CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-WORK SESSION
CITY HALL-10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
AUGUST 4, 2026

FINAL

This meeting was preceded by the Local Building Authority meeting.

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 6:18 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Tammy Clayton
Councilmember Suzette Jackson
Councilmember Heidi Smoot
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

EXCUSED: Councilmember Ted Knowlton

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; David Frandsen, Assistant City Manager; Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director; Jon Rueckert, Public Works Director; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Karyn Baxter, City Engineer; Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Wendy Page, City Recorder.

OTHERS PRESENT: Dee Lalliss, Barry Bryson, Samuel Beebe, Zoram Beebe, Ryan Holbrook, Thomas Appiah, residents; Jeanette Harris, Mark Anderson, Zions Public Finance.

1. PRESENTATION OF POSSIBLE BOND REFUNDING OPTIONS FOR EXISTING BONDS

Ken Leetham reported that in 2022 the City borrowed $17 million for the reconstruction of Hatch Park. He commented that at that time interest rates had just increased so the debt was quickly issued with the intent to refinance at a lower interest rate in the future. He continued that while interest rates had not declined substantially that staff and Zions Public Finance had determined it was the right time to refinance. He asked for direction from the City Council as there were several steps, including the adoption of resolutions, that would need to occur prior to refinancing.

Mr. Leetham introduced Mark Anderson and Jeanette Harris with Zions Public Finance. He noted that they had been advising the City for a number of years.

Mark Anderson, Zions Public Finance, shared a presentation which included the purposes of refinancing including economic savings by paying off the existing debt with a lower interest rate for reduced annual payments. He explained that in municipal bonding there was also protected bonds in which refinancing was prohibited for a period of time. He said the bonds for the Wetlands Park and the Golf Course were protected but had a 1.9% interest rate so refinancing those bonds were unlikely. He continued that the Hatch Park bond was placed with the Bank of Utah and did not have call protection so refinancing was available without restrictions.

Mr. Anderson reviewed the Hatch Park bond transaction which occurred in December 2022. He said the City issued $16.692 million in tax exempt bonds to fund the development of the Park. He noted that the bonds had a 25 year term with a true interest cost of 4.82% with annual payments of $1,137,000 per year. He shared that a rule for refinancing was a net present value (NPV) savings of 3% after all costs of issuing the bonds that equal or exceed 3% of the principal amount to be refunded.

Mark Anderson compared the difference in continuing with the existing bond until maturity in 2047 or refinancing now. He noted that the current interest cost was 4.923% and said the reason the rate was higher now was due to each bond maturity having a separate interest rate that increased each year until bond maturity. He shared the estimated bond refunding option summary if the City refinanced based on August 3rd rates:

True interest cost	4.128%
NPV savings	$981,410.72
Average annual payment	$1,068,693.90
Total principal interest	$22,442,571.94
Total cash savings	$1,445,004.06
Annual payment savings	$68,809.72

Mark Anderson then reviewed the steps for the 60 day public refunding process including the adoption of a bond resolution by the Council, preparation and approval of draft Preliminary Official Statement, a bond rating presentation, bond rating received, posting of Preliminary Official Statement with bond rating, competitive bond sale, drafting of bond documents by bond counsel, and the closing of bonds. He added that if interest rates became less favorable the City could stop the process at any time.

Councilmember Jackson commented that the current bond did not have a ten year call and asked if the new bond would also have that option. Mark Anderson replied not in a public market. He said the bond could possibly be shortened by a year or two but would result in a higher interest cost. He explained that investors would be willing to accept a lower interest rate for a longer period.

Councilmember Jackson mentioned that with private loans if interest rates dropped within a certain period of time from the refinance that the loan could be recast to those rates. Mark Anderson replied this was generally not possible in the public market unless you had a large amount of bonds.

Councilmember Jackson asked about locking in the current rate or if the City would have to take whatever rate was available at the end of the 60 day process. Mark Anderson responded that the only way to lock in the rate was through the bond pricing. He explained that the rating presentation, receiving the rating back and posting the official statement was a 30 day process by itself. He continued that if the City had the bond rating in hand and published that then it would be two weeks from being able to lock in interest rates on the bonds. He noted that the bond rating was then good for six months.

