avenue Consultants had successfully assisted multiple cities with comparable efforts and were currently conducting additional studies. He highlighted the firm's thorough approach, including its analysis of pavement preservation strategies, pavement condition indices, and other roadway maintenance considerations. Miller indicated that the presentation would summarize the findings and recommendations contained in the TUF Report.

Thomas McMurtry provided an overview of the transportation utility fee study, noting that the presentation largely reiterated information previously shared with the council. He outlined the agenda, which included a review of background information, updates to legal requirements resulting from the passage of HB 425, discussion of the recommended fee structure, and a summary of public engagement efforts.

As background, McMurtry explained that Millcreek is responsible for maintaining more than 170 miles of city streets, many of which have aging pavement and significant maintenance needs. He noted that roadway conditions naturally deteriorate over time, often at an accelerating rate, creating a growing backlog of maintenance projects throughout the city. The purpose of the study has been to identify strategies to address current pavement deterioration while also establishing a sustainable funding approach for future roadway maintenance needs.

McMurtry discussed the TUF as one of the funding mechanisms evaluated. He explained the distinction between a fee and a tax, noting that tax revenues are deposited into the general fund and may be used for a variety of municipal purposes, whereas a fee is based on usage and is dedicated to a specific service. He compared the TUF to a utility bill, where costs are allocated according to use. Under a TUF, roadway maintenance costs are distributed based on trip generation, creating a more equitable system that aligns costs with roadway usage. He also noted that transportation utility fees have been utilized in Utah for more than a decade, with Provo adopting the state's first such fee in 2013. Additionally, he referenced the 2023 Utah Supreme Court case Larson v. Pleasant Grove, which upheld the authority of municipalities to establish transportation utility fees, affirming that the fee is a lawful funding tool available to cities.

Mayor Jackson confirmed the fee can only be used for the purpose in which it was collected. Council Member DeSirant asked if sidewalks fell under the scope of the fee. McMurtry explained that sidewalks fall within a gray area because the legislation does not specifically address them, and the intent of the bill appears to focus primarily on pavement. However, he noted that sidewalks may be considered part of street maintenance depending on the scope of the project. For example, sidewalk work may be appropriate as part of a full roadway reconstruction project but would likely be less appropriate for more limited pavement maintenance activities such as crack sealing, patching, or surface treatments. McMurtry stated that the Legislature has provided cities with discretion in applying the law within these circumstances.

McMurtry reviewed the current condition of Millcreek's roadway network, noting that the most recent pavement condition assessment, completed in August 2025, identified a citywide average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 64 out of 100. He explained that many streets throughout the city fall within the yellow, orange, and red condition categories, indicating PCI ratings below 70 and a need for maintenance. While he noted that Millcreek's pavement conditions are comparable to many other Utah communities, he emphasized that the city faces a significant backlog of roadway maintenance needs. As a point of comparison, he stated that Springville's average PCI is approximately 68, while the newer community of Ivins has an average PCI of 81 due to its recently constructed infrastructure. The study established a target citywide PCI of 75, which is considered an industry standard and would provide a sustainable balance between roads in better and worse condition.

McMurtry further explained that the study's maintenance goal is for every city street to receive some form of treatment within a ten-year cycle. However, a review of past maintenance activities found that only 32 percent of Millcreek's streets have received any treatment during the last ten years, highlighting the gap between current funding levels and the maintenance needed to preserve the roadway system. He stated that achieving the city's pavement condition goals will require additional investment beyond existing funding sources.

The presentation also reviewed roadway maintenance expenditures over the past five years, which have increased from less than $5 million annually to more than $6 million in the most recent year. Approximately half of this funding is derived from Class B and Class C Road Funds, which are generated through state fuel taxes and distributed to local governments based on roadway mileage and population. Millcreek currently receives approximately $3 million annually from these sources. Despite these revenues and additional support from the General Fund, McMurtry noted that current funding remains insufficient to meet the city's long-term roadway maintenance needs, and road conditions are expected to continue deteriorating without additional resources.

McMurtry then discussed the advantages and disadvantages of implementing a TUF. He explained that a TUF would create a dedicated funding source restricted to roadway maintenance, distribute costs among users based on roadway usage, and provide a stable and predictable revenue stream that would allow the city to better plan future maintenance projects. The fee would apply broadly to residential, commercial, institutional, nonprofit, school, and church properties based on trip generation. He noted that challenges associated with the TUF include the introduction of a new fee for residents and businesses, as well as the need to establish an effective billing mechanism, potentially similar to the city's existing stormwater utility fee collection process. McMurtry explained that choosing not to implement a TUF would avoid creating a new expense for residents and businesses. However, he cautioned that reliance on existing funding sources would likely be insufficient to address maintenance needs, resulting in continued roadway deterioration and increased future repair costs. He noted that deferred maintenance often leads to more expensive reconstruction projects that could have been avoided through timely preservation treatments.