Councilmember Jackson commented that with a bond of this size that even a fraction of a percentage would make a significant difference. She asked about rate fluctuation in the public market. Mark Anderson said that in the last few days he had seen downward trends of one and two basis points. He noted that rates and movement varied based on factors like the maturity of the bond, what investors were interested in, and activity in the Iran war.

Councilmember Jackson also asked about market predictions. Mark Anderson commented that the Federal Reserve met last week and there was no change in the overnight lending rate. He said that really only affected the front end of the yield curve for short term investments and said treasuries had more affect on long term investments. He added that the market anticipated a 60 percent likelihood that rates would increase a quarter of a percent at the September Federal Reserve meeting.

Councilmember Van Langeveld clarified that the bond pricing to lock in the rate would occur in approximately 30 days. She asked if the parameters resolution would include interest rate thresholds. Mark Anderson replied that it would take longer than that and said the first step was to have the Council adopt a parameters resolution followed by drafting the official statement to then seek a bond rating. He explained that the parameters resolution would include the maximum years the bond would be issued for, the maximum interest rates, the maximum discount at which the bond would be sold, and the maximum par amount.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked what the interest rate threshold would be and at what point it would no longer be advantageous for the City to refinance. Mark Anderson said it was based on the City's preference as to what would be an acceptable amount of savings. He said the ability to call the bonds also had value and to not discard this without thought.

Councilmember Van Langeveld noted the volatility in the last year related to interest rates and that there would be additional information in November, related to the mid-term elections, that might change what interest rates looked like.

Councilmember Smoot mentioned that the total cash savings of $1.4 million was over the life of the bond or approximately $70,000 per year until 2047. She asked about the cost to go through the refunding process including closing costs or similar. Mark Anderson replied the estimated cost of the issuance for bond council, Zion's services, trustees, and the rating agency was $115,000. He added there was also an underwriting fee that varied from $2-$8 a bond. He noted that the goal was to look for the lowest combination of interest rates and underwriting fees being offered. He said that the $1.4 million was the cash savings over the life of the loan and the net present value (NPV) was $981,000 in today's dollars.

Councilmember Jackson commented if the City obtained the 4.128% rate that it would take two years of savings to pay off the costs that were mentioned. Mark Anderson replied that the savings were calculated after paying the cost of issuance.

Councilmember Jackson then asked if there were other reasons to pursue this refinance beyond lower rates right now. She mentioned that having the lack of a call restriction was valuable and potential rate drops in several years. Ken Leetham replied that staff reviewed refinancing the bond and asked these same questions. He continued that they had observed instances where the City could have saved more and found the trend was going in the wrong direction each year the bond was not refunded. He said the opportunities to recoup those funds decreased each year.

Ken Leetham added that reducing the annual payment had some benefits today even if it was less than one year ago. He also anticipated that the interest rate and savings would be more if the City did a refunding now than it would be if the City waited two or three years. He said it would not be the wrong decision to refund the bond now or to pass on it. He commented on the statement that things may be different at the end of the year, stating it was possible to go through the 60 day process incurring some costs and decide later if the City should proceed or not at that point.

Mayor Horrocks asked if interest rates jumped dramatically if the City would still pay the preparation fees. Mark Anderson replied that the parameters resolution and bond council allowed for one year before the bonds were issued. He continued that there was no cost to adopt a parameters resolution. He recommended if the City Council wanted to consider refunding the bond that they should move forward with adopting the parameters resolution.

Mayor Horrocks commented that there was a feeling of being too late if the City Council waited until the next meeting to adopt the resolution. Mark Anderson said the process could be accelerated with quicker efforts through Zions, the bond council, and City staff. He confirmed that the parameters resolution could be reviewed at the next City Council meeting in two weeks.

Councilmember Van Langeveld was in support of refunding and said the decision was the timing for the interest rate and not whether to do it. Councilmember Jackson was in agreement.

Councilmember Jackson asked what was needed to move forward. Ken Leetham replied that staff would plan for a parameters resolution at the next City Council meeting in two weeks.

2. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 6:56 p.m. to begin the regular session.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-REGULAR SESSION
CITY HALL-10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
AUGUST 4, 2026

FINAL

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 7:09 p.m. Zoram Beebe provided an invocation and Suzette Jackson led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Tammy Clayton
Councilmember Suzette Jackson
Councilmember Heidi Smoot
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

EXCUSED: Councilmember Ted Knowlton

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; David Frandsen, Assistant City Manager; Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director; Jon Rueckert, Public Works Director; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Karyn Baxter, City Engineer; Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Wendy Page, City Recorder.