McMurtry reviewed the legal framework established by HB 425 for calculating a TUF. He explained that state law requires the fee to be based on trip generation and that municipalities must use the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual to determine usage. The methodology involves evaluating every parcel and address within the city to calculate anticipated trips and allocate costs accordingly. In response to questions raised during public outreach, he noted that alternatives such as using vehicle registration data or the number of vehicles owned by a household are not permitted under the statutory framework, which requires the fee to be calculated using trip-generation standards. Mayor Jackson asked about assessing fees based on the number of cars a residence has. McMurtry acknowledged that car registrations were always changing and that type of information was not accessible to cities.

Council Member DeSirant brought up implementing a TUF on businesses only. McMurtry explained that HB 425 does not permit such exclusions. He noted that state law specifically requires municipalities to include, at a minimum, residential, commercial, and public property categories when establishing a TUF. While cities may create additional classifications, they must include these required categories in their fee structure. McMurtry referenced a recent example in South Salt Lake, where an attempted fee structure that did not comply with these requirements was subsequently repealed and replaced with a revised TUF that included the mandated categories. He emphasized that the statutory framework does not allow municipalities to omit required user groups from participation in the fee program.

John Miller added some people have multiples cars but do not drive as much as those with two cars. The Institute of Traffic Engineers has gone out and proven the typical number of trips generated.

Council Member Uipi asked about increasing fees for businesses that use heavy trucks, such as grocery stores or UPS. McMurtry explained that the recommended monthly fee for residential properties is $7.65 per dwelling unit, with residential users accounting for approximately 46 percent of all trips generated within the city. He further described the commercial fee structure, which divides commercial properties into four categories based on trip generation levels. Commercial properties that generate higher volumes of traffic are assigned higher fees to reflect their proportionate use of the transportation system. While the fee is not calculated based on vehicle weight or specific trip counts, it is tied to the percentage of overall trips generated by each category. McMurtry noted that larger commercial properties, such as major retail establishments, would fall within the highest category and could be assessed a monthly fee of approximately $623, reflecting their greater contribution to roadway usage and maintenance needs.

Council Member Catten asked McMurtry to explain trip ends. McMurtry explained that the term refers to the destination point of a vehicle trip and is used as the basis for calculating trip generation. He noted that trips are not double-counted; instead, each trip is associated with the property where the trip begins or ends. For example, a trip from a residence to a store is counted as a trip ending at the store, while the return trip is counted as a trip ending at the residence. Additional stops at other destinations, such as a library or another business, are counted as separate trips associated with those respective properties. This methodology allows trip generation to be allocated among different land uses based on their contribution to overall transportation system demand.

The council and McMurtry focused on the specifics of the proposed TUF, its structure, expected revenue, and long-term impact on Millcreek's road system. McMurtry walked through the recommended fee schedule, explaining that residential units would pay a flat monthly amount and that commercial and public properties were divided into sub-categories based on trip generation, with higher-traffic uses like big box retail and fast-food drive-throughs paying significantly more. He noted that the total TUF would generate about $5.7 million per year, which, when combined with existing funding, is designed to raise the citywide pavement condition index (PCI) to an average of 75 and allow every road to receive some form of maintenance within a 10-year cycle. Council members clarified that residents should not expect all roads to be improved in the first year and discussed practical constraints such as contractor capacity and staffing. They also discussed how the PCI target functions—some roads will be above 75 and some below, but the system average will be maintained near that level. The council asked about long-term scenarios, such as what happens once the city "catches up" on deferred maintenance. McMurtry and staff explained that the state law requires periodic reassessment, and future councils could adjust the fee up or down depending on conditions. Miller then recommended indexing the TUF to inflation, similar to the city's storm drain fee, to avoid having the fee's purchasing power erode over time and later requiring a sharp one-time increase. As an example, McMurtry cited Provo, which is now phasing in a 42% TUF increase after years of keeping the fee flat. Overall, this segment framed the TUF as a dedicated, usage-based funding tool designed to systematically improve and then maintain Millcreek's street network at a sustainable condition level.

Mike Winder emphasized the importance of improving and maintaining the city's pavement condition, noting that a PCI in the mid-60s places a roadway network in a vulnerable position where deterioration can accelerate rapidly. He explained that delaying maintenance often results in significantly higher repair costs over time, making proactive preservation the more cost-effective approach. Winder stated that the recommended target PCI of 75 was developed in consultation with industry experts and represents a balance between maintaining roadway conditions and avoiding the diminishing returns associated with pursuing substantially higher pavement ratings. He noted that while achieving a PCI above 75 is possible, doing so would require increasingly greater investment for smaller incremental improvements.