OTHERS PRESENT: Dee Lalliss, Barry Bryson, Samuel Beebe, Zoram Beebe, Ryan Holbrook, Thomas Appiah, residents.

1. CITIZEN COMMENT

Thomas Appiah, resident, shared that he had attended an international conference related to sister cities. He spoke on representatives from different countries proudly proclaiming their connections in different parts of the world. He noted that President Eisenhower had established Sister Cities International in 1956 to allow communities to be friends and exchange culture, ideas, and thoughts.

An anonymous individual commented that three months ago he had presented a statement to the Council addressing the use of automated license plate reader cameras (ALPRs) and said they violated privacy and civil rights of everyone who lived or entered into the City. He continued that the City has taken no action on this despite the information provided related to the potential for theft and abuse of ALPR data. He spoke on several large scale data hacks including, Instructure Inc., which was a Utah based company and instances where ALPR data was used to wrongfully identify vehicles. He urged the City Council to consider the violation of individual civil rights when collecting/retaining ALPR data and to remove all ALPR cameras and cancel contracts with Flock, Motorola, etc.

Mayor Horrocks commented that everyone had some type of mobile device and that NSA (National Security Agency) would continue to monitor and were much more nefarious than the City's police department.

Councilmember Smoot mentioned reading an article about a woman who was unfairly charged because a camera took a picture of her license plate. She said the issue was that it placed the burden on the individual who was then financially responsible for legal bills as well as criminal liability. She continued that the burden was then in proving your innocence rather than presumed innocence until proven guilty. She was not in support of the cameras and asked to revisit this item.

Mayor Horrocks noted that in his 20 years on the City Council that every time there was an issue between the City and a resident the City worked to make the resident whole. He continued that the County, the State, and the federal government would continue to utilize cameras/technology.

Councilmember Smoot commented that the City would handle it well but spoke on the instances if the data was used to prosecute those outside of the City. Councilmember Van Langeveld was also in favor of addressing this as a future agenda item.

Councilmember Jackson requested information related to how many cameras, who was being monitored, how long the information was stored, where it was stored, and what was done with the information being given, etc.

Barry Bryson, resident, commented that he had noticed Elm Street was closed due to receiving a slurry seal and commented that it had been 15 years since Odell Lane had received a similar treatment. He said that while staff had informed him that Odell Lane was on the schedule for treatment in eight years that the current condition of the road was poor due to construction. He also mentioned the poor condition of Orchard Drive and how road maintenance was a basic city service that should be performed.

Ken Leetham commented that staff could follow up with Barry Bryson.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked what was wrong with Odell Lane. Barry Bryson replied that it was falling apart with cracks. He said the road was torn up due to construction and Google

Fiber installed in the road and then just left as is. He also added that Odell Lane was unsafe due to the narrowness of the road and the need for improvement there.

2. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:
   a. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

The City Council minutes of July 21, 2026 were reviewed and approved as written.

   b. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2026-31R: A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN DAVIS COUNTY CITIES AND DAVIS COUNTY FOR UPDES GENERAL PERMIT

A resolution for an interlocal cooperation agreement between Davis County cities and Davis County for UPDES General Permit was approved.

   c. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2026-32R: A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AMENDED WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE MAP

Councilmember Jackson asked if this was the same map the City Council reviewed four weeks ago. Ken Leetham presented the original map and the new map, which was discussed a month ago.

Councilmember Jackson thanked staff for making the map as favorable to residents as possible.

Councilmember Smoot also thanked staff for the adjustment which was more logical. She asked about the inclusion of four homes on Eaglewood Loop, and adjacent to the golf course, into this WUI map. Ken Leetham clarified that the updated map did not include those properties and was the map that the resolution would adopt.

Councilmember Smoot added that the president, Kate Bradshaw, of the League of Cities and Towns had mentioned that cities would be allowed to adopt their own map but would have to apply to receive approval. Ken Leetham said the City had submitted this map with a cooperation agreement with the State with anticipated acceptance of the agreement unless otherwise notified.

Sherrie Pace added that the State statute was written so that any property that had a smooth score of four or less would not be included without approval from the State.