Winder further explained that state law requires periodic evaluation of transportation utility fees and roadway maintenance programs, providing future policymakers with the flexibility to adjust funding levels based on actual conditions and performance. He noted that if the city successfully achieves its PCI goals, future leaders could choose to reduce the fee or maintain current funding levels, while also retaining the option to pursue higher pavement condition targets if desired. He stated that a PCI of 75 is widely recognized by transportation professionals as a practical and cost-effective benchmark that allows communities to preserve roadway infrastructure while avoiding significant long-term deterioration.

McMurtry noted that research indicates pavement should generally receive some form of maintenance treatment approximately every seven years, meaning roadway preservation is an ongoing responsibility rather than a one-time effort. He explained that the city will need to continually assess roadway conditions and prioritize improvements to elevate the condition of its poorest-performing streets while maintaining the overall network. McMurtry also provided a comparison to South Salt Lake's recently revised TUF. He stated that South Salt Lake's residential fee is based on building square footage, at approximately $1.70 to $1.75 per 1,000 square feet, resulting in a monthly fee of about $5.15 for a 3,000-square-foot home. He noted that South Salt Lake also applies a square-footage-based calculation to commercial properties. As an example, he explained that a large commercial property such as REI would be charged approximately $400 per month under South Salt Lake's fee structure, based on its commercial square footage. These examples were provided to help compare Millcreek's proposed fee structure with another nearby municipality's approach.

Council Member DeSirant asked if a visit to a drive through was considered a trip end. McMurtry confirmed.

McMurtry concluded the presentation with a summary of the public outreach and community engagement efforts conducted as part of the TUF study. He explained that the city implemented a comprehensive public information campaign that included newsletter articles, informational flyers, website content, educational videos, and other outreach materials to inform residents about the study and proposed fee structure. In addition, the city hosted three public meetings and a stakeholder workshop to provide information, answer questions, and gather community feedback.

McMurtry noted that the stakeholder workshop included representatives from major businesses and institutions within the community, including the school district, St. Mark's Hospital, Zions Bank, and other organizations. He highlighted comments from a representative of Woodbury Corporation, who expressed support for transportation utility fees based on experiences in other communities and stated that well-maintained roads contribute positively to economic development and business attraction efforts.

Feedback collected through public meetings, emails, and other outreach efforts reflected a range of perspectives. Supporters cited the data-driven nature of the fee structure, the equitable distribution of costs based on roadway use, the potential for improved road conditions and safety, and the opportunity to address maintenance needs proactively before they become more costly. Opponents expressed concerns about the timing of the proposed fee, the financial impact on residents and businesses, the perception of paying both fuel taxes and an additional transportation fee, and potential impacts on fixed-income households. Additional concerns were raised regarding the relationship between electric vehicle use, roadway impacts from development and heavy trucks, and the overall fairness of the fee structure.

McMurtry reported that, based on the feedback received, approximately 50 percent of respondents expressed support for the TUF, approximately 23 percent expressed opposition, and the remaining respondents were neutral or undecided. He also noted that, during the stakeholder workshop, a majority of participating businesses indicated support for the proposal, while a smaller number expressed opposition or stated that they needed additional information before forming a position. To illustrate the range of public opinion, McMurtry shared representative comments received during the outreach process. These comments reflected both concerns about imposing a new fee during a period of economic uncertainty and support for establishing a sustainable funding source to address roadway maintenance needs and avoid similar funding challenges in the future.

In response to questions from Councilmember Uipi's online comment regarding the anticipated timeline for improving roadway conditions and the potential impacts of future road construction projects, Miller explained that the goal of the proposed TUF program is to ensure that all 171 miles of city streets receive maintenance attention within a ten-year cycle. He noted that while roadway conditions will continue to deteriorate over time, the dedicated funding source would provide a consistent mechanism to address both current maintenance needs and ongoing preservation efforts necessary to maintain the city's target PCI.

Addressing concerns about road closures, Miller explained that most pavement preservation treatments, such as slurry seals and microsurfacing, can typically be completed within one to two days on a given roadway segment. More extensive treatments, including mill and overlay projects, may require approximately one week to complete. He noted that full roadway reconstruction projects, which will be necessary for some severely deteriorated streets, involve significantly longer timelines. Similar to recent projects on 900 East, 1300 East, and the ongoing work on 2000 East, reconstruction efforts can require several months of construction, in addition to a one- to two-year design and planning process.

Miller discussed the proposed residential TUF of approximately $7.65 per month and suggested incorporating an automatic annual inflationary adjustment similar to the mechanism currently used for the city's stormwater utility fee. He explained that inflation gradually reduces the purchasing power of a fixed fee, limiting the city's ability to maintain consistent levels of roadway maintenance over time. Miller noted that roadway preservation costs are heavily influenced by petroleum-based materials and fuel prices, which can fluctuate significantly and often increase faster than general inflation. He indicated that an annual adjustment of approximately 2 to 2.5 percent would help preserve the long-term effectiveness of the fee and maintain purchasing power between the required five- and ten-year program evaluations. Miller stated that, if directed by the council, he would recommend adopting a similar inflationary adjustment structure for the TUF to ensure the program remains financially sustainable over time.

Council Member Handy asked about the administration cost with Rocky Mountain Power. Miller said it would be $7-8,000 a month; it is based on population. Mayor Jackson noted it was cost-effective to have Rocky Mountain Power do the work than hire city personnel to do it.

Council Member DeSirant asked whether new TUF revenue would simply flow through the city's existing contract with Salt Lake County Public Works or be used with other contractors. Miller responded that some of the money could go to the county, but emphasized that, under state law, TUF revenue must be "above and beyond" what the city is already spending on roads; it cannot replace existing funding. He notes the council has, for the past two years, added about $1 million from strong sales tax revenues to the public works budget as a one-time supplement, and such one-time additions do not have to be counted as part of the base. McMurtry then clarified HB 425: the statute requires that on the date the TUF is adopted, whatever the city is already spending on streets (e.g., B&C road funds and any ongoing general fund contributions) becomes the baseline, and TUF revenue must be in addition to that baseline—not a substitute. The law also references a 10-year horizon as the planning standard for evaluating and reporting on the fee, though the mayor notes the city is free to reassess and adjust more frequently than that; the 10 years is a state requirement for formal review, not a limit on local oversight.

Winder read in state code that a transportation utility fee is defined as a fee imposed on the public at large to generate revenue to pay for costs associated with developing, constructing, maintaining, operating, repairing, upgrading, or replacing a transportation system, or any component of a transportation system, and that defines transportation system means traffic and pedestrian safety infrastructure, including a sidewalk, curb and gutter, a safety feature, a traffic sign, a traffic signal, or street lighting, and streets, alleys, roads, highways, and thoroughfares of any kind, including connected structures. He noted it would help with the city's traffic pedestrian safety goals.

In response to a follow-up question from Councilmember Uipi regarding the potential impact of deferring the proposed inflationary adjustment for one, two, or three years, Miller explained that delaying the adjustment would reduce the purchasing power of the TUF and result in less roadway maintenance work being completed than anticipated in the plan. It was noted that, if inflation were approximately 2.5 percent annually and the adjustments were deferred for three years, the city would have roughly 7.5 percent less purchasing power for planned maintenance activities by the third year.

McMurtry provided Provo as an example of a municipality with a flat transportation utility fee that remained unchanged for several years. He explained that Provo eventually needed to approve a significant increase to restore the fee's purchasing power, ultimately adopting a series of three annual increases of approximately 14 percent each to reach an overall increase of about 42 percent. He noted that smaller annual adjustments, such as a 2 to 2.5 percent increase, would help avoid the need for larger catch-up increases in the future. Staff estimated that a 2.5 percent increase on a $7.65 monthly residential fee would amount to approximately 19 cents per month.

Miller further explained that the city's stormwater utility fee includes an inflationary adjustment, which has helped the city maintain its planned project schedule despite annual increases in construction costs. He noted that this adjustment has allowed the city to keep projects moving forward rather than cutting or delaying them due to inflation. As an example, he referenced the Scott Avenue Park area sidewalk, curb, and gutter project, which had been planned for many years and was able to move forward because the stormwater program's inflationary adjustment helped preserve funding capacity. Miller stated that without such adjustments, projects that are needed but less urgent are often the first to be deferred or removed from the work plan.

3.2 Review of the Transportation Utility Fee Report; Public Works Department
This item was encompassed in the discussion of item 3.1.

3.3 Public Hearing on the Transportation Utility Fee Report

Council Member DeSirant moved to open the public hearing. Council Member Handy seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Linda Zenger expressed interest in the city exploring the use of available funding to improve sidewalk infrastructure and pedestrian safety. Zenger described several locations in Millcreek where sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings are lacking, particularly along routes used by students traveling to Rosecrest Elementary School and Canyon Rim Academy, as well as areas near 3300 South and surrounding neighborhoods. Concerns were raised regarding the absence of sidewalks and marked crosswalks along key school routes, which Zenger stated creates unsafe walking conditions for children and residents and limits safe access to nearby schools and community facilities. Zenger also noted that limited pedestrian infrastructure along 3300 South makes walking difficult and unsafe in certain areas. In response, it was noted that the referenced funding sources may be eligible for sidewalk improvements, and appreciation was expressed for the public comment.

Sheryl Martin inquired about jurisdiction and maintenance responsibility for a section of 3300 South near Elgin Avenue and Richmond Street, specifically regarding deteriorated sidewalk conditions and temporary safety markings in the area. Martin asked whether Millcreek City, Salt Lake City, or another entity is responsible for ownership and maintenance of the roadway and adjacent infrastructure. The mayor responded that jurisdictional responsibility in the area is complex and may involve coordination between municipalities and noted that the issue is routinely evaluated in the context of maintenance activities such as snow removal. The mayor indicated that the City Attorney's Office handles intergovernmental agreements and jurisdictional determinations and would be the appropriate point of contact for formal clarification. Martin also raised additional safety concerns regarding pedestrian access, including stairway conditions and the potential need for safety improvements such as handrails.