A resolution approving an amended Wildland Urban Interface map was approved.

d. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2026-33R: A RESOLUTION DECLARING A POLICE DEPARTMENT FIREARM AS SURPLUS PROPERTY AND AUTHORIZING ITS TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP TO AN OFFICER RETIRING IN GOOD STANDING

A resolution declaring a police department firearm as surplus property and authorizing its transfer of ownership was approved.

e. APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 2026-34R: A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE TRANSFER OF UDOT PROPERTY ON OVERLAND DRIVE TO THE CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

Mayor Horrocks requested a review of the transfer of UDOT property on Overland Drive to the City. Karyn Baxter replied that there had been previous transfers of property for Overland Drive. She explained that this section was in between two parcels that the City had already accepted. She said part of the UDOT widening had caused Overland Drive to be relocated slightly west and as a result UDOT would rebuild the entire road. She clarified that the parcels directly south and north had already been transferred to the City and that this property was the middle piece.

A resolution accepting of the transfer of UDOT property on Overland Drive to the City was approved.

Councilmember Van Langeveld moved to approve the consent agenda as presented in the packet. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Smoot, and Van Langeveld. Councilmember Knowlton was excused and not present for the vote.

3. UPDATE ON CONSIDERING ADDRESS CHANGES FOR VARIOUS PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY

Sherrie Pace reported that the City Council had tasked staff with creating a committee to review address changes in the annexation area and any addresses in the City with a Bountiful address. She shared a map highlighting 350 residential and 15 business properties which currently utilized a Bountiful address but were located within the municipal boundaries of the City. She continued that the majority of these properties became part of the City during the 2022 annexation. She proposed a nine member readdressing committee including one City Councilmember, the Community Development Director, the Police Chief or designee, the Fire Chief or designee, the Public Works Director or designee, two business owners from the area, and two neighborhood representatives.

Ms. Pace suggested that staff would send out letters of interest for the community representatives who would then be appointed by the Mayor with consent from the Council. She shared the proposed scope of the committee:

- Estimated associated costs
- Develop public communications plan
- Identify potential impacts
- Create owner transition packets
    - How to change the address on your driver license, voter registration, etc.
- Recommendations to the Council
    - Street names
    - Reimbursement for expenses
    - Timeline for implementation

Ms. Pace then reviewed the proposed timeline:

Phase 1

8/4/26	Work session review plan and direct staff
8/24/26	Deadline for letters of interest to serve on the committee
9/1/26	Approve resolution and appoint community representatives • creating committee (limited duration) • define scope

Phase 2

9/9/26 to 10/21/26 Committee meetings (every two weeks, four meetings total)

- Review address changes
- Review street name proposals
- Meet with representatives
    - County Clerk (voter registration)
    - County Recorder (official records)
    - USPS postmaster (address change process)
    - City Communications Manager
    - Assess implementation expenses
- Propose timeline for implementation
- Plan for public feedback

11/4/26 Work session with City Council

- Review recommendations
- Direct committee/public comment period

11/15/26 Open public comment period

Phase 3

1/6/27 Committee meeting

- Review public comments received
- Prepare for open house(s)

1/13/27 Public open house

1/20/27 Committee meeting

- Prepare recommendation for Council

2/2/27 City Council

- Consideration of resolution implementing address changes
- Approve budget for expense reimbursement

Phase 4

February/March

- Update City databases
- Notify external agencies
  - Property owners/tenants (formal notice effective dates)
  - USPS
  - EMS (911)
  - County/State (voter registration)
  - Utility providers
  - Private logistics (Google maps, Apple maps, FedEx, UPS)

Phase 5

April/May

- Issue official notices
- Provide transition packets to property owners
- Record address affidavits
- Install new street signs
- Run 90 day dual address system

Mayor Horrocks asked about the estimated cost and if this referred to residents and business or the City. He asked if it was expected that house numbers would change. Sherrie Pace replied that she would like the committee to review both. She said the anticipated cost to the City was minimal including updating databases and changing street signs. She responded that house numbers would change to coordinate with the City's addressing system.

Mayor Horrocks noted that there had been one election since the annexation and it was assumed that the County mailed those residents ballots for North Salt Lake. Councilmember Van Langeveld commented that she had the opportunity to speak with residents there and confirmed they received North Salt Lake ballots.

Councilmember Jackson asked if public comment could be received at the very beginning of the process as well. She said while she was campaigning, residents were very adamant about not wanting to change their address. She spoke on hearing the reasoning and suggestions from residents. Sherrie Pace said the plan was structured like this so the public comment would not be whether the residents wanted or did not want to change their address but instead to ask how this was going to affect them. She continued that this would help the committee and Council in determining reimbursement or how the address change would work with USPS or FedEx, etc.

Sherrie Pace added that the City Council could guide the direction of the committee and also determine whether it would be too big of an impact to change the addresses. She spoke on making a determination based on the perspective of actual impacts and benefits and not necessarily if the citizens liked or disliked the address change.

Councilmember Clayton commented on similar comments made while she was campaigning including a resident petition. She spoke on sharing the phases and showing the reasoning behind the process. Sherrie Pace said there could be an open public comment period at the beginning to allow residents to submit issues attributed to the change so the committee could address those items.

Councilmember Jackson was in favor of public comment at the beginning of the process as well. She spoke on the importance of being heard and understanding the resident concerns right at the beginning. Sherrie Pace asked about an open ended public comment period or a door to door survey.

Councilmember Van Langeveld suggested an agenda item for the September 1st City Council meeting for public comment on the proposed plan for address implementation.

Mayor Horrocks provided context and said that the County approached him five years ago because they were done offering services to the unincorporated areas and how these residents were already using the City's facilities (parks, etc.). He continued that these residents would show that their driver licenses had a Bountiful address but those properties were not part of Bountiful City's annexation plan. He said there had since been confusion in the last five years when new residents moved in and thought they were part of Bountiful.

Councilmember Smoot asked why the existing house number could not be utilized with the addition of North Salt Lake as the City. Ken Leetham replied that this would not work with the City's addressing system since the annexation area was on an old County addressing grid.

Councilmember Jackson commented on the turnover in the last five years and the prior public comments. She said there may be a change in consensus on the addressing since the annexation and suggested the City could allow for public comment to gauge the current temperature. She spoke on giving those affected residents a chance to speak. Sherrie Pace spoke on having the public comment on a different date as the September 1st City Council meeting was scheduled to be held in Foxboro.

Ken Leetham added that when the properties were annexed the City did not announce that the addresses would be changed at that time. He continued that the City said they would enter into a process to work on and identify issues such as public safety. He said that while the addresses did not have to be changed that the real problem was that those residents wanted to remain unincorporated and did not want to be annexed into the City. He felt that the sooner the addresses were changed then those residents would no longer be confused about where they belonged.

Sherrie Pace commented that she hoped these residents were pleased with the City services they received and that these services were more timely than those provided by the County. She spoke on the ability for those residents to come into City Hall rather than driving to Farmington for any issues or services. She also mentioned the potential to provide an evaluation on the potential tax change after being annexed into the City. She suggested that staff could prepare a presentation and then allow time for a public hearing during the City Council work session.

Councilmember Clayton commented that she would invite those residents who had expressed it was a positive change to provide comment at the public hearing.

Councilmember Jackson was also in favor of staff sharing a presentation with the perceived advantages prior to the public comment.

Councilmember Van Langeveld spoke on the comprehensive plan and the workload that was part of the proposed address change. She said it was not just land acquisition but helped to show those residents that they were part of the City. She noted that the earlier comment about how the City always went above and beyond to help a citizen that was disadvantaged at the cost of the City to feel whole and supported. She also suggested that the residents in the annexed area should be allowed to name the streets and provide the opportunity to submit suggestions at the open houses.

Councilmember Smoot was also in favor of allowing residents to rename the streets.

Sherrie Pace commented that she also had a list of street name suggestions including prominent residents, historical events, etc. to deter duplication and provide inspiration. She confirmed that a public comment period would be added to the September 15th City Council work session followed by the proposed timeline as presented. She asked if the public comment should occur before the resolution to form the committee was made.

Councilmember Smoot asked if there had to be a resolution to form the committee.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked if there had to be public comment prior to forming the committee. She said if the public comment changed the minds of the Council then the committee could be disbanded.

Councilmember Smoot said the intent of the public comment was not whether the address change should occur or not. She continued that the City necessitated the change and to frame it as how will this impact the residents and what the City could do to help alleviate that.