Christian Larsen provided comments in support of the proposed transportation funding measure and commended the Public Works Department for its ongoing efforts to address roadway maintenance issues, including pothole repairs. Larsen noted that while experiences vary among residents, transportation-related concerns such as road conditions, traffic speeds, and safety improvements are frequently raised during Planning Commission meetings. Larsen expressed strong support for the proposed funding approach, stating that it represents an equitable solution by ensuring that commercial and public users contribute to transportation improvements. It was further noted that dedicating the fund exclusively to transportation-related purposes provides transparency and aligns contributions directly with roadway maintenance and improvement needs. Larsen concluded by expressing personal and household support for the proposal and urged its approval.

Linda Milne commented on the city's use of Rocky Mountain Power for fee collection services, seeking clarification on whether this represented the second such fee being collected through the utility. Milne suggested that, over time, it may be more cost-effective for the city to bring collection services in-house and expressed that direct City administration would improve ease of interaction and customer service for residents and businesses. Milne also commended city leadership and staff for responsiveness and communication, noting positive prior interactions with elected officials and staff. In addition, the commenter encouraged the Council to consider internalizing additional administrative functions where feasible to enhance efficiency and resident experience. Milne concluded by requesting information regarding how other municipalities, specifically South Salt Lake, determined their methodology for calculating fees based on square footage rather than trip-based structures, and suggested the consultant provide further explanation following public comment.

Andrei Tarassov provided comments regarding the proposed fee structure and its potential fiscal and economic impacts. Tarassov acknowledged the potential for significant revenue generation for the city but raised concerns regarding the cost of administering the program, including the possibility of duplicative payments to Rocky Mountain Power, and suggested that in-house administration may be more cost-effective. Tarassov also expressed concern about the distinction between taxes and fees, noting potential impacts on taxpayers who itemize deductions and may rely on property tax deductions related to high property taxes or medical expenses, while fees are not deductible in the same manner. Tarassov further raised concerns about the proposed fee schedule's impact on businesses, suggesting that similar fee structures in other jurisdictions have contributed to business relocation discussions. Tarassov questioned how business activity and customer generation are measured under the proposed framework and expressed concern that the structure could unintentionally penalize businesses that attract customers from outside the city. Tarassov noted that local businesses serve regional clientele who contribute to local sales tax revenue and encouraged the Council to consider these economic dynamics in evaluating the proposal.

Elyse Sullivan read an online comment submitted from Andrew Gruber, *"I support the Transportation Utility fee. Keeping our roads and transportation system in good condition is a fundamental and important function of city government. Doing preventive maintenance to keep the roads from falling into disrepair is cheaper and safer in the long run. The city did a full analysis of costs, and is tying the fee to the needs. It's targeted. It's broad-based, paid by all property owners, so the fee can be reasonably low. The city* *has been very communicative and transparent throughout the process, sending out and posting information and holding multiple open houses. This is how government is supposed to work. Thank you, and I'm sorry I was not able to attend in person."*

Council Member DeSirant moved to close the public hearing. Council Member Catten seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Thomas McMurtry explained that jurisdictions use different methodologies for calculating transportation-related fees, often based on trip generation data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. He noted that some cities apply a straightforward rate per 1,000 square feet of commercial space or per equivalent residential unit (ERU), requiring staff to calculate fees individually for each property based on standardized trip generation factors. McMurtry explained that other cities, including South Salt Lake, utilize this more direct rate-based approach, which requires ongoing calculations for each property and business, including existing uses.

McMurtry further stated that the city's approach differs in that staff have already completed a comprehensive analysis of all properties, applying trip generation rates to existing square footage across the city to establish a more uniform and pre-calculated fee structure. As an example, he referenced a 30,000-square-foot retail property and noted that the city's methodology applies standardized calculations across all similar properties in advance, rather than requiring case-by-case determinations. McMurtry concluded that jurisdictions which do not complete this upfront analytical work place a greater administrative burden on staff over time, whereas the city's approach incorporates these calculations into the initial study for greater efficiency and consistency.

Mayor Jackson asked about a formal appeals process for businesses or residents who believe their transportation-related fee was incorrectly calculated or disproportionate to their actual use and assessment for multi-family housing.

McMurtry confirmed that an appeals mechanism is required and would be included, consistent with state legislation, to allow for review of both hardship cases and potential reclassification requests. It was noted that various municipalities implement different appeal processes, including application-based reviews such as those used in Provo, and that staff have been coordinating with city personnel to develop appropriate procedures. In certain cases, property owners may request to fund a third-party study to demonstrate that their classification or trip generation assumptions are inaccurate, though the burden of proof would rest with the applicant. McMurtry confirmed that each residential unit, including single-family homes, condominiums, and individual apartment units, would be assessed a flat residential fee. It was further explained that this approach is consistent with practices in many jurisdictions, where a uniform fee is applied per residential unit, regardless of housing type, to maintain consistency and administrative efficiency.