Councilmember Jackson said the public comment should be held before the committee was established through resolution. She said the public would not feel heard if they felt like the City had already made up its mind to proceed. Sherrie Pace suggested public comment during the work session on September 15th followed by the resolution to form the committee in the regular session. She said any suggestions from the public could then be added to the charter before it was adopted.

Councilmember Van Langeveld was not in favor of waiting to move forward until the City heard from the public. She spoke on making choice and obtaining feedback from the public and then changing direction if there was convincing comments.

Councilmember Smoot noted that having the public comment followed by adoption of the resolution to form the committee would reinforce the negativity and residents would not feel heard. She commented that the City has determined that the address change needed to occur for a myriad of reasons.

Ken Leetham suggested the September 1st meeting at Foxboro HOA be moved to September 15th and then allowing for public comment on September 1st at City Hall.

4. ACTION ITEMS

The action items list was reviewed. Completed items were removed from the list.

5. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Smoot spoke on having a sister city and putting this under the purview of the Arts Committee. She spoke on building community and unity and having a sister city in another country. Councilmember Van Langeveld explained the reason it had not occurred was due to the workload and budget. She spoke on looking into other ways to connect and partner without spending money. She asked about the difference between an action item (staff) and an agenda item (Council policy discussion).

Councilmember Smoot commented that she would look into this item first. Councilmember Jackson said she had the application information and parameters which staff could review prior to making it an agenda item.

Councilmember Smoot noted she could provide bullet point information to determine if it was worth filling out the application. She would bring this back to the City Council when she had further information.

Councilmember Smoot then reported on the Arts Committee meeting on August 3rd and the Night Out on August 6th at Legacy Park. She spoke on the NSL Reads Event and the graphic novel theme for next year. She noted possible locations for the next mural including the Big West Oil round building at the entrance to the City. She added there were backup locations on Highway 89 (former Bird World) and Redwood Road (near Lee's).

Councilmember Smoot said that the Arts Committee also planned to have electrical boxes wrapped and spoke on ideas for the wrap including historic photos. She introduced Arts Committee member Jean Montanaro and encouraging art appreciation and talent in the younger generation.

Jean Montanaro spoke on the idea to create a North Salt Lake school mural program. She continued that this program would create a connection between the City, schools, families, residents, etc. and that people would volunteer their time and abilities to mentor students through the process of creating a mural. She volunteered for the first mural at Orchard Elementary if the school was amenable to the idea. She anticipated the cost for supplies per school would be \$300-\$400. Ms. Montanaro spoke on the benefits including community collaboration, awareness of the City's Arts Committee, beautification, and teaching young people the value of art.

Councilmember Smoot said this was a great way to provide art at a local level. She noted the need for volunteers as some elementary school art teachers may not have the capacity to do what Jean Montanaro could do.

Councilmember Clayton noted that Adelaide Elementary had a mural near the front doors. She was unsure if the mural still existed but said the mural could even be done inside the schools.

Councilmember Smoot spoke on community members investing in schools and the opportunity to plant a seed as arts were being lost in schools.

Councilmember Jackson was in favor of the school mural idea. She spoke on the sister city program and moving forward with a plan. She reported on the North Salt Lake Recreation Center Day and said the estimate was 100 City residents attended that day. She said Recreation Center staff was unsure if that was 100 families or separate individuals.

Councilmember Jackson then asked about the delay and timeline for the Hatch Park remodel. She suggested a public interface on the City's website to address the delays and projected timeline. Ken Leetham replied that there was currently no delay and the current work was underground utility or prepping for the foundation of one of the buildings. He noted there had been a delay due to contaminated soils but noted that the park completion date had moved up. He said project status could be updated on the City's website.

Councilmember Van Langeveld was also in favor of the project status on the website. She added that a brief Hatch Park update could be added to the City Council agenda once a month.

Councilmember Van Langeveld then reported on the upcoming Night Out Against Crime/Back to School/Health and Wellness event on August 6th. She said each of the public schools would have a representative at the event including Bountiful High, Woods Cross High, South Davis Junior, Mueller Park Junior, Adelaide Elementary, Orchard Elementary, and Foxboro Elementary. She said Wasatch and Spectrum Academy were invited but she had not heard back.