3.4 Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 26-13, Revising the Audit Committee Guidelines to Assist in the Oversight of the Internal and External Audit Functions of Millcreek

Lisa Dudley presented proposed updates to the city's Audit Committee resolution in advance of the annual fraud risk assessment, noting that one evaluation criterion is whether the city maintains an internal audit function supported by an audit committee consistent with best practices from the Government Finance Officers Association and the State Auditor's Office. She explained that the existing Audit Committee was established by resolution in 2020 and that the proposed revisions primarily refine membership structure, clarify duties, and improve alignment with current practice.

Dudley highlighted that the Audit Committee is a five-member body consisting of two city council members, the City Manager, the City Attorney, and the Finance Director, and recommended clarifying that one of the council members serving on the committee should be the City Treasurer, consistent with historical practice and financial oversight responsibilities. She also proposed clarifying language related to internal controls, specifically emphasizing separation of duties, and noted minor wording updates throughout the membership and responsibility sections.

Regarding committee operations, Dudley stated that the committee's role has expanded in recent years beyond receiving the annual external audit to also include audit engagement discussions and review of additional audits such as stormwater, workers' compensation, and retirement system audits. She proposed formalizing expectations for quarterly meetings, which would better align with existing budget amendment cycles and other financial reporting needs. She further noted that while the resolution requires formal agendas and minutes, this requirement has not been consistently implemented in practice and would be addressed moving forward.

Dudley also recommended updating reporting requirements to ensure committee activities are reported to the city council following each meeting, rather than solely on an annual basis, and adding language to include reporting on audits conducted by other regulatory agencies. Finally, she proposed modifying the requirement for annual review of the Audit Committee guidelines to a periodic review, unless changes in legislation or personnel necessitate more frequent updates, in order to improve efficiency while maintaining oversight.

Mayor Jackson appreciated the changes. Dudley noted that the original Audit Committee resolution required the two elected body representatives to be replaced annually. She explained that this provision has been removed in the proposed revision, as the city does not annually rotate the Treasurer, and maintaining that role on the committee is important for continuity in financial oversight. Dudley further expressed concern that frequent turnover of committee members could reduce institutional knowledge and diminish the effectiveness of the committee, particularly given that members often require time to become familiar with audit processes and reporting. She stated that while rotation of membership is generally appropriate, annual changes to elected representation on the committee may be excessive and could negatively impact continuity and the committee's overall effectiveness.

Council Member DeSirant moved to approve Resolution 26-13, Revising the Audit Committee Guidelines to Assist in the Oversight of the Internal and External Audit Functions of Millcreek. Council Member Catten seconded. The Recorder called for the

vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3.5 Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 26-14, Approving an Interlocal Cooperative Agreement with the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands to Cooperatively Discharge their Joint Responsibilities for Protecting Non-Federal Land from Wildland Fire

John Brems explained that the item is a state-requested interlocal agreement clarifying responsibility for fire protection services. He noted that while the Unified Fire Authority (UFA) provides firefighting services under contract, the state has determined that the city retains the formal responsibility for ensuring those services are provided. Brems stated that although UFA has historically executed the agreement, the interlocal now appropriately reflects the city's responsibility in alignment with the state's determination, while still recognizing UFA as the contracted service provider.

Council Member Catten moved to approve Resolution 26-14, Approving an Interlocal Cooperative Agreement with the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands to Cooperatively Discharge their Joint Responsibilities for Protecting Non-Federal Land from Wildland Fire. Council Member Handy seconded. The Recorder called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3.6 Discussion and Consideration of Ordinance 26-39, Regulating the Use of Municipal Pickleball Courts; Prohibiting Non-Pickleball Activities, Including Soccer and the Use of Wheeled Vehicles; and Providing for Enforcement

Mayor Jackson introduced item 3.6, a proposed ordinance regulating the use of municipal pickleball courts. She explained that the ordinance was prompted by instances of inappropriate use of the courts, including soccer practice activities that have resulted in balls striking pickleball nets, as well as bicycles and scooters being ridden on the courts, which could damage the playing surfaces and associated equipment. She noted that such activities may lead to increased maintenance costs for taxpayers and reduce the intended recreational use of the facilities.

Mayor Jackson stated that the ordinance is intended to provide enforceable guidelines so that police and code enforcement personnel have clear authority to address misuse when it occurs, including the ability to request that individuals cease prohibited activities or leave the area. She added that while the intent is for users to exercise common sense, the ordinance is necessary to protect public facilities and ensure they remain available for their intended recreational purpose.

John Brems said the enforcement is asking people to leave or a civil penalty of $300 with joint liability on the parents/guardians.