Councilmember Van Langeveld then spoke on the process with the Health and Wellness Committee to obtain a grant through Get Healthy Utah. She noted the grant funding would go towards establishing community councils in the City.

Councilmember Clayton reported on the Bountiful July parade and said the Council passed out America 250 swag. She mentioned the community chair, Gentry Holbrook, for the Back to School event had done a lot of work and encouraged the Council to attend.

6. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Todd Godfrey had nothing to report.

7. MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Horrocks reported on the elected officials day on September 26th at South Davis Metro Fire. He continued that the Fire District held a truth in taxation hearing on August 3rd and approved salary increases and a new assistant fire chief position. He then spoke on a mountain lion sighting at the 12th hole on the golf course. He commented on a letter from Big West Oil who had committed to providing $25,000 towards trees for Center Street.

8. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Ken Leetham reported on participating in the Bountiful parade. He then spoke on the curbside green waste pickup and said the Waste Management District would not be expanding their curbside green waste pickup program until 2029 or 2030. He would continue to explore other options.

Mr. Leetham introduced an issue in Davis County related to the fifth transportation sales tax. He said that this issue was in front of the County Commission now and that he had attended a meeting earlier in the day on it. For that reason, he needed to bring it up and inform the City Council on it and would be requesting their feedback. He explained that this transportation sales tax was an authorized tax by the State Legislature. He continued that recent changes allowed counties to adopt a sales tax of 0.20% at the register for every transaction that collected sales tax. He shared how the tax would be divided if the County Commission adopted this change with 0.05% to the cities, 0.10% to UTA, and 0.05% to the County. He added that this breakdown would be for the first three years the tax was imposed.

Ken Leetham then reviewed the distribution formula for counties of the second class which included Davis County. He said the initial distribution would change in 2029. He anticipated that the City would receive approximately $300,000 in revenue if the tax was enacted in Davis County. He spoke on the history of the transportation sales tax and said residents in Davis County currently paid the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarter transportation sales taxes. He explained how the cities could apply for transportation funds through those quarter taxes. Mr. Leetham said the City received 0.25% of the 4th quarter sales tax which was approximately $650,000 per year. He added that the County had the chance to adopt the 5th quarter sales tax of 0.20% which would be added to the City's revenue for transportation. He anticipated that this would result in approximately $1 million in sales tax revenue streams for transportation.

Councilmember Smoot commented that the law had already passed and Davis County was not currently collecting it. Ken Leetham replied affirmatively that Davis County Commission would need to formally adopt the tax before it could be collected.

Councilmember Jackson asked if this raised the sales tax by 0.20% or reallocated it. Ken Leetham responded that it raised the sales tax at the register by 0.20%. He added that the sales tax rate in Davis County was 7.25% and this would raise it to 7.45% if adopted. He noted that only the chair of the County Commission wanted to adopt this tax at the present time.

Ken Leetham commented that he was in favor of adopting this tax and asked the Council for feedback in order to lobby with other cities to encourage the County Commission to adopt this tax. He provided the reasons why the County and cities should adopt the tax including the fact that Weber, Salt Lake, and Utah counties had adopted this tax, the cost of transportation and infrastructure projects (ex: $700,000 annually resurfacing streets), benefits to the City, the Davis/Salt Lake Connector transit project, residents want good roads and transit services, and a negative view of Davis County and all of its cities from the Legislature if the tax is not adopted.

Councilmember Smoot commented that this was the same logic if the City did not adopt the WUI code. She spoke on being tired of being bullied into doing things and how upset the citizens would be if the tax was adopted.

Mayor Horrocks commented that he was conflicted as $300,000 annually would be helpful for transportation projects but also mentioned that the purpose was to fund UTA and the lack of UTA performance in Davis County. He asked about the three year collection period. Ken Leetham replied that the City would continue to collect the 0.05% in perpetuity if it were adopted, but UTA would reallocate their collection after three years.

Mayor Horrocks said that ultimately, due to the reasons listed, that the City should push for implementation.

Councilmember Jackson disapproved of this and preferred a reallocation of funds before raising taxes. She said the County just did a major property tax increase and would rather comb through the budget and reallocate before raising taxes.

Councilmember Smoot was in agreement and spoke on issues at the previous truth in taxation hearing. She then mentioned the property tax notice and said the largest portion went to Davis County School District which she felt was mismanaged.