Council Member DeSirant moved to approve Ordinance 26-39, Regulating the Use of Municipal Pickleball Courts; Prohibiting Non-Pickleball Activities, Including Soccer and the Use of Wheeled Vehicles; and Providing for Enforcement. Council Member Handy

seconded. The Recorder called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3.8 Discussion and Consideration of Ordinance 26-40, Approving the Disposition of Certain Surplus Public Property

Lisa Dudley reported that the council packet included an updated list of additional items identified as surplus property, including a drone that is no longer usable due to its components. She also provided an update on previously approved surplus items, noting that all items from the prior list have been sold with the exception of a refrigerator previously used in the coffee house area. Dudley stated that surplus items are being sold through a public auction platform, which manages sales tax collection and remittance, resulting in streamlined processing for the city.

Dudley explained that the item before the council is a resolution seeking approval to formally declare the newly identified items as surplus, allowing them to be listed for sale through the same auction process. Dudley noted that the surplus program continues to help reduce stored inventory while generating modest revenue for the city.

Council Member Catten moved to approve Ordinance 26-40, Approving the Disposition of Certain Surplus Public Property. Council Member DeSirant seconded. The Recorder called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Financial Matters

4.1 Public Hearing to Consider the City's Fiscal Year 2026-2027 Tentative Budget (Including the FY27 Millcreek Municipal Fee Schedule)

Lisa Dudley provided an update on revisions to the tentative budget since its initial presentation to the council on May 11 and subsequent discussion on May 26. She noted that the current adjustments reflected in the light green column result in a net zero impact to the general fund, including a reallocation within the Community Life program for a public art market initiative and a minor reclassification related to software expenditures, which increased by approximately $500 over the original budgeted amount. Dudley also indicated that additional informational notes were added for programs such as the Promise Program and departmental travel, training, and membership details, without changes to the underlying appropriations.

Dudley further reported that the property tax certification process remained in a preliminary stage at the time of the update, with final certified values expected prior to final budget adoption. She explained that any newly identified growth would reduce the budgetary use of fund balance, which serves as the balancing mechanism in the budget. She noted that staff would provide Council with updated certification information, including comparisons of certified rates and new growth figures once finalized.

Dudley referenced adjustments within CIP, including an additional $50,000 allocation for traffic calming measures requested by council, along with minor updates related to a parking structure line item. She confirmed that the general fund fund balance roll-forward remains unchanged due to the net-zero nature of the adjustments presented.

Mike Winder relayed comments from John Miller regarding the potential use of an additional $50,000 allocation for traffic calming and pedestrian safety improvements. He noted that prior funding over the past several years had been used to replace outdated DFS signage, many of which had exceeded their expected service life of 12 to 15 years. Miller reported that the city has largely completed its signage replacement goals and that new signage installations would focus on additional locations moving forward.

Winder further explained that if additional funding is approved, staff would explore a range of pedestrian safety enhancements, including flashing beacons, curb extensions (bulb-outs), and other crossing improvements. These projects would be evaluated based on site-specific needs and distributed across all four council districts where appropriate. He added that staff would also seek opportunities to leverage external grant funding to maximize the impact of local investments, and that the proposal reflects a broader effort to enhance traffic calming and pedestrian safety throughout the city.

Dudley reminded the council that CIP expenditures must be used for the creation of new assets and not for routine maintenance or repair. She also clarified a budget adjustment related to the parking structure project, noting an additional $10,000 allocation for a pavilion-style awning or canopy to provide weather protection at the sixth level (fifth-floor entry), which is currently exposed to the elements. Dudley stated that, although this adjustment contributes to an overall increase in the budgetary use of fund balance, the CIP fund balance roll-forward indicates that sufficient resources remain available for future capital improvements and asset acquisitions. Mayor Jackson asked about the awning for the parking garage. Winder noted the $10,000 was an estimate. It would be placed on the open air top floor to help keep weather elements off those going in and out of city hall.

Council Member DeSirant moved to open the public hearing. Council Member Catten seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Linda Zenger asked about the use of private donations. Dudley explained that private donations received by the city function similarly to grants in that they are typically restricted to specific programs or purposes designated by the donor. She noted that, unlike intergovernmental grants, which are received from state, federal, or other governmental entities, private contributions often come from organizations such as United Way or local businesses and are frequently designated for specific initiatives, including programs like Promise or recreation-related activities. Dudley stated that when private donations are received, the city records a corresponding revenue budget adjustment and an equal expenditure to ensure proper accounting and transparency in the use of funds. She explained that these contributions are generally expended within the same fiscal year; however, in cases where funds remain unspent at year-end—such as timing differences in program expenditures—the remaining balance is reported as restricted until it is used in accordance with donor intent.

Council Member DeSirant moved to close the public hearing. Council Member Handy seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2 Public Hearing to Consider Adopting the FY27 Municipal Employees Payscale
Lisa Dudley reported that the proposed pay scale for the upcoming fiscal year includes a 3% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), which is informed by prior-year Consumer Price Index (CPI) data. She explained that the COLA adjustment applies across the entire pay scale, increasing the salary ranges for each grade, while the 1.5% merit increase does not alter the pay scale itself and instead applies individually to eligible employees within their existing pay ranges. Dudley further noted that the city's pay structure is based on a range system with minimum and maximum values rather than step-based progression, with the midpoint serving primarily as a hiring reference point.

Winder added that recent CPI data for the 12-month period ending April 2026 reflects an increase of approximately 3.8%, compared to earlier figures used during the budget development process, which were closer to 2.8–2.9%. Dudley stated that the city typically bases COLA decisions on observed CPI trends during the budget preparation period and does not use a multi-year rolling CPI average, noting that the current proposed adjustment remains within an acceptable range based on available data at the time of budget development.

Council Member DeSirant moved to open the public hearing. Council Member Catten seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

There were no comments.

Council Member DeSirant moved to close the public hearing. Council Member Handy seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4.3 Discussion and Consideration of Ordinance 26-37, Enacting a New Compensation Schedule/Payscale for Executive Municipal Officers and Statutory Employees for Fiscal Year 2026-27

Council Member DeSirant moved to approve Ordinance 26-37, Enacting a New Compensation Schedule/Payscale for Executive Municipal Officers and Statutory Employees for Fiscal Year 2026-27. Council Member Catten seconded. The Recorder called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4.4 Public Hearing to Consider Adopting the FY27 Department Directors and Deputy Directors Payscale

Lisa Dudley explained that the pay scale and compensation items are presented separately due to statutory requirements. She noted that the employee pay scale is required under longstanding state statute, while a newer statutory requirement mandates a public hearing and council approval of compensation increases for department directors and deputy directors as part of the budget process. Dudley clarified that this requirement does not require disclosure of exact salaries but does require that compensation increases be publicly noticed and approved.

Dudley further stated that the same general increase structure—consisting of a 3% cost-of-living adjustment and a 1.5% merit component—applies to both employees and applicable management positions, with the exception of the City Attorney, whose compensation is governed by contract rather than W-2 employment status. Dudley noted that the City Attorney's adjustment differed from the standard structure in prior and current years, reflecting contractual terms rather than the standard COLA and merit framework applied to other positions.

Council Member Handy moved to open the public hearing. Council Member DeSirant seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

There were no comments.

Council Member DeSirant moved to close the public hearing. Council Member Catten seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4.5 Discussion and Consideration of Ordinance 26-38, Adopting an Increase for Executive Municipal Officers and Their Chief Assistant(s) or Deputies for Fiscal Year 2026-27

Council Member DeSirant moved to approve Ordinance 26-38, Adopting an Increase for Executive Municipal Officers and Their Chief Assistant(s) or Deputies for Fiscal Year 2026-27. Council Member Handy seconded. The Recorder called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Reports

5.1 Mayor's Report

Mayor Jackson provided an update on several ongoing initiatives, including the city's Arts and Culture Master Plan, noting that work is underway with the project consultant and that recent community engagement at the Venture Out Festival has been positive. She highlighted that the Venture Out series is in its 20th year and expressed appreciation for staff leadership in sustaining the program over time. The mayor also stated that an extension has been granted for completion of the Arts and Culture Master Plan to allow additional time for thorough development and implementation. She further reported on discussions with the Recreation Bond Application Board regarding the 10-year ZAP fund bond program, noting that the city did not submit projects for the current application cycle due to eligibility requirements, but that future opportunities may exist for projects such as those associated with Big Cottonwood Regional Park if bond funding is approved. Additionally, she referenced participation in the Tourism, Recreation, Culture, and Convention Board, indicating that the city anticipates pursuing grant opportunities through that program to support local projects and leverage external funding sources to advance community priorities.

5.2 City Council Member Reports
Council Member DeSirant reported attending a grand opening for New Glass Antiques and a Program Design Committee meeting for Utah Renewable Communities.

5.3 Staff Reports
There were none.

6. Consent Agenda

6.1 Approval of May 11, 2026 Work and Regular Meeting Minutes

Council Member DeSirant moved to approve the May 11, 2026 Work and Regular Meeting Minutes. Council Member Catten seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

7. New Items for Subsequent Consideration
There was none.

8. Calendar of Upcoming Meetings
- Historic Preservation Commission Mtg., 6/11/26, 6:00 p.m.
- Planning Commission Mtg., 6/17/26, 5:00 p.m.
- City Council Mtg. 6/22/26 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNED: Council Member DeSirant moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Council Member Catten seconded. Mayor Jackson called for the vote. Council Member Catten voted yes, Council Member DeSirant voted yes, Council Member Handy voted yes, Council Member Uipi voted yes, and Mayor Jackson voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED: ______________________ **Date** July 13, 2026
Cheri Jackson, Mayor

Attest: ______________________
Elyse Sullivan, City Recorder