Councilmember Clayton said while it was not that much of a difference that she would prefer to keep things as they are. Ken Leetham said that a sales tax increase of this kind was much different than a property tax increase. He commented that in our City this may help to put off or reduce a property tax increase in the future. He noted that part of the reason the Legislature had used sales tax to generate transportation dollars was because it only took a half penny per dollar to generate millions for transportation projects.

Ken Leetham added that the City had a need to increase revenues associated with road repairs. He continued that while it may be $300,000 today that in the future it would increase and could be a significant help to the City as it struggles to keep up with maintenance and repair of aging infrastructure.

Mayor Horrocks commented that Front Runner would cost $3 billion and this was one way the City would pay for that. Ken Leetham said the Front Runner double track project was a federal program.

Councilmember Smoot said while everyone else was doing it that the City could take a stand and say enough was enough. She commented that every single tax had a justifiable reason. Ken Leetham replied that the Council should view this as whether it was the right thing for the City. He said the State was well meaning in this case in providing a revenue stream for transportation. He added that the City would get sales tax that would provide the ability to keep roads in great repair and build infrastructure.

Councilmember Smoot asked if transportation funding was an issue in the City. Ken Leetham replied that funding was an issue. He noted that over time the cost to maintain the current level of service would become more difficult. He said aging infrastructure was a challenge in the City including sidewalks, street resurfacing, etc. He explained that eventually the City would need to expand revenues for road maintenance and repair.

Ken Leetham asked the City Council to consider whether this was a good thing for the City or not.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on the needs of government and the benefits to every resident. She also mentioned that residents felt the pressure of costs increasing while incomes went down. She said the Council was in government and represented residents and the conflict that this was an easy lift that would not be felt and could benefit roads/transportation while there was tax exhaustion. She spoke on little increases with property tax, sales tax, the Fire District and determining where the line stopped. She proposed reallocation of funds before an automatic tax increase.

Councilmember Van Langeveld mentioned the sentiment that this was a strong armed version to collect taxes while giving the cities a percentage back. She said the State Legislature was passing these types of tax structures so that they did not have to actually collect the taxes they needed to do their job. She said the State pushed the tax collection onto counties, sales tax, and school districts who then had to raise their taxes. She explained that while she was also frustrated with the State Legislature that this was not the way to push back and was supportive of this item as a way to increase funding while being fiscally conservative.

Councilmember Van Langeveld commented that while she supported implementing the sales tax the question was whether the City should lobby in support. Ken Leetham replied that in the meeting earlier in the day he had asked what input the County Commissioners needed to make this decision. He said the answer was communication of support or providing a clear statement on the City's position. He continued that the City could take a position including being quiet or opposing it.

Councilmember Jackson commented that the answer could be that the City Council was split.

Councilmember Smoot said she could think of one project that could be canceled to pay towards any shortages. Ken Leetham commented that this would help staff in preparing budget proposals.

Mayor Horrocks mentioned that one County Commissioner ran on the campaign of no new taxes. He said every elected official had to weigh the question of whether to increase revenues or cut services. He noted that at some point deferred maintenance became more expensive, that costs would increase, and that revenues did not necessarily follow.

Councilmember Jackson said one of the fastest growing industries in Utah was government. She mentioned one of the cuts was administrative overhead and said inflation was real but was something to consider as salaries and the number of employees increased.

Councilmember Van Langeveld commented that it was bad to vote no without having a solution to solve the problem. She appreciated that staff had offered a concrete suggestion.

Councilmember Smoot said making cuts was the equivalent of giving a suggestion. She gave the example of slashing employees in the private sector during COVID and said in times of recession that the government did not start cutting back. She noted that when a public servant voted no and said here is where we can cut back that this was a great policy.

Councilmember Smoot noted this was not personal and thanked Ken Leetham for his efforts. Ken Leetham replied that the way to look at this was complex and noted it came about because Weber County adopted this fee which set things into motion including putting pressure on Davis County to make a decision.

9. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 9:28 p.m.

The foregoing was approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday August 18, 2026 by unanimous vote of all members present.

Brian J. Horrocks, Mayor

Wendy Page, City Recorder

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CORPORATE
SEAL
1946
STATE OF UTAH